

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

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 4, 2012

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman; Peter Rice, Deputy Director, Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Steve Dubois, Police Chief; Corey MacDonald, Deputy Police Chief; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Two Way Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **120 Spaulding Turnpike**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of an existing building, retrofitting of an existing building for auto reconditioning, expanding the dealership parking and display area, and reconstructing the right-in/right-out access from the turnpike, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 236 as Lots 33, 37 and 38 (which lots have been voluntarily consolidated) and lie within the General Business (GB) District and Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the July 31, 2012 TAC Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Taintor indicated that the Planning Department had received a request from the applicant to postpone this matter to the next TAC meeting.

Police Chief Dubois made a motion to postpone to the October 2, 2012 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **High Liner Foods (USA), Inc., Owner**, for property located at **1 Highliner Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a 4,524 s.f. 28' high addition to the rear of the existing building, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 259 as Lot 14 and lies within the Industrial (I) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bill Turner, of the Stella Group, was present with Mark Fischer of HighLiner Foods. Mr. Turner confirmed that they addressed the issues brought up at last week's TAC Work Session. They distributed revised plans to the Committee.

Mr. Turner stated that the Existing Conditions plan was clarified to show where the public sewer connected into Borthwick Avenue. They also cleaned up a lot of the lines where the truck dock and access area was. They still show where the existing sewer line comes around the south side of the plant. They show where the addition is located but do not show any changes to that area which helps clarify the impact of the new addition to the existing conditions on the southwest corner.

Mr. Turner displayed a proposed plan showing the impact the building will have on the access roadway to the water tower which they will be totally closing off. The new access will come down the paved area which goes out to Borthwick Avenue and goes around the trees. Since the road is currently locked and gated they are not installing a new lock and gate up by the water facility. They are installing a new manhole south of the addition and re-routing the sewer line around the building with a 5' from the edge of the building. This is currently a paved area where they still store pieces of equipment and they will be maintained during and after the project. It will be very difficult to see this building from the road when it is completed.

Mr. Desfosses asked what the use of the new addition will be. Mr. Turner stated it will be a maintenance area. They currently have to do a lot of equipment change-outs due to all of the different products that they make. There will not be any employees added as a result of the addition.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they did any calculations on the sewer to make sure they could extend the length without violating the sewer pipe slopes. Mr. Turner responded that they did do any calculations on the sewers. They evaluated for the slopes and took the depths of the manholes and he did not believe there would be any issues with the slopes of the pipes as they got to the connections. They are not adding any flow to the pipes. Mr. Desfosses indicated that they would usually see this type of data on the plans. Mr. Taintor confirmed that they were looking for inverts and slopes. Mr. Desfosses added that he would also like to see manhole details. There is a lot of groundwater in this area so they would be very interested in their manhole details because of groundwater infiltration which would ultimately get into their sewer collection system. Mr. Turner responded that they usually submit those details when they submit the final drawings submitted for permits. Mr. Desfosses stated that's what this is.

Mr. Taintor asked about issues about the sidewalk construction. The plan just says it is a sidewalk. Mr. Desfosses was not too concerned as it was an on site sidewalk. He asked if it would be handicapped accessible. Mr. Turner stated there is no handicapped accessibility in this section of the building. Mr. Desfosses was only asking because last year Highliner Foods built a sidewalk out to the road and it was built as non-conforming and not handicapped accessible.

Mr. Rice asked if they would be making those sidewalks handicapped accessible based on the comments. Mr. Turner did not see where there was a requirement to have a handicapped accessible sidewalk. Mr. Rice felt the requirement was through the ADA. Mr. Turner confirmed it is handicapped accessibility though the building – no need to. Mr. Rice asked if there was documentation stating that this area is not required to be handicapped accessible. Mr. Turner stated he

would provide that. Mr. Rice indicated that they did not want to be approving something that was not compliant with the ADA

Mr. Desfosses asked if they knew where the water mains are that attached to the tank system. Mr. Turner did not know. There were no water lines to the tank shown on the site plan. Typically before they do any digging they have all of the underground utilities located.

Mr. Desfosses asked if any trees will be removed. Mr. Turner confirmed there were none to be removed. They are working to relocate the access road behind the trees so no trees are impacted.

Mr. Turner showed a photo on his camera of the new access.

Mr. Rice asked if the water well was identified on their drawings, as well as the monitoring wells. Mr. Turner confirmed those are not shown on the drawings. Mr. Rice advised him that they typically need a complete set of plans including this type of information.

Mr. Turner stated this was typically more information than they usually provide for Site Review. Mr. Taintor advised him to review the regulations but the Committee's questions are mostly utility questions.

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. Taintor stated that it appeared they need additional information.

Mr. Rice felt it would be worthwhile seeing a revised utility plan showing the slope and invert elevations of the relocated sewer, the location of the water lines, monitoring wells and other water utilities and the sewer details and manhole details.

Mr. Taintor asked if the Committee has enough information to recommend approval and have the information provided to DPW or do they need to postpone for further review. Mr. Rice was comfortable giving approval with conditions as this was not a huge project and it is all on private property. They would request DPW concurrence on the proposed changes. Mr. Taintor added they would have to have the revised plans in advance of the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Rice made a motion to recommend approval with the stated condition. Mr. Taintor confirmed that the motion would be with the stipulation that a more detailed utility plan would be provided, to include sewer lines and sewer details including manholes, the water lines and utilities, the well locations and the connection to the water tank.

Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

Mr. Rice stated they would need the plan by next Monday and they could review them on Tuesday, September 11th at the reconvened TAC meeting.

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

- 1. The applicant shall provide a revised Utility Plan to the Planning Department by Monday, September 10, 2012, which shall include slope and invert elevations of the relocated sewer lines, sewer details including manholes, water and utility lines, and the connection to the water tank.

.....

B. The application of **Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **183 International Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct three new buildings with the following dimensions: (1) 3-story, 12,300 s.f. footprint; (2): 2-story, 20,160 s.f. footprint; and (3): 2-story, 7,800 s.f. footprint, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 313 as Lot 17 and lies within the Pease Business Commercial District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Taintor indicated they received a letter from the applicant with a request to postpone to a special TAC meeting next Tuesday September 11th at 2:00.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone to next Tuesday, September 11, 2012 at 2:00 pm. Police Chief Dubois seconded them motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Review to the reconvened TAC meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 11, 2012 at 2:00 pm passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road (Southgate Plaza)**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to demolish a portion of an existing building and the construction of a 28,385 s.f. cinema with 1,264 seats; to reduce a previously approved retail pad from 27,335 s.f. to 16,075 s.f. of retail and 833 s.f. of restaurant; to increase parking spaces from 732 spaces to 859 spaces; and to remove existing trees along the frontage of Lafayette Road, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273 as Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway (G) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernie Pelech appeared on behalf of the Applicant, along with Patrick Crimmins of Tighe & Bond, and Stephen Pernaw, Traffic Engineer, and a representative from 2422 Lafayette Road. They will review the changes they made in response to the TAC comments at last week’s Work Session. They are no longer seeking to remove any trees along Lafayette Road and their traffic engineer will make a presentation. They understand Mr. Taintor is desirous of a peer review of the traffic study and hopefully that can happen expeditiously. They are under some time constraints and they need to move forward.

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, stated this project was previously approved in May of 2009 and they are amending those site plans. The previous proposal held 58,000 s.f. of building in the northwest corner of the site and also included a proposed 23,554 s.f. building expansion onto that strip. They plan to remove the 48,000 s.f. of existing building and eliminate the expansion. In lieu they will construct a 28,385 s.f. cinema with 1,264 seats. In addition, the northeast corner the previous plan had 27,335 s.f. of retail and they are changing that pad to 16,075 s.f. of retail and 833 s.f. dinner/restaurant. There was also a comment at TAC about the Taco Bell and they had since revised the plans to indicate that is vacant. The previous plan showed 731 parking spaces were approved and the current proposal is 852 spaces and they are adding landscape islands within the parking area and reconfiguring the parking a little by the retail pad to add a pedestrian connection. The 852 spaces exceeds the parking requirement and they were granted a variance in July to allow up to 859 spaces. Some other changes include a drive lane behind the retail pad and they have adjusted that by making it a one way drive lane and provided a 10' wide loading area in the rear with a 5' sidewalk.

In the rear of the building, the cinema itself is set back from where the previous strip building was and they are adding parking in front of that. They added additional landscaped islands and pedestrian sidewalks for people entering and exiting the cinema. They have added a curb cut for the Water Country access drive, which is an easement across the Southgate Plaza property, and they are proposing to gate that. They will confer with the Fire and Police on how that should be locked.

Another comment from last week's Work Session was that pedestrian circulation was a concern. There was one missing connection between the cinema and the revised retail pad which they have changed. They reconfigured the parking along the northern wall to allow a continuous connection up to the front of the retail pads.

They added some directional signage to promote traffic heading out to the signal. They added three exit signs throughout the parking area. Two are along the front aisle and they noted a sign in the center parking area of the cinema to direct patrons out towards the signal.

They have added motorcycle parking for the diner on Sheet C-3A across from the diner. They reconfigured the island and added a pad. There was some decorative pavement at the entrance coming in from Route 1 and the applicant would like to remove that. It was just aesthetic and did not serve a function.

The proposed lighting has being adjusted based on the revised parking and a photometric plan was provided.

They are not proposing any significant changes to the grading or drainage. They still intent to go with the previously approved system which entails underground infiltration in the main parking area, true box filters throughout the front parking area and water quality inlets. In the rear there is a water quality inlet and a detention pond and pervious pavement proposed. They are still maintaining Best Management Practices and they have made it so that the flows are still going to the same places as the previous proposal and the post development flows are less than the post development flows. They are not proposing any major utility changes. They were only adjusted based on the revised building layouts.

They are providing a grease trap for the 833 s.f. diner. They requested a waiver for not providing a grease trap for the cinema but DPW has denied request so they will add on in the rear of the cinema.

They added a note on the Utility Plans that they will add separate Knox boxes for the retail pad and the cinema.

They previously requested to remove 11 trees along the front of Route 1 however they are no longer requesting that.

Their initial package included a security policy for the cinema.

They initially provided Addendum I to the previously approved traffic evaluation and have since added a second addendum.

Stephen Pernaw, of Pernaw & Company, spoke to the traffic. Mr. Pernaw stated that he was asked to give a "Readers Digest" version of their 2012 traffic report. Their office prepared the original traffic study in 2009 and at that time the proposal had a total gross floor area of 221,000 s.f. Their Addendum I addressed the cinema. He pointed out that the gross floor area of the entire center dropped from 221,000 s.f. to approximately 168,000 s.f. so there was a big drop in floor area. Today he will talk about Addendum II which was based on input from City Staff, where they were asked to evaluate mid-day where there was a cinema and Water Country interacting at the same time. They actually took that one step further and analyzed two different peak periods.

He used flip charts to assist him with his presentation. Their study was done in August to give a peak month condition. They researched traffic data (page 6) which showed daily variations in daily traffic flow on Route 1 and on Constitution. It shows traffic is fairly consistent on a weekday basis and Saturday is a little less than weekday (info from DOT 2010 data). More important is the hourly rate of flow. In the bottom graph showed midnight to midnight by intersection. It shows that Constitution carries a lot less traffic than Route 1 and that on weekdays and on Saturday the traffic peaks at mid-day onward. On Saturday the peak is close to lunchtime and on a weekday it is later, closer to 5:00 – 6:00 pm.

Figure 2 in their report shows the results of their traffic count. They showed a traffic count on a Saturday from 2:15 – 3:15. They added in an extra count at the Water Country driveway at 5:00 pm and slightly more than half of the vehicles exiting Water Country take a right and turn towards Banfield Road. They did projections for 2013 without the new proposal at the Plaza for a comparison purposes. Mr. Pernaw summarized their trip counts. By adding the cinema they are losing retail so one conclusion is that the proposed development will generate just about the same amount of traffic should the existing site become 100% occupied. The different uses at the site will peak at different times and the cinema traffic will peak after all other uses have started to decrease.

Figure 4 in their report shows their build projections with everything full and Figure 5 is a summary of the impacts. Using a schematic diagram they picked several check points and showed the net change at each location. At the signalized intersection at the site driveway, during Route 1 peak hour of 2:15 – 3:15 pm, the impact is +3%. This impact compares an 84% full shopping center today with a 100% full cinema site. Often typical traffic flow can change trips by more than 3% and can often change up to 10 – 15%. He understands that Banfield Road is a concern which is why they have been asked to do counts and projections at this intersection.

They looked at the capacity of the intersections. The bottom line is that today with 84% occupancy at peak summer month conditions, the level of service is C. With the new development of the cinema fully occupied, the level of service will be C and there will be no change. At 5:00 – 6:00 pm there is

less traffic on Route 1 but they have Water Country adding their traffic and the level of service today is B and level of service with the proposed development. Therefore, they are expecting impacts but nothing major.

They also did studies at the other intersections. At Banfield Road they have levels of service at A and B and down to D and E when Water Country is letting out. Water Country certainly has a big impact on the intersection of Banfield and Constitution. The conclusion is that the volumes going through that intersection will continue to operate at low capacity but with delays from 5:00 – 6:00 pm when Water Country is letting out in August on a Saturday. Overall, this site will continue to operate below expectations.

They analyzed the signalized intersection and determined that they do not have to make any changes to the signal timing or phasing. This intersection is interconnected with others all the way down to Walmart and it is demand responsive and the type of changes that they anticipate from the Southgate Plaza is not enough to require a complete retiming of the corridor and, as a matter of fact, they found it operating almost optimally.

Mr. Desfosses asked how the traffic signals interconnect on Route 1. Mr. Pernaw did not know but it is irrelevant to their analysis.

Mr. Taintor noted that they talked about the potential for shared parking because the cinema is at a different peak than the retail yet there was an argument made that by replacing retail with cinema they need much more parking. He asked if those two things jive with each other. Mr. Pernaw turned the question over to Patrick Crimmins however what he was referring to on shared parking was that at night, when the cinema needs most of its parking to be available, the retail uses are closed. Mr. Taintor felt that the variance request implies that there is more traffic coming from the cinema than from the retail space and it's not complimentary. Mr. Taintor asked about a comment in the Traffic Report where two percentages added up to 100% in terms of traffic using the primary and secondary site driveway but it felt there were three site driveways. There is a third driveway in the back that is a service driveway. Mr. Pernaw confirmed that driveway was not counted as it is a dirt parking lot and there is nothing happening in that space for customers.

Mr. Taintor stated that, as they just received the revised plans today, they would like to go through the plans systematically for any comments.

Attorney Pelech responded to the parking issue. In 2009 they were required to obtain a variance to have 790 spaces where 980 were required, under the old Zoning Ordinance. When the new Zoning Ordinance went into effect there was a section regarding maximum spaces so they were then required to get a variance to have 800 parking spaces where a maximum allowed was 500. They haven't really had a lot of parking spaces and that was primarily a result of the reduction of buildings. Because this center has an unusually large number of food establishments they wanted to make sure there was adequate parking to provide for all restaurants.

Doug Richardson, of Weatherstone Development, confirmed they have four restaurants on site and the proposed 832 s.f. diner. For the cinema they are looking at approximately 4 seats per parking space and the restaurants will be about 3 seats per car. They have a mixed use project in Epping and they did a study of 8 shopping centers in New Hampshire that showed other mixed use shopping centers and the balance that worked out well is about 4 cars per 1,000 s.f. of the total GLA. That is where they are in

their calculation for this proposal. They would like more square footage for the north building but decided to keep it as is as it has been proven in operating shopping centers that it works very well.

Mr. Pernaw added that he finished his proposal with a chart showing that the proposed fully occupied development generated 830+ trips and the approved plan from 2009 was approved at over 1,200 trips at the Saturday peak hour. He wanted them to understand that the current proposal was generating a lot less traffic than the larger shopping center, without the cinema, which was previously approved.

Sheet C-2A – Mr. Taintor asked about the two trees that they are still proposing to remove. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that those trees previously approved to be removed. All eleven trees that were previously proposed to be removed along Route 1 they are now proposing to keep.

Sheet 3-A, Sheet 3-B or Sheet 3-C – Mr. Taintor asked about the clouded area at the entrance. Mr. Crimmins stated there was some decorative paving there and they are proposing to remove that stamped asphalt. Mr. Cracknell felt the motorcycle parking should be larger. Mr. Richardson indicated there was no problem enlarging it. They will double it in size.

Mr. Taintor referred to behind the retail pad building where they have the loading area, he thought they were talking about something smaller last time. Mr. Crimmins stated they took the existing 24' drive in the rear, made a one-way lane with Do Not Enter signs on both sides. They then created the striped loading area in the area to provide for 2 trucks at once. Mr. Taintor asked about the gap between the granite curb and the loading area and why is it pavement. Mr. Richardson explained that is programmed as a loading area specifically for the diner. The other door that comes out onto a sidewalk is so that they can service from the kitchen to the outdoor patio of 20 seats. Mr. Cracknell asked why they couldn't bring the sidewalk around to the back of the building. Mr. Richardson indicated they could do that but they were also thinking that they may want a dedicated single tip dumpster they could put it at that door. They could do a concrete pad for more durability with a raised sidewalk. If they ever did a roll-off dumpster for their trash rather than the area that is designated in the future they would need an area by their door to provide that and they would come back for an amendment if needed. Also, the building is angled to maximize visibility to Route 1 and that allowed them to create the outdoor seating. Mr. Cracknell recommended a tree in that large lawn area. It's pretty big and would create an edge for the outdoor seating.

Mr. Rice asked how they were going to deal with the renderings. He knows they have a grease trap for the brown grease but what about the yellow great. Mr. Richardson confirmed there is a recycling container at the rear or they would place it within the fenced in dumpster area. Mr. Rice was concerned that was a good distance away so they would have people dragging grease laden items across the parking lot and around the side. He recommended that they consider the dumpster fenced in area nearer to the building. Restaurants typically don't want to drag trash bags a long distance and look for the shortest distance possible. He felt they were looking for trouble. Mr. Robertson stated they would give that some thought. The containers weren't that large (30' x 60') and they will designate and show that on the plans.

Sheet 3-B – Mr. Taintor noted they added some islands but there was no change to the landscaping. Mr. Crimmins confirmed there will be trees planted there, just like the other islands.

Mr. Taintor asked how many spaces dedicated to the theater. Mr. Robertson stated between 300 – 320 parking spaces would be for theater use. That is based on the 1264. The reason they reduced the size of the building to create a more balanced parking field in front of the cinema. Mr. Taintor's question

was regarding pedestrians walking through the parking lot. He asked if they feel they have sufficient access to the theater. Mr. Richardson stated they can add a brick sidewalk to continue through to the proposed brick sidewalk to get people through the parking lot.

Mr. Taintor asked about bicycle parking. Mr. Richardson indicated there was nothing designated but there is an area where they could add that. Mr. Taintor felt that was a good idea.

Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control plans – no comments.

Utility Plans – Sheet 5-A & 5-B.

Mr. Taintor confirmed they will be adding a grease trap for the theater. Mr. Rice noticed on Sheet 5-A that the pumping station will be sized on tenants but the reality is they are putting the force main in which determines the size of the pump station, not the use. They need to call out the pump station capacity as anything over 50 gallons per minute is a DES permit requirement for a wastewater discharge permit. Mr. Crimmins stated they would note that on the plan.

Mr. Desfosses noted there was a 2” and a 3” PVC force main. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that was an error and they will note one force main size coming from the station and they will also note the capacity.

Mr. Desfosses did not see a gas main going into the theater. Mr. Robertson confirmed there will be a gas line to the theater. It is currently coming off Constitution to the Big Lots loading area so it will have to be continued to the southwest corner of the theater. Mr. Desfosses noted they are also showing a 6” lateral coming out of the theater and they should look at putting in an 8” going all the way to the building.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there was an elevation for side of Big Lots. He would like to see what it will look like.

Mr. Desfosses feel that the lighting is pretty bright. He asked if the lights will be on all night. Mr. Robertson responded that they typically turn them off one hour after their last business closes. Mr. Desfosses asked if they had given any thought to phase lighting so that certain areas are lit up more and certain areas are lit up less. Mr. Richardson stated they have installed all of the lighting up to the north shore building. If they need to segregate the theater area, where it has not been installed, they could put it on a different time clock. Mr. Desfosses asked why the parking lot was lighted so brightly. Mr. Robertson stated they are meeting the requirement of the one foot candle. Mr. Desfosses felt that their average is a 6 feet. Mr. Richardson explained that the issue with that is the pole height, maintaining the 20’ height, and it creates hot spots directly under the lights. They have supplemented that in a cost effective plan by introducing the decorative light fixtures into the islands at midpoints between the shoebox fixtures so that it is a single lamp and allows them to light the dark area between them. They did not want an excessive number of poles on the site.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the wall packs on the back of the cinema. Mr. Richardson confirmed they are night sky compliance, full cut off. They can designate them to shut off one hour after the cinema closes. Police Chief Dubois felt that the problem with that corner is the topography from Route 1 and you can’t see it. It creates a little pocket that the police can’t see from the main road. They may want to have lighting in that area to prevent people from causing problems and it would also keep the riff raff away. Mr. Richardson also felt they could look at a balance of turning half of the wall packs off

and half stay on. Police Chief Dubois asked if they will have any outside cameras. Mr. Richardson would have to check with the user. Police Chief Dubois stated it would be to their benefit if there was any criminal activity going on back there and it would be a benefit to the police if it was lit to some degree and on a 24/7 recording they could get access to. He didn't think the lighting would effect any neighbors.

Mr. Taintor asked about lining up the site plan with the lighting plan as they now have an island with a light pole that is not in the island. He wasn't sure that made sense. Mr. Cracknell felt it would make sense to have one more landscape island. There was a discussion about the placement of light fixtures. Mr. Richardson stated he could move the light fixture over. Mr. Cracknell felt one more landscaped island south of the other two, so they would have the same depth of breaking up the expansive pavement. Mr. Taintor agreed. Mr. Rice asked that they move the light that is in the sidewalk right in the island so they have a clear sidewalk. Mr. Cracknell asked what is in the island outside the Japanese restaurant. Mr. Crimmins indicated there was a hydrant in that island. Mr. Cracknell suggested putting something in the island, like a tree.

Mr. Britz asked if they will mow the lawn. Mr. Richardson confirmed that they mow the lawns.

Mr. Taintor had comments from Carl Roediger which he had received this morning. He asked for separate fire alarm systems for the cinema and retail buildings, he indicated that if the rear exit is gated it must be maintained in a useable state and plowed in the winter, all turning movements must allow for the operation of all City emergency apparatus, knox boxes should be installed at each tenant space, and all buildings should be protected by automatic sprinkler systems IAWNFTA13. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that those would all be taken care of.

Mr. Taintor indicated they have had calls from people who are concerned by the signage on Banfield Road as people leave Water Country. People are turning around on people's lawns and turning around. That is one of the things that should be addressed. Police Chief Dubois sits on Traffic Safety Committee and indicated they have reviewed that problem in the past but the problem is that they are dumping so many people onto Constitution and the GPS tells them something different the signage for directions back to I-95. Mr. Taintor felt they may need to add confirmation signs once they start heading down Banfield Road. Police Chief Dubois also added that he was not sure the cycle of lights to get them on Lafayette Road is long enough to get all of the cars from 2-3 movies getting out at the same time and he suspects that might be problematic.

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:

Attorney Pelech asked if it would be possible for this Committee to recommend approval pending a comprehensive traffic study as that is their biggest issue. Mr. Taintor indicated that they are having a special TAC meeting next Tuesday so it could be postponed to that date.

Mr. Rice made a motion to postpone this matter to the Special TAC meeting which has been scheduled for next Tuesday, September 11th. Police Chief Dubois seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to September 11, 2012 passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Parade Office, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street** (Portwalk, Phase III), requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to replace an existing 12” drain line in Hanover Street with a new 36” drain line and to place subsurface soil tie-backs in Hanover Street, Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 1 and lies within 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:

Mr. Taintor stated that a request had been received from Parade Office LLC to postpone this matter to next Tuesday.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone the application to the Special TAC meeting scheduled for Tuesday, September 11, 2012. Police Chief Dubois seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to September 11, 2012 passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:40 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant