

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

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 11, 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; Corey MacDonald, Deputy Police Chief; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. NEW BUSINESS

A. 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.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Chad Kageleiry, of Summit Land Development, thanked the Committee for the reconvened meeting to keep the project moving. He indicated that one overall concern of the Committee was the amount of pavement and lack of green space. They had the required parking but they were boxed in by some requirements of the tenant. They discussed that with the tenant and were able to make some revisions and eliminate some proposed parking and keep it as green space, rotate some of the parking, working around a tree, and save some additional parking in a second area. This will result in removing 32 parking spaces and they will file a waiver request from the Planning Board as they are averaging about 4.7 rather than 5 spaces per 1,000 s.f. The drainage systems will not change dramatically and will not change size. They are simply keeping more green space and more mature trees.

Mr. Taintor asked about the waiver. Maria Stowell, of the Pease Development Authority, explained it would work as a waiver and not as a variance.

Matt McCormack, of Hoyle Tanner & Associates, stated he would go through the comments and suggestions from the TAC Work Sessions. The majority of their conversation originated with the concern of saving mature trees on site. Under their previous design, they raised the site quite a bit, between 3' – 6' in some areas, in an effort to save the mature trees. He pointed out which trees will be saved. Another comment was to try to make an effort to send as much stormwater run-off to the storm deck chamber system as they could. They have revised the site to bring as much stormwater run-off as the grades would allow to the storm deck system. The required amount of water quality volume

required for ground water recharge for the Alteration of Terrain was 4,500 cubic feet. The original design had 5,000 cubic feet and they have increased that by another 2,000 cubic feet. They went above and beyond the AOT groundwater recharge requirements. Another discussion was regarding sidewalks along Oak Avenue. The plan shows sidewalks on the north of Oak, as opposed to the south where they were originally, and they show a crosswalk going across International Drive and the proposed sidewalk connects up to the entrance to Rand Whitney on the east. They will paint and install double yellow lines at the entrances of the site. They have revised the general notes regarding comments from the Police and Fire Departments. They have increased the width of the water tower access road from 14' to 16' lane and included a turning template for a WB-55. Lastly, they discussed the existing water main that runs in the grass right-of-way on Oak Avenue. They will be extending the 10" water main all the way over to where the Federal building water line extension will be. They have also brought the water services in from Oak Avenue rather than from International.

Mr. Taintor noted that at this point they do not have a landscaping plan, a photometric plan or a drainage report. They don't have the proposed final site plan reflecting their most recent changes. Mr. McCormack felt that the site plan they had was very similar except the parking will be rotated. All drainage, utilities and infrastructure will remain the same.

Mr. Rice asked them to add to the notes on Sheet C-8, where they are tying into existing sewer manhole 5, that the invert is to be reworked.

Mr. Britz asked if the reduced parking is going to change the ability of the detention basins to do some settling. Mr. McCormick stated it will not change. The detention basin will stay the same size. The peak will be reduced as there will be less impervious going to the ponds. Mr. Britz asked about changing the function of the pond. In the previous AOT report it said that they couldn't do settling and it was all one basement. Mr. McCormick confirmed that the pre-treatment is all still in the deep sumps. There will be settling in the pond but it won't be extended detention. They increased the storm tech system to increase the amount of groundwater recharge by 2,000 cubic feet. The previous design met the ATO requirements and based on the Committee's suggestions, they increased it by 2,000 which is quite substantial.

Mr. Roediger asked if building 1 & 3 are totally inter-connected or free standing. Mr. Kageleiry stated that the only way building 3 would be built is if it is an expansion for building 1.

Mr. Taintor asked about the number of parking spaces they are proposing. Mr. McCormick stated that they show 465 parking spaces and this reduces 31 parking spaces. Mr. Cracknell felt if they take 31/32 spaces out of the mix, he would suggest eliminating the 33 in the double loaded bay which would make them down 2 spaces and they could add the 2 spaces along building near the double loaded bay. They could add a space and shift the dumpster over. They could add a space in the next bank of parking to increase it from 11 to 12. Along Oak Street they could add one along the bay from 9 to 10. Also, where they have the two shade trees in front of building 1, he could extend the island two more spaces and they would then net out the parking spaces. He was concerned about the curb going in so close to the trunk of the tree and felt the parking area is actually touching the tree.. He felt they would still be able to meet their PDA requirement. A discussion was held regarding which trees were being saved. Mr. Cracknell recommended that they add a note to their plans to erect a snow fence around the drip line of the trees to be preserved and a sign should be posted saying it is a tree preservation zone. Kageleiry stated that their intent is to try and create a better aesthetic as you approach the buildings, get rid of some of the retaining walls and have bigger open green spaces for a better entrance to the park. Mr. Cracknell asked if they were proposing to remove 32 spaces on the International side and

leave the double loaded bay to the left. Mr. Kageleiry confirmed that only half of them are being removed. They are only having parking on one side of the drive. Mr. Cracknell stated he would want to see what they are doing by Building #2 as he is having trouble visualizing everything. Mr. Kageleiry stated he was happy to sit down with them with a better plan showing the grading.

Maria Stowell, of the PDA, commented that their rules give them some flexibility in that they have different categories for offices and they have an office category which is based on employees and not on the square footage of the building. Looking at the number of employees for this building they could probably meet that with the reduced parking and not even require the waiver from the Planning Board. Mr. Taintor asked if the waiver was from the PDA. Ms. Stowell confirmed that it would be from the Planning Board if they can't meet the PDA rules. She was suggesting that based on number of employees, they only need one space per two employees so they can probably meet that requirement even with the reduced number of parking spaces.

Mr. Taintor felt that they need another round of review as they are talking about a plan that doesn't exist yet. He did not believe it was efficient to try and design it at this meeting and they should come back with a revised plan for TAC to review. There also is no landscaping, drainage or photometrix for them to review.

Mr. Rice indicated that another topic that came up was alternative access to the water tank and they talked about the potential of revitalizing the road. He believed Ms. Stowell was going to talk to the Board and investigate that. Ms. Stowell stated that their Board meets next week and she plans to ask them about building another driveway off of International. Mr. Rice stated they were either going to have the driveway or some sort of language to the effect of indemnifying the City if they are forced to go through the parking lot for construction and maintenance of the water tank. Ms. Stowell confirmed that Mr. Kageleiry will agree to make provisions for them now but that won't be needed if they end up doing the drive off of International.

Mr. Taintor confirmed that the subdivision plan has been approved but not recorded. Before anything happens, the plan would be recorded. This Site Plan is based on the lot dimensions of the approved subdivision plan.

Mr. Kageleiry stated that he hopes to maintain a certain schedule through the approval process. He asked if there is a way to provide certain materials to the Board so that they can remain on the Planning Board Agenda. Some pieces can be produced within a few days. Mr. Taintor stated there was not enough time to have a third TAC meeting before the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Kageleiry asked if the information they have provided so far is adequate to keep this moving forward. Mr. Taintor stated the Board will discuss that after they close the public hearing.

Mr. Britz asked if they got a copy of the letter from the Hodgsdon Brook Association. A copy was given to Mr. McCormack. Mr. Britz asked if they have any plans to plant in the detention basins. Mr. McCormack stated just loam and seed would be planted. Mr. Britz asked it would work with their stormwater calculations if they planted shrubs in there. Mr. McCormack stated that would not effect the stormwater calculations. He didn't know if that would increase the maintenance. He would have to read through the letter and discuss it with the applicant. Mr. Britz felt it would reduce maintenance.

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. Cracknell made a motion to recommend approval the revised plans as submitted and presented, for discussion purposes. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion, for discussion purposes. Mr. Cracknell believed the revised plans are reflective of many, if not most, of the comments from the last TAC meeting but there is a high likelihood that they will reduced their parking by as many as 32 spaces which is a positive attribute to increase the green space on the site and diminish the impervious surface. There are many ways to address that and he would support the preference to reduce parking by 22 spaces along the detention basin, minimizing its maintenance and visual impacts to the streetscape. They don't have enough information on how they will remove the other 10 spaces so he would recommend removing 10 spaces on the other end of the driveway. If the applicant wants to come back later and re-orient the double loaded bay against building #2 they could look at it as an amendment to the site plan. He doesn't have issues with the removal of the two trees they were trying to preserve last week. He would like to have a note for tree preservation along the drip lines of any existing trees and a sign posted on the snow fence and the island in front of building #1 with the two existing trees extended by 2 parking spaces. He felt Mr. Rice's comment about 3rd party review and the Hodgson Brook Committee recommendation should be included.

Mr. Rice added that if the applicant chose to move forward and they wanted to come back and change the angle of the parking, could that be an administrative approval or would it require a public hearing. Mr. Taintor indicated that if they move forward with this motion, they would have to revise everything in time for the Planning Board meeting, they could show that rotated parking area and if the Planning Board voted to approve they may recommend a stipulation that it go back to TAC. By recommending approval they are stating that they agrees with the grading, drainage, landscaping and lighting and they have to be able to support that.

Mr. Cracknell clarified his motion to include that any re-orientation of the double loaded bay come back to TAC. He assumed the landscape plan will be revised as presented today regarding the tree preservation and will be consistent with Site Plan. He also assumed the photometric will be dark sky compliant. Mr. Taintor felt it was hard to assume as they have not seen it. Mr. Britz indicated he would like to look at the landscape plan as he was concerned about it. It is a big area and is a nice site now. He doesn't have any idea what it is going to look like.

Mr. Rice asked how important it was to meet their June deadline. Mr. Kageleiry stated that a month would be a big problem. They can't even submit their revised plan to AOT until the City approves it. They planned to turn them in on Friday.

Mr. Kageleiry asked what type of shrubs they want in the detention area. Mr. Britz responded that their landscape architect would be able to come up with a plan. He could suggest things if they need him to. It would depend on how long the water is going to be held in there.

Mr. Taintor was hesitant to move forward on this as he doesn't know enough about the project to know if they have enough information to move forward. He asked if the DPW members feel comfortable and whether the changes are significant or not.

Mr. Rice stated that the benefit is they are reducing the impervious surface and keeping the stormwater treatment the same size. This is an improvement to the operation of the system. The risk is that their recommendation will be incomplete and contingent upon the successful submission of an item they have not seen. Maybe the Planning Board would take more time in viewing those various components.

He understands the hesitancy in recommending this on a plan they haven't seen but the stormwater system will be a better system than currently exists. The question comes back to whether there a way to move forward with other project approvals if they held off for a month on the TAC approval. Mr. Kalegeiry indicated it was really important to them to move forward. Mr. Taintor stated they need a new site plan, to include a grading plan, a landscaping plan, a photometric plan and a drainage study, and they need to have this to the Planning Department by noon on Thursday, so that TAC can review it prior to the Planning Board meeting. They are really asking a lot of TAC to get that done.

Mr. Taintor stated that the motion was to approve with stipulations, including the reduction of 22 parking spaces along the detention basin, removal of 10 parking spaces in the parking area north of the access drive, the addition of a snow fence and signage around the trees to be preserved indicating they are tree protection areas, add a drip line around the trees, extend the island in front of Building #1 to take up another 2 parking spaces, implement the planting recommendations from the Hodgson Brook Association, provide a parking waiver to allow the reduction of 31 or 32 parking spaces, provide a revised Site Plan, Grading Plan, Landscaping Plan, Photometric Plan and Drainage Study all by a deadline of Thursday, September 13, 2012 at noontime. All plans and exhibits shall be subject to final review and input by the TAC members.

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

1. The Site Plan shall be revised to include:
 - reduction of 22 parking spaces along the detention basin
 - removal of 10 parking spaces in the parking area north of the access drive
 - addition of a snow fence around the drip lines of trees to be preserved with signage indicating they are tree protection areas
 - extension of the island in front of Building #1 to take up another 2 parking spaces
 - implementation of the planting recommendations from the Hodgson Brook Association
2. Provide a parking waiver to allow the reduction of 31 ± parking spaces.
3. Provide a revised Site Plan, Grading Plan, Landscaping Plan, Photometric Plan and Drainage Study by Thursday, September 13, 2012 at noontime.

The recommendation to grant Site Plan Approval is conditioned on review and approval by TAC members of the revised site plan set.

.....

B. 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; and to increase parking spaces from 732 spaces to 859 spaces, 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:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe and Bond, appeared before the Committee, with Doug Richardson of Waterstone Development and Stephen Pernaw, Traffic Consultant. Mr. Crimmins stated they were before them last week and were postponed to address comments. They are here today to review revised plans and review those comments.

The first item was not a TAC comment. He discovered the building partitions in the existing building were inaccurate. The Goodwill building is "L" shaped and extends behind the Big Lots building. That results in a change to the site plan as they plan to keep the rear portion of the Goodwill building. They updated the Site Plan to show the correct square footage and they also updated all loading and parking calculations. This actually brings the maximum parking requirement closer to the variance which was granted. They also added Addendum #3 to the Traffic Evaluation to address this additional square footage.

Mr. Crimmins addressed the comments from the previous meeting.

They were asked to double the size of the motorcycle pad which they have done.

They extended the raised sidewalk to the rear of building to connect with rear of the diner.

At the recommendation of DPW they added a dumpster pad in the rear of diner. That will include a 6' x 8' dumpster and a grease waste container.

They added an additional landscaped island to break up the parking area.

They added six bicycle storage spaces with the same detail which they have in the front of the plaza near Subway.

There was a light pole which was in the center of parking which was relocated to the center island.

They provided a pedestrian connection from the cinema to the islands so that pedestrians are not cutting diagonally across the parking lot.

They added Note 21 indicating that the emergency access gate lock shall be coordinated with the City of Portsmouth Fire and Police Departments and the applicant shall keep the emergency access gate plowed in the winter.

They added Note 22 indicating that the cinema parking lot will be on a different time clock to keep the lights on later than the rest of the plaza.

There was some question about the size of the force main coming out of the pump station. Mr. Crimmins had a further discussion with DPW who had concerns with pumping capacity into the existing shallow manhole and it was determined there was an existing manhole 8' deep in Lafayette Road and they are planning to tie an 8" gravity sewer line into that manhole which eliminates the force main, eliminates the pump station and any capacity concerns pumping into that shallow manhole. .

They were asked to revise the sewer lateral from 6" to 8".

They were denied their request to not add a 1,000 gallon grease trap for the cinema so they have added that to the plan.

There was a question about the gas service. Initially their thought was to tie into the same line as Big Lots but that line is too small so they are proposing to construct a new line from the cinema to Constitution Avenue and they will coordinate with Unitel.

They added Note 31 regarding comments made by the Fire Department, regarding separate knock boxes, alarm systems and NFA standards.

They added a tree in the back lawn area. Landscaping is shown on the islands. One island was approved without landscaping as it included a hydrant but they have since added landscaping.

There was a request to add a building elevation for the Big Lots portion of the building which will remain and that is included in color on Sheet EL-2.

Mr. Crimmins indicated that Steve Pernaw was present to answer any traffic questions regarding the Addendum they prepared.

Mr. Taintor was looking at the proposed retail pad touching the diner and he thought part of that would be part of the restaurant space. So, the restaurant space is actually bigger than 833 s.f. Mr. Crimmins stated that the diner space was itself is the 833 s.f. Mr. Taintor asked that they adjust their plans to show how much is restaurant and how much is retail.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they know where the gas line is on Constitution. Mr. Crimmins did not know yet. Mr. Desfosses would be making a stipulation that the line gets bored directly underneath Constitution Avenue and they are going to have to infrared the pavement patch.

Mr. Rice asked them to add a note where they are tying into sewer manhole #169 that they are going to rework the invert. Also, he asked them to add to their sewer structure table the additional manholes they are adding.

Mr. Rice noted an inconsistency on Sheet C-5B with the service pipe size from the cinema. They should change all of it to 8”.

Mr. Taintor mentioned the storage for six bicycles and felt they may want to go higher than that. Mr. Cracknell felt they may want storage for 25 bikes. Mr. Taintor agreed they should add something more along that line.

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger referred to Sheets 5A & 5B, he noticed they are adding a hydrant to the northeast of the cinema building. His concern is if they are adding retail space on the back of Big Lots, there is no type of supply anywhere in the southwest corner on the back side of the building. Mr. Crimmins clarified that it is existing. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger felt it is still a new separate retail space from Big Lots so somewhere in the back corner would be good. He has the same issue with the only hydrant being on the island between the 99 and the plaza exit and they should have something added in the proposed area of the retail space or in one of the islands. All water coming in is where their sprinkler room would be. Mr. Crimmins asked if it would be acceptable to go more to the northwest where they are having the new water line installed. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger was fine with that as long as it was 50' from the back corner.

Mr. Taintor stated they have requested a proposal for independent traffic review which they haven't received yet. One question they will have to address is how far they want to go with this before getting the report back.

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. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that there are hydrants that need to be adjusted, they discussed a stipulation about the gas service in Constitution Avenue and the new sewer line going out to Lafayette Road (needs to be added to the plan and details are missing). He felt that the applicant has made great strides from the last meeting to come up with a complete set of plans and the only item missing is impact on traffic. Mr. Desfosses felt there will definitely be an impact and that they will need to look at the traffic. He didn't know if they were looking at long term or short term impacts. Some of the numbers seemed low to him. Although Mr. Pernaw said that the lights on Lafayette Road are coordinated, he felt that they fall out of coordination quite often, leading to massive backups, so he doesn't know if they should ask for some sort of contribution from this site, and maybe that contribution doesn't take place right away and takes place at some time in the future. He couldn't get a handle on whether that is appropriate to ask for or not until he sees the independent review of the traffic study. He thinks they could recommend this to the Planning Board with a stipulation that might come through the Planning Board is that City staff further negotiates traffic impacts with the developer. He doesn't know if that should be broken out into short term improvements needed by DOT.

Mr. Rice added that the traffic study seemed to focus on the daytime peak and the function of the roadways. He felt there are two components to the traffic impact. One is the max traffic on a roadway and making sure it stays functional and the other is impact to neighborhoods during periods when they are not used to seeing sustained larger traffic volumes. Mr. Desfosses stated Springbrook, across the street, would be impacted. Mr. Rice did not feel that this was a typical shopping center as it is restaurant heavy. He needs to better understand those impacts as that is what residents will call them about.

Mr. Taintor was not sure how to handle the traffic question. He hopes to get the traffic study before the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Desfosses felt the Planning Board could possibly issue approval with a condition that staff and the developer resolve impacts to traffic.

Mr. Taintor indicated they also had miscellaneous details that they talked about including the correction of the inconsistency of the sewer size, on Sheet C-5B add bicycle parking and add the square footage of the restaurant.

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

1. Hydrants shall be added to Sheet C-5A and C-5B with final approval by the Fire Department.
2. The applicant shall directionally bore the new gas service in Constitution Avenue or infra-red the pavement patch so that there are no seams.
3. The new sewer line to Lafayette Road shall be added to the site plan with details.
4. The sewer line pipe size shall be 8" (inconsistent on plan).
5. Sheet C-5B shall be revised to increase the bicycle parking capacity to 24 bikes.
6. The square footage of the restaurant and retail space shall be corrected on the site plan.

The recommendation to grant Amended Site Plan Approval is conditioned on review by the TAC members of the independent peer review of the applicant's traffic study, and on any short-term or long-term mitigation resources that may be determined necessary.

.....

C. 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:

Patrick Crimmins, of Tighe & Bond, was present with Jeff Johnson of Cathartes Private Investments, Gary O'Neil from McPhail Associates and Tim Levine from Old Harbor LLC.

Mr. Crimmins first addressed the Site Review Exhibit, the Easement Plan and the Grading and Drainage Plan. He reviewed the previous stipulations.

On Sheet 3C-A, the Easement License Plan, they have removed the proposed earth tie back easements.

On the Site Review Exhibit, Note 26 was deleted and the other notes were renumbered accordingly.

There was a stipulation that should the HDC approve any changes to the site plan, they must come back for Site Plan approval and Note 18 was revised regarding the screen wall material stating it shall be brick as approved by the HDC.

There was a change to the Grading and Drainage Plan. The previous plan had an 18" line that ran along the sidewalk of Hanover and ultimately connected to the existing connection that ties in with the 36" line. They have since determined they cannot fit the 18" line between the foundation design and the existing electrical duct bank that runs along the sidewalk so they are proposing to tie the drainage into the system entering from the intersection of Portwalk Place and Hanover Street and they will need to upsize to a pipe to match the 36" size downstream.

Mr. Desfosses asked what the size of the manhole was and if it was big enough to handle the 36" drainage pipe. Mr. Crimmins does not know but the contractor will have to verify that the manhole can handle it or they will have to replace the manhole. Mr. Desfosses asked that the record reflect that.

Gary O'Neil, of McPhail Associates, LLC, the geotechnical consultant for Portwalk, spoke next. He has addressed the Committee and explained that he has participated in several informal meetings with DPW.

Mr. O'Neil stated that the bounds of the site require a temporary shoring system as they are building a basement that is up to 17' below grade on Deer Street and 12' below grade on Hanover and Maplewood. At the southern portion, the temporary wall will consist of steel sheet piling driven into the ground as that is a soft clay material. On the northern half of the site they will use a soldier beam outside wall in 8' sections in the ground. In order to get the best benefit out of the practicality of construction they are proposing a wall should be braced with a single level of tie backs, or anchors.

The shaded area on the plan is where they are proposing the tie backs. The zone is longer on the southern side because that is where the clay is and they have to go further into the ground.

Mr. Taintor confirmed that where the ground at the southern end of the site is lower they have to go deeper than the northern section which is higher. Mr. O'Neill confirmed that was correct.

Mr. O'Neill pointed out Sections A & B which are sheeting sections, where the clay is, and the clay goes away at Sections C & D are soldier pile sections. Mr. O'Neill pointed out Section A, on Hanover, which was the proposed basement with 12' of excavation and they are digging to about 2'. The vertical element is the sheet piling. There are 2' – 3' of fill, 12' of clay and then the glacial soil. In order to get this earth support system to work properly they will drive the sheeting through the clay and it will stop at the glacial soil at the bottom of the sheeting where it belongs. The tie back element will consist of an anchor that will be screwed into the ground, it will penetrate the clay and get its anchorage in the glacial soil. When they were developing these ideas they were consulting with H B Fleming, who will be the shoring contractor. In terms of how much real estate they needed to put these anchors in, the developers have shown a three dimensional space where the tie backs will be installed. That will not extend beyond past 35' of Maplewood. They are going to be anchored in the better soil beneath the clay.

The section along Hanover to Maplewood is a similar section but the clay is a little bit thicker and the anchor is a little bit longer and the sheet piling would extend through the clay and into the competent granular soils. They will stay below all surface utilities in both cases.

Mr. McNeill mentioned that the earth retention wall itself will be the construction site. The anchor is the only component that extends into the public way.

His next diagram shows the Maplewood soldier piles with tie backs in the glacial soil. As you move up Hanover Street the clay thickness becomes much thinner and as you reach Deer Street it's not even there. This is shown graphically as a soldier pile with the anchor which will go in on an angle which will penetrate the clay and get anchored into the glacial soils.

Once the building is constructed, the entire system will be abandoned in place.

Mr. Taintor stated that the City has retained a consultant for an independent review. Mr. Rice added that the consultants are present today and he would hope that the information they have requested has been provided to them.

Charlie Nickerson and Mark Grenier, of RW Goleski, were present. Mr. Nickerson confirmed they have received almost all of the items they have requested. They have only had an initial cursory review and they should receive last item they requested tomorrow. The substance of their review is looking at the concept. They do not see a fatal flaw or something that defies engineering practice or construction. They understand the idea of the concept and from a geotechnical point of view it is fairly common practice, it facilitates the construction and the process all seems correct and appropriate for the subsurface conditions. Preliminarily there is nothing they take exception to and there is nothing they see as a real item for concern in concept.

Mr. Taintor asked about a timeline for the report. Mr. Nickerson responded that they are working for a goal of having a written report next week.

For clarification, Mr. Taintor stated that the reason this is before them is not necessarily the construction method per se, it is because the applicants are requesting an easement from the City and the TAC recommendation will be part of the granting of an easement for the tie-backs. The concerns that were raised previously had to do with the impact of this on their maintenance or reconstruction of the street and utilities within the street. They need to be satisfied from a technical view that the tie backs do not create any hazard or potential negative impact on any of the public or private utilities in the right-of-way and that this is the best approach to the temporary internal bracing of the foundation walls.

Mr. Rice asked if they have good boring information and ledge profile on the Deer Street side. Mr. O'Neill confirmed that they have good bedrock information. Mr. Rice's concern is in the northeast corner where the ledge extends. Mr. O'Neill did not believe the rock comes up as high as 5+ but if it did, they would still have the ability to put the anchor in at a flatter angle and still be in the grey zone and 5' away from the utilities. Mr. Rice was concerned about the control during installation and if they do go in at a steeper angle and they go a little further they are getting into the zone of influence of the brick sewer line which was installed over 100 years ago. He is worried about the guy out on the street doing the construction. Mr. O'Neill understood Mr. Rice's concern and stated that would have to be monitored during construction. Mr. Rice reiterated that the key is control during construction.

Mr. Britz asked what they are screwing the anchor in with. Mr. O'Neill stated if was a drill rig with some horsepower to it with a tork resistance. There are two criteria. They want to get it into ground at a certain depth and there is a tork resistance. There will be 100 – 200 of these installed. There is a reasonable degree of flexibility and if it hits a boulder it will stop. Mr. Britz asked if they will know if the drill takes a new direction. Mr. O'Neill responded that they will tend to slope downward. In the absence of an overt obstruction they should be going where they belong.

Mr. Cracknell asked if the ledge is higher than anticipated or shown on the sketch on Deer St and there is some deflection or resistance and they reset it, are all of the screws the same length. If they shift this up and the screws are all the same length, it will reduce that buffer around the culvert. It won't hit it but it looks like it will move outside the grey area. Mr. O'Neill tried to clarify that on Deer Street the benefit is that the clay is not there so all of the soil is suitable to anchoring. It is correct that the rock does trend upwards as you approach Deer and Portwalk Place. There is a possibility there may be some replacement anchor and it usually happens on any job.

Mr. Taintor asked Mr. O'Neill to explain the 45 degree angle. Mr. O'Neill explained that it is more of a geotechnical guideline. When they are using tie-backs, they want to anchor the tie back in the zone that is not in proximity to the wall. The 45 degree line is a common plane that extends from the bottom of the excavation up outside of which the anchorage has to occur.

(Deputy Fire Chief Roediger left the meeting)

Mr. O'Neill added that over most of the project where they have clay they are going deeper than normal. They will probably be well away from the easement limits.

Mr. Taintor asked about the soldier piles. He asked if the anchor is anchored by a steel plate behind the timber legging. Mr. O'Neill responded that there will be a physical connection between the soldier pile and the tie back. They will install a steel whaler in between the two soldier piles. They will just cut a hole in the steel piling, screw it through and reconfigure that plate.

Mr. Rice mentioned that one item they talked about from a public consumption and lay person understanding of easements, he encouraged them to develop more graphics depicting the alternative approach and why they can't take that alternative approach. Not everybody is up to speed on methods of construction and it will go a long way for the public understanding at the public hearing.

Tim Levine, of Old Harbor, stated that was one of the questions at the peer review that the engineer asked about and Mr. O'Neill responded to that. He asked if the engineer could respond to that. Mr. Rice indicated that it was not a technical question but rather a recommendation for style of presentation at the Planning Board.

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 that the City grant the developer a construction easement and approval of the Hanover drainage change. The most important thing to consider is the time frame and that the City consider a finite time. These create a structural load on the soil underneath the road. After that point, if they need to be removed for any reason under the road, the City should not be held hostage by them. Also, the tie back company should have a bond with the City. They will need insurance and the City listed as co-insured on the policy in case one of the anchors hits a utility that is not City owned so that the City is covered by liability for letting the developer put the anchors into the road. What this system will do is create a retaining wall which will hold the edge of the street up so the City needs to be in complete partnership with the developer to insure that the system is going to be legally adequate to cover the City.

Mr. Rice seconded the motion and added that they have independent inspection during installation to assure proper installation per design.

The motion to recommend approval of the Hanover Street drainage revision and to grant the developer's construction easement, pending a favorable recommendation from the independent peer review, passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. As the tie-backs create a structural load on the roads, and to protect the City from any liability at a later time if they need to be removed, an Agreement shall be prepared for review and approval by the City Attorney.
2. The company installing the tie-backs shall post a bond with the City, in an amount to be determined by the Planning Director.
3. The applicant shall provide insurance for the tie-back work, listing the City as a co-insured.
4. An independent inspector shall be present during the tie-back installation to assure proper installation, at the cost of the applicant.

.....
Mr. Cracknell, Mr. Britz and Deputy Police Chief MacDonald left the meeting.

II. WORK SESSION

A. **1 Highliner Avenue** - High Liner Foods (USA), Inc., Owner, to review revised Utility Plan.

Last week the Committee recommended approval on the condition that they received a revised Utility Plan.

Mr. Fisher, of High Liner Foods, was present.

The only item that Mr. Desfosses had noticed as missing was core and seal boots for the new manhole. The inverts need to be brick rather than concrete. That will make a water tight connection. Typically they show 1/10' drop inside the manholes and they are showing less than that. They might want to adjust their lines a little bit.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there was a reason why they were using a bolt down manhole cover. Mr. Fisher asked the same question to Stellar and they indicated they were concerned because the City was monitoring something at the time and they didn't want anyone tampering with it as they are a food processing facility.

Mr. Rice did not recommend spending the money on bolt down because it's just going to fail. If anything, the city wants to be able to pop the manhole and see if there is grease on that side of the system.

Mr. Rice did not see any other issues. To summarize they need to core and seal boots for the manhole penetrations to make a water tight connection, solid brick invert, and adjust the pitch of the sewer lines and the bolt down manhole cover is not necessary.

Mr. Taintor confirmed they will need 12 copies of the revised plans by Thursday at noontime.
.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:10 pm.
.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant