MINUTES OF MEETING  
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  

2:00 P.M.  JULY 3, 2007  
EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  

MEMBERS PRESENT:  David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works, David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Debbie Finnigan, Traffic Engineer; Deputy Fire Chief Steven Griswold; and Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa  

ALSO PRESENT:  Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner  

I. OLD BUSINESS  

A. The application of David F. Mahoney Marital Qtip Trust, Owner, and Granite State Minerals, Applicant, for property located at 227 Market Street, wherein in Site Review approval is requested to relocate an existing 24’ x 58’ scale building and to install a second scale, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 119 as Lot 6 and lies within the Waterfront Industrial (WI) District; (This application was tabled at the June 5, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)  

The Chair read the notice into the record.  

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:  

Attorney Bernard Pelech addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant. He indicated they have provided some additional information as a result of last month’s TAC meeting. Mr. Allen was concerned about the two water services and he spoke to Tom Cravens about that. For many years there have been two separate water lines, both metered. The 4” line exclusively services the ships and is billed through Granite State Minerals. The 1” water line is the one that services the property. They would like to continue with the two lines as it has worked out well in the past. There is no hydrant on site and the 4” line would probably not be sufficient for a hydrant. They will revise the plan to show the easement. He asked Mr. Allen how wide they would like that. Mr. Allen indicated 20’ was enough. Mr. Pelech stated they will add that 10’ to either side of the brick box, or 10’ to either side of the center line. Mr. Miller will relocate the existing parking as well as the doors on the existing garage. They will add the setbacks from the mean high tide lines. The other issue that was raised was flipping the in and out pattern of traffic. If that is the recommendation of this Committee or the Planning Board, they will consider that and it can be done either way. The reason it is shown the way it is now is that they believe the pattern works better that way, especially now that they don’t have the direct route up Deer Street which they had previously. They hope these changes could be made between now and the Planning Board meeting.  

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.
DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden referred to the letter from the Department dated June 7th, listing the stipulations.

1) The applicant should comply with the Site Review Regulations. See Page 5 which lists a minimum of 16 items that should be included;

Mr. Holden asked Attorney Pelech if his client could comply with those prior to the Planning Board meeting? Attorney Pelech confirmed that they could.

2) The major drainage outfall on the lot needs to be shown on the plans as it is very important to the City;

Attorney Pelech confirmed that had been added to the Site Plans.

3) The applicant should confirm whether they have a drainage easement for the drainage pipe;

Attorney Pelech confirmed that will be done. Mr. Holden requested language on that as well.

Mr. Holden suggested having a motion on the floor prior to going any further. Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Ms. Finnigan seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden confirmed, for the record, that #1 and #3 above apply, with Mr. Allen’s comments.

Mr. Allen requested that they work with the City Attorney to have appropriate language so that the City would not be responsible for relocating the scale, which is located over the easement, should any work be required by the City.

4) That the Site Plans should label the traffic pattern coming in and going out of the site, as well as truck turns;

Mr. Finnigan felt there were issues that should probably be discussed in a meeting prior to the Planning Board meeting. Attorney Pelech stated that Mr. Miller has provided him with mylars of turning templates for the trucks which he will be happy to share with Ms. Finnigan.

5) The edge of the Piscataqua River should be identified on the Site Plan (i.e. high tide line or low tide line);

Mr. Holden stated this is still outstanding.

6) That more detail should be provided concerning the intersection at Market Street and Deer Street where the driveway cuts are, by the brick wall;

Mr. Holden confirmed this has been done.

7) That abutters should be shown on the Site Plan;

Mr. Holden confirmed this has been taken care of.

8) That the Site Plan Set should consist of an Existing Features Plan and a Proposed Conditions Plan;

Mr. Holden confirmed this has been taken care of.
9) That the water service needs to be clarified, both existing and proposed;

Mr. Allen felt the only addition needed on this was for them to show and explain the two services but they need to show where the water shut offs are. Attorney Pelech stated that the 4" line is shown to terminate in the building and it obviously doesn’t and it must have an outlet somewhere. Mr. Desfosses stated the line goes inside the building so that the meter can be read inside the building but the rest of the line should be shown on the plan. Mr. Desfosses added that the proposed electric and telephone services should be underground.

10) That the applicant will be responsible for upgrading the sidewalk in front of the site.

Mr. Holden requested a sidewalk detail to be reviewed and approved by Mr. Desfosses. Attorney Pelech felt that might be problematic but he will continue to try to impress upon them. Mr. Holden stated they have another public hearing to consider it.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations, including that Attorney Pelech will schedule a meeting with Ms. Tillman and Mr. Holden to review the updated plans prior to the Planning Board.

1.) That the applicant shall comply with the Site Review Regulations. See Page 5 which lists a minimum of 16 items that should be included;
2.) That the applicant add the drainage easement for the drainage pipe to the Site Plans, and that they work with the City Attorney to have appropriate language so that the City would not be responsible for relocating the scale, which is located over the easement, should any work be required by the City;
3.) That the applicant shall schedule a meeting with Deborah Finnigan to discuss traffic patterns coming in and going out of the site, as well as truck turns, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
4.) That the edge of the Piscataqua River should be identified on the Site Plan (i.e. high tide line or low tide line);
5.) That the two water services need to be explained on the Site Plans, that the shut offs need to be added and the rest of the line needs to be shown on the Site Plans;
6.) That the proposed electric and telephone services shall be underground and added to the Site Plans;
7.) That the applicant will be responsible for upgrading the sidewalk in front of the site.
8.) That the applicant shall meet with Mr. Holden and Ms. Tillman to review the revised Site Plans prior to the Planning Board meeting.

B. The application of Parade Office, LLC, Owner, for property located at 195 Hanover Street (aka Parade Mall) wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct four buildings and an underground parking garage, consisting of the following: 1) a 52,138 ± s.f. (10,900 ± s.f. footprint) 5-story building, consisting of retail and 28 residential units; 2) a 98,303 ± s.f. (25,800 ± s.f. footprint) 5-story building, consisting of retail, restaurant and a hotel; 3) a 128,267 ± s.f. (45,600 ± s.f. footprint) 4-story building, consisting of retail, restaurant and office space; 4) a 95,490 ± s.f. (24,600 ± s.f. footprint) 4-story building, consisting of retail, restaurant and office space; and 5) a 135,859 ± s.f. underground parking garage, after demolition of the existing building, all with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 1 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD); (This application was tabled at the June 5, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.
Ms. Finnigan made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gregg Mikolaities, of Appledore Engineering, addressed the Committee. Also present with him were Robin Bousa, of VHB, Jeff Johnson and Josh Anderson, Tim Levine, Alec McEachern, legal council, Patrick Crimmins from Appledore, Lisa DeStefano, John O’Brien and Mike ____ from AHA, project mechanical and electrical consultants, Sal Capobianco, the parking garage consultant, Rick Feldman, the retail consultant, and members from Sasaki Associates, landscape architects.

Mr. Mikolaities indicated that they were before TAC on June 5th and he recapped where they have been and where they hope to go. This project started in February with a Pre TAC. They followed up with a DPW staff meeting and appeared at the April Pre-TAC. They have had multiple HDC work sessions and have received HDC approval. A great deal of work has been done with traffic and they have received approval from the T&S Committee. Their goal is to receive a positive recommendation today. They have followed up since June 5th with meetings with DPW personnel, Deputy Fire Chief Griswold, Gil Emery, Deputy City Manager Cindy Hayden & Attorney Sullivan, The Hill and abutters.

They handed out four mini plans. The first plan shows the existing orientation of the parade mall. It also shows the four proposed buildings and he explained the buildings and their different uses. The project is a 128 key hotel, 28 residential units, 24,000 s.f. of restaurant space, 57,000 s.f. of retail space and 158,500 s.f. of office space.

Mr. Mikolaities reviewed the comments from the June 5th TAC meeting and stated they provided a detailed submission to that and he walked through those points and showed how they addressed them.

1.) That the connection to the Vaugn Mall shall be detailed and the applicant should attempt to make it more “seamless”.

After the Pre-Tac meeting they went out and took a look at this and agreed they need to get some additional surveys. There is a light pole and a retaining wall and they want to make sure the crosswalk ties into the Vaughn Mall.

2.) That the applicant meet with Tom Cravens regarding water issues.

They had a detailed meeting with Mr. Cravens and he had a number of questions regarding the sprinkler system and the mechanical system, etc. They will work with him on that but they think they are okay and the plan reflects Mr. Cravens comments. They have guesstimated sewer flows and domestic water requirements. Mr. Holden asked for an update from Mr. Allen regarding the water. Mr. Allen felt the applicant had addressed the comments from Mr. Cravens however there are a couple of details that they can deal with later so the stipulation should remain.

3.) That the orientation of both the Site Plan and the Architectural Plan be the same.

The plans have been corrected and this is now a non-issue.

4.) Snow removal should be addressed.

Note 12 was added to Sheet C-6-A that states that when snow banks exceed 3’, the snow will be removed and stored off site.

5.) The current utility plan should be more clearly marked.
They changed their plans from a 40 scale plan to a 20 scale plan and they have had a number of meetings with DPW to discuss the details.

6.) That the gravity sewer route going out to Hanover Street is preferred over a pump system.

They have eliminated the pump station after a meeting with Peter Rice and they will connect directly to Hanover Street at the sewer and they will repave the road where they cut in.

7.) That a meeting with Mike Coffey of PSNH will be required.

They met on June 26th and had a very productive meeting. PSNH is working on some sketches. What they are showing on their plans is consistent with PSNH’s master plan for that area. They will have a discussion on how they will provide temporary service and they had a lengthy meeting and agreed to provide temporary poles along Maplewood to provide a continuous loop of service. This is all on going and they have done all they can at this point.

8.) The Site Plan should define paving limits and limits of work.

He will be passing out a sketch later in his presentation showing pavement limits. On Hanover Street they have a full width overlay and on Maplewood Avenue it will be a center line overlay.

9.) That the Harborcorp/Westin Site Plans, proposed land conveyances and traffic analysis should be reviewed by the applicant.

They have since added the Deer Street striping plan to their set. Apparently somewhere in the process the Westin driveway shifted a little bit and they have added an extra 15 – 20’ for a left turn going into the Westin garage. They handed out a sketch that they prepared after Pre-TAC this morning.

10) That a detailed Construction Management Mitigation Plan will be required.

They agree that will be done.

11) Plan of trash removal, including hours, to be identified;

Note 11 on Sheet C-6-A states that trash removal will be prohibited during the hours of 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 pm – 6:00 p.m.

12) Add detail showing the type/location for trash receptacles.

This is shown on Sheet L-1 and details are on L-3. Mr. Mikolaities indicated that he met with David Desfosses who has a wealth of knowledge regarding downtown and they changed the lids on the trash receptacles.

13) Referral to Traffic & Safety Committee.

They had a Site Walk with T & S and a meeting on June 28th and received a positive endorsement on that date.

14) A plan delineating truck movements to access loading areas needs to be submitted.

Sheet C-15 provides a WB 40 vehicle turning plan. They revised that again as Mr. Desfosses wanted to make sure the WB 40 could get into the private way.
15) A plan delineating turning movements of fire trucks needs to be submitted;

They had a meeting with Deputy Fire Chief Griswold and they received information on the new ladder truck. They have shown the fire truck turning and the City’s new fire truck will also be able to make the turn.

16) That the applicant report back to TAC on what would happen if the Harborcorp/Westin does not go through;

Robin Bousa will address that later in their presentation.

17) That plan C-5-A should include pavement markings.

These have been included on the Site Plans.

18) That a warning system be proposed for exiting the garage.

They have added a note on C-6, showing a warning for pedestrians as vehicles are exiting the garage.

19) That the applicant consider angling the garage accessway more;

He attached a letter from the Parking Garage Consultant and they are going with their recommendation and is shown on the Site Plans.

20) That the right of way line is vague and should be identified as a detail.

This was a housekeeping item and going to the 20 scale plan they can see it better.

21) Construction project signs should be added to the Site Plans.

Project signs have been added to Sheet C-6-A.

22) That the applicant should report back to TAC on whether crosswalks located on private property need to be done to city standards.

Their response was that crosswalks at the entrance and exit to the private way, as well as at the garage entrance will be different than city standards to differentiate the private way from the city streets. There are additional cross walks on site and those will be brick pavers. All other crosswalks will be constructed to City standards.

23) Identify if tip downs are located on private property.

Again the larger scale plans made it easier to see. Looking at the proposed easement and license plan, they have identified six different areas with tip downs. That is clearly shown on Sheet C-4.

24) Provide a better detail of the traffic intersection to include slope, width, etc.

That was provided as a detail on Sheet L-2.

25) Coordinate with Gil Emery, City Communications Supervisor, regarding using a digit other than “9” for outside calls.
A meeting has been held with their consultants and Mr. Emery and they will continue to work with him until he is satisfied.

26) That testing be done at the expense of the applicant to determine whether a repeater needs to be installed and said analysis to be coordinated with Gil Emery.

That is combined with #25 above.

27) Confirm that the proposed hydrant on the traffic island provides maximum available flow;

They have added another hydrant with the service coming in off of Deer Street. He provided an excerpt from AG Consultants regarding water flow: “Based on the flow test provided to me by Appledore, there will be close to 4500 gpm available for fire flow at the street. Assuming that the yard hydrant will be connected to the street by 150 ft. of 6 in Class 52 cement lined ductile iron pipe, the available flow at the hydrant would be around 2,500 gpm. This could be increased by using 8 in. pipe; however, 2,500 gpm is plenty for a group of fully sprinklered buildings.”

28) Provide details for review by TAC of a wall hydrant installed on the interior of the pedestrian right of way, with detail specs.

There was a lot of discussion on this and there will be no wall hydrants.

29) Restaurant square footage to be refigured to include outside dining areas;

This was done on Sheet C-6 so they have included the 2,700 s.f. of outside dining area and they have provided parking for that.

30) Any outdoor screening required by the State Liquor Commission will require HDC review.

They agree to that. There is still a lot of dialog discussions with potential tenants so they don’t have that information yet.

31) That the private street should be labeled and signed to make it clear that it is one way.

They have provided signs on Sheet 6-A and 6-B and they have also agreed to add signs stating Private Way to their plans.

32) Provide specification on the pavement and include ways to differentiate that the proposed street is not a public street.

They have shown a cross section on Sheet C-11. This is unique as this private way will be above a garage. The detail came from the structural consultants. They show some different crosswalks at both ends. There will be different site lighting than the City. Trash receptacles, parking meters and street lights will all be different than City Standards.

33) Details should be provided on the type of parking meters/monetary systems.

This detail is provided on Sheet L-2. They understand the City may consider using the same mechanisms but they haven’t made a decision.

34) That the physical tie in to the Vaughn Mall should be added to the plans, as well as on the Maplewood side.
They expanded the scope a little bit to show the crosswalks going over to Bridge Street and the other side of Hanover Street.


They provided bicycle racks in three locations. Sheet C-7 shows a bicycle storage area. They are also considering zip cars.

36) Review Site Review Agreements and approved Site Plans for the Hilton Garden Inn so as to avoid and address any potential conflicts with prior stipulations.

They have done this and on Sheet C-4 they have relocated the easement.

37) Report on how applicant will address all easements and their conformance of it.

They have provided a detail listing of proposed easements on Sheet C-4. Attorney McEachern has had several meetings with Attorney Sullivan.

38) Report on how/when closing the private street for special events.

After their June 5th meeting, there is a June 6th letter from Attorney McEachern to Attorney Sullivan regarding the street closure and details will be worked out.

39) List State and Federal permits on the Site Plans.

These have been listed on Sheet C-6.

40) Planting Plan should show public benefits.

Their original plan from Sasaki shows their design and intent and have since provided detailed plans.

Mr. Mikolaities stated that after addressing the above comments they made one more loop to City Staff to see if there were any further comments. On June 27th they made another round of changes that were more minor in nature but provided more clarification.

Questions that came up were the construction of the dewatering Plan and Note 7 was added to Sheet C-8-A and it will be included in the Construction Management Plan.

Regarding the detail on the basement water run off, there will be a garage waste ejector pit to the floor drains in the garage that will tie into the gravity sewer line tied in at Maplewood. That detail was added on Sheet C-10 and C-13 shows the basement level floor detail. There was a discussion on how ground water flows. They will be constructing a big waterproof “bathtub” and there will be no continual pumping of ground water.

Regarding the municipal stormwater, they added Note 8 on Sheet C-8-A. They have revised the grading on Deer Street and that is shown on Sheet C-8-A and 9-A. They changed the sewer pipe to SDR 35 PVC. Comment 7 was grease traps and they have consolidated them on site. Comment 8 about grease traps, they have been relocated on Hanover Street and another sanitary connection to Hanover Street has been added for the office building. They provided flow arrows for clarification on sewer pipes. There was discussion on delivery trucks loading and they originally provided two parking spaces. After Pre-TAC this morning, they have now changed the loading and signage. They changed their standard on the trash receptacles. Light poles will be City standard along Deer, Russell and Hanover Street. A detail was requested for run off/sediment collation within the private way and they
have since worked with their mechanical engineers and show a detail of street drains with removable sumps in them. They will have City catch basins with 4’ sumps. They also agree to provide a maintenance plan. They have contacted Jon Frederick and they are now specing out City standard meters. There was a discussion about raised planters and they are showing on L-8-1 all planter locations. They have maintained a 5’2” clearance for all trees for plowing. There is a large project tree which they now have details on as it is sitting on top of a parking garage. Their 8’ benches are now 6’ benches. They met with Mr. Desfosses on their drainage system and mimicking the existing flow. Their intent is not to increase stormwater runoff. They received information on the City’s new ladder truck and it will have a smaller turning radius than the city’s existing ladder truck.

Mr. Mikolaities handed out four plans to the Committee. The first plan was entitled “Revised Left Turn Lane Sketch” which showed a revised left turn lane sketch on Deer Street. They provide extended striping all the way to show a 70’ stack lane into the garage. The second plan was entitled “Revised Private Way Loading Sketch” which addresses the loading zone questions. They have added signs showing the hours. They have tried to limit the number of signs to avoid sign pollution. The third plan was entitled “Revised Rear Parking Area to Eliminate Crosswalks Sketch”. They eliminated the crosswalks to provide protection by having raised islands. The fourth plan was entitled “Revised Water line to Hydrant Sketch” that shows the 8” line they are installing and this will be added to the revised plans. The last plan was entitled “Pavement Delineation Plan”.

Robin Bousa, Director of Transportation Systems with VHB, spoke next. She indicated that the last time they met she gave an overview of the traffic study and their access and circulation plans. They went to the T&S Committee, who made some requests of them. They asked them to update the original traffic study. The only significant change on the plan was that Deer Street became one way so they ran the analysis on that. The second item they looked at was an analysis for special events on the site. The third analysis was what if the Parade Mall project was completed prior to the Westin project. They prepared three separate memorandums for each analysis and came up with three key findings. The proposed access and circulation plan does help minimize the traffic on the public street system. The second finding was that there will not be any delay in service at any unsignalized intersections with left hand turns. The third finding is that as traffic patterns change in the area, that they look at retiming the Maplewood Avenue signals, particularly Maplewood and Deer Street as a lot is happening in that area. The applicant has agreed to provide funding which will allow them to hire independent consultants to develop the appropriate plan to do that. In addition to the three analysis that the City asked for, there was also a concern about queuing on Deer Street. Rather than just say they will provide money for retiming lights, the applicant has made suggestions to improve the situation.

Mr. Holden stated that as new evidence had been presented to the Committee, the public hearing remained open and he called for speakers.

Sharon Somers, Esq, appeared on behalf of The Hill Condominium Association. She submitted a June 29, 2007 letter indicating that they have been working very diligently with the applicant regarding this project. They have reached an agreement on their concerns. Her letter summarized the items they have come to agreement on and asked that they become stipulations today. With regard to the Construction Mitigation Plan, she represented she will continue to have dialog on this plan to assure that the fire lane are properly protected. Items 1-4 are already incorporated as stipulations from T&S and will be noted on the plan. As a result of the Pre-TAC meeting, she understands that all remaining items in her letter will not be recommended as stipulations. It is critical that their agreement be able to be enforced. She is pleased to report they have worked out many of their issues. She has one outstanding issue that they will continue to work on with the applicant with to insure that their agreement is a viable one and that they will be able to continue to support this project.

Mr. Holden was pleased to see that the Hill Condo Association have agreed to pull these together. TAC is trying to avoid acting as a mediator between abutting properties. He assumes they will be able
to report to the Board that all private issues have been addressed to their satisfaction prior to the Planning Board meeting.

Attorney Somers responded that they will explore a mechanism with the Parade Mall. Enforceability is a key component to them being able to endorse the project.

Attorney Alec McEachern concurs that they will be working together to come up with a solution. Mr. Holden felt that the City’s Legal and Planning Department would be willing to work on that too.

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.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa seconded the motion.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa did not hear the private street agreement mentioned which they met about on the 20th. Attorney Sullivan was going to give documents for them to construct a private street agreement. He expressed his concern that his officers act under the color of law when they are taking enforcement action on that street and that street will basically be like someone’s driveway. Right now they have limited enforcement action and under certain conditions they would have to be invited onto the street. The Private Street Agreement would take care of those issues. He does not believe the Planning Board will go forward until the Memorandum of Understanding is completed.

Mr. Holden asked Deputy Police Chief DiSesa if it would be appropriate if an acceptable Memorandum of Understanding between the Police Department and applicant be presented to the Planning Board for their July meeting? Deputy Police Chief DiSesa agreed that would be appropriate.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa also added that the communication issues continue to be worked on with Mr. Emery. His major concern is the private way. The name for the street and signage are under consideration. Mr. Holden confirmed that the street name and the labeling of the street shall be approved by the Emergency Operation Center and Deputy Police Chief DiSesa.

Mr. Desfosses stated he would like to meet with Mr. Mikolaities and Patrick Crimmins to review final lay out issues. Also, the signals at High and Deer where they meet at Maplewood need to be shown on the plans. He would like to see a final paving and street marking plan presented for final review at DPW. He is looking for a final electrical plan for street lighting on City property and where that meter will be. There is an issue on Deer Street where on street parking spaces are and the transition in front of The Hill. On street parking spaces must meet City standards. He would recommend that at least one of their loading areas on the private street have extended hours of operation to assure there is a loading area open for tenants that may not necessarily be open by 9:00 a.m. That is a recommendation they look into and is a stipulation for someone else to make.

Ms Finnigan commented on the left turn lane sketch. She still has concerns with a left turning vehicle turning. This a.m. they talked about keeping the left turn lane and changing the transition line to make the left turn more of a pocket. She still has an issue with this design. Mr. Holden clarified that she is still looking for a revision to the Site Plan to show a specific configuration.

Ms. Finnigan asked to be involved in their meeting with Mr. Desfosses regarding on site issues.

She asked that they include in the Construction Management Plan their demo plans and how that will be dealt with regarding City streets as well as construction. Also, this plan must be approved before demolition and construction.
Once construction is completed, all pavements markings shall be repainted on all three streets. Also, if a section of roadway is damaged, they will repair it.

The tip down ramp at the exit to the garage is still not right so they need to review it. It looks like they are sending them into on coming traffic.

All crosswalks need to be City standard and the painted crosswalks are not showing city standards. Also, when they go to the Parking Committee, the three spaces near the relocated crosswalk from their site to the Parade Mall need to be removed due to a 20’minimum from sidewalk to parking stall.

On Sheet C-6-A, Note 4, it says the Stop Bar shall be 12(18”) and it should be 18”.

The project signs are in the way of pedestrian paths so they should be placed somewhere else. The sidewalk should be more in line of the pedestrian pathway near Deer Street.

She questioned how the parking meters next to the raised planters will be accessed.

On Sheet C-16 they need to put re-stripe pavements markings in their entirety on Market Street.

On Sheet C-7, they should look at the left turn only sign and move the sign closer to the inside of the garage somehow.

They need to add the street name on the street legend. Also, the handicapped signs need to be labeled consistently in their details. The accessible ramp needs to be City standard. They have a single striped parking stall and they don’t show a detail.

On Sheet L-1-B, they show a meter next to a light pole and they need to verify that is acceptable practice and there is enough room for the manhole and wires.

On Sheet L-3 she asked what the artpiece detail was? They responded that it is supposed to be a nautical theme. Ms. Finnigan asked them to make sure it doesn’t block the pedestrian way.

One Sheet L-4, they need to add that all trees shall be a minimum of 5’ from the ground to the bottom of the leaves.

Mr. Desfosses asked when they reset the curbing around the entire block it is probably going to be 5 loop detectors they will have to replace and those should be identified on the plan.

Mr. Allen asked the applicant to continue to work with the City and PSNH on the development of the temporary power and the relocation of the switches. On the Pavement delineation plan, if in fact the PSNH switches end up going across the street, they will go all the way across the street with their pavement restoration. The intent of pavement restoration is not to have a bunch of finger trenches going out. It would either be some sort of longitude cut but not cross trenches in the finished paving.

Mr. Allen asked that the fire service be upgrade to 8” and labeled as fire service only on the plans.

He also requested a follow up meeting with Peter Rice to review the grease trap location and details to make sure they have the appropriate covers and access to those.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold requested that every entrance where there is an access to a fire alarm enunciator or fire alarm system needs to have a knox box. Each building must provide automatic notification of emergency forces.
Mr. Holden verified that the cost of the traffic light at Market Street and Deer Street shall be shared between the applicant and the Westin project. The design and the construction will be a City project and cost allocations will be part of that agreement.

Regarding the Maplewood Avenue and Deer Street corridor, an independent consultant will be retained, and the cost will be shared by the parties, to look at the timing and coordination issue. It may change if one project changes. It is important that types of bricks be coordinated with DPW to insure some continuity. The intent is to make sure brick has some reasonable connotations.

Parking spaces on the indoor parking garage should be indicated as to which are contributing to the parking tallying and which can be dedicated for other non-public use (substandard size would not count).

As appropriate for public or private substations, BOA may or may not be required, and that is an outstanding issue.

All easements and licenses are to be approved as to content and form by the Planning Department and the City Attorney’s office.

Rather than have this Committee reaffirm the issues identified by The Hill, the TAC Committee recommends to the Planning Board that there should be a Memorandum of Understanding between the abutting properties and the Planning Department and Legal Department will work with the parties.

Mr. Holden asked about the asphalt to be used on the private street. Mr. Mikolaities stated that the asphalt is to be black. The difference is the crosswalks, lighting, granite banding. They started with a big distinction and now the consensus is to stick with Portsmouth materials.

Steve Parkinson, Director of Public Works, stated that it was his understanding that the asphalt would be black. Parking meters on Deer and Hanover will be the same as current City parking meters, unless the City changes their system as the City is doing a pilot program.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the following comments from the previous TAC meeting remain outstanding:

#1, 2, 10, 11, 12,14,23, 25, 26, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40.

That a Landscape plan be approved as to content and form by Lucy Tillman and any trees on City property will require review by the Trees and Greenery Committee.

Mr. Desfosses is fully prepared to meet with Appledore and their team during off hours but he is not available during the day. Mr. Allen felt they could probably schedule something at DPW and invite Mr. Holden to attend.

Mr. Holden instructed Mr. Mikolaities to schedule a meeting with Mr. Allen early one morning prior to the Planning Board meeting.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations.

(Note Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa left in this middle of the hearing and did not vote)

1) That the connection to the Vaughn Mall shall be detailed and the applicant should attempt to make it more “seamless”;
2) That the applicant shall meet with Tom Cravens regarding water issues;
3) That a detailed Construction Management Mitigation Plan shall be required, including demolition and the effect on City Streets. Said Plan must be approved prior to commencement of any demolition or construction on site;

4) That a plan of trash removal, including hours, shall be identified on the Site Plans;

5) That a detail showing the type/location for trash receptacles shall be added to the Site Plans;

6) That a plan delineating truck movements to access loading areas shall be submitted for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan;

7) That all tip downs shall be identified that are located on private property and so noted on the Site Plans;

8) That the applicant shall coordinate with Gil Emery, City Communications Supervisor, regarding the use of a digit other than “9” for outside calls;

9) That testing shall be done at the expense of the applicant to determine whether a repeater needs to be installed and said analysis shall be coordinated with Gil Emery, City Communications Supervisor;

10) That any outdoor screening required by the State Liquor Commission shall require HDC review;

11) That the physical tie in, including the sidewalk, to the Vaughn Mall, as well as on the Maplewood side, shall be added to the Site Plans;

12) That the applicant shall report back on Mass Transit Facilities and accommodations for bicycles;

13) That the applicant shall review the Site Review Agreements and approved Site Plans for the Hilton Garden Inn so as to avoid and address any potential conflicts with prior stipulations;

14) That the applicant shall list all State and Federal permits on the Site Plans;

15) That the applicant shall report on how they shall handle the closings of the private street for special events;

16) That a Memorandum of Understanding relative to the private street between the Police Department and the applicant shall be presented to the Planning Board for their July 19th meeting;

17) That the private right of way name and labeling of the right of way shall be approved by the Emergency Operation Center and Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa;

18) That a meetings shall be held with David Desfosses, David Allen, Peter Rice, Deborah Finnigan, Thomas Cravens and David Holden at DPW to discuss final details of the Site Plans;

19) That the signals at High Street and Deer Street where they meet Maplewood shall be shown on the Site Plans;

20) That a final paving and street marking plan shall be presented for final review to David Desfosses prior to the Planning Board meeting;

21) That a final electrical plan for street lighting on City property, showing where the electrical meter will be located, shall be reviewed and approved by David Desfosses;

22) That the applicant review the on street parking and the transition in front of the Hill with David Desfosses;

23) That the applicant shall consider extended hours for one of their loading areas to accommodate tenants who are not open before 9:00 a.m.;

24) That the Left Turn Lane Sketch for Deer Street be further reviewed and approved by Deborah Finnigan;

25) That once construction is completed, all pavement markings shall be repainted on Deer Street, Maplewood Avenue and Hanover Street and if any roadway is damaged due to construction, it shall be repaired to City standards;

26) That all crosswalks shall be City standard and so noted on the Site Plans;

27) That the three parking spaces near the relocated crosswalk need to be removed due to a 20’ minimum requirement from sidewalk to parking stall;

28) That on Sheet C-6A, Note 4 shall be changed to require an 18” Stop Bar;

29) That the traffic control signs on the pedestrian paths shall be relocated as they are in the way of pedestrians;
30) On Sheet C-16 pavement markings need to be restriped in their entirety on Maplewood Avenue;
31) On Sheet C-7 the Left Turn Only sign should be moved closer to the inside of the garage;
32) That the right of way name should be added to the “street legend” on the site plans;
33) That the handicapped signs need to be labeled consistently in the Site Plan details;
34) On Sheet L-1B, the applicant should verify that the meter next to the light pole is acceptable and there is enough room for manholes and wires;
35) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that all trees shall be a minimum of 5’ from the ground to the bottom of the leaves;
36) That all loop detectors shall be identified on the Site Plans and that when the curbing is reset around the entire block applicant shall be responsible for replacing them;
37) That the applicant shall continue to work with PSNH and the City on the development of temporary power and the relocation of the switches;
38) That if the PSNH switches extend all the way across the street, then the applicant shall be responsible for paving the entire street section to avoid finger trenches;
39) That the fire service be upgraded to 8” and labeled as a fire service only on the Site Plans;
40) That the applicant meet with Peter Rice to review the grease trap locations and details to confirm appropriate covers and access;
41) That every entrance where there is access to a fire alarm enunciator or fire alarm system shall require a knox box; and every building shall provide automatic notification for emergency forces;
42) That the cost of the traffic light at Market Street and Deer Street shall be shared between the applicant and those of the Westin project. The design and the construction shall be a City project and cost allocations shall be part of the agreement;
43) That an independent consultant shall be retained to look at the timing and coordination of the Maplewood and Deer Street corridor and the cost shall be shared between the applicant and those of the Westin project;
44) That the type of brick being used shall be coordinated with DPW to insure continuity;
45) That parking spaces in the indoor parking garage shall be identified as to which are contributing to the parking count and which can be dedicated for another non-public use, i.e. substandard size;
46) That BOA and HDC approval may be required for public or private substations, to be considered as the plan further evolves;
47) That all easements and licenses shall be approved as to content and form by the Planning Department and City Legal Department;
48) That the TAC Committee recommends to the Planning Board that there should be a Memorandum of Understanding between the abutting properties and that the Planning Department and the City Legal Department will assist the parties;
49) That the Landscape Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department Chief Planner;
50) That any trees on public property shall require review and approval by the City Trees and Greenery Committee;

Deb Finnigan left the meeting and designated Lucy Tillman as a voting member.

II. NEW BUSINESS

C. The application of C. Frederick Lowell and Alfred J. McElaney, Owners, for property located at 62 Deer Street, and The Hill Condominium Association, Owners, for property located off Deer Street, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the installation of a trench drain to facilitate site drainage, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said
property is shown on Assessor Plan 118 as Lots 26 and 27 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Historic District A and the Downtown Overlay District (DOD);

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Corey Colwell, AMES MSC, indicated that he provided a drainage easement plan showing the proposed easement which benefits Mr. Lowell. This will be recorded along with a plan at the Registry of Deeds. Sheet two of the Site Plan, shows their proposed improvements in detail. They plan to construct a plastic channel drain with two plastic pipes at the bottom. The purpose is to collect the water that is currently running down the sidewalk and into the applicant’s basement. They are proposing to eliminate that water by installing the trench drain. The water would then run through the Hill property to Deer and Russell to the City system. Under a ten year storm event this is pretty insignificant. The details of the channel drain are shown on D-3 and it has two four inch pipes to carry the water into a catch basin.

They should have the deed completed by the Planning Board meeting.

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.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

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

Mr. Holden asked if the Site Plan detailing the Hill shows any areas that have unauthorized brick on them? Mr. Colwell confirmed that it does. Mr. Holden made a condition that the review of this Committee is limited solely to the drainage and they are making no representation to the parking areas. He also asked Mr. Colwell to add a note to the plan.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1) That the review of this Committee is limited solely to the drainage and no other details were considered;
2) That a note be added to the Site Plan confirming #1 above.

D. The application of 85 Heritage Avenue Holdings, LLC, Owner, and Mike MacDonald, Applicant, for property located at 85 Heritage Avenue, wherein Site Review approval is requested to modify the existing building by increasing the gross floor area from 7,200 s.f. to 9,000 s.f. by adding a second floor to the northern half of the interior of the building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 285 as Lot 5 and lies within the Industrial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Dirk Grothenhuis, of Kimball Chase, presented. He stated that this project proposes some minor site accommodations for a building addition which is internal to the existing footprint. The renovations are to the 2nd floor, consisting of 1800 s.f., and will be entirely within the existing building foot print. There is a need for an egress from the 2nd floor so an exterior staircase is proposed to the north side of
the building. Building plans have been provided for the interior renovations as well as the proposed stairway plans. In reviewing this site, there were a couple of items that they wanted to review. He verified the drainage that is currently on the site. The site was developed in 1992 and approved for the plan presented. They modified the plan to update to the current conditions and at the Pre-TAC meeting they made modifications that were requested in the smaller scale plan submitted at the meeting. They are proposing to bring the building up to ADA accessibility by providing handicapped parking spaces appropriate signage and pavement markings, for access through the front door. Through the review they also confirmed the power to the building is underground and they have modified the plan to show that. They verified that the gas meter was not on the previous plan and they have now updated the approximate location of the gas line. They indicated, based on the use, an additional parking space requirement. They provided additional parking spaces. The original project had 9 spaces and they have recalculated to 18 spaces. They added some delineated spaces although there is ample room for any configuration.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden asked if the parking area in the back and adjacent to Patriot’s Park is existing? Mr. Grothenhuis confirmed that it was existing.

Mr. Desfosses assumed a sidewalk from the emergency stair is required and that was not shown on the plan so that would be his only stipulation.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses requested that a sidewalk be provided from the bottom of the emergency stairwell to the nearest paved area.

Mr. Allen requested that the 11” x 17” plan that was submitted today to TAC be submitted as a full size to the Planning Board.

Ms. Tillman asked for confirmation that the stairs meet the side and front setbacks.

The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That a sidewalk be provided from the bottom of the emergency stairwell to the nearest paved area and added to the Site Plans;
2. That the applicant provide the Planning Board with full size site plans;
3. That the side and front set backs shall be added to the plans to confirm that the stairs meet the zoning requirements.

E. The application of Bellwood Associates Limited Partnership, Owner, for property located at 2300 Lafayette Road, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the installation of a new water park slide and pool, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 273 as Lot 5 and lies within the General Business and Industrial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.
SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dick Samuels, of Bellwood Associates, Water Country, addressed the Committee. He explained that they are proposing a new attraction which is a four person tornado with a landing pool, associated walkways, fencing, lawn and stone area. It takes up approximately ½ acre of the site. It will increase park capacity by 2 – 3%. There is no change in the driveway or other parts of the park. Three years ago when they did their last addition, they left space for this walkway. The height of the structure is a little over 65’. Mr. Holden asked, for the record, if it was under 70’. Mr. Samuels confirmed that it was.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold did not have any real reservations but he asked about a hydrant? Mr. Samuels indicated that he will be submitting separately a proposal for a hydrant as the existing hydrant is not accessible. They are proposing adding another hydrant but it is not on this plan. They could include it or do it separately.

The Chair called for speakers.

Bernie Pelech, Attorney, spoke on behalf of DEH Ventures, CHI Engineering, an abutting property. They have concerns about needing a variance for a non-conforming use. Mr. Holden stated it is being considered a normal and reasonable expansion of the use and it is not a new area so the administrative finding is that it does not need to receive a variance. This decision was made by the Legal and Planning Department. Attorney Pelech stated that this use creates a lot of noise and they asked what could be done for buffering, either fencing or plantings.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Samuels about buffering. Mr. Samuels responded that when they put the driveway in years ago, they pushed it off to the west to give additional buffering. There are trees and underbrush between the industrial land. They will put trees and scrubs in along the new attraction. Mr. Holden asked that he work with Ms. Tillman and the abutter to propose some arborvitae in the area.

Mr. Holden noted that the sidewalk ends on the access drive. Do people actually walk around that sidewalk? Mr. Samuels confirmed that is for the employees to get to the infiltration area.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they should they talk about a 12’ easement now, in anticipation of the Route One expansion? Mr. Samuels stated he has not been contacted by the State but he was more than willing to grant that easement.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Ms. Tillman asked about the existing sidewalk for employees that shows fencing. She asked that the plans show where the gate is and that a sign be posted stating it is for employees only.
Deputy Fire Chief Griswold asked them to have their site engineer show the hydrant on the plan and coordinate with the water department for the installation of that.

Ms. Tillman asked if there would be an access problem to the hydrant for the fire department? Deputy Fire Chief Griswold confirmed they would go into the site and use the pathways. He did not see a problem.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1) That the applicant’s site engineer shall contact NHDOT to verify whether land is needed at Division Six in Concord, in anticipate of the widening of Route One;
2) That the Site Plans shall show where the gate is on the fence and that a sign be posted stating it is for employees only.
3) That the applicant’s site engineer show the hydrant on the plan and coordinate with the water department for the installation;

F. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 400 of the Pease Development Authority Site Review Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of 177 Corporate Drive, LLC, Applicant, for property located at 177 Corporate Drive, wherein site review approval is requested for the construction of a 10,400 ± s.f. 1+ story building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 314 as Lot 0001 and lies within a Business/Commercial District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bradlee Mezquita, of Appledore Engineering, addressed the Committee. He indicated that Appledore is constructing their own office at the PDA, just south of the Martin Point building. The project proposes to build 41 parking spaces to support a 10,000 s.f. building. Keeping with their goal to keep the building as green as possible, they constructed several stormwater measures to clean up stormwater as well as an educational facility. Utilities include water from Corporate drive and using the City sewer system. He provided a letter based on their Pre TAC meeting that morning with respect to why the entrance drive was locate where it is. It is between the two Flextronic entrance drives. They couldn’t go any further south due to the wetland buffer and they couldn’t go north due to elevation grades. Ms. Finnigan asked them to look at site distance and they are in excess of 900’ in either direction.

Mr. Holden asked if they explored the possibility of a shared driveway. Mr. Mezquita confirmed that they did to the north and they indicated they would be willing to work on a six month termination basis so that was not acceptable. Site lighting is dark sky friendly fixtures and they provided a photometrix plan as part of their project.

Ms. Tillman asked them to describe the difference in pavement colors. Mr. Mezquita stated that as part of their low impact development they are trying to make this an educational facility as well as helping the environment. The parking lot is split into two different sections. One is traditional pavement and the lighter color is pervious pavement with crushed stone and gravel underneath it. This will drain over to a low gravel wetland to the Hodgson Brook watershed.
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.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses noted the sidewalk is already built in front of their location but there is a gapping hole in front of Flextronics. He asked if it would be fair to ask the applicant to fill that section of the sidewalk? Mr. Holden felt that would be excessive. Maybe they could work out a contribution towards the sidewalk.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the applicant shall work out a sidewalk contribution with the PDA regarding the missing sidewalk.

Mr. Allen referred to the existing monitoring well on the plan. As long as it is not active, he asked them to contact Scott Hilton at DES on Pease and verify that. If it is not being used, that it be properly decommissioned.

Mr. Holden requested that they make an appropriate contribution to the transportation fund at the PDA.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold asked for automatic notification of emergency services and a knox box.

The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1.) That the applicant shall work out a sidewalk contribution with the PDA regarding the sidewalk that is already constructed in front of their site;
2.) That the applicant shall contact Scott Hilton at DES to verify whether the existing monitoring well is active. If it is not being used, that it should be properly decommissioned.
3.) That the applicant make an appropriate contribution to the transportation fund at the PDA;
4.) That automatic notification of emergency services and a knox box shall be added to the Site Plans.

---

G. The application of 68 State Street, LLC, Owner, for properly located at 68 State Street, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 7,370 ± s.f. 4/5 story mixed use condominium building, after demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 105 as Lot 13 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District and the Historic District A;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Holly Clark, from Ambit Engineering, was present on behalf of 68 State Street, LLC. The proposed use has changed from hotel to mixed use residential and retail condos. The existing building is next to Rosa’s and was used for storage by Strawberry Banke. The proposed building will be 4/5 stories. The first floor will have retail in the front and parking in the back. Court Street would provide access to parking. The existing building footprint will be reduced by pulling the building back and cutting out access for a driveway for parking. Currently utilities are water and gas from State and sewer in the rear. There is no tie in to the drainage system. They are proposing to continue to use gas in the front and work with the gas company to have proper sized lines. They will continue to use City sewer in the
rear. They will connect water and fire to Court Street and connect the roof drains to the drainage on Court Street. They recently learned that the City is planning to pave Court Street next week and they would like to proceed to install their utilities on Court Street before they do the final paving. They would also like to obtain permission to use the sidewalk during construction.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen stated that they were given the opportunity to go into Court Street with their facilities a long time ago so he felt very strongly that they would either be required to pave the top coat themselves between March Street and Atkinson Street or they go through State Street. He doesn’t see any reason for the City to jump through hoops on this as they can easily get their utilities out to State Street. Therefore, he strongly opposes them going in Court Street after the City has paved.

Mr. Allen also stated that the City is planning to redo State Street in the next couple of years and they need to do something about the roof drains draining into the sidewalks and this would be the time to deal with that issue. This is going to be a brand new building so this would be the time to address that. Ms. Clark stated they are proposing to have everything in place underground so that they would not have to dig the sidewalk back up. Mr. Allen did not see that shown on the plans. Ms. Clark referred to the utility plan, Note 7 on C-3.

Mr. Holden asked if these plans are now based on the revised lot line approved by the Planning Board recently? Ms. Clark could not confirm that. Mr. Holden stated this project is going back to the HDC for revisions and normally they would go before HDC prior to Site Review. He felt this might be a good time to identify items that they will need more information on but they will need to have the HDC approve it first.

Mr. Holden asked if there was an open space calculation? Ms. Clark pointed out the open space and included the atrium. Ms. Tillman asked if the 19% open space is the area that has scrubs in it and not the driveway and not the atrium. Mr. Holden suspected that the atrium needed to be subtracted out but they still had their 5%. Ms. Tillman asked for them to shade the areas that are being used for open space. She also stated that final parking calculations need to be provide by the Planning Department. The access to the parking needs to be 24’ wide and the plan shows 16’. Therefore, this needs BOA approval before going any further.

Mr. Holden stated they will indicate what they need and table to the next month so they can make application to the BOA and complete their HDC revisions.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Comments from the Committee are as follows:

1.) That a Certificate of Appropriateness from the HDC for the revised plan is required prior to going forward with Site Review;
2.) That BOA approval is required for the 16’ accessway to the parking area and is required prior to going forward with Site Review;
3.) That a recalculation of the open space should be noted on the Site Plans;
4.) That the water service connection must be a separate tap from the main for the fire service and the domestic service;
5.) That as Court Street will be recently paved, if the applicant disrupts Court Street they will be responsible for paving the entire street from Atkinson Street to Marcy Street to City standards;
6.) That a contribution towards repaving State Street shall be discussed due to the numerous patches in front of the three individual properties owned by the applicant;
7.) That Court Street should show a tipped down area in hatched brick and the change in grading should be better delineated;
8.) For clarity, they should show the sidewalks that are being replaced on Court Street identically to what is on State Street and if they want to show the difference of where there are brick now and where there are bricks later, they should show hatching on Court Street in a faded back color for the bricks that are already there.
9.) That the applicant should request a Pre-TAC meeting for the morning of July 31st, even if they have not completed BOA and HDC;
10.) That a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) will be required;

The motion to postpone to July 31st passed unanimously.

``````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````````

III. **ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 4:30 pm.
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Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant
Planning Department