I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of The Meadowbrook Inn Corp., Owner, and Key Auto Group, Applicant, for property located at 549 Route One By-Pass (Traffic Circle), wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 5-story 120-room hotel, a 4,500 ± s.f. retail building, a 1,964 ± s.f. retail building, a 1,940 ± s.f. restaurant with drive through, a 3,800 ± s.f. restaurant and a 7,000 ± s.f. restaurant, after demolishing the existing buildings, with an accessway off of Coakley Road, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 234 as Lot 51 and lies within the General Business district; (This application was postponed from the January 2, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion.

The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Malcolm McNeill was present, along with Anthony DiLorenzo, Mike Leo, project engineer and Nick Sanders, traffic engineer. Attorney McNeill indicated that they were before the Committee on January 2nd at which time there was an extensive meeting regarding on-site and off site issues. This has been an evolving plan and one that reflects the comments of TAC. At the January 2, 2008 TAC meeting, after identifying issues regarding on site circulation and truck movements, they went to Traffic & Safety on January 10, 2008. They had a lengthy discussion and received a favorable vote from that Committee. One condition was that the pedestrian phase on the light on the by pass in the vicinity of Coakley would be required if DOT required it. They responded with a letter to David Holden on January 17th reflecting all of the TAC concerns. Based on his discussions with TAC he felt that all issues had been addressed satisfactorily except truck movements along Coakley Road, the crosswalk across the by–pass and the pedestrian phasing of the traffic signal. He wanted to make it very clear that they were supportive of the crosswalk and the pedestrian phase and they will work with the City to advance that argument with the DOT. It is the position of the applicant, and the commitment of the applicant, to work together to achieve the results that the City seeks regarding the pedestrian safety of the project. However, Attorney McNeill went on to say that if that does not occur, they wish to have the condition of approval be the same as that of Traffic & Safety which indicated a request and a desire to attempt to achieve this result but if that is not the case, it does not mean that the
municipality denies the project. They are willing to work with the City to achieve the crosswalk and pedestrian phasing. Attorney McNeill stated that this is not a case of there being a difference between the developer and the City. That difference would only come about if the city leaves their action to an action by the DOT that does not support the crossing.

Mike Leo, project engineer for VHB, reviewed the changes to the site on Coakley Road. He passed out an 11 x 17 plan of the area. There were issues raised with trucks entering and exiting off of Coakley Road from the site and particularly whether or not they could get a WB 50 into the site when one was coming out. The first of the two figures on the handout shows a WB 50 coming in at the same time as a WB 50 is going out. There is a fair amount of daylight and there is a fair amount of additional space towards the restaurant for maneuvering. This allows trucks to move in and out of the site without any conflict. The second sheet shows a passenger vehicle coming from Coakley Road. He eliminated a lot of background information on the plan to make it clearer. They moved the edge of the pavement back about the width of the sidewalk to make more room.

Nick Sanders, Traffic Engineer from VHB, indicated that as the TAC Committee was aware, they recommended as part of their off site mitigation package, signal retiming packages. The intent was to reestablish the time plan to allow the side streets to access the by-pass. The issue today is traffic backing up from the traffic circle. They looked at retiming and added a lagging southbound phase to allow the traffic circle to access the heavily northbound flow. When the side street timing comes up there is room for them. This gives the effect of increasing north bound traffic on the by-pass. They submitted this to Ms. Finnigan for her review and also Dick Ireland, Assistant Engineer at DOT and he has passed it along to their design bureau for their review. They also looked at an exclusive pedestrian phase at the end of Cottage Street. This will have a negative impact on the thru traffic which is why they didn’t originally recommend it. Public testimony and TAC comments are that the pedestrian crosswalks outweigh traffic flow. They have requested a meeting with DOT and the City to review and find a common ground and to get DOT to sign off on the pedestrian phase.

Mr. Holden asked if they are proposing that the City and the applicant go to DOT together to review this issue? Mr. Sanders confirmed that was correct and that was requested at their last TAC meeting.

Attorney McNeill indicated that the applicant is prepared to put the button and the crosswalk in and go to DOT with the City to work for it but if DOT says no the applicant would feel that they had done everything they possibly could.

Attorney McNeill requested that be approved by TAC and scheduled before the February 21st Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Holden indicated that as this is a public hearing and new information has been presented, he called for public comments.

Al Romano, Coakley Road, stated that he appreciated all of the work of the City to put in a pedestrian phase light. He hopes they don’t stress the negative impact when the traffic backs up.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Ms. Finnigan made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Ms. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden indicated that because this application has been postponed in the past there is not a complete list of conditions so the Committee members should make sure they make a complete list.
Mr. Desfosses indicated that the applicant has shown that they are willing to work with the City and he commended them for that. At the end of the day, he felt this project will be a good thing. Mr. Desfosses stated that pedestrian crossings have been his main issue since the first meeting. He is aware that Traffic & Safety asked the applicant to work with DOT but he feels it should be the City’s position and a recommendation to the Planning Board that they need a pedestrian crossing and the City wants one and the project is dependent upon one. He is looking for an exclusive or concurrent pedestrian phase at the intersection of Cottage, Coakley and the Route One By-Pass and for the striping and signal equipment that comes into play with a pedestrian crossing being installed by the applicant.

Mr. Cravens noted, in reviewing the plans, that there is only one gate valve on the fire or domestic entering the buildings and they would like to see a valve on both and it should be clearly shown on the plans for the Contactor. That way, if one building happens to not have a tenant and it’s not heated, the water can be shut off and there is no worry about it freezing. The next item is the utility services entering Restaurant C should be checked for interference with underground utilities and plantings overhead. They should also check the same thing where the utility enters Restaurant B. On the Detail Sheet C-9 Mr. Cravens gave Mr. Leo a sketch of how he would like the meter installation done. Also he gave Mr. Leo a sketch of how they would like to have the valve pumping arrangement where the waterline crosses and ties into the Cottage Street main so they can continue to pick up the end of the 12’ and continue it without interfering with the people tied into the services on the 6”. The hydrant detail on the Detail Sheet indicates that if thrust blocks are not used in the valve or the piping shall be tie rods or clamps and the City’s standard is they like to have them all restraining joints from the T all the way up to the hydrant, in addition to the thrust blocks. Also, on the General Note Sheet C-2 or C-3, it indicated they are going to use 6 mm poly over all the pipe to protect it from corrosion but in the detail sheet they are saying 5 mm poly. Mr. Cravens confirmed the standard is 6 mm and that should be corrected.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Cravens if he had any concerns with automatic sprinklers for landscaping? Mr. Cravens asked Mr. Leo if there was going to be any irrigation for the landscaping? Mr. Leo confirmed it was just in the front of the building. Mr. Craven confirmed they should be controlled by Smart Controller, which is a standard definition by the Irrigation Association. Mr. Cravens also indicated that they need to make a note that they only irrigate between 10:00 pm and 5:00 am.

Mr. Allen confirmed that Mr. Cravens already mentioned the adjustment on Cottage Street. Mr. Allen felt that the water improvement to bring water into this site have also extended across to Cottage Street which will provide a redundant feed of water into that area which is very helpful to the City’s system. They also did the off site sewer improvements which they felt were necessary to take care of this area and those have all been shown on the plan and reflect the City’s need. Mr. Allen also confirmed that he has received the past use surcharge paperwork with calculations and those seem to be in order.

Mr. Britz looked through the Stormwater Management and Inspection and Maintenance Plan and he noted that it talks about the site logs and he would like to have copies of those sent to the Department of Public Works or himself.

Assistant Fire Chief Achillies indicated that the Fire Department supports the development and it is moving along pretty well. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold has talked to them previously but he reiterated that all of the buildings require a supervised and monitored fire alarm notification system tied into the municipal system or a private one appropriate to the buildings and he would refer specific requirements to Deputy Griswold. They would require the appropriate fire protection system for all alarms. Hydrants need to be kept accessible with no vegetation close to them. Assistant Fire Chief Achilles indicated that it was brought up at Traffic & Safety and he wanted to reiterate that the two intersections going to the hospital are key intersections and he requested a stipulation that traffic preemption that is approved by State DOT shall be installed at the Cottage Street and By-Pass.
intersection and the Borthwick and By-Pass Intersection. He stated that radio coverage is important at
the hotel. Having lived on Cottage Street, Assistant Fire Chief Achilles believed pedestrian access
across the street is a very important part of public safety for the neighborhoods and as they will be
crossing the street he feels they should provide a safe crossing.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa discussed the communication issue. He asked them to continue to work
with Gil Emery, Emergency Center Supervisor, and the Motorola carrier to establish the need and do a
site survey to assure that the proper communications are set up at the location. Fire and police need to
be heard inside the hotel building and transmit out of the building. For the record, Deputy Police Chief
DiSesa indicated that he is on the Traffic & Safety Committee and he feels very strongly that they have
to get pedestrians safety across the by pass. He believes this site will draw pedestrians by the very
nature of the businesses that they will have on the site. He stated the City would be remiss and would
create a possible serious issue if they do not do all that they can to get pedestrians safely across the by-
pass. He will work with them and DOT any way he can. As the Deputy Police Chief, he would be
very reluctant to sign off on anything that did not include a safe route for pedestrians to cross that road.

Assistant Fire Chief Achilles also requested Knox boxes on their occupancies. They will require
individual knox boxes so they can gain access during emergencies and off hours to all locations. On
the Siamese he noted Fire Department connections, and he would defer to Deputy Griswold, but they
are moving to a Storz connection rather than 2 ½”. The Storz connection is 5”. That was not a
stipulation but should be referred to the Deputy Chief.

Ms. Finnigan stated for the record that the plan submitted that they received on January 22nd is what
she approved. As well as plans she received today for the driveway configuration what she agreed will
work a lot better and that should be included in plan set.

Ms. Finnigan requested a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP). On Sheet C-1 they
have a construction sequence that needs to be included in the CMMP. Any of the Stormwater
Protection Plan needs to include a detail of the catch basins if any are on Coakley Road and the Route
One By-Pass. Secondly, she requested that they include a post signal timing and phasing into the plans
for the intersection at Coakley Road and the Route One By-Pass as well as Borthwick and the Route
One By-Pass. This timing and phasing needs to be approved by the New Hampshire Department of
Transportation.

Ms. Finnigan asked for a request for a meeting with DOT between the developer and the City and there
should be a follow up prior to the Planning Board meeting to resolve some of these issues. She
understands that the developer has requested a meeting but that has not been set up so they need to
make sure that they follow up and make sure that occurs before the Planning Board meeting. She will
support the crosswalk across the by-pass.

Attorney McNeill indicated that they don’t have control of the timing of that meeting. Ms. Finnigan
stated she understood that but her issue was that if they go to the Planning Board without the State’s
approval, the Planning Board won’t have that information. Attorney McNeill stated that the Planning
Board would not approve this without that information. He suggested they arrange the meeting before
Planning Board meeting but not before the Planning Board approval. He felt if they could go before
the Planning Board on February 21st they could accomplish a lot of business even if the DOT meeting
has not been arranged. They will make a commitment not to ask for approval until the DOT meeting
occurs. Ms. Finnigan stated that would be fine.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-1, under General Notes, Note 12, where it talked about damage
resulting from construction loading shall be repaired by the Contractor at no additional cost to owner.
She asked them to add “or the City if City owned property is damaged”.
Ms. Finnigan asked Mr. Desfosses where they put in the sidewalks where they need an overlay? Mr. Desfosses felt it was. Ms. Finnigan indicated that it does not quite match up. Mr. Desfosses stated that the concrete sidewalk that is shown on that side of Cottage Street is a concrete sidewalk added to the slop granite curbing that is already there. On the other side of the street the applicant has committed to mill and overlay from the water main connection to the by-pass. Mr. Leo confirmed that was correct. Ms. Desfosses stated he was okay with the plan because it would be very complicated to do that one little corner and they can live with a small patch. Regarding Cottage Street he felt they should be asking the developer for sidewalk A to be extended to the driveway of 174-14, the house on the corner. Mr. Leo had given testimony before that because there was a small bumpout in the right of way that there is not enough room. However, if they were to draw a line further up the street instead of ending, they would see that there is enough room because the street has gotten wider because of the driveway. He would ask that they extend the sidewalk to that driveway to actually get people off the sidewalk instead of the middle of the lawn area. Secondly he asked that the curbing on that side of the street from the drive way to the handicapped ramp, including the handicapped ramp, be converted to vertical granite curb in accordance with the detail shown on the Detail Sheet which shows a 6” reveal on the granite curb.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-2 and the handicapped signage near Restaurant A needs to show the order that they will be on the post. By Restaurant A the handicapped space does not have a sign associated with it. The stop sign past Restaurant B needs to be pointing to the actual sign post and not the striping. Stop bars at the By-Pass and Coakley Road should be 24” wide and not 12” wide.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-5 where most of her questions have to do with the trees blocking stop signs. They need to be pulled away from the stop signs by either changing the landscaping or making a commitment to trim them. She will need to know that prior to the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Holden felt it might be easier to have a meeting to review the Landscape Plan with Ms. Finnigan, Ms. Tillman and the applicant.

Mr. Desfosses went back to paving and milling. He felt it would be appropriate to cover the gas trench with pavement milling. It appears they can go out past the gas and still be inside the curb line and not be in the By-Pass. Ms. Desfosses stipulated that the area shown as shaded milling area be expanded easterly to cover the proposed gas trench.

Ms. Finnigan referred to Sheet C-11, Site details, they need to add a note that trees under 4” need to be a minimum of 6’ from the ground to the canopy. Mr. Leo said it was Note 1 on the right hand side of Sheet C-5. Ms. Finnigan was fine with that.

Ms. Finnigan referred to the sign summary, 7-1, and indicated it should have left or right underneath it.

For the record, Ms. Finnigan requested the following stipulation: That the New Hampshire Department of Transportation approve, and the Developer construct, a crosswalk to convey pedestrians across the Route One By-Pass along with a pedestrian phase, appropriate pedestrian signal equipment, meeting ADA requirements, for the Route One By-Pass at the Coakley Road traffic signal.

Mr. Britz felt, as with other big projects, it is important to have an over-site engineer on site. He was not sure how they would select that individual. Mr. Holden clarified that the stipulation should indicate that TAC recommends an independent over-site engineer to assure the Site Plan is followed and Mr. Britz will work out the details with the applicant and the City.

Ms. Tillman asked about offsite utilities and details needing to be worked out. Did that need to be a stipulation? Mr. Allen felt that the details they need worked out have been taken care of with Mr. Cravens and they are all set.
Mr. Holden indicated, for the record, that he was unsure whether prior Plan Sets, separate from the one before the Board at this meeting, satisfied Site Review criteria G, J. and N.

   g. That site development lacks adequate quantities, type, or arrangement of landscaping and open space for the provision of visual, noise and air pollution buffers;
   j. The proposed volume and arrangements of vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow, including but not limited to parking areas, intersections, roads, or driveways, and traffic controls will create an unacceptable increase in safety hazards and traffic congestion;
   N  The site development will result in an unacceptable burden on municipal solid waste disposal facilities, police services, or other municipal services.

Under one of those previous plan sets he would not have voted in support of this project. The present plan set addresses off site improvements and satisfies criteria N. In working with TAC, the site development now has the proper arrangement of landscaping. The sole criteria that still remains at issue for himself is J regarding the proposed volume and arrangements of vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow and he feels that it is addressed by the stipulation that Ms. Finnigan made which requires basically all parties to meet and bring this about. Absent that pedestrian control he does not know how he would review this plan and that is a critical proponent and he intends to support the motion.

Motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following Stipulations:

1) That there shall be a separate gate valve on the domestic and fire water service entering the buildings, and these shall be clearly shown on the Site Plans;
2) That the utility services entering Restaurant B and Restaurant C should be reviewed so as to consider/correct for possible interference from plantings that may grow into these;
3) That the meter installation on Sheet C-9 and the valving pumping arrangement where the waterline crosses and ties into the Cottage Street main shall be revised and approved as to form by Thomas Cravens of DPW;
4) That the hydrant detail should be revised to include all restraining joints from the T all the way up to the hydrant, in addition to the thrust blocks;
5) That the Detail Sheet shall be revised to indicate that 6 mm poly rather than 5 mm poly shall be used to wrap all pipes;
6) That the irrigation system shall be controlled using a Smart controller and a note shall be added to the Site Plans that irrigation shall only be done between 10:00 pm and 5:00 am;
7) That the Drainage and Stormwater Management Maintenance Logs shall be provided to Public Works on a regular basis, and that schedule shall be determined by Peter Britz, Environmental Planner;
8) That an Emergency Notification System shall be installed and tied into the City’s municipal system or a connection to a private system;
9) That individual knox boxes shall be required to gain access during emergencies and off hours;
10) That all hydrants shall be kept clear of vegetation that would hinder their accessibility;
11) That a traffic pre-emption system, approved by NHDOT, shall be installed at the intersection of Cottage Street and the By-Pass and Borthwick Street and Route One By-Pass;
12) That the applicant shall work with Gil Emery, Emergency Operations Center Supervisor, and Motorola to complete a site survey to determine what is required to allow radio contact within the buildings;
13) For the record, Ms. Finnigan indicated that the Site Plan received by the Planning Department on January 22, 2008, along with a plan received at the February 5, 2008 TAC meeting regarding the revised driveway configuration, which should become part of the Site Plan set, are what she has approved;
14) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by the City Manager, City Attorney, Planning Director, and Director of Public Works, prior to the issuance of a building permit;
15) That a post signal timing and phasing shall be included into the plans for the intersection of Coakley Road and Route One By-Pass and Borthwick Avenue and Route One By-Pass, and shall be approved by NHDOT;
16) That a meeting shall be held with NHDOT, the applicant and City representatives and approval must be received from NHDOT for the pedestrian crosswalk;
17) That on Sheet C-1 under General Notes, Note 12, the following wording should be added “or the City, if City owned property is damaged”;
18) That the applicant shall extend the sidewalk to the driveway of 174-14 (the house on the corner);
19) That the curbing on the north side of Cottage Street from the driveway to the handicapped ramp in the intersection, including the handicapped ramp, shall be converted to vertical granite curb in accordance with the detail shown on the Detail Sheet which shows a 6” reveal on the granite curb;
20) That on Sheet C-2 the handicapped signage shall show the order that the signs will be placed on the post;
21) That signage shall be added to the Site Plans to identify the handicapped space next to Restaurant A;
22) That the Site Plans shall be revised to show a 24” wide stop bar at the Coakley Road and Route One By-Pass intersection;
23) That a meeting shall be scheduled with the applicant, Deborah Finnigan and Lucy Tillman to review landscaping and sight distances, prior to the Planning Board meeting;
24) That the area shown as “shaded milling area” on the Site Plans shall be expanded easterly to cover the proposed gas trench;
25) That the New Hampshire Department of Transportation shall approve, and the Developer shall construct, a crosswalk to convey pedestrians across the Route One By-Pass along with a pedestrian phase, appropriate pedestrian signal equipment, meeting ADA requirements, for the Route One By-Pass at the Coakley Road traffic signal;
26) That the Technical Advisory Committee recommends that an independent over-site engineer be retained to assure that site work is done properly;
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SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Michael Mates of HTA Kimball Chase, representing Two International Group. Also present was Dirk Grotenhuis, of HTA Kimball Chase, Dan Plummer, of Two International and Maria Stowell of the Pease Development Authority. This application was postponed as they had a site setback that was not conforming. They made a lot line adjustment through the PDA so that the set back now conforms.

Mr. Mates reviewed the stipulations from the last meeting.

First, the sewer line that was running through the building should be abandoned. This condition is referring to an existing sewer line that goes through the property. It is abandoned and is shown to be removed on the Sheet C-3. It has also been called out to be filled with flowable fill and capped at both ends.

There is also a fire hydrant that is on site that is abandoned and that is called out to be removed on the plans. They worked with Tom Cravens to confirm it had been abandoned.

There was a comment regarding a detention basin and they have revised the basin to reduce the disturbance in the wetland by 7,000 s.f. They have also added to the plans the side slopes to the basin and the treatment swale and conservation seed mix.

A copy of the Traffic Impact Statement was provided to Ms. Finnigan and Ms. Stowell, in addition to the land use code handbook that allowed them to calculate those trips.

In their meeting with Ms. Finnigan they discussed truck circulation on site, they reviewed the plan that they submitted prior to January 8th TAC meeting and they came to a meeting of the minds that the plan was sufficient. They were able to add some additional signage on C-5 identifying the truck routes in and out of the site.

They were asked to discuss with Gil Emery the necessity of putting a repeater in the vicinity. They have contacted Mr. Emery and they are in communication to begin a study process to see if that repeater was required.

Mr. Allen had required that they delete the manhole connection which they noted on the Detail Plan.

It was noted that some utilities were in the vicinity of proposed landscaping. They did an overlay of the landscaping plan to make sure there were no conflicts in that area.

Mr. Mates indicated there were a number of site distance issues with regard to landscaping. In their January 16th meeting they reviewed that with Ms. Finnigan and they have met her requirements.

They were asked to add trees to International Drive which they have done. The burning bush has been replaced on the Landscape Plan.

Mr. Desfosses had asked for a detail to the drawing for a light pole with a 6” base and a 25’ pole, which are shown on Sheet C-12.

There was confusion about what would happen in a parking area and it will be replaced with loam and seed. Rather than call out what they were doing in that area, they specified that a 6” depth of loam and seed will replace the parking lot.

They showed on Sheet C-5 where they had filled in the existing curb cut with vertical granite curb.

They corrected the stop lines and they removed the stop lines but the signs will remain.
On the utility plan they revised the contact info to include Mike Jenkins for the Water Department and Frank Ott for the Fire Department.

There was a question about sidewalk along International Drive. They have added a detail on Sheet C-9 pertaining to the front side. There are two sidewalk details.

There was a request to add a sidewalk along the main entrance which they have done.

There was a request for water and waste water calculations. Their mechanical plumbing engineer is getting to that point and they will submit that information to them at a later date.

The Construction Management and Mitigation Plan will be prepared and a note has been added to Sheet C-2.

There was confusion about sediment erosion control shown on the plans. They have showed the silt fence at the construction entrances.

Mr. Mates believed that he touched on the major points that were brought up at the last TAC presentation.

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 made a motion to approve with stipulations from the January 8, 2008 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden indicated that the applicant has probably addressed a great many of the previous stipulations but this keeps them current.

Ms. Finnigan requested that the Construction Management and Mitigation Plan shall show the protection of catch basins in the roadway on the plans and the construction sequence from Sheet C-8 shall also be included along with drawing C-6.

Ms. Finnigan requested that a stop bar be added to the middle driveway on C-4. There should also be a stop bar on the new driveway that comes from the new building. Lastly, she requested that during construction the truck entrance signs should be on the main road and should have a left or right arrow, depending on what direction they are coming.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa indicated that he would request that the applicant shall work with Gil Emery, Emergency Operations Center Supervisor, and Motorola to conduct a site survey to determine what is required to allow radio communications inside the building.

Assistant Fire Chief Achilles asked what the stipulation was regarding Frank Ott? Mr. Allen confirmed he was just the contact person for the fire alarm. Assistant Fire Chief Achilles was not present when they had the discussion on the alarm system however he reiterated that they will require an emergency notification system. Mr. Mates confirmed they will have a sprinkler system inside the building and the alarm system will be connected to it. Assistant Fire Chief Achilles added that it must be tied into the City system. He also required a knox box. Mr. Mates stated there was a note on the plans.
Mr. Allen noted one section of the sewer line that is on the southerly side of the site that runs into the manhole. They show removal up to the berm but they had also intended that that last section of line be filled and plugged at the sewer manhole and that is not called out.

Mr. Cravens referred to the note sheet where they mention testing the water main with air. It is highly recommended they use water and not air. They should follow AWA standards.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that at the last meeting he had requested one additional light pole which was provided but he would also like them to move it to the southwesterly side of the driveway.

Mr. Holden felt that the plans are very appropriate and address all of the concerns that they had and he appreciates his effort.

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

**Stipulations from the January 2, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:**

1) That the sewer line running through the building needs to be labeled on the Site Plans as abandoned and that it shall be removed;
2) That the applicant shall address the hydrant in the middle of the parking lot by contacting DPW to work with the field crews to either relocate or abandon the hydrant;
3) That it is recommended that the detention basin be moved outside of the wetland buffer to protect a significant wetland;
4) That a copy of the traffic impact information used to calculate the traffic impact fee shall be provided to Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, for review and comment;
5) That a Landscape Plan shall be included in the Site Plan Set and shall be reviewed and approved by Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer and the Chief Planner;
6) That a Photometrix Plan shall be included in the Site Plan Set for review and approval by David Desfosses, DPW;
7) That the curbcuts shall be revised on the Site Plans;
8) That the existing parking shall be labeled and hatched on the Site Plans;
9) That truck turning radii shall be provided for WB 60’s going around the site, including how they will back into the loading berths, for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer;
10) That the two way traffic in the rear of the building shall be documented for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer;
11) That truck route signs and a barrier shall be added so that trucks are prohibited from making a left hand turn out of the site;
12) That a study be completed to determine whether radio communications are adequate. The applicant shall contact Gil Emery of the Emergency Operations Center for assistance;
13) That a WL center line shall be added to the Site Plans at both locations;
14) That the ADA parking calculations shall be provided to Deborah Finnigan for review and approval;

**Stipulations from the January 8, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:**

15) That the sewer line shall be revised to show the unused sections filled with fill and bricking off the manhole connection;
16) That the sewer mortar connection is not allowed by the City and only the boot shall be used;
17) That the hydrant shall be labeled on the Utility Plan;
18) That a conservation seed mix shall be used around the treatment swale and so noted on the Site Plans;
19) That the trees that are on top of the underground utilities shall be relocated and so noted on the Site Plans;
20) That a copy of the ITE Lane Use Code 150 shall be provided to Deborah Finnigan for her review and approval prior to the Planning Board meeting;

21) That trees CA and CK shall be moved back from the curbline for site distance, that the two trees nearest the delivery section shall be moved back from the line of site; that the tree in the middle of the driveway needs to be moved as it blocks the view of the two parking spaces; and all trees must have a minimum of 6’ from the ground to the canopy;

22) That the last parking space shall be reviewed to make sure there will be room to open the car door when the tree is full grown;

23) That plants and trees shall be added to the Site Plans in the parking lot furthest to the south;

24) That the burning bush shown on the Landscape Plan shall be replaced with another species as it is on the States Prohibitive Species list;

25) That a recommendation was made that none of the light pole bases shall be more than 6 inches from the ground and that a detail be provided;

26) That an additional light pole be added by the north driveway, similar to the pole at the south driveway;

27) That a detail for the existing paved area be added to the Site Plans;

28) That a detail showing all existing driveways being hatched except the one which will be done with granite curb shall be added to the Site Plans;

29) That the Existing Site Plan shall be renamed Demolition Plan and a note added that the pavement is being removed and replaced with loam and seed;

30) That the issue of trucks coming into the new driveway and going over the on coming travel lane shall be resolved;

31) That the stop line at the edge of the pavement shall be removed;

32) That the Utility Contact information shall be revised to include Mike Jenkins (427-1552) for Water Division Construction purposes, the Sewer Division should be added and Frank Ott, Fire Department (427-1515) should be added;

33) That the integral curve shall be removed from the detail for the concrete sidewalk;

34) That a note shall be added to the Site Plans that no metal or wire shall be used in the concrete sidewalks;

35) That water and waste water discharge flow calculations shall be stamped by a Professional Engineer and submitted to DPW for approval;

36) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by Deborah Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, David Holden, Planning Director, the City Legal Department and the City Manager;

37) That on Sheet C-2, Note 10, it should read “police detail” rather than “flagman”;

38) That truck entrance signs shall be added at the new driveway;

39) That the stabilized construction entrance should be included in the CMMP and removed from the Grading and Drainage Plan;

40) That a connection from the sidewalk to the building be added to the Site Plans;

41) That it is recommended that the Planning Board recommend to the PDA that prior to the issuance of a building permit the PDA staff will review the final proposed Site Plan with staff from the City to assure that all conditions are met;

**Stipulations from the February 5, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:**

42) That the Construction Management and Mitigation Plan shall show the protection of catch basins in the roadway on the plans and the construction sequence from Sheet C-8 shall also be included along with drawing C-6;

43) That a stop bar shall be added to the middle driveway and the new driveway that comes from the new building, on Sheet C-4;

44) That during construction the truck entrance signs shall be on the main road and should have a left or right arrow, depending on what direction they are coming from;
45) That the applicant shall work with Gil Emery, Emergency Operations Center Supervisor, and Motorola to conduct a site survey to determine what is required to allow radio communications inside the building;

46) That the Site Plans should reflect the section of the sewer line which is on the southerly side of the site being filled and plugged at the sewer manhole;

47) That the note on the Site Plans regarding testing of the water main should be revised to follow AWA standards which requires testing be done with water and not air;

48) That the new light pole shall be moved to the southwesterly side of the driveway;

II. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant