II. NEW BUSINESS CONTINUED (from May 4, 2010)

H. The application of Bromley Portsmouth, LLC and RCQ Portsmouth, LLC, Owners, for property located at 1465 Woodbury Avenue, requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish a 1,600 s.f. addition and replace with a 1-story 2,700 s.f. (footprint) addition, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 216 as Lot 3 and lies within the General Business (GB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared before the Committee on behalf of the applicant. This project is an expansion of the Schoolhouse Restaurant on the K-Mart Plaza lot. This includes the demolition of 1,600 s.f. of an existing wooden structure attached to the historic brick structure and the construction of a 2,770 s.f. expansion with associated site improvements which include new paving, new sidewalks, curbing, underground utilities, new drainage, lighting and landscaping. The project will result in a net loss of 4 parking spaces and it will reduce impervious area by 550 s.f. On April 27th they met with City Staff and he handed out revised plans based on those conversations.

Mr. Crimmins explained that this restaurant is an out parcel to the K-Mart Shopping Center. There are 591 parking spaces required for the entire parcel and they are providing 901 parking spaces. They will be constructing 36 parking spaces within the out parcel. There was a comment from staff that they should provide a traffic and trip generation analysis and that was provided. It includes the traffic generation analysis. They used ITE to determine the spaces based on the square footage of the existing building vs. the square footage of the new building.
For the record, Mr. Crimmons stated what the new building will generate in additional trips. On a weekday AM peak it will generate 15 additional trips from the existing building, the weekday PM peak will also generate 15 additional trips. The Saturday peak hour will generate an additional 23 trips from the existing structure and the Sunday peak hour will generate an additional 22 trips from the old structure to the new structure. Because this is part of the shopping center, many of the trips to this shopping center will be shared.

Their drainage design incorporates some low impact designs. Staff had commented that they should provide a Green Building Narrative and he noted in that narrative the low impact design features they have included on the site, including four tree box filters in the parking area to collect and treat the stormwater that is generated from the out parcels parking area, they will construct a rain garden as well adjacent to the loading area on the north side which will collect and treat run off that is generated from the loading area in the rear. The rain garden will also be constructed to the UNH Stormwater Center specifications.

For lighting they are proposing 12’ high dark sky compliant fixtures. A cut sheet was provided to the Committee. They also provided a Photometric Plan which was submitted to David Desfosses for his review and he confirmed it was acceptable.

They are constructing new underground utilities that will consist of underground electric communications. He noted one change on the utilities plan based on conversations with DPW: where the electric conduit will cross the road it will be encased in a 2’ x 2’ concrete encasement. They are proposing a new sewer service for the restaurant which will include a 1,000 gallon grease trap. They found that the inverts allow them to relocate the grease trap to the rear loading area.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the dumpster pad size was increased to 16’ x 16’ to accommodate any grease waste storage and the dumpster pad.

They are providing landscaping throughout the site. Their low impact design features that were incorporated for the drainage will get incorporated with the landscaping as well.

Staff had noted that the square footage for the proposed building had been added up wrong and the total building size should be 3,830 s.f. and it does not affect the parking calculations from what they previously proposed.

Mr. Desfosses asked what the concrete square was by the entrance. Mr. Crimmins stated it was the existing flag pole which will remain.

Mr. Desfosses noted they are planning on a 6” domestic water service. Mr. Crimmins stated they have not yet decided on the exact size but they can reduce it to a 4” for now on the plans. Mr. Desfosses didn’t think the 6” made a lot of sense and one of the reasons they are looking at it is because even though the water service itself is coming off the water loop for the plaza, they want to be able to isolate those valves. They want them to put a valve in for each line so it would be helpful to know what size the lines are so that when they shut down the main or the valves they
will know whether they have a complete shutdown or not. Therefore, they need to determine what size the domestic water line is going to be, prior to the Planning Board meeting. They also need to move the valves as they are underneath the parking spot and they should be put in the drive aisle so that if there is a car parked there they can still shut the main off if they have to.

Mr. Desfosses has noticed that the back driveway which they are tapping onto generally has very poor pavement and he feels that is because of the wetland to the right. The water table is very high in that area and they need to construct some underdrain in the driveway. That is a little off site but it really is the principal driveway for this use. He would like them to figure out what is wrong with that driveway and come up with an approach of how it can be fixed.

Mr. Desfosses noted that the sidewalk that they are constructing out to Commerce Way is shown as an ADA tile out at the connection of the other sidewalk. He did not feel that was appropriate as there was not a crosswalk and he asked them to remove it.

Mr. Desfosses noted the three parking spaces across from the drive aisle which they added but felt it would be more appropriate to have angle in parking. That way if someone is coming into the driveway you will be able to see them and not back into them. It is a sharp little corner and he was not sure it was appropriate to have parking there at all but if they are going to have parking spaces, they should be on an angle.

Mr. Desfosses noted they are using sloped granite curb and they have a lot of 3’ radius and they should spec those as bullnoses as they always blow apart but if they are too tight they will stay there.

Mr. Britz asked if the construction entrance was going to be the closest one to the wetland. Mr. Crimmins confirmed it will be off Commerce Way.

Mr. Desfosses also noticed where the gas main is coming into the building, he does not know what size the main is but they only show a little 5’ sidewalk next to building. Those gas meters take 2’ of that space so they won’t have much of a sidewalk left. They might want to look at running the gas off of Commerce Way or another direction so that they don’t have that issue.

The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against this application.

Kelly Mayhill, Facilities Manager at Four Direct Capsule Corporation, 155 Commerce Way. She asked if any provisions will be made for traffic off of Commerce Way while construction is underway. They have a lot of employees, clients and visitors that use that street.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the only work proposed in Commerce Way is construction of the electric conduit and the appropriate police details will be hired to direct traffic. Traffic will remain open. That will be addressed in the CMP.

Mr. Desfosses asked where they will stage the construction from. Mr. Crimmins responded that they haven’t discussed that yet but it will also be incorporated in the CMP.
The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

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

**Conditions precedent (to be completed prior to Planning Board approval):**

1. The ADA detectable surface on the sidewalk at Commerce Way shall be removed.
2. The three new parking spaces at the west end of the site shall be angled.
3. The driveway at the rear of the site shall be improved to address pavement deterioration due to high water table adjacent to the wetland.
4. The final size of the domestic water line shall be indicated on the Utilities Plan.
5. The water valve shall be relocated from the parking spaces to the drive aisle.
6. The gas main location should be reevaluated and adjusted so that the gas meters do not obstruct the sidewalk.
7. A concrete encasement shall be provided for the conduits under Commerce Way.

**Conditions subsequent (to be completed prior to start of construction):**

8. The Applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.

I. The application of **Portwalk Apartments, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **195 Hanover Street (Lot #2)**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to revise parking spaces and to add landscaping components, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 125 as Lot 23 and lies within the Central Business B (CBB) District, the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and the Historic District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of Portwalk Apartments, LLC. He stated that Lot #2 was originally approved on September 22, 2008 and final plans were submitted to the Planning Department on June 2, 2009. They are now proposing to amend those final plans. On April 19, 2010 they filed an Amended Site Review Application and met with Staff on April 27, 2010 to review the plans. Since that time they submitted minor amendments to staff for administrative approval which was received on April 30, 2010 which was for additional landscaping added along Portwalk Place and between the buildings and those changes
are included in their current plans. Secondly, on April 29, 2010 they submitted revised plans that outlined the proposed changes they are seeking approval for today. He reviewed the six changes:

1) They are revising the building footprint as a result of architectural features, including some jogs in the building. There is no increase in square footage or increase in units.

2) They removed a parking space to add a landscaped area and that has been noted in the parking calculation table.

3) Two handicapped accessible parking spaces were located on the north end of Lot #2 and they are now centered on the main entrance doorway. These spaces will be delineated by pavers.

4) The “Resident Parking Only” signs were located on the sidewalks and they have been shifted onto the edge of the landscaped areas.

5) An ornamental fence with granite bollards has been added to the parking area in four locations. This is a landscape feature to give a feel of privacy to the residential parking area.

6) The previously approved 10,000 s.f. of retail space on the first floor has been revised to include 6,000 s.f. of restaurant, 3,200 s.f. of retail and 100 s.f. of lobby space. The parking has changed as they are now providing 35 spaces and with the change of use they will use 107 of the current parking credits that were awarded to the site from the old regulations which they were approved under.

Mr. Desfosses felt they needed to find a better spot for the gas units. He does know if all of the units will have their own individual gas meters, but he did not believe the frontage on Hanover Street was an appropriate place for the gas units.

They are showing the parking meters inside tree wells and that is not acceptable for DPW. They will need to swap those around somehow so that they fit.

Mr. Desfosses stated that two light poles need to be moved. One is on Portwalk Place, almost in front of the bench. It needs to shift north so that it is not in the way of the driver’s door. Mr. Crimmins indicated they are trying to keep them centered and evenly spaced. Mr. Desfosses felt if they shifted it 2’ north, nobody will notice, and then the door will clear.

The second light pole is on Hanover Street in front of the door on the west side of the building. The pole is right where the passenger door opens. Further down, there are two parking spaces in front of a hydrant which will have to be removed and relocated.

Mr. Desfosses also stipulated that they should use the modified new brick sidewalk cross section. It is an asphalt base and sand/cement mix setting bed (not stonedust). They need to spec the same thing on the handicapped parking spaces which they are putting with pavers because they do not want those settling.

The landscaped area between the two buildings does not have to be done as it is on their property. It is up to them.
The Chair asked if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval with the above stipulations and a CMP. Deputy Police Chief Dubois seconded the motion.

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

**Conditions precedent (to be completed prior to Planning Board approval):**

1. The gas meters along Hanover Street shall be relocated.
2. The 2 parking meters on Hanover Street shall be relocated out of the tree wells.
3. The middle light pole on Portwalk Place shall be relocated to avoid car door openings.
4. The light pole on Hanover Street closest to Portwalk Place shall be relocated to avoid car door openings.
5. The hydrant on Hanover Street shall be removed or relocated away from parking spaces.
6. A detail shall be provided specifying the City's modified brick cross-section (asphalt base and sand/cement mix setting bed).
7. ADA detectable surfaces at the private parking lot shall be removed, and the brick sidewalk shall continue to the curb.

**Conditions subsequent (to be completed prior to start of construction):**

8. The Applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.

The application of Great Bay Community College, Applicant, for property located at 320 Corporate Drive, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to expand an existing parking lot by adding 84 new parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 315 as Lot 4 and lies within the Airport Business and Commercial District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Patrick Crimmins, of Appledore Engineering, appeared along with Michael Mates and Maria Stowell of the Pease Development Authority, Brad Mezquita, from Appledore Engineering, and Will Arvelo, President of Great Bay Community College.
Mr. Crimmins stated that this is a parking improvement project at the Great Bay Community College. It includes the construction of 84 additional parking spaces with associated curbing, standard paving, landscaping, relocation of one existing light fixture and the construction of pervious pavement along the northern strip of parking to mitigate potential impact of the additional parking spaces.

The proposed project includes a lot line revision in order to construct the new spaces along the northerly property line. The plan has been revised and he handed out a copy to the Committee. Mr. Crimmins pointed out that the lot has not officially been subdivided yet so the lot number should be 0 rather than 5. There is an existing wetland that is located on the northwest side of the parcel and the PDA asked them to flag that wetland and locate the 25’ buffer to make sure their proposed spaces do not fall into the buffer area. The plan reflects that the buffer is not disturbed.

They are constructing 84 additional parking spaces throughout the parking area. In the northern tier they are removing spaces and constructing some new spaces with pervious pavement. They added landscaped islands. They are proposing additional parking in the front set back and a variance was approved by the BOA last week.

Mr. Taintor noted on Sheet C-2, in one location they changed it from requested to approved but in another place it still says requested. Mr. Crimmins confirmed it will be changed for the Planning Board.

Mr. Taintor asked for clarification on the Lot Line Revision plan. Mr. Crimmins stated it was a change in the lot number from 5 to 0.

Mr. Britz asked if the wetland was shown on their plan. Mr. Crimmins confirmed it was not. Mr. Britz asked if they were putting up a silt fence up and a fence along the construction area to keep debris out of wetland. Mr. Crimmins confirmed they would do that.

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

Candace Dolan, Coordinator of the Hodgson Brook Restoration Project. She was speaking in support of the application. She indicated that Great Bay College is in the Hodgson Brook Watershed and they have an issue in the Hodgson Brook not only with the quality of the water but also the sheer volume of the water that comes in during rain events. Anything they can do to reduce peak flow by encouraging infiltration through porous pavement is something that they are really looking forward to. She is also hoping as the College moves towards being a more sustainable campus that she has the opportunity to come back again and support other projects with them.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing for this matter.
DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend Site Review Approval with stipulations. Mr. Britz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be prepared by the Applicant for review and approval by the City, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. A silt fence shall be installed to protect the edge of the wetland and an orange construction fence shall be installed at the edge of the work area.

Mr. Desfosses added that what they are basically looking for on the CMMP is how they are going to construct the parking lot expansion so they are not losing parking spaces and forcing people to park on the Pease roads.

K. The application of Meadowbrook Motor, Inc., Owner, and Key Auto Group, Applicant, for property located at 549 Route One By-Pass (Traffic Circle), requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 1-1/2 story 29,405 s.f. (footprint) automobile sales/service center, a 1-story 3,800 s.f. restaurant with drive-through, and 490 + parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 234 as Lot 51 and lies within the General Business (GB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Taintor stated the Department has received a letter from Key Auto Group requesting a postponement as they need to appear before the BOA for zoning relief. They requested to be rescheduled for the June 29th TAC meeting.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to postpone this matter to the June 29, 2010 TAC meeting. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone the application to the June 28, 2010 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

L. The application of the City of Portsmouth, Owner, for property located at 25 Granite Street, requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish an existing building and construct a softball field with bleachers, restroom/concession pavilion and a 63-space parking area, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 217 as Lot 5 and lies within the Municipal District.

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

Bryant Anderson, of VHB Civil Engineers was present along with Lisa DeStefano, project architect, and Russ Wilson, City Recreation Director. Mr. Anderson indicated he will review the proposed softball field relocation from the Middle School site to the Granite Street Wentworth School site.

They are proposing a 300’ deep softball field to replace Alumni field at the Middle School. Along with that they have a parking lot to accommodate 60 motor vehicles, and 6 motorcycles and 3 handicapped spaces are included in the total. The field will be sodded out with a skin, a dirt infield and a 740 s.f. concession building with men’s and women’s bathrooms, a press box and a storage facility.

In order to handle the stormwater from the parking lot, they are proposing a rain garden located below the parking lot to collect sheet flow from the parking lot. There is an existing drainage system that crosses through where the outfield will be which has some existing structures. The concern was that the structures would be difficult to find once the field is built and they get buried. They revised the plans to add one new structure in an area outside of the fence. They will replace the existing structures and drainage pipe that run underneath the field. There will be a 40’ high barrier netting along the outfield to catch stray balls towards Market Street. There will be bleacher accommodations along each foul line for 55 seats each with a chain link fence safety system around them so that people won’t fall off.

The PA system will consist of 2 speakers mounted on the concession building with one speaker facing towards each foul line with volume controls. They will be proposing a small sewer ejector pump system to get the sewer flows back up to Granite Street. Where the driveway comes into Granite Street there is an existing utility guy pole and it will be relocated to the west side of the driveway and will run a short space of overhead wire to a guy pole and then underground. There will be no gas, telephone or cable service. Also, they will be able to have a moveable PCV outfield fence system.

Mr. Taintor referred to the revised plan that was handed out. Mr. Anderson had hoped to get the lighting plan before coming today as there was some question about the photometrics coming out to the property line. Mr. Taintor asked him what he had actually changed on the plan he handed out today. Mr. Anderson stated they updated their plan set based on their conversation last week but had not formally submitted that to the Planning Department and intended to wait to include the changes coming out of today’s hearing. Mr. Taintor noted they added the motorcycle parking and bike racks. He asked what other items are different. Mr. Bryant noted the bleachers are different as a result of comments from the Recreation Department. They added the fence to prevent people from falling off it and they made the rain garden slightly larger.

Mr. Taintor asked about the chain link fence. Mr. Anderson stated that will be 8’ at the infield area and 6’ in the outfield area. The 6’ fence is going around the perimeter of the field.

Mr. Desfosses stated that most of his comments are utility based. He felt the layout looks good.
Mr. Desfosses asked if they talked to the utility company about running the new electric service off of what is now the guy pole and moving the guy pole. Mr. Anderson stated they have to move the guy pole as it is in the middle of the drive. They met with PSNH and they suggested running 3-phase wires overhead across the street and then dropping down and also installing a pole mounted transformer. Mr. Desfosses asked if they need 3-phase power? Mr. Anderson confirmed they need it for the lighting system and for the sewer pumps. Mr. Desfosses stated he would like them to clean up how Granite Street works. He oriented the driveway as more of a curve into the parking lot to create a hammerhead that lines up with Rite Aid so that when they are plowing they have a turnaround and asked them to leave 20’ of pavement beyond where the driveway is for a place to put the snowbank. Then they can back up into the parking aisle and pull back out of Granite Street.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the granite sidewalk that was built two years ago by Rite Aid doesn’t show up on their plan and it runs all the way to the end of the Rite Aid property. He would like them to continue the concrete sidewalk from where they left off to the point where they show it connecting to the bridge path. It would be a straight shot.

Mr. Desfosses asked that the hydrant that is at the intersection of Market and Granite which is basically out in the woods be eliminated. The question is whether they want to put another hydrant out by the Rite Aid driveway to compensate for it or whether they don’t need it or not. The next hydrant is all the way down Woodbury Avenue. He should find out what the Fire Department will want. Mr. Desfosses assumed they are going to run a conduit for the 3-phase underneath the sidewalk? Mr. Anderson confirmed it will be down the left side of the pavement. Mr. Desfosses asked them to run a couple of spares when they run the electric in case they need them in the future and the conduits will be in place.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the line to the scoreboard should go down the fence line and follow the fence line around so that it is not underneath the field. At the existing field, if a line goes dead they have to dig in the middle of the field. He’d rather dig outside the field.

Mr. Desfosses indicated that they had discussed the drainage problem on the xxtension out to Woodbury Avenue. There is a swale down the left property line. It follows the finger at Woodbury Avenue and is draining across the lawn and it is a mosquito infested area in the summertime because there is so much water and the ground is so flat. They might want to hardpipe that.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they are tying onto the existing pole on the finger of land. Mr. Anderson stated that originally they were but it doesn’t have 3-phase today. It does feed one of the residential houses.

Mr. Desfosses was very concerned about the rain garden because of the rain table in that area, when they are excavating so close to the rain garden. He requested underdrains. Mr. Anderson stated they are putting underdrains in but they are not shown on the plan.

Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked about the lighting plan for the area as he didn’t see one. Mr. Anderson stated they are in the process of preparing a plan that shows lighting out to the site.
boundaries and includes the parking lot. Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked about the light pollution spilling over to the neighbors. Mr. Anderson stated they are standard shoe box LED fixtures intended to light just the parking lot. The field lights are more of the larger 60’ poles to light the field with a switch to turn them on when the game starts and to turn them off when the game is over. Deputy Police Chief Dubois was concerned about the spillover. Mr. Anderson stated the revised plan will show that. Mr. Taintor asked when they will have the revised plan. Mr. Anderson stated the end of this week or the beginning of next week. Mr. Taintor asked if they have a full set of plans except for the photometric plan. Mr. Anderson stated he does but they need to take a look at the drainage but he will leave a set with Mr. Taintor.

Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked what the target date for demolition was. Mr. Anderson stated they do not have that yet.

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

Ellen Bolton, 1173 Woodbury Avenue. She asked if there was a fence shielding the property abutting the ball field so that they don’t become a shortcut to the ball field as they have in the past. Mr. Taintor asked if she was asking for a barrier fence to prohibit people walking through, except for the long finger of land. Ms. Bolton confirmed that was her concern as they have had people cut through in the past and she has a garden.

Mr. Anderson stated they do not have a fence now. They will need to take a look at 1173 Woodbury. At this point they are not proposing any perimeter fencing.

Kevin Leary was present on behalf of Carrie Boeing who was out of the country but lives at 1201 Woodbury. She also was requesting a fence between the ball park and her property and had concerns about what time the PA and the lights would be on until.

Russ Wilson, City Recreation Director, responded that they try not to play past 11:00 on any field in the City and they try not to have the PA heard beyond the confines of the ballpark.

Karen Oxholm, 51 Granite Street. She wanted to understand about a 40’ fence for protection. She is trying to understand where the field is going to be built and whether the balls are going to go towards their house. Mr. Anderson pointed out the 40’ fence which is a barrier netting fence along the outfield. There also will be a 6’ fence and then 8’ fence along her property.

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

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses stated he would like to see this plan one more time before it goes to the Planning Board. He would like to have a work session to work out the details.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.
Mr. Taintor stipulated that a work session would be held at Public Works to review utility issues.

Mr. Taintor noted that the fence was brought up by two different residents so he requested that the applicant look at the options for a fence to prevent people from cutting through residential properties.

Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked about the photometric plan approval. Mr. Taintor requested that the applicant provide a revised Photometric Plan that demonstrates compliance with the Site Plan standard and protects abutting residential properties.

Mr. Taintor asked about the sidewalk on Granite Street. Ms. Desfosses felt that the sidewalk on Granite Street is more of a traffic issue. They are showing the driveway coming out of the site curving left as it is the last thing on the street and there is not reason to T up the driveway. Mr. Desfosses would like to tighten it up a little bit. Mr. Britz pointed out that it will be the turn around for the road.

Mr. Taintor indicated they will be looking for a revised set of plans and they should get those done as soon as possible.

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

1. The applicant shall arrange a Work Session with staff at DPW to review utility issues and driveway configuration, and adjust the site plans accordingly.
2. The applicant shall look at options for a fence to prevent people from cutting through residential properties.
3. The Photometric Plan shall be revised, demonstrating compliance with the Site Plan standards and protecting abutting residential properties.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant