

## MINUTES

### SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

#### CONFERENCE ROOM A CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

2:00 PM

DECEMBER 4, 2018

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Juliet Walker, Chairperson, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Fire Department and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** n/a

.....

#### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the October 30, 2018 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Eby moved to approve the minutes from the October 30, 2018 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

#### II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Islamic Society of the Seacoast Area, Owner**, for property located at **686 Maplewood Avenue**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 2-story building for religious assembly with a footprint of 3,880 s.f. and Gross Floor Area of 5,333 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 220 as Lot 90 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

#### SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon and Doug Larosa from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. Mr. Chagnon noted that this application was presented at the last TAC meeting, so he would not go through the formal presentation. They had received comments from that meeting and had prepared a response. Mr. Chagnon addressed the most recent round of comments.

TAC Comments:

- Occupancy calculations provided in previous TAC package identify considerably higher occupancy numbers for the mosque than the stated maximum occupancy of 240 identified on the site plan. Please explain the difference.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they had filed for a CUP with the Planning Board to allow 60 spaces for a 240 occupant building. The parking analysis determined that the demand was for 78 parking spaces. The applicant intends to not use all of the function areas in the facility at the same time. The proposed maximum occupancy is 240 people.
  - Ms. Walker questioned if the email response was in the packet. Mr. Chagnon responded that they would provide it to the Committee.
  - Ms. Walker wanted to make sure the occupancy was clarified. The building code measures occupancy load differently from how the space will be used. The occupancy load should not be mixed with the intended use occupancy. The building will need to have all the proper egresses etc. for the building code occupancy load. The parking will be designed based on the intended use occupancy.
  - Mr. Roediger noted that a lot of the question has to do with the report from the consulting engineers. There are plenty of egresses for the capacity. The applicants should file a letter stating that they understand what came out of the engineer report, but the intended use is for 240 people. Ms. Walker noted that the building has capacity for more than 240 people.
  - Mr. Marsilia noted that they don't generally artificially reduce the maximum occupancy load. The only time that is done is if it's a special production facility. The project should be designed to the code. Ms. Walker questioned if they would post a different occupancy than what the building is designed for. Mr. Roediger responded that they would post what the building is designed for. Ms. Walker noted that the applicants would need to use a different phrase for the parking. They will need to work with the Fire Department on how to resolve that. The applicants can make their case for parking to the Planning Board. The main concern is how the building is designed and ensuring that it meets the life safety codes. The applicants will work with the Fire Department on that. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was fine. Mr. Chagnon questioned if it could be part of the building permit phase. Ms. Walker responded that TAC needed to understand the answer to that before the design is completed.
- Landscape plan must be modified to eliminate any blockage of Fire Department Connection or hydrant on north side of building. The yard hydrant seems very close to the building, please review with Fire Department.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they took care of the landscaping part of that in the revised plan. Mr. Desfosses noted that the Fire hydrant is 10 feet from the building. Mr. Roediger responded that was probably the only location for it. The hydrant is in the best spot.
- The U-shaped sidewalk on the north side of the building does not appear to have a tip down ramp to connect to the sidewalk coming up the driveway, or for the single handicap parking space.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the design of the building includes an elevator plan.

The handicap parking space on that side has direct door access to the basement. The elevator can get people to the first floor. It is not the intent to use the sidewalk to get around. Mr. Eby questioned if the door was under the stairs. Mr. Larosa responded that it was to the left of the stairway. Mr. Eby noted that it looked like there was a tip down missing from the sidewalk. Mr. Eby pointed out where the tip down was missing. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they would add another tip down.

- Detail D on sheet D1 is inadequate. The intent is to show how the stormwater pond will be constructed to prevent ponded water from leaking down and blowing out the wall.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the detail was revised to show a perforated drain behind the wall to alleviate pressure. Mr. Chagnon did contact the Turnpike Department and they responded, but have not followed up. It will be preferable to work with them to make this part of the embankment slope. They are still pursuing it. Mr. Desfosses responded that this was still inadequate. The water should be released slowly. It should be kept in the bowl and meter out instead of infiltrate through the wall. The water should be captured and sealed. Mr. Chagnon confirmed he would update the detail for the pond. Mr. Britz questioned if Mr. Desfosses was worried about the wall's integrity. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that was correct.
- Please show the intended light fixtures and how light will be screened from the neighboring residential development.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the proposed light fixture have a full cut off. It's a box. Mr. Desfosses noted that there was still an issue because this site is higher and the houses below will be looking up at the bulbs. The cutoff won't do anything, and they can't put trees there because of the power lines. The applicants need to be very thoughtful about how to light the parking lot. Mr. Chagnon questioned if shorter poles would help. Mr. Desfosses noted that they should be screened in some way. Mr. Larosa noted that there is an existing dense set of trees on the residential lots. Mr. Desfosses responded that they are being removed to construct the houses. The lights should be directed away from the lots. Mr. Chagnon noted that they could do some landscaping on their lot to screen the light. Trees cannot be planted right there because of the power lines. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that he would reach out to the developer to work with them.
- Details E&L are incorrect. They are showing very thin binder pavements and thick top course pavements.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they would verify that.
- The drainage system has not been revised to pick up the offsite flow as requested.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that they were confident they could resolve that issue. The topography showed a flow line that went to the drainage system. The drainage will be reviewed more and they are working on the response to the peer review. They are looking at potentially putting in porous pavement. The ordinance demands the most treatment possible. The proposal includes some deep sunk catch basins. There is a small section next to the street that will be impossible to treat. Mr. Desfosses questioned if there were guardrail details on how to protect the wall. Mr. Larosa confirmed there was. Mr. Desfosses

questioned if there was enough soil between the guardrail and the wall. Mr. Chagnon responded that he would verify that. Mr. Desfosses noted that 3 feet is required.

- No revised drainage study was received. No review of the new study has been completed.
- Detail Q on D3 is still wrong. No pvc repair coupling was shown for the wye connection.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that the detail would be revised.
- Copper water service lines don't use tapping sleeves.
  - Mr. Chagnon responded that a new note would be added.
- Due to the size of the fire service and height above Maplewood, this fire line will likely collect a lot of air. The applicant will need to provide a maintenance plan for the hydrant.
  - Mr. Chagnon wondered if there was a possibility to tap the domestic and provide a shut off with an easement. Mr. Desfosses responded that the City Engineer would need to review that.
- Add a note to the Site Plan per Section 2.5.4.2E.
  - Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be added.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the turn around in the parking lot was shortended, and questioned if they still needed that much space. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was still needed. The space will allow cars to back up and turn around. Mr. Cracknell noted that it seemed like a waste of pavement. Mr. Eby added that the space was also for the cars that go all the way to the end and cannot find parking. They will be able to turn around and get out.

Mr. Cracknell questioned what the intention was for the the square shaped island with the light in it. Mr. Chagnon responded that it was not landscaped in landscape plan. It would just be grass. Mr. Cracknell commented that it should be labeled. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if the informational sign in the plan was all they were going to do. Mr. Larosa confirmed that was correct. Mr. Chagnon added that they may want to do something nicer, but they would follow the sign ordinance.

Mr. Britz pointed out that the wall measurements were a little off on sheet C4. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that would be updated.

Ms. Walker questioned how soon they would have the drainage meeting. Mr. Larosa responded as soon as it can be scheduled. Ms. Walker clarified that it was ready to go. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it was.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Ms. Walker noted that some of the items discussed today seem resolvable with meetings with the Fire Department and the Building Inspections Office. The applicant will follow up with the City Engineer on the water service. Ms. Walker asked Mr. Desfosses if the neighboring property was fine with the lighting plan, then would he also be fine with it. Mr. Desfosses confirmed he would be. Ms. Walker noted that the drainage was still outstanding. There could be a motion for initial approval with lots of outside discussion.

Mr. Britz commented that he would still love to see the wall out of there. Mr. Chagnon responded that would be a lot of negotiation with the turnpike. Ms. Walker noted that would be a big ask to make this a condition of approval. Mr. Britz noted that it would solve the wall and drainage problem. Ms. Walker commented that she would feel uncomfortable recommending this to the Planning Board with that as a condition of approval. They need to solve the wall issue without considering that, and then come back with an amended site plan if necessary.

Mr. Cracknell moved to postpone to the January 2, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Desfosses. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

### III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **The City of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Owner**, for property located at **125 Cottage Street**, requesting Site Plan approval for adaptive reuse and renovations of the former U.S. Army Reserve Center into a Senior Activity Center, and a front entry addition with a footprint and Gross Floor Area of 150 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 174 as Lot 15 and lies within the Municipal (M) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

### SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Brinn Sullivan, City of Portsmouth and Tim Nichols, AECM spoke to the application. This project is an adaptive reuse of an existing building. Most of the work that is being completed under this phase involves rehabilitation. There will also be a new entry foyer added to the front of the building. The new entryway will provide a more accessible public entry to the building. The site improvements involve some paving, improving traffic circulation, improving pedestrian access, and enhanced parking. This is essentially the initial phase of work. There may be future projects and additions that may occur at the facility.

#### TAC Comments:

- Driveway width on east side of building near handicapped parking shows 16' where 20' is required.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that this was related to comment 3 about the drive aisle. This is going to be reconfigured. The angled parking will become parallel parking. Another handicap van accessible space will be added, so there will be

two on the island and two parallel spaces on the side of the building.

- Fire hydrant to be added on south side of building to the right of the access driveway.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that two hydrants are in the area now and flank the site on the east and west side of the property on Cottage St. They did not consider the addition of a new hydrant with the scope of this project. The only addition is a 150 square foot entry foyer. That could be included in a future phase. Mr. Roediger questioned how far into the future the next phase would be. Ms. Sullivan responded that it would likely be far into the future. Mr. Roediger commented that they will have to put in a water line anyway with the sprinkler, so the new hydrant should be part of that. This is the time to put it in. Mr. Desfosses noted they will need to upsize the water line coming from the street to the building, or at least to the hydrant. Mr. Nichols confirmed that he would add that to the notes.
- The drive aisle behind the angled handicap parking spaces is not wide enough. If a 19 foot long vehicle is parked in one of the HP spaces, it will leave only 10 feet for an aisle width. Perhaps these spaces could be laid out as parallel spaces.
- A trip generation memorandum should be provided detailing the expected number of peak hour and daily vehicle trips to be generated by the facility.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that in the initial design concept they looked at the actual load trips that occur now at existing senior center. They looked at both the daily average, which was 30-40 and the event peak average, which was 60-80. Ms. Walker noted that they just needed to update the memo. Mr. Nichols confirmed that it would be updated.
- Do not attempt to widen the driveway on the west side. It is too close to the wall and railing.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that they did take a look at this, and knew it was relatively tight. The existing design does consider the constraints and there is enough room. They will look at that again to confirm. Mr. Desfosses commented that he could not imagine trying to widen that driveway between the steep slopes and the wetlands. Mr. Nichols noted that the biggest concern was the culvert. It will be reinforced with riprap to help stabilize the slope. Mr. Desfosses commented that he would be happy to meet out there to talk about the site if necessary.
- Where and of what size is the existing water line(s)
  - Mr. Nichols noted that the water pipe is on Sheet C5.0 and that information came from the army utility drawings. It is a 2.5-inch galvanized steel pipe. That service will be replaced with a copper pipe. Mr. Desfosses commented that they don't make that size. Mr. Nichols questioned what the City's preference would be for the material. Mr. Desfosses responded that they needed to determine what size is actually needed, and then he would assist with the material after that. It is likely it is a 2-inch pipe now and they measured the outside. Mr. Nichols responded that they would assume a 2-inch copper pipe is needed, but will verify that is sufficient.
- We should attempt to clean/impound stormwater from the main parking field on the west side of the building.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that all the storm water flows on to vegetated surfaces or enters the City storm drain systems via two catch basins. There is no evidence of

concentrated flows off site. There will be no new construction in the parking lot. It will just be treated and re-stripped. The goal is to not do anything in there to leave room for future re-development. When that occurs there will be more storm water management needed.

- Please clarify if 2.5" water service pipe is correct as shown, please explain.
- Please show details of the proposed lighting poles.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that this would be provided. Ms. Walker noted that they should be consistent with the City standard. Mr. Desfosses added that he could provide the standards. Mr. Nichols confirmed that would be updated.
- Any railings over 18" should be using balusters.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that there would be a new ADA ramp on the west entry. Considering the intended use would be for limited ADA access, Mr. Nichols did not believe that balusters were necessary. Mr. Desfosses questioned if they could raise the grade an inch. Mr. Nichols confirmed they could do that.
- Please use City standard •••" 50 gyration/low rap fine binder pavements for the parking lot binder and 3/8" 75 gyration/low rap mix for surface pavements.
  - Mr. Nichols responded that this would be revised.
- Use ductile iron roof downspout connections similar to the attached product submittal
  - Mr. Nichols responded that it looked like it should work fine. They used custom copper to match the historic downspouts. Mr. Desfosses noted that iron was more durable. Mr. Nichols confirmed they would make that change.

Mr. Cracknell noted that he was disappointed that there was not a lot of landscaping. Ms. Walker added that they understood it's a limited scope project. Ms. Sullivan responded that the seniors have specifically said they want to have a say and have the garden clubs work in there. Ms. Walker noted that the westend lot has a lot of landscaping potential.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if there would be a new sign on the street. Mr. Nichols responded that has not been designed or included in the package.

Ms. Walker noted that this was a City project and they are going through this as advisory. Ms. Walker questioned if this would go through Planning Board as well. Ms. Sullivan confirmed it would.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Cracknell moved to **grant** Site Plan approval, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:



1. Applicant shall update the parking configuration on the east side of the building to accommodate a 20' driveway width as required.
2. A Fire hydrant shall be added to the south side of the building to the right of the access driveway and the waterline shall be upsized as required.
3. An updated trip generation memorandum shall be provided detailing the expected number of peak hour and daily vehicle trips to be generated by the facility.
4. Applicant shall verify the feasibility of widening the access driveway on the west side with DPW.
5. Applicant shall verify the existing and proposed water lines and note size on the plans.
6. Applicant shall provide details of the proposed lighting poles consistent with the City Standard, to be provided by DPW.
7. Applicant shall update the plans to show increase in grade of at least 1" where railings are currently proposed over 18".
8. The parking lot detail shall be updated to be consistent with City standard for binder and surface pavements.
9. The detail for roof downspouts shall be updated to reflect the use of ductile iron roof downspout connections.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road**, requesting Amended Site Plan approval to construct three (3) restaurant buildings; Proposed Building #1: 5,000 s.f. footprint and Gross Floor Area, Proposed Building #2: 1,600 s.f. footprint and Gross Floor Area; Proposed Building #3: 2,310 s.f. footprint and Gross Floor Area, with related green space and associated site improvements within the existing plaza parking area. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273 as Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

## **SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION**

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond and Doug Richardson from Waterstone spoke to the application. Mr. Crimmins received the comments from Staff last evening and provided a response this afternoon. Mr. Crimmins provided a hard copy of the revisions in the meeting. They have been here before for this project. In 2016 they were here for revisions to the plaza and the Viridian complex. That was completed about a year ago. There are some changes from the last round of approvals specific to the plaza. The plan included an overlay that shows what was previously proposed vs. what the proposed amendments are. The plan originally proposed a rest pad, but there is now a tenant who needs an additional 1,000 square feet. The proposed entry in the prior design had two rest spaces that anchored middle. Those have been consolidated into one building. One of the reasons is that Chipotle is looking to occupy this space. They want to be visible on entry. This will create more of a view corridor. Another



entertainment restaurant user is looking to occupy the other location. The two buildings will be moved in to create view corridors to the back. It's a more economical solution. It will cut down on the utility service connections. Mr. Richardson added that the plaza has an alcohol restriction. They have secured two licenses. 900 Degrees is using one license and the other will be used in the new restaurant. Chipotle will not have alcohol, so it will be a good fit.

TAC Comments:

- Turning templates for driveways around all new development must be recalculated for fire department aerial apparatus.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that the prior turning exhibit used a trash truck. It has been revised to show that a fire apparatus can maneuver on the site.
- On Sheet C-3 some of the base layer of abbreviations appears to be reversed.
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed that has been cleaned up in the plans.
- Stop lines should be added at three locations near the two new restaurants.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they added the stop locations. Mr. Eby added that there were no stop signs in the aisle in the gray area. There should be one added there. It can just be paint. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- The plan shows a brick sidewalk across the driveway to the 99 restaurant. Is the driveway being closed, or is this a mislabeled crosswalk?
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed this was updated.
- To connect the main driveway sidewalk with this sidewalk, a crosswalk across the main driveway at the end of the median island should be provided.
- The 11 bike racks at the end of the main driveway are not in a desirable location for bikes. They should be closer to the stores or restaurants.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that this was moved because new tenants were moving in. They are now clustered throughout the site for better access. Ms. Walker questioned if there were any on the new green space. Mr. Crimmins confirmed there was.
- Is Tentant the name of the business, or is it supposed to be Tenant?
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed this would be revised and updated.
- The S-1 residential signs appear to be missing from the detail sheet. What is their intent?
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed this had been revised and updated in the detail sheet.
- There is a bold dashed line in a few places that appears to be a pavement marking, but is not labeled. If they are pavement markings they should be double yellow lines.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that he looked back at the history of the submissions. In January of 2016 they weren't there and then in March of 2016 they were there. Mr. Crimmins thought it had something to do with looking at traffic calming. Now the parking lot is more broken up, so they were not sure the dashed lines were warranted. They have been removed. Mr. Eby confirmed that going without striping was fine.
- There is a sidewalk near the green space that ends with no tip down ramp. It should probably be connected with a crosswalk across the drive aisle to the other sidewalk and crosswalk.
  - Mr. Crimmins requested clarification on the comment. Mr. Eby pointed out the location in the plans. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be added.
- 6" domestic water services for building of this size are not needed.

- Mr. Crimmins agreed and noted this was just a carry over from the prior plan. It will be based on what the plumbing engineer says. They will coordinate with DPW.
- Show all sewer lines as a minimum of 6"
  - Mr. Crimmins confirmed this was revised to 6".
- The applicant may want to revise the pavement thickness to something suitable for a commercial use.
  - Mr. Crimmins responded that they were just carrying the same section detail built throughout the plaza. Mr. Waterstone added that they have a good base of gravel there and have been there 10 years. They haven't had any issues with potholes. This phase will allow us to finish the top.
- The usability of the proposed reconfigured pedestrian oriented space at the front of the plaza is questionable. By placing the buildings in the center, this space is now interrupted and dominated by buildings. Please explain why this is so different from what was initially presented and approved by Planning Board for this space.
  - Ms. Walker noted that when this was approved it was done as part of the Viridian approval. This space would be designed for the Viridian. Right now it is not a community space. TAC had some access issues with it and Ms. Walker thought they had come out with a good design. This project is grandfathered for the Gateway Ordinance, so it is not as driven by community space. However, the new zoning focuses on that. This does not seem like community space. This doesn't comply with any of the community space types. This space may need to be reworked. In this plan it is dominated by a building. Ms. Walker understood the tenants drove it, but this is not programmable space. It is pretty discouraging. Mr. Richardson responded that the Viridian has been functioning for a year and they are filling up the leasing program. The green space will have a lot of events like movie nights etc. Mr. Richardson understood and fully and respected what Ms. Walker was saying, but felt there was more functionality and less traffic in some of the other areas. The green space in the Viridian is used more positively and there is a new dog park behind the movie theater.
- Please provide a comparison of what was previously approved versus what is being proposed.

Mr. Eby elaborated on his sidewalk comment from earlier. Mr. Eby pointed out where he was talking about and showed where a connector could be. Mr. Crimmins confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Cracknell questioned how they would program the two green spaces. Mr. Cracknell noted that the crop circle brick areas were confusing. Ms. Walker responded that those were the result of a previous TAC conversation, but that could be revisited. Mr. Richardson responded that they have been talking about movie nights, and will write out a list of the programming they hope to do. They are working with the movie theater to have them project a movie on the wall on the back of the building. Ms. Walker clarified that Mr. Cracknell was talking about the landscaping. Mr. Richardson responded that would be updated in the plans.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the 99 restaurant was probalbly a fairly busy place, and connectivity to that and the main plaza was weak. A crosswalk should be closer to that area. Ms. Walker responded that there was a crosswalk there previously. Mr. Richardson added that if they needed to create better pedestrian access, then it could be done. They are doing upgrades along the Constitution entrance. Ms. Walker noted that the new plan was going to be a hard sell to the Planning Board. This is replacing what was sold as a central community place. It is now scattered through the site. A small space between restaurants is not a replacement for that. This has gone backwards away from the intention. It's starting to look a lot like a shopping center.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Desfosses moved to **grant** Amended Site Plan approval, seconded by Mr. Britz with the following stipulations:

1. Plans shall be revised as presented by the applicant at the December 4, 2018 TAC meeting in response to TAC member comments.
2. Plans shall be updated to correct typos, specifically “Tentant” to “Tenant”.
3. Plans shall be updated to include a tip-down ramp and crosswalk to connect the sidewalk near the green space across the drive aisle to the other sidewalk.
4. Applicant to provide formal response on the usability of the proposed reconfigured pedestrian oriented space at the front of the plaza, including the intended program on the landscape plan for the green spaces in the plaza.
5. Plans shall include a better pedestrian connection to the main plaza from the 99 Restaurant.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Cate Street Development, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **428 Route 1 Bypass, Cate Street, 55 Cate Street, 161 Cate Street and 1 Cate Street**, requesting Site Plan approval for the redevelopment of the properties into a mixed use development, including 40,000 s.f. +/- retail/office space, 325 residential apartment units; Proposed Residential Building A: 23,800 s.f. footprint and 177,000 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Residential Building B: 21,000 s.f. footprint and 141,000 Gross Floor Area, and 23 townhomes; Proposed Townhome Buildings A: 8,640 s.f. total footprint and 25,920 Gross Floor Area; Proposed Townhome Buildings B: 11,440 total footprint and 34,320 Gross Floor Area, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 1, Map 173 as Lot 2, Map 165 as Lot 2, Map 163 as Lot 33 and Map 163 as Lot 34 and lie within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone to the January 2, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Desfosses moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:16 pm, seconded by Mr. Britz. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,  
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee