

**MINUTES OF MEETING
REGULAR MEETING
PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

7:00 P.M.

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

APRIL 21, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kenneth Smith, Chairman; John Ricci, Vice-Chairman; Thomas Ferrini, City Council Representative; Cindy Hayden, Deputy City Manager; Richard A. Hopley, Building Inspector; John Sullivan; Raymond Will and Donald Coker

MEMBERS EXCUSED: George Savramis and Alternate Jerry Hejtmanek

ALSO PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director; and,
Lucy E. Tillman, Planner I
Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

.....
The Chair announced that the Department of Public Works will be having a Hazardous Waste Day on May 7, 2005 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon at the Peverly Hill center.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes from the March 17, 2005 Planning Board Meeting – Unanimously approved.
 2. Minutes from the March 24, 2005 Planning Board Meeting – Unanimously approved.
-

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **Engel Family Trust, Robert Engel, Trustee, Owner, and API of New Hampshire, Applicant**, for property located at **50 Campus Drive**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 108.4' x 111', 12,032 ± s.f. 1-story addition to an existing structure, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 267 as Lot 23 and lies within an Industrial district. (This application was tabled at the March 17, 2005 Planning Board Meeting)

B. The application of **Engel Family Trust, Robert Engel, Trustee, Owner, and API of New Hampshire, Applicant**, for property located at **50 Campus Drive** wherein a Conditional Use Permit is requested as allowed in Article VI, Section 10-608(B) of the *Zoning Ordinance* to allow a 12,032 ± s.f. addition to an existing warehouse within an Inland Wetlands Protection District. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 267 as Lot 23 and lies within an Industrial district.

The Chair read both notices into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Pelech addressed the Board. He pointed out the existing building that was approved in 2000 and the wetlands that are now 6' from that building. The wetlands were considered non-jurisdictional as they were man-made.

Peter Britz and Michael Cuomo took a look at these wetlands to determine whether it was now taking on the characteristics of a real wetland. Over the past 5 years this had taken over some characteristics of a wetland and a determination has been made that this is a jurisdictional wetland and they have now applied for a Conditional Use permit.

Mark West, the applicant's wetland scientist was present for questions. Mr. Britz also made recommendations that they will follow. They will be making the situation better. He then turned the presentation over to John Chagnon to review the Site Plan aspect.

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, indicated the project consists of doubling the size of the existing structure. Pavement will be extended to the northeast and will provide additional parking spaces, they will move the dumpster and in the southeast corner there will be loading doors for the box trucks. There will still be a loading zone in the front that will be used as a receiving area. To offload some equipment they will need a fork lift truck access to the outside, requiring a small paved ramp to the side door of the addition. The building pitch runs east-west but it consists of run off from the roof. 864 feet are actually in the buffer and that is mostly the ramp. In October, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval with stipulations. Mr. Chagnon addressed those stipulations.

- 1) That this approval shall not be presented to the Conservation Commission as grounds to grant a Conditional Use Permit;

They did not present this approval to the Conservation Commission and the Conservation Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit;

- 2) That the water supply to the automatic sprinkler system shall be shown on the Site Plans;

This has been shown on the plan.

- 3) That the irrigation system shall be isolated with a backflow preventer, commensurate with the degree of hazard, installed according to water division standards;

This will not be a problem and should remain as a stipulation.

- 4) That the dumpster pad shall be attached to the pavement;

This has been done.

- 5) That sidewalks shall be required along the frontage of the property;

Mr. Chagnon asked that if a sidewalk is required, that it be constructed on the west side of Campus Drive as it is flatter. This would also be the only sidewalk in the subdivision.

- 6) That snow storage shall be labeled on the Site Plans;

This has been done.

- 7) That the need for Conditional Use shall be determined between the Planning Department and the Applicant;

This has been determined and an application has been filed.

Mr. Coker asked about the pavement below the Phase II section and to the side of the Phase II section. He asked where the ramp was?

Mr. Chagnon indicated there is a paved ramp to the southeast side of the building and it is in the buffer zone. The square on the plan is the concrete door.

Mr. Coker asked about stormwater runoff treatment.

Mr. Chagnon stated that on the original plan there is a dividing line at the line of the existing building and the drainage to the west flowed down and collected in the front/green area, underneath the northerly driveway to a culvert and then down a 100' treatment swale and down the north side of the parking area. Originally they had an area with a grass filter strip or a catch basin with an oil debris hood. They discussed with the Conservation Commission putting in plantings in the buffer.

Mr. Coker confirmed that there are two methods of treatment?

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that was correct. They will work out which is most appropriate and indicate that on the plan.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked what material was going to be in the back area?

Mr. Chagnon stated there would be grass and an enhanced buffer.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if there would be new irrigation on site?

Mr. Chagnon indicated that none was proposed. The concern was that when they put the original irrigation in they did not put the proper back flow prevention in so they want to make sure that is corrected.

Mr. Ricci asked how they were enhancing the buffer zone.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that Mark West would talk about that and describe the planting of materials.

Mark West addressed the Board. He indicated that he did the original delineation when the original building was constructed. If you leave a wetland area untouched for a long period of time, vegetation grows. There is a complete photo log in his report of what happened. The wetland was evaluated in his report to see what functions it provided. Other than carrying water across Campus Drive from a ditch that extends to the southwest and also fed by a detention basin for Water Country for their large gravel parking lot, it is carrying water in a northeasterly direction to the back side of the industrial park. The main function of the wetland is some trapping of sediments, which helps clean the water. However, he also indicates in his report that there is a lot of water from the Industrial Park that makes its way into the area that isn't well treated because there are older facilities that didn't have state of the art drainage. The issue was raised about enhancing the buffer. They talked about putting in a seed mix that has grasses, wild flowers and scrubs which prevents invasive species from coming in and creates some better habitat screening behind the building. They won't do any maintenance but will leave it

and let it grow back into a scrub grub buffer. He does not feel the building will have any significant impact on the functions that the wetlands are occurring now and as long as they are not effecting water quality, they will not be doing any harm to the wetland system.

Mr. Ricci indicated he would like to see the enhanced buffer zone delineated with what types of species they are going to use and the treatment swale on the eastside should be shown on the plans

Mr. West indicated that anything inside the silt fence is where they will be seeding and anywhere where shrubs are already growing they will be seeding.

Mr. Ricci asked if the seed mix required any nurturing or watering?

Mr. West indicated that they specifically design the mix so that it doesn't require any nurturing. This is called a New England Roadside Matrix Upland Seed Mix. It would be straw mulched just to seed it but there are 30 different species so it will do well anywhere. It does not need to be watered other than when they first put it down.

Mr. Ricci indicated he would like to see that it is watered once a week and have that added to the landscape plan.

Mr. Will asked about the use of pervious pavement that was discussed at the Conservation Commission. He asked if they could get more elaboration on the risk of porous pavement and how much impervious surface is there with this application?

Mr. Chagnon confirmed that none of the proposed pavement is porous pavement. The Conservation Commission debated that issue and decided that this area was not a good place to use that application. . If there was an oil spill, with porous pavement, it would go right into the ground. Also, the treatment swale was constructed in Phase I and is already there.

Mr. Coker asked about the man-made wetlands on the northerly side, which evolved over time. There is a delineation on the plans that says "buffer required north of this" and "no buffer required south of this". He asked for clarification.

Mr. West stated that there was a difference in the ditch, which is a wider swale now, than the ditch between the two lots that comes down and dumps out. The break is where it cattails into the defined ditch. This is how the City Regulation treats manmade wetlands. It is an interesting debate over what constitutes a manmade wetland but a lot of this was made when they didn't do treatment swales but did ditches instead.

Mr. Will asked if one was intentional and one was an unintentional wetland?

Mr. West indicated that the difference is that one is holding up as a ditch because it is very narrow and limited and it carries water more often. The other dries up and allows woody vegetation to grow.

Mr. Will's concern was this was the first application where they will be drawing a distinction between a manmade wetland and a structure. Right now they have a line that separates the jurisdictional wetland and the non-jurisdictional wetland and he would feel more comfortable to have this more clearly defined.

Mr. West indicated the ditch was intended to carry water through the two buildings from the catch basins behind the storage facility. This was not meant to be a wetland but it grew up and developed into one.

Chairman Smith asked Mr. Cuomo to speak.

Michael Cuomo, Soil and Wetland Scientist, Rockingham County Conservation District, indicated that he reviewed this project for the City. He agrees with Mark's presentation and conclusion. He indicated that the City would be safe in drawing this conclusion. He would like to have the area specified on plan where the buffer seed enhancement is being done.

Attorney Pelech brought up the issue of the sidewalk. This will be a sidewalk from no where to no where. They would like to have it on the other side. There is a hot top walking trail on the other side which they could connect to the sidewalk. Going back to the drainage ditch, there are five culverts. Attorney Pelech interviewed Mike Iafolla who built the original man made swale and he agrees with Mark West that it is was very shallow and probably gave rise to this becoming a natural wetland as it didn't flow through a natural channel.

Chairman Smith indicated that they would revise the stipulation to leave it to DPW regarding which side the sidewalk should be on.

Attorney Pelech indicated that was acceptable. Also, regarding the porous pavement and Wal-Mart, what made the decision for TAC was that they consulted with NHDOT who recommended against it at this time until they had more time to study it. Their experiences to-date in this weather was causing problems. They recommend a "wait and see attitude" at this point.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION:

Councilor Ferrini made a motion to grant Site Review approval with the previous TAC stipulations, Mr. Ricci's request to have the seeding delineated, and sidewalks to be determined by DPW. Mr. Will seconded.

Mr. Coker asked about clarification on the oil/water separator as he didn't see it on the plan.

Chairman Smith clarified that it was going to be an oil/water separator or a grass strip. At this point they are going with the grass strip.

Mr. Britz confirmed that, in the Conditional Use Process which they will address next, he put in a condition about putting in an oil/water separator or an effective treatment that is similar, in the northwest corner.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked what past level of detail are required for sidewalks?

Mr. Holden indicated his interpretation of the stipulation would be that it should be a conforming city sidewalk.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked that the previous TAC Stipulation #5 should be modified to "sidewalk" (singular) and that it shall be subject to DPW's determination of where it should be.

The motion to approve **passed** unanimously, with the following **stipulations**:

Stipulations from the April 21, 2005 Planning Board Meeting:

- 1) That the applicant shall provide an appropriate planting mix for the buffer area with the planting location to be delineated on the Site Plan and instructions for planting, including irrigation schedule, to insure plant survival shall be noted on the Landscape Plan;
- 2) That the treatment swale on the east side should be shown on the Site Plan;
- 3) That sidewalks shall be required in a location to be determined after review and approval by the Public Works Department and the Planning Department and shown on a revised Site Plan;

Stipulations from the October 5, 2004 TAC Meeting:

- 4) That the irrigation system shall be isolated with a backflow preventer, commensurate with the degree of hazard, installed according to water division standards;

Mr. Coker made a motion to grant Conditional Use approval with the recommended stipulations. Mr. Coker also asked that the stipulation be for an oil/water separator as opposed to the vegetative. Mr. Will seconded.

The motion to approve **passed** unanimously with the following **stipulations**:

Stipulations from the April 21, 2005 Planning Board Meeting:

- 1) That stormwater treatment, which shall include the installation of an oil water separator, shall be included on the site to treat all of the proposed new impervious surface runoff and as much of the existing impervious surface runoff as is practical, and a note reflecting this shall be added to the approved Site Plans;
- 2) That the proposed stormwater treatment device or area be maintained on a frequency sufficient to insure that continuous effective treatment is provided, and a note reflecting this shall be added to the approved Site Plans;
- 3) That an annual maintenance report shall be provided to the Department of Public Works;
- 4) That the graded area to the rear of the property be planted with native vegetation to provide an effective natural buffer to the wetland area, and a note reflecting this shall be added to the approved Site Plans

.....

C. The Portsmouth Planning Board, acting pursuant to NH RSA 12-G:13 and Chapter 500 of the Pease Development Authority Subdivision Regulations, will review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Pease Development Authority regarding the following: The application of **General Services Administration, New England Region, Applicant**, for property located at **254 Corporate Drive** wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval is requested with the following: Lot 0000 having an area of 30.18 ± acres and with continuous street frontage off Corporate Drive; and the remaining land area being decreased by 30.18 ± acres and constituting a portion of the Tradeport; and, lying in a zone where a minimum lot area of 5.0 acres and 200' of continuous street frontage is required. Said properties are located in an Airport Business Commercial district and are shown on Assessor Plan 315, as Lot 0004. (Plat plans are on file in the Planning Department Office and are identified as #02-01-05).

The applicant requested that this matter be tabled to the next regular meeting.

Mr. Will made a motion to table to May. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded.

The motion to **table** passed unanimously.

Mr. Holden indicated that the Department is communicating with GSA on the application and it is moving along. This is a very important project and they looking forward to addressing this next month.

.....

D. The application of **Philip J. and Marie E. Beaupre, Owners**, for property located at **297 Peverly Hill Road**, wherein an Amendment to a previously approved subdivision is requested to move a driveway from the northerly side of the lot to the southerly side of the lot, said proposed driveway to be located off of Peverly Hill Road. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 255 as Lot 7 and lies within a Single Residence B district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Marie Beaupre, owner, would like to move their driveway for safety reasons. The right of way is in very poor condition and is not their property. They also have poor visibility. The upkeep of the right of way has been their responsibility but is dirt, full of potholes and needs repairs. Safety is their main concern.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION:

Mr. Holden indicated that this is unfortunate due to a prior decision to subdivide the property. This might be a good approach to move the driveway and David Desfosses, of Public Works, thinks it would work. Mr. Holden would recommend preliminary approval with a further review by DPW.

Mr. Sullivan asked if this would be done at city expense?

Mr. Holden confirmed it would be done at the applicants' expense and no municipal money would be spent. The Department believes there is a public safety issue.

Mr. Hopley asked where the new driveway location was?

Mr. Holden indicated it would be on the left and that would be shown at the time of final approval.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked what preliminary approval provides?

Mr. Holden indicated it shows that things are moving forward.

Deputy City Manager Hayden stated she was having trouble picturing what they were approving.

Councilor Ferrini asked if that meant that no significant construction could be undertaken?

The Chair confirmed that no work could begin until final approval is granted. It allows them to get before DPW and Legal.

Mr. Hopley made a motion to table this application to allow the applicants to appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee prior to the May Planning Board Meeting. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded.

The motion to **table** passed with Mr. Will voting in the negative.

.....

E. The application of **Michael Power, Owner**, for property located at **105 Saratoga Way** and **Thomas and Lisa Conrad, Owners**, for property located **off Saratoga Way**, wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Lot Line Change) is requested between two lots having the following: Lot 36-1 as shown on Assessor Plan 212 increasing in area from 3,939 ± s.f. to 4 349 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage off Saratoga Way and Lot 37 as shown on Assessor Plan 212 decreasing in area from 43,888 ± s.f. to 43,479 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage off Saratoga Way, and lying in a zone where a minimum lot area of 5,000 s.f. and 80' of continuous street frontage is required. Said properties are located in a General Residence B district and are shown on Assessor Plan 212 as Lots 36-1 and 37. (Plat plan is on file in the Planning Department Office and is identified as Plan #03-01-05).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Charles Griffin addressed the Board on behalf of the former owners, the Clews.. He was also present with permission of the Conrads and Mr. Powers. This arises from the fact that there was a chain link fence along the rear of the property that was thought to be the boundary line. A neighbor has indicated that the fence and shed were both there when she moved in during the early 80's. The Clews had a survey done and found that the fence and shed were on the Conrad property. The Conrads agreed to deed the area to the Clews and the Clews subsequently sold the property to Mr. Powers. It will decrease the Conrad property but it will remain conforming for the SRB district. Mr. Power's name will be reflected on the revised plan. He asked that the application be approved.

Mr. Sullivan asked if, after the fence is put up, will the shed be moved back from the property line?

Attorney Griffin did not know.

Mr. Sullivan doesn't believe sheds can be any closer than 5' or 10' from the property line.

Mr. Holden indicated that the Department recommends preliminary approval and the Department will look to see how long the shed has been there. It may be pre-existing.

Mr. Sullivan also noted that the back side of shed is not pleasant for the neighbors to look at. Maybe they could put a coat of paint on it?

Attorney Griffin assured him that Mr. Powers will consider his request.

Mr. Hopley asked if they had any idea how long the shed had been there?

Attorney Griffin was told that the shed was there in the early 80's.

Mr. Will contributed that the shed was there when he was a kid and it was used as a bedroom !!!

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION:

Mr. Hopley made a motion to grant preliminary approval, with the recommended stipulations. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded.

The motion to grant preliminary approval **passed** with the following **stipulations** with one voting in the negative.

1. Satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues;
2. Receipt of an updated/amended Plat plan;
3. Placement of permanent boundary monuments as per requirements of DPW;
4. Submission to DPW of conforming GIS data for updating City records; and,
5. Submission of an application for Final Subdivision Approval as required by the Board's Regulations.

.....

F. The application of **Eugene and Beatrice Short, Owners**, for property located at **175 Gosport Road** and **Karl E. Hahn, Owner**, for property located at **340 Odiorne Point Road**, wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Lot Line Change) is requested between two lots having the following: Lot 1 as shown on Assessor Plan 224 decreasing in area from 198,459 ± s.f. to 183,537 ± s.f. and with an existing access easement from Gosport Road and Lot 10-018 as shown on Assessor Plan 224 increasing in area from 59,206 ± s.f. to 74,128 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage off Odiorne Point Road, and lying in a zone where a minimum lot area of 1 acre (43,560 s.f.) is required. Said properties are located in a Single Residence A district and are shown on Assessor Plan 224 as Lots 1 and 10-018. (Plat plan is on file in the Planning Department Office and is identified as Plan #04-01-05).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Cory Colwell, of AMES – MSC, spoke on behalf of the Shorts and Mr. Hahn. He pointed out the relationship of the two lots and explained the purpose for the relocation was that the house was built to the back of the cul de sac and Mr. Hahn recently discovered that he didn't own the property yet he has been maintaining it. Both lots would remain conforming. The lot line would be monumented.

Mr. Sullivan asked, if approved, what type of pipes would be put in the ground because around salt water, the pipes tend to disintegrate. He asked if there was a better material.

Mr. Holden suggested that they say "per requirements of DPW" as they have the option to request concrete.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION:

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to approve preliminary and final subdivision approval with the following recommended stipulations, along with Mr. Sullivan's request on boundary marker type. Mr. Will seconded.

The motion **passed** unanimously with the following **stipulations**:

- 6. Satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues;
- 7. Receipt of an updated/amended Plat plan;
- 8. Placement of permanent boundary monuments as per requirements of DPW;
- 9. Submission to DPW of conforming GIS data for updating City records; and,
- 10. Submission of an application for Final Subdivision Approval as required by the Board's Regulations.

.....

G. The application of **2859 Lafayette Road Ventures, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **2859 Lafayette Road** wherein a Conditional Use Permit is requested as allowed in Article VI, Section 10-608(B) of the *Zoning Ordinance* to allow the addition of four bays to an existing car wash with associated accessways and parking within an Inland Wetlands Protection District. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 286 as Lots 19 and 20 and lies within a General Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

This application was **withdrawn** by the applicant.

.....

H. The application of **Harborcorp, LLC, Owner**, for property **located off Deer and Russell Streets** and **Boston & Maine Corp., Owner**, for property located **off Green and Vaughn Streets**, wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Lot Line Change) is requested between three lots having the following: 1) Lot 28 as shown on Assessor Plan 118 increasing in area from 44,955 ± s.f. to 47,082 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage off of Deer and Russell Streets; 2) Lot 12 as shown on Assessor Plan 124 increasing in area from 11,986 ± s.f. to 16,008 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage on Russell and Green Streets; and 3) Lot 13 as shown on Assessor Plan 124 decreasing in area from 23,343 ± s.f. to 17,194 ± s.f. and with continuous street frontage on Green and Vaughn Streets. The minimum lot size in this area is 1,000 s.f. with no continuous street frontage requirements. Said properties are shown on Assessor Plan 18 as Lot 28 and Assessor Plan 124 as Lots 12 & 13 and lies within a General Business B and Historic District A districts

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Councilor Ferrini recused himself from the hearing.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Donald Peterson, Development Administrator for Harborcorp LLC, addressed the Board. He indicated that this was their first step towards a new conference center/parking garage. This is allowing access along the railroad side of the property for emergency vehicles and will clean up the property lines.

Cory Colwell reviewed the plan with the Board. He indicated that years ago the railroad used the land to load and unload cars but they no longer stop at that location so it is just lawn. They would be transferring an approximate 50' wide strip of property to Harborcorp. Upon approval they would set monuments.

Chairman Smith indicated they are looking at this at the Historic District Commission level and one of the intents to come off of this is a road from the back of the building.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION:

Mr. Hopley made a motion to approve preliminary and final subdivision with the recommended stipulations. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded.

The motion **passed** unanimously with the following **stipulations**:

1. Placement of permanent boundary monuments as per requirements of DPW; and,
2. Submission to DPW of conforming GIS data for updating City records.

.....

III. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS/REQUESTS

1. Request to place temporary signage at Leary Field for the 2005 baseball season;

Chairman Smith turned the gavel over to Vice-Chairman Ricci. Mr. Holden reviewed Scott Pafford's letter with the Board. He indicated the Department had come up with a recommendation plan and he reviewed the conditions with the Board. He indicated it was too late to implement this for the 2005 season. He also indicated they may wish to table this until such time as Mr. Pafford is available to speak.

Mr. Will asked why they were so specific in the color of lettering on the signs?

Mr. Holden indicated the City is trying to find a balance between allowing a test program to see how it works. They could review it the following year to revisit the conditions.

Mr. Sullivan felt that the Department should consider the size of the signs and the location of the signs on the fence. It might be dangerous in the dark if the fence has solid wood signs on it. He suggested maybe raising them up higher to get light into the field at night.

Mr. Coker indicated he had no problem with the concept but was concerned about limiting the size of the signs and wondered whether 3 x 5 was big enough? Also is seemed boring to him to have the same colors and lettering. There are only five of them so there is plenty of room but he thought some of the condition were too limiting.

Councilor Ferrini felt that it is a sensitive scenic area of city and he felt dark green and specifications are reasonable for a pilot program. He would like to see them start small.

Mr. Ricci was under the assumption that signs will go on back field fence?

Mr. Holden confirmed that was correct.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if Mr. Pafford had any concerns? She would agree that as this is a pilot program, so she felt they should be conservative to start with.

Mr. Coker indicated that the object is to raise money and if they arbitrarily impose a standard, he felt the business owners may want more say in the design of the sign.

Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated that was why it is a pilot program.

Mr. Will agreed by adding that it was only for a year. If it's not reasonable, they can change it next year.

Mr. Ricci indicated there was no reference to logos. Were they just allowing lettering?

Mr. Holden felt a logo could be included.

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to recommend approval, with the added conditions that the signs were only placed on the outfield fence and that logos would be permitted, for the '06 season. Mr. Will seconded.

The motion to recommend approval with the two additional conditions **passed** unanimously.

.....

IV. OLD BUSINESS

1. Request for One Year Extension for Conditional Use Approval granted on April 15, 2004 from Mark Giovannettone for property located **Off Lang Road**;

Mr. Coker stepped down.

Mr. Holden indicated this request was timely and was the first request.

Mr. Will made a motion to approve. Councilor Ferrini seconded.

The motion to grant a one-year extension **passed** unanimously.

.....

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn at 8:25 pm was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved by the Planning Board on May 19, 2005.