

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**2:00 P.M.**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS                      MARCH 1, 2005  
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; John Burke, Director, Parking & Transportation; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Richter, Engineering Technician; Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician, and Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief

**ALSO PRESENT:**            Lucy Tillman, Planner

.....  
**I.        OLD BUSINESS**

1.        The application of **Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **125 Brewery Lane**, wherein site plan approval is requested to construct a 4-story, 64' x 240', 15,500 ± s.f., 48-unit residential building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 154 as Lot 2 and lies within a Business district. (This application was tabled at the January 4, 2005 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

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

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon, representing Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., indicated that they have submitted an up-dated Traffic Report and are working with the City on that. They continue to address the TAC comments and therefore requested that they be tabled to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to table this matter until the April 5, 2005 TAC meeting. Mr. Cravens seconded.

The motion to table passed unanimously.

**Issues raised at the November 2, 2004 TAC meeting:**

- 1)        A crosswalk at the back entrance of Chevrolet Avenue is shown 20' – 30' off of the street and it is unclear why that was done;
- 2)        There are interior stairways shown on the layout and it is not clear where they go;
- 3)        The loading area by Building C is oversized and it should be reduced;

- 4) The City of Portsmouth normally requires one single handicapped ramp rather than one at each corner (3 shown on the plans);
- 5) There is a 4' sidewalk shown heading towards Plaza 800 that needs to lead somewhere;
- 6) That a meeting should be set up with DPW to address sewerage and drainage issues;
- 7) More information is required about the proposed pond;
- 8) Details are required on the plans on the water feed, keeping in mind that the City only allows one meter per lot;
- 9) Lighting needs to be shown on the plans;
- 10) The sprinkler system needs to be shown on the plans;
- 11) Hydrants need to be added to the plans;
- 12) A revised traffic study should be submitted, including the Bartlett/Islington intersection and the Middle/Cass Street intersection;
- 13) A meeting should be set up with the applicant, the Planning Department and the City Attorney to address the conservation land, easements with Chevrolet and Brewery Lane, as well as parking;
- 14) The sidewalk on Chevrolet Avenue should be the City standard of 5' concrete;
- 15) Concern was expressed over the shortcut through Jewell Court;
- 16) It was felt that the sidewalk should be extended to encompass Building B and a detail should be provided showing the general conditions on both sides of the right-of-way;
- 17) The elevations and slope of the retaining walls should be noted on the plans;
- 18) That the City address their contribution to off site improvements.

**Issues raised at the January 4, 2005 TAC meeting:**

- 19) That the applicant meet with the Public Works Department regarding sewerage and drainage issues;
- 20) That a determination be made regarding who maintains the upper half of Chevrolet Avenue and Brewery Lane from the intersection of Jewell Court;
- 21) That the traffic study should address the entire build out of the project;

.....

2. The application of **Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust and Joker's Realty One, LLC, Owners, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **2460 Lafayette Road**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the expansion of an existing 124,852 ± s.f. Wal-Mart Store to a 190,800 ± s.f. Wal-Mart Supercenter, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 285 as Lots 16-1 & 2 and lies within a General Business district. (This application was tabled at the February 1, 2005 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Britz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Paul Hayner, of Hayner/Swanson, Inc. the project engineer, addressed the committee. He indicated that they were currently working on three items: A site lighting comparison plan, architectural

elevations, and off site traffic issues. Mr. Hayner indicated that stipulations #11 & #12 have now been noted on the Site Plans.

He indicated that site lighting was discussed at the last meeting. They had proposed 38' poles and he has discussed changing that to 28' poles and was requested to bring a layout of the 28' pole and a layout of the 16' pole to show how many poles that would create. He handed out a comparison to the Committee members that showed how many poles would be needed at each height and what wattage would be needed. Mr. Hayner indicated that Wal-Mart was willing to go with 28' poles as 16' poles would result in too many poles, too many obstructions in the parking lot and a much lower ceiling for lighting which would be one half of the height of the building.

Mr. Holden asked if the total wattage used was changed by the different poles?

Mr. Hayner indicated it was quite close. It is not the amount of electricity that is being used but is just the amount of poles.

Mr. Holden asked if they have greater control with spillage over the property line with a different pole height?

Mr. Hayner indicated it was about the same. They use cut off fixtures that are adjacent to property lines.

Mr. Holden indicated that a Work Session was being done with the Planning Board on this topic in March so hopefully they can continue with this process.

Mr. Desfosses indicated he was still waiting for the level spreader details.

Mr. Hayner indicated he would make sure those were provided.

Mr. Holden indicated that one of the elements that was coming out of the new Master Plan was whether the City should become more involved in building elevation reviews. The City is exploring this for the first time with this significant development so it represents a partnership between the applicant and the City to look at façade improvements. TAC may not be formally approving or rejecting these and they are doing this as more of a work session.

Chris Sullivan, of PBA Architects, reviewed the elevations. Renderings were distributed to the Committee members and Mr. Sullivan reviewed each upgrade. Mr. Sullivan indicated that their second upgrade refaced the front to look like brick, but the sides and rear were neglected. Their third upgrade added elevations but still lacked "punch". Therefore, their latest elevations include more details and more pleasing aesthetics.

Mr. Holden indicated that their last revision was quite a change from their first presentation.

Ms. Tillman clarified that the signage package that was reflected on the elevations was pending before the Board of Adjustment so this may or may not be the final package.

Giles Ham, of Vanasse & Associates, spoke on behalf of the applicant and indicated that they had been working with the City and NHDOT regarding roadway improvements in the area. To that end, they

provided the City a survey around Route 1 and Wal-Mart has agreed to contribute \$500,000 to assist with these road improvements. NHDOT has allocated approximately \$360,000 for the fiscal year 2006 for road improvements at Route 1 and Constitution Avenue.

The first plan looked at creating an additional right hand turn lane going onto Route 1. They extended the lane by 270' and the estimated cost was \$30,000.00. The second plan looked at widening Route 1 to two lanes from Constitution Avenue to Shaw's Plaza. There is a very tight area between the cemetery and the red brick building. The estimated cost was \$900,00 and that plan was written by the State. There was a second widening plan which involved taking some land by the red brick building which was estimated to cost \$1.2 million.

Mr. Holden asked if the preparation of all of these plans for road improvements were paid for by the applicant?

Mr. Ham confirmed that the applicant has paid for the survey and the improvement plans.

Mr. Burke asked about the Constitution back driveway where the radius needs to be increased.

Mr. Ham indicated that was something that was just brought to his attention and he will look at those turning templates and will take care of that.

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

Attorney Sharon Somers spoke on behalf of the principals of Lafayette Plaza, also known as the Southgate Plaza. Also with her was Douglas Prentess, traffic engineer. She indicated that at a previous TAC meeting, it was requested that a traffic study be completed and as that has not been done this matter should not go before the Traffic & Safety Committee. She stated that actions of this Committee and Traffic & Safety should only be taken after the State renders their ultimate decision. She felt the sequence of decision making is important. She asked that all off site improvements should be completed prior to the opening of the new store and a Certificate of Occupancy being issued. She felt they should look at the queuing on Constitution Way, particularly going into the driveway of Lafayette Plaza. The issue of funding should be considered as there is a balance of construction costs that has not been identified. The Committee should take into account access in and out of the Kia Dealership, the cemetery, the coordination of the timing of signals and the truck radius and right of way locations on Constitution Avenue. She felt the Committee could look at this presentation as a good start, move it over to Traffic & Safety, address funding and coordinate with NHDOT.

Douglas Prentiss, traffic engineer, spoke on behalf of Lafayette Plaza. He pointed out some safety concerns with the concept plan. One was the turning radius onto Constitution Avenue, next to the cemetery. If a tractor-trailer wants to turn onto Constitution Avenue from the south, it cannot turn if a car is coming out of Constitution Avenue. About 100' back from the intersection is the loading and unloading area to Shaw's and on the other side is the driveway to Friendly's. People exit from Taco Bell onto Constitution Avenue. The Kia dealership has a center turn lane and with the widening of the road, there would only be a very small left turn lane. If a very small vehicle were in the turn lane waiting to turn into Kia, it could be a very big safety concern. This concept plan should require a coordination analysis of the traffic signals. He felt this plan was a preliminary draft plan and should continue to evolve.

Mr. Holden asked if he had any questions concerning their information regarding their potential traffic impact arising out of the redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Prentiss indicated he had only started reviewing this last week so he had not gotten to that stage yet. At some point he will have a written document with a summary of their findings.

Mr. Holden asked if he was raising the idea that the applicant is responsible for any queuing out side of any existing driveway?

Mr. Prentiss felt it was a concern and all he was saying was that it should be studied.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else present to speak to, for or against the application. There being none, the Chair reserved the right to keep the Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Ham would like to address the Committee on any item?

Mr. Ham felt there were valid issues that they could look at. The queuing problem was something they could look into. Kia has access and they are not changing that, it's mid-block between signals so they are not going to change that.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Holden asked the lead consultant to come back up so that they could go through some of the Stipulations to see where they stand. Attorney Somers indicated a concern about whether or not the State had responded and as there was a Stipulation from the November TAC meeting that a report from NHDOT was required, Mr. Holden was assuming that that report was still pending?

Mr. Hayner indicated it was his understanding that the State was reviewing their preliminary plans and they are awaiting a response from them.

**Stipulations from the November 2, 2004 TAC Meeting:**

- 1) A report from NHDOT is required; **(Pending)**
- 2) This matter should be scheduled before the Traffic & Safety Committee (if a Traffic Study is not required); **(John Burke indicated that they still needed documentation from the State regarding the traffic study but they could move forward. )**
- 3) The water line should show that the fire service connects around the entire building and is connected to the loop with a valve and also identify how the service is going to work with the pump building (the plan is confusing and the area should be detailed); **(done)**
- 4) The Easement Plan and language needs to be reviewed by the Legal/Planning Departments; **(outstanding)**
- 5) The City will meet with Coast to work out a bus loading area in front of the building; **(done)**
- 6) That one or two new lights will be added to the rear intersection with Constitution Avenue; **(done)**
- 7) That the conditions from the TAC meeting of September 7, 2004 will be brought forward;

**Stipulations from the November 30, 2004 TAC Meeting:**

- 8) That the size and type of the two grease traps be noted on the Site Plan; **(done)**
- 9) That a Site Plan set be provided to the all Committee members, complete with revision dates and a note of what the revisions were; **(done)**
- 10) That the note on the Site Utility Plan behind Joker's that reads "Line to be abandon by city (typ)" be revised to read "Line to be abandoned according to City standards"; **(done)**
- 11) That a note be added where the easement line leaves the property for clarification; **(done)**
- 12) That the water service be changed to a 4" service; **(done)**
- 13) That the irrigation system be changed to come off of the domestic water meter in the building; **(done)**
- 14) That the applicant work with the Planning Department and the DPW to revise the parking plan to address pedestrian safety and aesthetics; **(done)**
- 15) That porous pavement be used on the parking lot areas to break up the significant amount of flow from the site; **(This has been addressed with DPW)**
- 16) That a written report be prepared for the Committee regarding trip generations and traffic issues, including all written correspondence with NHDOT; **(They are awaiting a letter from NHDOT District 6, accepting the Traffic Study)**
- 17) That after a response has been received from NHDOT, a meeting shall be scheduled with the NHDOT, the applicant and City personnel to discuss Constitution Avenue and trip generations; **(done)**
- 18) That the applicant appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee after receiving a recommendation of approval from TAC; **(outstanding)**
- 19) That an Easement Deed and Easement Plan be prepared for review and approval by the City Legal Department; **(outstanding)**

**Stipulations from the January 4, 2004 TAC Meeting:**

- 20) That a lighting comparison be prepared for presentation to the Planning Board; **(done)**

Mr. Holden confirmed that the only matters which were still outstanding were a report from NHDOT, a report from Traffic & Safety, the level spreader detail, and the easement deed and plan.

Mr. Burke indicated that they need something from NHDOT accepting the Traffic Study and that no further studies are necessary but they really need that letter before going before the Traffic & Safety Committee.

Mr. Hayner asked if they could request to go forward with the Traffic & Safety Committee pending that letter? Also, at the last TAC meeting, they had discussed going before the Planning Board on the 17<sup>th</sup> for a discussion.

Mr. Burke indicated that he had no problem going forward at Traffic & Safety on the 10<sup>th</sup> but they need the letter before that date. He did not want the Traffic & Safety Committee to go through with the hearing if something is required by NHDOT that would require them to go back to square one.

Mr. Holden confirmed that the pubic hearing remains open but when they table the matter they will list out the items that they are still looking for. From an initial list of around 20 they are down to 4 so they

can just concentrate on those 4. The public hearing will remain open, primarily to deal with traffic. He asked if there was a motion to table?

Mr. Cravens made a motion to table to the next regularly scheduled meeting on April 5th. Mr. Britz seconded.

Mr. Holden asked that they send a letter requesting a discussion at the March 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting.

The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

**Stipulations from the March 1, 2005 TAC Meeting:**

- 1) That the applicant appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee;
- 2) That an Easement Deed and Easement Plan be prepared for review and approval by the Planning and Legal Departments;
- 3) That a level spreader detail be added to the Site Plans;
- 4) That a letter from NHDOT, indicating that no further traffic studies are required, be provided to John Burke;

.....

3. The application of **F-Series Realty, LLC, Owner** for property located at **215 West Road**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 2-story, 2,500 ± s.f. addition to an existing structure and construction of a fenced in parking lot, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 267 as Lot 10 and lies within an Industrial district. (This application was tabled at the February 1, 2005 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Britz made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Cravens seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Eric Weinrieb, of Altus Engineering, addressed the Committee. He indicated they had submitted a revised set of plans and they addressed the previous TAC comments on those plans. They added a statement on the plans regarding the 60' right of way, they have added a site lighting plan and he spoke to David Desfosses regarding drainage on the site. Mr. Desfosses suggested using porous pavement however Mr. Weinrieb does not believe that would be the best use for the site, the State is not endorsing that at this time as it is still in the research stage and there have been some long term problems with it. They will be using open drainage with a detention pond, reducing the rate of run-off on the site. They have provided a turn around area for the trucks on site and they have realigned the open gate from the center of the site and it will be used for emergency access only. They have added a handicapped space and have added handicapped signs.

Mr. Weinrieb addressed a letter that had been sent by Mr. Iafolla expressing concern regarding access across the easement. On the plan they had shown snow storage in the easement area however they have eliminated that snow storage. He believed that addressed that concern.

Mr. Holden asked if Mr. Weinrieb had addressed all 8 of the stipulations.

Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that he had.

Mr. Desfosses asked about the washing of vehicles?

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there would be no washing of vehicles. He also clarified that they had previously indicated that they would be storing new vehicles only. They will actually have “low program” vehicles, which are low mileage vehicles that are sold through the dealer from the manufacturer.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else present to speak to, for or against the application. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Holden asked that there be a stipulation that there be no washing of vehicles on the site and no loading or unloading of vehicles off of West Road.

Mr. Desfosses added that there should be no loading or unloading of vehicles in the right of way either.

Mr. Burke asked that a turning template on the reverse turn be added to the revised plans.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold indicated it was his understanding that the entire lot was going to be bumper-to-bumper cars and he asked what access emergency vehicles would have to the back of the lot.

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there would be no “wedging them in like a puzzle”, but rather they will have double rows with spaces in between so that they can move the vehicles around.

Ms. Tillman asked if the aisle will align with the gate?

Mr. Weinrieb indicated that was their intent.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they would be creating any additional stormwater volume?

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there was a slight increase in a 10 year storm event but there will be significant decrease in the peak rate.

Mr. Desfosses asked if that would make the down grading drainage better?

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there should not be any adverse impact to down grading impact. There are things that are out of the control of the analysis, however, based on the information that they have of the system working properly, there will not be any adverse impact.

Mr. Holden asked about the structures on this lot.

Mr. Weinrieb indicated there was one structure on the lot and it was a Vee-Notchweir, designed specifically to eliminate or reduce any potential for blocking because it's a self cleaning device.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold moved to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Burke seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Stipulations from the February 1, 2005 TAC meeting:**

- 1) That a reference be added to the Site Plan showing the driveway easement that crosses the property; (done)
- 2) That more details on site lighting be added to the Site Plans; (done)
- 3) That the drainage system be evaluated regarding volume to determine whether a better system could be developed; (done)
- 4) That the Site Plans identify how trucks will turn around on the site, using signage and striping; (done)
- 5) That the Site Plans clarify how the back gate will be used; (done)
- 6) That the Site Plans reflect that only new vehicles will be stored on the site, and amended approval would be required to store any used vehicles on the site; (done)
- 7) That the back gate be re-aligned; (done)
- 8) That upright handicapped signs be placed in front of the handicapped parking spaces; (done)

**Stipulations from the March 1, 2005 TAC meeting:**

- 9) That a turning template be added to the Site Plan;
- 10) That a note be added to the Site Plan indicating that no washing or repairing of vehicles is allowed on the site";
- 11) That a note be added to the Site Plan indicating that no loading or unloading of vehicles is allowed off of West Road or any part of the right-of-way";
- 12) That the Landscaping Plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department;
- 13) That the travel aisle in the rear line up with the gate entrance so that it is always accessible;

.....

4. The application of **Northeast Credit Union, Owner**, for property located at **100 Borthwick Avenue**, wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a 2-story, 8,000 ± s.f. addition to an existing structure and expansion of the existing parking lot, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 259 as Lot 15 and lies within an Office Research district. (This application was tabled at the February 1, 2005 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Britz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared on behalf of Northeast Credit Union. Also present were Devon Parker, Facilities Manager, and Paul Kelly, Assistant Vice President. They provided revised plans that addressed the previous stipulations. Mr. Chagnon went through those individually.

There was no change to Plans C-1 & C-2. Plan C-3 shows a proposed sidewalk that starts at the pedestrian bridge, continues on the side of the road and on to the Credit Union lot. Following the edge of the road all of the way proved problematic due to existing wires and poles. He felt this turned out to be a nice pleasant walkway. The sidewalk then follows all the way to the existing sidewalk which services the Credit Union facilities up to a crosswalk that has already been approved and required for a development across the street, providing continuous sidewalk along Borthwick Avenue all the way to the Jackson Gray building. On C-4 a small section of fence was added to keep the vehicle lights driving around the right side of the building to access the ATM off of the abutting properties. They also added a note regarding the sidewalk being on the Credit Union property and there would be an easement to the City, with the understanding that the City would take over the liability and maintenance of the sidewalk. Directional signage was added to facilitate traffic flow on site. Sheet C-5 showed a PSNH easement due to the relocation of an electrical line. The proposed Easement Deed was provided to the Committee. Note 8 addresses an easement to the City to allow them access to the monitoring well. Mr. Chagnon indicated that the City aerial photos do not show a manhole on the premises and the piping seems to be about 20' – 30' off from the actual location they found. He suggested that the City make a note of that for their records. Note 9 talks about the addition being sprinklered and the water lines will be expanded internally. Light pole heights have been changed to 20' and they believe that is the only way to adequately light the facility.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the eight stipulations.

- 1) That a meeting be scheduled with John Burke, David Desfosses and David Holden to discuss traffic, sidewalks and on-site signage;

This meeting was held and the issues were addressed. Royd Benjamin of Maguire Group was present and addressed this later in the presentation.

- 2) That the traffic engineer provide a written report;

The traffic report was presented at the TAC meeting:

- 3) That the details of the PSNH easement be shown on the plans;

They have shown this on the plan and have provided a copy of the deed.

Mr. Holden assumed this was an easement to PSNH and it doesn't involve the city, but rather is it showing something that is currently on the site plan.

Mr. Chagnon indicated this would be deeded over because PSNH needs to relocate the line.

- 4) That an additional monitoring well be installed at the expense of the applicant next to the dumpster, with the location to be worked out with DPW;

Mr. Cravens indicated it should be clearly stated that this will be done at the expense of the applicant and the applicant will work closely with the City to install the monitoring well

- 5) That an easement be prepared to allow the City access to the monitoring wells;

Mr. Cravens confirmed that the language is currently with the Legal Department for review.

- 6) That the ATM lighting be evaluated regarding the installation of buffering;

Mr. Chagnon described how they were proposing to take the sign on the SE & SW sides of the ATM signboard and change the color scheme to blue background with white letters, which will cut out approximately 80% of the light source.

Mr. Holden understood that the applicant had met with the abutters and it met with their satisfaction.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that there were abutters present and he would let them speak to that. They have also agreed to remove a flood light, as well as some flood lights on PSNH poles. There will be no lighting spilling over the property line.

- 7) That the Lighting Plan be reviewed to determine what height the light poles should be;

Mr. Chagnon indicated the photometrics were still being worked on and they will have them prior to the Planning Board meeting.

- 8) That the Landscape Plan be approved by the Planning Department;

This is still outstanding.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that in their discussions with PSNH, they had been asked if there was another place they could locate the dumpster. They were proposing a new location for the dumpster which meets the ordinance and he distributed a drawing showing that location.

Mr. Chagnon then introduced Royd Benjamin from Maguire Group.

Mr. Benjamin indicated he had been retained by the applicant to do a traffic assessment for the expansion of the Credit Union building. Their first step was to determine how many trip generations would be expected from the expansion. In the a.m., there would be a total of 36 new trips and during the p.m. 34 new trips. This expansion is a result of over-crowding so the actual new trips expected probably will be less than their calculations. The City is not requiring a detailed traffic impact study but they did ask them to study certain things in the corridor with the best available information.

They were asked to look at two intersections, the Route 1 By-Pass – Borthwick Avenue intersection and the Route 33 – Borthwick Avenue intersection, and compare that with what the State had

previously done. They were also asked to look at the corridor in general and make suggestions to make that corridor function better. Their data for the Route 33 – Borthwick Avenue intersection came from the NHDOT 2003 traffic counts for the synchronized traffic signals. Their Route 1 By-Pass intersection data came from a 2003 Parsons Brinckerhoff By-Pass corridor study. Using that information, they distributed the new trips on the existing system and it appears that almost the same amount of traffic comes on to Borthwick Avenue from Route 33 as it does from the Route One By-Pass so they used a 50/50 split. They looked at the actual turn movement at each intersection and those percentages were applied to the new trip generations.

Mr. Benjamin indicated that based on that information, they determined how much increased traffic the Credit Union would have on the system. In general, there is a 3% increase on Borthwick Avenue in the a.m. and 2% increase during the p.m., which are very small increases in traffic. They did not believe the operations at the Route One By-Pass intersection would create a problem with the right turn lane signal. The Route-One corridor study is going to have to address a much larger problem at this intersection. This intersection is complicated by the proximity of the signal at Coakley Road and that will have to be resolved as a result of the Route One corridor study. They looked at the Route 33 intersection, added in the new traffic, and the results are that the level of service remained unchanged. The lane for the eastbound turn lane is a problematic lane and will be increased by .6 seconds. The eastbound approach increased by .5 seconds. The overall increase to the intersection was .3 seconds. Again, this intersection has existing problems and the solution is going to have to be derived while they are doing their study regarding the railroad bridge. The solution to that problem is much greater than the impact from this project so there is no way to put a dollar value on what their fair share might be.

Mr. Benjamin indicated that the applicant does recognize that they are adding traffic to the system and looked at ways to improve the corridor. They made some suggestions that they believe would help the operation of the Greenland Road intersection.

Mr. Burke indicated that he felt they did an excellent traffic assessment. Both intersections are under study and those improvements are years ago. He felt their increased trip generations were very low. It seems that the recommended improvement in their diagram #4 could help improve conditions. Mr. Burke asked about improvements at the Route One By-Pass intersection?

Mr. Benjamin indicated the biggest problem is the closeness of the two signals and there is nothing that can be done to improve that. He doesn't see what minor improvements could be done.

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

Steve Jones, of 56 Harvard Street, indicated he had talked to the applicant about additional plantings behind the building, without taking down any existing trees. They had discussed the fence. He also wanted to clarify that they were concerned with two sides of the ATM machine, being the south and east sides of the machine.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that additional landscaping will go along the southeasterly boundary which will densify the buffer and that is on the plans. The sides of the ATM machine that they are changing are the southeast and southwest sides. This will make the lighting less disturbing to the abutters.

Mr. Desfosses asked if the proposed dumpster relocation was the closest spot they could find?

Mr. Chagnon indicated there was one other spot but it was right at the point where people stop at the drive up so they found that unacceptable.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there was a walkway to the dumpster so it was accessible. He also pointed out that it should be the same specifications as the one shown on the plan.

Mr. Desfosses also indicated that he had previously spoken to Mr. Chagnon and had emailed him city sidewalk specifications. Mr. Desfosses also asked that they show the clearing limits for any specimen trees.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else present to speak to, for or against the application. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

#### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Burke seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Stipulations from the February 1, 2005 TAC meeting:**

- 1.) That a meeting be scheduled with John Burke, David Desfosses and David Holden to discuss traffic, sidewalks and on-site signage;
- 2) That the traffic engineer provide a written report;
- 3) That the details of the PSNH easement be shown on the plans;
- 4) That an additional monitoring well be installed at the expense of the applicant next to the dumpster, with the location to be worked out with DPW;
- 5) That an easement be prepared to allow the City access to the monitoring wells;
- 6) That the ATM lighting be evaluated regarding the installation of buffering;
- 7) That the Lighting Plan be reviewed to determine what height the light poles should be;
- 8) That the Landscape Plan be approved by the Planning Department;

#### **Stipulations from the March 1, 2005 TAC meeting:**

- 9) That the dumpster as relocated on drawing dated March 1, 2005 be shown on the Site Plan;
- 10) That the tree clearing limit for the sidewalk be shown on the Site Plan;
- 11) That the sidewalks must be ADA accessible (details to be worked out with the DPW and the applicant)
- 12) That the City approved sidewalk that is not constructed should be shown on the Site Plans as constructed by others (details to be worked out with the DPW and the applicant);
- 13) That the sidewalk easement of 15' should be shown on the plan and the Easement Plan and Deed should be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Legal Departments;
- 14) That this matter be referred to the Traffic & Safety Committee for review;
- 15) That the Landscape Plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department;

- 16) That one set of revised Site Plans be annotated, showing all revisions, prior to the issuance of a building permit;

.....

**II. ADJOURNMENT** was had at approximately 4:00 p.m.

.....

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Jane M. Shouse, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.