

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

2:00 PM

SEPTEMBER 2, 2008

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Deputy Fire Chief and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Old Tex Mex, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **3510 and 3518 Lafayette Road**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct a 4,275 ± s.f. warehouse building with a 1,400 ± s.f. mezzanine office, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 297 as Lots 7 and 8 and lies within the Single Residence A district. (This application was postponed at the August 5, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to take the application off of the table. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The motion to take the application off of the table passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Cory Colwell of MSC Engineers and Land Surveyors, was present on behalf of applicant. Mike Brown was also present. Mr. Colwell indicated that last month this went through TAC and there were eight comments. There is a three sheet set of drawings in their packet as well as a color plan that he has on display. He addressed how they have addressed the eight comments.

Comments #1 & #2 go hand in hand. There was a berm proposed over the property line a month ago to help retain some of the stormwater in that small wetland. When they reviewed it they realized the wetland was 10-12 years old and had not been delineated in a long time. They had a wetland scientist re-delineate the wetland and their stamp appears on Sheet 2 of 3 which shows the new delineation which falls short of the property line. They can now construct the berm entirely on their property now and will not go over the property line to the abutter's property.

Comments #3 was relative to how the berm would affect wetlands. They talked about that in Pre-TAC this morning. The berm is only going to be, at its maximum, 1' high and it will assist the wetlands in its current function which is stormwater retention and toxicant and sediment control. The 12" berm will help the wetland store some of the storm surge and will have very little effect on the wetlands. The berm is short in length and in one year they won't recognize it as a man made berm.

Comment #4 was a request for them to shade the berm so that it stood out clearly. That was done on Sheet 2 of 3.

Comment #5 requested that the plan be dressed up a little. They trimmed some lines so that all of the contours and spot grades are clearly identified. Every contour should be clearly read and identifiable now.

Comment #6 requested some "No parking" signs. Last month they just had one "No Parking" sign along the split rail fence along Lafayette road. The intent is to have no parking in the front of that split rail fence at all. They added a left, center and right "No Parking" sign so it is clearly indicated that there is no parking between Lafayette Road and the split rail fence.

Comments #7 was addressed on Sheet 3 of 3 regarding standard parking signs. They are called out as 12 x 18 which is the standard.

Comment #8 requested that the revegetated area be better identified and they added a note and hatched the areas to be revegetated. There is a hatching on Sheet 2 of 3 which clearly delineates the areas being loamed and seeded. That means loam and seed only and they are not putting any landscaping plants in there. It will be converted from what it is today to grass.

Mr. Colwell indicated those were the eight comments from last month and they feel they addressed them.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen felt they addressed the concerns from past meeting. He indicated that they will need a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan (CMMP) prepared by the Applicant and submitted for review and approval by City Staff prior to a building permit being issued. Mr. Britz added that he would like to get a Maintenance Plan for the swales and rip rap areas in the CMMP. Mr. Allen agreed that was a good comment at the CMMP does not typically extend beyond that construction period. Mr. Holden asked if they would like that Maintenance Plan sent to DPW? Mr. Allen felt that would be appropriate.

Mr. Holden asked Mr. Colwell if he felt they have met all conditions that they had in the letter or should they bring them forward? Mr. Colwell felt that they have met all of the conditions in the August 11, 2008 letter.

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

- 1) That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by City staff prior to the issuance of a building permit. Said CMMP shall include a maintenance plan for the swales and rip rap areas;

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

B. The application of **Seacoast Trust LLP, Owner**, for property located at **150 Route One By-Pass**, wherein Site Review approval is requested for the placement of a mobile coach for diagnostic services along the existing building on the Route One By-Pass side, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 231 as Lot 58 and lies within the Single Residence B district;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

Mr. Holden advised the Committee that the applicant has requested that this matter be withdrawn.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone to a time indefinite. Deputy Fire Chief Griswold seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to a time indefinite passed unanimously.

.....
C. The application of **Saco Avenue Professional Building, Inc., Owner**, for property located at **125 Brewery Lane**, for a third additional one year extension of Site Review Approval which was granted by the Planning Board on October 20, 2005, 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.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, appeared with Christopher Keenan and the developer, requesting another extension to the approval of the Site Plan. There was an approval granted by the Committee last October with approval by the Planning Board in November. The Planning Board had some additional stipulations which they tried to detail on their plans that are before them. They were concerned that a detail be added about Dark Sky Lighting. The lighting fixtures on the plans are downward pointed shoebox fixtures and are Dark Sky Friendly. They do not have the Dark Sky tag that the Committee is used to seeing but the lighting designer assured him that they are Dark Sky Friendly compliant. Cut sheets were also included. They took a stab at showing some lighting along Chevrolet Avenue by adding four additional lights on the east side of the site, just south of the Chevrolet entrance and three more along the sidewalk. The interior of the site is already pretty well lit already.

One major change was they added some speed bumps to slow down any through traffic, at the request of the City Traffic Engineer. They changed those to speed humps so that has a speed hump designation and a typical detail at the bottom of the page.

There was a question about the stop controls at Chevrolet Avenue and Brewery Lane. Because Chevrolet Avenue and Brewery Lane don't actually meet but his understanding is that they are talking about the intersection at the end of Brewery Lane. It is currently a four way stop. Three sides are marked and on the parking lot side there is a painted bar with a stop on it but not sign. They could revise the plan to show a fourth stop sign although that would be on the Griffin property.

Another change from last year is a result of the continued design of the sewer system by the City's engineer and consultant. They received the plan in January showing incorporation of their final design into the City design although there was one change. There was a drain manhole (A8) and in the final design that was eliminated and the catch basin (A9) was connected to catch basin (A7) directly. The plans were revised to reflect that change.

Mr. Chagnon indicated that was pretty much all that has happened as far as the plans go and they were available for questions.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden was looking for a recommendation from the Committee and he recommended that they continue the conditions from the prior meeting so they can have one final checklist when the time is right.

Mr. Allen made a motion to recommend approval of a third one year extension of Site Review Approval, with stipulations. He asked if they could go through the stipulations to determine which ones have been applied and which don't apply. They included Mr. Chagnon in the discussion.

Mr. Chagnon referred to the November 19, 2007 letter and went through the stipulations:

Stipulation 1: Dark Sky lighting which is now compliant.

Stipulation 2: That they meet with DPW and Planning regarding lighting. He asked if this would be considered the meeting? Mr. Allen requested an on-site.

Stipulation 3: Speed bumps have been noted on the plans.

Stipulation 4: Three way intersection. There are three ways to stop now and he didn't know if they want to leave it at that. Mr. Holden thought the idea was that it would now be a four way? Mr. Chagnon wasn't present at the Planning Board meeting but he felt the Planning Board thought it shouldn't change. Mr. Allen felt there was some concern about that and that it probably should change and would recommend they appear before Traffic & Safety for a recommendation.

Stipulation 5: Motorola. They have added a note to the plans.

Stipulation 6: CMMP. This remains outstanding.

Stipulation 7: Remove catch basins. That has been changed so that the catch basins are not located on the main line.

Stipulation 8: Notes on the site plans regarding easements. They have added those to the plan.

Stipulation 9: Upright handicapped sign. Those have been added.

Stipulations 10: Work with Deb Finnigan. Mr. Chagan believed they addressed her concerns at that time. Mr. Allen pointed out that there are some things she brought to his attention that need to be addressed on the plans so those have not all been addressed.

Stipulation 11: Knox box. This was added to the plans.

Stipulation 12: Carry forward the previous stipulations.

Stipulation 13: Traffic Impact Assessment. Agreed to \$25,000!!

Stipulation 14: Signage for handicapped spaces. Notes were added.

Stipulation 15: Dark Sky Lighting. This is done.

Stipulation 16: Striping at Chevrolet Avenue and Plaza 800. That was addressed.

Stipulation 17: Bicycle rack. This was added.

Stipulation 18: The area at Brewery Lane and Plaza 800, shown on C-4, where they currently have pedestrians coming down Brewery Lane sidewalk and end up in the Plaza 800 parking lot. They talked about the getting them to the sidewalk system. The way to do that is to cross the street and go over to the edge of the building to connect to a crosswalk that connects to the sidewalk down the middle of Plaza 800. There is a grade change and they can only overcome that with 2 steps. They worked out

an agreement with Plaza 800 that they could make those improvements and add hand rails. That written agreement is in the file. It won't be wheelchair accessible but Mr. Chagnon felt it was the best they could do and is what they feel is reasonable and appropriate.

Stipulation 19: Parking spaces. He thought that issue would be a condition subsequent to approval and should be kept open.

Stipulation 20: Dumpster was enlarged. Done.

Stipulation 21: Impact fee. That was taken care of in Stipulation 13.

Stipulation 22: Deb Finnigan and Steve Parkinson were to submit a report on the Brewery Lane parking spaces. That related to Stipulation 19 and it appears the Planning Board decided they should further review them.

Stipulation 23: Landscape plan. Need to be reviewed by Lucy Tillman.

Stipulation 24: Temporary fencing. This will be part of the CMMP

Stipulation 25: Crosswalk and stop bar be reversed. Done.

Stipulation 26: Bumpouts/tip downs. That has been done although he believes Ms. Finnigan has some remaining comments.

Stipulation 27: Drainage Plan to be redesigned. He believes the City has approved that drainage plan.

Stipulation 28: Written agreement with abutting property. That has been submitted.

Stipulation 29: Sewer construction agreement be approved. Mr. Allen indicated that is outstanding.

Stipulation 30: Sidewalk Easement. That is shown on the Plan Set although the easement language will be approved subsequent to the Site Plan approval.

Stipulation 31: Die tests. Done.

Stipulation 32: Drainage and sewer easements. Those have been provided and shown on the plan.

Stipulation 33: Utility work in the Conservation Easement to be reviewed and approved by DPW.

Mr. Holden suggested having Mr. Chagnon provide an annotated set of plans and they will attempt to match their concurrence on them so that when it goes to the Planning Board they can reduce it to just a few significant stipulations. Mr. Holden did agree that most of the easement language has been proposed and it just has to be reviewed for content and form.

Mr. Chagnon asked they can look in their files for those items? Mr. Holden agreed they could. Mr. Chagnon asked to just let him know if they needed anything from him.

Mr. Holden confirmed that they have a motion to approve with stipulations. They will try to reduce them but he asked if there were any new ones.

Mr. Allen requested that they go to Traffic & Safety? Mr. Holden felt they should just to make sure nothing has changed since this is a fairly old project. Mr. Holden indicated that if they get in touch with Deb Finnigan they should be able to make the September meeting.

Mr. Holden requested that the second stipulation would be that they receive an annotated set of plans to reduce the stipulations.

Mr. Holden asked if it would be helpful to have an all party meeting with regards to the sewer items? Mr. Allen agreed. Mr. Holden assumed it would be representatives of DPW, Planning, the applicant and his representatives.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold requested that the fire alarm actually be shown on the utility plan. For some reason they seem to forget to install them, even though there is a note, and they end up going back later at major expense to get things squared away.

Mr. Holden confirmed that they have the Construction Management & Mitigation Plan as a previous condition.

The motion to recommend approval of a third one year extension passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Stipulations from the September 2 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- A. That this application shall be referred to the Traffic & Safety Committee for their review and approval;
- B. That an annotated set of Site Plans incorporating all previous stipulations that have been completed shall be provided to the Planning Department for their review so that the list can be reduced to only those stipulations that remain outstanding prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- C. That the fire alarm shall be shown on the Site Plans, specifically on the Utility Plan;
- D. That a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by City staff prior to the issuance of a building permit;

Stipulations from the November 15, 2007 Planning Board Meeting:

- 1) That a detail shall be added to the Site Plans for Dark Sky Lighting;
- 2) That the Applicant shall meet with DPW and the Planning Department regarding lighting along Chevrolet Avenue;
- 3) That speed bumps shall be noted on the Site Plans;
- 4) That the 3-way stop sign intersection at Chevrolet Avenue and Brewery Lane shall remain as it is today;

Stipulations from the October 30, 2007 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 5) That the applicant shall work with Communications Supervisor Gil Emery to have a Motorola carrier conduct a survey to ascertain whether there is coverage for a frequency inside the building and, if not, that a repeater be installed inside the building.
- 6) That the applicant shall work with the City's Legal and Planning Departments to prepare a Construction Management and Mitigation Plan and a meeting should be held to discuss timing and phasing of projects;
- 7) That a number of catch basins shown on the main line should be put off the main line for stormwater treatment purposes, and revised on the Site Plans prior to the Planning Board meeting;
- 8) That the notes on the Site Plans that refer to easements for maintaining the water lines and sewer lines, should identify that as a private line;
- 9) That the upright handicapped signs shall be added to the Site Plans, Sheet C-4;
- 10) That the applicant shall work with Deb Finnigan, City Traffic Engineer, prior to the Planning Board meeting regarding the ADA compliance crosswalks, the parking spaces in conflict with the sidewalks and a 12" crossbar on Chevrolet Avenue;
- 11) That a Knox Box shall be required and added to the Site Plans;
- 12) That all stipulations from the November 17, 2005 Site Review approval shall be carried forward.

Stipulations from the November 17, 2005 Planning Board Meeting:

- 13) That a traffic impact assessment in the amount of \$25,000 has been agreed upon by the applicant and the Department of Public Works and said fee must be paid into the City prior to the issuance of a building permit;

- 14) That signage shall be added for handicapped accessible parking spaces located underneath the building;
- 15) That all proposed lighting shall be Dark Sky Friendly and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 16) That the striping at the intersection of Chevrolet Avenue and Plaza 800 shall come all the way up to a stop bar and a stop sign;
- 17) That a bicycle rack shall be added to the Site Plans;
- 18) That the two steps at the intersection of Brewery Lane and Plaza 800 shall be reviewed by the City Inspection Department, Planning Department and Legal Department for a determine of what is reasonable and appropriate;
- 19) That the Department of Public Works shall review the parking spaces on Brewery Lane and make a decision on what will be allowed;
- 20) That the dumpster shall be enlarged to include recycling bins;

Stipulations from the October 4, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 21) That the traffic impact fee be finalized prior to the Planning Board Meeting;
- 22) That Ms. Finnigan and Mr. Parkinson shall submit a report on the parking spaces on Brewery Lane prior to the Planning Board Meeting;
- 23) That the Landscape Plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department;
- 24) That temporary fencing be installed around the construction area;

Stipulations from the August 30, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 25) That the crosswalk and the stop bar be reversed on all appropriate sheets of the Site Plans;
- 26) That the bumpouts on the curbing shall have tipdowns on them and noted on all appropriate sheets of the Site Plans;
- 27) That the drainage plan should be redesigned so that the City can connect into an extended Jewell Court drainage system and said plan must be reviewed and approved by the City;
- 28) That a written agreement be prepared between the applicant and Plaza 800 regarding the proposed crosswalks which cross on to abutter property and said Agreement shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney;

Stipulations from the August 2, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:

- 29) That the Sewer Construction Agreement be approved by DPW and the Legal Department;
- 30) That a sidewalk easement from Chevrolet Avenue to Brewery Lane be provided for review and approval by DPW and the Legal Department;
- 31) That dye tests be completed on site to provide information regarding sewer pipes and said information should be noted on the Site Plans;
- 32) That drainage and sewer easements shall be provided for review and approval by the City Legal Department;
- 33) That the proposed utility work in the conservation easement shall be reviewed and approved by DPW;

Mr. Holden confirmed they should coordinate a meeting on the sewer issue with Jane, to be held prior to the Planning Board meeting.

.....

D. The application of **Tidewatch Condominium Association, Owners**, for property located at **579 Sagamore Avenue**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to install a new drainage system around units 61-67, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 223 as Lot 30 and lies within the Single Residence A district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Bruce Crawford, of Ambit Engineering, presented. He passed out photos of the pipes as requested at the Pre-TAC meeting this morning due to concern about the outlets to the pipes.

Mr. Crawford indicated that they had submitted a drainage report with the pre-construction and post-construction set of plans. They were asked as part of their submission to prepare this drainage report to study the impacts of the culvert under Jones Avenue and they determined that the flow does not go through that culvert. The flow to the west of Jones Avenue actually flows into the big bog or detention pond. They also determined there will be no impact to the culvert because of that reason. They determined that the flow instead goes down towards the scuba shop and that is the outlet of the 24' pipe that appears to be a very stable outlet. It is all natural stone with quite a bit of vegetation surrounding it. There were also some questions about whether they were increasing the flow, which they are not. There will be a slight increase in the volume but it will be circumvented into the pond and it will be insignificant as the pond is almost 4 acres in size and many millions of gallons. In their professional opinion they are not impacting anything along that site. Mr. Crawford indicated that Joe Bean, President of the Tidewatch Condo Association, was also present for questions.

Mr. Crawford explained that the purpose for this project is that there is a problem with wet crawl spaces and basements. They have solicited bids for the work and hope to start the project this fall. They would like to get this taken care of as the owners had a very bad summer due to all of the rain.

Mr. Holden understood that the run off that is occurring now goes to the same source which is the pond. Mr. Crawford confirmed that was correct and they will just slow it down a little more. Mr. Holden understood that with this system they will just hold it back a little longer than it might otherwise have been. Mr. Crawford confirmed that he determined that there was no change in the peak flows at all because it does a little bit further route into the pond. Mr. Holden asked if under this plan there is no additional run off heading anywhere near Jones Avenue? Mr. Crawford confirmed that was correct. Mr. Holden understood that in this case it was all heading towards Sagamore Creek and the outlet is near the scuba shop. Mr. Crawford confirmed that was correct and it was right behind the scuba shop.

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

Maureen Murtaugh, 912 Sagamore Avenue. They received an abutter notice but have not received enough information to make a very clear decision as to whether or not this is going to effect them in any manner. Mr. Holden indicated he would relay her question back to the engineer and the question would be what impact does this have on their property, which is on the dirt road behind the scuba shop.

Joseph Bean, President of Tidewatch Condominium Association. He indicated that the Tidewatch Board has been dealing with this problem for the last few years but it has really worsened. The buildings 12, 13 & 14 have had significant water intrusion into their crawl spaces. They have tried sump pumps and various internal mechanisms to deal with the problem to no avail. They are concerned with the structural damage from the constant presence of water. They only dry out during the summer months when they tend to have less rain but in the winter it is an ongoing problem. They engaged a hydrologist to assist in developing an effective plan. They have tried to meet regulations regarding run off. They feel this is an appropriate solution and will provide a permanent solution rather than the temporary measures they have been trying. This is a substantial undertaking and they are funding it through their own reserves.

Caley McComb, who lives right behind the scuba shop, indicated that when they had all of that rain in the spring, the drainpipe that goes from Tidewatch underneath her back yard and then discharges underneath the creek. There is a hole that is covered that you can open and see half way through her yard in the pipe. During that rainy spell the water was just pouring out of there and it came across her driveway and she has 12" of water in her cellar that she had never had before. Since then she has had water in her basement every time it rains. Her question was whether any of this was going to make it worse for her because that drain pipe goes to the little pond where the water usually stays there and goes through the pipe but when it gets really wet it can't handle that and it comes up over the road or through her back yard.

Mr. Crawford pointed out on the plan to the resident where the pond was and explained how it would affect her property.

After a conference with the residents, Mr. Crawford indicated that one of the people mentioned a spring storm two years ago, which was a 500 year storm. Typically they have analyzed a 25 year storm, the State only requires that you analyze a 10 years storm, but the numbers will still show the still thing. It is an insignificant volume compared to the pond.

Mr. Holden indicated they design for a 25 year storm and he asked what was the difficulty with a 500 year with this? Mr. Crawford stated that there is no infrastructure in the City that is designed for a 500 year storm. Mr. Holden indicated he would largely agree with that. Mr. Crawford stated he would expect her basement to get wet in that storm. Their capacity would probably handle a 100 year storm. All across the country when engineers are doing drainage studies, they look at peak flows and volumes are a separate issue altogether. They looked at peak flows pre-construction and post-construction and they don't change. They wouldn't change for a 50 year storm or a 100 year storm. All of the groundwater that hits the site is going to end up in the same place, the low area. They are not increasing the ground water flow, they are just redirecting it to the huge pond in back and it tends to slow it down. The HydroCad program they use is a pretty powerful program and he feels comfortable it gives decent number.

Mr. Allen stated that David Desfosses was not present and he is the one that does most of their drainage review. He asked if the HydroCad takes into account that this is ground water interception? Mr. Crawford confirmed that he had to make some assumptions. The program will give you the amount of run off in inches which he subtracted from the total amount of rain and that was what he felt would infiltrate into the ground and he felt if he used the same approach in the pre and post construction, it would be consistent. He felt it was a conservative approach. Mr. Allen stated that he was satisfied.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Holden confirmed there will be another public hearing before the Planning Board.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Crawford if they took a look at the path of the culvert as they mentioned water bubbling out of the culvert. He asked if the culvert was in tact? Mr. Crawford indicated he did not see the structure she was referring to. The abutter indicated it was something in her yard and had a big cast iron cover. Mr. Crawford felt it sounded like a drain manhole and that it is not Tidewatch's. Mr. Allen confirmed it was not part of the municipal system. The resident stated it was put there as a section of the big pond drains and that culvert goes over the road underground to the creek. Mr. Crawford confirmed that it is not Tidewatch's. It was there long before Tidewatch. Mr. Holden asked if Tidewatch is separate from everyone else? Mr. Crawford indicated that everything flows into the culvert. Mr. Holden confirmed that Tidewatch didn't construct that culvert. The resident indicated it

was her culvert. Mr. Crawford felt it was new and had been replaced over the past 10 years as it is in fairly good shape.

Mr. Holden asked for suggestions on how to satisfy the residents' concerns. One resident stated that she has more questions than she knows how to formulate because there is not enough information. She wants to know how this will impact their little area. She is not talking about the manhole cover. She would like something in writing for them to read and study.

Mr. Holden indicated that the applicant has submitted a drainage report that shows that this works. They could request that the applicant meet with them but they can't hold the application up as they have met their requirement.

Mr. Chagnon stated there has been a technical report issued to the Board as a result of a study that they did on the impact of the run off and they could provide them with a copy of the report although it is a technical document. They would be glad to meet with them and review it before the Planning Board meeting. They could also take a look at the structure in her yard and see if there is maybe a bend in the pipe and they could put that in the model to see if it makes a difference. One thing that wasn't made clear is there is no new construction going on. The ground water is infiltrating the crawl spaces of some of the buildings so there is an upward pressure as they have experienced. They are putting in a drain to move the groundwater away from the building. There is some surface drainage because the roofs are not connected to anything. The roof run off and some existing foundation drains go directly over to the swale. He pointed out how the run off flows on the displayed plan.

Mr. Chagnon stated he can meet with them and explain it more so that they will have a better understanding of what is going on. Staff could also be present if that made them more comfortable.

Mr. Allen added that one point that hasn't been mentioned is when they talk about the numbers in the study, the current 25 year flow is 28.10 cubic feet per second and it changes 2/100th of a cubic foot per second discharging into a pipe that has 16 cff's of available capacity. Based on the report, the numbers are quiet insignificant relative to that entire drainage area. Mr. Holden also added that the key for him is that the water is draining to the same area. Mr. Allen stated that was correct.

Deputy Fire Chief Griswold made a motion to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen stipulated that the applicant meet with abutters prior to the Planning Board meeting to review the drainage study and give them some understanding of what is being proposed in both the design area and what the study says.

Mr. Holden asked about a Construction Management & Mitigation Plan? Mr. Allen did not think so as there is no impact on the public street.

Mr. Allen stated they show the standard stormwater SWIFF methods as part of their construction.

Mr. Holden did not believe there was any reason for the City to be involved with the meeting. They can submit something in writing for the Planning Board.

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

- 1) That the Applicant shall meet with the abutters prior to the Planning Board meeting to review the drainage study and give them a better understanding of what is being proposed

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:05 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant