

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

2:00 PM

JUNE 2, 2009

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Holden, Director, Planning Department, Chairman; David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Thomas Cravens, Engineering Technician; Steve Parkinson, Public Works Director (for Deborah Finnigan); Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; and Len DiSesa, Deputy Police Chief;

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy Tillman, Chief Planner

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **51 Islington Street, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **51 Islington Street**, wherein Site Review approval is requested to construct one 4-story, 7,836 ± s.f. residential building and one 5-story 12,342 ± s.f. mixed use building, after demolition of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 33 and lies within the Historic District A and Central Business B Districts; (This application was postponed from the May 5, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting;)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

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

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, presented. Also present was Paul McEachern, Counsel, Jennifer Ramsey, from Somma Studios, and Stephen Kelm. They were here most recently on May 5th. Since that time they met on May 14th with the City's Parking Committee and received their approval for the parking plan on Islington Street. On the same day they met with the Traffic & Safety committee and received their approval for the site access and layout. The proposal before the Committee is the approved proposal, making Parker Street two-way which will provide access into the site. From the intersection of Tanner Court to Hanvoer, Parker would remain a one-way street.

At the May 5th TAC Meeting, they were asked to address some issues. The first was the parking layout. Their proposal is to come off of Parker Street with a ramp down to a parking garage which will be underneath the 51 Islington Street building. They added Sheet D-5 to the Plan Set which shows 33 underground parking spaces. There were also questions about drainage patterns and they had plans showing all of the spot grades and drainage listed including roof gutter connections.

They submitted a full set of plans for this meeting which include a detailed landscaping design. The plans include off site sewer and drainage and they also submitted lighting specs separately, which

are dark sky friendly. Also included was the street circulation plan, which was approved by Traffic & Safety. Tanner Court is up in the air at this point on whether it should be one way, two way or which direction. The Committee referred that to DPW for further study. They also submitted a proposed Sight Distance Plan showing that a 300' sight distance at the intersection of Parker and Islington.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the positives that this site brings to the City. By increasing the width of Parker Street to 24', moving the curbline back, creating safe sight distance in both directions at this intersection. They are creating abilities for pedestrian traffic where there are none now. The project is going to have sidewalks on all sides whereas the current building goes right up to the property line. They are providing underground parking, shifting it from on street. Another benefit is they are removing run off from the sewer system. Currently the Kline's building has a connection of the roof drains directly to the City's sewer system and the City has to pay to treat that. They are taking that away by doing off site improvements. They are upgrading the sewer on Tanner Street. Currently from Hanover to Tanner Court and all the way up to the Kline's building there is a substandard sewer, a very old clay pipe which they are going to replace with an 8" PVC pipe which is today's standard which is a substantial improvement of the City's infrastructure on that street. They are also improving stormwater run off collection. There are currently no catch basins coming up Hanover Street from Bridge Street and they will be installing a drainage system in Hanover and up Tanner Street to provide for that run off that used to go into the sewer. Another big benefit of this project is the upgrading of the landscaping. Currently there is no landscaping on the Tanner Street side, there is no landscaping on the Islington Street, and there is hardly any landscaping on Tanner Court. They now will have landscaping elements on all sides to enhance the beauty of the site. They are providing streetscape improvements. John Bohenko made a comment at the T&S meeting that the bumpouts are a precursor to what may occur up and down the corridor so this would test out that plan. Lastly, this project provides development and revenue to the City. They believe they have submitted all required items for the Committee to act on this. The project complies in all ways with the current Zoning Ordinance, it has received HDC approval, it meets the lot size and frontage requirements, setback requirements are zero. The only place this project has a zero setback is on Tanner Street at one point. On the Parker Street side the building is set back almost 10' and they have given this area up to public use. The Tanner Court side is 7' back and will be used for an increased public space and sidewalk. On the other side, it is also set back on Islington. Structural coverage is 65% and they could go to 90%. Open space is 20% where 5% is required. The uses they are proposing are allowed. Under the parking calculations on C-2 they are proposing 24 residential units in the 4 story building which requires 36 spaces, 28 residential units with 4,700 s.f. of retail and 5,400 s.f. of other retail which requires 63 spaces, for a total of 99 required spaces. They are providing 33 covered spaces so their requirement is met and they have no unmet parking need.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses pointed out that he was glad that they finally got a full size, complete set of plans to start reviewing the project.

Mr. Holden asked if the parking garage has changed in its configuration at all? Mr. Chagnon indicated that because they had to make the building smaller, it changed in size but this is the first time they have submitted it as part of the plan set. The underground parking level does extend further towards Tanner Court. Mr. Holden assumed that the structure will have to have the parking structure constructed first? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it would. Mr. Holden asked if that changed their phasing at all? Mr. Chagnon stated that the project is not phased so it does not affect their project. Mr. Holden asked which building will be constructed first? Mr. Chagnon responded that the Tanner Court building, in the rear, will go up first.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they were proposing an interim grading plan or following construction straight through. Mr. Chagnon indicated they are asking for approval of the whole project and if there was an interim plan they would address that in the CMMP process. Mr. Holden asked if the Tanner Street building would be open before the Islington Street building was done? Mr. Chagnon thought that might happen and would all be part of the building permit as they would just pull the permit for the back. Mr. Holden felt that some of that has to be dealt with now.

Mr. Cravens asked if an irrigation system was being planned? Mr. Chagnon stated that will come much later as part of the building design.

Mr. Desfosses had some questions about power. He asked if they had had any conversations with PSNH and developed any type of plan on phasing on how the building will receive power? He wondered if they knew what their power loads would be and if they would need three phase power. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that they have met with PSNH several times. He pointed out where the power currently comes from. They talked about bringing power in with a pad mounted transformer but that pole provides Comcast and Fairpoint connections so they couldn't put a drop down on the transformer as it would interfere with the equipment on the pole. So, they looked at the other side. They could upgrade the pole to three phase power, down to their transformer and service the building with an underground. They will meet with Mr. Desfosses after they have had another meeting with PSNH. Mr. Desfosses asked if any further guiding would be required? The poles heights are quite low. Mr. Chagnon indicated that Sonny at PSNH is confident that this plan would work and could address Mr. Desfosses' questions. Mr. Desfosses was concerned about how many other utilities would be coming off that pole and whether there would be enough room. There area already two drops on the Tanner Street pole. PSNH typically wants plenty of room so he wants a detail on that to make sure they have at least 3' of walkway around the pole and handicapped access. The guide is currently 1' into the street and he would like to see the guide wire moved. He would like a detail for the Parker Street pole. It is a tight place for plowing and trash removal. Mr. Chagnon explained that the Parker Street pole is why they couldn't put their drops on that pole. The two drops they need will be on the back of the pole and they will provide a detail.

Mr. Desfosses referred to Sheet C-7, Off Site Drainage Plan. He would like to see the catch basin that is in the middle of Tanner Street moved up to the curb line, even if they need an 8-bend in that pipe. Mr. Chagnon indicated that in a rain storm the water comes down that curb line and shoots across. It's a wonder it doesn't just go into the building. Mr. Desfosses would like to pick up that water before it goes across the street.

Mr. Desfosses talked to Steve Parkinson about the fact that Parker Street is inverse crowned and the water goes to the middle of the street. Now that the width of the street is increasing, it will be a sea. He would like the crown of the street revised to pitch to the side. The only ting that would entail is installing the curbing along the Robbins building and re-grading the street. Mr. Desfosses addressed limits of paving. They will have a big impact into several city streets. He would like them to show limits of reclaim on Tanner Street as they should reclaim and rebuild it.. Parker Street will need to be ground up too so he would like to see Tanner Court repaved. They can live with a patch on Hanover Street.

Regarding handicapped tipdown details. They need to set up a meeting so they can go over things. They need to make sure the tipdowns match city standards. The handicapped widths are not typical and he would like the ramps to line up too what's on the other side giving more room for tree planters. The corners should match all other corners in the City. They are showing an 8' crosswalk and the east corner of Tanner Street tip down is only 3' and is undersized. They would want to line up their tipdown with that tipdown. It doesn't need to be that wide. As opposed to having an L shaped retaining wall with retaining, it could probably be graded out with brick rather than having curbing there. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they want to keep it flat as it is in front of useable space. They will talk about it.

Mr. Desfosses requested a detail on tree wells and tree grates. He had a problem following grades on Parker Street and would like to see some more existing spot grades if they have them. Mr. Chagnon pointed out that Parker is pretty steep. Mr. Desfosses requested more existing information.

Mr. Desfosses asked them to make sure the standard 4' cross section pavement is on all cross sections. Another concern is that the pipe going across Hanover is only 2' from the top of the pipe to the pavement level and maybe they want to go with something more sturdy? They should take a look at it.

Mr. Cravens was all set.

Mr. Allen noted on the details they are showing sidewalk as 5' and calling it out as 4' and that should be clarified. He asked if there will be an agreement with the City on the sidewalk along Parker and Hanover because if the City is accepting it through agreement, their normal width is a 5' sidewalk. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they have been around on that. Mr. Holden confirmed that they concluded that 4' would be alright in the sections that were not going to be plowed. Mr. Desfosses wanted to make sure they have 3' for handicapped access everywhere.

Mr. Desfosses asked if they know from their test borings if they will have to dewater the foundation for this building? Mr. Chagnon had not see the results yet. Mr. Desfosses assumed they wanted to see that water in the drainage system. Mr. Allen agreed. Mr. Chagnon felt that was easily accomplished.

Mr. Britz asked if they are expecting a lot of ground water? Mr. Desfosses pointed out that they don't have the test results back so they don't know. They still need that information. Mr. Holden felt that was uncomfortable at this stage.

Mr. Allen felt the issue of sidewalk on the front and having the curbing and tipdowns is not a safe method of dealing with tipdowns and the sidewalk plow getting through. They need a full plan showing any sort of trench patch or street work being done.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Chagnon to go over the part of the plan on the profile sheet. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they asked a number of times if they could do exploratory digging on Tanner Street to find that existing sewer. They just want to replace the old sewer with a new pipe and they need to coordinate that. Note #3 (P1) is saying that because of the tightness of the corridor they don't want to drop the sewer any lower than they have to but they do have to pick up the building in front and there is going to have to be a run all the way over and it will have to be deep enough to catch it. It says they have to be careful about changing grades in the field. Mr. Desfosses felt they could say this is the design and if they run into problems they will come back and DPW will review it. This note just says follow the ledge. Mr. Chagnon stated if they want them to do some test pits they will find out where the ledge is. Mr. Allen felt there is a ledge issue and making sure this thing is set at an adequate depth to pick up the other sewer on Tanner Street. Mr. Allen felt that TV'ing it would be a good idea but it would mean getting access into it. They can coordinate test probes with the Sewer Department.

Mr. Allen confirmed that T&S has approved the new traffic pattern on May 14th.

Mr. Parkinson asked if they have talked to the gas companies about adequate supply and whether any problems were anticipated? Mr. Chagnon indicated they were in the middle of becoming Initel and they are waiting for the company to get back to them. Mr. Desfosses thought they may want to replace the one on Parker Street. It's plastic in Tanner but bare steel in Parker. Mr. Parkinson would like to see something on the adequacy from the gas utility that they have no plans to upgrade their facilities within the proximity of the project. He doesn't want them to be re-digging up the streets.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa asked how did they resolve the safety issue of cars backing out of the garage? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they show a gate on the plan

Mr. Britz asked what the slope of the garage ramp was? Mr. Chagnon confirmed it was 16%. Mr. Britz felt as you come out of the garage it looks like the sidewalk ends but the curb doesn't look safe how it is configured. He was concerned about pedestrians. In his car, with a clutch, he wouldn't be inclined to stop at the steep grade. He thought a gate might help. Mr. Chagnon indicated that there is a flat spot at the top. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa suggested a stop sign and stop line and a sign towards the building warning pedestrians about vehicles exiting. Mr. Desfosses agreed with Mr. Britz. Typically the radius on the ramp slopes into the radius on the street. One might be a granite planting retainer and one might be granite curbing. They should take a look at it along with the other items.

Mr. Britz asked about the note on plan about the garage representing a "possible" garage layout. Mr. Chagnon stated that at this time they are not going to design the structural elements. Mr. Holden felt it should be subject to review by this group. When the Westin came through this Board it was designed, as well as 198 Islington Street. Mr. Chagnon agreed to remove that note and if they need to change it, they will have to come back. Mr. Allen felt the parking layout drawing was confusing as they are showing surface details and garage details on the same plan. They should correct that.

Mr. Parkinson asked about on Sheet C-5 the staircase shown on the northerly side ramp going down along with some gas meter locations. Mr. Chagnon explained that you step out of the building at 6" below floor level and the steps go down and they meet the level of the garage. There is a wall and is at the same grade to provide access onto the ramp. It is an emergency access and the gas meters are flat.

Jennifer Ramsey, of Somma Studios, explained that the area is a platform and the egress is from the common hallway. The area is flush with the ramp for emergency egress and the other end leads to the meters. Mr. Chagnon added that they reviewed that with the gas company. It is going to be hung from the ceiling of the garage. Mr. Parkinson was surprised to hear that plan was approved by the gas company as that is not typically how they want to do things. Mr. Desfosses felt they might be better going down Tanner Street rather than bringing it across the garage. Mr. Chagnon agreed that was not a bad idea.

Ms. Tillman referred to Sheet D-5, the Parking Plan. If they are taking off the note and this is the parking plan, the spaces are not 8.5' wide as they have posts in them which makes them non-conforming so that needs to be an outstanding issue. The handicapped space seem remote from the elevator. Mr. Chagnon felt it doesn't work to put it closer to the elevator. Mr. Desfosses confirmed that it needs to be the closest spot to the accessible entrance. Ms. Tillman confirmed that because of the design, posts, handicapped space and the parking calculations remains outstanding. She asked if they submitted elevations in this plan set? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they were not submitted with this set but were submitted to the HDC. Ms. Tillman felt they should be coming to TAC. She asked when the rear building is built and the underground parking doesn't get built, where does the parking go? Mr. Chagnon stated they will have to work on that.

Ms. Tillman could not find the Lighting Plan. Mr. Desfosses confirmed he needs a Photometrix Plan.

Mr. Holden asked about the green area heading down the parking ramp and whether there would be any access from the fence? Mr. Chagnon pointed out that the fence comes across and you can walk along the back of it and it can be maintained.

Mr. Holden assumed this parking garage will require ventilation and if they presented to HDC for equipment? Ms. Ramsey stated that when they go back to the HDC for exterior lighting they often discuss these details. They can do ventilation windows on the sides that don't have windows. They have provided a roof trough in the front building and a room in the rear building. Mr. Holden asked if the foundation where it was a zero yard on Tanner was under the right of way and would need an easement? Ms. Ramsey stated they can do it either way. Mr. Holden confirm they will have to have that on the plans at the next hearing.

Mr. Holden noted for the record that they received a memo from Jon Fredericks which Mr. Holden read regarding parking concerns from abutters. Mr. Chagnon confirmed that Mr. Fowle has spoken to this group before. In the T&S approval, they requested that DPW include in their report parking on Tanner Court. They suggested one way with parking on one side. Mr. Holden asked Mr. Chagnon if this was an issue that does not affect their project? Mr. Chagnon responded that T&S discussed this and they did not want to hold them up on this issue.

Ms. Tillman noted trash storage area in the lower left corner on Sheet D-5. She asked how will they get it out of there? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that a pick up truck would bring it off site. Ms. Tillman asked about the rear building? Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will use the same area. Ms. Tillman asked about when the front building is not built and there is no place for the trash? Mr. Chagnon agreed that was a good question.

Mr. Allen noted on the Utility Plan they are calling for a 4” diameter and it should be 4’ for all structures. On some pipes they are calling out a slope of .4% and in others they are putting in feet per foot and he asked them to be consistent by either using all percentage or feet per foot.

Mr. Britz asked about drainage for the ramp going into the garage trench. Mr. Chagnon confirmed it is going into the drainage system. It connects to a hard pipe to a catch basin.

Mr. Holden felt that in spite of their drilling they have done a good job on the issues.

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone to the June 30th TAC meeting for more details. The record will speak to the Board’s concerns. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone to the next regularly scheduled TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....
II. NEW BUSINESS

B. The application of the **City of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **10 Middle Street (formerly 8 Islington Street)**, wherein amended Site Review approval is requested to reconfigure parking , with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 126 as Lot 21 and lies within the Historic District A, Downtown Overlay District (DOD) and Municipal District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Steve Parkinson, Director of Public Works, addressed the Committee. He indicated this is a very minor change to the existing parking lot at what is know as the old public library which is now the Portsmouth Discovery Center. There is a shaded area with three vehicles which represents an expansion of the existing parking lot where a big beech tree used to be. The area has been used on and off as a parking area. The plan is to remove existing organic material and broken down curbing and repave the area so it drains to the natural drainage patterns. They will remove two handicapped spaces that are against the building and move them to the Keefe Side of lot to make them more accessible.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve amended Site Review approval. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion. Mr. Holden recommended a waiver of Site Review Regulations on the plan.

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

- 1). That a waiver of Site Review Regulations shall be required at the Planning Board Meeting;
-

C. The application of **Madison Town houses, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **5, 7, 11 and 13 Old Parish Way (formerly 66 Madison Street)**, where in amended Site Review approval is requested for revisions to Units 8 – 11 to include interior garages, , with related paving, utilities, lighting, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 147 as Lots 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3 and lies within the Apartment District;

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, representing King Weinstein, stated this was a simple request to provide one parking space inside a garage. The original design had extended parking areas where the two card would stack and they are proposing to cut the sidewalk area back for access into the unit and allow one spot inside and one outside, with no change in pervious area and thus no change in run off from the site. Mr. Holden asked if it was the intent to complete this project?

King Weinstein stated it was his intent to complete framing on the last two buildings this summer and it should be completed by spring 2010. Mr. Holden asked if any built units will be modified by this proposed change? Mr. Weinstein confirmed they would not.

Mr. Holden asked how the address of Parish Way was created as it is a private road. Mr. Weinstein stated that it came from DPW. Mr. Holden stated that Old Parish Way is a driveway, not a street. Mr. Parkinson confirmed that typically they will use a street address and not a private way address. He will talk to Tom Richter.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Desfosses asked if the foundations are already built? Mr. Weinstein confirmed that they were but they haven't poured the pad on it with the grades yet. Mr. Desfosses asked if the driveways were already built. Mr. Weinstein stated they were not, just the parking spaces that were shown on the original plan. Mr. Desfosses asked if the driveways on the side of the units are already built? Mr. Weinstein believed they were. Mr. Desfosses felt this would entail excavation, loam, seed and Mrs. Kearstead. Mr. Weinstein confirms that Mrs. Kearstead has his home and cell phone numbers.

Mr. Parkinson asked if they are talking about taking away some green space in front of the building and making that a driveway, shorting up the existing paved areas that were already done and adding a sidewalk from the shortened parking stall to the rear of the building and adding on to the rear of the building where there are dashed corners on the four units? Mr. Chagnon believed those are decks. Mr. Parkinson asked because it says original building layout and it is a dark line with the dashed lines in the corner. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they are patios and not part of the building. Mr. Weinstein confirmed that there is a roof over the patios. Mr. Parkinson asked if that was currently as designed?

He asked to have those labeled appropriately so that people can understand what it is. Looking at it quickly, he thought they were squaring up the building. Mr. Parkinson then asked about the right hand part of the lot there is a dark line that says retaining wall and he asked if that was part of this approval or is it existing? Mr. Chagnon confirmed that it is part of the original approval but it hasn't been built. Mr. Parkinson asked why hasn't it been built as a retaining wall is there for a purpose. Mr. Weinstein stated that the slope isn't as great as depicted on the plans but they do plan to put it in.

Mr. Holden asked if a condition should be that that they build that retaining wall first? Mr. Parkinson's only concern was that he wanted clarification on the plan as far as what is already approved and what is being proposed. Mr. Holden suggested striking "proposed" and if this goes forward have a stipulation that a retaining wall be built. Mr. Desfosses asked if there was any street sign that said Old Parish Way? Mr. Weinstein said it wasn't installed yet. Mr. Holden indicated the City would be looking at the street names and hopefully that will get clarified. Mr. Desfosses felt that if there was going to be a private street and people were going to be referring to it, it should have a sign so that somebody knows where it is. Mr. Holden indicated that every private street he has seen has gone through an EOC process and that wasn't done with this one.

Mr. Parkinson made a motion to approve with stipulations. Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Holden indicated that the first stipulation is that the retaining wall be constructed next in sequence. He asked if anyone believed this retaining wall is not necessary? Mr. Desfosses does not want to open up any new ground that isn't absolutely necessary as he has gone through hell on this project. He felt they should do a report back to the Planning Board as they might not need it. Mr. Parkinson's question was whether this was something new to this request that they have before them today. If it is not part of today's request, then he suggested getting "proposed" off the plan and label is as "previously approved".

Mr. Holden with drew his condition.

Mr. Allen agreed as they have all been through hell with this project with the neighborhood and agrees with Mr. Desfosses and Mr. Britz that you don't need a retaining wall if this system is functioning and the turn around is there.

Mr. Holden asked about an assessment of the need of the retaining wall upon completion of project to determine its usefulness. Mr. Parkinson indicated that, to satisfy him per this particular request, he wants to lighten up the wall on the plans, and label it "previously approved". Upon a request to release the bond, that will be a question to address at that time. He just doesn't want to make it appear as new.

Mr. Allen requested that they put some dimensions on the pavement that is to be removed and to remain so that the appropriate amount is removed.

Mr. Allen assumed that because the symbol looks the same as the concrete walk he asked if they are proposing Portland concrete? Mr. Chagnon indicated not necessarily. They could be fieldstone or brick walkways. Mr. Allen felt that materials are typically called out on the site plans. Mr. Chagnon looked on the original plan and it says "surface material to be determined – typical". Mr. Weinstein would like cobbles, as that is what the patios are. Mr. Chagnon understood that they want them to call the material out.

Mr. Desfosses requested a stipulation that the site shall be completely stabilized within 30 days of whenever anything happens out there. Otherwise he is not voting for them disturbing property out there as he has had enough calls at 8:00 a.m. on Sunday morning.

Mr. Allen requested that erosion control measures should be installed as part of this approval. Hay bales and silt fences for example. Mr. Chagnon indicated they will add something that they have to conform to State stormwater guidelines. Mr. Desfosses reiterated 30 DAYS.

Mr. Holden requested that the Site Plans be revised and reviewed by David Desfosses before it goes to the Planning Board.

Mr. Parkinson will look into the address.

Mr. Weinstein confirmed they will not put a sign up until the address issue is resolved.

Mr. Holden requested that they provide elevations to the Planning Board to correct the patio issue.

The motion to approve passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the patios shown on the Site Plans with a dashed line shall be labeled appropriately;
- 2) That the line on the Site Plan for the retaining wall shall be lightened up and re-labeled as "previously approved";
- 3) That the applicant shall add dimensions on the pavement that is to be removed and the pavement that is to remain so that the appropriate amount is removed;
- 4) That the material for the walkways shall be labeled on the Site Plans;
- 5) That the site shall be completely stabilized within 30 days of the date of commencement of any work on the site based on this approval;
- 6) That erosion control measures should be installed as part of this approval and shown on the Site Plans;
- 7) That the revised Site Plans shall be reviewed by David Desfosses before the Planning Board meeting;
- 8) That elevations shall be provided to the Planning Board.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:45 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant