

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

2:00 PM

AUGUST 3, 2010

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; David Allen, Deputy Director of Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Steve Griswold, Assistant Fire Chief and Stephen Dubois, Deputy Police Chief

.....
I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Meadowbrook Motor, Inc., Owner, and Key Auto Group, Applicant**, for property located at **549 Route One By-Pass (Traffic Circle)**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 1-1/2 story 29,405 s.f. (footprint) automobile sales/service center, 432 ± parking spaces, and future development site, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 234 as Lot 51 and lies within the General Business (GB) District. (This application was postponed from the May 5, 2010 Technical Advisory Committee meeting).

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gordon Leedy, Planner and Landscape Architect with VHB appeared and gave an overview of the project. This is the former Meadowbrook Inn property, bounded by I-95, the traffic circle, US Route One-Bypass and Coakley Road. Hodgson Brook runs through the middle of the site which has a fairly significant wetland area. There is an existing access right-in/right-out off the Route One Bypass and a second access off Coakley Road.

Previous to this application there was a plan that went through the local approval processes which included a hotel, a number of restaurants and a number of retail businesses in several buildings. As part of that project they applied for and received a Conditional Use Permit for impacts to the regulatory buffer as well as a wetland permit for certain fills of wetlands bordering the Hodgson Brook area. Part of that was also to establish a restoration plan for the buffer area to be reconstructed as well as some lawn area.

There were a number of drainage facilities which were part of that approval, including infiltration areas to handle roof run off from the buildings and a significant gravel wetland which provides significant removal of pollutants and suspended solids from the stormwater stream. All of those elements have

been incorporated into this new plan. As a result of some of the work being done on site, the Wetland Permit and the Conditional Use Permit remain in effect. The exterior edge of the new development remains predominantly the same as what was shown on the previously approved plan.

The new site maintains access from the Route One Bypass, same as today, along with a new access off Coakley Road to provide some additional queuing at that signal. This is a proposed automobile sales and service facility. The total square footage is 39,051 s.f. total on two levels which includes a mezzanine or second level for offices, break rooms and storage of parts. They are required to provide 1 parking space per 600 s.f. of gross area as well as 1 parking space per 2,000 s.f. of outdoor display area, which totals 94 parking spaces. These are the striped parking spaces on the plan. The rest of the parking spaces are display spaces and, in addition to the 94 spaces, there are 338 vehicle display spaces, for a total of 432 spaces.

The circulation on the site accommodates trucks coming in from Coakley Road or the Route One Bypass and circulating around the site, exiting out onto Coakley Road to the signal. They do not anticipate a large number of articulated trucks. They will likely unload vehicles at another location and transport them. Although they do not anticipate unloading from car carriers on the site they have planned for it in the Site Plan. Parking is not between the principal use and the street. All parking is on the other sides of the building. There was a requirement to have landscaping and they are in excess of the prior number of trees which were previously approved. The drainage includes subsurface infiltration areas that will handle the roof runoff and the gravel wetland will carry the drainage from the pavement.

They have shown a future development area which at one time was proposed for a fast food restaurant, but there is no tenant at this time. They reserve the right to come back at a later date for a Site Plan amendment.

Water, gas, and fire protection services are coming up Coakley Road and into the building. Electric, television, cable and fire alarm come up underground from the street and into the building. The sewer service comes out an existing service in the street. Drainage comes from the Bypass into the infiltration basins into a system that takes lower flows to the gravel wetland and in a high intensity event there is an overflow system that goes to Hodgson Brook.

They are proposing to do the same traffic improvements that they proposed to do in the previous approved project, although with a much lower traffic volume. There will be improvements to the entrance and the re-timing of the signal.

The other off site improvement they are required to complete is the extension of a water line from the existing large water main that transits the property. They will dig it under the existing culvert of Hodgson Brook and they will install a water line with a valve and provide water service to both developments from Coakley Road.

In terms of building design, Mr. Leedy displayed elevations for the front with either halo lit or internally illuminated signage. It will be a fairly understated building.

All lighting will be compliant with the new Site Plan Review Regulations. They will provide more information on security lighting. They received some comments from the City but nothing too major and they will accommodate all of those comments in their revised plans prior to the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Allen asked for an explanation of Note 1 on the Utility Plan, which talks about removing some drainage pipes under Coakley Road. Mr. Leedy responded that the intent is to take that drainage right into their system instead of discharging directly into Hodgson Brook. They are providing a Stormscepter at that corner location. Mr. Allen asked if those are three pipes that go under there now. Mr. Desfosses indicated those are old culverts from before the hotel was built and they should probably be removed. Mr. Leedy stated they are going to overlay Coakley Road in that location and they have the water line construction so it wouldn't be difficult to remove them.

Mr. Britz referred to the gravel wetland. He asked them to confirm they looked at the gravel wetland in relationship to the new site and that it is adequate to treat the stormwater coming off the site, given the different uses on the site. Mr. Leedy responded there were some minor changes in volumes and they reconfigured the gravel wetland to accommodate that. It is sized to allow for dirty drainage from the future development outparcel. In other words, it not only has capacity to deal with the instant development but also the future development pad area that may occur on site. Some goes down to the Stormscepter area but some of it also goes into the main drainage system.

Mr. Taintor asked if the front of the building is facing the wetlands. Mr. Leedy confirmed the front elevation will be looking towards the Bypass. Mr. Taintor asked if the rear elevation will have solid overhead doors so that nothing will be illuminated facing the Coakley Road neighborhood. Mr. Leedy stated there will be cut off wall packs on the building but there won't be showroom lighting showing through to the neighborhood. Mr. Taintor noted that on the front and back elevations and on the left elevations there are areas that are shown as existing. Mr. Leedy confirmed that was a typo and they will revise that.

Mr. Taintor also confirmed, as previously discussed, they will provide a lighting plan showing nighttime lighting at the levels allowed by the City's regulations.

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

Al Romano, of Coakley Road, addressed the Committee. He indicated that in the fall when the leaves are off the trees, the lights are going to be more of a problem on Coakley Road. He was concerned about the PA system as they currently can hear the PA systems from the existing dealerships from Coakley Road. Regarding traffic, the last project included the requirement of a pedestrian light and there was to be a meeting with the State on that. He would like to know what the result of that meeting was. He wanted to make sure the pedestrian crossing is included in this approval. This intersection is the only intersection that doesn't have a pedestrian light, other than Borthwick Avenue, going all the way down the Route One Bypass. The traffic is terrible at this intersection and the intersections are blocked with traffic that is backed up. When the intersection is blocked, cars can't get out from Coakley Road. If carriers are coming out of the site and for some reason the truck gets stuck, there will be no way for the residents to get out of Coakley Road. He also indicated that they do not want to have people test driving cars in their neighborhood.

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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked to hear more about the PA system they will be using. Mr. Leedy responded that, to the extent permitted, they would like to do some low level PA. They could commit to directing any speakers away from the neighborhood and he felt that would be a reasonable compromise. He understands that sound carries, particularly in the wintertime, but there is a lot of noise around the area that currently exists. Deputy Police Chief Dubois asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Leedy stated they would be 7:00 am to 8:00 pm or 9:00 pm.

Mr. Allen wondered why they couldn't give their employees cell phones to use rather than a PA system. Mr. Leedy felt it was an additional cost to provide cell phones.

Mr. Desfosses had some concerns. In general, he felt this will be a much better use than the original use that was proposed, regarding traffic and noise. Originally one of the main reasons he voted positively for the last application was the public benefit of putting the crosswalk over the Bypass. The applicant has made a case that the last application called for a significant possibility of pedestrian traffic crossing over from the other side of the Bypass toward this development to go to stores and restaurants and as that doesn't apply to this application they are saying they don't want to put the walkway in. He felt the City should take a good look at this as it is probably their one shot to get the pedestrian crossing. Also, the two driveways going into and out of the site are very close and there is a small connector section that connects the two driveways. He stated he would like the Traffic & Safety Committee to take a look at this at their August meeting. The two issues he would like them to look at is the internal layout of the site and the pedestrian crossing at the Route One Bypass.

Mr. Desfosses indicated there were a number of notes made this morning at their meeting that were written down and need to get done before the Planning Board meeting. He would like to see the revised copy of the Lighting Plan, the revised drainage around Coakley Road, the details regarding putting Coakley Road back together, and the underground utilities servicing the pad site and the dealership to be broken out somewhere near Coakley Road so that they don't have numerous stubs on the pole.

Mr. Desfosses made a motion to approve based on his above comments and approval by Traffic & Safety relative to traffic issues.

Mr. Allen seconded the motion.

Mr. Taintor summarized the stipulations as follows: Referral to Traffic & Safety to look at the issue of the walk light and potential shortcut through the driveways. They want to see the revised lighting and drainage plans before the Planning Board meeting, revising how the underground utilities are dealt with, and some details on the reconstruction of Coakley Road.

Mr. Desfosses added that it was not just the shortcut or short circuiting of traffic but because that connector is so short it is really a congestion issue as well. He also did not find a good plan on how to build the gravel wetland. There are cross sections and plan views but many are very small and there is a lot of grading. He felt they might want to have a gravel wetland sheet that is very easy to follow. The gravel wetland is a new technology and there should be some sort of maintenance plan on the plan stating how it is to be maintained.

Attorney Malcolm McNeill asked for permission to ask for clarification regarding the referral. With regard to the crosswalk issue, they may recall that involved discussion with the City and with DOT and it is significantly related to the previous plan. This site does not generate pedestrians and, using the reasonable rational nexus test, this application does not impact the intersection and should differentiate this application from what happened previously. He wanted to make sure they weren't recommending a crosswalk. Mr. Taintor confirmed that they are asking the Traffic & Safety Committee to look at it. The intent of the recommendation was to have Traffic & Safety look at the crosswalk issue. Attorney McNeill felt it was two different things whether TAC is recommending it rather than referring it for review.

Mr. Britz suggested a CMP. He also asked if they need an oversight engineer on site to follow the design and construction of the site. It is still a big project and a gravel wetland is a big thing. He would like some sort of review of the gravel wetland as they construct it. Mr. Allen would agree relative to the gravel wetland, as well as the utilities and water main work.

Mr. Britz added a stipulation for an oversight engineer to be paid for by the applicant, to look at site development and the gravel wetland during construction.

The motion to recommend Site Review approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

Conditions Precedent (to be completed prior to final Site Plan Approval):

1. The applicant shall submit the following revised plans for review by the Planning and Public Works Departments prior to the Planning Board meeting:
 - (a) Revised Layout and Materials Plan (Sheet C-2) showing updated floor area and off-street parking calculations;
 - (b) Revised Grading and Drainage Plan (Sheet C-3) showing drainage around Coakley Road;
 - (c) Revised Utility Plan (Sheet C-4) showing additional detail for underground electric, telephone, cable TV and fire alarm services (including separation of services for the dealership and Future Development Area near Coakley Road); and addition of a sewer stub for the Future Development Area
 - (d) Revised the Site Lighting Plan (Sheet SL-1) demonstrating compliance with the Zoning Ordinance limits for security lighting when the business is not open to customers (Sec. 10.1145.12);

- (e) Details on the reconstruction of Coakley Road, including 1½” pavement overlay;
 - (f) Gravel wetland sheet, including a maintenance plan.
2. The applicant shall provide the Proposed Exterior Building Elevations (Sheet A3.1) in the large plan set submitted to the Planning Board.
 3. The proposed development shall be reviewed by the Traffic and Safety Committee for its recommendations regarding (1) the desirability of a pedestrian signal on the Route 1 Bypass at Coakley Road and Cottage Street, and (2) the potential of the entry and exit drives to become a connector between the Bypass and Coakley Road, encouraging drivers to bypass the traffic signal.
 4. The applicant shall submit documentation that the condominium plan previously filed for the site has been formally abandoned.

Conditions Subsequent (to be completed prior to Certificate of Occupancy):

1. The applicant shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 2. The applicant shall pay for the services of an oversight engineer, to be selected by the City, to monitor site development including the gravel wetland construction.
-

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Owner**, for property located at **400 Gosling Road**, requesting Amended Site Plan approval to amend the Truck Management Plan regarding deliveries, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 214 as Lot 1 and lies within the Waterfront Industrial District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dick Despina, Station Manager at the Schiller Station, addressed the Committee. Mr. Despina stated that they have before them an application to amend their previously approved Site Plan from 2004 associated with the project that they refer to as Northern Wood Power. The proposed amendment would change the opening of their wood yard for delivering from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m., Monday through Friday, and they currently have approval as part of the plan to receive wood on Saturdays as needed, typically due to lost deliveries during the week due to inclement weather, which is currently approved from 7:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and they are seeking to have that changed to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Despina indicated that at the request of TAC in December, they conducted a 6-month trial period utilizing those hours. They utilized the Saturday hours one time on April 3rd. There was a request that they list the arrivals of deliveries on that date and he provided copies of that document to the Committee. There were 39 deliveries on that date. During this trial period they have not received any complaints. He also noted for the record that this change in wood delivery times would have no effect on their recent Site Plan approval associated with the hours of operation for their newly expanded wood yard.

After discussions with the City, Mr. Despina stated that they recognized the concern with the potential for deliveries later in the day on Saturdays. As he mentioned, the Saturday use is periodic and usually as a result of inclement weather during the course of the week which impacts their normal deliveries. They are willing to limit the Saturday deliveries to no more than 15 per year using the 7:00 am – 7: pm hours. They are also open to adjustments to the hours as previously discussed of 6:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. on Saturdays as necessary on a trial basis for up to one year with no restrictions on the number of times it can be utilized. The reason that he cannot offer a restriction under the lesser hours is because he did not have a good feel of what the impacts may be in terms of their ability to get a minimum amount of wood during the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. He has a high level of confidence that from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00p.m. he can receive the wood that would be necessary but under the shorter hours he may need to do two Saturdays in a row to make up lost volumes from a lost day during the week.

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 this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve a one year trial of the proposed amended Truck Management Plan, with shortened hours from 6:00 am to 3:00 pm on Saturdays and that the applicant come back to the City with a report that includes the date, number of visits and a log of any complaints at 11 months so that the City can review it prior to the expiration of the one year trial period. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

Mr. Britz asked if that would give them the opportunity to do a revocable approval or does he want them to come back. If they are able to and there is no problem with the one year trial period, could they let them continue without having them come back through the process after one year. Mr. Allen agreed that would make sense. Mr. Taintor suggested they could recommend to the Planning Board either a one year trial basis or a revocable permanent approval, based on what the Legal Department recommends.

The motion to recommend amended Site Plan approval for a one year trial of the proposed amended Truck Management Plan, with shortened hours on Saturdays, from 6:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., with one of the following options, depending on the recommendation of the City's Legal Department, passed unanimously:

- 1) A one year trial with the condition that the applicant come back in 11 months with a report for the City's review prior to the expiration of the one year trial period;
- 2) A permanent revocable approval.

B. The application of the **City of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **155 Parrott Avenue**, requesting Site Plan approval for the renovation and expansion of the Portsmouth Middle School, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 128 as Lot 15 & 16 and lies within the Municipal District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Gordon Leedy, with VHB, appeared for the applicant. He advised the Committee that they have been working hard to resolve various issues as this is a fairly complex site. The existing site is bounded by Parrott Avenue, Rogers Street, a number of residences on the northerly side and westerly side and the existing library facility. There is the existing middle school, part of which is the early historic school building and part of which is a late 1970's era addition and there is a service area to the rear which is also an addition to the original school building. AlumniField is being relocated to the Wentworth School site on Granite Street.

Mr. Leedy displayed a color site plan and explained that the darker brown was the existing school building to remain and the lighter area was two different series of additions. One is the proposed middle school addition and the other is a proposed youth recreation facility. The plan is to raze the additions to the existing building, construct the new additions and then renovate the existing parking area to have better circulation although it stays pretty much in the same footprint as the existing parking area. The entrances are essentially in the same places off Parrott Avenue. Cars and buses will circulate around the building and buses will load up on the site, rather than on Parrott Avenue. There is a plaza area on the south and west of the new building with a generous sidewalk and there is an interior courtyard. There is a multi use field adjacent to the school for outdoor recreation. To avoid flooding, they are proposing to raise the grades in the parking lot by 1 1/2' which will transition into the library and it will be ADA accessible. The landscaping is pretty simple. Because of the grade changes, they will have to eliminate landscaping along that side of the parking area and replace it with decent sized street trees and an evergreen hedge to buffer the parking area from the street. They anticipate they can save all of the trees near the library. They have trees and tree grates along the pedestrian promenade to provide shade and some definition between the drive aisle and the pedestrian way. In the courtyard they have smaller scale trees against the building and some ornamental trees. There are some gardens designed by some teachers and students and they are working on how to work around those.

They are still working on the lighting design but it will meet City regulations and there is existing lighting in the field area that will be removed. Although he has been told by folks in the neighborhood they have become used to the lights the new plan will reduce impact on abutting properties.

Bryant Anderson, of VHB, gave a brief overview of utilities for the project. He noted that they are in the process of refining some of those with DPW to make sure they meet the needs of the City. The site has an existing sewer line that crosses through the site out to Parrott Avenue with another sewer line

behind the existing building coming out Rogers Street. As part of the City's separation project, they are trying to remove as many lines as they can from the site. They will leave the existing sewer line that comes across the site from Richards Avenue and through the site to the 48" existing brick sewer. That will remain until the City's ultimate sewer separation project relocates that sewer to the west.

Regarding electrical service, there is an existing transformer at the library that was sized by PSNH to accommodate the school. They will run underground along the parking lot to the back to the utility room. Telephone, cable and fire alarm lines will remain overhead because of the other utilities going underground. There is a fairly tight corridor there and they would require additional space to include the telephone, cable and fire alarm. They will request a waiver when they go before the Planning Board.

The biggest area they are working on now is the drainage system. Water currently ponds in the existing parking lot. They are lifting up the parking lot from elevation 6.4 to elevation 9 to avoid some of that flooding and hopefully provide relief to get into the existing drainage system on Parrott Avenue. Today, all drainage from the site, except some of the drainage from the front of the building which sheets off of the road, gets into the existing sewer system and as part of this they will be separating that out. They will run a line through the brick sewer with a manhole to the opposite side of Parrott Avenue to connect into the 24" drain line that drains into the South Mill Pond. As they refine that they will be adding some stormwater treatment, possibly tree box filters or an underground sand filter. The big challenge they have is a maximum of about 3' - 4' vertical difference between the ground elevation and the invert elevation of the pipe. They are looking for options to accomplish this with a shallow depth. Water and gas will come off of Rogers Street to the utility room.

Mr. Leedy reviewed traffic and parking. They are scheduled to appear before the Traffic & Safety Committee on August 12th. They have had discussions with the Parking Committee. They have done a parking study and a traffic study and Meredith Graham, from VHB, was present to answer any technical details. He gave a summary of the findings of the report: All of the intersections in the study area are operating at acceptable levels of service and they will not change as a result of this project. Even though they are unsignalized, the major intersections, if not all of the intersections, work at a Level C or better which is quite good for an unsignalized intersection. There was a bit of an imbalance in the traffic networks which they could adjust if they felt they need to but they are talking about 30 to 60 trips which shouldn't have any significant impact on anything. They suspect it may have something to do with U-turns and drops-offs which creates imbalance and they do not feel it is significant.

With respect to parking, Mr. Leedy stated they did an inventory of the area and found there is adequate parking within the neighborhood to accommodate both the existing demand and future needs of the school system. It was determined that rather than create on-street permit parking for the school, a certain number of spaces will be dedicated in the Parrott Avenue and Junkins Avenue municipal parking lot for school parking. The other recommendation that came out of the Parking Committee was that the parking along Parrott Avenue be designated as 2 hour parking. They have reviewed both of those recommendations and believe they can both be accommodated in the neighborhood. There will be a requirement to provide some additional directional signage, particularly for people who park all day and are primarily downtown workers, to direct them to the Masonic Temple lot. There is a deal in the works to provide 16 parking spaces within the church parking lot for library employees. Mr. Leedy stated that they believe there is adequate parking and they have made arrangements to dedicate the required number of spaces both on and off site.

Mr. Desfosses requested a parking layout plan for Parrott Avenue itself when they come back next month to finish up the utility issues. Mr. Leedy indicated that the parking spaces already exist on Parrott Avenue. Mr. Desfosses did not see where they were surveyed. Mr. Leedy agreed they may not have done so. Mr. Desfosses would like to see some sort of parking plan from Rogers Street to Richards Avenue.

Mr. Taintor asked them to update the parking report to address the 2-hour limit. They are, in effect, taking away downtown parking so an issue that will come up at the Planning Board is the removal of 45 long term parking spaces. They should pay more attention to where the available spaces are and who will be using them. In terms of growth, they have an increase of 16% in student population and an increase of 50% in staff. He asked if there is any reason to believe that there will be any difference in the characteristics of the new children compared to the existing children, such as whether they will be coming from further away and if they might be driven or taking the bus. He was particularly interested in whether there will be a change in the traffic generation ratios of the new students compared to the existing students and whether it makes a difference. Mr. Leedy responded that he discussed this with his team this morning and he does not believe they can make the assumption that additional students generated will come from new housing stock. They have to assume the geographic distribution of new students is going to mirror the existing geographic distribution and that they will come from the turnover of existing housing stock.

Mr. Taintor brought up bicycle parking. He would like some information on how many spaces are provided and he doesn't want it to be a nominal amount. Mr. Leedy stated that their team discussed that and they have been advised that there is a periodic survey of how many students are bicycling to school, busing to school or walking to school and the bike parking spaces is adjusted to meet that demand. They will have information on how many spaces they are providing. Mr. Taintor felt the best way to promote bicycling is to provide more bicycle parking spaces that are easy to use.

Mr. Desfosses asked what the screen wall was behind the service area. Mr. Leedy stated it is an 8' tall masonry wall and it is there to provide screening for neighbors.

Mr. Taintor asked if they will be looking at the turning radii around the building. Mr. Leedy confirmed they are currently working with the School Department to determine what vehicles they are expecting on a regular basis. Their turning radii are currently sized for single unit trucks, buses and fire equipment. They have trouble accommodating larger trucks on the site. Mr. Desfosses asked when they will know what the truck standard is. Mr. Leedy confirmed they will know at their next meeting. He mentioned that they just received the relevant fire truck dimensions today.

Mr. Desfosses asked if there was any issue having the generator and transformer that close to the building. Mr. Leedy did not believe so.

Mr. Britz asked if the landscaping was irrigated. Mr. Leedy stated the proposal was to have a rainwater cistern in the courtyard area and irrigate that with rain water but they are not anticipating irrigating the entire site. Mr. Britz asked them to check the two ash trees that are spec'd on the plans. Mr. Leedy confirmed they are green ash rather than white ash but he will check to make sure there are no problems.

Deputy Police Chief Dubois did not see the standard Motorola strength test note on the plans. Mr. Leedy confirmed they will add that note.

Mr. Britz realizes they are going to redesign the entire drainage plan but the way the drainage goes into the low area, if it is going to stay that way, he would suggest a gate to protect it from overflowing.

Chairman Taintor opened up the public hearing and called for speakers.

Tom Morgan, of 39 Richards Avenue, direct abutter. He assumed this was not the final TAC meeting as there was no drainage or lighting plan for him to review. He had comments on the drainage as he has lived there for a very long time and has had an opportunity to observe the site. A few years back he noticed that his sump pump started working overtime so he got a bigger pump and had to dig a deeper well in order to fit the pump in. He noticed with the tide influences there is a greater effect than he realized. He handed out some graphics to help the Committee understand what he was talking about. He noticed the water fluctuates and rises the fastest when they have a big storm coming in and when there is a tidal surge through the South Mill Pond. His exhibit shows that they are actually building on top of a pond and some salt marsh with a few feet of fill on top of it. He wonders if there will be enough depth to handle that. Also, the Margeson Apartments generates a lot of stormwater and Richards Avenue floods and heads towards the Middle School. It starts to pond at Alumni Field. He felt this is a tricky site and he wanted to point out the dynamics to them. Mr. Morgan asked if the playing field that is being preserved was going to be illuminated. Mr. Taintor confirmed it was not lighted. Mr. Morgan noticed a note saying that the fence along the right field abutting residences will be replaced. Mr. Taintor confirmed it will be replaced with a 6' vinyl clad chain link fence. Mr. Morgan's final comment was that there used to be a lot of pedestrian traffic going to and from school. As part of the construction of the new library, the City patched all of the holes in the fence and kids lost their usual shortcuts. He thought they might want to consider pedestrian walkways. Mr. Taintor asked about Mr. Morgans second exhibit. Mr. Morgan responded that it shows the Margeson Apartments showing that the water goes to the low point, which VHB said was a parking lot. From his vantage point the low point is Alumni Field. He highlighted in purple a few areas that he wondered what was going on. It looks like they are bringing fill to Alumni Field and he wondered if that made any sense given the fields historic use as a big sponge for the neighborhood. Mr. Taintor indicated they will have the engineers look at that next time around,

Mr. Allen indicated that Mr. Morgan's comments were well taken on the drainage. The City has had meetings with the engineers and they have sewer separation projects that have been designed for this entire area. The design team has worked closely with the City's engineers. What they are seeing on the Site Plans does not reflect where things may finally end up. They have done the library and they have done sewer work in that area so they are well aware of the issues Mr. Morgan was talking about. Mr. Allen stated there are solutions and they are not seeing them on these plans yet. Mr. Morgan wanted to applaud the City for the work they did on the library as he did notice a noticeable improvement in the stormwater on Richards Avenue.

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 for this matter.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen made a motion to postpone Site Plan approval to the August 31, 2010 Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan approval to the August 31, 2010 Technical Advisory Committee meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:50 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Administrative Assistant