

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

2:00 PM

FEBRUARY 4, 2014

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner; Peter Rice, Director, Public Works; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Jared Sheehan, Engineering Technician; Carl Roediger, Deputy Fire Chief; Michael Schwartz, Captain, Police Department

I. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Taintor called the meeting to order and indicated that the first five items on the Agenda would require a motion to postpone.

He asked for a motion to waive the reading of the legal notices and to vote on the five applications together. Ms. Walker made that motion, Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone all five applications to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

A. The amended application of **2422 Lafayette Road Associates, LLC**, for property located at **2454 Lafayette Road (Southgate Plaza)**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to demolish 21,022 ± s.f. of existing retail space, add 11,000 ± s.f. footprint of new retail space to the existing retail/restaurant strip building, add a rain garden at the rear of the site, to replace the previously approved porous pavement in the rear of the site with a gravel pad for a garden center, and make related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 273, Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway District. (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2014 TAC meeting).

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Carol S. and Joseph G. McGinty, Owners**, and the **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Paul G. Sanderson, Trustee, Owners**, for property located at **300 Spinney Road and off Spinney Road**, wherein Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval (Lot Line Revision) is requested between two lots as follows:

- a. Lot 6 on Assessor Map 169 decreasing in area from 30,000 s.f. to 28,363 s.f. and with continuous street frontage on Spinney Road decreasing from 150 ft. to 132.54 ft.
- b. Lot 24 on Assessor Map 170 increasing in area from 181,725 s.f. to 183,362 s.f. with 139.06 ft. of continuous street frontage on Middle Road.

Said properties are located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District which requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage.) (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2014 TAC meeting).

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of the **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Paul G. Sanderson, Trustee, Owners, and Spinney Road Land Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **off Spinney Road and Middle Road**, for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide two lots into five lots with a new public right-of-way, with the following: Lot 5 on Assessor Map 167 having 263,937 s.f. (6.06 acres) and Lot 24 on Assessor Map 170 having 183,362 s.f. (4.21 acres), to be consolidated and subdivided into five separate lots ranging in size from 15,500 s.f. (0.36 acre) to 352,414 s.f. (8.09 acres), and all with a minimum of 100 ft. of continuous frontage on the proposed public right-of-way. Said properties are located in the Single Residence B (SRB) District which requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 s.f. and 100 ft. of continuous street frontage. (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2014 TAC meeting).

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Frances T. Sanderson Revocable Trust and Lynn J. Sanderson Revocable Trust, Owners, and Spinney Road Land Holdings, LLC, Applicant**, for property located **off Spinney Road and Middle Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within a wetland buffer to install a rain garden of which a portion is within the wetland buffer, with 3,120 s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 170 as Lot 24 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2014 TAC meeting).

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Strawbery Banke, Inc., Owner**, for property located off **Washington Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a 12,500 s.f. seasonal ice skating rink with an 8' x 10' transformer, a 25' x 10' rink chiller and a 25' x 60' concession pavilion, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 104 as Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the January 7, 2014 TAC meeting).

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone this application to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **The Aphrodite Georgopolous Revocable Trust of 1999, Owner, and Seacoast Trust, LLP, Applicant**, for property located at **1900 Lafayette Road**, requesting Site Plan approval to construct two medical office buildings: (1) a 2-story building with a footprint of 12,150 s.f. and gross floor area of 21,000 s.f. plus a 10' x 60' MRI coach, and a proposed 2,050 s.f. future MRI addition to the building; and (2) a 2-story building with a footprint of 10,000 and gross floor area of 20,000 s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 267 as Lot 8 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Peter Weeks addressed the Committee, on behalf of Seacoast Trust LLP. Mr. Weeks felt that the Work Session last week was very helpful and a lot of good information came out of it. Most of the issues that came up at that work session have been addressed on the revised plans.

Mr. Weeks stated that one outstanding item is the service road. They will need to get together and discuss how that will be completed. Their plan shows a left turn to connect to the service road that goes to Campus Drive. They do not object to being responsible at some point for providing the service road at the rear of this property but they do object to constructing the service road all the way out to West Road. Some of the TAC Committee members had mentioned that the City had plans to make that a complete loop road.

He also referred to the discussion about the left and right turn coming out onto Lafayette Road. His understanding was that, although the City wasn't particularly in favor of it, they would allow Steve Pernaw, their Traffic Engineer, to appear at the March 4th TAC meeting.

Corey Colwell, of MSC Engineers, addressed the Committee. His objective was to go through each comment from the work session and show how they addressed them. He felt there had been very good input at the work session.

1) The service road. Although they don't oppose to building this road to the full width of their lot, they do not intend to build any further. The service road for the full width of their lot is shown on Sheets C-2, C-3 and C-4. The service road inset on Sheet C-2 shows the proposed signs and the concrete barriers that were suggested at the terminus of the road. The grading and drainage associated with the service road is shown on Sheets C-4 and C-5. Drainage improvements include a 12" reinforced concrete pipe near the terminus of the service road to facilitate the natural flow of any stormwater exiting their site.

2) Show trees to be removed at the entrance of the site. That was added to Sheet C-2. There is a dark tree line that depicts the edge of the trees post construction and the lighter shaded tree line is what exists today.

- 3) A hydrant should be added. They added a yard hydrant to the northwest traffic aisle shown on Sheet C-6. They have also shown a 6" ductile iron connection from the 8" ductile iron fire service.
- 4) **Flow test.** They have not completed a flow test but they have made a request at DPW. The purpose of that test was because of the gate valve at the lower southwest corner of the lot which they intent to tap for water service. It is unclear from DPW how much pressure there is to that valve and they felt the best way to address that was to do a flow test.
- 5) Utility pole previously shown on the plans was somewhat close to Lafayette Road. This is the pole in the center of the lot and it was felt that there was not quite enough clearance between the edge of pavement and this pole so they have moved it back approximately 11' – 12' more to provide a much safer separation between the edge of pavement of Lafayette Road. The new pole location is shown on Sheet C-6.
- 6) 4" ductile iron. The domestic water line was previously shown on the plans as a 3" copper and it was suggested that a 4" ductile iron might be more appropriate. They have changed the labeling and notes to 4" ductile iron on Sheet C-6.
- 7) Height of the drop off for the front medical building. That is called a porte cochere, or a drop off, for people to drop their patients off and then go and park. The trash dumpster was oriented in such a way that the trucks servicing the dumpster would have to go underneath that drop off. The design process has not yet been completed so to facilitate this comment they have taken the dumpster and turned it clockwise 45 degrees so that the trucks no longer have to go under the drop off and they can now go around it. They did a turning movement radius to insure the truck could get in and out and they feel it would be a much safer situation.
- 8) Gas line to the back building. This was shown going to the front of the back building and there were comments that it would require bollards in the sidewalk so the gas line was changed to go out the west side of the building. That eliminates the need for bollards and there is no front access to the gas line. It also eliminates a sharp bend in the gas line so they feel it is a much better service connection.
- 9) Bike racks. The U shaped bike racks were preferred and they have revised the detail on Sheet C-12.
- 10) One of the bigger comments that lead to a lot of discussion was the exit lanes for traffic leaving the site. The overall width has not changed from 24' however it was shown as 12' for the left and 12' for the right. They revised the lanes on Sheets C-2, C-3, C-4 and C-5 with dimensions of 14' for the right turning traffic and 10' for the left turning traffic. They kept the left turning lane as the data in the Traffic Report by Stephen Pernaw suggests it is acceptable. Also they have an email from Kevin Russell, of NHDOT, stating that the traffic report is acceptable and may be used for design purposes. The Pernaw report states there is enough delay time for left turning traffic. Mr. Colwell also understands that further discussion is warranted and they would like to reserve that discussion for a future meeting so they can have their consultant present.
- 11) How they are constructing this site. There was much discussion about what will happen to the rear of the site as the proposal is to build the front building first and there will be some delay until the rear building is constructed. They drew up a landscaping plan showing a shading scheme which shows proposed landscaping in the same location as the proposed building. The darker colored landscaping is what is proposed to go in with construction of the parking lot and the front building. The gray colored

landscaping will be put in during the construction of the back building. They are not sure of the length of time between the construction of the two buildings.

12) Pedestrian access between the buildings via crosswalks or pathways. This is perhaps the only comment they haven't addressed as they believe it requires further discussion. They are not opposed to providing access between the front and rear building and, in fact, think it is a good idea, but they believe there are two ways to accomplish this. They feel the best way was to come out the front building, go with crosswalks between the traffic aisles and line it up front door to front door. The second option would be to put crosswalks adjacent to the traffic aisles in the parking spaces as proposed. There are currently light poles and landscaping in the traffic aisles and it would mean reducing landscaping. If it was a choice between the pedestrian access and the landscaping, they felt that the landscaping in the aisles was better for the site. They cannot really put pedestrian accessways between the buildings and the parking stalls as they require 172 spaces and they are only providing 172 spaces. They can't widen the parking lot because it would interfere with the drainage on the east side of the lot and it would require a lot more wetland fill on the west side of the lot. They are trying to reduce the amount of wetland fill in those pockets so they think the best solution would be pedestrian aisles across the traffic aisles, down the center of the site, aligning front door to front door. They would defer to the Committee for input.

13) For further planning, it was felt that the proposed sidewalk to the front building should be extended to Lafayette Road. That has been done and is shown on Sheets C-2 thru C-8. That sidewalk now terminates at the 12' easement for future widening.

14) Brick inverts in the sewer manhole had been specified on the Sewer Manhole Detail on Sheet C-11. Just prior to this meeting, Mr. Colwell noticed that he left a word that needs to be omitted. Where it says "concrete or brick" he will eliminate the word "concrete" so that the contractor is clear that only brick is acceptable.

15) There was discussion about showing suitable materials. Their intent is to remove a lot of material from the site as they believe it is unsuitable. Early geotechnical investigations reveal that there were stumps, debris, brick, concrete and rubble beneath some of the fill. Replacement of these are called out in the pavement section detail on Sheet C-12, the detention infiltration pond cross section detail on Sheet C-12 and also on the Stormtech Chamber detail on Sheet C-13. There are three places in the details that provide for a more stable base, not underneath the pavement but also underneath the proposed drainage improvements.

16) Fire connection on the driveway side of the building, adjacent to the fire door. The fire connection has been added near the fire door and is called out on Sheet C-6 in note form.

17) Underground electric should be centered between the sewer and water lines. This was revised on Sheet C-6.

18) Insure that all water lines are 8" to the gate valves. The gate valves to hydrants could be 6". They added some notes and called them out on Sheet C-6 that all lines are ductile iron 8" to the gate valves and 6" from the gate valve to the hydrant.

Mr. Colwell indicated that was a quick summary of the comments, however, he felt further discussion was warranted on the pedestrian access between the buildings and the left turn out which they would like to reserve until next month when their traffic consultant will be present.

Ms. Walker asked if they were showing their parking spaces at 9.5' wide and if all of the spaces were the same width. Mr. Colwell confirmed that all spaces are the same except for the handicapped. Mr. Desfosses clarified that all parking spaces are 9' wide except the parking spaces next to the islands are 9.5' wide. Ms. Walker mentioned that the minimum requirement is 8.5' so if they are looking for additional room for pedestrian connections, they might want to relook at the need for 9' wide parking spaces. She also agreed that landscaping should be removed to accommodate pedestrians. Mr. Taintor added that he had suggested last week that they remove 4 parking spaces to make that pedestrian crossing so there was never any implication to take away any landscaping. The suggestion was to widen the island rather than replace landscaping with pedestrian access.

Mr. Britz asked about the tree line. He was curious about how many trees they are cutting down and which ones are being cut. Mr. Colwell indicated that they show the existing trees and confirmed there were some mature trees that would have to be removed. Mr. Britz felt they could make a list of the trees in that area so that they didn't have to resurvey it. Also, Mr. Britz was not clear about the future building and asked if they were going to put landscaping in the future building location. Mr. Colwell indicated they show both design provisions for that rear building but they do not know the length of time between building the front building and building the back building. They are proposing some landscaping to make it look nice between construction of the two buildings. They are trying to avoid a big, open, messy site. Mr. Britz asked if the two beds of dogwood shrubs in the building footprint area would go in right away but they wouldn't plant the maples right away. Mr. Colwell confirmed that everything shaded in dark would go in now and everything shaded in gray would go in later.

Mr. Weeks mentioned that the legal notice states that both proposed buildings are medical office buildings but the rear building will be an office building. It may very well be medical office but it does not have to be medical office.

Mr. Rice didn't see anything about the pump station. They will have to do a wastewater discharge permit which will require detailed drawings and the requirement for the internal PVC piping will be 8" between sewer manholes and 6" out of the building. They are currently showing 4" and 6" so those need to be adjusted. Mr. Colwell confirmed that the pump station has not been designed yet. They are in communication with DES and they are not certain the discharge permit is needed but they will know soon. Either way, they are designing the pump station and will provide this Committee with the details of that.

Ms. Walker stated that she wanted the U shaped bike racks and not the wave style that they are now showing. They have found that the wave rack isn't very useful. Mr. Colwell stated he will correct that on the plans.

Mr. Desfosses stated that he was concerned about parking spaces. A lot of people will be coming on crutches, etc. so he felt the wider spaces would be better at this location. He felt an area of smaller spaces further away from the front building would be acceptable but in general a lot of people will need some extra room. Ms. Walker just wanted to make sure they explore that option, if there was an opportunity to make some adjustments on the size, and make the island a little wider .

Mr. Taintor also mentioned that a slight reduction of building size is something to consider as well.

Mr. Desfosses felt that Mr. Taintor's comment lead to his concern about this site being maxed out. He has serious concerns about drainage. He didn't feel there was enough geo technical work done to tell

them that the storm system is going to work as the drainage design says it is going to. That could lead to some very bad drainage situations downhill from this. Unfortunately, when this subdivision was approved in 1969, no provisions were made for draining any of the lots off Lafayette Road so the only spot that these lots have to drain is literally across their neighbor's property, short of installing a drainage system down the access road to connect to the West Road system, which is over-taxed at this point. Drainage is a very real concern in this area and will not be taken lightly. He will recommend a 3rd party drainage review as this is a very intense site.

Mr. Taintor asked what currently happens on the north side of the service road. Mr. Desfosses stated that there is a big hole in the ground where the service road goes, the water pools in there and it will eventually become a wetland, and it then over tops and floods onto the union hall property. The Army put some drainage in and the north side of their site drains into the West Road system and the south side goes into another detention area that falls into the hole where the road needs to go. Some significant engineering efforts will be required for this. Mr. Desfosses reviewed the Grading Plan with this set of plans and the road seems to be graded much lower than it should be. The road needs to end up at the same elevation as West Road so it is probably 2' – 3' too low. He believes they did a preliminary alignment and profile when the property next door went in, and he's not sure whether that was looked at or not, and he's not even sure whether they would need to revise that profile based on current conditions with what the Army did. The culvert that is shown is basically shown 2' underground so that the culvert is going to fill up on both sides and it will not work as designed. There are significant drainage issues that will require review. Mr. Desfosses reiterated that the site is very intense.

Mr. Desfosses also felt that issue leads right back to the driveway issue. As they discussed last week, when the site next door was developed, they "put them through the ringer" and forced them into having no exit onto Lafayette Road because of the type of use that they had, which was a bingo hall. They now come forward with this applicant on the site next door where the site distance is actually a little bit worse, it's an intensive use that will get traffic all day long, rather than just at peak periods, and they should take a very serious look at the driveway situation and how people are going to function coming in and out of the site and whether it is appropriate for people to exit onto Lafayette Road at all. He felt it was in the City's best interest, considering what happened next door, to have the traffic and access to the site reviewed so that they have some sort of proper and well thought out access plan for this lot.

Mr. Rice added to Mr. Desfosses' comments. He is not sure whether they misled the applicant relative to the willingness of the City to entertain a left turn onto Lafayette Road. He felt they were pretty clear it was not something they were going to entertain. He understands their engineer reviewed it and it appears DOT has reviewed it as well but the City's position is that they weren't going to allow a left hand turn onto Lafayette Road at this location. He understands there will be discussions relative to that but he wanted to make sure it was understood that was the position they are holding. Mr. Colwell agreed that they heard that but they also discussed at the work session that it was in the best interest of everybody to listen to their traffic consultant as to why he felt it was okay. He took from the work session that the Committee was willing to listen and that was all he took away from the work session. All they are proposing is for their traffic consultant to come in and demonstrate his findings. Mr. Rice acknowledged that they said they will listen, and they will listen, but he wanted to be clear that listening and changing the City's position are not the same thing. Mr. Colwell understood that.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the sidewalk along the front driveway should go all the way to the right-of-way line and not the easement line. Mr. Colwell indicated there was some discussion about that and he recalled that if the road was widened the sidewalk would be on the back edge and therefore it did not

make sense to extend the sidewalk all the way to the front of that easement. Mr. Desfosses responded that he felt it made sense to get people off the road as fast as possible. His comment that was made at the work session was if the State decides to widen the road there is going to be significant work done and whatever has to be done to modify their sidewalk will be taken care of. Mr. Colwell confirmed that they are not opposed to extending it to the front, he just wanted to clarify what he understood from last week's discussion.

Mr. Colwell referred to the drainage analysis. He stated that they have done significant testing on this site and the geotech as well as the environmentalist both came back with the test results that the materials they are draining into have an infiltration rate well in excess of 10" per hour. In their discussions with Rich Mark at AOT, AOT requires a factor of 2, which means if you get 10" per hour, they require that you design it to 5" per hour because over time the bottom layer will fill up with silts and clays and it will clog over time. Therefore they require that you conservatively take your results and make them "twice as better". Mr. Colwell indicated that they took it one step further and designed it at an infiltration rate of 3" per hour. The system is drastically oversized. They have no problem with a peer review and are confident they will get the same results. They also designed for the 50 year storm and feel that this system is significantly oversized. Mr. Desfosses responded, for the record, that the percolation tests that he saw in their report were for the front of the site where native materials, sands and gravels are still in tact and the area where the drainage system is proposed is in the back where the native material has been mined out. The comment was that he doesn't know for sure what is left down there. He is sure there is a layer that will absorb water but they don't know what the percolation rate is and the geotechnical report doesn't say what the infiltration rate will be below after they remove all of the material. Granted, they will remove all of the bad material and put better material in but, depending on what way the material is laid into the site, the site could trap water underground and that water could funnel into the area of better soils, creating an area where everything gets put in one spot. Without actually looking at all of the borings down deep, you can't tell what will happen. If this was a normal site without 6' - 7' of fill on it, and bad fill at that, it probably would not be an issue. They just don't know what is down there. He understands what Mr. Colwell is saying about being as conservative as they could but considering there is absolutely no drainage downhill for this site they can't just rely on what they think is down there. They need to have it confirmed. If the infiltration rate is at 4" then it will not be very long before it starts causing problems downstream.

The Chair opened the public hearing and called for public speakers.

Tom Hersey, Business Manager, Secretary/Treasurer for Laborers Local 976 who owns the property at 155 West Road. Mr. Hersey thanked the City for providing notification of this meeting. They are concerned about West Road being used as a service road and the traffic impact. West Road has a 90 degree corner and if traffic is going in and out it will be difficult for their tenants to use their parking area. He stated that it looks like the Army started to re-do West Road and he asked if that is as wide as it is going to be. He also asked if there would be any fencing along the road. Mr. Desfosses clarified when the land was subdivided, it was developed as a right-of-way for the use of all of the lots in common. It is not a public right-of-way, it is a right-of-way that every lot that abuts it has access to. Mr. Hersey asked if it will be used as an entrance and exit for the properties. Mr. Taintor responded that it has been the City's long term plan to develop it for access to minimize the impact on Lafayette Road. Mr. Hersey had some drainage concerns as well.

Mike Wolfe, representing an abutter at 235 West Road, Coastal Vantage Point. Their lot is effectively a catch pool for the development in front of them, where NH Living is. Currently the retention pond doesn't catch anything and all of the water from the applicant's lot, ever since they started building the

big piles, comes into their lot directly and there is no flow control at all. They maintain and repave and do everything and they are the one point on West Road where the water from the entire section has to go through a little 8" pipe. All that water, from some point, flows right back between Harris and the other one, and they happen to be lower than everybody else. Mr. Wolfe also asked about the MRI trailer and where it was situate. He just wanted to make sure the decibel level wouldn't be a problem for his property.

Peter Weeks confirmed that the MRI will meet the decibel level as it leaves the property on both the front and back.

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. Taintor thought it looked like they were looking for a postponement to the March 4th meeting as the applicant would like to have their traffic consultant address the Committee and, in the meantime, he believed they had raised a number of concerns. He asked Mr. Desfosses if there was anything specific he would be looking for regarding drainage that would help him.

Mr. Desfosses responded that they need to be comfortable with the drainage design and he is not at that point yet. Mr. Taintor confirmed that the applicant needs to add more detail and analysis. Mr. Britz asked about a peer review study. Ms. Walker mentioned the two peer reviews that Mr. Desfosses had discussed and felt their motion should also include having them look into that before the next meeting. Mr. Taintor stated that would be a 3-party agreement, for the applicant to pay for.

Mr. Rice confirmed that they have consultants they could call upon as they have a list that they rotate through and it would also depend on their expertise. He would look into that.

Motion regarding 3-Party Agreements:

Ms. Walker made a motion to request the applicant participate in a 3 party agreement to fund the review of both traffic and drainage. Mr. Rice added that they would work with the applicant to develop the scope of services that was appropriate for the level of review they are looking at prior to committing to the agreement. Mr. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to request that the applicant participate in a 3-Party Agreement to fund the review of traffic and drainage passed unanimously.

Motion to Postpone:

Mr. Rice made a motion to postpone to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone Site Plan Review to the March 4, 2014 meeting passed unanimously.

.....
B. The application of **Ertugrul Yurtseven, Owner**, for property located at **292 Lang Road**, requesting Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into four lots with the following:

- a. Proposed Lot 4 having 87,153 ± s.f. (2 acres) and 201.36' ± of continuous street frontage on Lang Road.
- b. Proposed Lot 4-1 having 405,342 ± s.f. (9.31 acres) and 384.05' ± of continuous street frontage on Lang Road.
- c. Proposed Lot 4-2 having 177,434 ± s.f. (4.07 acres) and 100' ± of continuous street frontage on Lang Road.
- d. Proposed Lot 4-3 having 140,181 ± s.f. (3.22 acres) and 310.87' ± of continuous street frontage on Lang Road.

Said lot is shown on Assessor Plan 287 as Lot 4 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District where a minimum lot area of 15,000 s.f. and 100' of continuous street frontage is required. (This application was referred to TAC by the Planning Board at the January 23, 2014 Planning Board Meeting.)

The Chair read the notices into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Christopher Berry, of Berry Surveying and Engineering, was present for additional questions and anticipated having this matter postponed to the March meeting. They are still completing their drainage analysis. They also wanted to know if there was any public input which there did not appear to be.

Mr. Taintor confirmed that the plan was unchanged from their last meeting.

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.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone to the March TAC meeting. Mr. Desfosses seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone final subdivision approval to the March 4, 2014 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 2:55 pm.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse
Acting Secretary