

MINUTES

SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

2:00 PM

JUNE 30, 2015

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Chairman, Planning Director; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner; Raymond Pezzullo, Assistant City Engineer; David Desfosses, Engineering Technician; Eric Eby, Parking & Transportation Engineer; Carl Roediger, Portsmouth Fire Department; and Chris Roth, Portsmouth Police Department

.....

Mr. Taintor called for a motion to take Item C Old Business, Item A New Business and Item B New Business out of order for the purposes of postponement.

Ms. Britz made a motion to take Item C Old Business, Item A New Business and Item B New Business out of order for the purposes of postponement. Deputy Fire Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

The motion to take Item C Old Business, Item A New Business and Item B New Business out of order for the purposes of postponement passed unanimously.

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Moray, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **235 Commerce Way**, and **215 Commerce Way, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **215 Commerce Way**, requesting Site Plan Approval for a proposed 4-story office building with a footprint of 28,125 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 112,500 ± s.f., and 640 parking spaces serving the proposed building and an adjacent existing office building (including a parking deck with 161 spaces below grade), with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 216 as Lot 1-8A and Lot 1-8B and lie within the Office Research (OR) District. (This application was postponed at the June 2, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Patrick Crimmins with Tighe and Bond was present to speak to the application. Robert Ciandella, Project Attorney and Matt Wirth, Project Architect with Procon, were also present. Mr. Crimmins explained how the applicant has addressed the comments received on May 5th, 2015. He used his letter

as an outline. One of the comments received was that Phase 2 did not have a Demolition Plan which would lay out the removal of a parking lot in order to construct the Phase 2 building and Phase 2 parking deck. The applicant has made that correction and Mr. Crimmins showed (on the slide presentation) the Demolition Plan for Phase 2. There was a question about a pedestrian connection through the site and whether the intent of the regulation was met. The applicant has added connections throughout the parking area for more pedestrian connections to the building. Mr. Crimmins showed these connections on the slide presentation. In the rear of the site, a sidewalk connection has been added. A sidewalk along the lower level parking has also been added. The applicant has shown landscaping on the Site Plan. They are adding 5 trees to the lower level parking area. They have moved Phase 2 loading out (it conflicted with access and parking spaces) and provided a compactor with a screening wall. Vehicles can now access the compactor directly. They are required to have one 12' X 20' and one 12' X 40' loading area. They've added some spot grades and a 60' contour line. They have removed the sidewalk along the frontage of the site. In lieu of this, the applicant is proposing to provide a contribution to the City for reconstruction of the sidewalk from the intersection of Commerce Way/Portsmouth Boulevard to Market Street. The applicant agrees to contribute \$28,000 towards the replacement of the sidewalk. With this contribution, however, they would not be required to provide any further money assuming the gravel is sufficient. The other offsite improvement discussed at the last meeting was signal upgrades at the intersection of Portsmouth Boulevard and Market Street. There would be camera detection on the traffic signal and the addition of a new pedestrian button for pedestrian crossing. The applicant will provide \$6,900 towards those improvements. The entire cost of this particular improvement would be \$25,-30,000. They will be screening the parking area (with a berm planted with trees and shrubs) from the roadway. At the request of the Fire Department, the applicant has added a hydrant to the rear of the parking area (service from Portsmouth Boulevard). The applicant was asked to ensure that the water for Phase 1 would be adequate for Phase 2. They were also asked to provide more detail for the Plan View for the gravel wetland. Mr. Crimmins showed the sheet that depicts further details for the gravel wetland. They were asked to provide additional detail for the Plan/Section View and have done so. Updated elevations for the Building Plans are in the package. They have provided a worksheet on Building Height calculation in the package. There were also concerns from DPW about the sizes of the parking spaces with respect to the columns (Mr. Worth will address this issue). There were questions about the Drainage Analysis and that it did not match the Watershed Plans. This has been updated and corrected. With regard to the traffic analysis, they have eliminated the "previously approved" notation and now have "previously reviewed" CDL traffic concerns. They have added plantings along Portsmouth Boulevard. They had previously provided two waivers, one for the landscaping along Portsmouth Boulevard and one for 3 driveways (only 1 is allowed).

Attorney Ciandella continued to provide details on offsite improvements. They will file for a variance tomorrow for parking.

Ms. Walker inquired if the issue around the poles in the way of parking spaces had been resolved.

Mr. Wirth stated that it is standard practice that the columns in the parking deck line up with the edges of parking spaces. The column will typically be 16" wide and will encroach into the parking space about 8". A car is typically 6' wide.

Mr. Eby stated that it is easier to turn a car into a space without those columns. Alternatively, extra space can be added to those parking spaces that will have a column.

Mr. Wirth reiterated that it would indeed be easier to turn into those parking spaces with more width to the spaces but the columns are pretty standard practice.

Ms. Walker inquired about the need for a second driveway and whether a fire truck turning template would be possible through the drive isle.

Mr. Crimmins stated that it would be possible, but landscaping would have to be removed. They feel they have a better layout the way it is set-up to have a second egress.

Ms. Walker inquired about how many trucks will be accessing the site.

Mr. Crimmins stated they are trying to plan for that, but without the tenants moved in yet, they don't really know the answer to that question.

Ms. Walker inquired about how the applicant came up with 8 bike racks for a site that has well over 400 parking spaces.

Mr. Crimmins stated that they did not use a ratio, but they felt that providing spots for 16 bikes would be sufficient. In addition, they were trying to limit bike racks out front.

Ms. Walker stated that bike racks can be aesthetically appealing.

Mr. Pezullo stated that he has seen garages provide the extra width in the parking spaces for the columns. He inquired about the lines on Sheet C2C; there are heavier lines where the columns are located.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the heavier lines represent striping (16" wide) for where the columns are located on the ends of the spaces.

Mr. Taintor is hearing two different things with regard to the parking space and width of columns. He clarified that at every 4 spaces, there is a 16" wide striped island with the column. All of the parking spaces (with the exception of the end runs) are 8 1/2' wide, exclusive of the column. It is not shown this way on the architectural. The architectural don't match the site drawing for these measurements.

Attorney Ciandella stated that they may be able to use a K-brace instead of an X-Brace. The bracing would always be narrower than the column.

Mr. Desfosses stated that if they are bigger than 8" columns, this doesn't work.

Mr. Pezullo recommended that the columns not be put in those spaces, which would make parking more restricted. An island should be put in. He inquired about where the borings are located.

Mr. Crimmins stated that they are not reflected in the drawings or the drainage analysis.

Mr. Pezullo asked for this to be submitted on the Plan View.

Mr. Taintor inquired about the comment from Mr. Crimmins regarding aesthetics in front of the building.

Mr. Crimmins clarified that they didn't want to put a lot of bike racks in front of the building because they are not aesthetically pleasing. The applicant felt that 16 bicycle spaces were enough to support the building.

Mr. Taintor stated that there are attractive bike racks out there that could be installed.

Mr. Pezullo stated that with regard to the offsite improvements in the sidewalk, his preference is that the applicant take on the project in its entirety and not provide just a contribution.

Mr. Desfosses agreed with Mr. Pezullo and also stated that the cost of construction for the sidewalk is closer to the \$42,000.00. He stated that this applicant is the one that built the substandard sidewalk. He is asking the Planning Board to make a decision on this issue. If the decision of the Planning Board is to accept the contribution rather than to have the applicant rebuild the sidewalk themselves, the applicant's contribution should be closer to \$42,000.00. He does support the contribution around the traffic signal improvements.

Mr. Crimmins stated that the applicant does not object to constructing the sidewalk out to Market Street. However, they would expect some sort of provision that they would only be held to the value of removal of the asphalt and replacement with concrete. If base soils must be pulled out, then the cost would be even more than \$42,000.00. If the construction costs are due to improper gravel subsoils, the applicant does not want to pay for that.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the applicant placed the gravel subsoils there. If they did the things they were supposed to do, then there should be no problem. If they did not build the sidewalk to any standard, the City should not be held liable for damages created by an unscrupulous contractor working for the applicant.

Attorney Ciandella asked for clarification around the decision of whether the applicant is to make a contribution towards, or rebuild, the sidewalk.

Mr. Taintor stated that it is the recommendation of the City that the applicant rebuild the sidewalk. If the Planning Board determines that the contribution is in order, the recommendation will be that the applicant make a \$42,000.00 contribution rather than the \$28,000.00 the applicant is proposing.

Attorney Ciandella inquired if there was any new information since this was last discussed.

Mr. Desfosses stated that there was no new information.

Mr. Taintor stated that the BOA meeting is July 21st, 2015 but the Planning Board meeting is before that on July 16th, 2015, therefore the Planning Board cannot act on this application at the July meeting as they do not grant Site Plan approval contingent on a variance.

Attorney Chiandella ensured that they can open their proceedings before the Planning Board on the 16th.

Mr. Taintor stated that they could indeed do this.

Mr. Desfosses clarified that with regard to the rebuilding of the sidewalk, if a contribution only is made by the applicant rather than taking on the rebuilding, it becomes a City project for which there would be bonding and insurance requirements (that a contractor working for the applicant would not have). This raises the cost greatly for the City. This is where the discrepancy in cost lies.

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

Ms. Walker asked if there were curb stops for the internal parking spaces.

Mr. Taintor stated that these are not required.

Mr. Taintor inquired about the height. There is a worksheet that seems incomplete. His understanding was that the top of the parking deck would not be counted as finished grade. A structure cannot be counted as finished grade.

Mr. Wirth stated that there was a drawing that was left out (for height calculations). He stated that this will be submitted. The first floor to second floor (floor to floor) height is 16' 6". The upper floors are at 12' 10" floor to floor. They end up at just under the maximum building height. The original tenant had requested these heights, which are higher than a typical office building. The overall building height could be reduced though as much as 3-4'. He can recalculate the heights based on using a lower parking level for one end of the building.

Mr. Taintor stated that it may be possible to deal with this through a stipulation.

Ms. Walker made a motion to grant Site Plan approval with stipulations. Mr. Eby seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker stated that bumper stops are helpful so that a car does not pull in too far so as to interfere with a pedestrian walkway. She inquired of Mr. Eby if it would be appropriate at these locales (where TAC requested the installation of a pedestrian way) to require bumper stops.

Mr. Eby stated that there is still enough width to have a walkway down the middle. Bumper stops get in the way of clearing and plowing.

Ms. Walker stated that Mr. Desfosses had a stipulation with regard to rebuilding the sidewalk.

Ms. Walker inquired as to whether the Committee wanted to address the columns issue. There was a discussion about removing them where they interfere with parking spots.

Ms. Walker inquired about how displacement of parking during construction would be dealt with.

Mr. Britz requested inclusion of a stipulation for long-term maintenance of the gravel wetland. It could be added to the plans.

Ms. Walker recommended the consideration of additional bike parking as appropriate for a large site. A recommended threshold is 5-10% of the vehicular parking.

Mr. Desfosses stated that Portsmouth Boulevard was recently reconstructed and Commerce Way is about to be reconstructed. Depending on the timing of the project, both of these roads could be fairly new. He recommended a stipulation that the construction routes through this project be videotaped and that the applicant would be responsible for repairing any damage to these roads. This is the last time these roads will be reconstructed for the next 20 years.

Mr. Pezullo stated that he is interested in seeing the boring logs in the final plans.

The motion to recommend Site Plan approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations.

- (1) The plan set shall be revised as follows:
 - (a) The parking spaces in the lower level under the Phase 2 parking deck shall be reconfigured to be exclusive of the width of the support columns.
 - (b) A plan for long-term maintenance of the gravel wetland shall be added to the plans.
 - (c) The applicant shall provide additional bicycle parking facilities (5%-10% of vehicle parking is recommended; plan currently shows only 2.6%).
- (2) The location of soil borings shall be shown on a plan, and boring logs shall be provided for review prior to the Planning Board meeting.
- (3) The applicant shall reconstruct the sidewalk on Portsmouth Boulevard between Commerce Way and Market Street (preferred option) or shall contribute \$42,000 to the City for the sidewalk reconstruction.
- (4) Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall provide documentation and an affidavit from the project architect demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Planning Department that the Phase 1 and Phase 2 buildings will comply with the height standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

- (5) The applicant shall videotape construction routes to the project prior to the initiation of site work, and shall be responsible for repairing any damage during construction. The site plan security shall be sufficient to cover any such repair.
- (6) The Construction Management and Mitigation Plan shall include specific provisions to address the displacement of required parking spaces during Phase 2 construction.

.....

B. The application of **Loyal Order of Moose, Lodge 444, Owner, and Chinburg Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **1163 Sagamore Avenue**, requesting Site Plan Approval for the demolition of existing building and the construction of 11 single family dwellings and a private roadway, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 224 as Lot 17 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) District. (This application was postponed at the June 2, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon with Ambit Engineering was present to speak to the application. Eric Chinberg, Developer, and Colin Dinsmore, Plans and Drainage Analysis with Ambit Engineering were also present. Mr. Chagnon stated that the applicant and the owner are now one in the same. The property was transferred to Chinberg Properties by the Loyal Order of Moose. The applicant has addressed comments from the last TAC meeting. Mr. Chagnon went through the letter that was submitted outlining the changes. The proposed site curb type is now a Cape Cod berm with a 3” reveal and it is sloped. The owners will be able to access their driveways easily. They’ve put in catch basins to capture the runoff and convey it under the sidewalk. The east side has a curb break. The location of the mailbox has been revised. Previously, the plan had 3 outfalls for the stormwater treatment system. They have revised that to two outfalls. The outfall will be completely on the applicant’s property. They have a plan of showing an easement area and a request in to the legal department for permission to do the work. They have reduced the lighting down to 3 lights as shown in the Lighting Plan. There will be a light at the entrance at Sagamore Avenue, one about half way down across from the driveway to Fairpoint switching area, and a light at the end of the road in the turnaround area. Previously, there was an underdrain system. They’ve eliminated this in the street. The sewer design has been revise to an E1 system and appropriate detail pages have been included. They’ve reduced low-pressure forced main from a 3’ to a 2’ as a result of the design change. The size of the turnout area has been reduced. Unit 11 has been taken out so now it is a 10 unit structure. They’ve added zone requirements and calculations to Sheet C3 and removed LCA areas from the plans. The proposed underground propane tanks in the Utility Plan are now included. A plan has been submitted to the Conservation Commission as part of the CUP application and it shows a trail connection to the Sagamore Creek Headlands Trails. The applicant is offering to provide a connection to the trail system as well as an easement along the sidewalk.

Ms. Walker stated that there is a boundary line on Sheet C3. She did not understand why this was there.

Mr. Chagnon stated that this was a leftover construction line to ensure that the driveways were 20' back. The line should be removed.

Mr. Taintor stated that Unit #1 doesn't seem to have the depth.

Mr. Chagnon stated that Unit #1 is tight, but there is at least 16'.

Mr. Taintor stated that perhaps the driveway could be moved to the other side.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the driveway can be flipped to the other side.

Mr. Taintor stated that the applicant needs a drainage easement in order to drain across City property into the creek.

Mr. Chagnon stated that there is an easement for flowage.

Mr. Taintor stated that the deed was created in 1985 and only one drainage easement was referred to.

Mr. Chagnon stated that this will need to be corrected

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger inquired about where the propane tank is for unit Unit #4.

Mr. Chagnon stated that this was omitted, but it would be in a similar place as the one for Unit #5 (to the south).

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger stated that the tanks for Units #5 and #10 are awfully close to the road. He inquired if they could be pulled back or moved to the side to ensure that the tanks would be away from anything that could hit them.

Mr. Chagnon stated that they could be moved, or at the very least bollards could be put in place. He stated that they will work on the tanks for Units #4, #5, #9 and #10.

Mr. Desfosses stated that he has a couple of concerns. There is a high ground water table in this area so the water main installed should be bagged in plastic. The drainage system is heading in the right direction, but the easement should extend all the way to the wetland line and the reason for doing this is that in the future if there are issues with the drainage system, then it is under the purview of the developer/condo association. He added that the applicant should apply to the City for the easement.

Mr. Taintor inquired if there were trails crossing the area.

Mr. Britz stated that there are no designated trails, but may be unofficial trails.

Mr. Desfosses stated that issues with the sewer system and where it will become private and public are still outstanding. The applicant needs to obtain a sewer permit and this issue will need to be worked out for that permit.

Mr. Eby stated the public easement to City land follows the path of the sidewalk. He wondered whether this should be entirely on the applicant's property.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the line should be moved over a bit.

Mr. Taintor stated that there is a sidewalk easement that will need to be provided.

Ms. Walker inquired about whether the applicant had approached NH DOT about the sidewalk.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the applicant has not approached NH DOT.

Ms. Walker stated that a question for them would be how to resolve the corner property line issue.

Mr. Desfosses said the State will need to see the Sidewalk Plan. They will request that Chinberg Development deeds the land over to the City. The City will have to sign off that the sidewalk will be maintained by the City, otherwise they will not allow Chinberg to develop the parcel. The City will own the physical sidewalk but not the right-of-way.

Ms. Walker stated that a sign at the trailhead would be a worthy consideration.

Mr. Britz stated that a trailhead sign where it intersects with the Sagamore trail in the woods would be nice too.

Ms. Walker stated that the mailbox pull-off seems as if it is on the wrong side of the road.

Mr. Taintor stated that this has been discussed and it was decided that there was enough of a sight line around the corner in order to pull out from the mailbox pull-off.

Mr. Pezullo stated that on the east side there is still is a chute going down to the drainage basin. He wondered whether a catch basin can be located in this area. It looks to be the same grade.

Mr. Chagnon stated that the maintenance for a catch basin would be over and above that of a chute in the long term. He felt that the chute will work fine.

Mr. Pezullo stated that it will work fine, except when there is an ice dam or the snow is piled high.

Mr. Chagnon stated that they can put a catch basin in this area.

Mr. Taintor stated that sprinkler systems cannot be included as a stipulation of development.

Deputy Chief Roediger stated that in this case, the sprinkling of the buildings was proposed by the developer in exchange for the reduction in the size of the turnaround. The general consensus was that this was an acceptable tradeoff.

Mr. Taintor stated that he would want to include this as a stipulation so that it is recognized in the decision and doesn't change in the future. In addition, he inquired if only one water line to the house was needed for a single family home.

Deputy Chief Roediger stated that he would have to check this. It isn't often the case, unfortunately, that a developer agrees to sprinkle a single family home.

Mr. Desfosses stated that given everything, he is satisfied with the drainage plan.

Mr. Britz inquired about long term maintenance of the raingarden and the plunge pool (and other drainage detention areas).

Mr. Chagnon stated that the drainage analysis talks about this piece. There is the usual drainage inspection and maintenance plan. This will be transferred to the homeowners association.

Mr. Taintor cited another example (Sanderson subdivision) whereby the legal department reviewed the homeowner's association documents. This can be added to the stipulations.

Mr. Chagnon inquired about the riprap channel. This will go all the way to the wetland. He inquired as to whether the application could be amended to include this because it is a recommendation from TAC.

Mr. Britz inquired if Mr. Chagnon could get an amended application submitted by Thursday morning so that it could be in the packets. He asked that Mr. Chagnon get the language on the impacts in by 1pm on Thursday.

Michael Valinski of 1155 Sagamore Avenue was present to speak to the application. He sent a note to the Planning and Zoning Board about his concerns. He felt that his concerns were being addressed. However, he would still like to see some shrubbery as a buffer from the driveway. The builder seem to be addressing his concerns. He asked for assurance that the new fill issue was being addressed and also requests that the sidewalk is not right up against his property. With that, he thanked the applicant for all they are doing.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the developer is proposing to change all the grades in the area. There will be no erosion. Stormwater will be conveyed down below.

Mr. Taintor inquired with regard to Mr. Valinski's comment about the location of the sidewalk, whether it was possible to move the sidewalk closer to the existing driveway in order to provide some buffer for Mr. Valinski's property.

Mr. Chagnon stated that as long as it maintains sight distance, he does not have a problem with it. They have no problem providing a row of shrubs for Mr. Valinski's property as a buffer. They would rather not install a fence.

Mr. Valinski stated that he is not concerned about the last 100' of the property. If it is going to be a public access way to the trail system, he would rather not see pavement. He requested that a fence not be installed.

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. Desfosses made a motion to grant Site Plan Approval subject to the following stipulations. Deputy Chief Roediger seconded the motion.

Mr. Desfosses stated that the applicant needs to work out easement language with the City Attorney and get the drainage easement approved.

The motion to recommend Site Plan approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations.

(1) The plan set shall be revised as follows:

- (a) The driveway and sidewalk shall be shifted away from the lot line adjacent to 1155 Sagamore Avenue (Map 224, Lot 18) to the extent possible in order to preserve a landscaped buffer.
- (b) A catch basin shall be added on the east side of the driveway at the low point (opposite CB #2), draining into proposed detention pond #1.
- (c) The drainage from the proposed rain gardens across the City-owned parcel (Map 223, Lot 25-B) shall be modified by adding a rock-lined channel down to the wetland line with a second plunge pool at the end. The final design shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works.
- (d) The private water main in the driveway shall be polybagged to protect from corrosion.
- (e) The propane tanks for lots #5, #9 and #10 shall be set further back from the edge of the driveway to protect above-ground elements from damage by snowplows, and the location of the propane tank for lot #4 shall be added to the plans with an appropriate setback from the driveway.
- (f) A public access trail to the trail system on the adjoining City-owned parcel, as shown on the sketch submitted at the June 30 TAC meeting, shall be added to the plans, along with signage indicating public access at the end of the sidewalk at Sagamore Avenue and at the beginning of the trail at the sidewalk.

- (g) The plan set shall include the locations of the proposed drainage easement(s) across the City-owned parcel, and a public access easement along the sidewalk from Sagamore Avenue to the trailhead and along the trail to the property line.
- (2) The applicant shall confirm with the Fire Department whether a second water service is needed to each dwelling for the sprinkler system, and shall modify the Utility Plan if required.
- (3) The final sewer design shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works through the sewer permit process.
- (4) A plan for long-term maintenance of the drainage improvements shall be incorporated into the condominium documents and shall be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney.
- (5) The public access easement along the sidewalk and trail and the drainage easement(s) on the City-owned parcel shall be subject to approval by the City Attorney and the City Council and shall be recorded at the Registry of Deeds prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- (6) Approval shall be contingent on approval by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation of the improvements in the state right-of-way and recording of any easement required to complete such improvements prior to the issuance of a building permit.

.....

C. The application of **One Way Realty, LLC, Owner, and 406 Highway 1 ByPass, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **406 Route 1 By-Pass**, requesting Site Plan Approval to demolish the existing building and construct a new 3-story building (brewery, pub and office) with a footprint of 5,857 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 20,033 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 172 as Lot 2 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. (This application was postponed at the June 2, 2015 TAC meeting.)

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger made a motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval until the August 4th, 2015 TAC meeting. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval until the August 4th, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of **Amba Realty, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **806 Route 1 By-Pass**, requesting Site Plan Approval to expand the first floor of an existing building by 5,150 ± s.f. (footprint and gross floor area) for proposed retail use and add a new second floor with 4,450 ± s.f. (footprint and gross floor area for proposed office use, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 161 as Lot 43 and lies within the Business (B) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Deputy Fire Chief Roediger made a motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval until the August 4th, 2015TAC meeting. Ms. Britz seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval to the August 4th, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Two International Construction, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **85 New Hampshire Avenue**, to construct a two story office building with a footprint of 14,400 ± s.f. and gross floor area of 28,800 ± s.f., with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 306 as Lot 3 and lies within the Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. Britz made a motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval until the August 4th, 2015 TAC meeting. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

The motion to postpone consideration of Site Plan Approval until the August 4th, 2015 TAC meeting passed unanimously.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 3:50 pm was seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Toni McLellan
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee