

**SITE PLAN REVIEW TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

2:00 PM

NOVEMBER 5, 2019

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Britz, Environmental Planner; David Desfosses, Construction Technician Supervisor; Eric Eby, Parking and Transportation Engineer; Nicholas Cracknell, Principal Planner and Robert Marsilia, Chief Building Inspector

MEMBERS ABSENT: Patrick Howe, Fire Department

ADDITIONAL STAFF PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Chair, Planning Director Jillian Harris, Planner 1

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the October 1, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Desfosses moved to approve the minutes from the October 1, 2019 Site Plan Review Technical Advisory Committee Meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval to subdivide a lot with an area of 2.7 acres (116,591 s.f.) and 1,635 +/- ft. of street frontage into two (2) lots as follows: proposed Lot 1 with an area of 90,096 s.f. and 1,120 ft. +/- street frontage and proposed Lot 2 with an area of 26,495 s.f. and 515 ft. +/- of street frontage. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District. LU #19-211.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Corey Belden with Altus Engineering and Robbi Woodburn with Woodburn and Company spoke to the application. Mr. Belden commented that there were a few updates made since the last presentation. The owner will replace the sidewalk in kind with asphalt. Eversource will pull electrical off an existing transformer. The proposed water lines were relocated, so they will not go through the drive aisles. A blanket easement will be provided. The storm water maintenance plan has been updated. The architectural plans have been revised to show two egresses on the

first floor to Chase St. and Market St. 22.2% of the site is now community space. The team met with Deputy Fire Chief Howe and they will provide a new cut through in the parking lot. The plan includes the turning movements. It is not required for fire code, but Deputy Fire Chief Howe did like the cut through. Mr. Eby agreed it would give better access and circulation for the site. The team will withdraw the subdivision application. The lot line will remain.

TAC Comments:

1. On page 4 of the stormwater maintenance and inspection manual section under Landscaped Areas, the applicant should include a statement that only slow or controlled release fertilizer is allowed in the 250' foot Shoreland Protection Area as defined on the plan by the line labelled SWQPA.
 1. Mr. Belden confirmed they would add a comment to ensure that is used on site.
2. How will the trash be accessed by the trash truck? It would appear that the bins will have to be moved out into the parking lot aisle.
 1. Mr. Belden responded that it will be a private service. The trash truck will pull up to the bins in an enclosed area. The bins will not be rolled out. Ms. Walker noted that there were parking spaces on either side of the trash enclosure and questioned if they would be blocked during collection times. Mr. Belden responded that the truck would stay within the drive aisle while loading.
3. There needs to be separate water services and valves outside of the structure
 1. Mr. Belden responded that they don't have the sprinkler system designed. It is noted that a 6-inch pipe is required for a sprinkler system. They will confirm with DPW that it is correct.
4. The sidewalk has not been changed to the City Standard.
 1. Mr. Belden responded that it would be a 2-inch sidewalk with a single lift. Mr. Desfosses commented the City doesn't allow asphalt sidewalks in the public way. Mr. Belden responded that would need to be revised.
5. The parking calculations for the church should not break down by uses that are part of the primary church use. As you explain in your parking demand analysis, the nursery, office space, church school are all part of the church use. Therefore, the parking calculations should only list place of assembly and residential uses (including the single family residential uses on the site). This will reduce your overall parking requirement, but a parking demand analysis and CUP will likely still be required.
 1. Mr. Belden responded that using the assembly area as the baseline will cause the numbers to go down. Ms. Walker questioned what the total shared parking requirement would be. Mr. Belden responded that he would follow up with that number.
6. The Parking Demand Analysis should include actual counts of the number of cars parking in the lot during church hours (not just estimated vehicle occupancy by attendance).
 1. Mr. Belden responded that they provided an updated parking demand analysis with new numbers. It was hard to distinguish between the church attendance and public parking. The church refined how they were counting. The services at the beginning of October had 60-61 cars for both services. The church has requested that volunteers carpool. They will continue to include all updated data.
7. Community spaces still need some work to make the case that these meet the definitions and intent of the Ordinance. Specifically, show how they are designed to be oriented and accessible to the general public. The pocket park and lawn space in front of the church seem more like a

landscaped private entrance, how will this invite use by the neighborhood as a pocket park? How are you proposing to design and manage the community spaces that are located immediately adjacent to the church so that they invite public access and use rather than being used primarily and exclusively by the church and residents. The areas abutting the City land should demonstrate how they will enhance and tie into those public spaces. There should be inviting access through the site to the proposed community spaces. The proposal to tie in the community space on the rear of the church with a striped pedestrian path across pavement, is not convincing as encouraging public access, nor should a paved area that is part of an existing driveway count as community space.

1. Ms. Woodburn responded that the garden in front of the church has a curving walkway and benches along it leading to the public way. There are connections all the way through the site to Market St. The plantings along the roadway would be 2-3 feet in height, so benches will be visible. Ms. Woodburn suggested adding simple informational signage to indicate it is a public space at every walkway connection. At the other entrance there is a two-bench sitting area at the corner right where it meets the sidewalk. There is a pocket park that has a loop through it. The benches orient away from the building out toward the sidewalk along Market St. The plantings will enhance the property line. There are two greenways in the plan. The one at the back of the church is a walkway that goes along the existing parking area. It provides an important connection. It could be delineated with more decorative plantings to make it more of a pathway. It is a simple walkway to get through the space. Rain gardens can look very different depending on how they are designed and managed. In this case the plantings are an accent to the gardens. The natural grass garden would make the area look like a park. It will look more like a garden than a drainage feature.

Mr. Belden added that the plan shows an 8 by 6-foot bike pad, and there was a comment that there needs to be 2 feet of space between the sidewalk and pad. Ms. Walker confirmed that was correct. Mr. Belden confirmed they would move the bike pad.

8. Community Space – The community space table does not fully correspond to the labels on the plan. Additionally, several community space areas seem to be labelled as greenway enhancements or pocket parks when they are primarily being used as drainage areas. Is deeded public access to the community path part of the proposal?
9. As requested at prior TAC meeting, the landscaping plan needs to cover the entire development site. What landscaping treatments are you proposing to the area on the west side of the site?
10. How far is the dumpster from the property line? How far is the dumpster from the nearest stormwater inlet?
 1. Mr. Belden responded that they submitted a waiver request for a 10-foot offset for the trash storage area.
11. Please confirm if there is any proposed exterior lighting on the building itself.
 1. Mr. Belden responded that there will be 2 mounted lights on the building which are shown on the lighting plan. There has been some public concern about lighting on one side of the building. There will not be exterior lighting on the Market St. side.
12. What are the proposed dimensions of the concrete pad for the bike racks? 3 u-racks will be required in order to provide the minimum 5 bike parking spaces required. These should be spaced a minimum of 3' apart and the pad should be a minimum of 6' deep with 2' of additional space added where the pad abuts a building, fence, other structure, or sidewalk.

13. Your proposed snow storage area along Market Street conflicts with the landscaping proposed for that area. You indicate NA next to the checklist item for a traffic analysis / traffic generation report. While a full traffic study may not be required, a traffic generation memo is required. Please provide.
 1. Mr. Belden responded there was a 10-foot area from the parking lot to the property line. The plantings are within 4 feet of the property line. The 6-foot lawn area would be used for snow storage. In extreme events it will need to be removed from the site.
14. Will the applicant be seeking to restrict on-street parking on Chase Drive, to ensure that overflow parking does not hinder access to the residential homes in this neighborhood?
 1. Mr. Belden responded that the applicant was not seeking to restrict that parking, but does not have a problem with the restriction.
15. There is concern that overflow parking from the church could spill onto Chase Drive, which is the only way in or out of the neighborhood. The applicant should provide an exhibit to determine if emergency access into the neighborhood can be maintained if/when the on- street parking is occupied. This should include widths and a turning template.

Mr. Belden commented that they have provided a traffic generation memo. It addresses the trip generation for the new 22-unit building. There will be a reduction for the site.

Mr. Eby commented that the memo under total trips it says peak hour, but it should say Weekday/Saturday/Sunday. Mr. Belden confirmed that would be updated.

Mr. Desfosses requested clarification on the rain garden drainage. Mr. Desfosses was not sure about some of the assumptions made in the drainage study and noted that DPW and the applicant should review it.

Mr. Cracknell questioned if they supplied a landscape plan around the church. Ms. Woodburn responded that it was shown on the plan between the forested ledge and the building. They will just add a sidewalk through it. There is no added landscape. The pavement around the corner will possibly be changed. Mr. Cracknell commented that would be a good idea. There are two public access trails leading from Market St. to Chase Drive. It may make sense to have a public access easement across them to make sure they remain there.

Ms. Walker noted that the intent of the community space is that they each stand on their own. It is good to have connections, but these community space types don't stand on their own. There has been some good progress made on it. If the parking restriction was going to be offered as a measure to offset other concerns, then it needs to go through the Parking, Traffic and Safety Committee and City Council. That should happen before this goes to the Planning Board.

Mr. Eby commented that they should continue to collect parking demand data to help support their case.

PUBLIC HEARING

Jason Karlin of 29 Brigham Lane commented that the community space doesn't seem like it qualifies for the City's definition of community space. The trash access to the enclosure is not

big enough. The trash storage area is right next to Market St. Ext. The parking and vehicular access configuration doesn't make sense. Mr. Karlin questioned if there would be an easement for the cut out between the two parking lots. The parking analysis data for non-holiday services indicates that they are filling the lot. The sidewalks need to be concrete. Last time a neighbor had suggested an alternative plan that was dismissed. Mr. Karlin was in favor of the alternate plan that was proposed. It would resolve a lot of the concerns, increase open space and eliminate circulation issues. There would be better engagement with Market St. Ext. and it would move the building away from Chase Dr.

Ms. Walker commented that the proposed alternate plan would require variances because the parking would be in front of the building and it would not meet the building setback minimum. It could be worthy of consideration, but it does require variances.

Bernice Richards of 435 Cutts Ave. submitted a letter from her husband and read certain portions. If the site is considered together, and they still subdivide at the end of the process, they will not have the community space needed to sell separately. The parking provided for the condo building is too low. They are relying too much on the bus stops. Each unit will likely have 2 cars. 75 spaces for the church is also not enough. The proposal ignores future use by the present owner or a future owner. The parking should be based on the capacity of the building. The development of the east end of the parking lot will create a non-conformity. The church should get variance to reduce parking. The community space proposed is inconsistent with the community space as defined by the City. The project does not fit into the neighborhood.

Dianne Chalifour of 411 Cutts Ave. commented that she was concerned about the overflow parking concerns for the church, condo building, and city park attendees. It will be a bigger problem on the weekends. The community space plans will also add more people. Ms. Chalifour questioned how the parking would be managed. The neighborhood has already experienced access issues for first responders if cars are parked on both sides of the street. The trash truck will block parking spaces when it comes to empty bins.

Kyle Crossen-Langelier of 304 Leslie Drive commented that her main concern was the lighting, and that has been explained more in this presentation. There was less concern about lighting from the building, but Ms. Crossen-Langelier was still concerned about headlights from traffic coming in and out. Ms. Crossen-Langelier requested that the seasonal screening in the plan be changed to arborvitaes for year-round screening.

Maryanne Gauthier of 36 Brigham Lane was concerned about traffic, parking, and the community space. The church has a lot of cars parking there. They are offering multiple services, but that does not guarantee that people will go to them. There will be a big increase of people coming on holidays, church events, weddings and funerals. The parking attendant is there now to regulate the parking and count cars. They will not continue that once this is approved. They should have to petition to reduce the parking. No one knows what will happen in the future. The building capacity is 525 people. The community space does not make sense. Ms. Gauthier spoke for her neighbor Kevin O'Brien at 28 Brigham Lane as well. The rain gardens should not be considered community space. This plan refers to the new building as apartments not condos. The parking reconfiguration addressed the circulation concerns for the

fire department, but trash is still an issue. The cut through could result in overflow parking for the condos in the church lot.

Roger Gauthier of 36 Brigham Lane commented that there was no concern over the safety of the kids in the neighborhood. There is a drop off for kids to play in the church. Occasionally they run into the road.

Gale Peacock of 355 Chase Dr. was concerned about the parking issues. The two signs on Chase Dr. that say no parking is on Ms. Peacock's property. The no parking should be extended. The proposed parking for the condos will not be enough. The church will be used for overflow parking because people are used to parking there now. It is a huge concern if an ambulance or fire truck cannot get up the road because of parked cars.

Bernice Richards of 435 Cutts Ave. was concerned about the greenways. One of them is a walkway that ends up at the pastor's house. The rain garden is not listed as acceptable community space. The parking is concerning. The sidewalk needs to be concrete. This tall building will block the view of the water and bridge from houses and travelers coming into the downtown. It's a gateway to the community.

Corey Belden from Altus Engineering noted that they have heard most of the comments before. They are anticipating 14 bins for the storage area. Pick up can be adjusted based on need. The bins will be in a solid fenced enclosure that will not be visible from street. The proposed plan makes most of the stormwater treatment areas functional gardens. The City wanted the parking lot screened as well as the walkway along Market St.

Pastor Chad Lynn commented that they have attendants in the parking lot to host the guests and that will continue beyond the project. The church is open to the community. The parking should not be judged based on overflow days. The church has been part of the fabric of the city for 60 years. They are committed to being part of the City and are here to serve the community. The property is a community piece of property. People do hang around the property and churchgoers will use the public spaces as well as the public. They want to help beautify the gateway. The development team is working to make it look like it matches the gateways and are trying to meet all of the requirements.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Walker commented that TAC doesn't have a role in making a recommendation for the parking, but they can provide comments. TAC has asked for a lot of things and they have responded. The community space is up to the Planning Board to determine if they have met the requirements.

Mr. Marsilia questioned if they could require the applicant ban parking on one side of Chase Dr. Ms. Walker responded that was outside of their per view, but they can comment on it. They should provide a road width analysis.

Ms. Walker questioned if any of the pending information needed to come back to TAC. Mr. Desfosses responded that the drainage should come back. Ms. Walker questioned if the parking demand analysis had to come back. Mr. Eby responded that it did not need to. They should continue to monitor the attendance and provide updated numbers. Ms. Walker recommended that they have someone from outside the church do the counts. They should provide an analysis of the ability for first responders to get in and out if cars are parked on both sides of Chase Dr. Mr. Desfosses noted that there could possibly be parking problems on holidays and events. They should bond for additional work on Chase Dr. in the future to widen it and allow for parking. Mr. Eby noted that they could provide a shuttle bus service. Ms. Walker noted that a lot of measures were recommended for events. The applicants should show how they will manage the larger events and if the attendance increases.

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, December 3, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the construction of a new 22-unit residential apartment building with a footprint of 7,440 s.f. and 28,727 s.f. GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District. LU #19-211.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, December 3, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

C. The application of the **Bethel Assembly of God, Owner**, for property located at **200 Chase Drive** requesting a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.1112.14 of the Zoning Ordinance for provision of 105 on-site parking spaces where a minimum of 175 are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 210, Lot 02 and lies within the Gateway Neighborhood Mixed Use Center (G2) District. LU #19-211.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Desfosses moved to postpone this request until the Tuesday, December 3, 2019 TAC meeting, seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. The application of the **Roman Catholic Bishop of Manchester, Owner**, for property located at **98 Summer Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval to create a new parking lot following demolition of an existing building, with associated site improvements, grading, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 137, Lot 1 and lies within the General Residence C (GRC) District.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering, Attorney Peter Lochlin, and Robbi Woodburn from Woodburn Landscaping spoke to the application. This application has been to the ZBA because the shape of the lot puts the parking between the principle building and lot line. The parcel is a full block. The proposal is to raise the existing building and disconnect all existing utilities. The building demolition package is out to bid now. The proposed site plan shows the existing building for reference. They are proposing a one-way entrance and one way left only to Winter St. They are closing off the upper lot to reduce traffic on Winter St. A driveway will be added onto Chatham St. Runoff will be reduced by reducing the impervious surface on the site. They will set up the site for sewer and water separation. Two rain gardens will be added. The end of the parking lot will be reshaped to prevent run off from going to Winter St. It will be directed to the rain garden.

Ms. Woodburn commented that the plans show details of walls, steps and lighting. There is a robust planting which will help to provide a garden feeling around the parking lot itself. The walls will be cement. The overall landscape plan was adjusted to accommodate changes for the curbing.

Mr. Weinrieb commented that the site lighting plan has been updated for the ground lighting to reflect up onto the church. There is also a pole mounted cobra light on the corner of the building. That will be replaced with a similar light.

TAC Comments:

1. The LEFT TURN ONLY sign proposed for Winter Street should be a NO RIGHT TURN sign instead. A left arrow should also be painted on the driveway throat of the parking lot
 1. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that would be updated.
2. In addition, a NO PARKING HERE TO CORNER sign should be installed 20 feet from the back edge of the sidewalk on Austin Street.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb questioned if this would be for Winter St. or Austin St. Mr. Eby clarified on Winter St. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was fine.
3. The existing parking lot does not provide sufficient aisle width or parking stall depth. It is recommended that it be reconfigured to allow for better usage, although this would mean a loss in parking.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb commented that it was their preference not to touch it. The beautification is for the area where the former school was. It is understood that it doesn't comply, but they also know that it works.
4. It may be best to donate frontage along Winter Street for the widening of the entire street to allow for two way flow for better access between the two parking lots.

1. Mr. Weinrieb responded that could be problematic and would not work for them.
5. A 6' wide street widening/sidewalk easement should be provided along the entire frontage of Winter St. In addition, no new plants are to be planted in this easement.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they would provide an easement for the area where they are doing the widening. However, they don't want to provide any future widening easements up Winter St.
6. All the existing sewer and water connections from the school need to be abandoned properly. We believe there may be multiple sewer connections.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb agreed there are multiple connections there. Note 8 on demolition plan tries to cover that. Mr. Marsilia questioned if they would remove the foundation elements. Mr. Weinrieb responded that the foundation slab would be broken into pieces 6 feet in diameter or less. The foundation wall is mortar and brick.
7. "Green" Statement – It seems a stretch to characterize the demolition of the St. Patrick's School as a "green" building component or some sort of sustainable action. While you could argue that the proposed parking lot design is sensitive to the environment, any reference to the demolition itself as a so-called "green" action falls outside what would reasonably be termed a "green" building component. Otherwise, all the other items are appropriate as listed in the "Green" Statement.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb did not think it was a stretch. Mr. Cracknell responded that a large amount of the demolition materials would be put into a landfill. Mr. Cracknell recommended taking that off before going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Eby added that there should be a no parking sign on Austin St. as well. Mr. Weinrieb agreed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ed Mullen of 82 Austin St. was not speaking in favor or opposition to the plan. Mr. Mullen questioned if the demolition would increase or decrease the storm water runoff. They have an issue with storm water management on Summer St. The runoff should not increase. The applicant should consider light control with dimming or motion detection for the lighting. There are two existing trees in the corner, and they should consider adding more of a buffer in that area. They should also consider the security of the lot and access to it. It is a dangerous intersection and Mr. Mullen has filed a report with the Parking, Traffic and Safety Committee (PTS.)

Bill Hartglass of 30 Winter St. questioned what side of Winter St. would have no parking on it. Mr. Eby responded there would be no parking on the opposite side of the street from the parking lot. Mr. Hartglass commented that there is a good size building of condos there. That entire street always has cars. Ms. Walker questioned if this was required to go to PTS. Mr. Eby responded no because it is an existing law to have no parking within 20 feet of intersections. Mr. Hartglass supported the project and encouraged TAC to move it along.

David Random lives on Summer St. and the back of his property is on Chatham St. Mr. Random was thrilled that the building is coming down and there would be more church parking. The hope is that the illegal parking that happens every Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday would end. It is difficult for Mr. Random to pull out of his driveway with illegally parked cars. The visibility at the intersections is also poor. Hopefully the parking issues will be resolved.

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Eby commented that the City has been looking at the Summer St. and Austin St. intersection and collecting data. It's compounded by parking demand and speed.

Ms. Walker noted that they haven't come to an agreement on the widening, but they are getting half of it. They can include comments in the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Eby moved to recommend approval of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

1. The LEFT TURN ONLY sign proposed for Winter Street shall be changed to a NO RIGHT TURN sign. A left arrow should also be painted on the driveway throat of the parking lot.
2. A NO PARKING HERE TO CORNER sign shall be installed 20 feet from the back edge of the sidewalk on Austin Street and Winter St.
3. The existing sewer and water connections from the school need to be abandoned properly.
4. The "Green Statement" shall be revised per comments from TAC.
5. The lighting plan shall be updated to include the ability for parking lot lights to be timed for dimming at certain times of day.
6. The landscaping plan shall be updated to provide an all-season landscaped buffer at the Winter and Austin Street end to screen the parking lot from abutters.
7. Applicant should include details on how parking for church patrons will be managed to encourage use of the parking lot and to reduce impact on the neighborhood streets.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. The application of **Francis Delbene and Gwyn Burdell, Owners**, for property located at **32 Union Street** requesting Site Plan Review approval for the addition of a third dwelling unit on the lot, to be constructed on the top floor of a new accessory garage structure with a footprint of 784 s.f. and 1,280 s.f. GFA with associated site improvements, grading, utilities, stormwater management and landscape improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 145, Lot 29 and lies within the General Residence C (GRC) District

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Eric Weinrieb from Altus Engineering spoke to the application. The proposal is for a first story garage with an apartment above it. The existing duplex will remain. The garage space will be designated for the apartment as well as the space behind it. The water service will be replaced for the new house and interconnected with the garage. There will be new sewer and

underground electric. The new garage building will have a 10-foot side setback and a 6.5-foot rear setback. The walkway will go from the house to a covered area and into the parking area. It can be reconfigured if necessary. The plan analyzed storm events and used the AOT requirements plus 15%. The plan reduces runoff to the rear, but because the driveway pitches out there will be a slight increase in runoff to the street.

TAC Comments:

1. How will parking spaces 1 and 2 be used? Who will use which spaces, and how will they avoid blocking each other in?
 1. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they will be for the apartment.
2. Will parking space #2 be assigned to the new building, in addition to the garage parking?
3. Site Plan –suggest the walkway from the rear of the existing house to the covered entrance of the new building be expanded around the covered entrance to allow for pedestrian traffic to bypass the entrance to the new building when moving between the main building and the off-street parking area. It should also be noted that egress from the 3rd off-street parking space may be challenging when a large vehicle is parked in space #2.
4. The applicant is showing underground utilities, this will complicate moving the pole in the future for street improvements and is out of character with the other structures in the street. While we are not recommending either overhead or underground utilities, this area has not yet been reconstructed and overhead utilities would be easier for us to deal with in the future.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they had no issue with that.
5. The gas line should run directly to the structure in a straight-line square to the main.
 1. Mr. Weinrieb responded that they had no issue with that.

Ms. Walker clarified that the door and balcony will be eliminated. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Desfosses commented that the sewer should be a 6-inch pipe in the right of way. Mr. Weinrieb confirmed that would be updated.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Britz moved to recommend approval of this request to the Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Desfosses with the following stipulations:

1. The sewer lateral should be shown as 6” in the ROW.
2. A waiver for overhead electric utilities would be supported by TAC because of future street improvements that may necessitate moving this pole.
3. The gas line should run directly to the structure in a straight line square to the main.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Britz moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:11 p.m., seconded by Mr. Eby. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Technical Advisory Committee