

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

2:00 P.M.

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

JUNE 3, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: David M. Holden, Planning Director;
John Burke, Parking and Transportation Engineer;
David Allen, Deputy Public Works Director;
David Young, Deputy Police Chief;
Charlie Jones, Fire Marshal;
Tom Cravens, Engineering Technician (Water); and,
Alanson Sturgis, Chairman of the Conservation Commission

ALSO PRESENT: Lucy E. Tillman, Planner 1

.....
The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

I. OLD BUSINESS

A. The application of **Michael Brigham** for property located at **487 Cutts Avenue** wherein site plan approval is requested for the creation of six residential house lots ranging in size from 15,394 s.f. to 30,326 s.f. with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 210 as Lot 26 and lies within a Single Residence B district. **(This application was tabled at the Committee's April 29, 2003, meeting to this meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record. Mr. Sturgis moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Dennis Moulton of Millette, Sprague & Colwell addressed the Committee and spoke to a 3.4 acre site with a multi-family dwelling thereon. He commented that there is a drilled well on site.

He reminded the Committee that a six lot subdivision was presented at the last meeting with drives coming off Chase and Michael Succi Drives. The construction of a water line would go down Chase and up Michael Succi. That plan would require a large amount of ledge removal and would result in precipitous slopes. That proposal called for a land swap with the Petroulises for additional frontage to make the lots more viable.

Mr. Moulton offered that numerous discussions had been held with David Holden, Dave Allen, Lucy Tillman and David Desfosses. Negotiations have been ongoing with Mr. Ricci, an abutter, for the purchase of additional land to provide enough width for a right-of-way/cul-de-sac entering from the top of Cutts Avenue and allowing for a seven lot subdivision that would be conforming as to size and frontage. Five driveways would come off the new cul-de-sac. One drive would be off Chase Drive with the final drive off Michael Succi Drive.

Mr. Moulton went on to state that part of the discussions with the City involved the issue of water. The proposal before the Committee calls for the replacement of the existing lines with a new 10" line basically from the end of Cutts all the way down to the railroad tracks. It was Mr.

Moulton's opinion that such should help improve the water situation. He spoke to a hydrant in the cul-de-sac. Mr. Moulton continued on by speaking to the sewer connections and to the catch basin system. The proposal before the Committee would reduce the amount of ledge that would have to be removed and would result in very gentle slopes with cuts of 10-12'.

Mr. Moulton went on to explain that the proposal would minimize the impact on the tidal buffer zone with the only disturbance being the construction of a driveway. There would be no disturbance for a water line.

Mr. Moulton reviewed a number of omissions from his plan that would be corrected on a subsequent submittal.

He informed the Committee that he had submitted two requests for waivers; one being for the sidewalk and the other concerning the width of the cul-de-sac. He stated that the requested 24' width for the cul-de-sac would provide additional space for grading and would allow the realignment of the road to a 2% grade which would be safer than what is shown currently. He stated that the elimination of the sidewalk would provide additional space for grading. It was his opinion that it seemed superfluous to provide a sidewalk that would serve five houses and would connect to a street with no sidewalk. He pointed out that traffic would be minimal and that residents walk in the street currently. He did not feel that there were any real safety issues that would dictate the use of a sidewalk in this area. He felt that these requests were in keeping with the ongoing Master Plan process and the "New England Village" concept of narrow streets and a more rural look.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone else in the public who wished to speak to, for or against the application for the first, second, third and final time. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed and awaited a motion on the part of the Committee.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen moved to approve with stipulations. Deputy Chief Young seconded the motion. The Chair asked that the stipulations/concerns associated with the previous meeting be reviewed.

1. That slope stabilization be reviewed; (Not an issue. Slopes have disappeared.)
2. That the notes regarding the cemetery buffer and the Shoreland Protection buffer be on the subdivision plan that will be recorded in the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds; (Notes have been added.)
3. That a letter be submitted to the Planning Department with a sketch attached thereto setting forth the rock/ledge crushing plan including the hours of operation and a start and finish time for the project; (A letter will be submitted.)
4. That the pavement detail for Michael Succi Drive be in compliance with industrial street standards; (Not needed. No impact to Michael Succi Drive.)
5. That a note be added to the site plan concerning the protection of the catch basins; (Note has been added.)
6. That a note be added to the subdivision plan that there will be no access from Lot 3 out to Cutts Avenue; (Issue has gone away with the reconfiguration of lots.)
7. That the grading for Lots 5 and 6 be reviewed; (Not necessary with reconfiguration.)
8. That the streets be video taped before construction takes place. It was understood that the developer would agree to an overlay to correct any damage; (Amend to say Cutts Avenue.)

9. That the site plan indicate an additional gate valve on the water line going up Chase Drive; (Not applicable to current plan.)
10. That the length of pipe be extended beyond the gate valve at the dead end some 18' to 20'; not 10';
11. That a determination be made as to whether State Subdivision Approval is required; (Not required for this plan as lots would be on City sewer.)
12. That it is understood that the Planning Department will make a recommendation to the Planning Board when it reviews this site plan; that final approval be tabled until all Federal and State Permits are in hand; and, (Agreeable with applicant.)
13. That the configuration of the property lines for Lots 4 and 6 be reviewed. (Not necessary.)

Mr. Sturgis congratulated the developer and engineer for the submission of a much improved plan over what had been previously submitted..

The Chair stated that he would not recommend approval of the requested waivers noting that the City is going through a new Master Plan process adding that the Study Circles associated with Portsmouth Listens have spoken to a walkable City.

The Chair stated that he would like to add his compliments adding that the process does work and that there has been a lot of give and take in terms of the overall density of the project resulting in less impact on the site. He went on to state that he was rather encouraged.

The question was moved. The motion to recommend approval passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That a letter be submitted to the Planning Department with a sketch attached thereto setting forth the rock/ledge crushing plan including the hours of operation and a start and finish time for the project;
2. That Cutts Avenue be video taped before construction takes place. It is understood that the developer agrees to provide an overlay to correct any damage;
3. That it is understood that the Planning Department will make a recommendation to the Planning Board when it reviews this site plan; that final approval be tabled until all Federal and State Permits are in hand;
4. That there will be no sale of crushed rock from this site;
5. That the right-of-way shall be monumented in accordance with City standards;
6. That the sewer line configuration shall be reviewed and approved by Peter Rice of the Public Works Department;
7. That the note on the site plan indicating proposed water and sewer conveyance indicate proposed sewer and drainage;
8. That the applicant work with Tom Cravens of the City's Water Division regarding the replacement of the 6" and 8" water lines with a plan and profile of Cutts Avenue to be provided;
9. That the note on the site plan indicating the reconnection of the existing laterals indicate the reconnection of the existing laterals and hydrant;
10. That a mechanical engineer determine the water size servicing the lower two lots;
11. That the note on the site plan, WSO (TYP.), at the corner of Chase and Michael Succi Drives be deleted;
12. That the Technical Advisory Committee recommends that the requests for waivers on the sidewalk and the width of the cul-de-sac be denied. That the cul-de-sac be built in

accordance with the street standards of a 50' right-of-way with 32' of pavement. However, notwithstanding the above, if the Planning Board desires and as a part of the new Master Plan Planning Process, it could direct the Technical Advisory Committee to advise the Board on a possible amendment to the *Subdivision Rules and Regulations* regarding residential street standards. As such, this project could go forward and, as appropriate, any street changes could be considered as an amendment to the site plan; and,

- 13. That as the subdivision plan that has received Preliminary Approval from the Planning Board has changed substantially, Preliminary Approval will be re-advertised and considered by the Planning Board and that the new subdivision plan will indicate the elimination of the proposed Petroulis lot line relocation and the inclusion of the proposed Ricci lot line relocation

.....

B. The application of **Gordon B. Sorli and Eleanor R. Sorli, owners, and the Portsmouth Gas Light Company, applicant**, for property located at **64 Market Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the construction of a second and third floor rear addition above the first floor of the existing building with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 35 and lies within Central Business B and Historic A districts. **(This application was tabled at the Committee's April 29, 2003, meeting to this meeting.)**

The Chair read the notice into the record. Mr. Sturgis moved to take the application off the table. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

J. Corey Colwell of Millette, Sprague & Colwell addressed the Committee and informed them that Lisa DeStefano (architect) and Paul Sorli were also present. The proposal calls for a two-story addition to an existing one-story portion of a three-story structure. Mr. Colwell reviewed the concerns from last month's meeting:

- 1. That a note be added to the site plan indicating that the existing fire and domestic service is adequate for the proposed addition (done – note 9 on the plan and a letter from Petersen Electric is on file);
- 2. That the fire and domestic lines be dimensioned and shown on the plan (those have been indicated on the plan – 4" ductile iron and 2" copper);
- 3. That a note be added to the site plan citing the approvals received from the Board of Adjustment (note 8 on the plan refers to a document that lists the approvals);
- 4. That the parking calculations be included on the site plan. The parking calculations are on the site plan and have been modified somewhat due to modest changes to the interior footprint. In other words, the required parking went from 308 to 310;
- 5. That the applicant will work with Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department and John Burke, the City's Parking and Transportation Engineer regarding the wood storage and recyclables. It was Mr. Colwell's understanding that Mr. Sorli had taken care of the matter via a letter to City Attorney Sullivan; and.
- 6. That a plan be submitted indicating how the elevator works. Lisa DeStefano has submitted a plan. Mr. Sorli's attorney, Jonathan Flagg, is working on the access easements.

Mr. Colwell went on to state that the amended site plan includes site lighting, utilities and all building entrances. He further stated that an estimate of site costs had been submitted showing the only item as the removal of overhead utilities.

Ms. Tillman inquired as to the change that increased the parking by two spaces. Mr. Colwell explained that the restaurant/basement area went from 1,350 s.f. to 1,285 s.f. with the resulting parking calculation going from 18 to 17 and that the kitchen areas went from 930 s.f. to 1,158 s.f. with the resulting parking calculation going to 15 instead of 12. Mr. Colwell went on to explain that the interior dimensions for each use had been redone; that the footprint is the same and that the shifting was done as a result of a meeting with the Building Inspector.

With regard to stipulation #5, Mr. Sorli explained that he had talked with Attorney Sullivan who referred him to Silke Psula of the Public Works Department; that he (Paul Sorli) is working with various department heads and John Bohenko (the City Manager). Mr. Burke felt that something definitive should be submitted as to the public good and the private hardship suggesting that something in writing should be submitted to the City Council.

Lisa DeStefano spoke to the floor plans that were submitted showing the basement through to the fourth floor attic space. The plan also shows the access to the elevator at 78 Market Street. The Chair inquired if the plan meets code requirements with Ms. DeStefano responding, "absolutely" adding that they had met with Chief Building Inspector, Richard Hopley, and Fire Marshal Jones.

The Chair inquired of the Fire Marshal as to whether there were any concerns with the street address in terms of emergency response. Marshal Jones replied that the property in question is reflective of most downtown properties that have similar addresses with multiple tenants, so to speak. It was his opinion that the dispatch CAD system would list all tenants at one location.

Marshal Jones did have a concern, however, with note #5 on Lisa DeStefano's plan that gave the impression that elevator service would be available in case of fire. He explained that during a fire, the elevator shuts down and is not available. He suggested that the wording be changed to indicate that the elevator would be accessible for medical emergencies (not fire emergencies).

The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Sturgis moved to recommend approval of the site plan with stipulations. Mr. Allen seconded the motion. The Chair noted that the easement language is still a work in progress and offered a stipulation in that regard. The Chair went on to state that the issue of the right-of-way is still open and was uncomfortable with the use of City property by a private party. A stipulation was offered.

Mr. Allen inquired if the kitchens were being redone with the response being in the affirmative. The question Mr. Allen asked next was whether there were separate grease traps for the basement and the first floor. Mr. Sorli explained that there is one grease trap for both kitchens. Mr. Allen offered a stipulation to covering his concerns.

Mr. Cravens noted that the Petersen Electric letter refers to a 5/21/03 plan that Mr. Cravens did not have. Ms. DeStefano explained that the plan was revised after a meeting with the Chief

Building Inspector. Mr. Cravens asked that a revised letter be submitted and that the letter be signed this time.

Deputy Chief Young referred to the City Council’s concern about noise and wondered if soundproofing materials would be used for the addition. Mr. Sorli stated that as a resident of the downtown, he, too, is concerned about noise adding that they have consulted with noise engineers. The Chair pointed out that the outside deck is regulated by the City’s noise controls and that the inside is also subject to noise standards. It was the Chair’s understanding that Mr. Sorli would attempt to abide by those regulations with Mr. Sorli responding, “that is correct”.

The question was called. **The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:**

- 1. That the last sentence of note #5 on the Fire/Life Safety Provision Diagram shall read as follows: In case of medical emergency, the elevator will be accessible for the evacuation of injured persons;**
- 2. That the easements shall be reviewed and approved as to content and form and record by the City Attorney in conjunction with the Planning Department;**
- 3. That City Council approval is required for any encumbrances in the right-of-way;**
- 4. That the existing grease trap system be reviewed by John Lanoie, the City’s Mechanical and Plumbing Inspector and David Allen, the City’s Deputy Public Works Director; and**
- 5. That a revised duly executed letter/memo from Peterson Engineering be submitted to Tom Cravens of the City’s Water Division with a copy to the Planning Department for record keeping purposes prior to the Planning Board meeting.**

.....

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. The application of **Thomas Battles** for property located at **948 Route 1 ByPass** wherein site plan approval is requested for the development of an existing three-story structure into a mixed use of office space, artisan space and five apartments with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 142 as Lot 17 and lies within a Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

James Verra addressed the Committee and stated that he was present with Tom Gables. The project involves the Gableview building on the Route 1 ByPass. He stated that the structure has been vacant off and on for the past thirteen years. The proposal before the Committee is to change its use to artisan spaces and six apartments.

Mr. Verra reported that the zoning board had granted three Variances for front and side yard setbacks and open space. He explained that there would be no on site changes to the structure pointing out that the site is all paved with a fence around it. Twenty-five parking spaces are required for the apartment and business use. The building is sprinklered. Mr. Verra spoke to the fence on Alder Way and the installation of a stockade fence to the Route 1 ByPass. A dumpster will be provided with screening and some new striping will be done.

The Chair inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak to, for or against the application. Seeing no one rise, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen moved to recommend approval with stipulations. Mr. Sturgis seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on the fence location. Ms. Tillman explained that the fence is required to go up to the building in compliance with a recorded subdivision plan. The intent of that requirement is that there would be no access to the neighborhood. She noted that the Board of Adjustment stipulated that the fence be extended up to the ByPass.

The Chair inquired as to site lighting with Mr. Verra replying that it would be as presently exists adding that he would go out to the site and add the lighting to the plan. The Chair noted that the glare from the lights should not extend to adjacent properties and offered a stipulation in that regard.

Fire Marshal Jones asked that verification be made that there is off site notification to the Fire Department should the sprinkler system be tripped due to a fire.

The Chair noted that the project calls for residential units and asked if any thought had been given to "greening" the site. Mr. Battles explained that he had received a Variance to limit open space. The Chair offered a stipulation with regard to a vegetation plan.

A loading zone is indicated on the plan for the commercial use (artisans). Mr. Verra explained that the parking calculations were based on a General Business usage.

Mr. Burke questioned the aisle widths. Ms. Tillman explained that Variances were granted years ago for the aisle widths. The Chair commented that it looked "like this horse is dead". The question was called. The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant and design team take a look at the site lighting to see if it needs to be supplemented;
2. That the availability of off-site notification capabilities for the sprinkler system be confirmed. If none is available, then such should be added; and,
3. That the applicant work with Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department on a vegetation plan.

.....

B. The application of **Great Islington Street, LLC** for property located at **871 Islington Street** wherein site plan approval is requested for the conversion of an existing structure from office use to twelve dwelling units and artisan studio space with associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 165 as Lot 4 and lies within a Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

Attorney Bernard W. Pelech addressed the Committee and stated that the proposal involves the conversion of the existing structure, which is primarily used for office space, into twelve residential units and ten to fifteen artisan studios of various sizes. Attorney Pelech informed the Committee that Ken Wood of Attar Engineering was also present. Attorney Pelech went on to

state that the proposal meets all the requirements of the *Zoning Ordinance*. The entire parking lot has been reconfigured resulting in the reduction in the number of spaces from 50 to 40. Attorney Pelech explained that the existing parking spaces do not conform to City standards.

Ken Wood of Attar Engineering spoke to the proposed conversion which would include the demolition of the 1,735 s.f. wood frame building to the rear. Mr. Attar reiterated that 40 parking spaces would be provided with two spaces for each of the 12 residential units and the remainder for the artisan studios.

A new water line will be installed coming in from Islington Street. No changes in grade are proposed. Some improvements will be made to the landscaping.

Mr. Cravens inquired as to what the monitoring wells are monitoring with the response being that they were part of a Phase 1 study in 1994. It is the intent of the applicant to abandon the wells. It was suggested that a letter be submitted clarifying the status of the monitoring wells and how they are proposed to be handled.

The question was raised as to a detail of the party wall with the response being that the architect is still working on it; that it is a four hour party wall with a two foot thick brick wall and two steel doors. The question was asked as to whether the buildings are connected with the response being, "separate". Reference was made to a back stair well with the Committee asking for a detail.

The Chair asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak to, for or against the application. John Chagnon of Ambit Survey addressed the Committee and stated that Bud Gallagher, an abutter to the project, wanted to go on record as being in favor of the project and felt it would be an asset to the neighborhood.

The Chair asked for speakers for the second, third and final time. Seeing no speakers, the Chair kept the Public Hearing open.

The Chair referred to a sea of asphalt and inquired as to how the property lines would be delineated. The response was, "striping and curb stops". The Chair asked that such be shown on the site plan.

Mr. Burke asked for a clarification on the ownership of Frenchman's Lane. Mr. Flynn (Timothy) who was sitting in the audience, stated that the City owns it. Reference was made to Note #3 on the site plan. Attorney Pelech indicated that he didn't know who owns Frenchman's Lane adding that Mr. Flynn doesn't own it. Attorney Pelech did offer, however, that the City does plow and maintain Frenchman's Lane and tows vehicles that are illegally parked.

Attorney Pelech went on to state that the proposal calls for a large rectangular green space in the area of the wood building that is proposed for demolition. A stockade fence will be installed and the area will have a picnic table for residents. Otherwise, it was felt that the Button Factory people would be parking in that area.

The question was asked if the vehicles parked in spots 38, 39 and 40 would have the right to back into Frenchman's Lane. Attorney Pelech responded that he didn't know.

The Chair inquired as to any expected increase in traffic. Mr. Wood replied that the traffic would probably be the same or actually decrease. The Chair asked that such be documented.

It was Mr. Burke's opinion that the application would need a review by the Traffic/Safety Committee inasmuch as there have been parking problems on Frenchman's Lane. Mr. Burke also noted that buses are stopping there what with the new bus system. Furthermore, he felt that pedestrians would be crossing the street to get to Fleet Bank causing pedestrian crossing issues.

The Chair inquired whether a sidewalk existed in front of the property on Islington Street with Attorney Pelech responding in the negative and Mr. Flynn indicating that there is a 5' sidewalk. The Chair asked that the sidewalk be labeled on the site plan and that the applicant work with the Public Works Department as to the condition of the sidewalk. The Chair noted that the site plan is a residential site plan and that there should be a way to get pedestrians out to the sidewalk.

The Chair inquired as to water and sewer services for the artisan space. Mr. Flynn replied that there would be a common bathroom and a common corridor with its own entrance. The question was asked if there would be any food preparation with Mr. Flynn responding in the negative.

Mr. Cravens noted that the site plan shows two water lines entering the building with only one line to the property. He advised the applicant that the domestic and water services need to come from the right-of-way.

Mr. Allen asked if it was intended for vehicles using spots 32 through 37 to enter onto Frenchman's Lane. The response was that the vehicles would enter from the main entrance on Islington Street and would be separated off from Frenchman's Lane. The applicant was asked to show such on the plan.

It was the Chair's feeling that the proposal had a good conceptual design but he felt that the application should be tabled so that the plan could be freshened up. He asked that a supplemental plan show such items as lighting and snow removal. He expressed his concern about parking spots 27 and 28 on the site plan.

Mr. Allen stated that he shared the Chairman's concerns and felt that there should be an internal sidewalk for pedestrian access and expressed his concerns about the parking on and drainage of Frenchman's Lane.

Mr. Allen moved to table the application to the July 1, 2003, meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee to allow for review by the Traffic/Safety Committee and for the submittal of revised plans. The motion was seconded. Mr. Burke informed the applicant that he would need 12 sets of plans by June 12th for the Traffic/Safety Committee packet. It was Mr. Burke's feeling that the status of Frenchman's Lane should be clarified, and he spoke to the issue of vehicles backing onto Frenchman's Lane.

The Chair noted that the site plan is tight comparing it to "too much fertilizer in a too small pick-up truck". He asked that building elevations be submitted showing how the floors will generally be used with proof that the uses would be 1/3 commercial and 2/3 residential. He asked that the applicant note on the site plan that two spaces per residential unit are being provided rather than the required 1 1/2 spaces. He suggested that the applicant and his design team join in on the pre-TAC meeting at 9:00 a.m. on July 1st for a review of the amended plans.

It was noted that the plan would be the subject of an on site by the Traffic Safety Committee on June 17th and review by the Traffic Safety Committee on June 19th.

The tabling motion passed unanimously. Some of the concerns/stipulations of the Committee follow:

1. That a letter be submitted to the Planning Department clarifying the status of the monitoring wells and how they are proposed to be abandoned;
2. That a detail on the party wall be submitted;
3. That the site plan indicate how the property lines are being delineated and how vehicles will be prevented from going over the property lines;
4. That the ownership of Frenchman’s Lane be clarified;
5. That documentation be submitted to the Planning Department regarding proposed traffic;
6. That the site plan be reviewed by the Traffic/Safety Committee with a report back to the Technical Advisory Committee;
7. That the existing sidewalk on Islington Street be labeled on the site plan and that the applicant work with the Public Works Department as to the condition of that sidewalk;
8. That an internal sidewalk out to the Islington Street sidewalk be indicated on the site plan;
9. That the site plan indicate two water services in the right-of-way;
10. That the site plan indicate how the parking spaces will be separated off from Frenchman’s Lane;
11. That the site plan include a vegetation plan;
12. That the site plan indicate the snow removal area(s);
13. That site lighting be included on the site plan;
14. That the site plan indicate underground utilities;
15. That the issue of vehicles backing onto Frenchman’s Lane be resolved;
16. That a schematic be presented indicating how the inside is going to work; and,
17. That the site plan note that more parking is provided than is required.

.....

C. The application of **Philbrick’s FreshMarket, LLC** for property located at **775 Lafayette Road** wherein site plan approval is requested for the renovation of the former Stroudwater Bookstore at Lafayette Plaza into a grocery store with a restaurant (café) with both inside and outside seating with associated site improvements. The conversion will involve the construction of a 1,020 s.f. ± addition. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 245 as Lot 1 and lies within a General Business district.

The Chair read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:

John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering addressed the Committee and informed them that Attorney Pelech and the applicant were also present. The project involves the renovation of the former Stroudwater Bookstore into a “Fresh Market”. He referred to a proposed elevation. Over 500 parking spaces are available in the Lafayette Plaza parking lot.

A small addition is proposed to the southwesterly side of the building that will be used as a storage and receiving area. There is an existing receiving area to the back of the building.

A café with outdoor seating will spill into the interior space. The proposal calls for the installation of a 1,000 gallon grease trap. The NHDOT has been made aware of the proposed penetration to Lafayette Road for the sewer connection. Mr. Chagnon submitted a letter from NHDOT that indicated that a Trench Permit would be issued based on the submitted plans. An

application will be filed when the applicant is ready to commence construction for the sewer service.

A compacting dumpster will be located on the easterly side of the building resulting in the relocation of an exit door. The electrical system will be upgraded.

Mr. Chagnon offered that Variances were granted on the 27th of May of this year to allow the project to go forward.

Me & Olie's bakery will become part of the Fresh Market with fresh bread baked on site. It is the intent of the applicant that the market would provide the service of taking the groceries out to the patrons' cars.

The butcher shop will have a separate connection to a grease trap. A pumping station inside the structure will pump to the sewer connection. Floor drains will be installed at the appropriate locations. The proposal does not call for any changes to the existing parking.

Discussion was had regarding the existing overhead electrical service. Attorney Pelech commented that this side of the building had not been touched since its creation in 1960. The Chair stated that the service needs to be underground from the pole to the building with the response being that it is now underground.

The Chair inquired if the parking spaces and aisles are in conformance with Mr. Chagnon responding that he believed that they are substantially in conformance pointing out that they are existing.

Discussion then turned to the sidewalk in front of the structure. The Chair asked that information on the condition of the sidewalk be submitted as well as whether it is handicapped accessible.

The Chair inquired as to site lighting with the response being that it would be period lighting. The Chair asked that a cut sheet be submitted.

The Chair asked that the vegetative areas be indicated on the plan. Mr. Chagnon indicated that there would be sidewalk planters and hanging plants.

Discussion ensued on whether emergency vehicles could get by any vehicles parked in the newly created receiving area. The response was that small delivery trucks with local produce would use the newly created receiving area with the larger vehicles using the existing receiving area. The Fire Marshal was satisfied that fire trucks would be able to access the rear of the building.

Discussion then turned to the configuration of the nine parking spaces in the corner. Attorney Pelech felt that the only way to resolve the issue would be to have the access easement in that area relinquished (as was done when the Bread and Butter structure was renovated). It was Attorney Pelech's feeling that the nine parking spaces would be used as employee parking.

The Chair made three calls for speakers. There being none, the Chair declared the Public Hearing closed.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE:

Mr. Allen moved to approve with stipulations. Mr. Cravens seconded the motion. The applicant was asked to work with John Burke of the Public Works Department as to the posting of "no

parking” signs in areas around the building. Attorney Pelech indicated that they would be happy to post signs.

The issue of the site being a “sea of asphalt” was discussed with the Chairman offering the services of the City in any attempt to provide more attractive landscaping. Attorney Pelech felt that there was plenty of parking in that one-quarter of the parking lot is devoted to the Rotary Christmas tree sales during the Christmas season. It was noted during the discussion on the parking layout that parking is tied into a Variance.

The motion passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

1. That the site plan indicate the condition of the sidewalk in front of the building;
2. That information on the site lighting be submitted;
3. That the applicant work with Lucy Tillman of the Planning Department on some landscaping;
4. That the site plan indicate the posting of “no parking” signs in the areas around the building; and
5. That the site plan indicate that all services to the structure will be underground.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT was had at approximately 4:00 p.m.

.....

These minutes were taken and transcribed by Barbara B. Driscoll, Administrative Assistant in the Planning Department.