



**Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
March 21, 2018
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Bob Baskerville, Chairman
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative
David Canada, Member
Jameson Paine, Vice Chairman
Diedre Lawrence, Alternate

Members Absent: Tom House, Secretary
Robert Roseen, Alternate

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chairman welcomed Diedre Lawrence who has been appointed by the Board of Selectmen to an Alternate position with the Planning Board.

The Chairman took roll.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. February 7, 2018

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the meeting minutes of February 7, 2018 as submitted.
Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

b. March 7, 2018

Mr. Houghton made a motion to accept the meeting minutes of March 7, 2018 as submitted.
Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Hearing

- a. **6-Lot Subdivision Application** to create five (5) new building lots at 8 Whittaker Drive, Stratham NH 03885, Map 19 Lot 68 submitted by Jonathan S. Ring, PE, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., PO Box 219, Stratham, NH 03885.

The Chairman explained to Ms. Lawrence that since this case has been ongoing and she missed all of the prior meetings he does not recommend she be a voting member for this application. Ms. Lawrence agreed.

Mr. Austin stated the previous staff review remains current for today as no new changes have been made. Mr. Austin stated that several letters from abutters were received today and are included in the meeting material. Mr. Baskerville explained the board will only hear new public comment that has not been discussed at previous hearings. Mr. Baskerville opened the hearing.

Jonathan Ring, Jones & Beach Engineers, introduced Brian Sullivan, and Attorney Kevin Baum. Mr. Ring gave a brief statement regarding the proposed subdivision and updated the board on the revisions to the plan submitted this evening. Mr. Ring explained Until prefers the utilities come off of the current utilities on Whittaker Drive and will be underground. The utility easement off of High Street has been removed, rip rap stone at drain removed and the pipe will be cut back to the Brockelbank's property. Mr. Ring stated a quote for the cistern has been received from Knipstein for \$95,000 and the applicant is willing to cover 1/3 of the cost. Mr. Ring stated the trail has been detailed on plan D1. Mr. Austin stated a note will need to be add to the plan regarding the HOA and their responsibilities.

Mr. Lavery stated the connector road was deemed practical and makes more financial sense for the town for all seasons of maintenance. Once the developer designed the connector road the maximum grade was 7.5% and within the Town of Stratham 8% maximum regulation. The Planning Board should not cater to the developer's "wants" just to increase their profit margin. The PCAC has worked hard to encourage pedestrian and cyclist accessibility throughout town and a seasonal trail does not promote year round access. No discussion has taken place of who will be responsible to maintain the trail if the HOA doesn't. There has been no discussion of where users of this trail will park. Market Street and Bittersweet Lane have ample parking for trail use. Scamman Road has no on-street parking which has resulted in numerous complaints with regard to trail users parking on their lawns and in front of their residences. Mr. Lavery questioned the board on the justification to waive a practical design other than abutter displeasure. Mr. Lavery explained he understands the abutters don't want development around their house, but a 50 ft. right of way between Hillcrest and Whittaker was put in place for future connectivity and is practical and makes the most sense for all public safety services. Mr. Lavery asked the board to deny the cul de sac extension as proposed this evening.

Chief Larrabee stated many building fires use in excess of 10,000 gallons of water and the fire department doesn't carry that much water on the vehicles, even with mutual aid assistance, which is the reason to establish a water supply from a pond or cistern. This location, including

the existing homes on Whittaker and Hillcrest provide a challenge to water supply and are a significant distance from any previous built water supply locations (>1,000 ft). Extending Whittaker with an extra five homes will provide a challenge for the safety of that community. When choosing a fire water location, the location should be chosen where trucks can pull up, off load, and drive way without having to turn the trucks around. This current set up does not allow for that to happen. A cistern eliminates the need to develop a water shuttle system, which would include turning trucks around. Chief Larrabee asked Mr. Ring to confirm the distance of the furthest home on Whittaker if the cistern was on High Street. Mr. Ring stated 2,400 ft. Chief Larrabee questioned where the 2/3 cost of the cistern is supposed to come from, since the fire department is asked to keep a flat budget from year to year and this cost would be a 21% increase. Attorney Baum stated monetary exaction is reasonable and proportionate. Attorney Baum stated the applicant is willing to sprinkler the new residences. Chief Larrabee stated sprinklers may not work if electric is lost during a fire.

Chief Scippa read an email he sent December 29, 2017 to Mr. Graves regarding meetings they had and Mr. Graves concerns with regard to the proposed subdivision. Chief Scippa stated a through road would be easier for police vehicles to patrol and the concern is the public safety with regard to the highway and fire departments.

Roy Byrnes, 2 Hillcrest Drive, apologized to Mr. Lavery and clarified his questions regarding Mr. Lavery's numbers. Mr. Brynes stated that much of the applicants submission, stamped by an engineer, was sent out for third party review and his earlier comment was not to question Mr. Lavery as much as to point out that the planning board was taking Mr. Lavery's numbers without third party review.

Bettina Kersten, representative for PCAC, as the committee works to make Stratham a more walkable/bikable area this proposed subdivision, so close to the school, should be accessible for all. The trail as proposed speaks to being only seasonal and it should be year-round and maintained.

Melissa Gahr, representative for PCAC, questioned why the town should bear the extra cost for the lack of connectivity and reiterated Ms. Kersten's statement that the trail should be accessible for all and maintained year round.

Candy Graves, 5 Hillcrest Drive, told the PCAC members this is the first time they have come to speak with regard to this subdivision and the neighborhood has been going through this process for months. Ms. Graves stated the PCAC should read the minutes and stay informed, and as taxpayers get up to speed.

Darrin Brockelbank, 110 High Street, asked the board to keep in mind that approving this subdivision violates Section 4.4.1.b.3 of the Subdivision Regulations regarding irregular lots. Mr. Brockelbank asked for confirmation of who would own the detention pond; the owner of Lot #2 or the HOA. Mr. Baskerville stated Lot #2 would own the property and an easement would be placed on their property regarding the pond.

Don Graves, 5 Hillcrest Drive, asked Mr. Lavery for clarification on the cost difference between Whittaker Drive and Hillcrest; Whittaker being a longer road should cost more than Hillcrest. Mr. Lavery explained Hillcrest is wider which accounts for the cost difference.

Paul Deschaine, Town Administrator, stated the town's department heads are present at this meeting because they are dismayed and thought it important to come to the meeting and state their concerns to the planning board. Whittaker and Hillcrest point to each other for future connection, which is the master plan intent. The planning board has had discussions regarding no more dead ends for the safety of services and you are now looking to extend a dead end. Police, fire, highway, town planner and administrator have spoken that the through road is practical and now the planning board is looking to approve a waiver to the through road. In order to approve the waiver the planning board has a duty to follow the regulations and the master plan, and will need to note specific conditions showing unnecessary hardship and that it is not contrary to spirit of regulations. Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Deschaine if the town has ever shared the cost of a cistern with an applicant. Mr. Deschaine explained he has no recollection of the town sharing the cost of a cistern and the 2/3 required would need to be approved by the board of selectmen. Mr. Baskerville stated the applicant is responsible for the cost of the cistern.

Mr. Baskerville closed meeting for public comment and opened for board discussion. Mr. Canada stated he cannot approve the cul de sac proposed. Prior planning boards approved the Whittaker and Hillcrest subdivisions with a future connection and to approve this would go against good planning. Mr. Houghton stated in all his years working with the town he has never seen town staff so passionate and willing to come forward to state their concerns. Mr. Baskerville agreed. Mr. Houghton explained that the town staff's passion cannot be ignored, since they are the experts and the reason they work for the town. Mr. Paine agreed.

Mr. Paine made a motion to close the public hearing at 8:25 p.m. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to GRANT Section 3.3.2 and Section 3.3.3 – Plan Scale to Allow 1" = 60'. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 4 votes in the affirmative, 0 votes against.

Mr. Paine made a motion to DENY Section 4.4.3.a.I – Dead End Street - No unnecessary hardship exists due to a through road is practical and town staff input. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 4 votes in the affirmative, 0 votes against.

Mr. Canada made a motion to DENY Section 4.4.3.a.II – Dead End Over 800 LF - No unnecessary hardship exists due to a through road is practical and the spirit of the regulation must be met. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 4 votes in the affirmative, 0 votes against.

Mr. Canada made a motion to DENY Section 4.4.3 – Allow Cul De Sac; Section 4.5.1.f – Side Slopes 3:1; and Section Addendum Table 1 – Road Width 22' on Plan A1, Note 3 as submitted by the applicant based on the previous denials no action is required. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 4 votes in the affirmative, 0 votes against.

Mr. Deschaine stated two options for the board. 1) The applicant can withdraw without prejudice; or, 2) deny the application.

Attorney Baum stated the applicant would like to withdraw the application without prejudice and agreed to pay for third party reviews and abutter notice if decided to reapply for a similar application.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to waive the application fee if the applicant decides to reapply for a similar application. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Houghton requested the applicant submit a letter of withdrawal without prejudice within five days of the date March 21, 2018.

b. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Review Applications for proposed residential/commercial buildings with private well and on-site septic at 149 & 151 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH 03885, Map 17 Lots 39 & 40 submitted by Mark Perlowski, Perlowski Properties, LLC, P.O. Box 1137, Stratham, NH 03885.

Mr. Austin stated a modification to the site regarding the driveway was submitted this evening.

Joseph Nichols, Beals Associates, representing Perlowski Properties. Since the last meeting a possible solution to the entrance locations was made for the board to consider. The entrance was moved slightly 6.5 ft. to the west, towards the circle, to gain a better sight distance and

209 further away from the parking in front of Unit #2. The handicap location which was located
210 to the right side of the parking in front of Unit #2 has been moved to the left hand side of the
211 patched area, which is required in a handicapped zone. Mr. Nichols stated the request for
212 samples of the colors and siding will be passed around for the board to see. Mr. Nichols
213 stated the maintenance of wood for a commercial building was an issue for the applicant.
214 Ongoing maintenance, paint peeling and chipping from neglect, will not be aesthetically
215 pleasing. The Stratham Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.9.a.7 Architectural and Site Design
216 Standards, states wood or hardiboard is required, but it also states that “exterior materials shall
217 be durable and of high quality”. Mr. Nichols explained the “traditional” is a historic building
218 being renovated and may not currently be sided, but the Old Town Hall is vinyl sided. The
219 ordinance also states buildings should be consist with surrounding buildings and the
220 surrounding buildings are all vinyl sided. Mr. Baskerville asked for clarification whether the
221 sample submitted is being considered vinyl. Mr. Nichols stated yes. Mr. Nichols explained
222 the applicant would like to maintain the commercial building and this is a better solution,
223 longer lasting, durable, and high quality product that meets the zoning ordinance. Mr. Nichols
224 stated the regulation state multiple buildings on the site and attached buildings should be
225 designed to create a cohesive, visual relationship, as well as efficient circulation access for
226 pedestrians and vehicles. Accessory buildings should be designed to complement the primary
227 building and/or use on site in design and material. Mr. Nichols explained the relationship
228 between the Old Town Hall and the new buildings, as well as the changes requested by the
229 board at prior meetings. Mr. Nichols pointed out that the siding being proposed is used on
230 million dollar homes on the seacoast, holds up to the New England weather, and is denser and
231 hardier than the traditional, standard vinyl siding.
232

233 Mr. Baskerville explained that Ms. Lawrence was not appointed a voting member to the first
234 hearing because there were many missed hearings. Mr. Baskerville stated this application will
235 be looked at in its entirety tonight and asked Ms. Lawrence, if the applicant was agreeable,
236 would she be comfortable being a voting member to vote on this application. Ms. Lawrence
237 agreed to be a voting member on this application. Mr. Nichols stated the applicant agrees
238 with Ms. Lawrence being a voting member for this application.
239

240 Mr. Austin stated three of the waivers are one package and deal with the sidewalk, lights and
241 the trees from 3.9.8, Figure 1, Town Center District Roadway Cross Section. Mr. Austin
242 stated Mr. Nichols has a presentation on Figure 1, with questions for the planning board on the
243 road detail that applies to Portsmouth Avenue. The same question could also be raised in the
244 Gateway District, that very clearly defines boulevard, avenue, and street, and all are a much
245 different standard than Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Baskerville stated it is his recollection that
246 buildings fronting on Portsmouth Avenue versus internal roads that are to be created and that
247 cross section is not for Portsmouth Avenue but for internal roads. Mr. Canada stated there are
248 two members in the audience that worked through the Gateway process and asked if they
249 would share their recollection. Rebecca Mitchell, Portsmouth Avenue, stated the Gateway
250 discussions she was a part of were dealing with the Gateway Commercial District and this is
251 different. Mr. Austin stated the Gateway and Town Center Districts are essentially the same,
252 but Town Center had a different aesthetic that it was targeting. Street lighting in Town Center
253 states 1 per 25 ft, street trees is 1 per 25 ft. which was modified in the Gateway District two
254 town meetings ago. The same changes could be made moving forward if the planning board
255 would like. Mr. Houghton stated he was part of the planning board when the avenues and

streets were designed and the design intent expressed by the planning board was to have sidewalks and street trees along Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Paine stated he was on the Town Center Committee and agrees with Mr. Houghton's account. Mr. Deschaine stated the intent was to have that on all roadways where practical. Mr. Deschaine stated that practicable is if it is going to be in the state's highway right of way it is going to be what the state allows.

Mr. Nichols explained that in reviewing the regulations they do not specifically call out the applicant is required to upgrade Portsmouth Avenue, which is the reason for the waivers. The street, which only has a sidewalk on one side, has parking lanes, and has a minimum width requirement of 51 ft. Portsmouth Avenue currently has a 66 ft. right of way along that section of roadway and then a variable width once it gets out to the traffic circle. In order to have the avenue on both sides, the minimum width required is 72 ft. and a maximum width of 76 ft., and a boulevard which has sidewalks, trees, and lighting on both sides the width required is 72 ft. to 94 ft. Currently Portsmouth Avenue does not allow for those requirements for the width of the existing right of way. The applicant is providing a 20 ft. access, provided the waivers go through, for future upgrade. DOT has been involved in possibly putting in a median to slow down traffic in regard to this project. Mr. Nichols explained this site has many challenges; steep slopes, proximity of the building requirements for zoning, existing overhead utilities such as issues with street trees, lighting, and sidewalk locations, etc. Mr. Nichols explained that Unitil cut down some trees on the site because of the powerline issues. If street trees were required, underground electric would be required. Mr. Nichols stated the applicant is giving an easement across the back of the parcel as well.

Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Austin for clarification on the application. Mr. Austin stated an application package is submitted and includes a complete site plan application and if any waivers are posed a Conditional Use Permit application is required. The complete packet is processed by the TRC, if the TRC determines the project is Gateway or Town Center compliant the planning board's mission is a statutory public hearing on the site plan approval and the project is expedited. Mr. Austin explained that two weeks ago his understanding was if a project was deemed not Town Center compliant, which is the case with this project, the planning board was required to have a public hearing on the site plan and consider the waivers. Further review of the regulations and conversations with Town Administrator, Paul Deschaine, if a project is not Gateway or Town Center compliant, the planning board is required to perform a full site plan review. Mr. Austin explained that Gateway and Town Center Districts only work as written if utilities exist. Meanwhile, TRC processes less than full site development compliant projects if they are compliant.

Mr. Nichols stated the waivers were provided on good faith in case they were required. Mr. Nichols explained that in prior meetings and past intent of DOT as well, is to get the traffic from Main Street off of Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Nichols stated there is a right of way across the back of the property and discussions have been held with Stratham Market, Stratham Mattress, as well as Dave Short whom are all on board. Mr. Nichols explained the plan if Main Street was to be put in. Mr. Nichols explained the Old Town Hall is an old building that has a lot of significance to the Town of Stratham. It would have been easy to just tear the building down and build a regular complex, but the applicant decided to renovate the Old Town Hall which makes this site more difficult to work with. Mr. Nichols stated there are many things to do to this building to make it appear better; adding cedar shakes style, cutting

some of the overgrown shrubs, parking has been removed from the front, which was in very short site distance because of Stratham Market. There are several site constraints of this property; soil conditions, disturbed soil on site which is what depicted where the septic can go, elevation concerns coming off of Portsmouth Avenue which have to meet DOT requirements, and the septic has been through Rockingham County Conservation District and have been approved. Public water supply is required because of the use. Mr. Nichols explained the difference between community water supply and individual well. Mr. Paine asked if the well radius crosses property lines. Mr. Nichols explained public water supply is not allowed to cross but if a recorded easement exists it can cross. Mr. Nichols explained he has the necessary paperwork for the recorded easement. Mr. Nichols stated he has worked with this property since 1999 and at least 7 or 8 potential buyers to develop this property with several issues. Mr. Perlowski was willing to work with the abutters and come up with a solution to make this a viable project. Mr. Nichols explained the applicant has worked with the abutters and a hydrogeologist to make this work. The well was tried in several locations and the best location is one single well, in the rear of the property, away from Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Paine questioned if the well radius on the effluent disposal plan take into consideration a proposed roadway which would cut from Winnicutt Road over towards the Post Office on College Road. Mr. Nichols explained that it does cut through the protected well radius, but at the time of such a road, water and utilities would be going in as part of the process for the Main Street corridor and the well radius would be removed. Mr. Nichols explained that Mr. Perlowski has been through several designs to make this project work. The parking was reviewed and designed at length and what is planned is the best option for all. Mr. Paine stated he does not approve the parking in the front. Mr. Paine questioned whether bio-retention or storm water loading been researched to be underground/below pavement or to install pervious pavement. Mr. Nichols stated yes, because of the soil criteria, it would need to be lifted and it would be higher to come off of Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Paine stated if it is in the back of the property a grade up could be created. Mr. Paine stated this is the center of the town and where pedestrian traffic wants to be and the introduction of mixed use and residential is key but a setting that is walkable and within an area that doesn't necessarily visually have parking in the front. Mr. Baskerville questioned if an alteration for terrain is needed. Mr. Nichols stated it is below the threshold. Mr. Baskerville and Mr. Nichols discussed the soils from the test pits and the water table. Mr. Nichols stated an additional study was done and all of the parcels, but two, in the Central District have parking in the front. Mr. Austin questioned how many of those parcels were developed after the Town Center Guidelines went into effect. Mr. Nichols stated there are not many parcels left to be developed. Mr. Austin stated this might be mitigated by leaving the parking were it is proposed but not have Portsmouth Avenue access. Mr. Austin stated the planning board might contemplate the waiver for the parking in front of the building as it is behind the front plain of two of three structures on the site. The issue with that is that it is immediately in line with the only break in the landscape strip in front of the parking. Mr. Paine questioned if Unit #1 could move to the right and put parking on the left side or an access with parallel parking. Mr. Nichols stated the only location for the septic is where it is proposed so the elevation of that would be a 3:1 slope and the close proximity to the other building it would come up and then elevate at the corner down was difficult to make it work correctly, and the location of the existing building makes it steep so guardrails would need to be added and that would not be appealing.

350 Matt Larrabee, Fire Chief, stated coming out of Winnicutt Road going through O'Brien
351 creates a challenge for the fire department and the turn is not conducive for the trucks. Mr.
352 Nichols stated for emergency access the one-way could be used. Chief Larrabee asked the
353 entrance by the Old Town Hall could be a one-way entrance only that forced access in and
354 around the building and then the exit would be a right-turn only onto Portsmouth Avenue.
355

356 Mr. Nichols explained the old structure was uninhabitable and torn down, some trees that
357 were intertwined in the power lines were removed, and the applicant made some much needed
358 site improvements. Mr. Paine questioned if Unit #1 and Unit #2 could be put together as one
359 building. Mr. Nichols didn't think a strip mall type building would be presentable in the
360 downtown district. Mr. Paine stated an architect could make it look presentable. Mr. Nichols
361 explained that a wider building presents a traffic issue to get around the buildings. The
362 entrance would need to be moved over and the left side of the property is steep and DOT
363 access is not feasible. Mr. Austin stated that would work for parking and potential access, but
364 is unsure of what that would do for egress from the apartments. Mr. Paine stated new
365 buildings in a historic area that look like they've been there for a long time exist in many
366 areas. Mr. Nichols stated the applicant researched that idea and in order to get the density for
367 the apartments, interior stairwells would be required, which would make the building wider
368 for egress.
369

370 Mr. Baskerville opened the meeting up for public comment. Lucy Cushman, Winnicutt Road,
371 stated she likes Mr. Paine's idea and understands the applicant has explored several options,
372 but she is concerned with the number of waivers requested. Ms. Cushman explained the
373 reason Town Center was written the way it was is to not have what has been done in the past.
374 Ms. Cushman would like to see the old buildings repurposed and is happy the developer
375 agreed to consider repurposing the town hall but to ask for waivers not only for parking, but
376 lighting, sidewalks, landscaping and the siding is what the regulations call for. Ms. Cushman
377 stated the people who were opposed to the preservation easement used the example that the
378 building is vinyl sided so it doesn't matter and only means it is easy to maintain. In the
379 Gateway District there have been several buildings built and they have not used vinyl siding
380 but used cement hardboard. Even though the siding is not unattractive it is vinyl siding and if
381 this is allowed in the Town Center everyone else will want vinyl siding. The only waiver Ms.
382 Cushman agreed with is the sidewalk since there is a walkable path within the site. Ms.
383 Cushman stated her dislike for not having trees and didn't know Greg Blood worked for
384 Unitil, since it appeared Mr. Blood was there removing trees. Ms. Cushman would like the
385 lighting underground. Mr. Baskerville stated the siding proposed is not the old vinyl siding
386 from decades ago. Mr. Austin stated it is not the vinyl siding that is currently on the Old
387 Town Hall. Mr. Austin stated in Gateway and Town Center the regulations are very specific
388 and demanding, but all predicated on having utilities. Mr. Austin explained the site is
389 constrained without utilities. Mr. Austin explained his experience regarding vinyl siding. Mr.
390 Houghton stated the previous application had to follow the regulations and is now hearing that
391 this proposed project does not need to adhere to the regulations. Mr. Nichols stated several
392 town centers are guidelines and is open to interpretation. Mr. Houghton stated that is when a
393 hardship is proven and he is not seeing a hardship. Mr. Austin explained his statement, as
394 staff, is the hardship that a regulation is in place that is predicated on utilities that are not
395 present. Mr. Houghton asked for confirmation where the Town Center regulations are
396 predicated on utilities. Mr. Austin stated 3.9.1.c which is the regulation referencing the

397 Master Plan, and the Master Plan by extension is predicated on the introduction of municipal
398 water, sewer, and fire suppression.
399

400 Mark Perlowski, owner of Persimmon Homes and Perlowski Properties, stated he is a resident
401 of Stratham and explained the proposed plan. Mr. Perlowski stated he is a custom home
402 builder, has built close to 100 houses in Stratham, and has been doing this for 25 years. Mr.
403 Perlowski stated he is not building these buildings to sell, he intends on keeping them. Curb
404 appeal is important and every option was researched, especially with the apartment building,
405 having the building close to Route 108 traffic is loud and the reason the building is pushed
406 back. The architect Mr. Perlowski has used for the last 10 years researched and designed the
407 two building after every option was looked at. Mr. Perlowski explained he has been working
408 on this for three months and has exhausted every option.
409

410 Mr. Baskerville stated he understand the applicant has taken on a tough site with an existing
411 building to be renovated and believes there needs to be some give and take with the center
412 building. Mr. Baskerville does not agree with granting a waiver for parking where people are
413 backing into the entrance. Mr. Nichols explained that does not work from the standpoint of
414 elevation grade change in the back for parking, the parking will not work at a 1:5 grade. The
415 septic location doesn't work because of the grade difference between the high and low side.
416 Mr. Nichols stated in reviewing the regulations, the sidewalk, lighting and street trees are not
417 called out for an applicant to install and is an option of the board. The waivers were provided
418 in case the planning board acted on those and the applicant doesn't believe the regulation
419 requires the applicant to provide as such.
420

421 Mr. Baskerville asked for confirmation that wall packs are being proposed. Mr. Nichols stated
422 yes and they are all downward facing. Wall pack lighting was discussed. Mr. Deschaine
423 questioned whether a small public sidewalk could be brought out into the easement area into
424 the front which would be identical to Unit #2 entryway. Mr. Deschaine questioned if the
425 entrance could be shifted down another, approximately, 20 ft. to better line with the corridor
426 and avoid the backing up of vehicles and improve the site distance. Mr. Nichols stated that
427 was looked at and the elevation coming off of Portsmouth Avenue, NH DOT's 2% needs to be
428 kept. Mr. Deschaine asked if the knoll could be cut down. Mr. Nichols explained the
429 elevation of the septic location to the rear of the building holds the one side of the parking and
430 a 1:5 slope maximum is required for parking.
431

432 Mr. Baskerville stated he likes the effort and idea of this proposal, but there is a little refining
433 that needs to be done. There is a lot of nice landscaping in front of Unit #2 but there is
434 nothing in front or around Unit #1 and just a wall pack aiming toward the street. Mr.
435 Baskerville recommended putting a lower light and a little landscaping in would be beneficial.
436 Mr. Baskerville stated he would like a good looking quality siding.
437

438 Mr. Austin recommended the board ask the applicant if any of the waivers requested are
439 denied, does the applicant want to continue and redefine based board recommendations or
440 withdraw without prejudice. Mr. Baskerville asked the applicant if there is critical date the
441 application needs to be decided. Ms. Lawrence questioned if there is a more aesthetic side
442 arm lighting that could be mounted on the electric poles. Mr. Austin stated it is possible to

443 approach Unitil, they allow it to be replaced but you have to pay the balance of the
444 depreciation and the full cost of the new arm.

445
446 Mr. Baskerville would like to continue this hearing until the April 4, 2018 meeting and allow
447 the applicant to fix some of the planning board concerns. Mr. Houghton agreed and asked the
448 board to give the applicant a definite list. Mr. Houghton stated his concern with parking in the
449 front of the building and pulling the building closer to the road; as well as the siding that is
450 used. Mr. Canada asked if there is a reason beside cost not to use hardiboard. Mr. Perlowski
451 stated the hardi plank is a concrete siding which is either primed or pre-painted which only
452 lasts eight years where the siding being proposed will last 30 years. Mr. Paine questioned if
453 the parking is based on zoning or space. Mr. Nichols stated zoning. Mr. Paine asked if there
454 is an ability to accommodating some of the numbers understanding the downstairs retail
455 would not be there after a certain hour. Mr. Baskerville asked the applicant to take another
456 look at Unit #2 to move it, turn it, etc.

457
458 Mr. Paine made a motion to continue the application to April 4, 2018 meeting unless an
459 extension is requested by the applicant. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried
460 unanimously.

461 **4. Adjournment.**

462
463
464 Mr. Paine made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 pm. Mr. Houghton seconded the
465 motion. Motion carried unanimously.