



**Stratham Technical Review Committee
Meeting Minutes
July 26, 2016
Municipal Center
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 6:00 PM**

Members Present: Lucy Cushman, Chair
Tom House, Vice Chair
Nate Merrill, Full Member
Joe Johnson, Full Member

Members Absent: Jeff Hyland, Full Member

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chair took roll call.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. June 28, 2016

Mr. Austin made a motion to approve the June 28, 2016 minutes. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Meeting

a. 34 Portsmouth Ave—Honda Barn—vehicle storage lot

Mr. Bruce Scamman, Emmanuel Engineering introduced himself as representing MEG Realty Trust. He explained that this application is for an expansion of their parking lot which is approximately 16,000 S.F. of new pavement. This expansion is located behind Citizens' Bank. It is a natural expansion of an existing use. They were before the Planning Board for a preliminary hearing in December 2015 which included 2 phases. Phase 2 related to sewer and water coming to Town. They have removed Phase 2 for now in light of the Town vote in March not being in favor of water and sewer.

The addition will be in porous pavement which is for the treatment of the water and its environmentally friendly nature versus run off. It will have a 40" depth with stone and drains underneath. Mr. Scamman handed out photographs showing the site from different perspectives to show the location of the extra pavement.

1 4 down facing L.E.D. lights have been proposed so there will not be any glare. Mr.
2 Scamman said there is a gas line that runs through the site which is from the 1950s. They
3 have met with Granite State Gas about that line and are working with them about the
4 parking lot. There is also a sewer line.

5 Mr. House questioned why the applicant was before the TRC if they had already been
6 before the Planning Board. Mr. Austin said they will start to look into the regulations
7 as this seems a little off. He explained to Mr. Scamman that any application in the
8 Gateway District needs to come before the TRC. Mr. Austin said the proposed parking
9 area not precluding any of the anticipated Gateway roads with the appropriate lighting is
10 largely Gateway compliant; what is missing is any interior landscaping. However, the
11 proposed expansion qualifies as an amendment to the existing site plan as it's less than
12 the 20% increase to the impervious surface of the site. Mr. Austin continued that even if
13 the parking lot was standard asphalt, the area in question is still less than 20% of the site,
14 so it can go through an amendment process rather than a full site plan review process.

15 Mr. House asked about part of the parking lot going over the existing septic system. Mr.
16 Scamman said they are building up to the slope, but not over it. Grading will be
17 necessary. Ms. Cushman said this is more in keeping with the Gateway in that it is
18 screened and porous pavement. Mr. Scamman added that this is not for display purposes
19 or for customers; it is for storage only so having landscaping within it doesn't make sense.
20 Mr. House asked about lighting. Mr. Scamman said they would be 20' mount height.
21 Mr. Johnson asked if they were matching current light fixtures. Mr. Scamman said they
22 were not. Mr. House asked if the lights would shine over onto the neighboring parking
23 lot. Mr. Scamman said they would not because they are L.E.D. Mr. Austin observed
24 there were trees and the elevation was low. Mr. House pointed out a break in the trees.
25 He also felt a little bit of landscaping would be nice, but he isn't concerned about things
26 like sidewalks. Mr. Johnson asked about the effectiveness of porous asphalt and asked
27 about using gravel as an alternative. Mr. Scamman said with gravel 89% of the
28 infiltration of water runs off. With porous pavement, it all goes through the surface and
29 sand where it is treated. Mr. Scamman said one of the possibilities is to connect into the
30 existing catch basin system to take the water all the way to the back of the lot where there
31 is a large treatment pond. They could still do that, but one of the things in the way is
32 the conflicts with the gas and sewer pipes. He feels this porous pavement is a better long
33 term solution knowing the planned future of the Gateway. If the pond is taken away in
34 the future, how would the water get treated if they went with the other suggestion? The
35 porous pavement suggestion also takes water away from the conservation easement.

36 Mr. Jeremy Riecks, resident commented on the lighting for the storage lot. He said 2 of
37 the lights have shields, but they have chosen the high output light level of 29, 070 lumens
38 which you would expect more in the front and not the storage area. There is one pole
39 that has 3 lights and one of them is angled and he would like some reassurance that will
40 not be used. Mr. Scamman said he had spoken with the lighting engineer to remove that,
41 so those will not be put back up. The triple head will be replaced with a double head.
42 Other changes have also been made which he will share with the Planning Board when
43 they are before the Board.

44 Mr. Austin made a motion that the proposed minor amendment to the existing site plan
45 for Honda Barn as illustrated with porous pavement given the multiple design aspects

1 including the porous pavement and the failed porous pavement element as it's located to
2 the side and rear of the existing facility toward the interior of the lot behind existing
3 landscaping without removal of any existing landscaping and without its preclusion or
4 prohibition of anticipated Gateway roads is Gateway compliant. Motion seconded by
5 Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

6

7

b. Review potential amendments to Gateway regulations

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

Mr. Austin said while reviewing this, he feels that there are 2 different kinds of check lists that could be put together; one would be like a scoring card system, the second one would take into account the fact the current Gateway/TRC language is tantamount to a preliminary consultation. The issue at hand is that when a preliminary consultation goes before the Planning Board it protects that application for a year from any potential detrimental zoning changes. Mr. Austin doesn't know if a TRC meeting is noticed in accordance with the abutter notification if it would qualify in the same way under a R.S.A. Having said that, it is clear that TRC is intended to be used as a stepping stone to go directly to the Planning Board public hearing for site plan review. Mr. Austin took the current site plan review checklist and turned it into a version for TRC. Functionally if the ordinance is followed, once the TRC says a site plan application is Gateway compliant, the completed site plan review application can move onto the Planning Board for a public hearing. The problem is the amount of work and expense that goes into an application especially for an applicant who just wants to get an idea of the TRC's thoughts. Mr. Austin suggested the TRC gets some feedback from the Planning Board on this issue. He informed the TRC that he got the impression from the Planning Board that they are happy dealing with the technical issues such as drainage, lighting and topography and feel the TRC are helpful with site layout, architecture and whether or not they feel an application is Gateway compliant. Next Mr. Austin talked about waivers; the Planning Board can grant them as part of the site plan review process. The waiver equivalent in Gateway is to get a conditional use permit (CUP) for a deviation, however a CUP is something you are allowed with conditions, but a waiver is different from that. In summary, Mr. Austin said he wants to see if TRC can be the functional equivalent through an appropriate amendment of preliminary consultation. This way a fee can be charged and the applicant can go straight to full site plan review with the Planning Board.

Mr. Johnson asked about the current process of a preliminary consultation with the Planning Board. Mr. Austin explained it is a non-binding discussion between an applicant and the Board. The applicant will take the plans away and make any pertinent alterations from the discussion. This could raise an issue if the TRC did the equivalent for a Gateway project in so much that they could agree an application is Gateway compliant, but the applicant could go away and change the plans so they are not the same plans they bring before the Planning Board for a site plan review.

The committee discussed the language put forward by Mr. Austin including changes to the review process. There was discussion around waivers versus conditional use permits and if either are granted, should the applicant be expected to give something in return for the granting of either.

Mr. Nate Merrill arrived at 7:01 pm

1 The Board updated Mr. Merrill on the Honda Barn application and the suggested
2 revisions to the regulations so far.

3 Ms. Cushman said her perception is that a conditional use permit is more of a give and
4 take regulation whereas a waiver is easier to get approved.

5 Ms. Cushman confirmed that there would be a regular TRC meeting the last Tuesday of
6 every month at 6:00 pm. She suggested they meet on August 30 at 6:00 pm whether they
7 have an application or not to discuss the suggested changes made by Mr. Austin and in
8 the meanwhile that gives the committee time to review those changes. Mr. Merrill asked
9 if they could meet at 7:00 pm as he has another meeting he attends at the same time every
10 month. He wondered if they could meet on another Tuesday. Ms. Cushman observed
11 that the 30th was the 5th Tuesday so suggested they go ahead with that and then look at
12 the schedule going forward from then. Mr. Austin said he would check the overall
13 meeting schedule for other committees and boards.

14 Mr. House requested Mr. Austin send the suggested revisions to Jeff Hyland for his
15 comments.

16 **4. Miscellaneous**

17 Mr. Merrill said he had visited the Subaru site and had some comments and questions
18 like the chain link fencing being black rather than shiny.

19 Mr. Austin said there are elements on the site that are not consistent with the approved
20 plan and a lot of those changes were landscaping ones.

21

22 **5. Adjournment.**

23 Mr. House made a motion to adjourn at 7:25 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Merrill.
24 Motion carried unanimously.