SOMERSWORTH PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF MEETING June 19, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ron LeHoullier, Chair, Harold Guptill, Vice Chair, Bob Belmore, City Manager, Paul Robidas, Chris Horton, Kenneth S. Vincent Council Rep. Alternate, Jason Barry, Alternate
MEMBERS ABSENT:	David Witham, City Council Representative, Jeremy Rhodes, Jameson Small

STAFF PRESENT: Shanna B. Saunders, Director Development Services

The Meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

LeHoullier appointed Barry as a full voting member for the meeting.

1) <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u>

Motion: Horton MOVED to approve the minutes of the May 15, 2019 meeting.

Seconded by Guptill.

The MOTION CARRIED with a vote of 4-0-2 (Robidas and Belmore abstained)

2) <u>COMMITTEE REPORTS</u>

Land Use Board Reports (ZBA, HDC, Conservation Commission, SRTC) LeHoullier stated the reports are in the board's packet if they have additional comments to add. No additional comments.

<u>City Council Report</u> Vincent stated he had nothing to report.

<u>Minor Field Modifications Report</u> LeHoullier stated the summary is in the packet.

<u>Strafford Regional Planning Commission Update</u> LeHoullier stated the board continues to receive the updates, no additional comments.

<u>Vision 2020 Report</u> Saunders stated she had nothing to report.

3) OLD BUSINESS

No old business before the board.

3) <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

A) 100 Tri city Road LLC is seeking site plan and conditional use approval, with waivers to convert the existing structure into 20 condominium units for business use of various sizes ranging from 1,674 SF to 6,770 SF on property located at <u>100 Tri City Road</u>, in the Business (B) District, <u>Assessor's Map 39 Lot 01, SITE#04-2019 and CUP#01-2019</u> PUBLIC HEARING

Saunders stated in addition to her memo that the board received in their packets, the applicant has changed the request from a condominium site plan to a rental site plan. She stated therefore this is just a site plan approval and not a subdivision into condominiums approval. She noted there will be one owner who will rent the units.

Saunders stated the proposed project required a Conditional Use Permit for the small incursions into the 100' wetland buffer. The Conservation Commission reviewed the CUP and that application has been provided in the Board's packet. She noted the board also received tonight the Con. Com's recommendation form which references the minutes and is explained more in the memo. The Con. Com. recommended approval with four conditions that were as follows:

- 1. Look at adding grasses and/or flowers in areas of proposed swale that is within the buffer. The purpose is to provide functional plantings that provide enhanced habitat.
- 2. There is some washout and erosion on the southeast corner of site, please restore and loam and seed to prevent further sedimentation into the wetland.
- 3. There is Honey Locust proposed on the site. This is a NH invasive species. Please review the overall site landscape plan and change plantings to be per approved native list, Exhibit B, in City Site Plan Regulations.
- 4. Please add labels for proposed plantings at rear of property.

Saunders stated the applicant has submitted several waiver requests and will let the applicant explain those. She stated for the most part she recommends those be granted. In regards to the parking space waiver, there is not a lot of parking spaces being proposed even though there is a lot of pavement on site. She explained the proposed parking is sufficient for the intended use. She noted that in the additional conditions memo provided to the Board, they want to ensure this site does not begin to include the storage of materials or vehicles in the large pavement area. Saunders stated they think the waiver is fine as long as there is the condition the extra pavement space is not used for outdoor storage moving forward.

Applicant submitted a new map to the board. Belmore questioned what the difference was from what was provided in their packets. Chris Rice stated there was a snow storage area that was amended.

Saunders stated the following are the plan changes that had been requested of the applicant:

- 1. Additional architectural elements such as different color or material schemes to break up the large expanse of building per site plan regulation 11.7.b.ii.
- 2. Add a note to the plan that any rooftop mechanical units must be screened from view per site plan regulation 11.7.b.viii;
- 3. The rest being the changes that were requested by the Conservation Commission.

Saunders reviewed the proposed conditions that must be met prior to final approval. She noted they are the standard conditions enforced by the City.

Saunders reviewed the conditions to be completed prior to the start of work and conditions applicable during and after construction. She noted that there are a few additional ones than the typical, which are as follows:

- 1. The building is not currently proposed to be fire rated as a parking garage. Please be savvy to the number of vehicles parked inside the building so that does not become an issue.
- 2. Prior to CO's the offsite improvements to Tri City Road that were part of the Tara Fields/Tri City Road/Flatley approval in January 2019 and shown on the Key Auto Group site plans, case #11-2014 shall be constructed and Flatley shall have received a 50% contribution toward those costs from 100 Tri City Road LLC. The City shall collect that 50% share from 100 Tri City Road LLC or its successor prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy for the 100 Tri City Road LLC property, and shall pay that amount to Flatley as a capital cost recovery; looking at the condition of approval today agree that there needs to be a cost sharing, recommend the last sentence be struck, cost sharing agreement but the City will not collect the money, proof of the payment needs to be submitted prior to CO

Saunders explained the second condition has to do with the connection of this property long ago to the Tara Fields (Flatley) approval in 2014. She stated at that time this property was proposed to be a Key Auto detailing center. This property and the Tara Field's property were being reviewed at the same time and the Planning Board required the two entities to work together for offsite improvements on Tri City Road. She further explained there was a cost sharing

agreement at that time. She stated looking at the condition of approval today we agree that it does need to be cost sharing but not that the City needs to be the fiduciary mediator. She recommended the last sentence be struck and that there shall still be a cost sharing agreement but the City will not collect the money. She explained proof of the payment will need to be submitted to the City prior to the Certificate of Occupancy being issued.

Saunders stated the last thing is regarding third party reviews, the SRTC considered having the stormwater reviewed but there is so little changed to the site it did not make sense to do so. She added if anything the applicant is improving stormwater. She stated the traffic study that was submitted was very similar to what was submitted in 2014 and SRTC wanted a second pair of eyes on that to ensure it is accurate for today's count. Horsley Whitten has provided an estimate for that and it would be \$3,600, if the board is favorable to having the review the condition would need to be added.

LeHoullier opened the public hearing.

<u>Applicant statement:</u> Chris Rice of TF Moran, John Tuttle Architect of the project and Steve Pernaw Traffic Engineer, were in attendance on behalf of 100 Tri City Road LLC.

Rice summarized the characteristics of the project and property. He stated the lot is approximately 5 acres, there is an existing vacant 56,600 SF building. He stated the site is serviced by municipal sewer and water. He stated they have video'd the sewer lines and found them to be in good shape. He noted they would be cleaned as part of this project. The building has an existing sprinkler system and per the Fire Department a company will be involved during the project to ensure the sprinklers are code compliant.

Rice reviewed the project from the stormwater perspective. He stated that 80% of the site drains to the existing wetlands with about 20% draining into the City drainage system.

Rice stated the proposal is to remodel the building and convert it into 20 rental units. The units will range in size from 1,674 SF to 6,770 SF and will each have a mandoor and bay door. The proposal includes 60 parking spaces to accommodate the 20 units. He stated all site utilities will remain on the property with the exception relocation of two existing light poles. He stated all of the site lighting fixtures are being replaced to LED and compliant to the City's regulations (lighting plan provided).

Rice stated there are 4 existing curb cuts along Tri City Road and with this project it will be reduced down to 3 curb cuts. He stated they were required to submit a Conditional Use permit for removal of pavement in the 100' and 50' buffers. He stated approximately 7,100 SF existing pavement within the 100' buffer is being removed and 60 SF existing pavement in the 50' buffer being removed. Rice noted that approximately 5,000 SF of misc. pavement will be removed elsewhere on the site. The total removal of pavement is 12,100 SF and will be restored to vegetative state. He noted they did receive favorable recommendation from the Conservation Commission.

Rice stated an updated traffic memo was provided in the application. He stated they are agreeable to having it reviewed by a third party. He explained the traffic memo showed four main conclusions and findings:

- 1. The traffic counts from March 2019 of the High St./Tri City Road intersection have stayed similar to the September 2014 counts. The highest period is the weekday PM peak in the hours between 4:30 and 5:30. The 2019 numbers showed there were 2,237 vehicles and the 2014 numbers showed 2,296 vehicles.
- 2. The proposed plan generates approximately 112 vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak. 36 arriving and 76 departing. It is comparable to the previous development that had 105 trips.
- 3. The 2014 existing traffic volumes at the High St./ Tri City intersection from the prior study satisfy the NCHRP guidelines by providing two approach lanes on the Tri City approach to High Street. This finding does not change with the 2019 volume data.
- 4. A traffic signal was not warranted.

Rice stated there is an off-site improvement that is proposed with this project, his client has spoken with the Tara Fields developer. The agreement is that they will split the cost (50/50) of the improvement. He stated his understanding is that the Tara Fieldss development will do the work and this applicant will reimburse them.

Rice reviewed the Storrmwater improvements with the board. He stated they will be adding a berm where the pavement is being removed. Two sediment forbays will be provided for the 80% of runoff that moves that way. Rice stated all of the comments by the Conservation Commission have been addressed in the most recent submission of plans.

Rice reviewed the waivers that were being requested. The tree inventory greater than 12 inches waiver had to do with the CUP, they did not see benefit going out to measure the existing trees in the buffer because they are not taking anything down. The second waiver is the Class A Buffer Yard, there is a requirement for a 50' buffer but the site already has pavement that goes to the property line but they are removing 23' of pavement in that area but will still have some existing pavement. The third waiver is for the number of parking spaces, the City Regulations require 227 parking spaces for this building. This building has 20 rental spaces and provided 60 parking spaces on site allowing 3 per unit. Feel that is more than adequate and intend for the units to have one vehicle off and on. There is additional pavement areas on site if more parking is needed but trying to leave the area open for tractor trailer movement. The next waiver is for mitigation for impact of parking landscape islands: shade trees, etc. this is an existing site with existing pavement, and plantings have been increased around the perimeter. He stated there are 16 new trees and 36 new shrubs. The last waiver is from the Stormwater Regulations; they are improving 80% of the site. He stated there are two existing islands that had to be removed to help with the 30' fire access. The Stormwater Flow did increase by a small amount the run off into City infrastructure.

Rice reviewed the architectural aspects of the building. He presented the new plan for the board that includes a color band around the building as requested. Existing building is a brick building, there will be new metal siding in the front of the building. Granite curbing has been added, notes on the site plan for no outdoor vehicle storage or washing. Each tenant is required to have their own Certificate of Occupancy, they are removing the existing chain link fence, increased striped parking on site, the dumpsters have been moved to the rear of the building, added a bike rack and revised the plantings and grasses.

LeHoullier asked for any comments from the public. No public comments. LeHoullier closed the public hearing.

Motion: Belmore MOVED to accept the application as complete.

The motion was seconded by Robidas.

The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Board Discussion:

Vincent stated he is very familiar with the building and asked if this was all one story. Rice stated there is an existing mezzanine that is being removed in the proposed to make it one story. Vincent stated there are no windows, understands codes and sprinkler systems but the garage doors are going to stay and asked if vehicles will pull into the garage. Rice stated they have the ability to pull in it will depend on the user. He explained the tenants could be a variety of users like HVAC contractor or painter that keeps supplies on site. Rice stated some units may have vehicles that are kept there or used for storage that the tenant visits weekly to get the supplies.

Vincent asked for a point of clarification on the use of the building. Saunders stated they are rental units, commercial rental units.

Saunders noted the packets contain the 11x17 plans but if anyone would like to view the large plan sets those are available.

Robidas stated he is part of the SRTC and the applicant has done a fantastic job. He questioned if the lot will be overlaid with new pavement since the pavement is in rough state. Rice stated they are not sure, the plans call for the broken pavement areas to be seal coated and restriped. Rice explained the final budget numbers will control that if there is enough to overlay they will. Robidas stated there are some large cracks in the pavement and felt some would not be able to be filled. Rice stated it could be that once work starts they will find they have to do the overlay. Robidas

stated his concern is they have put together a great project and done all the City has asked but the parking lot is a mess.

Saunders stated that site plan requires it be initially paved and striped but no language on paving once it is down. She noted it could be addressed in property maintenance but would have to look at the language. Rice stated it might be something that they do but cannot speak for the applicant on this matter.

LeHoullier asked if there was a timeline for the completion of the project. John Tuttle of TW Designs stated the project will take about 7 to 8 months to complete. Saunders questioned when the project would start. Tuttle stated he did not know a date. Rice stated they would follow up with the department with that information and likely wait until the appeal period was over.

LeHoullier questioned Director Saunders if this would conflict with the original proposals by Tara Fields and Key Auto and what was decided at those meetings. Saunders stated this would act to revoke the Key Auto plans, which have expired. She stated the only condition that overlaps is proposed condition 4G. Saunders stated the Tara Fields project has a similar condition and tried to mimic that condition to this project but to take the City out of it in the last sentence. She stated the offsite improvements were approved as part of the Tara Fields and this cites it and states this applicant is responsible for 50% of the cost.

Guptill noted it has been stated that Tara Field is before this project but wants to ensure that whichever project requests the CO first that the improvements are done. Saunders stated it can be a condition of approval but it will be a tossup of who completes their project first. She has not seen indication the off-site improvements will not be completed. She stated there is a value to keep them separate. Saunders stated the CO will not be issued until this project proves they've paid their half. She believes the applicant if they have paid their half will ensure the improvements are done by Flatley Company.

Guptill noted the proposed parking is quite a bit less than what the regulations require. Saunders replied this was discussed during STRC and if the intended use is as suggested it is really small service business owners. Saunders stated they've seen this before and it is only one or two cars and is mostly off site storage for these businesses. She noted the City will need to keep an eye on the parcel because the units cannot be the type of business that requires a lot of storage or parking of vehicles. She stated it was not part of the proposal to have that and if that develops the applicant will need to come back before the board. She directed the board to condition 1G which addresses the matter. Rice stated the note was already added to the plan and explained they could add additional parking but would like to keep the area open for the large vehicles. Saunders noted part of the benefit is that the pavement exists and by striping fewer spots encourages the types of uses they are looking for.

Belmore stated in the condition for third party review of the traffic study it states the applicant needs to 'incorporate any proposed changes, including any offsite improvements into the final plan set.' He questioned what those changes would be and why the board would approve this proposal not knowing if there were additional offsite improvements needed. He stated he was concerned with the board approving something without knowing the additional offsite improvements recommended. Saunders stated they often do the same with stormwater. She stated she is not anticipating it to be the case and could amend it if there are significant changes for offsite improvement to require the applicant to come back before the board. Belmore stated he was comfortable with stormwater things moving forward without him looking at it again but not comfortable with offsite improvements regarding traffic flow without the chance to review and discuss. Saunders stated they could amend the condition to include any significant changes the applicant would need to come back before the board. Belmore stated any changes to the site or for offsite improvements to require the applicant to come back before the board. Belmore stated any changes to the site or for offsite improvements to require the applicant to come back before the board. Belmore stated any changes to the site or for offsite improvements to require the applicant to come back before the board.

Robidas questioned if then the board should table the application for the traffic study review to be done.

Horton questioned if the third party review of the traffic study was warranted and what has changed in that area in the past five years. He stated the data showed the traffic has stayed consistent and only minor changes could warrant the review. He felt the review was not necessary.

LeHoullier asked how the 144 new units at Tara Fields will affect future impact or is it considered in this study. Saunders stated Tara Fields also did a traffic study and the growth impact from that is why the offsite improvements are being done. She stated this study does account for the Tara Fields numbers and it does not warrant a light signal.

Guptill stated the studies being used are for the larger project. Saunders clarified that two different studies were done. She stated the SRTC wanted to ensure the numbers were accurate since they were so similar to the 2014 numbers.

Rice stated the traffic study showed the peak hour had 76-77 exiting trips from this development and that is based on the ITE manual for this type of use. He stated for rental building like this to have 76 vehicles leaving in one hour is very conservative and does not think they will have 76 leaving all day.

Saunders recommended if the board wanted to amend the condition it could state '... returned to you). Any proposed changes (including any offsite improvements) to the final plan set shall be a site plan amendment and the applicant must return to the Planning Board.' Robidas stated he would be comfortable with that.

Belmore stated he was still hung up on the idea and is ok with the condition. He stated he is considering the money would be better spent on updating the parking lot. Belmore questioned what kind of offsite improvement would even be recommended.

Rice questioned if the board would like to hear from the traffic consultant who was in attendance.

Robidas stated the data is the data. He asked if Belmore was thinking the third party review was not needed. Saunders stated it is to confirm the numbers are correct for the use proposed.

Vincent stated he felt the applicant should put money into the parking lot especially with all the work being done to improve the building.

Horton stated he is leaning towards not requiring the study and allowing the applicant to invest the money in others ways for the project. Guptill agreed to that.

Saunders reviewed the conditions of approval as provided in her memo.

MOTION: Belmore motions to approve the Conditional Use Permit (CUP#01-2019) for the project with the conditions that the Conservation Commission recommended from the May 16, 2019 memo issued by Director Saunders to 100 Tri City Road LLC. Robidas seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Waiver Motions:

Tree Inventory Waiver Motion: Robidas, I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC for a waiver from Section 22A.9.1.p of the Site Plan Review Regulations regarding tree inventory greater than 12" be APPROVED. Guptill seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Class A bufferyard Waiver Motion: Belmore, I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC for a waiver from Section 22A.11.6.d.viii of the Site Plan Review Regulations regarding Class A bufferyard be APPROVED Barry seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Required parking spaces Waiver Motion: Belmore I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC for a waiver from Section 22A: Exhibit A of the Site Plan Review Regulations regarding required parking spaces be APPROVED Robidas seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Mitigation for impact of parking Waiver Motion: Horton, I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC for a waiver from Section 22.A.4.b.viii of the Site Plan Review Regulations regarding Mitigation for impact of parking be APPROVED.

Guptill seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

1.

LID Stormwater Regs Waiver Motion: Robidas, I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC for a waiver from Section 22A.11.17.a of the Site Plan Review Regulations regarding LID Stormwater Regs be APPROVED Guptill seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIED by a 7-0 vote.

Motion: Guptill, I move that the request of 100 Tri City Road LLC to convert the existing structure into 20 units for business use of various sizes ranging from 1,674 SF to 6,770 SF be APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS and those conditions to include from the supplemental memo 1G and not include 2D (traffic study requirement)

- PLAN CHANGES
 - a. Please provide additional architectural elements such as different color or material schemes to break up the large expanse of building per site plan regulation 11.7.b.ii.
 - b. Please add a note to the plan that any rooftop mechanical units must be screened from view per site plan regulation 11.7.b.viii;
 - c. Please add grasses and/or flowers in area of proposed swale that is within the buffer. The purpose is to provide functional plantings that provide enhanced habitat.
 - d. There is some washout and erosion on the southeast corner of site, please restore and loam and seed to prevent further sedimentation into the wetland. Please add to plan.
 - e. There is Honey Locust proposed on the site. This is a NH invasive species. Please review the overall site landscape plan and change plantings to be per approved native list, Exhibit B, in City Site Plan Regulations.
 - f. Please add labels for proposed plantings at rear of property.
 - g. Outdoor storage and parking and transfer of commercial vehicles was not requested as part of this site plan and has not been designed for. This use is not allowed on site unless site plan amendments and variances are sought. Please add a note to the plan to reflect this.

2. CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL:

- a. Construction Cost estimate for this project shall be submitted to the Development Services Department; and,
- b. The final plans shall bear the stamp and signature of the engineer, licensed land surveyor, and the landscape architect. Please submit five folded 24" x 36" paper copies of the full set of plans to the Development Services Department for final endorsement.
- c. The site is required to have a new backflow device and needs a permit from the Water and Sewer Billing Office. The device(s) will be tested twice annually as part of the City's Cross Connection Control Program. Because of the change of use the owner will have to apply for water and sewer service at the City's Water and Sewer Billing Office.

3. CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE START OF SITE WORK:

- a. A preconstruction meeting is required prior to the start of work. Please contact the Development Services Department to schedule this at least 1 week prior to breaking ground;
- b. An escrow account, in an amount set by the City's Engineer and agreeable to the Development Services Department, will be established for site construction inspections prior to any site work;
- c. A performance surety, in an amount agreeable to the Development Services Department, but no less than 25% of the cost of site construction determined by the engineer's estimate of construction value, will be established for on-site erosion control and site restoration prior to any site work. If all site work is completed as proposed this account will be refunded;
- d. The applicant will be required to pay standard water and sewer connection fees assessed on new properties connecting to the water and sewer system. Water fees will be based on the size of water meter needed and the sewer connection fees will be based on estimate of water used and equivalent number of bedrooms;
- e. Erosion control shall be properly installed on site PRIOR to any construction. Erosion control shall be properly maintained throughout construction; any breaks or breeches shall be repaired within 48 hours of the storm event;
- f. A Somersworth Driveway permit must be obtained prior to building permit approval;

- 4. CONDITIONS APPLICABLE DURING AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION:
 - a. The building is not currently proposed to be fire rated as a parking garage. Please be savvy to the number of vehicles parked inside the building so that does not become an issue.
 - b. There shall be no wetlands degradation during construction;
 - c. Stormwater infrastructure including swales shall be inspected and cleaned no less than once a year. A copy of the completed Stormwater Inspection & Maintenance Log shall be provided to the Development Services Department annually on or before January 1st. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval and noted on the final plans;
 - d. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be replaced in a timely manner as long as this site plan remains valid;
 - e. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and roadways; and,
 - f. The new drainage infrastructure must be constructed prior to construction of the new building and associated parking. If the infrastructure is used as a temporary settling area during construction, the infrastructure shall be cleaned out and brought down to proposed bottom elevation prior to Certificate of Occupancy (CO) of new building.
 - g. Prior to CO's the offsite improvements to Tri City Road that were part of the Tara Fields/Tri City Road/Flatley approval in January 2019 and shown on the Key Auto Group site plans, case #11-2014 shall be constructed and Flatley shall have received a 50% contribution toward those costs from 100 Tri City Road LLC. The City shall collect that 50% share from 100 Tri City Road LLC or its successor prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy for the 100 Tri City Road LLC property, and shall pay that amount to Flatley as a capital cost recovery. The City shall receive proof from 100 Tri City Road LLC that the 50% contribution was paid prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy for the 100 Tri City Road LLC property.
- 5. AS-BUILT PLANS.
 - a. Within thirty days of the completion of the project and prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit an electronic As-Built Plan of the proposed development with details acceptable to the Development Services Department shall be provided on paper and on CD prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates.

Horton seconded the motion.

Discussion: Horton stated he thinks they need to amend remove last sentence of 4G. Saunders stated it should be to reword it as "The City shall require proof from 100 Tri City Road LLC that a 50% contribution paid prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for 100 Tri City Road"

Guptill stated he agreed to that amendment of his motion. Horton seconded the amended motion.

The **MOTION CARRIED** by a 7-0 vote.

Rice asked with the change to remove the traffic study requirement if the applicant is required to overlay the entire parking lot with those funds instead. Robidas stated the applicant knows the wish of the board and that they have a nice looking project and it would be a benefit for the paving to also reflect that.

Horton requested to be excused. LeHoullier excused Horton.

B) <u>Site Plan Regulations amendment; Chapter 22A, Section 11.4, Vehicular Circulation and Parking</u>. – to incorporate the Downtown Special Parking District into the regulations and to move the Historic Millyard criteria from the Zoning Ordinance to the Regulations. –PUBLIC HEARING</u>

Saunders stated this is a public hearing to make a change to the Site Plan Regulations. She explained the decisions that have already been completed. The special parking overlay district is being acted upon by the Council now to set up the

overlay district. The Planning Board will establish the rules and regulations that apply to that overlay district. She stated with that District those parcels would be exempt from off-street parking regulations because public parking is provided.

Saunders explained that Section II was struck out because it is later addressed in the regulations. The Historic Millyard has been put back into the regulations and requires 1.5 parking spaces per residential dwelling unit. She stated that District has room for parking onsite.

Saunders explained the tiered parking requirements. She stated the non-residential parking requirements already exists and for residential downtown would require no onsite parking, Millyard would require 1.5 parking spaces and everything else requires 2 spaces.

LeHoullier asked if the Northern most property includes the Bretton Cleaners on Winter St. Saunders stated that would be included in the overlay district and would be exempt.

Robidas stated for in the core it was said there are plenty of parking spaces for apartments. Saunders clarified for uses, the apartments would be second and maybe third above commercial uses. Robidas questioned what affect that would have on the downtown and clogging up spaces. Saunders stated the thought is the businesses will utilize the parking during the day into the evening and the residential will use it for overnight. Robidas questioned if the parking time limit would stay in effect. Saunders stated yes for now.

LeHoullier stated an example is the old Robert shoe; parking goes that way during the day.

Vincent stated to not forget the additional parking that has been added. Saunders stated that may have been discussed during the plaza project. Robidas stated there is a lot of parking on Main Street.

Saunders stated tonight is the public hearing. She stated the board can vote on the matter tonight or table for more review.

LeHoullier opened the public hearing. No comment. LeHoullier closed the public hearing.

Belmore MOTION TO APPROVE the Site Plan Amend of Chapter 22A Section 11.4, Vehicular Circulation and Parking to incorporate the Downtown Special Parking District into the regulations and to move the Historic Millyard criteria from the Zoning Ordinance to the Regulations.

Robidas seconded the motion. The MOTION CARRIES by a 6-0 vote.

5) WORKSHOP BUSINESS

A) Election of Officers

Belmore nominates LeHoullier for chairman, Guptill seconds, the MOTION CARRIES by a 5-0-1 (LeHoullier abstained) Belmore nominates Guptill, Robidas seconds, Guptill accepts, the MOTION CARRIES 5-0-1 (Guptill abstained).

B) Any workshop business that may come before the Board.a. None

6) <u>COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS</u>

LeHoullier stated he came to the Zoning Board meeting for a fence item, discussed the frontage. He questioned if they could look into the wording for rear yards to be used as rear yards even if it has frontage. Saunders explained the thought process behind the ordinance. LeHoullier stated to him there should be some privacy on the rear yard. Saunders stated they can take a look at that and PB would make recommendations to council for the change.

Belmore stated that they are going through the Form Based Code Review. He stated there is the Visual Preference Survey that is available in City Hall or on the website to take. He encouraged everyone to take the survey.

Motion: Robidas MOVED to ADJOURN the meeting. Belmore seconded the motion The MOTION CARRIED by a 5-0 vote. The meeting ADJOURNED at 7:38 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dana Crossley Planning Secretary