



1
2
3
4
5 **Stratham Technical Review Committee**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **June 28, 2016**
8 **Municipal Center**
9 **10 Bunker Hill Avenue**
10 **Time: 6:00 PM**
11

12
13 **Members Present:** Lucy Cushman, Chair
14 Joe Johnson, Full Member
15 Nate Merrill, Full Member
16

17 **Members Absent:** Tom House, Vice Chair
18 Jeff Hyland, Full Member
19

20 **Staff Present:** Tavis Austin, Town Planner
21

22 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

23 Ms. Cushman took roll call.

24 **2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes**

25 a. May 31, 2016

26 Mr. Austin made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion seconded by
27 Mr. Johnson. Motion carried unanimously.

28 **2. Public Meeting**

29 a. 60 Portsmouth Ave—Porsche of Stratham—Building renovations and façade changes

30 Wayne Morrill, Jones and Beach Engineers introduced himself as well as Scott Laffey
31 from ICL Autos and Patrick Finn from Landry Architects.

32 Mr. Morrill explained that they have reduced the scope of the work since they originally
33 came before this Board. The building expansion is less than 20%, which is less than
34 1,000 S.F. The leach field does not need to be changed with this proposal. Landscaping
35 has been added to the plan including street trees and the access road that is on Audi's
36 property.

37 The addition is for the customer drop off area and there is a bump out in the back that
38 allows the garage areas. One door does face Portsmouth Avenue which will be
39 architecturally pleasing. From the front the addition projects from the front by about 18'
40 to the right and it will be set back about the same distance to allow for the drop off and
41 pick up for customers. Most of the doors at the rear face the drainage and on the side
42 there are 2 windows similar to the glass out front. Overall, they are trying to be more

1 conforming and as such are trying to get lighter colored materials for a more colonial
2 look. They are proposing to use the clapboard previously approved by the Board which
3 is textured grain, hardy clapboards. They will clad the addition with that as well as the
4 front lower and upper areas and a portion of the side and some of the rear. The addition
5 on the side and rear is 987 S.F. Most of the work will be internal.

6 Mr. Austin commended the applicant for choosing the hardy board siding recommended
7 by TRC and for reducing the overall size of the addition while incorporating the corporate
8 need. There is little that Porsche can do aside from tearing down the building and starting
9 again to meet the Gateway regulations.

10 Mr. Austin made a motion that this is not Gateway compliant and he recommends the
11 applicant proceeds to the Planning Board with this plan submitted with the street trees
12 with the understanding that all of the conditional use permit requirements be satisfied in
13 such an application.

14 Mr. Merrill said it would be nice to have decorative street lights and sidewalk at least on
15 the driveway side for future connectivity with other redevelopment in that area. Mr.
16 Merrill referred to the siding and said on the diagram there is gray on the old part and
17 black on the new part. Mr. Landry explained that was a way to show the old and new
18 building for clarification on the plans. Ultimately it will all blend in with the rear being
19 painted the same color as the siding.

20 Mr. Merrill asked if this version of the plan satisfies ICL Autos. Mr. Laffey said it's a
21 phasing plan because they don't know what the manufacturer will require 5 or 10 years
22 from now. Mr. Merrill said he was impressed with what they had managed to come up
23 with. Even though it's not a Gateway building, it has minimal impact.

24 Ms. Cushman observed that considering all the iterations of this application which have
25 come before them, this is a nice modification to meet half way. She wished them good
26 luck with the garage facing the side road.

27 Mr. Austin said that Mr. Hyland wasn't there tonight as he is engaged on this project.

28 Mr. Merrill seconded the motion made by Mr. Austin. Motion carried unanimously.

29 **3. Miscellaneous**

30 Mr. Austin said he would like to have a regular meeting of the TRC from this point forward
31 with the concept that the Planning Board has asked him to rewrite the Gateway part of the
32 ordinance to clarify more the role of the TRC. The TRC then had a general discussion about
33 Gateway. Mr. Merrill felt the TRC was valuable as they are more familiar with the Gateway
34 regulations and as such they streamline the process. Ms. Cushman asked if they should
35 provide a list of reasons why an application isn't considered Gateway compliant going
36 forward. Mr. Merrill said at least one Planning Board member has made that request. Mr.
37 Austin said he'd be happy to assist with that, but the list could be long. Ms. Cushman said
38 they could just mention the obvious things. Mr. Merrill suggested that list could be used as
39 a negotiation tool also.

40 Mr. Merrill made a motion to ask Mr. Austin, Town Planner to create a list that can be used
41 on this project and future projects to streamline the process and improve communication
42 between TRC and the Planning Board highlighting areas where applicants are not currently

1 meeting Gateway code and also when Gateway codes have been accommodated. Motion
2 seconded by Mr. Johnson. Motion carried unanimously.

3 Mr. Johnson said it would be helpful for the applicants too if they were provided with a copy
4 of the checklist.

5 The Committee discussed the fact that applicants shouldn't have to spend too much money
6 on engineered plans just in case they don't even begin to comply with the Gateway; the
7 Committee could send them away with a list of things that should be added to the plans, but
8 after an initial discussion.

9 Mr. Johnson wondered if there was some kind of mechanism that allowed applicants to
10 contribute money to a fund for sidewalks so when the time is right, the sidewalks can be put
11 in. Mr. Austin said there is something that exists, but if the money isn't used within 6 years,
12 it gets returned to the contributor, so it might make more sense if the sidewalk was imminent.
13 Mr. Merrill and Ms. Cushman agreed that at the very least it would be good if the applicant
14 put a proposed sidewalk site on their plans.

15 **4. Adjournment.**

16 Mr. Merrill made a motion to adjourn at 6:36 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Austin. Motion
17 carried unanimously.