

PRESENT: Bayard; Brothers; Dever; Touhey; Lapham, Alternate; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Adm. Asst.,

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 22, 2011, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

### ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Touhey nominated the following slate of officers:

William Bayard, Chairman  
Roger Sorell, Vice-Chairman  
John Dever, III, Secretary  
Voted Unanimously.

### APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC** – Architectural Design Review of proposed alterations to an existing commercial building, Tax Map U10, Lot 34B, located at 351 Daniel Webster Highway in the CB District.

LaBrecque – This is the Architectural Design Review application for acceptance only so the elevations, application and abutter list are on file and fees have been paid. It's recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING AND THAT WILL BE DONE JOINTLY WITH THE SITE PLAN THAT WE ACCEPTED AT THE FEBRUARY 22, MEETING. Voted unanimously.

2. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment to construct two new buildings housing 13 hotel rooms, pool and public space, plus a covered walkway, Tax Map U06, Lots 147 & 149 located on D.W. Highway and Lakeshore Drive in the CB District.
3. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS** – Architectural Design Review of two new commercial buildings, Tax Map U06, Lots 147 & 149 located on D.W. Highway and Lakeshore Drive in the CB District.

LaBrecque – I would just note this is Phase 2 of the Church Landing Site Plan Amendment to a previously approved site plan. The plan architectural elevations, checklist and abutters list are on file. Application fee and technical review fees have been paid. It is recommended that both applications be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

**NOTE:** A public hearing may be held this evening on the above application submissions indicated by an (\*) should the Board accept the submission as complete.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC** – (Carl Johnson, Rep.) Continuation of a Public Hearing held on February 22, 2011, for a proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use from a bowling alley to a retail store, Tax Map U10, Lot 34B, located at 351 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District. Application accepted 2/22/11.
2. **JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC** – Architectural Design Review of proposed alterations to an existing commercial building, Tax Map U10, Lot 34B, located at 351 Daniel Webster Highway in the CB District.

Carl Johnson – A public hearing was held at the last meeting for Site Plan Review regarding the former bowling alley located on Route 3 in the Central Business District. Subsequent to that hearing which was continued, we filed the Architectural Design Review for the same building so you will be entertaining both applications in a single presentation. The last time we pretty much went over the site plan issues and the primary area of concern was the front of the building. A note on the previous plan mentioned a loading dock and we had some discussion that there wasn't actually going to be a dock as such and the deliveries would be made at grade through a single delivery door at grade. Merchandise would be unloaded off the truck and would enter through that single door. This is not the main entrance to the building. The main entrance door is going to be located on the south side of the building. I believe that area of concern has been alleviated by removing the note and seeing the elevation drawing identifying where that door would be. As a result of that, we've also extended the landscaping to come up to that delivery area door. Right now the landscaping essentially ends where the original doors were and its going to be covered with the same siding as the building is now. There is a single cutoff light fixture proposed for the door and in the packet is an illustration of the downward shining cutoff fixture for that location. To the north is the area for employee parking and the screened dumpsters. As you can also see in the packet, there is a view looking from that side of the building which would be the north side and you can see a car parked in that location as well as the screened dumpsters. For purposes of illustration, I've just shown you the south and west elevations but the north elevation is also located in your packet. Another comment regarding an existing air conditioning unit which is located on the south elevation is to be removed so it doesn't appear on either the site plan or architectural design review plan. We had talked about no changes being made to the existing parking. The comment on the staff review indicates that prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the parking would be restriped so it's clear where the people will be parking, primarily to prevent people from parking in the middle of the area. As you know, we have several businesses in town that have dirt parking lots and you can illustrate a very complex parking scheme and it really doesn't make

much difference if it's a dirt parking lot. This is a paved parking lot so it's important to have the spaces striped so the people will park on the sides of the lot and leave the center of the lot free and clear for travel. A note has been added to the plan regarding the wetlands. This is a property that's adjacent to the Town of Meredith Wetland No. 22 which is the Hawkins Brook Prime Wetland. We did not delineate the wetlands in that particular area because there are no changes being proposed to the physical extent of the building or the physical extent of the lot. That being the case, there was no real need to identify the wetlands and there will be no changes in that regard. The general traffic flow is the north entrance would be for the trucks coming in and exiting and the southerly entrance would be an entrance and exit for the main portion of the parking lot. There is no change to lot coverage, it's currently at 36.8%, 65% being allowed in the district. The awning being proposed on the south elevation is actually a metal awning and a paint chip was submitted showing the colors of the awning and the proposed colors of the building. It's difficult to get an exact match on my color pallet in the AutoCAD program with the actual chip so the chip would be the colors although the colors are close. We are adding some additional shrubbery primarily as I mentioned extending on the west elevation and also extending on the south elevation and on the other side of the proposed entrance and that will be blended in with the existing natural vegetation that comes up along that side of the building. The tree line essentially goes right around the building, comes up to the north side of the building and then continues up towards Prescott Park as shown on the plan and that's to remain as is. The other component that's related to both the site plan and the architectural is the big sign on the building. One of the original plans showed two light fixtures on the top of the sign shining down, the sign is actually internally illuminated so there will be no light fixtures shining down on that sign on that side of the building. Johnson gave the Board a handout which shows examples of other types of signs used by Family Dollar stores and the Family Dollar logo out front. As mentioned in the staff review, this particular sign that shows up on this is not the exact sign that shows up on the site plan. The sign on the premises is located at the front of the property and those are the dimensions of the sign. They are not to be changed; they will be fitting a Family Dollar sign to the existing signpost. All of the signage on the site meets or exceeds the requirements for signage in the ordinance. In your packet are examples of the typical styles of buildings that are located essentially from Aubuchon Hardware up to Prescott Park and then from the Laundromat up to just beyond the former bowling alley and the proposed store on the opposite side of the road which gives you the kind of nature of the neighborhood in terms of what we're proposing to do with the building. It is an existing large building, maybe a little bit difficult to do a lot of architectural changes to. At the last meeting, the former Chairman of the Planning Board, Mr. Vadney, mentioned in a case like this we really shouldn't try to overdo too much because it may actually end up being worse and look worse than if we just tried to tone the building down with some appropriate painting and some appropriate landscaping along the south and west elevations. That is essentially what we've tried to do. The length of the sign shown here is the maximum length allowed by ordinance and although that's a sign that's 25' x 4', given the mass of the building and the fact that the building is quite long, its really

not disproportionate to the size of the building. We did include on the site plan the planting schedule and also on the architectural design review, we have the list of existing plants and the proposed plants. In speaking with Mr. White recently, there is some intent possibly in this area when that section of the building gets put in there, if it doesn't blend in too well to actually put some larger shrubs or larger trees in that area to help block the area that's going to be cut and pasted facing the road. We are looking for flexibility to put some larger plants in there and the junipers if that is needed in that particular location. The fuel storage is inside the building so there is no outside storage noted on the plan. The dumpsters as I mentioned are shown to the north and there will be 3 of them in that area with appropriate screening from public view. We are requesting as part of the Site Plan application a waiver to the parking. As mentioned in the previous meeting, Family Dollar has a very good historical record of how much parking they need for a particular size store and according to the representatives from that business, this site exceeds the amount of parking that would be needed for employees and the general public. As I mentioned earlier, the lighting fixtures are the cutoff type, downward shining to avoid any addition to the sky light in the town. LaBrecque – I do have just a few comments and questions. Angela went through the packet and pointed out to the Board some of the photos that Carl mentioned and some of the attachments she put together. An example of the cutoff lighting fixture being used is included in the packet. There will be one at the loading door entrance and another one above the walkway. LaBrecque questioned why the light above the walkway was so high up. Johnson – Because we're limiting it to one fixture, we had it raised because it would tend to spread out over the parking lot as opposed to having two lower ones. LaBrecque You're proposing to landscape the length of the building so what will happen to the landscape box? Johnson – It would be of similar construction as the landscaping box that's there now. LaBrecque – I'm guessing that will go in this spring. When does the store plan on moving in? Johnson – ASAP. LaBrecque - So they will want a C.O. certifying site plan compliance before all of the landscaping is put in. There are a couple of options to make sure it gets completed, either by performance guarantee or sometimes by a temporary C.O. Johnson – All of the floodlights will be removed from the building. Jonathan White – Under the scope of work from Family Dollar, they do call for lighting under the canopies so in addition to the downward facing lights, there will be fluorescent lights under the canopies. LaBrecque – They would be recessed in. Pictures of Family Dollar signs were pointed out by LaBrecque as being the other side of the spectrum. White - The gutters are all being removed or going to have a veneer over them because they don't operate as gutters. The roof is getting some more work done to it so there will be roof drains directing the water away from the building and those gutters will not be seen. LaBrecque – I was concerned about the safety aspect of potential water coming down on the HC accessible ramp. White – The gutters are going to be made to not be used at all, they won't be interfering. The water's coming off the building now in that way because one roof drain froze because of the building not being heated but there will be one or two additional roof drains added so the water should go where we want it to. LaBrecque – I have information from the Fire Chief that I need to share with you before you go for your building permit but I did not

bring it. Is the freestanding sign going to be internally illuminated? White – That's currently externally illuminated and it will remain like that I believe. The Town did invest in a sidewalk there along Route 3 and 4 trees were planted there and we do see a lot of pedestrian traffic in that area so I was just thinking about the scale of the sign in relation to the pedestrian activity in that area. In this case I don't think anybody is going to miss Family Dollar so I see the proposed sign is maxing out what's permitted in the ordinance but I was just wondering why the absolute maximum. LaBrecque - The sign is larger than the Hannaford Rite Aid signs so that might give you some perspective and those are set far back. Johnson – In terms of the lighting, its not like its an unlit area to begin with, there's quite a bit of lighting in the area and during most of the summer hours Prescott Park parking lot is lit and there's additional lighting at the skate park and so forth which is just to the north of here. I think the lighting here will be blending in with the surrounding lighting in the area and I don't think its going to be contributing. We don't have any light poles in the middle of the parking lot or anything like that. I think the lighting has been toned down and I don't think its going to be any different than the lighting that's there right now. LaBrecque – There's no building sign right now on that site. Dever – Traditionally, the only one that's been on the building is the one out front. White – I think aesthetically a larger sign on that building will look good because it's such a big huge wall and a sign will help break up that wall. I think it looks better in the picture with the sign than without. Touhey – Mr. White, I am going to totally disagree with you, I am very concerned. The measurements of that sign 4' x 25', I think what we want is a sign that meets the need for the lessee of the retail facility to advertise what their business is all about. At the same time, the sign has to be proportionate to the mass of the building. I think the sign should take into consideration the speed of traffic going by the building, the proximity of the building to the roadway and I think that any lettering on a 4' x 25' sign would be massive and would not be what we would like to see in Meredith. I'm further concerned about putting illumination into that sign. I like the idea of the gooseneck light on the sign by the street but I have some concerns about the sign itself. On a sign that size, the lettering might be a foot high, I have no idea what the lettering size would be on the 4' wide sign, I assume the lettering is probably 3' and I think as far as the illumination is concerned, there would be no stopping that illumination, it would go right across the parking lot. Brothers – Mr. Chairman, I think Ed probably said 90% of what I'm concerned about. I don't think that a bigger sign being proportional is as important as trying to identify the property but at the same time keeping it with the village character that we've tried to evoke over the last couple of decades. My major concern relies on and comes back to the intensity of the illumination. That is a residential neighborhood on the other side of Route 3 and I'm not convinced with the illuminated Family Dollar signs that I've seen that it's necessary in Meredith to go to that extent. Ninety percent of the people who will be there will probably read about it and I do believe you will be found so being sensitive to the level of the nighttime illumination and the overall size is certainly a request and a consideration that I would like to see considered. Liz Lapham – What are the hours of operation? Johnson – 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. White – I don't know whether or not they keep the sign on after that, I know they are extremely conscious about the use of

electricity. They have 7,000 stores and have a computerized system that turns the lights on and off and adjusts the heat from their main headquarters through the internet. I'm guessing they don't leave it on all night and I would think they would shut that off when the store closes. Dever – Do they intend to retain the letter board on the existing sign out front? Johnson – The information we had originally when we prepared the site plan was the sign that's out in front of the building is going to remain the same so that's why we showed it the same. If it ends up being less, then so be it, but that's the sign that's been there as long as Mr. White has owned the business. Dever – It just means you're taking all of it, turning it sideways and putting it up higher, you're going to retain the same square footage of the sign as it stands now because as you look at it, the letter board is down below. Johnson – All I'm saying is the sign dimensions that appear on the site plan are the dimensions of the sign and the Family Dollar logo is going to be in the upper portion of that sign just the way it is. What I mentioned is that when I cut and paste this particular thing from a patch I had, it may be representative but it's not the exact dimensions of the sign. Dever – The bottom half is the letter board, hence my question about whether or not the letter board is going to be retained. Johnson - I don't know why it wouldn't be retained, but I don't know if they are going to use it or not, we don't have that information from the owner. If the Board says there shall be no letter board beneath the sign, I suppose that's what we would have to live with. Dever – What I would like to see on the plan is what's going to be there, not an approximation. Johnson – That is what I measured in the field. Dever - What am I going to see when I come driving up Route 3 now? It was my understanding that the upper portion of the existing sign which is 6' x 8' would have the Family Dollar logo sign within that area. I do not have any information regarding the letter board underneath, I simply showed the dimensions of the sign so I can't answer whether the letter board is intended to be used or not but I can say the Family Dollar logo sign will be 6' x 8' on the existing sign as it stands. LaBrecque – It will be lit by an exterior goose neck light. The sign on the building appears to be a rectangle, but all the examples are big bubble letters. What's being proposed are the signs you see on Family Dollar stores with the big bubble letters. Johnson – What's being proposed is what's allowed by the ordinance and if there's a problem with what's being allowed by the ordinance because of the component of the architectural design review, then that should be made clear by the Board and they should direct the applicant in terms of what they would like to see for a reduction in that signage. Mr. White and I are not Family Dollar and are limited to some extent to what we can represent. I represented what was allowed by the ordinance. That evidently is an issue with regard to the architectural component of the application and if the Board wishes to say to the Family Dollar, we don't really like the 4' x 25', we would rather you have a 3' x 18', then that's what the Family Dollar would have to live within. Touhey – I don't see with the proximity of that sign to the street that we have to max out the allowable size of sign. LaBrecque – Ed probably doesn't know the exact size it should be either. Johnson – I understand your comments and I'm not arguing with your concerns, all I'm saying is that representing an applicant, if I come away with they'd like to have a smaller sign, I'm not sure that's going to satisfy you. Touhey – What might satisfy me is more of an architectural sign. The Town has

made an investment in this area and wants to continue to. This section of town needs all kinds of improvements and I don't think it's unreasonable to ask that the sign that goes with a retail store can't be something different than a sign that went with the bowling alley 30 years ago. Bayard – I have to agree with what I'm seeing here looks excessive and I think the Board would agree especially when you light it up. If you have very soft lighting and light colors, its one thing but with these signs you can't tell what they will look like at night but they could be quite bright. If it were just a textured sign, it would look pretty nice. In some cases the Family Dollar does that but it may not be their preference. We may want to have staff be in contact with Family Dollar and see what they see for this particular location. Johnson – If there's a mechanism that we could cross this chasm without necessarily encumbering the entire site plan or architectural design review, I think that's probably what we should work towards. I really hope we don't have to continue either one of the hearings just because of the sign issue; I'd rather restrict it to a size and work towards that restriction. LaBrecque – I would be comfortable if that were to happen, if the Board were to give more specific direction, otherwise, not just say to Family Dollar, make it better, you need to give more specific direction. If they are going to come to me and say how big can my sign be, I'm no longer going to be able to rely specifically on the sign ordinance but some other granted architectural standard, its going to be a lot more difficult. If I could have some quantitative direction, it would help me in the future when people come in. Several points, a lot of times we are on a case-by-case basis so us giving you that specific direction for other cases in this Town, we don't know what we're getting. We can't say you can use 3' x 18' on all the rest of the buildings in Town so giving you a specific quantitative amount. I'm not getting the quantities I want to know about in this deal. Johnson – There's no question on the quantities that are there. Dever - I would think Family Dollar as a large company would be willing to spend a little more time looking at the specific community they want to do business in and provide us with a little better feel. If there's a fault, it's in my being able to tell you better what their indications are but there indications are to try to comply with anything the Planning Board in the Town of Meredith tells them to do. That's been the feedback we've gotten. In terms of access to the building, the parking, the paint, the color and the lighting, they've pretty much been willing to comply with anything we've said. It was probably my fault of assuming they would be allowed to have what's listed in the sign ordinance because that's what I've been going by and it's the first time it's come up that a sign's been too big. LaBrecque – Rarely do signs get maxed out. Dever – I think 4' x 25' is too big a sign. Johnson – Duly noted. Is 3' x 18'? I think taking the signage you're pointing out here, if we're going to do 6' x 8' out front, OK maybe but if we're going to add the letter board, adding that to the square footage and flipping it up on its side, that's way too big. I'm losing the flip it up on its side sign. You're telling me the sign's going to be 6' x 8' out front. Johnson – That's the sign that's there now. Dever - that's not the whole sign, what's the total square footage of that sign? Johnson – Its 6' x 8' plus 4' x 4'. Dever – So you're taking the total square footage and that's going to be it. Johnson - That's what I measured in the field. So you want the 6' x 8' and you want the 4' x 4' to be the stand with no additional signage. So let's say they will not

use it as a letter board and the front sign will commit to the 6' x 8' that's the existing sign. All I'm saying is for the sign in the front, we will indicate to Family Dollar that the letter board is being taken away and they will be restricted to use for signage purposes, the 6' x 8' double sided sign that's there now and the 4' x 4' will simply be the structure portion of the sign. Johnson - Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question through the Chair? Bayard - I don't think we want to go through negotiating here? Johnson - I'm not negotiating anything, all I'm trying to do is get to a resolution with the sign in that if we commit to only the 6' x 8' portion of the sign being used for signage, would that lessen the concern of the Board as to what is going to happen with the rest of the sign. Touhey - It doesn't lessen my concern that it could be shaped differently and could be a much more pleasing sign. Johnson - We're talking about the free-standing sign. I would like the free-standing sign to have more of a colonial shape to it. LaBrecque - If they are working within the parameters of the sign that's already there and using that light, then that's kind of the shape they're stuck with, it's not like a colonial is going to match the building in any way. Dever - It does lessen my personal concerns for that sign. Bayard - I consider that particular sign somewhat grandfathered, we're getting rid of the letter board which I think will be an improvement. You want some guidance on the side of the building. Has the front sign essentially been put to bed with what we've committed to? Yes. LaBrecque - Is that a potential condition that it remains the same size and lit as what's there today? Johnson - With the exception of the letter board underneath which will be removed. Although I don't have a quantitative size to look at, I would prefer to see it lit from the outside instead of internally lit. Johnson - So what you're talking about is a painted face board sign instead of the bubble letter sign with softer externally lit downward shining. Dever - Something along the lines of the pictures Angela has from the two other stores. Johnson - Externally illuminated, downward shining and it appears to be less than 4' x 25'. If that particular sign that you're looking at is typical of what you're talking about and we can get the dimensions of that sign and it's to be substantially smaller than the sign we're proposing and we could work that through staff, that would be acceptable to the Board? LaBrecque - I think that would be considerate to the residential zone that's just on Plymouth Street. Bayard - That would be acceptable to staff also. LaBrecque - That is clear direction, thank you. Johnson - I feel a lot more comfortable seeing one they have available and they are using in a different place. I didn't scour the internet as thoroughly as our Town Planner did. Touhey - There are not going to be any floodlights on the building itself, are there any parking lot lights there at all? Johnson - There's a light on the pole at the Public Works building but not on this property. You have a downward shining light near your loading door, but I know in that corner when the lot was not working on the other side of the lounge area, it was dark. White - When I ran the operation, I had a light on each pole and the electric company provided that for a monthly flat fee. I'm not sure if the Family Dollar is going to want to do that. I think the most important thing is the safety of people in the parking lot, that's got to be the main concern and those lights pretty much shine straight down. Dever - That corner is dark. White - There's going to be dumpsters there and employee parking. Maybe a similar downward shining light on the north side of the building would help. If we're doing downward



shining lighting on the sign, it's going to provide some illumination into the parking lot, but not a lot. White – I would think for it to be safe, you would have the electric company put the lights on their poles illuminating the parking lot. Dever – Maybe the addition of one more light on the south side of the building. Johnson – I think if there's an issue on something that's dark, I think Bill has a little flexibility in granting permission to add an additional light without coming before the Board so I think that could be something that would be investigated to prevent lighting that you don't need and add it if you really felt it was a safety issue. I'm thinking maybe 3 blue spruce trees that will grow a little taller to help break up the building a little bit. Dever – The junipers probably won't go much higher than they are now. As a condition, we could add that to this plan if you were to entertain a conditional approval part of the condition would be to add to the landscaping because I know Angela likes to see a more specific landscaping detail and we could add those to that detail. Lapham – I assume this is brick at the entrance on a steel building. White – It's a 4" cinderblock brick. You don't see it much around here but when you build a metal building and you want to improve the front façade, very often the first 10' they'll do in this brick that comes in different colors and is very attractive with metal. It could be clapboard but I think the thing that will look best with the metal would be this particular product. I could also do real stone but I think it would look ridiculous. It's not red brick, it's a rough cinderblock but is very rough on the front. It's just a veneer so it's only 4" deep but the size of a full cinderblock. Blue spruce grows very slowly. Douglas Fir grows a lot faster and covers all of that stuff. You need some 8 footers there, you need some 6 footers and you need some 4 footers, I don't care if they are arborvitae or whatever, I would like to see that mass broken up on the south side and on the west because that's what everybody is going to see. The size of what's pictured does nothing for me. White – It's unusual to landscape the front of a building with really tall shrubs because they get even bigger and it's very difficult to maintain them and I agree they shouldn't be 1' shrubs but the drawings showing approximately 4' shrubs and I think on that face, the shrubs that grow tall, grow wide as well. If you put a typical shrub that's going to grow up to 15' high, you have to plant that 12' away from the building. You can't take a Blue Spruce and make it be like a pole so you could put some taller growing things, but without that depth which we don't have, you're limited on the height the shrub's going to be. LaBrecque – In total there are 10 flowering shrubs not specified and 9 junipers so I think between the 10 shrubs and 9 junipers when this gets honed down a little bit more and they decide exactly what they're going to plant, I typically go on the internet and make sure they are appropriate for the zone, and if in parking lots that they are salt tolerant. White – The Family Dollar is pretty particular and they are very specific about what they want and they are going to want me to make the building look as attractive as possible without rebuilding the whole thing. I want to please them and I also am a resident of Meredith and I've taken quite a bit of pride in other projects I've done. I renovated the Village Perk building and I did the initial bowling alley that was dilapidated. I have a lot of pride in what I do. Bayard - I'm comfortable with him working with Angela on the landscaping and hope the Board is fairly comfortable with that part. The only

paving being done is in the area of the section that's being torn down; it will need to be patched. There are no wetland issues to come up at all.

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR A CHANGE IN USE FOR JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC, 351 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY, U10, LOT 34B, IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) IT SHALL BE NOTED ON THE PLAN THAT THE SITE IS LOCATED ADJACENT TO THE HAWKINS BROOK PRIME WETLAND AND THE ASSOCIATED SETBACK FOR THIS WETLAND IS 150 FEET.
- (2) ANY CONFLICT WITH ROOF DRAINAGE IS BEING ADDRESSED BY ADDING TWO OTHER ROOF DRAINS IN ADDITION TO THE PRESENT ONE AND THE GUTTERS WILL NOT BE USED.
- (3) WE GRANT THE PARKING WAIVER REQUESTED FOR THE 20 SPACES.
- (4) THE PARKING SPACES SHALL BE STRIPED PRIOR TO A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY BEING ISSUED.
- (5) THE FINAL SITE PLAN SHALL REFLECT THE PROPOSED LANDSCAPE PLANTS THAT WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE APPLICANT AND STAFF TO BE APPROPRIATE AND WERE SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS.
- (6) THE SITE PLAN SHALL CLARIFY WHAT DESIGN IS PROPOSED FOR THE FREE-STANDING SIGN. THE FREE-STANDING SIGN AND LIGHTING REMAIN THE SAME SIZE AS THE EXISTING. THE BUILDING SIGN WILL BE EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED AND WILL BE HANDLED ADMINISTRATIVELY. THE LETTER BOARD WILL NOT BE USED
- (7) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 7 & 17. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL MAKE A MOTION FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR THE PROPERTY AT 351 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE AND THE LIGHTING SHALL BE DIRECTED DOWNWARD AND WE WILL REMAND TO THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IF HE FEELS THERE NEEDS TO BE A COUPLE EXTRA LIGHTS INSTALLED TO ILLUMINATE THE PARKING LOT BETTER. WE ADDRESSED SIGNS PREVIOUSLY AND WHAT PLANTINGS WE DO USE WILL HELP TO REDUCE THE SCALE OF THE BUILDING AND BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE AREA AND THE ENVIRONMENT. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

3. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS:** (Rep. Rusty McLearn) Proposed Site Plan Amendment to construct two new buildings housing 13 hotel rooms, pool and

public space, plus a covered walkway, Tax Map U06, Lots 147 & 149 located on D.W. Highway and Lakeshore Drive in the CB District.

4. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS** – Architectural Design Review of two new commercial buildings, Tax Map U06, Lots 147 & 149 located on D.W. Highway and Lakeshore Drive in the CB District.

McLear – Site Plan and Architectural Review of the addition to ChurchLanding. I would like to introduce Gale Batstone, General Manager for HHH and runs the place. Neighbors to the project, Mr. & Mrs. L'Heureux and Bobbi Smith of the Symphony Motel are also present. What we have before you today is almost in scale, scope and design is exactly what we talked about last month and a couple months before that. I hope we have the details put together, we have all the architectural. We don't have the Town engineer's report because he has not finished his review so my engineer hasn't had a chance to go over it and we haven't had a chance to reconcile that so we'll be coming back again after that's done. We are planning on three buildings, one of which is the existing Biddiscombe building. This building is closest to L'Heureux's and this is a 6-room, single room building, residential in scale. The other building is a 7-room single unit building, plus and indoor/outdoor pool, lobby space and an upstairs patio. The Biddiscombe building has been turned into two units. The Biddiscombe lot is about 25,000 sq. ft., a little more than ½ acre, 186' of lake frontage. The smaller of the two buildings has a footprint of 2,011 sq. ft. and a roadside height of 29 feet. The other building has a height of 42 feet and has a footprint of approximately 3,800 sq. ft. The entire piece of property now is 175,140 sq. ft. and has 1,096 feet of lake frontage. The units in these buildings, 6 units and 7 units will be the best units we have. They all have lake views, they are not double-loaded corridors, single-loaded corridor, each building has an elevator, each building only has 2 rooms on a floor except for the 7-unit building which has 3 so each elevator will be serving 2 rooms. They all have a Jacuzzi, a large shower, a very large bathroom, fieldstone fireplaces, at least one patio and a couple of them have screened porches. They will be pretty impressive units, I hope. We do have a landscape plan which Angela hasn't had a chance to look at nor have I. We worked on it Saturday and Sunday and revised it a little bit and just got the plan today. One of the things I had promised the L'Heureux's is that we would do up a landscape plan and then they would get to veto whatever trees we were going to put next to them. They have some windows that look up the Bay, my original thought and what shows on the plan are trees which would shield their building from our view but I think they felt would reduce their view up the Bay so we'll get together and go over this plan and they can tell me what trees they want or don't want. You can see what we've tried to do is create pockets of places for people to sit; we don't have anything along the frontage. The frontage over there is made up primarily of blasted ledge from when Route 3 was built so it's not really conducive to people walking in it so we're just going to make it a rock garden and keep it that way. In your packet, you see a set of parking numbers, we have 15 units, 17 new spaces, actually 18, there is one space that was a turnaround in the existing and that will become a parking space now so we're up to 18 and I'll

redo that for you. We're building a big new double turnaround which I'll get to in a minute. We have, even with the removal of the 11 spaces under the carriage house, which turned out to be 13 spaces we had on the plan, 2 spaces in the drive-thru so we've removed 13 spaces but even with that we are ending up with 2 more spaces than we had before. The Mill Street lot will be ready to go by the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. It will be regraded, all the drainage put in providing it doesn't snow any more. LaBrecque – That's for valet parking, correct but also for employee parking as well because I know the Chief had concerns about Oak Street and Lang Street so now having this parking lot would be a place for overflow employee parking. We're going to take some other steps too which I'll get to in a minute. We have contracted with Valet Connection out of Rhode Island. They also have offices in Newport, Portsmouth and Warwick and are also going to be working with Castle in the Clouds. We've had them 6 times this winter doing valet parking. Some of you were at one of our valet events which was pouring rain and we have another large valet event on April 1<sup>st</sup> which is the Lakes Region Association so we've contracted with them and they will be training our staff on how to do this. We also have purchased a courtesy van and will provide a shuttle for employees to and from the Mill Street lot so that will ensure they use that lot and we're also going to be instituting an employee tag program to let us know, not just for our employees that will be all employees from the restaurants also to let us know where they are parking and finally we've leased some space from Roger Nash which is a small space across from the Biddiscombe house and that will be some parking and preferably the turnaround but because I don't own the space and because I don't have a long-term lease on it, we felt we couldn't really honestly put it on the plan because we don't really control that property. That is where I would like to put the turnaround with the proviso that if that lease ever got taken away, I would put it where it shows on the plan and that will add some additional parking and the turnaround. The reason I get into all these things is I think most everything we've done at Church Landing has been very positive and has been very good, we've worked hard at it. The one area where we have failed a number of times is when we're very busy and people drive around looking for parking spaces, they end up going down Lake Shore Road and end up turning around in L'Heureux's driveway. They told me one evening they had 26 cars turn around in that parking lot so what I have promised them is we will do everything we can and one of those things we can do is put double gates up which show on the plan, we've got a double turnaround, one of our issues is a single turnaround, a single space is too narrow and people didn't see it, they had gotten by it already so we have a large double turnaround. You will also see on your plan that there are arrows on the pavement, they are just there as kind of space holders but we will do something on there that says "don't travel any further, turn around ahead" or that kind of thing to try and mitigate that issue. I also promised them and I will stipulate to the Board that if with all these other things when we have large groups, if they are still having an issue, I said we would place an employee out there to stop people from turning around down there so I'm willing to put that in as a stipulation now. Our lot coverage when we purchased the church was a little over 65%, when we developed St. Charles it brought it down to 56.06% and after doing this development it will come down to

49.32% so we're going in the right direction. The walkway is a cedar walkway, we've talked about that before. The design of the buildings I think is exciting and interesting, I think our guests will like it, I think the neighborhood hopefully will like it, I know it's a great addition to Church Landing. The landscape plan is the first time that we've done a really professional landscape plan since G2+1. They are very good and I think its really going to make a difference by having that professionally done. I think our landscaping is beautiful down there now, but we've kind of done it ourselves and this is a little bit more professional. LaBrecque – That was a good explanation about what's happening there. I did have one comment and that was about the impervious surface and that was after talking to Bill. In the past the Town has not looked at pervious asphalt as not being coverage. As he described it to me, the intent of the ordinance was to limit land coverage and it was to be a limitation on what's developed vs. what's not. Not what's pervious vs. what's not. Back when that was written in the 70's, I don't think people were really using pervious lot coverage so that's probably a definition by the way we should work on in the future because people weren't using pervious pavers or pervious asphalt or pervious concrete and now that they are, I think that is something we could probably develop a little bit better. Up until now, he really hasn't been looking at pervious asphalt and counting it as not coverage because someone could come in on a 50,000 sq. ft. lot and pave it from corner to corner and say I have no coverage so that's something that needs to be worked on, admittedly we need to work on that and so it wouldn't put you over and you would still be way under. McLear – By the way, DES does count it. LaBrecque – Yes, but you can only have a certain percentage of it so they get complicated with it, we don't want to get that complicated with it but we also don't know how exactly to do that. McLear asked if he should re-compute the coverage. LaBrecque – Yes, and that was a comment I had for Paul Fluet. Also, the setbacks are reversed on the plan. These are all things I would address with Paul once I get the comments back from our engineer. Also, I want to bring to the Board that a couple of permits would be required from DES so there's a Dredge & Fill and that would be necessary for the dock structure which has not been applied for and then there's the Shoreland Permit that's required for all activity that takes place within the 250' from the shoreline and that has been applied for and the application has been accepted. Those two permits would need to be cross-referenced on our final plan and then seeing as how one of the proposed buildings will be on a lot line, the two lots will have to be merged prior to final approval. The Water & Sewer Superintendent has reviewed the plans and it appears the water connection will just be treated as a private service line that will be going in Lake Shore Drive so part of the road will be torn up during construction. Rusty has been communicating with his contractor, because the pavement in the parking area and Lake Shore Drive, you don't really want to put that in until the very end. As you know, it gets clogged up by sand, dirt and debris so you don't want to have construction vehicles or anything like that going back and forth over it so they would have to do something somewhat temporary so the residents and emergency vehicles still have access to the houses and structures beyond that portion of Lake Shore Drive so there is going to be some provision worked in and typically, we do that sometime before the preconstruction conference and we hold a pre-

construction conference before any large project breaks ground where all of our Department Heads meet with the construction team and go over all the conditions and things like this and it looks like they've already put thought into how its going to be done. The project will be on municipal sewer and those will be new connections to a couple of the buildings and I believe the sewer line there is already existing. There's also going to be substantial drainage improvements to the site in addition to that pervious asphalt and that goes as you can see on you plan kind of perpendicular to where the front wheels of your car would pull up to in those parking spots so you have a drainpipe that essentially goes parallel to the shoreline and then crossing it you have sewer and water service lines and underground utilities which I believe a pole is being taken away and utilities are going underground. McLear – There is currently a light pole with quite a conglomeration of wires and stuff and we'll be taking that down and running underground from there. LaBrecque – I think that was one of the initial comments that our engineer had when he first looked at the plan and also the Water & Sewer Superintendent, maybe we should verify some information so Dan Leonard went out there, he found the depth of the sewer main so they can accurately determine what the depth is going to be of the service lines and just ensure that nothing interferes in that area and nothing would have to be re-engineered at a later date. McLear – The construction people are advising to do the waterline differently than Paul Fluet did it and the last paragraph shows that so we'll get together on that. Between now and the next meeting, comments from the Water & Sewer Department and comments from Lou Caron and comments from your general contractor will all be brought to Paul Fluet and hopefully we can nail down the best possible solution to getting utilities and everything else accomplished the best way possible. There are also a couple of existing sand/oil separators that are going to be relocated as part of this project. It really doesn't change the flow too much, its just moving slightly away from that building. The Fire Chief did raise a concern about the ability to access the old Biddiscombe house and the building to the south of it with all of those cars parked between the road and the buildings. McLear - There are 2 HC spots and the turnaround and if we build the turnaround across the street, then this turnaround won't be built so that's 20'. LaBrecque - He didn't have a specific recommendation so I don't know if he would want the width of a parking spot. Afterward, I thought I should have pointed out to him the space between the two HC spots. McLear - Before the next meeting maybe the 3 of us should get together and take a look at that. LaBrecque – DOT's not always the easiest to contact. Will the increase of use on the property require a revised driveway permit and that's something I'm not sure, it's somewhat routine when they do that sort of thing, it's not like 13 new units are going to require a traffic light or anything, but nonetheless, typically a driveway permit will say this is for a single-family dwelling or for a 60-unit hotel so that might need to be revised. I have a call into them. McLear – I've called Jim Marshall, Don Leifert, I talked to C.R. Wilke and he said this will probably not be a state issue. Their level will be a DOT-3 issue and he didn't think it would rise to the level of needing anything, although I have to say when we built this originally, we bonded the entrance and I think it was \$80,000.00,. We no longer have that bond and I don't know why or where that went so there's some issue out there which we'll have

to get. Nancy Mayville is still the person in charge of that road project. LaBrecque – The 3 & 25 project? McLear - What they did last time is say we're going to ask you to pay for some of the 3 & 25 project when they run it by there. LaBrecque – Rusty touched on parking and I'll probably listen to the minutes and put that in the report to make that part of the decision when it comes time and then I want to note the parking lot lighting will remain consistent throughout the site so any new lighting will be similar to what's there today. I believe that covered walkway you spoke about earlier also has lighting and that appears to be in the vaulted area where the beams are so that shouldn't really spill off the site either. I have a brief discussion on the architectural, the cedar siding that's used and the latch pole details but I would say it's consistent with the intent of the architectural design review ordinance. There are some outstanding items and I hope to get them all addressed before our next hearing. We will have Lou Caron's drainage analysis and we'll have the benefit also of Paul Fluet being here and he can describe to you his design intent for the drainage. Our next meeting is April 26<sup>th</sup>. Bayard – You had the evidence of the lot being merged prior to final approval, do we need anything about the mortgage releases on that. On the parking waiver for the stalls, will we also need a parking waiver for the whole site? I know this is complicated how all the parking's going, it sounds like it's going to be an improvement. LaBrecque – I think as part of the decision, we could put on there a total demand, a total amount that was previously waived and all of the provisions that are being made off-site and on-site, just packaging it up altogether. As part of the staff report, I did note the parking calculations for the entire site should be on the plan because ultimately its one site plan so the coverage is a total and the parking should be a total too so down the road I'm not looking at multiple site plans to get the information, it should all be on one so that could be rolled into one, there are more parking spaces proposed than previously so what was waived before wouldn't be anymore and as a result of this, would be less, the net increase. Bayard – I think he answered the question by putting all of the details on the plan. Maurice L'Heureux, immediate abutter, to Rusty. My biggest concern is the parking and the turnaround. I know we discussed that before but unless there's something put in writing that we can call someone and enforce what is to take place its not worth talking about. Maybe while Rusty is here, he'll look after it but once he's gone, then what do you do. - Going back to Phase I, this is the run around I got. Originally, at the end of the parking lot they had for Phase I, they were going to put columns there and signs, no entering, no trespassing and all this and that. The first thing you know, the posts didn't go up, the signs didn't go up, no turnaround, they kept turning around in Bea's yard and when that was not convenient, they would come down to mine so I called the Building Department and asked what we can do. The Building Inspector will get back to you. After 3 times I gave up. What they are doing right now is moving that stop line directly onto my property where I have a nice parking area of about 30' x 50', give or take. I can put 4 cars there plus 2 cars in front of my garage, ideal turnaround spot so I think the parking area should be treated like a dead-end street and have a cul-de-sac put there immediately so this will show where the turnaround should be. It's no fault of Rusty's, I probably spoke to the wrong person but when they were striping the other parking lot, I spoke to the feller

and there's an 8 x 12 sign saying this is a turnaround. Can you put an arrow here showing turn, stop or turn here, I can't do it without speaking to one of his workers. His chief worker came around and said he would look into it so they had no indications where to turn around, the turnaround was what they call a hammerhead and I don't know if it was the size of one car. I know how to use a hammerhead, Rusty does and all of you people do, but the average person doesn't know how to pull forward, back up and turn around and keep on going so this is a big concern. Rusty did make a statement in December sometime before he went on vacation that he would control the parking. Three weeks ago, there was a wedding there, we pulled in the yard about 10:00 o'clock or so, there's 2 cars parked right in my driveway, I had to chase around, go to the cottage and get them out. Rusty had given me his number to call him. Would you like to go chasing the neighbor to get into your property? The amount of parking he's providing is nowhere near enough to justify that. Bea's cottage that he rented during the summer last year was just one family, there would always be 2 or 3 cars and a boat trailer so how can you justify 1 or 2 parking spaces for that unit. The house directly across from my garage always has 2 or 3 cars over there so I think the parking situation, even though they are going to have some off-street parking somewhere else, its got to be whatever Rusty has been saying he's doing, he has been committing himself to try to correct this. I think it should be put into the minutes of the meeting so if something comes up, somebody will know what is supposed to be done without me having to run around getting nowhere. Pictures were submitted showing the turnaround. No place for snow removal or storage or anything of that sort so I don't know what he's going to do during the winter months. McLear – When I said before that I would stipulate, I don't think there was any teeth in the Planning Board approval last time and what I'm saying now is we will stipulate that if we have a problem we'll have somebody out there or we will have somebody able to move cars or take care of it. It will be part of the approval process. L'Heureux – What kind of lighting will you have there because you are going to be close to my house, I don't want it lit up. McLear pointed out the closest light pole and it's the same size light poles that are in the rest of the development. L'Heureux – All your trees are all lit up. Mclear – They won't be here. You're going to have some kind of a retaining wall here. LaBrecque – A small one like 3 or 4 feet at its highest spot. We will be using the same cutoff lights that we have every place. L'Heureux – We want to maintain a little privacy. McLear – I believe we can set up a system that (a) isn't set up to fail like the other one, it really wasn't thought through, (b) its enforceable and (c) we have a backup of staff to take care of the issue, plus we now have a 31 car parking lot that valets about 90 cars so it really should take care of the issue of people driving around. That's what I'm hoping. Touhey suggested a sliding gate that one would trigger with a remote, that gate could be triggered by you and other people would not be able to go beyond that point. L'Heureux – For me that would be perfect, but there is a motel business at the end. McLear – Its something to look at, I'm certainly willing to do that if the neighbors want us to do that it would solve this problem but I do think it would create a problem for the Symphony. L'Heureux- That sounds like an ideal situation and I would like to see it done but in all fairness, I've got to consider my neighbors. McLear – Mr. L'Heureux,



would you mind having one across your driveway? No, but it still doesn't solve the overall issue if other people want to go further down and turn around or come back. LaBrecque - And you have the emergency vehicle access. Dever - I'm not going to be here next month so I would interject that whatever solution you do agree upon, make it so the C.O. doesn't get issued until all these specific improvements are in place. Whatever type of situation you work out amongst you, (1) it becomes part of the conditional approval and (2) those improvements are in place before you get the C.O. so that gives Mr. L'Heureux some assurance that we have a grasp and an enforceable type situation. McLear - It wouldn't be fair to Symphony Motel, they get business that comes right off the road but maybe we can solve this another way. As long as it's recorded somewhere. Bayard - I think John's idea makes a lot of sense, see what works keeping in mind emergency vehicles and stuff like that. McLear - As I said, we've had this conversation, they've been very good neighbors and we have failed to be a good neighbor sometimes so we owe it to them to get this right and we will. Bayard - It's not something that should hold up this project. Public Hearing closed @ 9:11p.m.

Dever moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO THE MEETING OF APRIL 26<sup>TH</sup> @ 7:00 P.M. TO RECEIVE THE REST OF THE INFORMATION FROM THE TOWN'S ENGINEER AND OTHER ISSUES. Voted unanimously.

Brothers - Mr. Chairman, I for one would like to go down and take a look at that situation because I certainly understand what you're saying, I just want to physically go down and take a look so if there's a blue Dodge pickup truck that turns around in your driveway, I'll wave to you. It won't be Rusty's fault, it will be mine. I'm familiar with where you are but I have not been down to Symphony Motel and I'd like to see it. Bayard - We do have time for a site walk. Site walk scheduled for Saturday, March 26, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. McLear - I can meet the Board and show them around. Bayard - It's not a formal hearing and we don't take public input. The Board is there just to observe the area and see what's there. Dever offered to take the minutes in place of Angela.

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, THAT WE SCHEDULE A SITE WALK FOR SATURDAY MORNING, MARCH 26, 2011, AT 9:00 A.M. AT CHURCH LANDING, DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY.

Meeting adjourned @ 9:21p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey, Adm. Assistant  
Community Development Dept.

The above Minutes were read and approved at a regular meeting of the Meredith Planning Board on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

John W. Dever, III, Secretary