

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

January 3, 2011

5:00 PM

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Osborne, Long, Ouellette, Shaw

Messrs: B. Stanley, J. Hoben

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. The Parking Division has submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

High Street, north side, from a point 50 feet west of Pine Street to Pine Street

(ORD 7128)

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

High Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to a point 75 feet west of Pine Street

(ORD 3141)

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

High Street, north side, from a point 50 feet west of Pine Street to a point 25 feet westerly

(ORD 7129)

Alderman Long

METERS – 10 HOURS:

High Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS:

Chestnut Street, east side, from High Street to Bridge Street
(ORD 3509)
Alderman Long

METERS – 10 HOURS:

Chestnut Street, east side, from High Street to Bridge Street
Alderman Long

Ms. Heather Freeman, Vital & Legislative Records Supervisor, stated the last item on the first page of the Parking Division agenda: RESCIND NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS should read as Pine Street and also the first item on the second page listed as METERS – 10 HOURS should also read as Pine Street. There is an addendum submitted by the Traffic Division.

Chairman Roy stated thank you.

Alderman Ouellette stated the ones that Alderman Long has submitted, I believe are around St. Joseph Regional Junior High.

Alderman Long responded that is correct.

Alderman Ouellette stated I'm wondering if we can hold off on this for maybe a few months. The reason why I say that is we're really not sure what the future of that building is going to consist of. I don't particularly oppose this depending on what the use of that building is going to be after a few months from now. I think we'll have a clearer picture of what that building may be used for in the near future. So I'm not sure if we're going to be doing something and then trying to rescind what we just did, and that's always a lot more difficult than it is just to sit on it for a few months and figure out what they're going to be using the building for.

Chairman Roy responded thank you for that question. Brandy can you help us out on that?

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, replied that particular area of town, I don't know. Some of the Aldermen may recall we had some issues with installing meters and taking meters out. There are a number of residents in the neighborhood who tend to leave cars on the street for extended periods of time; they are rather dilapidated. Installing the meters tends to get those cars off the street. When we took some meters out, probably about three years ago, we had some of the residents and business owners in the area were very, very upset that we took the meters out because of the type of vehicle that was left in those spaces

at that point in time. So while we don't know what the use of the building is, this would clean up the neighborhood a little bit, at least until we figure out what the appropriate parking regulations are around that building depending on the use.

Alderman Osborne asked what building are we talking about? Right on the corner of Pine and High?

Ms. Stanley replied St. Joe's Junior High.

Chairman Roy stated all around that block are the different positions they're talking about, and she's talking about the cars that come from the rooming houses that are up on Pine Street. There are two that are across from each other, and she's right, there are a lot of vehicles associated with that.

Alderman Ouellette stated the use of that building right now is for a school and that is the reason why I believe the parking is the way it is, so it's easier to use for that type of use. Is that right?

Ms. Stanley replied it is my understanding that that school is no longer operating.

Alderman Ouellette stated correct. That doesn't mean that in the future that couldn't be used for another school. I know that there's been a lot of discussion in this Chamber about looking for buildings that could be used as schools to relieve the overcrowding in the inner city. So I'd really like to see if this would be something that the School District would want to pursue before we do anything with the parking. That's just the way I'm looking at this, as an opportunity to look forward rather than do something and then try to rescind it to try to fix it back the way it was.

Alderman Long stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brandy, correct me if I'm wrong, but a lot of this parking arrangement is due also to the businesses that are around there. For example Julian's had a problem with parking arrangements for, as you said, cars being left there and just abandoned there. Although the school was part of the thought process, it was more than just...I remember working with Alderman Duval with getting parking in that immediate area. There were some problems with the parking there. Although we did take St. Joe's into consideration it was predominantly the businesses around there that were more tuned into the 10-hour parking meters than St. Joe's. Although St. Joe's was a consideration the majority of it was the businesses in that area.

Ms. Stanley stated yes, we did some changes for Julian's that affected High Street between Pine and Union. We ended up taking off the meters on one side of that block, and the business owners on High Street, between Pine and Union, are the

ones that are predominantly concerned with the removal of the meters. This particular area I don't believe affects Julian's a whole lot. It's the business owners that are on High Street that are affected by not having meters in that area and the vehicles that end up staying on the street for extended periods of times.

Alderman Osborne stated there are two law firms right there, and one is on the northeast corner and one is on the southwest corner of Chestnut and High. They do have their own parking lots.

Alderman Ouellette moved to table the Parking Division agenda without the addendum. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion. The motion failed with Aldermen Roy, Long and Shaw voting in opposition.

Alderman Osborne stated they are opposed to tabling it. Do you want to just receive and file it? Is that what you're saying?

Alderman Long moved to approve the Parking Division agenda as amended with the addendum. Alderman Shaw duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Osborne stated I'll go along with whatever the Alderman wants.

Alderman Ouellette stated again, I'm not trying to kill this. I just think it would be best if we waited a few months. That's all. I respect the Committee's decision, and no way is it any slight to the Ward Alderman, but I would be opposed to this.

Alderman Shaw stated I understand Alderman Ouellette's concern and I agree with him, but I think our immediate concern needs to be what this is being used for right now. It could be a year or two years before they decide what they're going to do with that building, and in that case something different could be done if it had to be done then.

Alderman Ouellette stated I just want respond to that. I did not want to wait a year or two; I just wanted to wait a few months until we get some direction from maybe some City departments that might be interested in the property. That's all I was asking for.

Chairman Roy stated but as you said originally, we can always go back and work on this again.

Alderman Ouellette stated but it's harder to take something away.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried, with Alderman Ouellette voting in opposition.

Alderman Ouellette stated not the addendum.

Ms. Freeman asked the motion includes the addendum?

Chairman Roy replied yes, it includes the addendum. But Alderman Ouellette wanted it to be noted that he was opposed to those measures but not the addendum.

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, submitting an amendment to Ordinance 70.54 establishing the existing parking lot at the main library branch as a public parking lot available to library patrons.

Alderman Shaw moved to approve this item. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Ouellette stated this is a good sized lot. Is there a way to determine...it says for library patrons? Are we going to have a way to determine who is a library patron and who is just parking for free?

Ms. Stanley replied we would manage this much the same way we do with the spaces outside City Hall that are also posted "City Hall Business Only". If we do visually see someone parking in a space and walking somewhere else, then we will issue them a No Parking Zone ticket. I've talked to the Library Director and we've agreed to work together. If their security officer sees someone that's not actually going to the library, they are going to give us a call. So it is possible that somebody could use it for free parking, but I don't think that they could get away with it on a daily basis.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, submitting an amendment to Ordinance 70.54 establishing a Line Drive Parking Lot and Permit Rates.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to approve this item.

Chairman Roy addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Discussion regarding a revised Ordinance proposal related to commercial motor vehicles.

Alderman Shaw asked have we had any new information? I think we should table this.

Chairman Roy replied no, we have no new information. I agree. We need to get more information and get some ideas in from other Aldermen as well.

Alderman Shaw moved to table this item. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Osborne asked I was just wondering what we're going to put together with this. Who is going to be involved in doing so, just the City Solicitor?

Chairman Roy responded I think we had asked the City Solicitor to talk with Brandy and the Traffic Department as well to see if they could come up with something. I know I had asked other Aldermen if they had any ideas to contact me or one of you or somebody on our staff, and I haven't heard anything yet.

Alderman Osborne stated I think Brandy would have some ideas on that one. I think they should be more involved in it because it does reach quite a bit of area here. With all the City Solicitor has to do himself, I think we have to put something together with it whether it be two or three Aldermen or Brandy or somebody...what her facts would be about it. What do you think Brandy?

Ms. Stanley replied I think the primary issue that City staff would have with revising this ordinance is the direction that we would revise it in. In other words, is it the will of the Board to take the tact of addressing graphics or the size and weight of a vehicle? We can revise the ordinance; we just don't know how to revise it because we don't know what the will of the Board is.

Alderman Osborne stated but before we come up with an ordinance I guess we have to know what we're putting in it, is what I'm trying to say. I know commercial vehicles, just this one statement. I've had a problem with commercial vehicles throughout the years, not against them, but for them. I say this; I say that commercial vehicles on these roads you have to have them. That is number one. Number two you can't keep them off all the streets in the City. They produce more taxes than automobiles or just about anything else. So it's not very fair to commercial vehicles to exclude them with all these different streets that we have. I think we need a good study out there on commercial trucks not allowed on certain streets. A lot of them have been there since Abraham Lincoln went up in his carriage, and a lot of them shouldn't even be there. It's just not fair to commercial vehicles out there to stop them from delivering all your food, your clothing, and whatever you have in your household when they can't even come into the City at a certain time, coming down Maple Street, let's say. It just doesn't make sense to me. So there is a big study that's involved in this, but I think someday this should be done with the City along with the Traffic Department. I think Mr. Hoben would agree with that. I think a lot of these things out there, especially signs, should be done away with because there are too many of them out there. It's just not fair to a lot of commercial vehicles. Thank you.

Alderman Shaw stated I just wanted to tell you that my opinion is that it should be by the weight of the vehicle. It should have nothing to do with the writing on the side. That's my opinion, and I agree with Alderman Osborne that there should be some sort of a study done on a lot of the roads that are already posted. I think it should be by the weight of the vehicle, that's how the law of the National DOT goes, and I think that's how our law should be too.

Alderman Ouellette stated I'm going to agree with my colleagues and say I think that probably we should use the definition used by the State. That way there we could be consistent with the State law in terms of what actually a commercial vehicle is and or isn't. I believe that the Alderman is correct and my information is that they go by weight and not by shape and size and what's on the panels.

Alderman Long stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the staff is looking for some sort of direction. I don't know if we want to send some representation from the Aldermanic Board. I'd be willing to sit with them. We certainly heard what Alderman Ouellette, Alderman Shaw and Alderman Osborne had to say, and I agree with them all. But let's take a look at this and then if we could just let all of the Aldermen know that there will be a meeting at whatever date. We can arrange that right after this meeting to sit and see where the Aldermen are coming from so that staff can put something together.

Chairman Roy stated we'll put this on the table for now and we'll set up a date with Brandy and Jim and maybe Maureen could be there, and we'll have a discussion and try to get something worked out.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to table this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

7. **RESCIND HANDICAP PARKING:**

On A Street, south side, from B Street to a point 30 feet easterly
(Ord. 8063)
Alderman Greazzo

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman Roy stated when I talked to Alderman Greazzo he wanted to approve this.

Alderman Long asked he wanted to approve it?

Chairman Roy replied that's what he told me. He wanted to approve it.

Alderman Ouellette stated parliamentary inquiry. Don't we have a moratorium on handicapped parking spots in front of...?

Chairman Roy interjected this is to rescind the handicapped parking.

Alderman Ouellette stated okay. I didn't see this ordinance.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Shaw, it was voted to approve this item.

8. Communication from Joseph Parrotto, Beaver Street resident, regarding traffic issues in the area of Candia Road and Hanover Street.
(Note: Tabled 12/6/2010 pending a review from the Traffic Division)

On motion of Alderman Long duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Osborne asked where do we stand with Item 8?

Chairman Roy stated I got an email just recently from Mr. Hoben talking about that. Mr. Hoben, could you come up and address this please?

Mr. James Hoben, Traffic Division, stated Southern NH Planning Commission has completed their turning and moving counts, as well as their volume study for both of those intersections. I've relayed them; they are up at the New Hampshire DOT. I spoke to the DOT this morning, and they said they would be working on it. Before the next meeting they will present the recommendation study and report regarding everything that was in the letter.

Chairman Roy stated they said the DOT had to look into it a little bit more and then they would give us the proposal; I guess you would say that they would be willing to do on their road. That should come to us at the next meeting. Correct?

Mr. Hoben replied it will be before February's meeting.

Chairman Roy stated that's where it stands now.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to re-table this item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee