

Town of Hampton



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

July 22, 2020 - 2:00 PM

Via Teleconference

Due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, in order to properly ensure the safety of the public and that of the PRC members, this body is authorized to meet electronically. Please note there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, the PRC are utilizing a teleconference service for this electronic Meeting. The Public may join the teleconference by calling **1-857-444-0744** and using the code **156034**.

PRESENT (Telephonically):

Jason Bachand, Town Planner
Jodie Strickland, CMA Engineers
Jennifer Hale, DPW Deputy Director
James Marchese, Building Inspector
Mark Gearreald, Town Attorney
Jamie Sullivan, Town Manager
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning

Absent: Richard Sawyer, Police Chief
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator
Cathy Gilman, Unitil
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer
Fred Welch, Deputy Town Manager
Mike Bernier, Aquarion

20-025 48-52 High Street

Map: 161 Lot: 2

Applicant: 48-52 High Street

Owner of Record: Same

Site Plan: Demolish existing structure and construct two new structures. Structure adjacent to High Street to consist of 2 commercial units and 4 residential units. Second structure to be at the rear portion of the lot and to consist of 12 residential units.

Jason Bachand, Town Planner read the statement about telephonically having this meeting due to the COVID-19 pandemic. PRC members stated their locations and whether anyone was in the room with them as required by the Right-to-Know law.

Attorney James Scully was present and discussed the application. Henry Boyd, Millennium Engineering is on vacation. Rob Roseen, Waterstone Engineering was also present on the call.

Attorney Scully said he believes most if not all PRC comments from the last meeting have been addressed by Mr. Boyd. The exception is that they have not received the traffic engineers report yet. Otherwise, he is ready for questions from the PRC members. He will also relay comments to Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Bachand started by stating that he sent his initial comments to Mr. Boyd back in May. He spoke to those and said if or how they have been addressed.

While the current submission is an improvement over what was provided for the May PRC meeting, there are still things that need to be worked on by the applicant per Mr. Bachand. There are no revised elevations, nor is the traffic study ready. A response letter was provided, but Mr. Bachand noted for future reference that it is helpful when the PRC comments are provided with the responses to each below. He is also concerned about having received hard copy stormwater reports and drainage plans today, though those were previously sent via PDF. The pre and post watershed plans were sent by email about an hour before the meeting. **He said we will need a third PRC meeting on this application, and it must be a complete resubmittal in order to move forward.**

Mr. Bachand thinks a separate recordable document which cross-references the recorded site plan would be acceptable, instead of another plan sheet dedicated only to variances. The recorded document should cite, for each variance, the section of the ordinance from which relief was granted, and should state what the ordinance requires, what the ZBA actually granted, and the reason the relief was necessary to accommodate this project. He feels the issuance of 14 variances necessitates a recorded explanation.

Attorney Scully said that they will put a document together stating the variances and why they thought they were necessary. He said that he cannot speak for the ZBA members. Mr. Bachand said that he is happy to coordinate with Attorney Scully on this.

The applicant has submitted a request for a Conditional Use Permit via letter detailing how each of the criteria are met, as requested at the last meeting.

Mr. Bachand did not see revised elevations. Mr. Boyd noted in his response letter that certain comments had been addressed, but without these elevations Mr. Bachand cannot confirm. **These must be included in the resubmittal.**

Are the proposed/anticipated commercial uses known at this time was asked. This came up at the last meeting and we still do not know. The Town Center-Historic District is much more restrictive; there are limits on permitted uses.

A Landscape Plan has been provided with this re-submission, but it was incorrectly labeled as "Utilities Sheet".

At the last meeting it was noted that the first parking space on then right when entering the site from Dearborn does not seem like it would function well. This was addressed, but Mr. Bachand questions what is being shown for the trash receptacle area. He noted that DPW may wish to comment on this as well.

Mr. Bachand noted that he believes the O&M Plan still needs work.

The resubmitted plans do not have surveyor or engineer stamps.

Mr. Bachand still has concerns that this project, as currently proposed, is intense for this 2/3 acre parcel. He believes that is largely the product of the relief that was granted. That makes it tricky for us. He noted that we are working with the applicant.

Ms. Olivier spoke about the O&M Plan. She will also speak with Attorney Scully directly. This was prepared by Millennium Engineering and Waterstone Engineering. She noted concerns about the revised date on the first page, map/lot numbers to be added, recording and tracking dates, the owner responsibility page, that there is no signature page, and to include an additional add-on page about projects being transferred to another entity.

Ms Olivier noted that the Planning Board changed its administrative procedure to generally say if a submittal is not complete enough for the PRC to come together and meet on it, that Mr. Bachand as Chair has the right to cancel the meeting if at least 5 days prior to the meeting. This is on the Town's website as well. Mr. Bachand reiterated the importance of this. The Planning Board expects us to be reviewing complete submittals.

Rob Roseen, Waterstone Engineering asked if the O&M information that Ms. Olivier spoke about is available. Ms. Olivier will send it over.

The Fire Department is not on the line, but they have nothing more at this point. They will be looking for life safety items during further plan reviews as this project moves forward.

Cathy Gilman (Unitil) is not on the line either, but noted that Mr. Boyd has plotted her facilities accurately.

Jennifer Hale, DPW has reviewed the plans and provided her comments, as follows:

S-1: Proposed Building B says there are 16 units. The ZBA application says 12 units. Please clarify.

S-1: Total Parking Spaces says 33. ZBA decision says that two spaces needed to be added. Looking at ZBA Plan submitted – there should now be a total of 34. Still showing 33.

S-1: There are two utility poles on the west side of the property line – is the guy wire of the one to the south in the proposed porous concrete walk?

S-1: What is the width of the driveway at the property line? Add note that a driveway permit will be required.

S-1: Building A to the west appears to be a stairwell with door on the Arch drawings. Does this empty onto the grass? Is there walkway here?

S-1: The corner of the porous concrete patio of building A appears to be drawn to the property line- as a double line? Confirm this is not building (building shown with footprint and overhang as double line, is this extra line?)

S-1: Show location of Transformer on plan.

S-1: Saw cut limits to replace curb/sidewalk on Dearborn need to be shown.

S-1: What is the proposal for trash?

S-2: Add the test pit data. Soils? ESHWT

S-2: Existing utilities are missing from High Street as well as existing service information to the building. Proper demo notes, including a sewer disconnection permit will be needed needs to be added to the plan. Add removal of existing service that is currently shown on S-4. (All utilities existing to the existing building are to be shown to the connections in the street. Subsequently anything changed needs to be identified as to be removed, reused etc...)

S-2: The Sewer Main in Dearborn Ave is 8"VC.

S-2: The guy pole on the east side of property and pole to service Map144 Lot 57 – is this to remain? Any conflict with proposed?

S-2 Show OHW to Dearborn to be removed. Why can't these poles be reused?

S-2: Revise the overlapping text between the word avenue and sewer info on Dearborn Ave as well as a few others on the sheet.

S-2: Assuming that all trees and vegetation on site will be removed? Add to Plan Note.

S-2: Is the chain link fence that surrounds the property on this property or property of others? Is there a future plan for fencing.

S-2: Plan notes need to include that all erosion control needs to be installed prior to any disturbance.

S-2: How will a construction entrance be handled? Will there be anti-tracking stone placed?

S-3: Grades are shown tying it at the property line leaving no room for adjustment for any unknown field conditions. Unless agreements are in place no disturbance to the adjacent properties is allowed. This occurs on the east and west side. DPW suggest that orange fencing be required to show limits of boundaries.

S-3: Confirm grades are not steeper than 3:1 – if so what will be used to stabilize slopes?

S-3: With a grade at 99 at the back of the sidewalk along High Street, the slope to the front doors of the commercial (Bldg A) will be in excess of 15% in some places. This is not ADA compliant.

S-3: What is the line that is adjacent to the Porous Concrete Patio on the east side adjacent to the patio between it and the property line?

S-3: Is there a section of retaining wall missing on the west side of Building A? The 103 and 104 contours do not tie into anything.

S-3: Is the proposed retaining wall adjacent to the porous concrete walkway on the east side of Building B? How high is it and what is the purpose?

S-4: Call out SMH, rims and inverts.

S-4: How is the electric getting to Bldg B.

S-4: How is the gas connected to both buildings. Currently existing is shown going under Bldg A and just a line (not touching) between both buildings.

S-4: A hatched area is shown on the west of building A – What is this?

S-4: Where are the water lines in Dearborn Ave that are being connected to. Is there trench cut in the roadway for these as well?

S-4: Notes need to be added that a sewer connection permit and excavation permit are required. In addition the flow calculations need to be shown for the WWDC. All construction to be according to the DPW Standards.

S-4: Confirm with Aquarion if shut offs are to be in the Sidewalk or in Dearborn.

E-1: Arch plans show lights on the Bldg A frontage. Plan needs to include these.

E-2: Plan is missing a tree symbol on west side between buildings (ArR); are plantings on patio to extend beyond patio as shown?; only 3 JcS are shown, not five on west of building A; remove gas line from plan;

A detail sheet needs to be added to the pan set to include SMH, Cleanout, Trench excavation/construction, sidewalk, curbing and all other applicable construction details necessary.

Ms. Hale provided the following drainage comments:

D-3: Who will be the supervising engineer that is referenced.

D-3: Will there be fabric on all sides of the drip edge infiltration trench especially at the property line to the west? Any impermeable at foundations.

Will the porous pavement be the last thing placed? IE – building construction will occur first to limit the equipment on the porous pavement? A construction phasing plan should be required prior to bldg permit.

What has been done to confirm that the area is acceptable for infiltration (soils).

What happens relative to the infiltration along the slopes to the west – will there be issues with the swale between the properties?

An Operation and Maintenance plan will be required. It was noted that one was provided within the Stormwater Management Report.

The Traffic Study will need to be reviewed.

Jodie Strickland, CMA discussed the following comments on the plans:

List the variances granted and what is being proposed as a result.

Provide both the required standard and the proposed standard in the Zoning District table.

The plans should be stamped by a licensed engineer.

Please provide details of water service, curb stop, thrust blocks, sewer service, clean out, manhole, sidewalk, signs, tipdown, loam and seed, landscaped areas, etc.

Are there architectural drawings?

Is there a traffic plan?

S-1:

List the contact at each utility company.

Add the architect's contact information.

Add the stormwater engineer's information.

Define the term "ridge" (ridge height and ridge elevation are both on the plans). Does this value matter?

Show the layout of the parking spaces below the building.

Proposed Building B incorrectly says 16 residential units.

S-2:

Some text is written over other text and is unreadable.

Please provide the test pit information (on this sheet or another sheet).

Show existing water main and drainage pipes.

Move the silt soxx detail to its own sheet with other erosion control details (a stabilized construction entrance, silt sacks for catch basins, etc.) and notes.

The existing building and TD Bank are both labeled as #40.

Please show the lot line for Tax Map 144, Lot 55.

S-3:

What are the elevations of the proposed retaining wall and proposed wall? What are the walls constructed of? How do they tie into the proposed grading. Please provide details. We note that the wall may need to be designed by a structural engineer.

Remove "rooftop to be infiltrated" from the buildings.

Show limits of sidewalk replacement.

S-4:

Show the proposed grades, not the existing grades.

What is the purpose of the hatching?

It doesn't appear that the roadway sawcut on Dearborn Ave needs to go all the way to the sidewalk.

Add the word "sewer" to existing service on Dearborn Ave.

Label the sewer manhole, inverts and rim elevation.

Is a sewer manhole on private property ok with the Town? Who is responsible for maintenance?

Where is the proposed gas service?

Remove the existing gas service.

Is the utility pole for #2 Dearborn Ave to remain? Is an access easement required or does one exist?

C-1:

The stormwater plans should be stamped by a licensed engineer.

Add a label for the location of D1.2.

D-1:

Relabel the Typical Roadway Section to indicate that this is for the parking area.

E-1:

Are there lights on the concrete patio on Building A?

Are there lights on the walkway for Building B?

E-2:

What are the details of the trash area? Is this a dumpster? Will there be a pad and fencing/screening?

There should be a note/leader about grass and other landscaped areas.

There should be a planting detail.

The planting table is missing some species.

Ms. Strickland provided the following stormwater comments:

Please provide the conductivity value used for infiltration purposes, how it was derived and the factor of safety used.

The square footage of building B is not the same as shown on the plan.

The square footages of buildings, sealed surfaces, pervious areas do not coincide in section 1.3, Table 2 and section 2.4.

Please separate the pre and post analyses in their own sections.

The incorrect rainfall values are used in the analyses (should be extreme precipitation plus 15%).

Please use inverts and elevations that coincide with site data.

Town Attorney Gearreald discussed his comments. A copy was forward to Attorney Scully by Mr. Bachand in advance of the meeting.

Map 161, Lot 18 - 69 High Street needs abutter notification as stated in his memo dated May 26, 2020 for the Planning Board's public hearing.

Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, Inc., the Town of Hampton, and Unitil all need abutter notification for the Planning Board's public hearing.

In his memo of May 26, 2020 Attorney Gearreald questioned what the commercial uses were to be. In Mr. Boyd's letter dated July 8, 2020 it is indicated that commercial uses are still not known at this time and anticipates Attorney Scully will expound on this at the next meeting. Attorney Scully spoke to this, but did not know at this point what the commercial space would be used for.

Attorney Gearreald discussed parking concerns. Town property cannot be allocated to give a number of spaces to a particular private property's use without Selectmen's approval. It appears the residential parking is within the buildings. The only parking at the Town parking lot would be for the public to use for the purpose of going to the commercial businesses.

Attorney Gearreald discussed deed description issues, and whether they have been addressed. Corrective deeds were discussed. There has been a delay due to COVID-19 issues, but Attorney Scully hopes this will be addressed soon.

Jim Marchese, Building Inspector did not have any additional comments.

There will be another PRC meeting on this application. Ms. Olivier noted that people will provide their notes to Attorney Scully. Mr. Bachand gave the next two dates for PRC resubmittals and meetings: August 5th deadline for an August 26th meeting or September 9th deadline for a September 23rd meeting. He noted there were many good comments today, and much work is to be done. **Mr. Bachand expects to see everything resubmitted together at once in order to move forward to the next PRC meeting. This means the traffic study, revised elevations, revised plans, and so forth. The applicant should submit in PDF and hard copy format by their chosen deadline.**

Adjourned 3:00 p.m.

Jason M. Bachand, AICP, CFM
Town Planner