

# Town of Hampton



## **PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES September 22, 2021 – 2:00 PM Selectmen's Meeting Room**

**PRESENT:** Jason Bachand, Town Planner  
Jodie Strickland, CMA Engineers (Telephonically)  
Joseph Lynch, Deputy DPW Director  
Mark Gearreald, Esquire  
Jim Marchese, Building Inspector  
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning

**Absent:** David Hobbs, Police Chief  
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer  
Tobey Spainhower, DPW  
Mike Bernier, Aquarion  
Taylor Raine, Until  
Brianna O'Brien, Conservation Coordinator

**886 Lafayette Road, Map: 71 Lot: 3.** Applicant: John & Amy Simmons, Trustees. Owners of Record: JA Simmons Revocable Living Trust. Site Plan: Raze existing commercial building & build a new building with new parking area. Waiver Request: Section IV Subsection D.2.VI for light only and Appendix E Section: Landscaping & Lighting, #12.

**886 Lafayette Road, Map: 71 Lot: 3.** Applicant: John & Amy Simmons, Trustees. Owner of Record: JA Simmons Revocable Living Trust. Wetlands Permit: Raze existing building; construct commercial building and porous pavement parking area. New building to have daylight drain for foundation within 50' wetland buffer.

Kat Racine, Millennium Engineering, appeared. They took the feedback and incorporated it into the new plans/documents. They combined the stormwater set and details. They revised the detail for sewer. They added downspout details.

Parking lot has been shifted (handicap spot). Do they need 9 spaces or 8 spaces was asked. Van assist space is where it should be. Granite curbs were added.

Jason Bachand (Town Planner) said with the revised plan set, there were a number of comments not addressed. He noted they should be reviewing the PRC Minutes more closely. A number of Attorney Gearreald's comments were not addressed as well.

Jason discussed the sealed surface note. It says 'minimum' at many places; Sheet S3, S4—and others say minimum sealed surface. All plans need to be checked. They should state 'maximum'.

Proposed planting area toward the front was discussed. What types and sizes/heights of plants will be there was asked. Kat added the comment. They are going to do bulbs, tulip and daffodil plants. It is in the comment section. Kat will call it out more specifically on the site plan.

Jason said the flood map reference was still incorrect. It should be noting the 2021 updated maps. That goes throughout. January 29, 2021 is the date of new FEMA maps. He said to be sure they are utilizing the latest flood maps in all of their work.

Jason discussed the O&M – there are comments also. Brianna O'Brien (Conservation) and DPW and CMA will have comments.

Jodie Strickland (CMA) was on the phone. Proposed landscaping should be shown on the plan. She asked Note 4-5 existing wastewater and proposed wastewater flow—is that required was asked. Kat said she thought they were asked to do that on another project so she did it here. From Public Works – there is an added fee with the increased flow.

No trash screening is proposed per Jodie. It notes 1,580 square feet but the O&M says 1,637; the numbers need to match. Stormwater Analysis and drawings need to match.

Test pits in the porous paver area was asked about by Jodie. It needs to be on the plan with a note; additional testing to be completed prior to construction.

Joe Lynch (DPW) asked Jodie about test pit results – what is the mechanism- do they get reviewed was asked. Jodie said it has not happened so far. Infiltration test needs to be done with the Town Engineer present. Jodie will report that back. Jodie can reach out to Jennifer for language. It has to be on the plan sets.

Existing sign being relocated was asked about from Jodie. Is the applicant reaching out to whoever's property it is on was asked.

Jodie: Minimum sealed surface should say “maximum”.

Parking area-striping – Jodie thought it was resolved. X’s are still appearing on the plan. Striping needs to be used.

Water and fire lines were discussed. Granite curb—not added to the legend.

Trench calculations were discussed. Detail for porous pavement signage.

Retaining wall-additional detail needs to be added. Existing and proposed. Retaining wall with abutter approval. What if an abutter does not agree. It will affect flow, etc.

1680 versus 1537 – areas should match.

Jodie will send her comments.

Kat asked Rob about the handicap sign; visual representation. Sheet D4 Part 4, third column. Signage – does Jodie want to see a visual aspect? Kat said it’s the writing that goes on it. Jodie will defer to the Town. Town usually likes to see a sign drawing with words on the sign.

Jim Marchese (Building Inspector) has no comments.

Joe (DPW) said he and Tobey Spainhower looked at the sewer connection. There is lack of information on the plan. Existing drainage line – 30” diameter in westerly gutter. Calculation is not correct. Proposed slope goes right through the drain line. Pitch is incorrect. Re-work the whole sewer design per Joe.

Joe discussed the sidewalk. The plan as drawn showing first parking area to the north – it does not work with the configuration of the sidewalk. When the new driveway goes in, extend the proposed sign area. Replace the sidewalk from the utility pole to the new tangent point. Then looking at the billboard, from the ground, parking pavement that encroaches from the north; where the billboard is – curb line runs through the pizza parking lot. The curbing can’t be built without affecting the neighbor’s parking. Joe said between the sewer and those issues, things otherwise seem to be in line.

Kat said the drain line – S4—very top of the sheet – catch basin; that runs parallel to the road and the curb. Flows south to north. Existing sewer service goes over the drain line. Pushing it back, against the grade and further back; they diverge. They are back into a pump system.

Kat discussed the current clean-out. Tobey calculated it separate. Kat asked if she read the tie wrong. Joe said to give him a call with Tobey.

Joe looked at the billboard posts – he felt that was a decent starting point. It is a conflict.

Joe discussed site distance coming out of the driveway. Pedestrians – height of the landscape bed is critical. Sign needs to be far enough away from the driveway.

Attorney Gearreald sent comments post PRC dated August 26<sup>th</sup>. Jason forwarded them to Kat. They were not addressed in the September 7<sup>th</sup> submission. Waterstone did address some issues. Written comments were not addressed.

He went over the comments. Kat thought John Anthony maybe was going to address those.

Apartment-no apartment anymore. A note on the plan should be added that the basement would be purely for storage; never for an apartment. Kat will add it.

Porous pavement – Item 4 – billboard footing detail. There should be a detail of footing since it is in porous pavement. It should be on SD-1. That will go to Rob.

Joe asked about the existing foundation; membrane and way to seal off membrane. Impermeable liner should be used.

Attorney Gearreald said C1 from Waterstone-July 28, 2021 as revised; it still says ‘remove existing billboard’. Kat missed that. She reiterated that the billboard is staying. It’s removed on C2.

Attorney Gearreald discussed the cover sheet and the site plan. The proposed sign out by Lafayette Road is shown. He asked Jim Marchese about the restrictions. **Attorney Gearreald said it should be a condition for the Planning Board as well.** It’s a separate sign than the billboard. Attorney Gearreald asked Mr. Marchese if there is a problem with Route One with the proximity of the sign to Route One. Mr. Marchese would have to check the Ordinance. It will be a sign on the post. Kat said the final design of sign is not determined.

Attorney Gearreald asked about the comment #5 on the drainage easement. Since 1899 it has been in place. It is in favor of the Boston & Maine Railroad. There is a note on the cover sheet. The cover sheet makes note of ‘please refer...’. Kat said both feel it’s referring likely to the way the topography slopes. They could not find anything that shows the culvert. They can’t find the culvert. It may be buried.

Attorney Gearreald said the State of NH is constructing a rail trail; they are finding things they did not expect. They may assert rights that have not been asserted for many years. Kat noted that portion is really not being changed much. Kat said it should not affect the site.

Joe discussed the pipe that goes back and discharges to the low area. Recorded plans from the DOT should be available – when Route One was constructed. It may be in the 2001 documents. Joe can look for it. Joe will check that for Kat.

Attorney Gearreald said the Town relied on drainage capability. Joe said where the two meet; it may show where the rights may be. Joe will try to find it.

Joe said Sheet 4 – edge of saw cut. 15’ wide trench across Route One was asked about. Joe said go with the narrowest trench possible.

Mr. Bachand discussed the billboard and whether the applicant would consider removing it from the site. Kat stated the applicant really wants to keep it.

Mr. Bachand said many things still need addressing. We’ve had 2 PRCs; October 6<sup>th</sup> is deadline for the November 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Board meeting.

Do we need a 3<sup>rd</sup> PRC was asked. Joe said it may have fatal flaw(s). If this/these issues are not taken care of, there is a problem anyway.

No third PRC is needed; Jodie agrees. Sewer and parking and abutter and drainage issues. They are not small issues, but if taken care of, they should be able to move forward.

October 6<sup>th</sup> is the resubmittal date and the meeting (tentatively) would be November 3<sup>rd</sup> with the Planning Board.

Laurie Olivier  
Office Manager/Planning  
Ended 2:50p.m.