

Town of Hampton



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

September 23, 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 Engineer
Jennifer Hale, Assistant DPW Director
James Marchese, Building Inspector
Mark Gearreald, Town Attorney
Tobey Spainhower, DPW
Mike Bernier, Aquarion
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning

Absent: Richard Sawyer, Police Chief
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator
Jameson Ayotte, Fire Chief
Cathy Gilman, Unutil

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.

Mr. Jason Bachand, Town Planner read the statement about telephonically having this meeting due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Kat Racine from Millennium Engineering, Rob Roseen from Waterstone Engineering, and Attorney James Scully were on the phone. Attorney Scully introduced Ms. Racine to the PRC members. She works with Mr. Boyd at Millennium Engineering. He received Attorney Gearreald's correspondence.

Ms. Racine discussed she feels she made the plans easier to read. They also provided a 12-page document addressing issues. Mr. Roseen forwarded Stormwater paperwork and the O&M. The biggest concern was the change in elevation. There was no change to the building elevation. There is an updated plan that came in after the deadline (lights) in front of Building A and Building B illuminating the parking lot.

Attorney Scully asked for committee comments and questions.

Mike Bernier called in (Aquarion). He emailed comments to Mr. Bachand (provided in the Planning Office). Individual businesses can have one meter. Each unit needs own its individual meter.

Attorney Gearreald, regarding #75-79 (in the applicant's letter), was asked about to Attorney Scully. Attorney Scully said abutters have been taken care of. The American Legion was notified. Aquarion and Unutil have been notified also. #77 – remains the same; not knowing what commercial uses are. They still are not sure.

Regarding #78, on parking – there are 34 spaces on site. Those are for residential units. Parking on site is for residences.

On the first set of plans dated September 8, 2020 – on the upper corner there are parking spaces provided. Should the note say “for residential use only” was asked. Attorney Scully said that can be added. Attorney Gearreald said to avoid commercial users parking in those spaces, it should have signage to that effect. Attorney Scully said ‘yes’, there will be at the entryway.

Attorney Gearreald said it should be on the site plan as well.

Attorney Scully said on #79 – nothing has changed. They spoke with the individual; they agreed to make the change, but due to the pandemic, they did not decide to go down there yet to have it signed. It's drafted and ready to go. It will be taken care of and will be provided to Attorney Gearreald when ready. Attorney Gearreald would like to see it in draft form. Attorney Scully said the previous owner is very cooperative and said there will be no problem in making the change.

Jennifer Hale (DPW) said most of her comments are plan related. On cover sheet, MB for mailboxes and TA for trash area. One is in a parking space. That should be addressed. This is the Site Plan. Parking as shown, she believes, does not work (5 & 4 spaces). It is asking for fender bender. It's not safe.

Ms. Hale said on the existing conditions (F1) sewer on High Street should be 12". Dearborn Avenue drain manhole is being called sewer manhole. Needs correcting. Existing conditions plan – demo notes should go on demo plan. **SHE WILL SEND HER NOTES TO THE APPLICANT/ATTORNEY SCULLY.**

Ms. Hale said the lot line wasn't shown. The response was it was not surveyed.

F2, demolition plan – frontage – sidewalks are not shown to the north where there should be. All utilities are not necessarily shown; it's missing sewer. Pieces of water and sewer are shown.

Ms. Hale discussed the building – what is going to be demo'd should be shown. The building coming down, the shed coming down. Existing fence – plan to take it down later; it needs to be shown what is coming down now and what is coming down later. Utility poles shown and to be removed must be shown.

Pole clarification is needed.

Proposed water line – what is happening to the existing was asked.

Site layout and grading plan; shut utilities off is ok. Still not clear how the front of the patio can be at (elevation) 99 with the finished floor of Building A at a different height. The elevation of the commercial space needs to be relooked at. ADA was noted.

How the poured concrete patio ties into the existing sidewalk was asked about. Will our (Town) sidewalk be affected was asked.

Ms. Hale does not know what utilities are being changed. How much disturbance.

The site layout plan should include the location of mailboxes and the trash/recycle area. Fencing in and shielding is not shown on the plan. She asked if they think every tenant

and business will get barrels. There is no way can they all fit there, and they need BOS approval. Not every tenant or business will get trash/recycling. Not enough room.

Utilities plan – F4 – inverts and manholes; material for sewer from Building A. Ms. Hale discussed electric from existing poles. Poles in the right of way were discussed. If existing can feed it, it should go that way. They should ask Cathy at Unutil. The response letter says it is based with Unutil on final line; it should be answered ahead of time. It needs confirmation asap.

The calculation needs to be shown on plan. The proposed water usage for new use. The last use was a school.

Each variance should be shown, including showing what now is being provided. Note that the zone requires “this”, and “this” is what is provided. It’s clearer to know where the variances are from.

Site components, etc. were discussed. This is overdevelopment of this site and requires all of this information.

Regarding #52, Homeowners Association is noted. How are these units owned was asked. Who is the responsible party.

Attorney Scully said these are apartments; not condos. Ms. Racine said the owner of the parcel is responsible for the manhole. This is not condominiumized. There is one owner to the parcel per Attorney Scully.

Ms. Hale looked at the watershed plans. Is only the property in the watershed was asked. Mr. Roseen did not model anything off site. Ms. Hale is concerned that there is so much poreous-ness; there is run off that comes on this property. Mr. Roseen does not have an answer for that; they need to do a site walk. Managing site run off needs to be addressed with permeable pavements and off-site run off. It is an important consideration. He will run it by Ms. Hale. It will be presented in writing.

Ms. Racine asked about the lot line. Ms. Racine said it is not surveyed because they care about the main parcel, not the abutter parcel. They approximated the location.

Attorney Gearreald said there have been problems with what the Registry can record. Chairman signatures and recording was asked about. The cover sheet may be the only sheet recorded; Ms. Racine said Sheet F3 will be the recorded site plan. The property lines need metes and bounds. F3 is the grading plan, and Attorney Gearreald said the Registry would not take the grading plan. Whichever one gets recorded needs to show metes and bounds.

Jodie Strickland (CMA) discussed the plans. She noted the traffic study has not been reviewed yet; someone else in their office will review it. Stormwater has not been reviewed completely now. She agrees with Jennifer Hale’s comments. Test pit – infiltration – larger drainage area that comes on site that should be looked at.

She will send her comments later on Stormwater.

Mr. Roseen said they will look at the off-site run-off. The infiltration system is raised; will only capture drip edge infiltration. Sidewalks will be raised. Same is true for porous.

Ms. Strickland needs to see grading addressed more. Does it pool; routed around front of property, etc was discussed.

The Planning Board needs to know what is going on. Information should be on the plans to see variances, relief, etc. There was discussion of a second recorded document cross-referencing the plan.

Cover sheet; remove overhead wire line going into Building A. Lines aren't called out or labeled. Utility contact – contacts should be added for every utility company.

The entrance to the site is extending across the first parking space. It should be cut off at the edge of parking space.

Ms. Strickland said show parking calculations. Where are the numbers coming from was asked.

Sheet F1-sewer manhole – should be drain manhole. Move existing seasonal high table. Ms. Strickland said 39' to existing sewer service; what does that mean or relate to was asked.

Ms. Strickland asked if sewer is coming off of High Street or Dearborn. Two services? No line being shown. It needs to be cleaned up. Label existing sewer. Existing utilities are still not clearly shown.

The existing conditions plan needs to show everything clearly.

Sheet F2 – in legend but overriding. **JODIE WILL SEND HER NOTES.**

The demolition plan is kind of an erosion control plan also. They need their own sheet.

Show what is being demo'd on the demolition plan.

Sheet F3 – triangles. At the front of the building. Building A has them in front; Building B has one. On the back too. What are those symbols; what do they mean was asked. Remove chain link fence across the parking lot.

Show the parking layout on the parking plan.

Ms. Strickland said it looks like each unit has its own garage door.

Ms. Strickland discussed the meter not pointing to anything.

Roof top being infiltrated was discussed. No feature infiltrating rooftop stormwater. It does not need to be on building.

JODIE WILL SEND NOTES; THERE ARE MANY COMMENTS FROM CMA.

A tree in an area noted may interfere with a parking space per Attorney Gearreald. He asked if the Town will do trash pick-up.

Ms. Hale said she is vague on trash. The Board of Selectmen has the policy; they have to be absolutely sure where they are going to put the trash and recycling to be picked up. As far as quantity; it is dictated by policy itself. Areas are to be screened as well. Per site plan regulations. Attorney Gearreald said if served by the Town (trash), each unit would not be allocated for 2 barrels was asked/noted. Under current policy, per Ms. Hale, the number of barrels they can safely pick up and store is as noted. Future policies would then apply to them. It is not grandfathered, she does not believe.

They have to be picked up on the street. No way for residences to bring it to that area. Then there needs to be an area to store them. Attorney Gearreald asked about private trash pick up. Ms. Hale cannot mandate that.

The applicant needs to show where to store trash; where will collection be was asked. The Board is working on changes here as well.

Attorney Scully said if making it easier (having private trash pick-up), he thinks his client would be fine with that. It was noted the Planning Board would want to see where it would be located and how it will be screened if private.

Ms. Strickland discussed Dearborn and High Street (landscaping), it is tricky to pull out. It needs to be looked at in the traffic analysis.

James Marchese, Building Inspector discussed the ZBA relief – 4' to building height it said ridge height is 38.6'; he wants the Town's terminology (grade plan is 38.6'). On the same cover sheet, it was noted sealed surface at 40.4 percent – on the sheet it notes porous concrete walkway. The Town uses impervious cover; land cover – they are allowed 75 percent. Now they have rooftop infiltration. Don't confuse by having numbers with what is going on.

Mr. Bachand noted that he also had a number of plan comments, but most have been spoken about (in this meeting). He discussed the architectural (elevation) plans. He noted it states 48-56 as the address; it should be 48-52. Lot number is "2"; not "20" as stated on the plans.

Mr. Bachand also noted no professional stamp is shown on the submitted site plan set.

We need existing and proposed (zoning requirements, variances, parking, etc) on record at the Registry per Mr. Bachand. There were many variances.

Mr. Bachand is concerned about the trash/recycling as well. What will it look like was asked. Can it be picked up safely was asked. We are concerned about visual appearance and avoiding traffic issues.

Mr. Bachand discussed the traffic study. He noted the conclusion was there would be a very small increase in traffic and it will not significantly impact existing traffic conditions. There is already significant congestion on high and Dearborn, especially at peak hours. We need to have a much better handle of this. How can this be minimized was asked. This needs to be dealt with before going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Bachand discussed whether relief (use variance) had been granted for the rear building. It is Section 2.8.C.1. A Conditional Use Permit is also needed under 2.8.D.1 (per previous comment), and the applicant has responded to this. He thinks the matter is addressed (see the ZBA application for requested/granted relief).

This project is an over-intensive use of this site per Mr. Bachand. The site is challenging. He feels that he must continue expressing this concern. It is why these PRC reviews have been so challenging.

Mr. Bachand believes we need to have another meeting on this. The PRC members agreed.

There will be another PRC meeting. October 7th is the next resubmittal deadline; October 28th would be next PRC meeting.

Meeting Adjourned 3:08 p.m.

Laurie Olivier
Office Manager/Planning