

# Town of Hampton



## PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

**March 25, 2015– 1:00 PM  
Selectmen's Meeting Room**

**PRESENT:** Jason Bachand, Town Planner  
Chris Jacobs, DPW  
Bill Straub, CMA Engineers  
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator  
Serge Laprise, Unutil  
Kevin Schultz, Building Inspector  
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager

**Absent:** Scott Steele, Fire Prevention  
Police Chief Richard Sawyer—absent  
Mike Bernier, Aquarion--absent

**Meeting Began at 1:00 p.m.**

---

***144 Ashworth Avenue, Map: 293 Lot: 66. Applicant: Zoo Property Management.***

***Site Plan: Addition to existing structure for storage space for existing business and addition of two residential apartments. Waiver Request: Section V.E. Detailed Plan.***

Henry Boyd of Millenium Engineering appeared with Al Fleury, owner of Wally's Pub. Mr. Fleury is proposing an addition on the southerly side of the building. Most of the site is sealed. They added pavers. This is a pre-existing situation. They are making it slightly better. Addition and pavers is all that is being added.

Kevin Schultz (Building) asked how many units are existing. There are two apartments; one is used as storage and an office; one is an apartment. The storage doesn't have a kitchen or bathroom; it's just storage--the unit on the right (looking at the back). Mr. Schultz asked about the two units. Mr. Fleury said the first floor is all storage. On the second floor, there will be three apartments in the new building. There will be a total of four apartments. Mr. Schultz said this triggers a multi-family. One apartment and an office is there; it is in fact an office. The prior apartment has been abandoned as an apartment. Mr. Schultz said if there is no kitchen, etc., it is storage/office; not an apartment.

Mr. Schultz asked about the easement. Mr. Boyd couldn't see anything in the Deed. There was a lot line adjustment. Mr. Boyd will read the deed again. Mr. Boyd said there is a recorded Lot Line Adjustment. Mr. Schultz asked about the existing retaining wall. It was asked if it is on 144's property. Mr. Boyd said "yes". That is on Mr. Fleury's property; Al just realized that at this meeting. The bounds are existing per Mr. Boyd. (We need to check on the easement). Mr. Schultz is worried about encroaching on an easement. **Mr. Boyd will look at both titles and will verify.**

Mr. Schultz asked about the four apartments; all spaces need two spaces per units. There are 8 parking spaces. The loading zone was asked about. Mr. Schultz said two in front of the addition are for one of the dwelling units. Mr. Schultz said there are concerns about aisle widths, etc.

Mr. Straub (CMA) had no idea of what was being proposed, etc. There is no application nor narrative provided with the plans.

Jason Bachand (Town Planner) asked about the sealed surface calculations. He asked how the numbers were reached. He noted the 89.5 and 89.9 percent for existing. 89.5 percent is noted on the proposed. The 83 percent impervious is sited on a pre-existing plan that was recorded. Mr. Bachand would like 83 percent; not 89.5. Mr. Fleury discussed the old plans. Mr. Fleury said the previous owner didn't do what he was supposed to do. Mr. Fleury put crushed stone in. Permeable asphalt or grass would work per Mr. Bachand and Ms. Rayann Dionne (Conservation Coordinator). Ms. Dionne asked them to extend pavers; it is all crushed stone. Ms. Dionne asked about the gravel pave. If it's gravel, the neighbors complain per Mr. Fleury. Mr. Fleury will dig up the old paperwork from the Town.

It was noted that the applicant could go to the ZBA for a variance. His variance would be to exceed something already exceeded. The numbers are now down to 75 percent.

Mr. Schultz doesn't think he can ask for a variance because he is not expanding the condition. **Ms. Dionne said the site plan may need to be amended and Mr. Schultz thinks that makes more sense.**

A waiver request is appropriate for the plan per Mr. Bachand; Chris Jacobs (DPW) asked Mr. Bachand why. Mr. Jacobs sees it as a lightly prepared, lightly engineered drawing trying to skate in under the Ordinance. Other applicants have had to prepare full plans. **He wants to see the proposed addition shown; where access points are; doorways, etc. Chris is concerned about paver patios.** The applicant did not prepare full documents. There are no handicap spots shown. Six spaces are probably already used for other spaces. All winter long they used Johnson Ave for parking spots. Tenant upstairs parked on Johnson Ave. Snow was piled all over the place per Mr. Jacobs. **This applicant needs to do a full site study. He thinks lighting and everything needs to be looked at. It needs more of a site plan.**

Mr. Jacobs realizes this will be expensive, but it doesn't preclude storm water (taking care of). The Town should not tolerate crushed stone.

The patio was asked about. It would not affect the business. Mr. Jacobs discussed floors. Mr. Boyd said Mr. Fleury is not required by the Regs to provide parking for commercial business.

Mr. Schultz discussed elevations, the patio (outdoor) – he stated it is not outdoors; it is enclosed. You have an opening with a gate. It's roofed over also. It has an encased opening to a room that is totally enclosed. Mr. Jacobs noted that it narrows down to 4.5'. Mr. Jacobs questions emergency access. The building is sprinklered per Mr. Schultz.

Mr. Bachand asked about parking with 45 degree angle. You can reduce from 22' to 11' aisle width, at that angle per the site plan regs, but Jason doesn't see how someone can negotiate that turn.

Mr. Bachand asked about the overhang. That is the loading area.

They are adding three additional units; the application says "2". **Mr. Schultz said the rental Co's need to be checked out.** Mr. Schultz said if he is abandoning the unit as an apartment, they will take that off.

**Mr. Bachand wants the residential parking to be designated for residents only.** Soundproofing was discussed. A preconstruction meeting will be needed. **Mr. Bachand wants a new plan to be worked on to coincide with Ernie's plan (i.e. bike parking, entrance/exit locations, HC spaces, etc). Snow removal was discussed as well.-should be removed from site.**

Ms. Dionne knows some of the parking lots were designated as handicap. He may need to have the parking lot re-visited. Ms. Dionne said changes on this project can affect the parking lot. She thinks they are tied in together. Mr. Jacobs discussed ADA. ADA states that each and every parking lot shall have a parking space for handicapped person. Mr. Jacobs told Mr. Fleury he needs it.

Mr. Schultz asked about the parking lot. It is adjacent to angled parking, Mr. Fleury provided access across the area (walkway) for accessibility. Mr. Schultz asked if that access is being blocked. **Mr. Boyd needs to check on that. Site plan for parking lot and 6 parking spaces needs to be looked at; there appears to be a problem per Mr. Schultz.**

Mr. Jacobs said it is there to serve the pub. Mr. Jacobs noted that the application is not just this lot/site, but for the parking lot as well. Mr. Jacobs also discussed

impervious there and pervious area and it may help comply with 83 percent if it's all looked at together. **A lot merger may be needed.**

## **FIRE**

Mr. Bachand met with Fire earlier today. They discussed fire rating between residential and commercial properties. Hydrant locations need to be on the plans as well.

Mr. Bachand noted a lot of work needs to be done. He knows they were hoping to be on April 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Bachand suggests to have this application continued to the May meeting.

Mr. Boyd asked if they should come before the PRC again and it was noted “yes”. The next PRC meeting will be on for the end of April (April 22<sup>nd</sup>). It was clarified that the application would need to be continued to the June 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Board meeting based on holding another PRC meeting and the subsequent resubmittal date.

**Mr. Bachand asked for a letter to have this matter continued to June 3<sup>rd</sup> because they need to go before the PRC again.**

Mr. Boyd requested to be **put on for the next PRC meeting.**

***47 Ocean Boulevard, Map: 293 Lot: 176. Applicant: David Bellman & Douglas Sharek.***

***Site Plan: Demolish existing single-family home & construct 3-unit multi-family building with commercial retail on first level.***

Amy Sanders with CLD appeared with David Bellman (applicant). Ms. Sanders said there was an existing single-family home there with a shared driveway; gravel parking lot is to the rear. They want to demolish the existing building and construct a multi-family building. It would be a one-bedroom unit on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. They went to Zoning and were granted relief for parking spaces; 6 are required; 5 are proposed. There is on-street parking.

Mr. Schultz is familiar with the project.

Bill Straub asked the area per dwelling. A pre-1986 issue was discussed. Ms. Sanders said they went to the ZBA first; only applied for the 6.3 – parking. When they went to the first meeting, they believed they needed to go back for area dwelling. The lawyer and Mr. Schultz agreed that they don't need a variance for that. They are grandfathered. Mr. Schultz said “under the footnote” section. Mr. Straub said there was only one dwelling unit at that time. Now it's three. Any expansion of a lot upward or size wise of a use does not require people to go for variance. A volume expansion is required in other towns/cities for ZBA. Mr. Straub believes it should have gone before the ZBA, but this is not his issue.

The easement was asked about by Mr. Straub. Ms. Sanders is not sure. Ms. Sanders applied for a driveway permit from the DOT. She has not heard anything

negative back. The change of use may have implications with access easement. The applicant granted the easement. **The Planning Board should know this; it should be documented for the PB.**

Mr. Straub asked about grading and drainage. He asked about infiltration of all the water. Ms. Sanders did a drainage study-table 5, and she did not account for infiltration when she did the drainage study. She said she modeled the pavers that underlying soil is gravel and it will not infiltrate. She ignored pavers.

Ms. Dionne asked if any water off site will not be made worse. Mr. Straub said they may want to model this with pervious pavers and get rid of the water. Ms. Dionne asked how there is minimal water. It's all infiltrating.

Mr. Straub discussed water for domestic and fire purposes. Ms. Sanders spoke with Aquarion and Aquarion wants to see fire service and domestic service. **That needs to be modified.**

Mr. Straub discussed sewer service. Ms. Sanders spoke with DPW (Toby) and he told her there was a 6" line. She believes there are 2. Toby told her to get rid of one of them. Mr. Jacobs said they are newer; he said the one on the southern side needs to be used; not the one on the northern side.

Mr. Straub asked where nearest hydrant is; **it needs to be on plan.**

Mr. Straub wants to see manholes on Ocean Boulevard, if needed. Chris J. said not necessary at this point.

The lighting plan was asked about (southern lighting). Ms. Sanders said it is a ceiling light (doorway light). Ms. Sanders will check it out.

Mr. Bachand asked about water – plans noted Town. **It is Aquarion; should be corrected. Snow storage was asked about; it should be noted on plan. There should be some plan for trucking snow off site.** It can be noted in the O&M.

Residential units – they are proposed to be condominiums. A condo site plan will need to be provided. Condo docs for legal review will be needed.

Coordinate with PD for safety plan for construction phase of plan.

An as-built will be needed at the end upon completion.

Mr. Bachand said it is leased land. No fences being erected on property was discussed. Retail use was discussed – per the Lease. Mr. Schultz pointed this out to applicants before.

Sheet 2 – there is a note regarding concrete or permeable pavers. Mr. Bachand thinks that should not be open-ended. The Planning Board would want confirmation on that. Planning Board Chair signature needs to be added to plans and on the condo site plan as well.

## **FIRE:**

Fire will provide a letter. Sprinklers to be added. Water connections and hydrant locations to be added.

Mr. Schultz said the building design and fire systems will have to be reviewed by fire protection engineer. Structural engineer stamps are needed per Mr. Schultz..

Mr. Jacobs asked about the stormwater plans; they will submit paperwork to review. Sign on site that says keeping them clean. Keeping pavers clean.

Handicap parking spot was addressed. Some sort of stop sign was discussed. A stop sign should be added. Mr. Jacobs is looking for cross walk as well.

Ms. Dionne asked about C1. She wants an explanation of how sealed surface numbers are calculated for her Conservation Comm commission – for impervious surface. She wants to see how the numbers came to what she has.

Ms. Dionne said on C2 she wants to see proposed numbers for sealed surface. She said it could all be put on C2.

Ms. Dionne wants them to identify snow storage – she wants it identified where it will be stored (added to plan). Ms. Dionne is concerned about permeable pavers, asphalt and then permeable pavers. You can't sand the pavers. You are setting pavers up for failure. She is not sure why it's chopped.

Ms. Dionne asked if they are having gutters or roof run-off. It's just dripping off. Mr. Jacobs does not have an issue with chopping up the pavers/asphalt.

Serge Larprise from Unutil/Electric appeared. Mr. Larprise asked about them going underneath for utilities. **Excavation permit – Serge needs a copy of that.**

A SECOND PRC IS NOT NEEDED. **Chris wants to see O&M prior to PB meeting.** They are on for May 6<sup>th</sup>.

**44 & 50 Timber Swamp Road, Maps: 66 & 85 Lots: 4 & 2. Applicants: Susanna Tetlow Dunbar & J. Michael Dunbar. Subdivision: 5-lot Subdivision (3 residential and 2 industrial).**

Joe Coronati of Jones and Beach appeared. There are two existing buildings on one lot. The property is two parcels to be combined, merged and re-subdivided. The Dunbars received variances to have less frontage (residential). This is a common drive subdivision. Three lots will have one common drive. There are no utilities. It will be private well; private septic. Drainage will be handled same as Exeter Road (Lovetere). The vacant parcel -- there is nothing planned for it. They are creating a lot; not a use. No special permit is required.

Mr. Schultz asked about lot line (C2); Mr. Coronati said the line goes away. A1 is the best plan for Mr. Schultz and all to look at. Lot 4—nothing is designated.

Mr. Straub asked about easements associated with wells. The well for Lot 4 is on Lot 3. The well is on Lot 4, but the radius is on Lot 3 per Mr. Coronati.. Mr. Straub asked about the radius onto Lot 3. Mr. Coronati said in case they could not get a well where Mr. Coronati indicated, they wanted to reserve a second spot. They gave a well easement. Mr. Coronati said they would need an easement. **Mr. Schultz said they will need to file for a well radius indemnification.** If a 75' well radius cannot happen, there is paperwork that needs to be filed. Mr. Coronati said at this point they just need to put an easement. Easements on all lots were discussed. Mr. Straub discussed

hardware easements and radius easements. Mr. Coronati said it would be in the easement language. Mr. Straub said a radius is a radius. If a well for one lot is on another lot, Mr. Straub suggests that something **should be added to this plan.**

Mr. Welch (Town Manager) said it's problematic for the Town. Emergency situations regarding extending the sewer, etc. is a problem and costly to the Town if it goes that route. **\*(FRED, PLEASE REVISE AS NECESSARY; WAS HARD TO HEAR FROM UP FRONT – THANKS LAURIE)**

Mr. Straub discussed utility easement on Lot 4. It is Lot 3. Lots 1 driveway has to go over Lot 2. **Mr. Coronati will fix that.**

The shared driveway was asked about by Mr. Straub. Mr. Coronati asked about a 50' right of way. Driveway language in ordinance. Over 150' it needs Fire's recommendation. It is a public safety thing. There should be a turn-around or hammerhead. **That needs to be added to plan (turning).**

Mr. Straub asked about a PSNH easement. It's gravel because they don't want pavement in the easement. It will be worked on more for joint use agreement. Mr. Straub asked if there are any other restrictions with PSNH, etc. Mr. Coronati said in the Joint Use Agreement it is all spelled out. Mr. Coronati feels comfortable with it all. Powerhead has to be underground per Mr. Coronati. Power is going underground now. **PB should follow up on that.** Mr. Straub said it is a big easement.

Permits needed – State subdivision. Under an acre of disturbance. No grading plan is developed yet. Mr. Straub needs it for drainage features. Grading and drainage needs to be shown per Mr. Straub..

Mr. Straub asked about fire suppression; Mr. Straub wants that documented. It will be needed for the driveway anyway.

Mr. Bachand discussed that Fire wants 22'.

Ms. Dionne will touch on new Zoning Amendment. A 12' dwelling structure setback needs to be complied with. Article 3.2.7.C. It is a new Amendment adopted on March 10<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Dionne said they need 30,000 square feet to be contiguous. It has to be outside the WCD; 12' goes to the primary structure.

Assessor discussed intent to cut. - Filing an intent to cut—developer or Mr. Coronati to handle.

Mr. Jacobs stated the street should be named. It serves more than two homes.

Blue background street sign versus green is needed. Mr. Jacobs. wants to see homeowners association document. Stop sign should be at end of common driveway. O&M plan needs to address annual inspection of culverts.

Refuge collection was discussed. Carts need to come out to the end of the road. They should create gravel pad to put containers on. That pad needs to stay clear.

Ms. Dionne asked for A1 or C2 to add that there are buildable lots. Ms. Dionne wants 2.3.4.A – no septic system....paragraph...She wants to have that shown. Ms. Dionne questions whether or not they need a special permit since the driveway is close to the buffer. Bio retention areas are close to the buffer. She recommends having him come to the next Con Comm meeting. There are a lot of wetlands on the site. Ms. Dionne doesn't have wetland delineator stamp and wetland scientist – poorly drained

and very poorly drained soils was discussed. **Stamps need to be added on the plans.** An independent review may need to occur on the property.

A1-Note 16-markers to be placed. They want granite bounds and markers and locations should be noted on the plan that gets recorded. Markers don't have to be on trees; they can be on stakes. They will discuss at Con Comm meeting.

Ms. Dionne asked for spec houses to be shown. Lot 2 it's hard to see where a house will go. Bio-retention area, well head....she wants an idea where house could go.

Note 13 on C2 – pad mounted transformer. She didn't see it on the plans. She asked if it's in the buffer.

Signage on snow storage should be added (tight area). 12" . The culvert on C2 was asked about. She asked if it could be moved west/down the driveway. Impacts in the 50' buffer will trigger special permit.

Mr. Welch thinks the granite markers are a good idea. Many times markers are gone. Putting them on trees is a bad idea. Trees die or neighbors cut down trees. There should be a penalty in the condo or homeowners documents if signs are down. Granite is a good idea.

Mr. Welch discussed State septic regulations where new leach fields can be placed, etc. The State is going to require this. The State can't require a reserve area.

Mr. Coronati said they will come to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Schultz said if they aren't proposing to be in the buffer, would they need a special permit Ms. Dionne is questioning the delineation.

No need for 2<sup>nd</sup> PRC. Revised plans due before April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**263 Drakeside Road & Towle Farm Road, Maps: 157 & 140 Lots: 1 & 1. Applicant: Chinburg Builders, Inc. Owners of Record: Valle Drakeside, LLC, Asset Title Holding, Inc., Vallee & Asset-Liberty Lane. Subdivision: 10-lot subdivisions (residential home lots).**

Joe Coronati appeared. Matt from Chinburg Builders appeared. There are two parcels at the end of Drakeside Road and Towle Farm Road. The parking lot is still there. They went to a conceptual hearing to the PB on this. One portion is Industrial zoned. It would be 10 frontage lots. It's on 6 ½ acres. Four lots would share a driveway. Manhole is to south of the site. State put in sewer main extension. There is a common force main. No association needs to come in to pay to pump. They talked to Aquarion, they want 400' extended water main up Drakeside Road to be brought in. Water service cuts across Drakeside. He will put that on the next plan. **Mr. Laprise's design is NOT on the plan. Unitil would like to extend its pole line to Towle Farm Road for future expansion. Serge wants to incorporate into design to feed the homes.** Serge stated there is a lot of discussion pertaining to the common driveway. Unitil wants to hold off on its design if this layout is to change. Unitil needs to be in the loop on that piece per Serge. L.

Mr. Coronati stated the Stormwater situation is similar to Lovetere/Exeter Road project. The bio-retention area was discussed. They are removing over an acre of asphalt. Infiltration was discussed. Leaching catch basins have been plugged.

Ms. Dionne said there was no information on delineation being done. **Notes will be added. She also recommends** that this go to Con Comm (Lots 9 and 10). She pulled older plans for abutting properties. Ms. Dionne said it may need a wetland delineation review. Ms. Dionne asked about the buffer impact. The 75 percent of underlined zoning – buildable lot issues were discussed. Granite bounds and markers were mentioned; to be on recorded plan. They need 12' primary setback buffer from wetland edge. HOA needs to be for the driveway. She wants O&M Plan.

Mr. Schultz discussed A1. All except Lots 9 and 10; frontage was discussed. Mr. Schultz wants to know about gap. They go across a lot of the right of way. Mr. Schultz asked about Lot #8. He sees 122'. Mr. Coronati does not want a variance; he will move it. Mr. Schultz asked about 4-lot driveway. Lot 7, 8 or 9 (living there) – road going through front yard. Mr. Schultz said there is nothing in Ordinance about individual lots having own individual driveway. Mr. Schultz hates the layout for the last four lots. It's not a cul de sac. Fire and travel and place for fire apparatus will all come to play in the last two projects.

Mr. Straub discussed Lot 8. Footnote 22 was discussed. Many lots 2, 3 4 and 5, square will not fit. Lots are too narrow. Look at Footnote 22 on zoning dimensional chart. Lots 2, 3, 4 and 5 don't appear correct.

Driveway—anything over 150' requires approval from Fire Dept. How will trucks turn around. HOA with easements was discussed by Mr. Straub;; he should look at private cul de sac meeting Town standards. It needs to be dealt with. Mr. Straub **reiterated that easement problem needs to be solved. There will be a common drive and utility easement.**

Mr. Straub discussed permits – State subdivision. Mr. Coronati said they are tying into sewer; they need sewer connection permit.

**Grading plan is incomplete per Bill S.** Bill S didn't complete drainage review. He asked about bio retention area. Joe C said it will infiltrate. That detail will be added.

Bill S asked about sewer. The force main ownership will need to be discussed. It's in the Town right of way. Applicant will need to see if Selectmen allow them to keep it there.

Bill S said force main needs to be worked out. Who owns grinder pumps; each house will own it. Where does Homeowners's responsibility stop and start was asked.

Water main was discussed by Bill S. 4" - Aquarion said they may end up with 2". That would be owned by Association. It would be a private water line.

There is going to be a hydrant. **Joe needs to add hydrants. Joe needs to look at 600' distance. Hydrants need to be added.**

O&M can't be reviewed. No lighting is proposed. No landscaping is proposed.

#### FIRE COMMENTS:

Mr. Bachand said 18' is not sufficient; they want 22' – they could do 20'. Hammerhead is essential. Mr. Bachand wants a truck turning plan. He also wants to see more of wetlands shown on the plan (off site). Site remediation issues on the old building should be investigated. Driveway permits will be needed.

Assessing wants lot numbering when needed.

Chris J. agrees with Kevin S. No one in his department liked the design. Chris J doesn't want the PB to accept application.

Chris J. read errors and omissions on the application.

Sealed and signed by all professionals. Mr. Jacobs read a memo he prepared to Mr. Bachand with complaints of the Jones & Beach Plan and application. Not Happy.

12" main should be provided. DPW does not like design.

Four lots sharing a driveway is not good.

Dropping 6' to 8' from driveways were discussed. Driveways have to serve police and fire as well as resident.

Redesigning the whole site was recommended by Chris J. Get rid of design difficulties. Create subdivision road working with lands profile. The force main shouldn't be extended down Drakeside Road.

Chris J wants them to take plan away. Re-do.

No trash would be picked up in that neighborhood.

Fred W said Selectmen need to give permission to tie into the State force main. They are proposing to tie into sewer main hole. If they tie into State man hole, there would be a problem. Rayann thinks it needs to go to another PRC. Chris J. is adamant that it does. Mr. Bachand agrees as well.

Ms. Dionne still wants it to come to Conservation Commission.

Meeting Ended: 3:47 p.m.

Laurie Olivier, Office Manager/Planning