

Town of Hampton



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

MINUTES

April 27, 2016– 2:00 PM
Selectmen's Meeting Room

PRESENT: Jason Bachand, Town Planner
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer
Jennifer Hale, DPW
William Straub, CMA Engineers
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning

Absent: Richard Sawyer, Police Chief
Kevin Schultz, Building Inspector
Scott Wade, Unitil
Mike Bernier, Aquarion

287 & 299 Exeter Road

Maps: 52 & 52 Lots: 1 & 2

Applicants: AG Hampton Hospitality LLC (299 Exeter Rd) & Charles F. Rolecek RT (287 Exeter Rd.)

Owners of Record: Same

Site Plan & Wetlands Permit: Construction of Hotel and Office Bldg.; SpringHill Suites by Marriott: 104 rooms, 4-story, 152 parking spaces. Office: 40,000 sq. ft, 3-story, 204 parking spaces. Connection to 287 Exeter Road with driveway and 12 new parking spaces. Wetlands Permit applies to 299 Exeter Road.

Mr. Keith Kelly and Barry Stowe appeared (Opechee).

Bill Straub (CMA) appeared. Jodie Strickland (CMA) attended the other meeting. Mr. Straub asked about outstanding sewer issues. The Drainage Plan looks reasonable to CMA. He will defer to DES.

Mr. Straub asked about the overall drainage discharge. He discussed right of way – approvals of easements, etc. He asked Opechee about traffic. Some comments were not addressed from the last time. All striping needs to meet MUTCD and other requirements.

A big issue is the negative left turn offset. They don't think it works any better than a month ago. Turning works against them. They need to line up as it is not safe. Mr. Straub asked about the left turn lanes; showing greater storage lengths. The deceleration length needs to be developed.

Mr. Straub said DOT comments are needed regarding access. The applicant needs painted islands or bubbles guarding through the lanes. Turning lane in A is better than the other option.

Mr. Straub discussed internal connections to CR's. Those should be required. There should be discussion with CR's.

Internal connection to CR's is needed for the long term. Mr. Straub will send his notes to the applicant in written form.

Mr. Steve Pernaw asked about the striping not working. This will be reviewed by the DOT. He asked what was not consistent. It has been reviewed by Mr. Pernaw. Mr. Straub said the design engineer needs to address this. Bill said striping requirements, he feels, are not adequate. Bill said there are so many geometric changes.

Mr. Pernaw said he felt the driveway did not need to be shifted. Mr. Straub thinks it should be. Turning almost collides. Mr. Straub does not believe it's safe. Mr. Pernaw said he doesn't know if the driveway can be moved; Mr. Straub said it could be moved to the East or Cornerstone could move to the West. Mr. Pernaw said the one across the street is defined.

Ms. Hale said she received a call from Bryan at DOT. She said the DOT has been involved a lot at this point. Ms. Hale gave them the latest information. She received an email back today saying they found it interesting. Ms. Hale said it sounds like the applicants are at square one. The DOT will have the final say as far as the roadway goes. Ms. Hale said the PRC comments are just comments.

Ms. Hale said Cornerstone is not built; their driveway is in the location it is because that is where it was. Now there are two applications before Hampton. Moving East disturbs large trees.

Ms. Hale said an alternative would be for Opechee to reach out to Cornerstone. Find out what Cornerstone's flexibility is to give 5 or 10 feet. As separate as these projects are; they are together she noted.

Mr. Stowe took measurements. There is a 13 foot negative offset. Mr. Stowe did a study in Belmont with a 7' offset. That intersection works fine. Mr. Stowe asked if he could go 7 feet. Ms. Hale asked them to show the Town as far as they can get over so the Town can see it. Mr. Stowe needs room to grade and do work. He may be able to get 7' offset. He will make an attempt.

Mr. Stowe said he can move closer to the property line. Mr. Straub said they can do retaining walls.

Ms. Hale gave examples in striping. Concept B was discussed. Full access needs to be cut because there is not a turn lane. Mr. Pernaw said private driveways do not break the line. Ms. Hale asked if they considered doing a pocket.

Mr. Pernaw said B does not provide a left turn pocket. Left turn volumes are very low. He thought they had issues with “A”.

Ms. Hale asked about the through lane going westbound.

Mr. Pernaw said the traffic study included the painted medium. Our consultant said to look at tapers, deceleration, etc. The original drawing had tapers. Mr. Pernaw discussed pockets; no room for deceleration. They can go back to the original study. Deceleration requires hundreds of feet. The Town has to view this as urban type design.

Mr. Straub said the traffic study didn’t address taper and deceleration-cell; it’s not in the report.

Mr. Pernaw thinks they need a Plan C; put painted medians back in and measure length of taper. Ms. Hale asked them to let them know if something is short, etc. Ms. Hale said to take A and B and show what will work.

Mr. Straub asked about signage for fast travelers to slow down, etc. Mr. Pernaw said it’s a good point.

Mr. Straub discussed internal entrance to CR’s.

Ms. Hale said the internal connection – she is not okay with eliminating that or constructing it later. The owner is amendable to it; it is best for the development for the Town and it should be constructed as part of the project. Ms. Hale said she doesn’t care how the financial arrangement is worked out, it’s part of the project. Ms. Hale wants it part of the traffic flow.

Mr. Bachand said the Planning Board will be unhappy with the existing curb cut to CR’s. Internal connection could alleviate that problem.

Ms. Hale likes Plan B; Mr. Straub likes Plan “A”. Bill asked if B takes away left hand turn into CR’s. Plan B discourages the turn.

Ms. Hale asked them to engage the DOT – look at A and B. Mr. Pernaw said they’ll go to the DOT with what the Town prefers. Ms. Hale said the DOT has everything now.

Mr. Pernaw discussed arrows. He could leave it unmarked. This is a DOT road. The DOT will mark it all up and put in arrows. Ms. Hale asked them to pick one with the curbs and give that to the DOT.

Ms. Hale is dealing with Bryan (Concord). She asked the Opechee to call Concord.

Mr. Stowe asked if he can get in front of the Planning Board; obtain conditional approval based on the DOT approval as long as they are satisfactory with them with the driveways. Ms. Hale said bombshells are getting dropped from both sides on these projects. She doesn’t want them in front of the Planning Board if curb cuts, etc. are not going to work. As well as drainage.

Mr. Pernaw asked if the Town could contact Nancy Mayville (sp) and ask for preliminary comments and Ms. Hale said that is already in the works.

Mr. Stowe asked about existing swale on the property. He asked what easement would be for. It was for conveyance of drainage on the property (to or from).

Mr. Straub said they have to show they can do the drainage on someone else’s property. They need permission. Doing construction on someone else’s property needs to be dealt with.

Mr. Straub said they may need to change the design.

Ms. Hale will send her notes from this meeting to them. On the O&M – first section – Municipality requirements...she wants it taken out.

Ms. Hale noted “revisions are pending”. She asked if they will be done soon; they are already there per Mr. Stowe.

Ms. Hale discussed inter-connectivity.

Ms. Hale said the sewer issue – still not signed. Association paperwork is with Town Attorney per Mr. Stowe.

Mr. Straub asked about roof drainage. Mr. Stowe said whole roof is not pitched. There will be a bit of a drip line. It'll be discharged to a pipe. Mr. Stowe said it did not get added yet; the new plan will have it; drainage goes to the middle area.

It was noted the doghouse manhole is not acceptable.

Mr. Straub said there was little to comment on (re: the site plan); it's a well-conceived site plan.

Mr. Kelly asked what right the Town has for the approval process. Ms. Hale said if they go to the Planning Board with driveway issues, there will be a problem. With no relief, the Planning Board may not be happy with this. Mr. Kelly said they can't hold a CO as part of their project. Mr. Bachand noted that the property owner next door is part of the application. Both are the applicants. It is being considered as one project. Ms. Hale discussed inter-connection. The Board can condition things for within two years. Mr. Kelly would rather have that.

Mr. Kelly said as a landowner the Town can't tell them when they can build their project. If he gets a site plan approved, he can do it in 10 years or one year. Substantial completion allows them to get a CO per Ms. Hale.

They could bring it as two separate applications.

Mr. Kelly said two separate owners may be on two separate paths.

Mr. Stowe said that maybe this should have been separate plans/separate applications.

Ms. Dionne asked about the wetland issues. Last week they met with Corey Colwell and Joe Valle regarding mitigation issues. The wetland impact/buffer impacts were discussed. They are working through that. She'll be back to Mr. Colwell soon.

Turning radius questions have been answered for Mr. Paine.

A response letter was given to Mr. Paine by Opechee. Officer Paine had not received the letter. It is regarding hydrants. Mr. Paine is happy with the hydrant location.

Mr. Bachand asked about earth removal. Material from site – how is it being handled was asked. They are hiring a contractor who will haul? No cut and fill has been filed.

Ms. Hale discussed structural fills being trucked in, etc.

Mr. Bachand mentioned the hotel deed restriction; he noted it has been resolved through a Hold Harmless and Indemnification Agreement.

Mr. Bachand asked about entryway enhancement. Something a little more substantial would be nice. Mr. Bachand discussed the need for additional evergreen buffer along Route 101 near the office building. Mr. Stowe will take a look at it.

Mr. Bachand discussed the natural buffer from the residential neighborhood being adequate at this time, but not if Map 40, Lot 4A (near Falcone Circle) is developed in the future – it was suggested as a possible wetland mitigation parcel but this is to be determined. It was stated the Zoning Review Subcommittee recommended conservation/recreation use for Map 40, Lot 4A.

Mr. Bachand said square footage should be noted on the plan (including patio square footage). Crosswalks were discussed. Mr. Bachand asked about outreach to nearby residents (who are not direct abutters required to be noticed).

Mr. Schultz (Building) noted to Mr. Bachand to remind the applicant about the height of the office building. Mr. Schultz wants to make sure it complies or it will trip a variance.

Ms. Hale said they may get in touch with the DOT before the third meeting. Mr. Bachand said the deadline to resubmit is May 11th. The next PRC on this application will be the 25th of May.

16-020 Liberty Lane (and Liberty Lane East)

Map: 67 Lot: 2.

Applicant: Asset Title Holding Company, LLC.

Site Plan: Creation of five (5) separate land units for future development on 78-acre tract of land.

Waiver Request: Section V.D.4 & 11; Section V.E.1,4,7,8,9,11,12,13,14 & 15 (Detailed Plans-Site Plan Regulations).

Mr. Corey Colwell (MSC) appeared with Brenda Coble (project surveyor) on behalf of Asset Title. This would create condominium land units. Liberty Lane East is Map 67, Lot 2; 78 acre tract of land. Liberty Lane is to the North. The hotel is to the North of this property. The 78-acre tract is vacant, but there is a road and utilities. Owners saw developing it in the past and built a road to the Town specs, put in gas, power, sewer. All infrastructure exists. There is an adjacent building (1 Liberty Lane East). The roadway goes out to Towle Farm Road in the back. It has five ponds; there are wetlands throughout the property; it's shown on the plans. There are walking trails; foot bridges.

The proposal is to create 5 developable portions for future development. There is no proposed development. This is to create 5 separate land units. The land units could be sold to potential buyers. This is just to create land units. They may not ever be sold.

Mr. Straub said this is like a conventional subdivision although conveyance of the land is under condominium format. Common land is not a part of the developable lot.

Mr. Colwell said common area is not really developable due to wetlands.

Unit A is on the left; it has sewer, water gas and electric. Across the street is Unit B; it has 8.2 acres; it has sewer, water. Unit C has water, sewer gas and electric; Unit E has all utilities; 2.34 acres. Unit D has sewer, water, electricity and gas (not at the frontage). Each unit has frontage on the road; more than is required. More area than is required as well.

Mr. Colwell said it's a change in a form of ownership; fee simple lot to condo form of ownership.

Mr. Straub said this is a site plan review. Had this come in as a subdivision it would have been simple.

Liberty Lane has an approved right of way, but is private. This would be on private sewer.

Mr. Bachand talked to Mr. Schultz (Building); each of the land units should be treated like a conventional subdivision lot (conformance with dimensional requirements, coverage requirements, etc.)

Mr. Bachand said a condo doc review will need to be done by the Town Attorney following Planning Board approval. Mr. Bachand said this was submitted as condo conversion at first. He disagreed and discussed with the Town Attorney. It was initially thought this might be a subdivision application, but Attorney Gearreald confirmed it is a site plan application.

Individual site plan approvals will need to occur for each land unit when development is proposed. Sheet 2 of 2 needs a signature block.

Attorney Gearreald researched the deeds and noted easements. There are notes about easements, but they should be depicted on the plan as well. Mr. Colwell said they didn't depict these because the easements in the deed are not defined by metes and bounds. It is by roadways and walkways. If the road changes, the easement changes. It's more of a floating easement. It is not a defined easement.

Ms. Hale said the 50 foot contours should be turned on. Note 8 – Dig Safe NH. Ms. Hale noted they should lift upland area of each lot.

Ms. Hale said Land Unit A – westerly boundary, a small narrow wetland crossing was discussed. A fence man goes through it. Moving the line slightly was advised. She thinks they should get sufficient room for crossing.

Ms. Hale said between Exeter and Hampton –following to the left, it says 8" water main. There is a series of lines that cross the water main. Those are culverts per Mr. Colwell. She asked about existing culverts – noting the size.

Land Unit B – line is very straight-566' long—goes through peak of mound. Are they going to have a shared cliff? Will they need a retaining wall was asked.

Sheet 2 of 2. 50' contour – middle of page. Varying distances over southwest.to the right...43.05 – she asked if it is attached to drainage, it needs to be noted.

Land Unit E – property line on southern side- it's 134.5...it connects to bound of Expressway...some kind of detail should be shown.

Ms. Hale asked about sewer, etc. Pump station work needs to be addressed. It will come up with the future development of each land unit.

Ms. Dionne said there will be wetland impacts. Sheet 1 about wetland delineation - clarify whether areas of poorly drained soils and very poorly drained soils. She wants to know what guidance was used. Ms. Dionne wants the area of wetlands and uplands noted. Section 2.3.7.C should be reviewed by them per Ms. Dionne. She wants calculations shown.

Ms. Dionne said Land Unit A will be interesting. Mr. Colwell said there is a gravel road that goes to the wetlands.

Officer Paine said when buildings are ready to go up, he will have comments at that time.

Mr. Bachand said the sealed surface in this zoning district (I) is 60 percent, and reiterated that each land unit should comply with dimensional and coverage requirements.

This application can go to the Planning Board. The resubmission deadline is May 11th, and they will be on the Agenda for the first meeting in June.

Meeting ended at 3:35 p.m.

Laurie Olivier
Office Manager/Planning Department