

Town of Hampton



PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

June 26, 2019 – 2:00 PM
Selectmen's Meeting Room

PRESENT: Jason Bachand, Town Planner
Bill Straub, CMA Engineer
Jennifer Hale, Assistant DPW Director
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator
Cathy Gilman, Unutil (audience-for first application)
Kevin Schultz, Building Inspector
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning
Tobey Spainhower, DPW

Absent: Richard Sawyer, Police Chief
Mike Bernier, Aquarion (audience)

**19-029 Mary Batchelder Rd.,
Liberty Lane West & Timber Swamp Rd.**

Map: 102 Lot: 3

Applicant: Chinburg Development, LLC

Owner of Record: Asset Title Holding, Inc.

Site Plan: Multi-family condominium development comprised of 46 single-family dwelling units. Waiver Request: Section V.E.11 (landscaping); Section V.C (application fee).

Chris (?) and Jack McTighe TFMoran and others were in the audience. Chinburg Development LLC is the applicant. It is about 36 acres in size. General Zone and Industrial Zone. Asset Title Holding Co. is the current owner. There is a small cemetery on the property. There is a buffer around that area. Two vernal pools on the property. No impact to wetlands. A year ago there was a plan before the PRC. There were 11 frontage lots and condo lots to the back. Lots 1-11 were to be single family lots. Then 35 single family homes. A second variance was obtained.

201 Facilities Plan said 11 frontage lots go to municipal sewer.

These are now 46 condominium homes; single family. All units are 3 – 4 bedrooms.

Lots serviced by municipal facilities were discussed. LCA range from 8400 s.f. to 32,000 s.f. Most range about 12,000 to 15,000 square feet.

There will be five home models to choose from, which were shown. April 18th they got a variance to get 46 detached single family condominiums. Pump Station C will be upgraded.

Stormwater – most property drains to northern portion.

They will add 10' gravel drive. A traffic memorandum was supplied also.

Tobey Spainhower (DPW) arrived.

Two waiver requests are asked for; landscaping plan. Landscaping would be responsibility of homeowners.

The second was for the fee. They initially submitted an application fee to the Planning Office. The application is about \$2,800. Number of new units x \$200 is what they are seeking a waiver for.

Jason Bachand (Planner) started. He had comments from the Town Manager (Fred Welch). Jason supplied those comments to the applicant. Five concerns; Batchelder Cemetery; Mary Batchelder Road, Timber Swamp Road, Drainage and Sewer. Mr. bachand summarized Fred's comments. Cemetery fencing needs to be erected 25' around the cemetery. Nothing can be disturbed within that area. Ground penetrating instruments to detect burials were discussed. Some houses are shown to be close to the cemetery buffer.

The fence should be permanent material; a double lockable gate is required.

The cemetery should be deeded to the Town in fee simple.

Trees within the buffer and cemetery must be removed and stumps ground (per Memo read aloud).

With regard to roads, both roadways are existing and need to be examined in great detail. Test borings to be made of the roadways. The roads are narrow and in need of widening.

Drainage is necessary on both roadways.

Sewer – sewer to be connected to private system.
Sewers to be televised and recorded.

Jason discussed the variances granted in 2017. The 46 units, he noted, the project is too dense in his opinion. With the prior application, they had 35 condo units; they reduced the condo component to 30 at that time. Jason said when the application went for conceptual consultation, there was discussion about a cluster design plan. Having more open space in the plan was discussed. There are some recreational areas on this plan, but not to the level of the cluster type discussed.

Jason discussed transportation and drainage components for Mary Batchelder Road and Timber Swamp Road. Is this scattered and premature was asked. Jason cited the section from the Site Plan Regulations. **Lack of drainage on the roads and the existing condition of those roads will be concerns of the Planning Board.**

Jason noted that the Planning Board has been discussing exactions for off-site improvements. It may be implemented. This project could be suitable for this.

Restrictions about prohibiting business oriented uses to be addressed.
Legal documents will need to be reviewed by the Town Attorney.

Jason has reservations about the landscape waiver. It is a large project. There is a lack of meaningful open space for this project.

Recreation – how will areas shown be utilized was discussed. It was noted it is just open space per the applicant.

Jason discussed traffic. Did CMA's traffic engineer look at it was asked. Mr. Straub stated 'no'. The traffic numbers have gone down a bit. Increased use of two roads is a major concern and that comment is carried forward.

Jason asked if there are proposed names for the private roadways. They do not have names yet.

Jason will provide the applicant with his notes.

Rayann Dionne (Conservation Coordinator) noted the RCCD went out and they are currently not proposing anything within the wetland buffer. Rayann noticed the common areas (#4) scale of plan – 4 is close to setback. Grading might enter into the buffer. LCA for #7, one side of the building is close to the edge. The LCA #3 was close to the utility easement. Grading in between units looked steep. 12' drop over a short distance was noted. Rayann said she thinks the Planning Board should have stipulations as they develop, **they should submit a grading plan.** There have been times where subdivisions they don't know what grading will look like until a person chooses a house.

Kevin Schultz (Bldg) discussed the elimination of single-family lots and incorporating units was discussed. There are 5 different house designs. Could there be others was asked; there could be others per the applicant. Kevin said pay close attention to Article 7 in the Zoning Ordinances. We don't want a cookie cutter thing going on. The applicant said that is the intent (to avoid cookie cutter appearance).

Bill Straub (CMA) discussed the evaluation of the intersection at Timber Swamp, Mary Batchelder and also with Towle Farm. There should be a mechanism from the Town – how does this development participate in it.

Bill discussed condition of Mary Batchelder and Timber Swamp. Roads are in poor condition. They are narrow.

Bill discussed clearing limits and grading. Possibility of emergency access to Liberty Lane West. It should be considered.

Bill discussed recreational areas. There's no plan dealing with open space. The Planning Board can consider this, but is it going to be maintained, mowed, access for playing fields. It is unaddressed.

Bill discussed traffic. Turning radii was discussed. There were no roads. Radius was tight.

Bill discussed sewer. Agreements are carried forward and needs to be dealt with. Sewer alignments show hefty cuts. Notes will be provided to the applicant.

Stormwater report is complicated per Bill.

Bill said they need an AOT – the submittal has been made to AOT. They are preparing the package, they have not submitted.

Zoning was discussed by Bill. Where on the site is the one space for every 8 residential units is provided. **Jason needs to see where that is provided in the plan. Jason to check this.**

Jason said stacked space counts as one space. Kevin said the garage counts for 2 as dwelling unit. Jennifer Hale (DPW) has concerns. She wants 28' wide roadway. People tend to park on the side of the road. Fire truck could not come down. No visitor parking and sloped roadways and painted line for walkway, there's too much going from a safety component for this roadway. There are open recreation areas; they should look at space for visitor parking. Jennifer will leave this to the Planning Board to discuss this. What do they think is best from a parking along the roadway and a painted walkway.

A painted walkway was added. **Mr. Straub thinks a separate sidewalk could be needed.** You're paying for curb and asphalt, put it at 26' mark; make it wider. Have

appropriate space in the roadway and walkway separate from the roadway. It was noted this is a neighborhood; they are creating a village.

Mr. Straub discussed clearing limits; it needs **to be made clear it is a ‘no cut zone’**. How are things restored was asked. To leave this to 46 owners, it should be looked at as a total package with some treatment. Is this land in current use was asked by Kevin. Applicant stated they do not believe so.

Landscaping – it was said they need to add this into the lot.

Jennifer Hale (DPW) will send her comments to applicant. Setbacks from Liberty Lane West.

SO3-drainage easement on east side – Farley White. She asked about drainage onto Farly White. What are the rights were asked.

SO4 – Liberty Lane West sewer line from site back up. Sewer manhole 8 shows connection to the State of NH. That connection is excluded on the sewer schematic. She wants to know why it is there. **Sewer association documents would need to be revised.**

Jennifer discussed Pump Station C – and flows. They are not provided to the DPW. How are pumps working.

Proposed Road A and B (S06). Road A and Shared Road A is shown– she wants consistency.

LCA #2-pond in the rear of property. It’s connected to common area. Why not make the pond common area. **She wants that removed.**

She said Lot #4 and #6 – wetland area surrounded by vernal pool area by 12’ no structure area. LCA area is kept for footprint. They promise it will fit in the square.

Rayann said it’s the primary building and attached garage. A deck, patio can go in there. The 12’ is intended for accessory uses.

Jennifer asked about 50’ wetland buffer and vernal pool buffer. Rayann said it has to be left in a naturally-vegetated state.

Jennifer said if they can’t cut it, flower it, make it common area. #4 and #5 seem close.

Rayann said a line of decent sized boulders can mark that edge. There are wetland conservation markers. Larger boulders are a better delineator. **The Planning Board should discuss boulders dealing with vernal pools. 4, 6 13 and 14 – to have something of that nature.**

The Town Manager asked for a fence to be put around the 25' buffer. LCA #6 may or may not conflict; there may need to be some adjustments.

No cut and no disturb – make sure buffer stays intact. Jennifer's concerns discuss buffer on one side to the other. If a 20' span of 80 foot pine trees that used to be all wind protected, there could be a problem along Mary Batchelder Road. Trees will fall down. **There needs to be a landscaping plan with this project.**

Jennifer wants the buffer to exist in perpetuity. Bill looked at C09-corner. He discussed clearing line. Intended clearing should be a commitment. Bill discussed heading west – clearing limit is to the north of the wetlands. **Clearing limit needs to be better defined.**

The applicant asked for clearing line. Jennifer said looking at 40' – they walked it. They looked at quantity of trees. Talking with neighbors. Big concern because of wind. She wants appropriate buffer. Check tree line – proposed and existing.

Jennifer asked for soil line on plan – for AOT. Having it on overviews, it takes away from what they are trying to show.

Jennifer did not go in depth into drainage plans. Keeping grading and erosion is one plan; drainage is another. Grading and drainage should be one.

Jennifer asked about the corner – bio retention area 3 – that is an effort to address run off was asked. Swale line for Mary Batchelder Road to Timber Swamp needs to be cleared out.

Jennifer discussed the drainage system along Road A (open) Are they culverting was asked. They stated 'yes'. **That should be required on driveway permits.**

Jennifer discussed A to B – Unit 1 will have a moat. Drainage going around back side of his house to the front. Water will be down each side of his house. Invert in is same as invert out – they don't want that. Unit 1 and Unit 2 – line going to Unit 1 – what is the line was asked.

CO3, woodline in middle of A and B and then there is lawn; then in the lawn there are catch basins. What is going on was asked. Leaving woods and having trails was asked or lawn recreation area. Match up with drainage plan or utility plan – catch basins in the grass area were asked about.

The applicant wants to meet with Jennifer.

Emergency connection was asked about. Is it gated was asked.

Note on CO1-public sewer and water (discuss with Jennifer). Jennifer will provide everything else with memorandum/meeting.

Sewer Manhole 0 to NOT be used anymore.

Grading behind homes needs more detail.

Tobey's (DPW) comments will be in with Jennifer Hale. C14 shows proposed force main. Timber Swamp Road entrance. It continues all the way over to Timber Swamp. Maintenance structure should be added. Sewer is not labeled on that plan.

Tobey said fine details on structures; 24" openings on force main drop – it has to be a 30" opening. Tobey can send copies of their standard details as needed by Town of Hampton.

Give them sewer ordinance as well.

Bill Paine (Fire) discussed they like this layout better than having 8 dead ends. The roadway width and potential of one or two houses having 4th of July party; parking will be along the road. It would be hard to get trucks in there. They should create more off road parking or wider roadway.

This is not asking for a raised sidewalk. Jennifer is worried about density.

Cathy (Unitil) said they will not come out of Mary Batchelder.

Another PRC meeting will be needed. July 10th is the resubmittal date for the July 24th PRC meeting. August 28th is the PRC meeting date in August. (the resubmittal date for the August meeting is August 7th)

Jennifer is out all of next week and this Friday.

19-030 431 & 435 Ocean Boulevard

Map: 266 Lots: 27 & 47

Applicant: East Coast Development, LLC

Owners of Record: Michael Napier, Keir Family Entrepreneurs, Inc.

Site Plan: Remove existing buildings and construct 23, 2-bedroom condominium units in a single building. (See Wetlands Permit File 19-031).

Mr. Coronati discussed the Riviera property. It was in front of the Town in 2007 and 2008. It was recently put under agreement. Bob Pace and Dave Spurtner and Mike and Brad and THA Architects were present. The building is pretty identical as before. Small variations to the site plan were discussed. Layout is the same. Parking configuration is the same. Parking was ecopavers, it is now porous pavement. The

building is a drive-thru style building. Garage headroom was raised. 13'6" so a larger vehicle can get through parking lot.

The property is made of two parcels. In front of the building is asphalt.

Joe Coronati said they are removing all the buildings and replacing with restoration area. Shrub area giving buffer to marsh was discussed. Proposed building is outside the 50' buffer.

No one from utilities was present.

Rayann (Conservation Coordinator) said they came to the Conservation Commission for a conceptual review. The Commission struggled with the installation of porous asphalt in the back; they have to raise the grades from 1' and 3' for base material. There are other permeable products that could be used that would not need so much fill. Rayann spoke with Eban Lewis at DES and they are not in favor of adding fill. They want existing grades to remain as well. Grass and gravel pavement was noted. Going down about 8" was discussed. Loam or gravel said they are rated to support fire trucks.

Rayann discussed first parking space out front. She said it looks dangerous – close to Ocean Boulevard.

Kevin Schultz (Building) asked who the structural engineer is; they don't have one. No testing agency. They are in early stages now.

Bill Straub (CMA) discussed fire and emergency for drive thru. Access from other properties to north and south of building was asked about.

On Site Plan; no site distance is reported. **It should be established on the site plan.**

Number of parking spaces; it meets dimensional requirements. Numbers per unit and one for every 8 – they did 2. Bill thinks 3 is appropriate. He does not think 2 is adequate.

Bill discussed ZBA variances – Kevin said it is shown on the plan. Kevin said relief was from Conservation Wetland Articles. Jason noted they also received variances for minimum lot area per dwelling unit and height. They were approved on May 16th.

Bill discussed Note 14 on Site Plan; DES permits and their dates. They need to re-do all permits. **The note will need to be updated.** There's no valid permits on anything now per Joe Coronati. Joe will send it all in.

Shoreland was 2011; wetlands was 2008 and driveway was 2008; they need to be updated.

Bill discussed heated walkways. Joe said it was brought up on initial approvals.

Utilities – drainline – does not affect project.

Water service – 6” fire service – have they been sized by fire protection was asked. Not yet. It needs to be evaluated.

Joe discussed porous pavement. 3’ section above ground water. It drops from 9’ to 6’.

Seasonal high water was discussed.

Joe said they can tip parking lot more.

This will comply with Town freeboarding was asked by Kevin. It was stated ‘yes’.

Bill asked if there is an O&M Plan; it should be in drainage report per Joe.

This will require a Wetlands Permit.

There is a guardrail at the edge. It drops off 3-4 feet.

Roof water treatment was discussed. It goes through StormTech treatment. Grass swale is for additional treatment.

New roof drainage treatment was asked about. Joe said they don’t need treatment. AOT does not require treatment on roofs. **A lot of water from the roof was discussed by Mr. Straub.**

Kevin asked about setbacks. **Pay close attention to height and code.** Allowable openings also. The front and rear are not affected, but both sides are.

Jason gave the applicants comments from Mark Gearreald (Town Attorney). An attached plan was discussed. Book and Page numbers should be noted. Northerly part of plan should be added to the overall site plan – it was cut off. They want to see it all at 20 scale. The recordable site plan should show the entire lot. Joe said both the Lot Consolodation Plan and Site Plan will be recorded. **A1 and C2 should be recorded together per Mr. Bachand.**

A lot merger will need to be done per Mr. Bachand.

Jason asked about line of sight and safety associated with the parking spot out front.

Joe said that could be a visitor space. **Rayann thinks safety is a concern.**

Joe said they could dedicate it or make it a handicap space.

Mr. Paine (Fire) was all set, indicating they met what they needed at this point. **Jason would like to further confirm this.**

On the cover page, Consolidated Communications should be added; they are no longer Fairpoint.

The building design was discussed by Jason.

In 2008 application, lighting was discussed.

The pool and cabana was discussed, and backwash from the pool. Joe needs to work on that. Applicant stated it will be a salt water pool.

State permits need renewal.

No access for fire on right side of building; walkable only. Bill discussed required space to get access to building.

Rayann asked about the turn radius.

Tobey (DPW) – fire issues were raised. If Bill’s okay, he is too. Jennifer wants to know about the heated walkway. Underdrains in the back on grading plan was asked about.

Tobey does not have an issue with the sewer. Cleanout has to be at property line to grade. Disconnect and cap it at the main. Bring 6” in. He asked about a utility line. Sewer service going into driveway entrance was asked. **Fix notes regarding manholes.** Joe said sewer would run up under slab or maybe in trash room. **Tobey wants it shown.** Tobey said for sprinklers, that is water company and/or Fire. Not DPW.

Tobey said on detail – show an 8” on sewer lateral – it should be 6”.

Joe said if they have to do 8” it would have to go to main. Tobey said they’d have to do a manhole. Joe is worried about too much flow.

Joe asked about fill. If they drop the back, how much – they can’t get down to grade. **Rayann said this will be challenging for Conservation.** You’re trying to put parking areas in an area that floods. Parking out the back – they are flooding. Regulations don’t support raising parking area. Joe said they are moving buildings.

Rayann discussed gravel pave. Fill material is different. It needs 6” to 8” to solve it. Not as much stone. They could drop it two feet and use porous pavement. **Maybe Eban and Rayann and applicants can meet.**

Jason said to have another PRC meeting. Jennifer can send her comments. It should not be lengthy. The date is July 24th; the resubmittal deadline is the 10th.

Meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.
Laurie Olivier/Office Manager/Planning