

# Town of Hampton



## PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

### DRAFT MINUTES

**October 28, 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  
Jennifer Hale, Assistant DPW Director  
Jodie Strickland, CMA Engineer  
Jameson Ayotte, Fire Chief  
James Marchese, Building Inspector  
Mark Gearreald, Town Attorney  
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning

Absent: Richard Sawyer, Police Chief  
William Paine, Fire Prevention Officer  
Cathy Gilman, Unitil  
Mike Bernier, Aquarion  
Tobey Spainhower, DPW

**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 read the statement about telephonically having this meeting due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Rob Roseen (Waterstone Engineering) and Kat Racine (Millennium Engineering) and Attorney James Scully are on the line. This is the 4<sup>th</sup> PRC on this application.

Attorney Scully said he received Attorney Gearreald's email and they are good with that and will address his comments.

Ms. Racine discussed comments getting addressed. She met with Kathy Gilman (Unitil) and Mike Bernier (Aquarion).

Mr. Roseen discussed Ms. Hale's concerns and Ms. Strickland's comments regarding off site run-off; potential for off-site run-off that could affect infiltration systems.

Mr. Roseen discussed final review and field investigation. They walked the perimeter of the property. The Bank to the west is a bit downhill so no interaction between that and the proposed parcel. Two parcels to the East – about the same elevation -they don't interact. It is not crossing the slope. The top of the parcel is almost at the top of the hill. That area is highly vegetated. The proposed construction – all elevated that there should not be any interaction.

His only other way to go would be to do a study on flow paths, etc.

Mr. Bachand noted that Adam Fleury joined the call.

Mr. Roseen discussed Ms. Strickland's comments – editorial pieces and numbers not matching. All changes have been made to the O&M plan. He would appreciate any more responses/comments.

Ms. Strickland does not have any more questions on that.

Mr. Bachand said the plan set has improved significantly from where it started, but he still has a number of comments.

The plan set does not include surveyor's stamp or signature. He noted the resubmitted set needs to include this before the Planning Board sees it.

Architectural plans – address needs revising. He does not see architectural plans with this resubmittal.

Cover Sheet and S3 – those should be recordable sheets. Grading is included on Sheet S3. Mr. Bachand noted the Registry has recording issues with lines crossing, etc. Grading on the plan being recorded could be an issue.

Trash and recycling is at a different location than previously shown. How will that look aesthetically was asked. The detail showing the proposed fence was discussed. This is a highly visible location in the Town Center-Historic District – we want it aesthetically pleasing and complimentary.

Line of sight was asked about by Mr. Bachand. He is concerned that the current proposed trash and recycling location may be an issue.

Mr. Bachand remains concerned about the overall density of this development; the rear building especially. If it (rear building) was pushed back a bit in the front, making it smaller in footprint, it would be easier with the site design (locating parking, trash/recycling, etc), and maneuverability.

Attorney Gearreald said his focus has been on the corrective deed. He was sent a copy and provided comments to Attorney Scully, and Attorney Scully said he will address them.

Mr. Marchese (Bldg) has no comments at this time.

Chief Ayotte (Fire) – he thinks he is all set right now.

Ms. Hale discussed two parking spots she feels will not work. She questions the alignment. Car pulls in, it can hit a car door to other spot. **A curb cut should be required if the Planning Board approves this.**

Ms. Hale discussed the dumpster – she wants it drawn to scale. How sight distance is affected was discussed. **The final location is to be shown on the plan – where the dumpster is located.** It's part of site plan review.

She noted there is no more room on this site; the density is too tight. It is noted there is a hard time fitting everything needed/required on the site.

Water services – construction is going over water services. If repairs are needed, it will be difficult to address.

Sidewalk to the north – not shown. It's all asphalt, but there are sidewalks on the west side of Dearborn. Sidewalks are to be reconstructed.

Asphalt on top of concrete on top of asphalt in an area was discussed.

S4 – proposed sewer manhole note – 36” – they need to be 48”.

The DPW does not support another pole on High Street. Pole after pole after pole was noted.

It is a process with the Board of Selectmen. There's another way to find alternatives to this. Can the pole across TD (Bank) be moved was asked. There are poles on Dearborn also. There should be no poles on top of each other.

S5 – wastewater development charge. DPW wants the charge added to the plans before signature.

The new parking plan was discussed. No dimensions are on it. *Ms. Hale will put her comments in writing.*

Mr. Roseen's site assessment – she has not observed water from the upstream area. She did not observe additional water coming through. She is not the engineer for this project was noted.

**A variance is being requested for lighting. Is this allowable after the Planning Board hears the application was asked or do they need to go to the ZBA before the Planning Board.**

Ms. Strickland – Some comments were not addressed or responded to. Plans should be stamped and signed by Licensed Engineer and Land Surveyor. Parking spacing – residences – the calculations are not shown.

Sealed surface calculation – 11,276 s.f does not match value in stormwater report. Both numbers need to match.

Provide contact for Comcast and Unitil.

Where does the 11,276 s.f come from was asked by Ms. Strickland. Building, sidewalk, etc.

Each building footprint needs to be shown. Footprint square footage is needed.

*Ms. Strickland will provide her comments in writing/email.*

Include what is being provided even if it meets the ordinance was discussed by Ms. Strickland.

Sheet S1-mislabeled. Another sewer service to existing service? No pipe being shown going on to the property.

Residential setbacks are not shown on all sheets. Setbacks applying to the project were asked about.

Ms. Strickland discussed Sheet S2 – catch basin. There is one shown on that sheet, but not on other ones.

S3-details need to be provided for dumpster, height, material, access. Compliance with sight distance needed.

Concrete included for pervious percentage (dumpster) was this included was asked (in the calculations).

Dimensions for mailbox needs to be shown.

Label all water services; fire service and domestic.

Gas service proposed – location size, etc. needed on the plan.

*Again, Jodie has these notes and will provide to applicant/attorney.*

Mr. Roseen said there are comments at the end of the document. They should be included in the plan set. He will email them.

### **TRAFFIC ANALYSIS**

Ms. Strickland noted this needs to be stamped by a licensed engineer. Looking south – there is substandard site distance. They should not make a bad situation worse. Plantings could impede the sight distance.

The development may hinder sight distance looking west on High Street. A sight distance triangle easement in front of the building – to maintain site distance in the future could be required. There is a patio out there. Tables, chairs, umbrellas – that could be included with landscaping and could limit sight view.

Mr. Bachand asked about the comment that a variance is needed for lighting. The order of things that the Planning Board prefers – it prefers variances being in place before being heard by the Planning Board.

He asked Attorney Scully and Ms. Racine about the variance comment.

Ms. Racine discussed illuminating the patio; it illuminates the sidewalk and patio. Ms. Strickland asked if this is in the Zoning Ordinance or the Site Plan Regulations. Ms. Strickland believes it is in the Site Plan Regulations. It requires a waiver from the Planning Board under the Site Plan Regulations per Mr. Bachand. He noted the applicant could ask the Planning Board for that waiver.

Mr. Bachand noted that if/when they resubmit, they need to let us know that they are requesting a waiver and list the appropriate Section.

Mr. Bachand noted there are still a number of comments. He asked the Committee if it felt that another PRC is needed.

Ms. Strickland said over utilities and blocking sight lines. It's up to the Board, but she thinks it is a shame to have the dumpster on the side of Dearborn Ave; they can't remove the parking space, because if they did, they would then not have enough parking. She is not sure it needs another PRC meeting, but is not supportive of how it stands now.

Mr. Bachand concurs. Ms. Hale does not know if another meeting fixes this. Mr. Bachand said he would like the applicant to resubmit; it will be sent around (to PRC members) and we will get their final comments. We will have the Planning Board look at it and decide themselves. **That is if the applicant wants to keep this project as shown.**

Ms. Strickland agrees. Her comments are a lot of housekeeping. Big issues like sight distance, dumpster, etc. Her making comments does not change the design. It becomes the decision of the Planning Board.

Mr. Bachand said the applicant can resubmit (8 hard copies of application and all materials for the Planning Board and file; Send PDF's for PRC members). That deadline date would have been November 11<sup>th</sup> but it is a holiday so the deadline will be November 12<sup>th</sup>.

Adjourned: 2:43 p.m.

Laurie Olivier  
Office Manager/Planning