

# Town of Hampton



## PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

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

**PRESENT:** Jason Bachand, Town Planner  
Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator  
Bill Paine, Fire Prevention  
Jennifer Hale, Deputy Director DPW  
Jodie Strickland, CMA Engineers  
Serge Laprise, Unutil  
Laurie Olivier, Office Manager, Planning  
Kevin Schultz, Building Inspector  
Fred Welch, Town Manager

**Absent:** Richard Sawyer, Police Chief

**653 & 663 Exeter Road, Maps: 14 Lots: 11 & 12. Applicant: Thomas and Marion Lyons. Owners of Record: Same. Subdivision: Subdivide Parcel into Nine (9) Residential Lots.**

Dennis Quintal, Dave Leach and Thomas Lyons, appeared. They submitted plans for subdividing the Lyons property. The utilization of the property was discussed.

Mr. Lyons stated he had plans prepared previously, but held off from going forward with the project at that time due to the economy. The current plans were revised to address subsequent changes to the regulations.

Mr. Bachand discussed Lot 11, where it shows an existing building with 4-one bedroom units. It is in the RAA zone; multi-family is not permitted. This is a pre-existing, non-conforming situation. Mr. Bachand said the lot area per dwelling unit in the RAA zone is one unit per acre currently. The lot is over 10 acres now and, after subdivision, they are showing it as 1.29 acres. Mr. Bachand believes they are increasing the non-conformity, and asked Mr. Schultz (Bldg) about this. A variance may be needed to address the increased non-conformity. Granting of such a variance would allow for the smaller lot.

This should be addressed before the application goes before the Planning Board. It was asked by the applicant if there had to be a denial first. The process was discussed. No denial letter is needed. Mr. Lyons said if it is denied, it would have a bearing on the project. Ms. Strickland said a revision would need to be made; a four acre lot. Mr Lyons asked if it could be reduced to two units, and Mr. Bachand said there would still be two dwelling units and this is also not permitted in the RAA zone. Providing two acres for two units was discussed. Mr. Lyons said originally it was acceptable.

Mr. Schultz said it is one acre per dwelling unit, and now that it will be under an acre, it's a more dense use. He said it is an existing use and it is over an acre. They are all three-room apartments/one bedroom. The occupancy load is fine.

Before this, it was a one family and then it was changed over to four. Mr. Lyons said he never saw so much land per living unit. Mr. Schultz said it's been in place since the 80's. They were asking for choices. They can go back to a single family, but two-family is not allowed in that zone.

Mr. Schultz said they (the Lyons') are 653 Exeter Road (the single family home). In 1978, it was a single-family home. They went to the ZBA to allow them to have as many as 20 horses on the property. Mr. Lyons said they didn't have to do a thing.

There are no certificates of occupancy on the rental units per Mr. Schultz. He asked Mr. Lyons to schedule an appointment to do a walk-thru and inspection on the units ASAP. If the project goes to the ZBA, that question will be asked for sure.

Mr. Schultz said the frontages, square footage, Peter's Box/Square, etc., it's good. He asked about the well radius and on two of the parcels, they may need to get waivers on those because of the overlapping well radius. That would require a waiver from the Regulations. Mr. Schultz said it's filed with the State. Mr. Schultz said the applicants have to get the easements and he thought there was a State form that goes with that. Mr. Schultz said the well for the apartment building goes across Route 27. Usually there is a well release form. There is an alternate well location given as well. Mr. Schultz said one of the parties will be the Town as far as the well release goes.

Mr. Schultz does not know about the wetlands. Most of the lot is upland. There are wetlands in the back.

The applicant asked if there is a process for site walks. Mr. Bachand said the Conservation Commission does the site walks for Wetland Permit applications. **Mr. Bachand said he could do a site walk, or he could ask the Planning Board.**

Mr. Paine (Fire) said the road width is great. There's plenty of turnaround. Water would be brought in for fire suppression.

Ms. Dionne said someone came out and there are no wetlands on site. She asked about natural infiltration area GD1—she asked what it means. It dries up quickly per the applicant; no plants. Ms. Dionne said they protect areas of poorly drained soils or very poorly drained soils.

Ms. Hale (DPW) will send an email with all of her comments (besides this memo). Ms. Hale asked about the O&M Plan. It is called an I&M in the materials. She would like it changed to "O&M" for consistency. Certification was discussed. **Laurie (Planning) can send language of the O&M Plan.**

Under BMP's, the language uses the word "should" –Ms. Hale would like "shall" investigate, etc.

Under deep sump catch basins; no hoods are allowed.

She said hoods provide water quality pre-treatment. She wants a limited disturbance line. The Alteration of Terrain (AOT) Regulations were discussed with disturbance - this application is under but close to that threshold. That should be in drainage plan. A four-bay should be incorporated into the detention basin.

Ms. Hale said in the O&M Plan there should be a plan showing detention basin so people can see what will be inspected.

Stormwater Analysis-Ms. Hale discussed run-off. Outlets were discussed. PVC 22" pipes were discussed. She said there are a lot of issues with drainage pipes. She noted an outlet structure could work.

Ms. Hale asked about the manhole. It's part of a Town road. She would rather see detention area downstream. The Regs make a comment that drainage should be on one lot. Mr. Quintal said sometimes dealing with a lot of small lots can be better than working with one large.

Ms. Hale is worried about the overflow pipe. She asked about water quality calculations. The Regs do follow AOT Regulations.

**Ms. Hale discussed Section 7.c.12 – a waiver can be requested. It would be a Planning Board issue.**

Ms. Hale discussed the existing pond 2P, she wants spot grades on the plan. She asked about the proposed driveway for Lot 12; the plan needs to show it. Existing gravel will be removed, but it should be shown where it is connected to the roadway.

Easement language will need to be reviewed by the Town Attorney. Ms. Hale said the Town "may" accept the roadway; we don't accept the infiltration facilities. They will need easements.

Ms. Hale discussed the treatment swale.

Ms. Hale is concerned about the flow from area 3; it comes off the side of the hill. It comes in a sheet flow (level spreading action) over the property line. It goes to the

DOT right of way. Volume matching may need to be done, but the applicant should be in touch with the DOT.

Ms. Hale said they could go catch basin to catch basin. Not having two outlets into detention basin.

Profile plan will need to show all utilities, manholes, - profile.

Ms. Hale discussed septic setbacks; they are designed as part of the mitigation system. They are part of how they are managing stormwater.

**Ms. Strickland (CMA) will email her comments to the applicant as well.**

Ms. Strickland discussed traffic. They should show site distance east and west and note some statement about traffic capacity.

Ms. Strickland discussed septic; she asked why they are named “reserved”.

Why do Lots 11 and 12 get reserved was asked.

Lot 12, existing septic area – it’s located in a reserve area.

Drainage –Ms. Strickland asked about the percentage. They need a plan with hatching, adding up to 97,000 SF. Otherwise an AOT permit may be needed.

Ms. Strickland asked about low impact development items. Some sort of bio-retention pond.

Ms. Strickland asked about infiltration areas. Area 2P has a seasonal high water table of 2’ –how much infiltration will that do was asked.

She also discussed the treatment swale – same comments as Ms. Hale.

Drainage easement on Lot 11 was discussed; there should be some protection.

GD1 and P1 – sheets don’t match. They should match.

It will need a headwall per Ms. Hale. She will take another look at that.

Ms. Strickland discussed the P5 pipe – with higher invert. They could look at something else in terms of storage.

Details show concrete inverts; Hampton does not require those. Ms. Hale said do not build those.

Ms. Hale will send over model numbers.

Mr. Quintal asked about aprons.

Ms. Dionne looked at the Deeds and she noticed a previous deed of Donald and Lorraine Heenan (sp) and it said it’s subject to easements – it looks like electric. It was noted on the documents. Bruce and Jean McGee and 653 Exeter Road parcel. The pole should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Bachand discussed the easement for wells and drainage. He said the Town Attorney and DPW will need to review this and a homeowners association will need to be put in place.

State subdivision approval is required. Nothing has been submitted yet.

Mr. Bachand said the Planning Board may like to see building footprints (conceptually) to get a feel of how subdivision would be laid out. It should say “conceptual”. It could be a supplemental page for the Planning Board.

Driveway permits will be needed for each lot.

Impact fees will be \$3,641 for each home.

A vegetated buffer is recommended; noise from the highway could be an issue for back lots.

“Residential” was misspelled – cover sheet.

Both addresses (653 and 663) should be on title block on plan.

Grading and drainage plan should be recorded with the subdivision mylar.

Lots 11 and 12 need to be merged.

The need for a variance was re-iterated.

Mr. Bachand said the Planning Board cannot render a decision on the matter until they get the variance.

Serge Laprise (Unitil) discussed Lot 12 – the long driveway. If that driveway is going away, Unitil won’t be able to maintain lines. Unitil would take down the pole and wire. Plans were given to the applicant and to Mr. Bachand. Mr. Laprise will be the point of contact.

Mr. Bachand asked about Labrador Lane. He noted roads cannot be named in advance; Selectmen give the name.

Mr. Laprise noted the structures are outside of the Hampton ROW.

Fred Welch (Town Manager) said if any easements are given, the road will not be accepted until the easements are discharged. The owners will have to plow until the easements are extinguished. The roadway will not be accepted with easements.

Mr. Welch noted the applicants cannot break the pavement on Exeter Road for at least 3 more years; it’s brand new and was just put down. This cannot be done without the Selectmen’s permission.

Ms. Hale said they are proposing to match to the end with the grades. No cutting.

Ms. Hale needs to see the drainage. Since they have to get a variance – the ZBA will be in between the next PRC meeting and the Planning Board meeting. The applicant will make edits. It was noted that August 10<sup>th</sup> at noon is the resubmittal deadline date. The next PRC meeting will be the 24<sup>th</sup> of August. It was confirmed this application does need a second PRC.

This application could be heard by the Planning Board possibly at the first meeting in October (October 5<sup>th</sup>).

Meeting ended at 3:10 p.m.

Laurie Olivier  
Manager, Planning Department