

**SOMERSWORTH SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 12, 2023**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff Gallant, George Kramlinger, Mike Hoage, Michelle Mears, and Michael Bobinsky

EXCUSED MEMBERS: John Sunderland and Paul Robidas

STAFF PRESENT: Dana Crossley, Planning Technician
Anna Stockman, Planning Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 10:03am.

1. **Approval of Minutes:** Bobinsky made a MOTION to approve the minutes from the February 8th meeting.
The MOTION is SECONDED by Gallant.
The MOTION CARRIES 5-0.
2. **OLD BUSINESS:**
 - a. Any old business that may come before the Committee. – No old business.
3. **NEW BUSINESS:**
 - a. McL Builders & Developers LLC is seeking site plan approval to allow the bottling facility to be razed and a new 3-unit townhouse style structure to be constructed along with associated parking and infrastructure located at 25 Myrtle Street in the Residential Multi-Family (R3) District, Assessor's Map 9 Lot 30, SITE#03-2023.

Robert Stowell of Tritech Engineering Corporation and **Michael Lefebvre** of McL Builders & Developers LLC were in attendance to represent the application.

Stowell stated they had made a submittal for minor site review and realized they needed a different approach. He said on April 6th, he made a submission that addressed Dana Crossley's request for more materials. The applicant is proposing to build a 3-unit townhouse style building and associated infrastructure. Last fall, the applicant obtained a demolition permit to remove the existing structure on the property. The three residential units has prompted the site plan review process. He noted the driveway will have additional parking in front of the garage. He stated they are confident about the project.

Mears stated the property was granted a variance in 2004 where it doesn't meet the dimensional requirements.

Stowell stated there were truck turning data included in the submission including traffic data and a number of other items. He stated that for the limited number of parking spaces, they feel that parking works well with the 16-foot-wide driveway and that it presents an adequate maneuvering area for tenants. He noted the waivers they are seeking which include parking space angle, school availability, park and recreation area, illumination levels, and drainage report. With regard to the illumination levels waiver, he stated that lighting distributors don't produce lighting models for residential structures with the type of detail the Board is seeking. He said he didn't think lighting levels will be a concern with what has been proposed. He noted that in terms of drainage, there will be 2,000 square feet of new impervious surface. Drainage will be designed to be more defined and be built well so that there will be minimal impact to the existing drainage system.

Kramlinger asked the applicant about the 16-foot space in front of the garage. He stated that regulations ask for 24 feet. He stated that when considering vehicle turning radius, a Ford 350 frame should be able to maneuver in the driveway. He said if a pickup truck were parked in front of the garage, it would reduce the turning radius of City fire and safety vehicles.

Stowell confirmed the picture the Chief has in his submission materials depicts the turning radius.

Gallant asked about lighting at the rear of the proposed dwelling. He questioned about whether there are any restrictions in the plan regarding a spotlight or floodlight. He stated the neighbor seems close to have that kind of light on the proposed dwelling.

Lefebvre stated there is usually a spotlight installed in the back of the property for security reasons. He stated that due to the close proximity of the neighbor, they will remove that fixture.

Mears stated she was unsure if the plan contained anything about downlit or shielded lights.

Gallant noted the 6-foot fence between the applicant's property and the closest neighbor. He asked about whether there is any additional landscaping planned for that property line.

Stowell agreed that that neighbor is close. He stated that deciduous trees were removed during the demolition of the dwelling that existed prior. He stated the applicant would like to install additional fencing and arborvitae.

Gallant stated that the neighbors might have concerns about buffering. He noted there will only be one EV charging station on the property.

Lefebvre stated the next-door neighbor to the proposed project shared their thoughts about the future of the project and said they would prefer a fence along the property line. He stated it is his intent to make sure the neighbor is happy.

Bobinsky stated that EV charging stations are typically based on demand. He noted that there should be a discussion about easement on the neighboring property to the proposed project.

Stowell stated that is a common easement that straddles the property line. Access to the easement is only available through the neighboring property. He stated the applicant is going to provide regrading to make it more accessible, as well as use pavement as opposed to gravel.

Bobinsky stated that when the time comes to work on the driveway, that will require a driveway permit. The Department of Public Works will review that and provide specific comments and suggestions. He asked whether the units will be rental units.

Stowell stated that the units will be condominiums. He noted there are some single-family units in the neighborhood. The condos would most likely remain as rental units in the future although there is a possibility that could change.

Bobinsky asked the applicant about the plan for snow plowing and removal.

Stowell referenced the landscape plan was part of the application and identified two locations for snow storage on the property. He noted the unique shape of the property and said there is adequate space for snow storage.

Bobinsky stated that they may have to consider a plan for snow removal rather than just plowing and storing it.

Crossley stated if the front building is a condo and the rear three are not condos, they'll need to record and submit that information to the Assessor's office.

Stowell stated they are going to keep the rental properties out front as they are operating now. The proposed project will utilize the common drive that was used previously. He noted that this would be a new use for the common drive.

Hoage stated he appreciated the comments provided to the applicant thus far. He noted that an Ordinance change is currently underway that will allow subdivided lots to have multiple storage lines. He stated it is looking like that amendment will be approved. He noted that the applicant can have any size water service they want, although he thinks an inch and a half is bigger than needed.

Stowell stated they may modify that part of the plan.

Crossley stated that the species of Maple tree that is in the current proposal, the Flame Amur Maple is an invasive species and asked whether that could be replaced with a native species. She stated that further guidance is located in Exhibit B of the Site Plan Review Regulations. She asked that more information about the building materials being used is provided. She asked whether the applicant could note existing parking calculations to note there are 14 parking spaces total including the duplex parking spaces. She made an additional comment to update the drainage waiver to Section 10.1.3 Drainage Study.

Stowell stated they will find a native species of tree to replace the current proposed tree in the plan. He stated they will update the parking calculations to note the total number of spaces on the site.

Crossley asked whether they will be using vinyl siding and also inquired about the line for the sewer.

Stowell confirmed that vinyl siding will be used. He stated that the sewer travels out of the back of the existing building and there is no easement for it but they are working on that.

Mears inquired about the existing driveway for the existing duplex and asked whether that will be paved. At present, the driveway is asphalt and gravel.

Stowell stated there are no changes planned for the existing duplex. He pointed out the driveways on the map.

Mears stated there is a note about parking on paved surfaces. She stated it is important to make sure plans are not in conflict with that.

Stowell stated their access and utilities are separate. He stated a likely scenario will be that the duplex becomes a rental for the current owner.

Mears stated if the rental units become condos, it would be helpful for the Assessing office to have any applicable HOA documents. She stated new addresses will need to be created and that 4 inches is a condition of approval for house number sizes at new addresses. She asked if Stowell could provide the plan for trash removal. She noted that the Planning Board may ask for additional buffering due to the project's close proximity to the neighbor at Map 9 Lot 22. She stated that she thinks the proposed building looks nice and

fits in well with the neighborhood. She noted the project is on the Planning Board agenda for the May 17th meeting due to the five waiver requests that require Planning Board approval. Stowell stated the tenants will utilize Somersworth's curbside removal services. In regard to additional buffering, the current owner is working on the sewer easement with the neighbor.

Crossley asked whether they have determined there is natural gas in the area. Regarding cable, she stated that is most likely sourced from the existing utility poles.

Stowell stated that yes, there is natural gas in the area.

Bobinsky referenced the sewer easement and asked if there had been one in the past, as there is one in process.

Stowell stated that they are doing research on Morning Street and the continuation of the subdivision. He stated when Morning Street was initially being developed, the process was not formalized. When the house was built on the lot in 2000, the sewer line traveled right through the property. He noted he thought it was best to get that in writing.

Bobinsky asked for clarification on whether the proposal would include connecting to the sewer on Morning Street.

Stowell stated that the proposed property would connect to the existing property with the utilities that are already there.

Bobinsky stated that a trench permit would be needed prior to any project that requires digging.

Mears asked Stowell if the retaining wall in the plan will be depressed or not.

Stowell stated the retaining wall will be depressed.

Kramlinger stated that a standard request that should be added to the plans is that the building needs to be reviewed by a fire protection engineer. For code compliance, sprinklers will likely be needed. He asked Hoage if he has identified the nearest hydrant to the property.

Hoage stated the nearest fire hydrant is located next to the driveway.

Mears stated the revised plans will not need to be heard by the SRTC again prior to the May Planning Board meeting. However, any revised plans will be sent to SRTC prior to their next meeting.

b. Any other new business that may come before the Committee.

Mears stated that Gallant passed his International Code Council exam. The Committee congratulated him on his accomplishment.

MOTION: Kramlinger made a MOTION to ADJOURN. adjourned: Bobinsky
The MOTION was SECONDED by Kramlinger.
The MOTION CARRIES 5-0.
The meeting was adjourned at 10:38am.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Stockman
Planning Secretary Site Review Technical Committee