

**SOMERSWORTH SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 8, 2019**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shanna B. Saunders, Chair, Mike Bobinsky, Keith Hoyle, Paul Robidas, Scott McGlynn, and Tim Metivier.
MEMBERS ABSENT: Tim McLin
OTHERS PRESENT: Dale Smith-Kenyon, Ron Standley, Robert Stowell, Alan Grinnell
STAFF PRESENT: Dana Crossley, Planning Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 10:31 am.

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 10, 2019. Smith-Kenyon noted she should be listed as 'other' not 'member'
 - a. **Motion:** Hoyle moved to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 10, 2019. Robidas seconded the motion. Motion CARRIED by vote of 5-0.
- 2) **OLD BUSINESS**
 - A) Any old business that may come before the Committee.
 - a. No old business discussed.

3) **NEW BUSINESS**

- A) **RJP Consulting Group, is seeking site plan approval for addition of a pad and walk in cooler at an existing KFC restaurant on property located at 9 Commercial Drive, in the Residential Commercial (RC) District, Assessor's Map 36 Lot 01, SITE#07-2019:**

Saunders stated this is a minor site plan.

Applicant Statement: Ron Standley from RJP Consulting Group represented the project. Stated they are proposing to put in a small freezer cooler on a concrete pad. They will be removing an existing tree for the cooler placement. Also interior and exterior renovations will take place.

Water Department: McGlynn stated he had no comments.

Public Works Department: Bobinsky questioned what the renovations entailed. Standley stated they would be cleaning up the landscaping and painting; the renovations will be the roll out of the corporate reimagining.

Bobinsky stated that they observe litter around the landscape banks and in parking lot adjacent to Commercial Drive, he felt it should be flagged as at least housekeeping. He also noted that the historic Cemetery, on the property, at the corner of High St. and Commercial Dr. should be tended to. More attention to detail on trimming and the fencing is broken. He suggested having that be added as a condition.

Fire Department: Hoyle stated he had no big concerns at this time. He stated he was fine with the proposed separation from the cooler.

Building Inspector: Metivier stated that the business is cited almost every year for the litter on the property. He noted that the vegetation is thick on the banking and could be

thinned in order to aid in the cleanup of the litter. He stated the cemetery fencing is a property maintenance issue and is required to be addressed. Metivier stated that some of the rebranding is to remove the small tower and pitched roof, which would be in violation in the site plan regulations to remove the New England style architecture. He stated that should be looked in regards of the ordinance to maintain the New England style.

Planning Board Rep: Robidas stated that the Planning Board typically wants to see more New England Style and not less. Standley stated they have a standard feature that he could bring in graphics of.

Conservation Commission Rep: Smith-Kenyon questioned where the location of the demo dumpster would be and how they would ensure not to get debris in the surrounding wetlands. Standley stated they have not located it but could depict it on the plans.

Smith-Kenyon questioned if the new signs would be in compliance with the City's ordinance. Saunders clarified that signage would not be addressed at this level but at an administrative level. She noted that the applicant knows they are required to submit a sign permit application. It will be reviewed to ensure it matches the site plan and meets ordinance requirements.

City Planner: Saunders questioned if the tree being removed would be replaced? Standley stated they could find a place to put a new tree. Saunders requested its location be shown on the plan that will show the location of the dumpster.

Saunders stated a memo will be issued to applicant with the comments of the board. She noted the next deadline is May 20th for revised plans, includes abutter notification information if not submitted already. The next meeting will be June 5th and it will be a public hearing.

Standley questioned if interior work could be done before site plan approval. Metivier replied yes with the approval of a building permit. But he advised the applicant to hold off on exterior work prior to site plan approval.

Standley stated the drive through would be open during construction and the dining area would be closed. Metivier questioned if the State would be involved to ensure proper separation of construction and food preparation. Standley replied yes.

B) SNTG, LLC, is seeking site plan approval to add at 4,500 sq. ft. commercial building and associated parking and infrastructure to the existing commercial site on property located at 472 High Street, in the Residential Commercial (RC) District Assessor's Map 40 Lots 4-A &4-B, SITE#08-2019.

Applicant Statement: Robert Stowell of Tri Tech Engineering and Alan Grinnell SNTG owner attended the meeting. Stowell stated the project has been reviewed and approved twice before by the PB. State the two previous approvals had expired without coming to fruition but this time expects the project to be fully developed. Stowell noted the changes that have taken place since the last approval in 2015. The garages have been torn down, water work was done on High Street and the front

building on the parcel operates as an accounting firm. He included the condominium site plan and noted that the owners are co-applicants and will both participate in the development. He stated they are asking for the same waivers that have been previously approved. The waivers being requested are as follows:

1. Buffer-yard Requirement (SPRR 22A.11.6.d)
2. Paved Area Setback (SPRR 22A.11.4.b.iiiv)
3. Landscaping Requirements (SPRR 22A.11.6.b & SPRR 22A.11.6.e & SPRR 22A.11.4.b.viii)

Water Department: McGlynn stated a meeting can be set up to discuss water details with himself and Bobinsky. Discussion of the location of water lines and service required. He questioned if they are looking to share fire services on the lot. Stowell stated they would be completely independent. McGlynn noted there are less than 10ft separating the water and sewer lines that needs to be further reviewed. He noted that before any work can begin an approved water and sewer permit is required. He advised the applicant begin that process.

Grinnell explained to the board that the laundry mat will be utilizing 'green' procedures and water usage would likely be less than expected.

Saunders stated the City does have a water/sewer impact fee. She advised the applicant to start the application process and include the alternate numbers and information that would affect the impact fee for the Finance Department's consideration.

Public Works Department: Bobinsky stressed to the applicant to provide the documentation that would support alternate numbers for the water and sewer usage. Bobinsky noted that the drainage report showed a decrease in peak flow for storm events due to underground storage and infiltration. Stowell explained the drainage system has been used on other projects and shown to be effective. He suggested potentially having a third party limited review if a review done. Saunders stated she was not going to recommend to the Planning Board to have a third party review. Stowell stated that during one of the previous site plan reviews the drainage went through CLD review and it is the same system.

Bobinsky stated he did not see the traffic plan and would like a copy of that. Stowell stated they have an updated one and will provide for the board.

Bobinsky stated he would like the applicant to consider screening in the front of the property with landscaping.

Fire Department: Hoyle questioned if there would be dry cleaning on site. Grinnell stated they would be only a drop off site. Dry cleaning would be done off site. He stated they practice in 'shades of green' and use the greenest process for dry cleaning.

Planning Board Rep: Robidas questioned if the rental space would affect approval or require the applicant to come back for additional site plan review. Stowell stated that during one of the previous site plan approvals it was established they would not have a food business. He stated it would potentially be a hair or nail salon something that fit in 1,000 sq. ft. and did not have continuous traffic.

Building Inspector: Metivier requested that room 105 be labeled, suggested 'future business use'. He questioned if the address would remain 472 High Street. Stowell stated he thought it would be a Tri City Road address, but that 472 High was the only current address for the property.

Metivier noted that there was no snow storage depicted on the plan. He questioned if there was a temporary snow storage place on the property. Stowell stated the plan was to not have a snow storage place and remove the snow each storm. He said temporary snow storage would ultimately be in a parking spot but did not want to limit the applicant. Metivier stated it was a point of concern for him when they were at the limit for required parking spots and to be taking up some of those with snow storage. Saunders stated snow storage should be depicted to the plan. Stowell replied that snow would not be stored on the property and would be removed per storm. Board held discussion of snow storage and removal, it was finalized that it would be left for the Planning Board to make the final decision.

Metivier noted he did not see a call out for the bike rack. Stowell stated it was listed as C17 with the model number.

Metivier questioned the 11 ft. parking sport next to the 8 ft. handicap van accessible spot, what was the reason for the larger spot? Grinnell stated it was for someone with children, unloading and loading convenience. Metivier replied no it is clearly marked for handicap. Stowell stated the math worked out to allow a larger space. It was pointed out that that space must be left for handicapped use and not be a loading zone.

Metivier stated that on the loading zone plan page, there is a note 30 but no depiction of a note 30. Stowell stated he would remove the note as he is unsure what it correlates to.

Metivier requested the gas connections be depicted on the plan.

Planning Board Rep: Robidas discussed the snow storage and that it may not be trucked off right away. Stowell felt it would be self-policing since it would take away potential business if the parking spots were full of snow. Saunders noted the applicant are smart individuals that would be able to come up with an appropriate plan. Stowell stated he felt there was a plan. It was decided to let the Planning Board make the determination on what was appropriate.

Robidas questioned when the moratorium was up for both High and Tri City. Bobinsky replied October of 2019 for both.

Robidas questioned if the sidewalk was being installed by the new development behind this property would have an effect on the site plan. Saunders stated since it was not on their property it would not.

Conservation Commission Rep: Smith-Kenyon questioned how the underground catch system worked and what the maintenance process entailed. Stowell explained the system and stated a maintenance plan has been submitted. He also stated reports will be submitted annually to the City.

Smith-Kenyon noted the second driveway with proposed access to Tri-City Road looks like it will impact a parking space. Stowell stated it would not. Board discussed with Stowell the parking spot. The Ordinance gives the Public Works Department authority of the matter and applicant will meet with Bobinsky to further discuss.

Smith-Kenyon questioned the referenced ceiling height on the second page of A2. Stowell stated it was not an approved plan just to show elevation and the note should be disregarded.

City Planner: Saunders requested the applicant provide updated condo documents that reflect who is responsible for maintenance of sewer and water lines. She noted the landscape plan and key do not match; the symbols used are not on the plan. Stowell stated he would provide an update plan.

Saunders stated she did not see a lighting detail for the street lights. She stated there was a note on SP1 that says install pole mounted lights but does not point to lights.

Stowell replied that the lighting plan is a new addition and will provide details.

Saunders noted that the Ordinance requires 24' isles and the plan is showing less than that. Stowell stated that it has been discussed during previous site plan reviews but could take out one of the travel ways to make the remaining isle 24'.

Saunders stated there are additional landscape waivers that the applicant will need to request. She noted that one would be for loading in the buffer yard.

Board discussed the placement of the roof drains. Applicant stated it was unclear at the moment where they would and that the construction of the building would clarify the location. Bobinsky stated it would be helpful to have them listed on the plan. Metivier noted the size of the drains would be controlled by building code.

Robidas noted that it is a tight site and does not want to make the same errors as done at the Old Rail site.

Applicant's next submittal deadline is June 26th. The next SRTC meeting will be July 2nd.

- C) Any other new business that may come before the Committee.
 - a. Saunders stated the ambulance business is on hold.

Motion: Metivier moved to adjourn the meeting. Hoyle seconds the motion. Motion carried vote of 6-0. Meeting adjourned at 11:39

Respectively submitted:

Dana Crossley, Planning Secretary
Site Review Technical Committee