

ATKINSON PLANNING BOARD
Atkinson, New Hampshire

Public Hearing Meeting
Wednesday, October 15, 2003

Present: Susan Killam, Chairman; Chuck Earley; Nicole Cheney
Alternates: Donna Sullivan
Town Engineer: Steve Keach

Ms. Killam called the meeting to order at 7:50 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 1, 2003
Tabled to the next meeting.

Mr. Earley made a motion to take the agenda out of order. The Kalil hearing will be heard first. Ms. Cheney seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

The Public Hearing was opened at 8:00 P.M.

New Applications

- 2. Teresa Kalil, submission of an application for Acceptance, Formal Consideration and Approval of an Amended Site Plan for Change of Use to allow an Automotive and Autobody Repair Garage at 9 Kipcam Road, Map 20, Lot 11 in the C-I Zone.**

The abutter's list was read. No abutters present.

This is a change of use to a use, which requires a site plan. Parking and fire lanes have been added to the plan. A statement of intent was read. Intended hours of operation, Monday through Friday 6:00 A.M to 7:00 P.M., Saturday 9:00 to 5:00 P.M. and Sunday 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. Number of cars will not exceed 10 and the owner will adhere to all guidelines of chemicle usage, storage and disposal set forth by the Town of Atkinson and will obtain all licenses and registrations as required. Signage was also detailed.

Mr. Earley stated that a MSDS is needed for occupancy. In response to a question from Mr. Keach Mr. Boucher stated that there are no new buildings being added. Some new pavement may be added. The existing pavement is the original paving. There are several businesses in the parcel. Mr. Boucher reported that this building was one of the first in Atkinson that required an indoor sprinkler system.

A motion was made by Mr. Earley to approve the amended site plan of Teresa Kalil for Change of Use to allow an Automotive and Autobody Repair Garage at 9 Kipcam Road, Map 20, Lot 11 in the C-I Zone. Ms. Cheney seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Earley noted that a unit in the building would be used to repair six waste trucks with 'roll offs' on top. Mr. Earley stated that the trucks could not be brought inside for repair with the 'roll on' tops. Mr. Earley added the 'roll on/off' tops are not to be left in the yard. It was his opinion that the trucks should not be brought to the site with the dumpsters on. If the dumpsters and the vehicles are brought to the site, 12 parking spaces will be used instead of six. The owner is in agreement. Mr. Boucher stated that the dumpsters do have to be repaired and welded occasionally. Mr. Earley noted that they would have to be repaired outside. Mr. Boucher assured the Board that he would take care of the site and keep it clean.

The hearing was closed at 8:15 P.M.

The next hearing was opened at 8:20 P.M.

1. Engineering Alliance, Inc. for Heyland Development, LLC and owner John Lathrop, III, submission of an application for Acceptance, Formal Consideration and Approval of a proposed 6 lot Rural Residential Cluster on 15.6 acres located at 33 Maple Ave, Map 9, Lot 33, RR2 Zone.

The abutter's list was read. Present: John Lathrop, III; Satco Realty Trust; Peter and Kerry Gulezian; Engineering Alliance, Inc.

James Hanley, Engineering Alliance presented. The elevation of the land is 195' at Maple Ave. and slopes down to Bryant Brook. The highest point of the property is approximately 265'. Bryant Brook flows from north to south and is located approximately 400' off Maple Ave. There are wetlands associated with Bryant Brook and they are shown on Sheet C2. Gove Environmental provided wetlands and the HISS mapping. The site is wooded and there is an existing footpath. There are two existing easements on site shown on Sheet C1. There is an access easement that provides access from 35 Maple Avenue to this property. The other is a drainage easement held by the town. A few years ago there was a subdivision site plan before the town and the access easement was provided for access to Maple Ave. at one location instead of providing two driveways. Lots 31 and 35 have their own existing driveways at this time.

This is a rural residential cluster development consistent with Section 6 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to gain access to the back lot a 920' long, 24' wide roadway is proposed with two lanes and two 3' wide gravel shoulders on either side that go down to a 2 to 1 slope. The maximum developable density was discussed and the calculations showed 6.2 lots with 7.2 acres of open space. See Sheet C3. The lot sizing calculations are based upon the State Subdivision

Regulations using slopes, soils and use. Each lot will have its own well and septic system. See Sheet C4.

To gain access to the back lot the applicant looked at crossing the brook in a number of different areas and the one shown was the most efficient and would cause the least amount of impact to the area. A head wall is proposed to control Bryant Brook with two 36" pipes at the headwall. A 100-year storm event is provided. Mr. Hanley noted that the proposed two 36" pipes have a greater passable area than one single 48" pipe. Mr. Hanley stated that the test pits have not been performed because the existing Bryant Brook can only be accessed by using a track excavator. There will be some disturbance out there but they will attempt to minimize it as much as possible.

The applicant is before the Board for any input, and would like to make any changes the Board recommends before digging the test pits. Mr. Hanley noted that he has been in contract with Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Keach referred to a trail on the property. He would like it to know where it leads and asked that it be marked. The 100' buffer has been honored through out the project. Ms. Killam suggested that Mr. Hanley meet with Ted Stewart who is familiar with the area. It was also suggested that he meet with the Fire Chief for his recommendations.

The Town Engineer's letter was reviewed.

Two state permits are required, State Subdivision Approval and Wetland's permits.

A performance bond is required.

Zoning Matters:

- 1: It is recommended that the applicant submit draft copies of homeowners association documents and protective covenants relative to stewardship of the proposed open space areas and that Town Counsel review and comment on these documents.
- 2: The six houses proposed would be subject to school Impact Fees.
- 3: It is recommended that a note be added to Sheet C-3 of the plans indicating each platted lot is intended to be used for the construction of one single family residential dwelling.
- 4: It is recommended that a note be added stipulating that each platted lot is to have a minimum of two on-site parking spaces.

Planning/Design Matters:

- 1, 2, 3: Minor issues.
- 4: The limits of the designated flood hazard area should be designated on the plan if any portion of the site is situated in a designated flood hazard area. If not a note should be added stating this.
- 5: It is recommended that the name of the proposed street, the proposed right-of-way width and the name of the project be noted on Sheet C-3.

- 6: It is recommended that the zoning district boundary shown on Sheet C-1 also be shown on Sheet C-3.
- 7: It is recommended that the application be reviewed by the Fire Department.
- 8: It is recommended that a note be added to the plan depicting a private or public road.
- 9: Platted Lots 33-3 through 33-6 consist of land with very steep slopes, which will make these lots difficult if not impossible to build upon in any practical way. It is recommended the applicant demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that these lots are truly buildable.
- 10: It is recommended the location of proposed driveways serving each platted lot be shown on Sheet C-4 and that all driveway aprons, with culverts where necessary, be constructed through the limits of right-of-way contemporaneously with the proposed roadway. This will prevent disturbance of finished roadway construction at the time individual homes are constructed.
- 11: It is recommended proposed house numbers be noted on Sheet C-3.
- 12: It is recommended that test pit data, sufficient to confirm suitability of soils for on-site sewage disposal be submitted.
- 13: It is recommended the design engineer recheck the proposed grading design shown on Sheet C-4.
- 14: It is recommended design radii of all pavement curves and flares within the proposed cul-de-sac and at the proposed intersection with Maple Avenue be specified on Sheet C4 as well as the proposed width.
- 15 and 16: Minor issues.
- 17: It is recommended the design engineer check runoff velocities with the proposed ditch line to be constructed along the northerly edge of the proposed subdivision road between Maple Ave. and the Bryant Brook.
- 18: It is recommended a headwall be specified in lieu of end sections at the outlets of the proposed twin 36" cross culverts.
- 19: It is recommended that slope and drainage easements be depicted and defined over all areas of the site where proposed construction is to occur beyond the platted limits of right-of-way.
- 20: It is recommended the limits of proposed guardrail be extended along the full length of roadway to be constructed with 2:1 fill slopes.
- 21: It is recommended that the plans specify that all utilities will be installed underground.
- 22: It is recommended that roadway cross sections of 50' at half stations be prepared and submitted.
- 23: An existing culvert discharges onto the parcel immediately north of the proposed intersection of the subdivision road and Maple Ave. It is recommended the design engineer address how flow from this culvert will be accommodated by the proposed roadway design.
- 24: It is recommended that Sheet C-4 of the project plans specify that a MUTCK R1-1 "stop" sign, with corresponding stop bar, as well as a street name sign are to be installed at the proposed intersection and that the applicant consider installing a street lamp at this intersection.

25: The plans specify guardrail to be installed is to be of wood beam construction. It is recommended the plans be revised to specify the use of standard W-beam galvanized steel rail and that the location of all guardrail construction be defined by station and off-set. Mr. Keach recommended the applicant receive input for Ted Stewart.

26: It is recommended the design engineer demonstrates and certifies the adequate sight distance is available at the proposed intersection.

27: It is recommended that plans be embellished to depict the following erosion and sedimentation control measures: a) the installation of a stabilized construction entrance drive apron at Maple Avenue; b) to specify adequate erosion control at the toe of all proposed roadway fill embankment slopes, especially in the vicinity of Bryant Brook; c) to specify an adequate means of dust control during construction; and d) to provide for a means of temporary diversion of stream flow during installation of the planned roadway cross culverts.

Mr. Keach noted that the Wetlands Bureau may have an issue with this because it could increase velocity.

28: It is recommended various typical design details provided on Sheet D-1 be revised as follows:

- The headwall detail should be revised to correct its title and to account for twin culvert installation.
- Sheet C-4 should indicate where the typical detail of the grass-lined swale is to be used.
- A typical design detail of residential driveway construction be provided.
- A typical guardrail detail be expanded to include design data for end sections.
- The typical roadway cross-section be revised to specify a 2'-6" gravel shoulder extension where guardrail is to be installed.

29: It is recommended the design engineer divert post development drainage from post-development catchment area PWS#2 highlighted in the storm water management report.

Discussion continued on the 50% open space calculations. This issue will be discussed further at the next Workshop Meeting.

The side slopes for the culvert crossing were discussed. The applicant may be requesting a waiver from the grading requirements from a 2 to 1 slope to a 1 to 1 slope. Mr. Keach did not recommend going below a 1-1/2 slope and recommended using a permanent cover such as erosion stone because the slope could not be maintained. Mr. Keach stated that there is a good opportunity for an accidental encroachment here.

It was determined that Jurisdiction not be granted at this time to give the applicant a couple of weeks to shorten the list of recommendations.

Mr. Earley made a motion to continue this hearing to November 5, 2003 without taking it under jurisdiction at this time. Ms. Sullivan seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

The hearing was opened to abutters.

Mr. Anderson asked if he could send a representative to the November 5th meeting if he could not attend. Ms. Killam stated that he could.

A question was raised on where the test pits will be dug. Ms. Killam stated that they would have to access all of their proposed sites to dig. The abutters were concerned with how the property would be accessed. It was hoped that the road agent would have some suggestions. Mr. Anderson stated that there is no way off of Washington Road that could be used to access the property.

The hearing was closed to abutters.

Ms. Killam reminded the applicant that fire suppression would have to be discussed and made part of the plan. Mr. Earley suggested meeting with the Fire Chief before the next meeting.

A site walk will be scheduled at the November 5th meeting.

Ms. Killam reminded abutters that there would be no further abutter notification.

Discussed at the November 5th meeting will be:

- Open space calculations
- Road design

Ms. Cheney made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Earley seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 P.M.

Next scheduled Planning Board meeting November 5, 2003.

APPROVED _____ Respectfully submitted,

Carol Kater