

**SOMERSWORTH SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**August 12, 2020**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Bobinsky, Scott McGlynn, Tim Metivier, Bob Belmore

**Excused:** Paul Robidas, George D. Kramlinger, and Timothy McLin

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dana Crossley, Planning Secretary and Carol Ogilvie Interim City Planner

The meeting was called to order at 10:41 AM.

Belmore stated due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Committee is authorized to meet electronically. Although this is a public meeting, the public is encouraged not to attend and instead to leave comments or concerns at the following phone number # 1-603-841-2936, or by emailing [planning@somersworth.com](mailto:planning@somersworth.com) or by sending written comment to the Planning Board/SRTC, either through the drive up window or by postal mail to 1 Government Way, Somersworth NH 03878. The public can access the meeting and listen live by telephone.

Roll call attendance was taken, **Belmore, Metivier, and Bobinsky** were present in the City Hall Council Chambers. **McGlynn** was in attendance remotely and alone. The Planning Secretary, Dana Crossley and Carol Ogilvie Interim City Planner were also in Council Chambers.

1) **Approval of the minutes:** no minutes for this meeting

2) **OLD BUSINESS**

A) Any old business that may come before the Committee. – No old business.

3) **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **Forget Management LLC, is seeking site plan approval and conditional use permit to expand an existing automobile sales and service facility with infrastructure on a property located at 285 Route 108, in the Commercial/Industrial (C/I) District, Assessor's Map 47 Lot 08, SITE#09-2020 & CUP#4-2020**

**Bob Stowell** of Tritech Engineering, **Matthew Enman** of Whitcher Builders and **Patrick Forget** were in attendance remotely to represent the application.

Stowell stated the proposal is for an expansion to the existing Nissan dealership. He stated the original site plan and conditional use permit was approved in 2003. He stated they are looking to expand the service capabilities and inventory display.

Stowell reviewed the proposed expansion. He stated the existing express drive has two lanes and they are proposing to add one more. He stated they are looking to extend the back of the building, which is the service area, to add 8 new bays. He stated 10 bays exist currently and are accessed through a single overhead door and they would be replicating that door with the expansion. He stated they just received the building elevations, completed by Whitcher Builders, this shows the express lane and additional building. He stated the installation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> service lane will require shifting of the landscape island. He stated that will be moved 16' over and retain the same parking and display area. He stated in the rear of the property they have added pavement around the parking lot to extend the vehicle display area.

Stowell stated the drainage is being revised with this project. He noted the standards have changed drastically since it was first designed in 2003. He stated the handling of runoff will be addressed with the current standards for new and existing pavement. He stated they will be installing 2 new bio-retention areas. He stated they are scheduled for the Conservation meeting later in the day to present the CUP application to them for additional impact to the wetland buffer. Stowell reviewed the original wetland buffer disturbance from the 2003 CUP and construction. He explained the stormwater runoff and proposed upgrades. He stated the new bio-retention will be able to handle storms and runoff more efficiently and at a high capacity.

Metivier stated on SP-2, construction note C-1 for the silt fence is not shown on the plans. Stowell replied it was actually shown on SP-3.

Metivier noted that note C-4 is shown on the plan but does not connect to a note. It points to the exterior wall of the addition. Stowell stated he would look into that and it may have been for construction specifics.

Metivier stated C-6 states to look at SP-7 but there is not SP-7. Stowell stated he would address.

Metivier asked that all symbols on the plan be made part of the legend. Stowell stated he can do that.

Metivier stated the additions shown on SP-1 and CUP-1 do not match. Stowell stated that was correct. He explained the CUP plan was submitted a week prior to the Site Plan submittal in order to get onto the Conservation Commission agenda. He stated the footprint on SP-1 is the final footprint they are going will and seeking approval for.

Metivier asked if there is an area reserved for snow storage. Stowell stated they typically depict that on the landscape plan and it will be in areas that allow it to drain into the drainage system. He stated he will ensure it makes it onto the landscape plan.

Metivier asked if the pavement will be impervious. Stowell stated no, it is standard pavement.

Metivier asked for more information on car washing on site. Stowell stated he does not know how that is handled. He explained in the original approval there was storm drains and the proposed addition is to have the same drain system and is more appropriate to do inside the building. Metivier noted there is car washing done in the parking lot. He asked if the addition will put an end to that. Stowell stated yes, the addition will help fix that and car washing is to be an inside activity.

Metivier asked where the bike rack is located. Stowell stated there is not one proposed and will speak with the applicant to see if they want to install one or seek a waiver.

Bobinsky requested the oil and grease separator be shown on the plans. He stated he is specifically concerned about the car washing and the extended service area. Stowell stated they can add those to the plan and a note explaining the drains.

Enman stated they would be looking to tie into the trench drains.

Bobinsky asked who takes care of the drainage maintenance.

Forget stated the car washing situation is one of the main reasons for the proposed addition. He stated it has worked best to wash cars inside in the winter. He stated in the summer they are overwhelmed and wash outside. He stated they have no issue with adding the bike rack.

Belmore stated on SP-2, C-5 states the details are shown on SP-5 note 4 but there is no note 4. He stated C-9 needs to specify that all lighting will be down lit and shielded.

Stowell stated they are working on the lighting plan for the submission. He stated it is more complicated than usual because of the existing lighting. He stated they will be submitting the plan sheet that shows the lighting specifications.

Belmore stated note C-11 points to a dumpster and trees. He asked for clarification.

Stowell stated there will be a shift in the landscape island and it will be replaced. He will correct the note attached to dumpster.

Belmore requested it be clarified that they will also be re-planting the existing trees.

Belmore stated note C-12 points to curbing and a few of the light poles. He asked for clarification on that note.

Stowell stated some of the lights in the rear of the property will be relocated but a few of them will remain in place. He stated note C-10 explain the new lights.

Belmore stated note C-13 is not shown on the page.

Stowell stated he would correct that.

McGlynn noted that a new water/sewer application will be required with the expansion. He explained how to apply.

There was a brief discussion on the proposed addition differences between CUP-1 and all other pages.

Bobinsky asked for more information on the referenced easements.

Stowell stated the easements exist from the original development. He stated the easement with the City was for the benefit of Avis Goodwin. He stated he does not believe it was utilized but that is why it was there.

Bobinsky asked if the easement was recorded.

Stowell stated he was unsure.

Belmore stated that should be clarified.

Bobinsky stated he reviewed the traffic analysis and feels it is straight forward. He stated the impact does not appear that it will be significant onto Route 108. He asked for more information on the turning lanes, specifically the southbound lane as it is not mentioned in the report.

Stowell stated as part of the site plan and driveway permit approval in 2003 they had to install a turning lane right in. He stated at this same time Velcro had a turning lane into their site as well this was re-striped as dual turning lane when the Nissan site was developed. He explained later when Velcro expanded, they re-striped the turning lane to turn only to their site. They are seeking clarification from DOT on this matter.

Bobinsky asked for a follow up on this topic at the next meeting.

Bobinsky clarified with the drainage improvements and modifications there is a reduction in runoff.

Stowell stated that is correct.

Metivier asked if they had applied for an updated driveway permit.

Stowell stated the indication was that they did not need a new permit but just to update it. He stated he would confirm.

Metivier asked how many vehicles are washed in a day.

Forget stated about 12-15.

Metivier clarified that due to the business volume in the summer they try to wash the cars outside.

Forget stated yes.

Stowell stated with this proposed expansion they would no longer need to do outside washes.

Ogilvie stated there needs to be a landscape plan submitted.

Belmore noted that the landscape plan is labeled as grading and drainage currently.

Stowell stated they have identified the areas that will receive new treatment and the landscape architect is putting together the plan.

Belmore noted on EX-1 the test pit symbol covers the building square footage. He added that the existing parking is also not shown nor the existing utilities. He stated the existing water line location is not clear and there are no hydrants shown on the plans.

Stowell stated those can be added to the plan and there are no waivers being requested.

Belmore asked if the architecture plans will be submitted.

Stowell stated yes and it will look similar to the existing with just an expanded footprint.

Belmore stated this Committee typically comments on third party review.

Bobinsky stated he did not think that this project would need third party review of the traffic memo.

Belmore stated the drainage should be reviewed and a quote for that review should be together soon and they will forward it along once received.

Ogilvie asked if there are any changes to the pedestrian circulation.

Stowell stated it will be similar to existing today.

A) **Any other new business that may come before the Committee.**

No other business.

MOTION: Metivier MOTION to ADJOURN at 11:33

The MOTION is SECONDED by Bobinsky.

The MOTION CARRIES by a 4-0 roll call vote.

Respectively submitted:

Dana Crossley, Planning Secretary  
Site Review Technical Committee