

SOMERSWORTH SITE REVIEW TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
June 29, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michelle Mears, Mike Hoage, Tim McLin, Michael Bobinsky, John Sunderland, George Kramlinger, Jeff Gallant Code Enforcement, Paul Robidas

Excused Members:

STAFF PRESENT: Dana Crossley, Planning Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 11:19 AM

1. Approval of the minutes: June 9

- a. Bobinsky motion to approve. Robidas 2nd. Motion carries 7-0.**

2. OLD BUSINESS

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

3. NEW BUSINESS

- a. John J. Flatley is seeking site plan amendment for access to a self-storage facility located on a portion of the lot within Rollinsford through a property located at Royal Drive in the Business (B) District, Assessor's Map 39 Lot 03, SITE#09-2022**

Kevin Walker of the Flatley Company and **Stephen Pernaw** of the Stephen G. Pernaw & Company Inc. were in attendance to represent the application.

Walker stated the Planning Board discussed and inquired if they would be willing to extend the existing sidewalk along Tri City Road to Royal Drive. He stated they would be willing to construct that remaining portion of about 700 more or less feet of sidewalk. He stated they also inquired if the site could be accessed from Rollinsford. Stated there is no access they are surrounded by open space lots, some being owned by the Town. It is about 3,500' to the nearest roadway in Rollinsford. Noted this was brought up during discussion with the Rollinsford ZBA when they were pursuing the apartment use, the closest road is a paper road which is the 3,500' away and then over a mile away is the closest existing road.

Pernaw stated after receiving the comments from the Planning Board he completed additional data collection and have provided a memo to address those concerns.

The applicant had been provided a list of concerns brought up by the Planning Board at their regular meeting in June. Pernaw addressed those concerns as follows:

1. Concern that Tri City Road is already overburdened

Pernaw stated in his opinion he does not agree that Tri City Road is overburdened and it could actually handle more traffic than it currently does. Noted for the intersection there are different capacities. Noted that the right turn in from High Street has no traffic to compete with but the left turn departure requires a gap in three lanes of traffic. He stated stacking on Tri City Road approach for left turns is at a max 4 cars, during PM peak 2 cars. He would agree that the roadway was overburdened if there was

stacking on 15-20 cars but in this case does not think there is an issue with it being able to handle the traffic.

Robidas noted he thinks a new traffic signal at this intersection would create new problems elsewhere. Noted there was some discussion regarding making this a right turn only or to close off the driveway/access point into Tri City Plaza from Tri City Road.

Pernaw stated he collected data regarding the traffic signal and the existing intersection does not come close to meeting the threshold for a traffic signal. He explained what data goes in to the determination of a requirement for a traffic signal per the MUTCD. He noted there was an inquiry if installing a traffic signal here would be too close to the existing one from Tri City Plaza and High Street and stated it can be done but does not think it is something that should be done since in part because it does not have enough traffic to warrant a signal. Regarding closing the driveway into Tri City Plaza, the applicant does not have authority to do that, and he would recommend it would be better to leave it as it is and allow for traffic's natural disbursement. He stated in consideration of making Tri City Road onto High Street a right turn only, it could be done but then would add additional burden to the signal through Tri City Plaza. He noted that the traffic fluctuates and adjusts to the conditions of High Street and does not see an advantage to prohibiting left turns. Noted that there are two approach lanes now and the report shows a max of 4 queuing cars.

Bobinsky questioned in regards to traffic warrants where the MUTCD is adopted and followed but if something does not meet the stated warrant for a traffic signal but the Board still requires installation of a light what would happen.

Pernaw stated as a traffic engineer, he would recommend that a signal was not installed. Noted there are likely places that have traffic signals where it is not warranted and added that the State has removed some lights in areas, they feel they are not necessary. Stated the MUTCD has a level of traffic that if met would warrant the consideration of installation of a light but at this intersection the numbers are too low.

Bobinsky in regards to meeting the warrants, the MUTCD, are adopted and followed, if something does not meet the warrant but if PB pushes and still wants a light put in there, what happens.

Pernaw stated as a traffic engineer would recommend that it is not installed, but expects there are locations that have signals that are not warranted, the State has removed some, the book states that there is a warrant that shall be met to start considering a light, as a traffic engineer does not recommend it at this location, the numbers are too low.

Bobinsky inquired for attachment 4 did they use 2021-2022 data.

Pernaw stated DOT does not want them to use that data due to COVID. He noted the signal warrant numbers are based on the average trips for a month. Noted that with their calculations have added a COVID adjustment which factored the numbers up and still does not meet the traffic signal warrant.

Mears suggested the applicant provide information regarding what Rollinsford has for allowed uses on this lot.

Robidas noted that the Board's concern is that this portion of the development is done correctly

Pernaw stated that this self-storage facility is tucked away and would expect a large portion of the people renting units would be from the apartment tenants. Could not think of another use that would generate less traffic.

Mears stated since the applicant has agreed to construct the sidewalk from the existing to connect to Royal Drive this would become a condition of approval. Stated they would be looking to have the design engineered.

Bobinsky added that they could meet to discuss existing design and materials to use for the extension. Noted they would prefer granite curb.

Walker agreed they could look at the existing and build to match.

2. Concern of the non-signalized intersection

Pernaw stated the most difficult movement here is the left turn departure but the queuing is short and there is an alternate route available through the signalized intersection of the Plaza.

3. Increased traffic volumes ranging from 75-92 trips per day potential for increased accidents

Pernaw stated that there is a document called the highway safety manual that takes a limited number of input variables and comes up with a predicted crash rate. Stated based on the conditions of the existing conditions of the intersection/roadway the software estimates a low number of crashes, less than 3 a year. With the proposed additional traffic the calculation remains the same less than 3 a year. He stated that 100 cars a day is not going to change the accident history of this area, whatever happens now as a rate would remain consistent and is not concerned.

4. Concern of larger vehicles such as a U-Haul traversing not just cars

Pernaw stated he believes this is an existing condition. There are cars and trucks that traverse Tri City Road and the intersection is designed and operating.

5. Left turns onto High Street – safety concern, should a traffic signal be required.

Pernaw stated no as explained earlier.

6. Would a signal at the Tri City Road and High Street be too close to existing signal at Tri City Plaza and High Street

Pernaw stated as mentioned earlier this is a yes and no situation.

7. Explain how the site cannot be accessed from Rollinsford.

Noted that Walker addressed this issue prior.

8. Discuss the impact of traffic from the Tri City Plaza. If that access point was closed off how it would impact the traffic on Tri City Plaza, he noted he felt it would make the situation worse because it would shut off the access that some vehicles use to choose the signalized intersection. Would like the traffic engineer to address if that is correct and if not why, if it is how does it impact the overall safety of each area.

Pernaw stated per the provided attachment #6 and his statements prior, it would be his recommendations to not close that driveway. He stated it would be best to leave it as to allow for natural traffic disbursement to minimize traffic demand at the signal.

Bobinsky noted the site plan had been revised for site markings and inquired if there would be a need for any signage on Tri City Road for the new storage facility.

Walker stated they would apply for the appropriate permits if they decided to install signage.

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

None.

MOTION: Robidas MOTION to ADJOURN at 11:55 AM
The MOTION is SECONDED by Kramlinger.
The MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

Respectively submitted: Dana Crossley,
Planning Secretary Site Review Technical Committee