

MINUTES

City of Rochester Planning Board CLARK BROOK COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 6, 2012 at 3:00 p.m.
Conference Room, City Hall
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867

Committee Members Present

Derek Peters, acting chair
James Gray
Rick Healey
Gregory Jeanson
Matt Kozinski

Committee Members Absent

Nel Sylvain, excused

Others Present

Mark Sullivan

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting.)

Mr. Peters called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. The committee approved the draft minutes from the prior meeting 3-0 (Mr. Gray moved and Mr. Healey seconded, with Mr. Jeanson and Mr. Kozinski abstaining). The following items were discussed and comments/suggestions made.

Water line

- (1) It would be most desirable, and most expensive, to connect Somersworth and Rochester water lines (\$700,000?).
- (2) It would be next most desirable, and next most expensive, to connect the development only to Rochester water (\$480,000?).
- (3) It would be least desirable, and least expensive, to connect the development only to Somersworth water (\$220,000?).
- (4) The City Engineer is submitting a preliminary application to the State Revolving Fund (SRF) for a potential low interest loan.
- (5) What the Planning Board would require will depend on whether the City could receive SRF funding, what other requirements might be part of the PUD, and other factors that remain to be seen.
- (6) The City is owed about \$18,000 for the water line that was extended for Little Quarry. This should be clarified/addressed as appropriate.

There was additional discussion about how things might be structured if the City were to receive SRF funding.

Streets

- (1) Create a loop road that goes all the way around, including the multifamily.
- (2) Design the road to be a City street.

Multifamily

- (1) Make the buildings two story.
- (2) Reduce the size of the buildings and increase the number of buildings.
- (3) Have the buildings front directly onto the street or onto a park.
- (4) One suggestion was to move the multifamily to a separate part of the site, toward Blackwater Road.
- (5) The multifamily needs to be better integrated with the rest of the project [though this might not be consistent with the suggestion to move it closer to Blackwater Road].
- (6) It is best that parking for the multifamily be placed behind the buildings.

It was recognized that commercial is not viable on Old Dover Road.

Townhouses

- (1) A mix is desirable if practical.
- (2) Perhaps expand duplexes into triplexes and quadraplexes to function like townhouses.

Architecture

- (1) It is important to provide examples of what you are thinking of; these should be brought to the March 13 meeting. It would be helpful if you could provide at least half a dozen examples.
- (2) Some kind of standards are probably important.
- (3) It is desirable that the standards be clear and precise so there need be no judgment or review involved.
- (4) Perhaps hire an architect to provide a template of designs. Once the architect is approved, it might be set up so that anything this person designs is fine, without any further review.
- (5) While the other three PUD's have architectural standards, how the City treats the architecture here should not affect other PUD's as the architecture is treated uniquely in each PUD.
- (6) Including some type of porch element on most or all of the houses could be effective.
- (7) Still, allowing for variety is important.
- (8) Treatment of garages is important in the design, so they are not prominent.
- (9) We are not concerned about color.

Parks/greens

- (1) With a large loop road, the interior could function as a large park.
- (2) Parks should front on the street to be most usable.

Sidewalks

- (1) There should be a continuous asphalt sidewalk around the loop.

- (2) It would probably be appropriate to have it on one side only.
- (3) Placing it on the inside would be less expensive and it could be continuous and adjacent to a park if placed inside the loop road.
- (4) It should have sloped granite curbing along the road with a five foot planting strip.
- (5) A midblock paved pedestrian path extending through the houses to the multifamily would be a good amenity.
- (6) Where a path is shown between houses it should be wide enough to be usable and discourage encroachment by adjacent houses plus provide access to the leach fields beyond.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Behrendt
Chief Planner