



City of Rochester, New Hampshire
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
45 Old Dover Road • Rochester, NH 03867
(603) 332-4096
www.RochesterNH.net



MEMO PUBLIC WORKS & BUILDING COMMITTEE AGENDA

TO: PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS COMMITTEE
FROM: PETER C. NOURSE, PE
DIRECTOR OF CITY SERVICES
DATE: Revised July 13, 2020
SUBJECT: Public Works & Buildings Committee Meeting
Meeting Date Thursday July 16, 2020 at 7PM

There will be a Public Works and Buildings Committee Meeting held on July 16, 2020 at 7PM. This meeting will be broadcast on Cable 26 for Atlantic Broadband customers, and the meeting will be streamed online at City's website WWW.Rochesternh.net.

Good Evening, as Chairperson of the Public Works and Buildings Committee I am declaring that an emergency exists and I am invoking the provisions of RSA 91-A: 2, III (b). Federal, State and local officials have determined that gatherings of 10 or more people pose a substantial risk to our community in its continuing efforts to combat the spread of COVID-19. In concurring with their determination, I also find that this meeting is imperative to the continued operation of City government and services, which are vital to public safety and confidence during this emergency. As Such this meeting will be conducted without a quorum of this body physically present in the same room.

In addition to the following public access information, the Public Works and Buildings Committee will be allowing the public to come to City Hall and speak to the Committee via video conferencing software for Public Input and the Stillwater Circle Public Input. In an effort to adhere to CDC guidelines-enter only at the front Wakefield entrance and exit out the side closest the PD and adhere to 6 foot social distancing while inside. Hand sanitizer and face masks will be available at the Wakefield entrance.

For public access to the meeting by telephone: At this time, we welcome members of the public accessing this meeting remotely. In order for any public attendee to be allowed to comment during the public input portion of our meeting, you must have registered before the meeting with your name and the telephone number that you will use to call in. You may register now online [here](https://bit.ly/35Ru0Wu) or by copying or typing the following address into your browser: <https://bit.ly/35Ru0Wu>. Even though this meeting is being conducted in a unique manner under unusual circumstances, the usual rules of conduct and decorum do apply. Any person found to be disrupting this meeting will be asked to cease the disruption. Should the disruptive behavior continue thereafter, that person will be removed from this meeting.

The public can call-in to listen at the below number using the conference code.

Phone Number: 857-444-0744

Conference Code: 843095

Public Access Troubleshooting: If any member of the public has difficulty accessing the meeting by phone, please email PublicInput@RochesterNH.net or call 603-332-1167.

Public Input: Due to the ongoing situation with COVID-19, the City of Rochester will be taking extra steps to allow for public input, while still ensuring participant safety and social distancing. In lieu of attending the meeting, those wishing to share comments, are encouraged to do so by the following methods:

- **Mail:** Rochester Public Works & Buildings Committee 45 Old Dover Road, Rochester, NH 03867 (*must be received at least three full days prior to the anticipated meeting date*)
- **Email** – Lisa.Clark@rochesternh.net (*must be received no later than 4:00 pm of meeting date*)
- **Voicemail** 603-335-7572 (*must be received no later than 12:00 pm on said meeting date in order to be transcribed*)

Please include with your correspondence the intended meeting date for which you are submitting. *All correspondence will be included with the corresponding meeting packet (Addendum).*

Roll Call: Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name and ward, also please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law. Additionally, Committee members are required to state their name and ward each time they wish to speak.

AGENDA

1. Public Input
2. Stillwater Circle: Public Input.
3. City Hall Tree and Lawn
4. DPW Facility Update
5. 10-16 Wallace Street - Soil Remediation Project
6. Pickering Road – Kane Gonic Brickyard Soil Remediation
7. FY20 Paving – Salmon Falls Road
8. Strafford Square Roundabout
9. Excavation Request – Street Moratorium
10. Non Public – RSA 91-A:3,II (d)
11. Other

From: cinikki123@metrocast.net
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 8:58 AM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Cc: [Dave Walker](#); [James Gray](#); donald.hamann@rochester.net;
chris.rice@rochesternh.net; douglas.lachance@rochester.net; [Peter Lachapelle](#)
Subject: [External] Stillwater Circle subdivision impact

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Clark;

I am responding to the letter I received about the proposed Barrington subdivision requesting an ungated road access to Stillwater. I have contacted Peter Lachapelle in the past on this matter.

I know many of the neighbors are very concerned about this and am hoping they are also voicing their opinions.

My husband and I strongly oppose an ungated access road for the following reasons:

1. Increased traffic through our neighborhood (shortcuts to 125 and 202)
2. Higher safety risks for our grandchildren and all other children in the neighborhood due to increased traffic
3. Road maintenance costs would increase since traffic would increase.
4. Unknown impact on home valuations

We have lived here for 20 years and enjoyed the safety of the area and the minimal traffic flow. Most everyone knows their neighbors and looks out for each other. Once you open access to another development that is the same size as this.....that safety and sense of security is taken away.

We feel that if Barrington wants to build a development, they should have both access points on the Barrington side. Barrington will receive the tax dollars and be responsible for maintenance of GreenHill and the roads in the subdivision. There is no benefit to the residents of Stillwater Circle having an open gate access road.

We would however, be open to an **EMERGENCY LOCKED/GATED** road if that is an option without the possibility of changing it in later years.. We were here during the Mothers Day Flood when the bridge was underwater and this would make sense for the first responders. A contingency to a gated access road in the agreement would need to be perpetual in nature, and have side barriers to dissuade off road vehicle use of the area.

(Please note that there are several people who do not feel comfortable with this option because they believe the city will not keep its word).

Sincerely;

Cindy and James Andrews
21 Echo Brook Road
Rochester, NH 03839

Attachment 1

June 26, 2028

To Peter Nourse,

Please no gate or ungated roadway into Stillwater Circle. We live in a nice quiet neighborhood. Any type of gate will create more traffic & noise, more danger to the children playing & riding their bikes & scooters. A lot of mothers & fathers walk with their family & dogs in the evening & weekends.

A lot of seniors also walk every day.

Now only residents family & friends come into the circle. With a gate we will have strangers cutting through

to avoid the lights on 125.
a possibly undesirable
looking to rob or destroy
just for the fun of it!

I'm a senior citizen and
like my home + neighborhood
just like it is.

When I bought my
house having only one
way in + out was a plus!

Sincerely,
Beverly Crossman
9 Echo Brook Rd.
Stillwater Circle

From: [Tom Evans](#)
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 3:54 PM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Subject: [External] Proposed Residential Subdivision In
Barrington Requesting Access Road In Rochester

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The purpose of this communication is to relay a negative opinion of this request for the following reasons:

- The increase in traffic generated by the access road into Stillwater Circle will increase safety problems and concerns; Specifically, there is a great number of residents walking and bicycling the streets in this neighborhood who would need to share the road with the increased vehicle traffic.
- Allowing for the ungated access road would adversely impact the character of the Stillwater Circle neighborhood.
- The correspondence from the City, dated June 10, 2020 did not indicate how the ungated access road would benefit the City of Rochester.

Respectfully,

Tom Evans

11 Sugar Brook Rd, Rochester, NH 03839

Attachment 3

From: [Lisa Clark](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 5, 2020 12:43 PM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Stillwater Circle

From: Melissa DuVarney <melissaduvarney@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 5, 2020 12:18 PM
To: Lisa Clark <lisa.clark@rochesternh.net>
Subject: [External] Stillwater Circle

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

July 5, 2020

Dear Lisa Clark ,

This letter is in regards to the June 10th letter from the Public Works Committee of the Rochester City Council reviewing a potential ungated roadway connection from a new development in Barrington thru Stillwater Circle in Gonic.

This ungated roadway would allow the Barrington residents to use Rochester roads and bridge to gain access to 125 and the highway faster. This unnecessary added use would cost the city of Rochester money to repair both roads and bridge at a faster rate than our normal neighborhood use. Our neighborhood already has sections that are riddled with potholes due to poor drainage issues. Our streets were cut up and patched by the addition of added TV and internet cables. I don't imagine they would fair well with excess usage.

I don't agree to have it gated. This would allow it to be ungated in a number of years.

As a 14 year homeowner of Stillwater Circle I need to express my disdain for such an idea. I am a hard working single mom with a 4 year old, who plans on being here for the next 30 years. I grew up in Rochester and moved away as a young adult and chose to come back to this city because of this neighborhood. We live in this special neighborhood because it's quiet, private and safe. My son and I go for walks, bikes rides daily and enjoy visiting all the neighborhood cats that roam the streets. We have neighborhood parties and gatherings on our quiet streets. Children are able to safely play in the streets and enjoy an old fashion esque life that has since gone by the wayside.

My concern and as is the many neighbors I have spoken with and seen comments on Facebook is that this will create traffic we don't need or want. We have a right as hard working tax paying resident of Rochester to say, please don't allow this. This is our home and please don't tarnish our privacy, safety and quiet life here.

I have heard theirs concern over the storm many years ago where the river overflowed due to dam issues. We were all given the choice to stay or leave. We were all brought home and the rare issue was resolved by morning. We were never forced to be evacuated like the 55+ community Tara Estates, which to my knowledge also has one easement. Having one entrance and exit is common across the country for many communities. I can live with a rare situation like the overflowing that occurs once or maybe twice in a lifetime to have the benefits of living in our peaceful neighborhood.

I am pleading with you to please not allow this roadway connection to happen.

Attachment 4

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Melissa Eaton
30 Stillwater Circle
Rochester, NH 03839
603-973-1871
melissaduarney@yahoo.com

From: [Lisa Clark](#)
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 6:57 PM
To: [Ronda Boisvert](#)
Subject: Fwd: [External] [Rochester NH] Stillwater Circle additional roadway
(Sent by Dorothy Taraburelli , Dorothytaraburelli@yahoo.com)

Please pdf for pwc as we discussed
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Blaine Cox <blaine.cox@rochesternh.net>
Date: July 6, 2020 at 3:29:28 PM EDT
To: Lisa Clark <lisa.clark@rochesternh.net>
Subject: FW: [External] [Rochester NH] Stillwater Circle additional roadway (Sent by Dorothy Taraburelli , Dorothytaraburelli@yahoo.com)

FYI - one more for the PWC.

-----Original Message-----

From: cmsmailer@civicplus.com <cmsmailer@civicplus.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 2:15 PM
To: City Council <CityCouncil@rochesternh.net>
Subject: [External] [Rochester NH] Stillwater Circle additional roadway (Sent by Dorothy Taraburelli , Dorothytaraburelli@yahoo.com)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello City Council,

Dorothy Taraburelli (Dorothytaraburelli@yahoo.com) has sent you a message via your contact form (<https://www.rochesternh.net/users/city-council/contact>) at Rochester NH.

If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your settings at <https://www.rochesternh.net/user/661/edit>.

Message:

I have lived on Stillwater Circle since 1999. It is a wonderful place to live, quiet and peaceful and very little traffic except for those who live here. There are many one access roads in Barrington and in Rochester. I do not understand this problem. I also do not want an increase in traffic and lose my peaceful life. I ask you please to listen to my message and to vote not to allow the other access road going through here. That problem is the developers and it should not have any influence on us at all. Obviously this is a requirement for Barrington and that's their problem. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

From: "dianne51disney@icloud.com" <dianne51disney@icloud.com>

Date: July 8, 2020 at 8:39:54 PM EDT

To: Lisa Clark <lisa.clark@rochesternh.net>, Dave Walker <dave.walker@rochesternh.net>, James Gray <james.gray@rochesternh.net>, Donald Hamann <donald.hamann@rochesternh.net>, Christopher Rice <christopher.rice@rochesternh.net>, Douglas Lachance <douglas.lachance@rochesternh.net>, Caroline McCarley <caroline.mccarley@rochesternh.net>

Subject: [External] Proposal before Public Works Committee to build/allow ungated cut through into Stillwater Circle subdivision from proposed Barrington subdivision

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

TO: Rochester Public Works Committee

RE: July 16th Public Works Committee meeting regarding Stillwater Circle roadway connection at the request of Barrington developer

We wish to submit our objections to this proposed ungated cut through requested by the Barrington developer. We object for the following reasons:

- The Stillwater Circle subdivision is a family-oriented neighborhood of narrow streets used by its residents for walking, bike riding, playing, and the residents traveling to their homes. These people would be in danger from the heavy traffic and unable to enjoy their own neighborhood.
- The necessary repairs to the ROCHESTER streets caused by the heavy use would become the responsibility of ROCHESTER, but all tax dollars from the BARRINGTON subdivision will go to BARRINGTON.
- The intersection of Stillwater Circle onto Stillwater Circle is a blind intersection and would be made more dangerous by the heavy, fast moving traffic.
- The intersection of Stillwater Circle onto Flagg Road is also a dangerous intersection and would be made worse with the heavy traffic from the Barrington residents who will be racing through the neighborhood in order to avoid the Green Hill Road lights so they can get to the highway, or Lowes quicker.
- Home values in this neighborhood will decrease due to the heavy traffic and safety concerns. It will no longer be a family neighborhood, but a race track.

Why would Rochester destroy a lovely Rochester neighborhood in order to accommodate a Barrington developer and help the Barrington tax base?

I hope the Committee will recognize the dangers of agreeing to this proposal and tell the developer **NO** and protect the safety and home values of Rochester residents.

Douglas and Dianne DuVarney

30 Stillwater Circle

Attachment 6

Mr. Peter C. Nourse
Director of City Services
City of Rochester, NH

Dear Director Nourse,

My wife and I are residents of Stillwater Circle in Rochester. We reside at 29 Sugar Brook Rd and are the abutters to the roadway connection that will be discussed at the July 16th meeting of the Public Works Committee of the Rochester City Council. The other abutting neighbors to this proposed connection are the Parkers who live at 25 Sugar Brook Rd. There are approximately 103 homes in the Stillwater Circle development with an average of two vehicles per home.

Your letter to the Stillwater Circle residents does not provide much background information regarding the need to have an ungated roadway connection from the proposed 100 acre parcel in Barrington (Map 210, Parcel #57). There is also an adjoining 100 acre parcel (#44) which is not part of the presentation but could factor into future discussion. Parcel #44 could also be developed at a later date since an egress point would now be available. That potentially could compound the problem that this access point provides.

The Barrington Planning Board Meeting Minutes of 12/17/19 and the Public Works and Buildings Committee Meeting Minutes of 5/21/20 are the basis of my comments. The references to the Barrington Minutes will be noted as BPB and the Public Works will be noted as PWM.

In order to build the proposed 78 lot subdivision (BPB) which could have as many as 150 vehicles, a second egress road is required and per the town's regulations. The developer can't have more than 1,000 feet of roadway to the furthest end of the development (BPB, page 6 of 10). The parcel does have access to Hansonville road in Barrington for a second egress point that is requires over 1,200 feet of road construction. Based on the size of the parcel, the developer would require a variance from the Barrington Zoning Board of Adjustment which would likely be granted since the development would bring additional tax revenues to the town of Barrigt. The proposed ungated access to Stillwater Circle would result in a cost saving to the developer with no benefit to the residents of Stillwater who are unlikely to use the roadway into the Barrington development.

Regarding traffic flow in the area, the distance from the proposed entrance on Sugar Brook Rd to the traffic light on Flagg Rd to Route 125 is 1.2 miles. From this light, the distance to exit 12 of the Spaulding Turnpike is 3 miles. The distance from the entrance to the Barrington parcel on Green Hill Rd to the traffic light on Route 125 is 1.1 miles. If the traveler is going to Rochester or the Spaulding Turnpike, and additional 1.1 miles of travel is required to reach the traffic light at Flagg Rd. There would be an additional 1 mile of travel to reach the light on Flagg Rd. Some traffic would come through Stillwater Circle to save time and add to the current flow in the area. I performed a traffic study of the traffic moving across our home in Stillwater Circle using an unscientific process (an Arlo motion detector on my garage). The study was made from 6/22/20 to 6/28/20 and an average of 50 vehicles drove by my home daily. This does not include the residents who walk around the development and those who ride their bicycles every day. Allowing traffic flow from the Barrington development will increase the volume of traffic on Stillwater Circle.

Regarding the Mother's Day flood of May, 2006, there is only one access road to Stillwater Circle. This development was started over 20 years ago and no provisions were made for a second egress road. The residents who chose to leave until the water receded two days later were assisted by the NH National Guard. This was a once in a hundred year event but it did happen. We have lived on Sugar Brook for 20 and a half years (over 7,100 days). We left the development for two days.

In summary, this proposal is not beneficial to the residents of Stillwater Circle. It only serves the needs of the developer of the Barrington parcel #57 to reduce the cost of the project. Please deny this request.

Respectfully,
Leo and Michelle Brodeur
29 Sugar Brook Rd
Rochester, NH 03839

cc: Mr. David Walker, Public Works and Building Committee Chairman
Mr. James Gray, Public Works and Building Committee Vice Chairman

From: [John Hussey](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 11, 2020 2:35 PM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Subject: [External] Fwd: Stillwater Exit

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

----- Forwarded message -----
From: **John Hussey** <jhussey354@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Jul 11, 2020, 12:26 PM
Subject: Stillwater Exit
To: <Lisa.Clark@rochester.net>

Dear Lisa,

I am writing on behalf of
Trinity Conservation LLC. . We
are the "owner of record" of the
Land in Barrington that abuts
The open space owned by the
City of Rochester where the proposed exit would actually be
Constructed.

There seems to be a bit of
a "dis-connect" in the way that
This was presented to the residents
Of Stillwater..

Our intentions were to emphasize that this would be

an "Emergency Only" gate.

The town of Barrington does not want a crash gate installed because of possible cosmetic damage to their fire trucks.

In lieu of a crash gate, we would suggest a weather resistant Fabric be stretched across the opening, neatly lettered, "Emergency only"....This would Prevent any indiscriminant travel Through the exit and would not cause damage to a firetruck.

This type of arrangement would be a total benefit to all involved...It would not disturb the daily peace and quiet of the residents, but in Case of some catastrophic event That prevented crossing the bridge, The people would have another way in and out.

Also, just for the record:

About two years ago, we were approached by the City of Rochester with the then, assistant City engineer, Owen Friend-Gray, acting as agent and asked to Consider just such an agreement.

Two points of access and egress were required for the
Subdivision approval, but the
Second was never actually
constructed ...From talking with
Owen, we infer that he was worried
not only about safety of the
residents, but the potential liability
To the city and tax payers should
some one die because an ambulance could not get across
The bridge .

If it could be made more clear to
The residents of what our exact
Intentions are, we think that they
would be a lot more receptive....
Or possibly send it on to the council
with "Emergency Only" as a strict
Contingency.??

Sincerely, John Hussey

From: genaiwickey73@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, July 12, 2020 6:49 PM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Cc: [Dave OBrien](#)
Subject: [External] July 16th meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I hope all is well. I live at 89 Stillwater Circle and my husband and I are against the access road for Barrington. First of all, we chose our home due to it is a low traffic neighborhood and it is practically a cul-de-sac. Secondly, this will interfere with our property values. Thirdly, we do not want any additional traffic. We are the second house on the right as you come in this neighborhood and people speeding is already an issue.

I appreciate your time. My husband will be on the call. I can't be due to a work conflict.

Thank you,

Genai and David O'Brien of 89 Stillwater Circle in Rochester

Sent from myMail for iOS

Attachment 9

From: Beth Evans <slowdown.livehappy52@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2020 7:33 AM
To: Lisa Clark
Subject: [External] Stillwater/Barrington access road issue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning Lisa,

My husband and I have been living in the Stillwater development for 14 years and love the community in this development. It is, for the most part a quiet, family and pet friendly area where residents can walk peacefully and children can ride bikes without traffic worries. By adding this access road for the Barrington development we feel this life style would be compromised. Also the bridge over the Isinglass river at the entrance to the development would be subject to way more traffic than it was designed for.

We see no reason why this development would need to cut through our development when they can use either Hansonville Rd or Green Hill Rd to access it and stay in Barrington. It makes no sense to any of us.

I am not for this road and please don't allow.

Thank You

Beth Evans
11 Sugar Brook Rd

Sent from my iPad

Attachment 10

From: [William Horton](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 12, 2020 3:25 PM
To: [Lisa Clark](#)
Subject: [External] Stillwater Circle subdivision impact

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Dear Ms.Clark

I am responding to the letter I received about the proposed Barrington subdivision requesting an ungated road access to Stillwater. My wife and I have much concern on this issue, as many of my neighbors also do.

My wife and I strongly oppose an ungated access road for the following reasons:

1. Increased traffic through our neighborhood. {shortcuts for 125 to 202} 3 times a day.
2. Higher safety risks for all the children in our neighborhood due to increased traffic.
3. This would become a short cut to get to RTE>125 or other Rochester locations.
4. Road maintenance costs would increase as traffic would increase.
5. Unknown impact on home valuations.

We have lived here for over 20 years and enjoyed the safety of the area and the minimal traffic flow. Most everyone knows their neighbors and looks out for other. Once you open access to another development that is the same size or larger the safety and sense of security is taken away. We feel if Barrington wants to build a development, they should have both access points on the Barrington side. Barrington will receive the tax dollars and be responsible for maintenance of Green Hill and the roads in the subdivision. There is no benefits to the residents of Stillwater Circle having an open gate access road.

We would however, be open to an EMERGENCY LOCKED/GATED road if that is an option without the possibility of changing it in later years ,[Put in legal form]. Having been here during the Mothers Day Flood when the bridge was under water and this would make sense for first responders. A contingency to a gated access road in the agreement would need to be perpetual in nature, and have side barriers to dissuade off road vehicle use of the area.

Please note several residents of this development do not feel comfortable with this option because they believe the city will not keep its word.

Sincerely;

William L. and Mary J. Horton
18 Echo Brook Road
Rochester, NH 03839

Attachment 11