

EXETER PLANNING BOARD

DRAFT MINUTES

JUNE 30, 2011

Chairwoman Kathy Corson called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM in the Nowak Room on the above date.

PRESENT: Chairwoman Kathy Corson, Vice Chairman Ken Knowles, Selectmen's Representative Don Clement, Members: Gwen English, Katherine Woolhouse, Town Planner Sylvia von Aulock

NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

PAULINE BLONDA and SYLVIA NEE – PB Case #21110

A request for a preliminary design review of a proposal to subdivide the property located 4 Webster Avenue. The subject property is located in the R-3, single Family Residential district. Tax Map Parcel #52-5.

Sylvia von Aulock reminded board members that the case was preliminary, so that comments made by the Board were non-binding and that no decision was to be made.

Peter Landry, wetland consultant for the applicant, presented the case. He reviewed the information on the plans and handed out new 11x17 inch plans to the board which provided more information, including proposed house and driveway locations. Mr. Landry reviewed the various types of wetlands, noting that the largest wetland system impacting the lot had been mowed in past years and that therefore, the vegetation consisted mostly of grasses, verses more typical wetland plantings. He noted that after applying the buffer setbacks to the property, that the buildable area was reduced to a very small wedge of property, which he suggested, was 64 sq ft of area. He briefly reviewed the proposed wetland plantings and drainage swale, both of which were proposed to take care of storm water runoff. He noted that if his client wanted to move forward with the proposed minor subdivision that further engineering would be needed to design a drainage system that would satisfy the town's requirements.

Chairwoman Corson brought it back to the Planning Board for questions. There being no questions at this time, Chairwoman Corson opened it up to the public for comment.

Douglas Eastman of 12 Webster Ave presented the board with photos of the property being proposed for subdivision. Mr. Eastman added that he was very familiar with the property as he had been mowing it for years. The applicant's mother who had owned it had made an agreement with Mr. Eastman that he could mow it to benefit both of them. He shared that the field was wet every spring and depending on the weather, portions remained wet into July. He commented that one year his mower even got stuck in the wet area; he noted how the water moved laterally out of the soil at the approximate location of the wetland markers and that the soil within the wet area must be a layer of clay that would not allow water to penetrate. His photos showed portions of the field flooded in various seasons including times when snow was on the ground except for the wet areas, which remained wet. Mr. Eastman discussed his concerns with drainage, sharing that his own basement had flooded numerous times and that his property could not withstand any additional runoff from the proposed subdivided property. Mr. Eastman also pointed out noted that the rear setback was incorrectly drawn on the plan, that it showed 15 ft. verses the actual 25 ft required, which would result in no buildable area on the property if all setbacks were adhered to.

No other abutters came forward and the public portion of the hearing was closed. Chairwoman Corson suggested Town Planner von Aulock speak.

Ms. von Aulock utilized plans that had been submitted and analyzed by her, reviewing the existing lot, the proposed lot and adjoining area. She also reviewed the town's wetland buffers, including the 40 ft no cut and 75 ft structural and parking set back. She then reviewed the proposed drainage, and raised concerns about the proposed drainage swale, noting that the runoff would flow off the site in an area not within the control of the applicant, and could impact the abutter since the topography naturally drained to the abutting property. She also raised concerns of the proposed plantings, noting that the board had never received an application with planting within the wetland itself, and that the conditions within the wetlands would not likely be conducive to most plantings. Ms. von Aulock raised additional concern about setting such a precedent of providing the amount of forgiveness necessary to build the proposed driveway and home, noting again that they were completely within the buffers. She pointed out that the neighboring driveways were all much bigger than the proposed driveway shown on the plan and she was concerned what might get built would be even more impervious surface than shown. In conclusion she stated that after analyzing the site, she considered the proposed lot a non-buildable lot.

Chairwoman Corson brought the discussion back to the board, and suggested the board members provide comments to the applicant.

Selectmen's representative Don Clement stated thought that even though the field had been mowed in the past that it was still a wetland. He said that this is a lot that already has a building on it, so it is a bit different than someone having a property that they couldn't do anything with. He felt he could not support the subdivision because of the amount of house within the 75 ft setback.

Mr. Knowles stated he was in agreement with Mr. Clement and that the Board has been asked in the past to waive the wetland regulations for minor additions to existing homes, but the proposed location for a new house was not appropriate.

Ms. English expressed concern with granting waivers and raised the concern of setting a precedent.

Ms. Woolhouse agreed with the statements made by the other board members. She further stated that she tried to keep an open mind about these issues but didn't think it was a reasonable starting point, with only "64" sq ft. of buildable area or less.

Chairwoman Corson ended this portion of the meeting, summarizing the statements made by the board.

RIVERWOODS COMPANY AT EXETER – PB Case #21107

The application for a non-residential site plan review for the proposed construction of an administration building and associated site improvements to be located off White Oak Drive. The subject property is in the R-1, Low Density Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #80-18.

Chairwoman Corson verified all abutters had been notified, called for a motion and second, and the case was opened. Chairwoman Corson mentioned that the applicant needed to come in for a demolition permit, in accordance with Article 5.3.5 Demolition Review (of the zoning

ordinance) and that needed to happen prior to any decision by the Board. She also stated the desire of incorporating the history of the site into the design of the project.

Charlie Tucker, Counsel for the Applicant introduced the proposed project, acknowledging the process that had happened to date and verifying the need for the demolition permit review. Attorney Tucker reviewed the various roads and properties owned by Riverwoods as well as the nineteen-year history of parcels beginning with the Woods. He reviewed the numerous purchases and lot line adjustments, including the most recent acquisition of the Reedy property. He discussed the portion of the property reserved for the Fire Department, noting it would likely be the third substation built, the second more likely to go on or near Epping Road. He reviewed the high use of ambulances for the Riverwoods campuses and that because it was a “pay as you go” expense that Riverwoods residents could afford it, it was no cost to the town. He discussed the desire of Riverwoods Administration for a central administration building, to make staff more accessible to all campuses and to create a sense of community as well as availability of residents to access executive staff. He reviewed the present condition of the Reedy house and the feasibility of the house and barn to be used for Riverwoods’ purposes. The original house is small and had been altered considerably. It was found the existing Reedy house and barn couldn’t be converted to accommodate the applicant’s desire for office and meeting space. Originally the proposed building was located where the present building are currently but it was not liked by the abutters or ZBA members. It was later moved much further back onto the property. It was considered screened from what had once been known as the Dolloff property due to past plantings. Abutters had voiced the concern of seeing an office building from the road so it became a priority for main building to be out of sight from Kingston road. None the less it was designed to look like a house. The new location was approved by the ZBA and the neighbors were much happier with the new location. The raised bed garden and greenhouse were then proposed as a community area and other park like accoutrements. It’s been a year since we started and abutters are happier with current location. They went back to ZBA for approval for green house, raised beds for residents, gardens and fenced dog park. This was also approved by ZBA. It was noted ZBA added to the approval various conditions regarding items for the planning board to look at such as lighting. It was noted by Chairwoman Corson that the board did not have a copy of the approval letter to review the ZBA concerns, but that the board would review the items as it is typical for the board to do so.

Attorney Tucker continued with the project description mentioning some of the users, stating that the maximum number of employees and parking spaces were dictated by ZBA and incorporated into the site plan. Also the maximum building square footage was limited by ZBA and the Applicant is planning to go back to the ZBA due to the needs of the programs desired by the applicant to fit into the building.

Ms. von Aulock asked for a clarification regarding administration and other users, would it include marketing or marketing events? Ms. Dawn Barker, representative of Riverwoods, answered saying that the executive staff would be working out of the building (total of twelve employees). She stated it would not include marketing staff or events, which those staff would be at the Woods Community, so that prospects or potential residents would go to the community (meaning the Woods). Ms. von Aulock also asked about office hours. Ms. Barker stated they would be typical office hours for staff, between 8 and 5 with some fluctuation and that the board meets quarterly at night and that may go till 10:00 at night. She went on to explain, resident committees utilizing the space would likely meet during the day. Ms. von Aulock reviewed the intent, that the three campuses would have the one unifying meeting place. Ms. Barker confirmed, absolutely.

Mr. Jeff Clifford, P.E. with Altus Engineering continued the presentation, introducing the rest of the Riverwoods design team. Utilizing an overview plan of all three campuses, Mr. Clifford

reviewed the three campuses, access roads, existing farm house, and the proposed site. He then discussed the particular natural features of the site, including three wetland sections, culverts, the topography with a flatter area where they located the building and the steeper sections which they wanted to stay away from. He explained that the access into the site was developed to avoid steep cut sections and therefore stability issues, as well as to allow for maximum sight distance as well as the least amount of site disturbance regarding grading. The parking was located to manage runoff into the flatter wetland section. The 100 ft setback for the congregate health care limited the location of the buildings as well. Placing the building where it is currently proposed avoided need for variance and it meets the criteria for the 100 ft. buffer. Also pointed out possible future fire station and summarized the various site constraints that led to the building and parking location. Later Riverwoods engaged Ms. Robbi Woodburn to consider a master plan of the site to include various programs and desires of the administration for the residents. He noted that all structures are within required setbacks. He noted that there was a desire to retain curb cuts, parking and access off Kingston for the garden portion of the property which could also serve the town for the future fire station. He indicated that the parking was calculated considering the number of employees, staff turn-over, various uses (indoors) and shared use of garden space. The ZBA approval determined the maximum number of parking spaces would be 21 spaces. It was represented that the site would be serviced regularly by Riverwoods shuttle bus, utilizing the turn-around. The shuttle would be circulated constantly. No added traffic was envisioned because no additional employees. A 10 ft. wide gravel access to allow small pick-up truck type vehicle and users to connect garden area with the admin building. The proposed access will not impact the wetlands but will impact the buffer, most of the impacts would be temporary; this area was delineated by a shaded area on the site plan.

Mr. Clifford then reviewed the previously disturbed wetlands (second shaded area), suggesting that work that had been done on the septic system and that fill brought into the wetland had not been removed during pipe installation. He outlined mitigation for impact of the wetland's buffer for proposed parking and access road including an extended buffer area on the steepest part of the site as well as restoration of the previously disturbed wetland area. He compared the present mitigation package with past voluntary buffers provided during the Boulders project. Mr. Clifford also described some of the specifics of the drainage system including existing culverts, a swale that will provide initial treatment of the parking area, the reliance on the wetland system, and reduction in size of the culvert, a limiting orifice, to help detain the runoff.

Ms. Robbi Woodburn, landscape architect reviewed the various amenities and landscaping features around the administration building and greenhouse. Lighting in the fenced dog area and around the garden and administration building will go off by 10:00 PM at the latest and earlier on non-meeting nights.

Ms. Woolhouse asked about winter usage, Ms. Woodburn stated that there was no anticipated use during winter. Ms. English asked about watering for garden uses and if rain barrels could be incorporated. Ms. Woodburn thought it would be easy to incorporate and considered a good idea. Ms. von Aulock wanted clarification of kiosk or information board. Ms. Woodburn described it as more of a bulletin board or information board, somewhat two dimensional with a little roof. Ms. von Aulock also brought up the concern of no bathroom facility, and that Riverwood's residents have approached her with the concern that to have a user friendly site, there should be a restroom. Chairwoman Corson suggested the possibility of a composting toilet. Ms. von Aulock suggested continuing the bird house program down into this site and to develop an education program around the potential rain garden and restored wetland area. Chairwoman Corson asked whether the cupola on top of the barn might be utilized somewhere on the site due to its historic significance.

Mr. Mark Moeller of JSA Architects spoke briefly about the building details and the users. Modest building away from street, two stories, housing 8 offices on each floor, elevator, hospitality lounge, training room, restrooms, etc. Likely that the footprint will become larger than originally presented to ZBA to incorporate additional program. Materials, textures, colors, trim and design similar to that of the cottages at the Boulders. Following up on the issue of reuse of the cupola, Ms. English asked if it could be utilized within the admin building in some way? Moeller thought it would be possible and that they would likely look into various opportunities.

Mr. Larry Morse, wetland scientist with GZA Environmental, discussed value of wetlands, hydrology and the soils. Clay and sandy soils, specifically Deerfield soils exist on site. Marine clays where water cannot penetrate also consist of fine clay, within the steep slopes are marine clays that are highly erodible, fine sediment that would be hard to control, and that became an issue during the building of the Ridge. Wetlands in the center of the site are smaller and isolated, shallow, and the hydrology supporting them is from the storm water runoff nearby, the soils maintain the saturation. More diversity in the wetland system fed by steep slope and ground water, hydraulic period is maintained longer. The wetland community is more diverse and therefore a higher value. A function/value report was submitted with the application. We considered the larger buffer of more value for the lower wetland. The restoration of the impacted wetland will all us a chance to remove invasive species and to restore the original grade. He advised against a rain garden within the wetland, but that it could be adjacent to the wetland, especially to capture roof runoff.

Ms. von Aulock asked about the clay layer and whether or not it would be disturbed during construction, the question was asked due to the issues that occurred during construction of the Ridge and the sediment in the pond. Mr. Morse responded that only footings for the admin building would likely disturb the clay layer.

Mr. Knowles asked about the foundation drains and how they would interact with the drip strip around the building. Mr. Clifford described the separate systems. He also asked about the pet area and if the pet waste would get into the ground water. Mr. Clifford discussed the areas of the best depth to water table and about the layered system proposed. Solids are to be picked up and the liquid is held in the layers above the water table. He also reviewed the distance between the dog park and the wetland system, and the elevation change, so all that soil will be percolated through, believing that the distance was so great it would act as a filter.

Mr. Knowles then asked about the sub-station location, concerned that the present location was impacted by setbacks. He wondered where was it was originally meant to be located. Attorney Tucker reviewed the history of the proposed substation, stating that the town would not be subject to the same regulation that it was never determined for a specific area but in general near the orchard, and that the Reedy property hadn't been purchased till much later.

Ms. von Aulock asked about snow storage, requesting a depression at the end of the drop off so that the sediment in the snow could be perhaps be detained before it went into the wetland. Mr. Clifford discussed the concern of additional clearing but realized the proposed area was already cleared, so thought it could be done, but noting that for a rain garden a separation would need to be maintained between the rain garden and round water. Ms. English brought forward several concerns.

Ms. von Aulock reviewed that because the administration building was to be used by all three campuses that the applicant should provide a traffic circulation plan that indicated how residents would drive to the site. The issue being would residents, staff or board members be using existing private roads or also town roads to get there. Furthermore, Ms. von Aulock requested a signage plan, noting that with so many campuses and buildings, that a signage plan for visitors,

deliveries and others needing to get to the various locations would be vital to avoid the confusion that exists presently. She noted that the Planning Board's last meeting showed how much confusion there was among the various users and stakeholders. Ms. Barker asked for clarification of the request and Ms. von Aulock stated again, that there needed to be a signage plan to ensure various users of the site would know how to get where they were going.

Chairwoman Corson opened the meeting to the public. Mr. Prior discussed various issues and concerns of the proposal. He endorsed the idea of a sign plan and traffic flow plan. He stated that shuttle buses presently use Timber Lane. He discussed his concern for the 10ft. gravel drive connecting the uses and was surprised about the width, believing that the original plan called for a gravel path which would have less impact. He thought a golf cart could be utilized and that it could be reduced to a 4 foot width. He was concerned about the access near the corner, stating that it had poor sight lines. He then discussed the dog park, noting there was no place on the Riverwoods campuses that a dog could run, even though residents were allowed to have dogs. He understood the need for it and was pleased it was away from the road. He does not wish for there to be a restroom near the garden area. Regarding the additional square footage, he was unclear why it needed to be bigger. His analogy was one of sharp elbows, regarding the growth of the campuses. Mr. Prior acknowledged the issue of the pond from the Ridge construction and mentioned this should be dealt with carefully so that it does not happen again. He agreed for the need of signage, so people understood the expectations of the owners if they were public users. He stressed minimal signs would be appropriate but yet enough so that users would know where to go or what was expected of them. He thought the notion of utilizing the agricultural remnants of past farming would not be genuine. He expressed his concerns about the shuttle bus use and the use of the Kingston Road access, being unsafe. He concurred with a minimal amount of lighting being provided. He wondered that although no new additional employees were planned, that the office space freed up in other areas of campus would be filled by others and that would have the potential of adding traffic.

Attorney Tucker responded to the question regarding the freed up space, by noting that one space would be used as an additional unit, and three other offices would be converted back to guest rooms.

Chairwoman Corson suggested that a site visit be scheduled and that the demolition permit application be submitted to the Building Department. Ms. von Aulock reviewed the Planning Board calendar and realized they would be back before the Board on August 25th and that a site walk might be scheduled for the week prior to that meeting. Ms. English and Mr. Knowles requested the week before, being August 18th at 5:00 PM. Chairwoman Corson confirmed it would be a public meeting, and the applicant suggested the Board could meet at the Reedy House. Chairwoman Corson requested that the building footprints and paths be staked out.

A motion was made and seconded to table further discussion of the application until the Board's August 25th meeting, noting that a site walk was scheduled for Thursday, August 18th at 5:00 PM. VOTE: Unanimous.

OTHER BUSINESS

CONTOOCOOK RIVER LOFTS, LLC (formerly Tuck Realty Corp.) – PB Case #2711

Ms. von Aulock reviewed a memorandum dated June 27, 2011 from Town Engineer Paul Vlasich addressing a request for a bond reduction for the Linden Commons subdivision project. She indicated that he had recommended a reduction in the amount of \$227,955.36 in accordance with the process outlined in Section 12.2 of the Board's Site Plan Review & Subdivision Regulations.

***A motion was made and seconded to approve the bond reduction as recommended.
VOTE: Unanimous. BOND REDUCTION GRANTED.***

APPOINTMENT OF PB REP. TO HERITAGE COMMISSION

Board members nominated Chairwoman Corson to serve as the Board's representative to the Heritage Commission. ***The Board voted unanimously in favor of her serving as their representative.***

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

TOWN PLANNER ITEMS: None

REPORTS ON "OTHER COMMITTEE" ACTIVITY

- Chairwoman Corson gave a brief review of the recent EDC meeting.

CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS - None

There being no further business before the Board, ***Mr. Knowles made a motion to close the meeting, and Don Clement second it. VOTE: Unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 P.M.***

The next meeting of the Exeter Planning Board will be held Thursday, July 14, 2011 at 7:00PM in the Novak Room at the Exeter Town Offices.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed and formatted by,

Sylvia von Aulock
Town Planner

Barbara S. McEvoy
Deputy Code Enforcement Officer
Planning & Building Department