

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Exeter Planning Board

Draft Minutes

June 5, 2014

1. Chairman Ken Knowles called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm in the Nowak Room of the Exeter town offices on the above date.
2. BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Kathy Corson, Don Clement, Kelly Bergeron, Tom Kendall?, Katherine Woolhouse,
TOWN STAFF PRESENT: Sylvia von Aulock, Joyce Elton (Recording Secretary).
3. NEW BUSINESS: PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEWS

Wakefield Investments Preliminary Design Review:

A proposed redevelopment of 2 Hampton Rd for construction of 30 townhouse style units in 6 different groupings of 4-6 units, 1 larger multi-family building of 38 garden style condo units, Tax Map 64-Lot 52, Case No. 21322. All comments are non-binding in this preliminary review.

This is the second design review; the Board is looking for any updates/changes made and any information or feedback that Wakefield Investments would like from the Board.

Christopher Barry of Barry Surveying & Engineering along with two team members and Mr. Tucker, Project Attorney, are presenting for Wakefield Investments.

In our prior meeting, the design was extremely preliminary with a number of details to be worked out. The team took into consideration comments that were made at that time. There are still structured items at the proposed site from the prior concrete facility; the proposed project sits on top of a knoll in the center and then slopes down in the back to the parcel in the east. The overall concept consists of 30 townhouse units staggered throughout the site, and garden style units to the rear of site.

Proposed is an additional sidewalk on in front of project, and community trails to the rear. TRC provided a lot of guidance on re-design to make it more beneficial to the occupants, including additional sidewalks in front, the enhancement of a proposed bus shelter and a center island/safety islands in the center of proposed crosswalks to allow people to cross safely to community owned land in the east. Other revisions: generator pads, sewage pump stations designs and locations. These are the substantive changes.

There are also a subset of plans for landscape architecture along the front of a building and along the shared boundary line where the vegetation is proposed to be removed, leaving little or no screening on the boundary. This would enhance the buffer on that edge of the property. They are endeavoring to stay out of the buffer zones (75' shared boundary and 40' wetlands jurisdiction on site) – area was pointed out on the map. They will be removing concrete pads, vegetation, and other matter to enhance the buffer area. All construction will stay out of the buffer areas to the rear of the property.

Project drainage was originally designed to drain from front to back with the general slope of the land to a rain garden; due to the sensitive nature of the groundwater

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

uptake, a new drainage system to remove nitrogen in the form of a gravel wetlands drainage system is proposed. Research has shown this to be more effective in nitrogen removal. The redesign is included in the packet.

Developer would like any follow up comments the Board would have for the next round of detailed plans and also to schedule a site walk for the 24th of July for any site items requiring more information.

Board Questions

Mr. Clement asked further concerning the drainage and where is the pre-development drainage going now. There are three distinct discharge points (pointed out on Plan), which ultimately end up down at the brook. Designer stated that breakout water shed plans can be provided in the future if required. Current discharge in one area moves toward the boundary line (upper plan) and then turns toward the brook. Remainder discharges to the other boundary site (lower plan) and discharges off the property through a swale to the wetlands. Proposed gravel wetlands site pointed to in upper right corner of the map. The proposal is to mimic the existing flows, directing into the gravel discharge from both side entry points, keeping the system natural and stable. A rain garden treatment area remains at the front of the property, and a small gravel treatment area is also proposed in a sensitive area near the front.

Ms. Corson expressed approval for the project; and asked a question on turning lane into the property – it's not technically a turning lane, and not required by DOT. Wide shoulder allows traffic to turn off ahead of time and turn into the property in a safely controlled manner. Ms. Corson believes that widened shoulder was originally intended for bikes; can that be marked for biker safety since that's a busy corner. Bike lanes can be delineated, but it would be difficult to do that – may be necessary to widen the shoulder and allow for the bike lane. This would require some investigation. Ms. Corson said this is a popular bike spot. She then asked about turning from the other direction; they are not proposing anything special at this point. This area is becoming a 4-way intersection.

Mr. Clement continued with this busy intersection access question: have we seen a copy of the traffic survey and counts? This has not been submitted at this point – and he would like to get more information on the left hand turn and whether or not we need a left hand turn lane. This will be a very busy corner on Hampton Road, and he believes there will be an issue there. Ms. Corson suggested a widened area turn lane would end up being utilized as parking for local sporting events and present another issue. Another member (unknown name) commented that Public Works was looking for an analysis due to the recreation park and the intersection at the 88 connector road and how that would all interact – so that should be submitted for the public hearing. Mr. Clement expressed concern about the critical traffic area. Some of these issues were also brought up at the technical review. It was noted that “No Parking” signs would be beneficial for the area.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

The Recreation Director has expressed concerns; it was suggested that Wakefield Investment meet with them. The proposal is for the widened shoulder to start at the recreation park entrance and proceed towards the widened sidewalk area that addresses previous concerns that the sidewalk came to a dead end. The proposal is to widen the area 12 feet to turn into the site. The Recreation Department mentioned they periodically have busses that park in the shoulder now. Mr. Barry suggested it would be more appropriate for those busses to park in the recreation area instead of in the shoulder.

Ms. Colson also pointed out that the local police sit in that area to monitor traffic and this would eliminate their "spot" for that area.

Mr. Knowles pointed out an access point being tight now and Mr. Barry said the design was a specific request by DPW. Mr. Knowles asked if a DOT permit was required and Mr. Barry said they were told no, it's in the urban compact zone. Mr. Knowles asked about dumpster locations and if the front was the only place for those. He was told yes, one for recycling and one for refuse. All units will use that system and a typical pickup is estimated for once per week. Mr. Knowles asked if the decks of the town homes were outside the 75' buffer area. Mr. Barry stated that the Code Officer was asked about that and he stated that decks would be permitted in that area. Ms. Colson asked if sunrooms fit into that category – it was agreed that the Board should look into the deck and sun-room questions. Mr. Barry stated that decks were to be on piers, not a full foundation, and should not be enclosed.

Questions were raised about dumpster capacity and the sufficiency for the complex. Typically, that is 9 yards of capacity. Mr. Barry will look at the usage on this, as well.

Further questions were posed but were not audible on the recording as the Board member was facing away from her microphone pickup. Mr. Barry said a "landing pad" was created for residents to pull into the dumpsters.

Mr. Knowles asked for a review of the landscaping and its close proximity to the pool. He believes it looks quite tall from the perspective of abutters. He also asked for the elevation of the individual town houses. Mr. Barry responded without benefit of a microphone, and the conversation was not audible until "screen that area" and the height of the town houses are on the foot print and is 27 feet to the top of living space and then the peak is approximately 35 feet. Mr. Knowles again expressed concerns about the height as seen from the recreation area. He stated that when Wakefield comes back for the Public Hearing, he would like Ms. Woodburn or someone from her firm to be present and have access to those landscaping plans as they are an important piece of the development.

Ms Corson would like to have the corners marked for the 4 outside corners of the buildings.

Mr. Knowles asked if the parking for the garden style building was beneath the building. He was told yes, and then asked if there were plans for maintenance rooms, trash

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

rooms, or elevators in the building or basement area. Mr. Barry referred him to page 7, which shows a trash enclosure on wheels to be wheeled out of the building for pickup. Mechanical areas are in the front of the basement level under the front entrance. An elevator shaft is in the same location. Mr. Knowles asked if that under parking garage door was keyed access and was told it was not open to the public; there is a trigger access and a key access. Parking will most likely be restricted to a certain number of units and style of apartment.

Ms. Corson asked if this development was age restricted and was told no.

Mr. Clement had questions about the parking for the individual town house units. The artist depictions seems to show some with garages, but he is unable to discern the specifics. Mr. Barry pointed out that all units have at least a one car garage and some (end/side loaded units) have two car garages. Each unit also has a parking space in front of the garage as well as a dedicated space within the immediate lot. There are also 10 visitor parking spaces off to the side, accessible by sidewalk to the units.

A question was asked about whether or not the islands were landscaped. They are.

Mr. Knowles pointed out the space in front of units 1 and 2 is tight. It was acknowledged that is the tightest space. Mr. Barry said they can widen that area up to allow for parking/pulling in and out of the area.

Mr. Knowles asked about the plans for lighting. Lantern style lighting is proposed at the entrance center isle; additional lighting is provided at the visitor spaces parking area; staggered lighting up and down the street to provide some street lighting, but not an abundance thereof. The minimum lumen is .1 to .5 and the maximum is under 8 or 10. Lighting is also provided along the front of each unit as residential light, but doesn't provide much "throw" outside of the entrance to the units. Lantern style lighting is also proposed for the residential parking area and the garden style building will contain wall mounted packs to throw lighting against the front sidewalk area as well as the front of the building and the parking area. Additional lantern style lighting will be provided on the side building and at the rear of the site for the additional parking areas. Mr. Knowles asked for pictures of lantern style lighting and asked about types of bulb for non-distracting lighting. Mr. Barry will provide those pictures and will insure that the bulb is hidden by the casing to avoid glare.

Mr. Clement asked questions about snow removal and snow storage on site. Mr. Barry responded that there is snow storage space at the front of each pad site allowing snow plows to push the snow forward. There are also snow storage areas proposed for the larger parking areas. In years of high snow accumulation, there are provisions in place to remove the snow from the site and dispose of it properly.

Mr. Knowles asked if Ms. Woodburn has looked at landscaping proposals and the impact of snow sitting atop these areas. Mr. Barry stated that this is a challenge for her and for that reason a lot of the plantings are low to the ground to reduce impact of snow.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Condo fees for the impact of landscaping, snow removal and other concerns were briefly discussed. This should eliminate it from being merely the concern of an "off-site" landlord.

The prior meeting concerns about side walk access to recreation area and 88 loop were addressed. This was also addressed at the Technical Review, suggesting a side walk that went west and around as a concern for residents. As the site now stands, residents would be walking on an unpaved shoulder. Mr. Knowles asked the Board for their concerns and opinions on this so there's a plan in place before the Public Hearing. It was agreed that this should be looked at during the site walk.

Mr. Barry commented that if sidewalks were considered, they would be the same style as within the proposed site. His concern is that the connection is actually a ways down from the site. He believes that would be a lot to consider for this type of project and would like the Board to take that into consideration, as well. A Board member commented that the existing walkway is like "the side walk to nowhere." The Board will consider the options.

Ms. Von Aulock stated that the Technical Board is considering this matter. She asked if there was a demolition plan available and was told yes. Mr. Barry stated that for this round of discussion, they have tried to incorporate about 90% of the Board's concerns. They are still working out technical details with utilities and the actual binder and drainage concerns but they have tried to incorporate all the changes.

Ms. von Aulock asked if we could schedule a site walk now; a concern was raised by Mr. Knowles that typically site visits are open to the public, and since there has not been a public hearing yet, it's difficult to make sure the public is informed of a site walk. Mr. Barry suggested a Board site walk now, and scheduling a second walk after the public hearing that the public would be informed of. The reason for this is that it is not a high residential area, and most of the abutters are industrial. While the project is visible to the public, they are trying to keep a buffer area to reduce impact on passersby. Mr. Knowles agreed with that, but stated that the recreation area is open to the town, and creates many interested parties.

Mr. Clement suggested if we posted it adequately and posted it on the website, it would take care of the legal impact. Mr. Knowles suggested that not a lot of people would look at this. Ms. von Aulock suggested that the night of the public hearing we could do a 4:30 site walk, with notice, and we could make it an added portion to the letters, as well as the legal posting. This would depend on when the Public Hearing is scheduled. Mr. Knowles asked if the developer would mind the Board members doing individual site walks, and Mr. Barry said that would be ok in order to provide input. That would still require staking out now for the building boundaries and maintaining them until the public hearing. It was also suggested that an escort would be preferred by Board members. Mr. Knowles then suggested it would be best to just schedule the site walk after the public hearing. He also said he would not be opposed to doing two site walks, either. He asked if the Board would do that. It was discussed that a site walk should be done as early as possible.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Ms. von Aulock said she's not opposed to do one the day of the public hearing. She suggested the 26th, for a one notice site walk. The question was raised that a preliminary site walk shouldn't need to be noticed. Mr. Barry said they would like to do a site walk for the next meeting of the Board; Mr. Knowles is not available that date. He suggested some other dates that were conflicts for other board members. Ms. von Aulock raised objections to a preliminary site walk because it's not open to the public and a site walk qualifies as a public hearing. It was decided to schedule the site walk at the public hearing. There will be another TRC meeting and Mr. Clement asked for the notes.

Mr. Knowles asked if there were further questions for the Board, or by the Board, and upon receiving a negative response, closed this preliminary meeting.

Chinburg Properties Preliminary Design Review:

The next Preliminary Design Review is for the application of Chinburg Properties, for the redevelopment of 27 Chestnut St. including the subdivision of an 8.68 acre divided into 4 lots, 1 of approximately 28,000 sq ft and three of approximately 12,000 sq ft per lot, Tax Map Parcel 64, Lot 52, Case No. 21408. All Board member comments will be non-binding.

Mr. Matt Asia with Chinburg Properties and Mr. Eric Chinburg, design team Doug Griner, Jon Ring and Brenda Quigley from Gove Environmental are presenting. There was a 10-15 minute presentation by Mr. Chinburg. Property was purchased from the Exeter Mill a couple of years ago – Chinburg Properties is a subset of that group of purchasers. This is a market rate apartment project, tastefully done with nice buildings, great landscape, lowering the impervious debris and a nice compliment to the housing stock in the mill area providing a smaller unit size in that area. Proposing a use allowed in the zone; developers have met with the neighbors to discuss their concerns and will continue to work with them to create the buffering and other things that they would to see as spoken about at the last meeting.

In April Chinburg Properties went before the ZBA to get a height variance to allow a pitched roof with a 60 foot height with adequate screening and landscaping along the southern line. They are looking for feedback and guidance prior to formal submission.

Doug Griner provided an overview of the landscape with 2 buildings set back from Chestnut Street serviced with a one way loop road and adequate parking. This affords some privacy to the residents, provides a yard area and achieves necessary grades for an underground parking area for both buildings. The loop allows for a large ring garden feature that becomes part of the landscape and front door presentation to the project, and a feature known as the "birch grove" with native birch trees and other native vegetation. Coupled with this is a building off to the side that would be used to service the needs of the buildings and 3 single family house lots proposed on the side which complements the single family housing on the opposite side of the street.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Vehicular circulation is a one way loop road, 20 foot pavement width, angled parking and a series of paved and or graveled paths circulating from the lower part of the buildings and giving access to the entry, and allows access to a woodland park site that is proposed.

There is also a walkway proposed from abutter comments in an earlier discussion connecting Chestnut Street to Haven Lane.

Access for parking under the building is provided by a roadway (specified on map) which provides access in two places to double loaded parking underneath of 34 spaces per building or 68 in total. There are 131 surface spaces provided as well. There is a 40 foot extension to the lane provided for a fire vehicle as was recommended by the Fire Chief. The perimeter tree buffer is preserved all around the property, mostly mature white pine, oak and maple trees with a very dense understory and a chain link fence already on site. These provide a perfect buffer with the scale of the buildings provided.

The great feature is a reduction of impervious material of the previous structure, replacing that with natural materials. This proposal reduces that impervious area by about 50%. The proposed woodland park will be in the existing wooded area as an amenity for the residents. The goal is to clean up the area, removing dead trees and debris and providing a quiet natural environment.

Note: Discussion on abutters screening was not clear due to presenter waving mike off to the side causing crackling and indistinguishable vocals. It included discussion on fencing and finessing.

Jonathan Ring from Jones Beach Engineers continued the presentation with discussion on the favorable impact of reduction of impervious materials, rain swales for treatment of storm water, identifying utility connection areas and the LED lighting. They have identified some potential waivers they may ask of the Board in Section 7.4.7 and 9.6.2 – natural features regarding tree locations, grading within 5 feet of an abutter, parking space length waiver from 19 to 18 feet or shortened aisle way in parking area, and the 3 side residential lots.

They anticipate submitting the application on June 25 with a TRC meeting in July and potentially a Planning Board meeting in August for full normal discussion.

With respect to what appears to be the man made wetlands, Section 9.1.3 D of zoning regulations states that man made wetlands shall not be part of the protection overlay district. This appears to be a factor to this project.

Brendan Quigley, Golden Environmental Services continued the presentation regarding the wetlands which are limited to the woodland park area and consist of a stagnant pond which was apparently created as a catch basin by an earlier project. A corrugated pipe outlet is manmade and runs to a drainage pipe which has been altered for drainage purposes by the debris in the area. All these taken together indicate this was a man

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

made wetland created for drainage purposes. This current project would clean this up and be a benefit to the Town.

Board Questions

Mr. Knowles commented that this appears to be a well thought out & designed project. Ms. Corson likes the idea of the narrower roadway to reduce speed, but has concerns about shortening the parking spaces due to new regulations. She agrees cleaning this up would be great. She asked why the buildings were not moved forward towards the other large buildings but towards the neighboring abutters. She was told the general attitude was to do something different by creating a setting of a more rural environment; also parking underground was facilitated by putting the buildings further toward the back. Soils and grading geometry were taken into consideration, as well as the view with the park like feeling as you enter the property.

Ms. Corson asked about the fire truck road access. She was told the Fire Chief told them it was not needed or wanted and they could take out the existing structure. His needs are serviced at the rear of the buildings, as the Fire Chief told them he liked. Discussion ensued on the possibility of grass areas to make that area look better.

Mr. Clement asked about north bound turn into the complex and that it seems to be a difficult 180 degree turn; he was told it would be modified. Discussion on that. He commented about the maintenance building by Haven Lane and his thought was that there would be a lot of activity there and could that be located away from abutters to reduce the activity. It was suggested that the maintenance building could be tucked away near the fire lane – the designers will look at that.

Mr. Clement also commented about the existing drainage being man made and if the new drainage would be in that area. He was told that it would, however, it would go through the re-charge bio-retention area first, reducing nitrogen.

Mr. Clement asked about the individual houses to side and if this would be an appropriate time to put in a 3-way stop sign at the intersection of Jadey Hill and Chestnut Street. It was suggested it was time to check with Public Works and Police about that.

Ms. Bergeron asked if the chain link fence would be taken down? They have decided to remove that fence. They may use the posts to anchor a wood fence, instead. She then asked about the parking on Chestnut Street and was told that it was already there and they were retaining those areas. She commented that she loves the plan.

Ms. Woolhouse also stated that she liked the plan, and the narrower road, and then asked about snow removal and how that works for the residents. Essentially, a system is set up so that residents move from one side of the development to the other as the plowing is done. While they have some substantial snow storage areas there, in most instances, they would be removing the snow once all plowing is complete.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Ms. Woolhouse stated that when she first looked at the rendering, she was confused by the loop – she suggested that it would be more realistic looking with some cars depicted on there. The developer agreed that was a good idea.

Mr. Knowles asked about age restrictions, there are none. He then asked about school bus pick-up and whether it would be on Chestnut Street or would the busses come into the complex. He was told that if there was a school bus need, they would support that; however, as most of the apartments are studios, 1 and 2 bedrooms, he did not anticipate a great deal of school age children. Mr. Knowles suggested that even a small gazebo/shelter for that in the front would be beneficial. He noted a small structure on the south side as being potential for that. The developer stated that they were fine to put one in, but in other developments, no one has been inclined to use it and they tend to be graffiti boards.

Ms. von Aulock asked to again review the pedestrian access as some things were talked about with the development team on the Powder Mill route and cross walk access and she would like to have that addressed; her other question was the landscaping plan view and she doesn't see the plan depicted on the rendering of perspective A. She asks for a raised bed around buildings for a little more interest there; she says there's a scale impact there and by undulating the elevation it reduces the scale impact at front and sides. That will be her focus.

The comment is that they are intending to coordinate that effort and they are in full agreement that the rendering is preliminary. Commenter was difficult to hear as he was waving the microphone around as he spoke. He did talk about birch groves, flowering trees and groupings still to be developed which will change the scale.

Discussion on types of trees and winter/summer mix. The developer stated that the landscaper would almost have carte blanche to design this. Town Planner stated that she had seen some mono-culture plantings in the past be disastrous on the development.

Mr. Clement asked about the mix of apartments and if they would be market rate apartments, not specialties and was told they were work-force market rate apartments.

Ms. Corson asked if all the parking spaces would be used or if only the ones close to the buildings would be used. She was told that probably 1.5 spaces per unit would be used, but they need spaces for visitors. Some excess is needed. She then asked if a parking bank could be utilized, where the spaces are put in later, if needed, and was told that the parking spaces already exist but they are open to that possibility.

There is currently a shared easement for parking for the mills property across the street and details would have to be worked out. It was suggested that breaking up the parking with snow removal area would be beneficial, as well.

Public Comment:

Mr. Jim Griswold commented on the setback for surrounding properties and that it could be better done. Some of the trees are very mature and a storm hazard. He believes the buffering plantings should be on the property itself, not in the buffering areas, so they are the property of the owner for maintenance. He is also concerned about the setbacks in relation to his property and being able to go into his back yard and see a 60 foot tall structure. On one side, the buffer is only 27 feet and he'd like consideration into increasing that.

Mr. Knowles mentioned that a slight twist to 2 of the units might add more room to the buffer zone and make a big difference to abutters. The development team will take a look at that.

No further public comment.

Ms. von Aulock requested business cards from the development team for the secretary.

OTHER BUSINESS:

The Minutes of May 22, 2014 are ready for review and approval. Some members have not had an opportunity to read them; it was decided they be moved to the next meeting to allow time to review.

Town Planner had no further business at this time. She talked about the all boards meeting and discussion on zoning, site and sub-division regulations and how they get changed. It was suggested a review committee may be re-convened to tackle zoning review. Mr. Knowles said he was not against a grant option be used for review and that the Planning Board may want to tackle that as it concerns issues they've come up with. Some work sessions may be required for that, but he doesn't believe they need to re-convene "ZORC" and suggests they take a meeting to talk through this. Ms. von Aulock suggested we should talk to the involved Boards for comments on issues.

Ms. Corson said a lot of the prior information came from Zoning Board and before we begin to address issues, it would be appropriate to ask their input. That might reduce time in the process to have them address it before it goes to Planning Board.

Mr. Knowles talked about regulations taking precedence over approving individual projects.

Mr. Clement talked about impediments to new constructions, reviewing density for different zones, and parking regulations for zone to zone or as a whole town. Focusing on a particular aspect may save time as opposed to reviewing all the regulations. He would like to chop it into meaningful bites.

Mr. Knowles suggested preliminary discussion could be just that type of review this year and look at other things for next year prior to putting in a warrant.

**These minutes are subject to possible correction/revision at a subsequent
Exeter Planning Board meeting**

Mr. Clement commented that Master Plan, CIP review and other things are in front of the Planning Board process.

Mr. Knowles said they would work with the agendas for July. Ms. Corson suggested this be a work session and not public.

Ms. Corson said the Economic Development Commission is looking to change its charter to be run along the lines of the Conservation Commission. It has been proposed to remove the Planning Board member from that and she is opposed to that since they restructure regulations which the Planning Board utilizes and that could be detrimental. She believes the Boards need to know what the other Boards are doing and would like an open discussion tonight.

Mr. Knowles said he believes a Planning Board member should be there as it is the Planning Boards charge to revise and propose regulations. EDC is welcome to look at the regulations all they want, remembering the Planning Board is the charge body. Ms. Corson feels that we need to point out that the RSA's stipulate the Planning Board has this responsibility.

Ms. Woolhouse moved to adjourn the meeting, second by Ms. Corson **VOTE:**
Unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Bardwell