

DRAFT MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Woolhouse, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Hall on April 14, 2016.

2. **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Aaron Brown, Don Clement (BOS Member), Pete Cameron, Katherine Woolhouse, Gwen English, Langdon Plumer (Alternate) and Ken Knowles. Ms. Woolhouse said that Mr. Plumer would be voting tonight.

STAFF PRESENT: Dave Sharples (Town Planner), David Pancoast (New Recording Secretary)

3. NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case #21522

Continued public hearing on the application of Phillips Exeter Academy for a non-residential site plan review and Conditional Use Permit for the proposed construction of a new Field House (to replace the existing Thompson Cage building) and associated site improvements. The subject property is located off of Gilman Street, in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #83-1. Case #21522.

Mr. Sharples stated that the Applicant Phillips Exeter Academy (“PEA”) had appeared on 3/10, and the matter had been continued for more information in response to questions from the Board. The Applicant has revised their plan and has responded to the questions, as of 3/29, which information is in the packet. Applicant addressed majority of comments, and provided more information on a majority of items, but he has a few questions on a few items, such as the striping plan. He met with the Applicant on 4/11. Have those updates for the Board to look at. He has suggested approvals for tonight. There are six waivers requested and those are in the packets for review.

Beyond the conditions of approval which he had suggested, the Applicant, through Underwood Engineering, submitted information on the request for fertilizing waiver by email just today, and he has a copy here and will make copies for board, because he just got it.

Roger Wakeman, PEA Chief of Planning and Facilities, stated that they have their support team present. He recognized colleague Mark Leighton, who handled a lot while he was away. Last session thorough, so tonight a few more things in response, with some graphics and discussion points, but very condensed and streamlined, covering all issues raised. All has been covered in correspondence, so it won’t take long, then open to board questions and public comments, then deliberation on waivers. Team tonight is Peter Reese ARC Architect, Jeff Clifford from Altus Engineering, Kyle Zick, Landscape Architect, Steve Purnaw, Traffic Engineer, Charlie Tucker with the lawyers.

Mr. Wakeman presented a list as a presentation outline:

1. Introduction and agenda overview
2. Refresher on South Campus Master Plan
3. Quick Recap on Fieldhouse/Parking project – summary points
4. Update on Landscaping
5. Response to questions/follow up on proposed conditions and waiver requests

Mr. Wakeman presented a site sketch of the South Campus Master Plan. Last Fall PEA obtained approval of another phase of project, the Theater element, and there is a groundbreaking on that work scheduled for next week. He then presented three more sketches of renderings of proposed project components for this application. He summarized elements of the South Campus Pedestrian Promenade changes and the proposed field house work to the mezzanine level and lower level parking garage, which are the focus of this project.

Mr. Wakeman presented a list of milestones for the project. The Exeter ZBA application is complete, the Planning Board process began in March 2016 and has continued into April. Construction of the Fieldhouse and Parking project under review will commence in fall of 2016 and continue to Fall of 2017 if approved, with the building projected to be open for use in November 2017. Completion of the South Campus Master Plan elements is projected for December of 2018. They are trying to limit period of down time for facilities to one year. Site approval full completion is usually within two years, but they are asking for three years based on the amount of work.

He presents and goes over their Parking and Traffic Study Summary point by point.

Traffic/Circulation

- Reinforced acceptability of plan to use Chadwick Lane as single entry/exit way (emergency vehicle access via Gilman promenade)
- Study demonstrated it is not necessary to extend Marston St.
- Focused on additional screening along Chadwick.
- Will work with DPW on striping plan for Court St.
- Commitment to develop way-finding solutions to new parking

Parking

- Post development parking increases by 82 spaces
- Total post-development supply is 461 – with a projected peak demand of 443
- Includes replacement of 22 Court Street parking spaces

Additional screening at Chadwick St is important and Kyle will update on that. Working with DPW on striping for Court St and parking entry. Parking memo was submitted showing a net increase of post development of parking by 87 spaces. There is a calculation and analysis in packet. He discussed working parking for faculty.

Want Kyle to present landscaping information from last session.

Kyle Zick, Landscaping Arch (Boston)

1. Chadwick and Court St
2. Walking area as well

Mr. Zick presents a revised sketch showing walking area and enhanced landscaping at Chadwick St to add sidewalk and screening headlight issues and for privacy. They added sidewalk to

connect to public parking and walking area. Plantings are challenging due to overhead wires. They have added rhododendron plantings behind sugar maples to shield that area better.

Basically they are adding layered effect for screening abutter looking for privacy.

Mr. Wakeman stated that PEA can address some concerns through striping initially at Gilman St, separating traffic from pedestrians. Added sidewalk to get to river and fields there. In packet there is a narrative that covers it. That wraps up our discussion. Open to questions and discussion. We have a summary of waiver requests here.

Ms. Woolhouse asked if there was anything from Board.

Ken Knowles: What is the site distance at this area? Given speed on Court St, it's a concern, especially after proposed landscaping.

Steven Purnaw stated that he will look at the plan tomorrow and make site distance affirmation and no trees in the way there. Mr. Knowles stated that he just wanted to be sure it's properly evaluated.

Mr. Knowles then raised site lighting concerns. Mr. Zick, the site landscaper: stated that there are two types of lighting: shoebox and pedestrian style on pedestrian promenade. It's all LED and low height to keep light down.

Mr. Knowles stated that they are all 10 foot poles with one on Court St, and asked if applicant can shield that fixture a little bit? Mr. Zick responded that they can do that.

Mr. Knowles then raised the issue of construction monitoring and asked about turbidity monitoring. He asked about drainage outfalls discharging to the river? There was discussion with Mr. Purnaw about the site discharge permit and Storm Water Plan ("SWP"). Mr. Knowles asked about events that were above the SWP requirement, above the ¼ inch storm? Mr. Purnaw stated that, yes, in events above ¼ inch storm, it triggers higher levels of care. There will be three inspectors for the various elements and many inspections conducted. DES AOP requirements will be met.

Langdon Plumer: As to signage, is there any signage at the Gilman Park Pedestrian Bridge? There are spaces but what about parking signage. Mr. Wakeman responded that they will have signage there and they will work with the Exeter CEO to meet their requirements. Clearly an area that we need to take care of.

Gwen English then asked about reinforced turf, is it year round or just winter? Mr. Wakeman responded that it's year round, depending on events. There is also some snow storage there. Need to keep it open as they will funnel parking garage people there.

Ms. English then inquired about cars parking there. What is oil leak potential? Big parking area, close to river, how will PEA handle those concerns? Mr. Purnaw responded that water drainage happens vertically. Garage is lower than the rest of the area with a trench drain in middle. He stated that discharge can't get into rain garden they are doing. It's a 1% grade there. Also he stated that they can do clean up with clean up material they will have on site there. Ms. English then asked for more clarification regarding the reinforced turf area. Mr. Purnaw responded that

there is going to be a foot of crushed stone. If there is a spill, they will dig it up. It won't move at all.

Don Clement then stated that he understands spills as one-time events, but has a concern about the situation over time, with small drippings that then accumulate over years. How does PEA manage that? Mr. Purnaw explained that microbes in soil will break it down. Mr. Clement stated that this element is close to the river here, that it's only 75 ft. wide buffer to break things down. Mr. Purnaw stated that is correct.

Ms. English then continued with a landscaping question, regarding the area near walking bridge with bittersweet, knotweed and other invasives. Will there be an attempt to clear it up? Mr. Zick responded that they had an ecologist look at it. They are going to take a phased approach at control. They will tackle it early on, but will have to continue with it over time. Ms. English then moved the discussion back to parking and pedestrian access, stating that there are a couple places into going into Chadwick Street where is all that happening? Mr. Wakeman responded that there are two car drop offs.

Ms. English asked if regular people can still use Chadwick St too? Mr. Wakeman replied yes. PEA is also going to do staging area/drop-offs along area. Built in, can be used by the public.

Ms. English said that she heard a report on NH coastal hazards, talking about looking at 100 year flood and 500 year flood factors. She asked what PEA is planning on that factor, asked if they looked into bigger storms and more flooding. She also asked if it should be addressed on State level. It's a large facility and in place for a long time, so she posited that it may not be a fair question. Mr. Wakeman stated that his engineer will comment, but wanted to first say that the proposed dam removal, that it will result in a significant change in river level once dam out. In a future 100 year flood event, the overall water level will then be 2-3 ft. lower than it has been in past. As to 500 year flood they have some limitations on campus, not a lot of elevation change on campus. If much larger storms, we'd have a lot of issues on campus. This the best location for improvements in respect of those concerns. Mr. Purnaw stated that the FEMA map flood line is at corner of building. Just outside 500 yr. flood. Datums change, have to be careful. 31.8 ft., 100 yr. flood. Grade jumps to 35 ft. pretty quick. Some flood proofing has been utilized already. Have a pretty good sense as to what will happen now. Basement of garage will flood and water will pass out afterward. Water can come in through other pathways. Anticipate it will pass back out.

Don Clement then stated that he wanted to echo Mr. Knowles' comment on turbidity, there is another outfall downstream of Hill Bridge. Turbidity is important-it's an impaired river. Weekly monitoring is needed at the two locations. Mr. Knowles then added: are we going to ask them to do something here? Mr. Clement responded that the monitoring should be more aggressively than the SWP requires. Mr. Knowles stated that 1/4" is not much rain. Perhaps turbidity reports should go to the Town Planner within 48 hrs. Also, what action is to be taken? Mr. Clement said they need baseline and suggested that PEA would submit reports to DPW, as it handles these issues. Mr. Clement they moved the discussion back to landscaping plan: asking about the abutter on south side of the project and if his concerns are met?

Mr. Wakemen said there is a letter from one abutter, and they talked to other one. Mr. Clement said that he wanted complete abutter approval. [There is discussion about abutters being present and holding projects hostage and past board approaches to such issues.] Mr. Wakeman stated that PEA would like to have the abutters here. Mr. Clement stated that abutters need some say as to

landscaping plan. Mr. Wakeman responded that PEA was glad to be reasonable. Glad to meet with them about issues. Mr. Clement stated that he knew they had. He then moved on to discuss a historic marker for Gilman St., since it is being changed to a walking promenade. He asked PEA what they can do to recognize the history of Gilman St. Mr. Wakeman said that PEA was very aware of that historic discussion. The proposed plaque is not done, but it will signify Gilman St and its use and history. It will probably be placed at the end of the former street area, near river. PEA is committed to following through on that element.

Aaron Brown stated that it expected the project to be a beautiful end result. The only thing he is unclear on and is sensitive to is sidewalk from Chadwick and possibly out to Court St. He would like the town to become more walkable. He thinks they have ample land to do that, with plantings and such. Somewhat minimal approach in the filings and he doesn't understand any resistance on this. Mr. Wakeman responded that they are anticipating there will be biking. HE said the road shoulder could have space for bikes, but they don't want them on sidewalks. Their approach is a practical sense based on both cost and need, the intent here is to direct pedestrian traffic with most people driving in and parking at garage or other areas. This is high volume parking, so that is their reasoning. Striping there will help. If it's a strong sense of board, they would consider it if it's a 'must do.' Mr. Brown said that it's his own concern that sidewalks be more inviting to this area. The town has a nice relationship with PEA, it's very positive, but he would like it to be a more inviting atmosphere here with a sidewalk so that it's more welcoming to all people, but that he understands cost issue. Mr. Wakeman stated one other consideration is that despite PEA's clean up, it's still an industrial areas, not wanting to invite people there. There is a heating plant and an electrical substation there, so if promoting a lot of pedestrian traffic, then that could be an issue. We are trying to get away from the bunkered mentality aspect of the area. Mr. Brown responded that he knew that.

Ms. Woolhouse asked Mr. Sharples if he had any more comments. Mr. Sharples responded that the heritage committee met on it. Public hearing next week on it. Mr. Wakeman said he offered to support it but doesn't have a date yet.

Ms. Woolhouse stated this hearing is still open for public comment. Any public members wish to speak?

There was no public comment.

Mr. Knowles moved to close public hearing, seconded by Mr. Plumer.

Roll call vote to close the public hearing:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye

The vote was unanimous. Ms. Woolhouse asked if there was any more board discussion on issues. Mr. Clement asked if the work on the field house is first. Mr. Wakeman responded yes. Mr. Clement then inquired about use of Gilman St or Chadwick St? Mr. Wakeman stated that they will use Gilman St but separate it with jersey barriers and use half of it for construction traffic and half of it for pedestrian traffic. Only one way traffic for part of it, up Chadwick onto Gilman. Mr. Wakeman stated that they will cordon off the street. Mr. Plumer raised the issue of commencing work on the performing arts center. Mr. Wakeman stated there are several overlapping project components as to logistics. The cut off of Court St will be for access for this aspect of the project.

Ms. Woolhouse recognized Mr. Knowles who stated that they had the waivers to act on but that he had three more special conditions to add to this, namely: sightlines, additional landscaping/lighting to prevent glare, and turbidity monitoring.

FIRST WAIVER REQUEST:

Ms. Woolhouse went over the first waiver request, which is for Section 9.9.2 wetlands setback for a 75 foot wetlands structural parking setback from an inland stream. The requested waiver is for installation of a reinforced turf parking area that will encroach 5,296 sq. ft. into the 75 foot parking setback from the Little River. The parking will encroach on an area of compacted gravel soils that is currently being used as a ground storage yard. The remaining portion of the ground storage yard will be vegetated to expand the buffer along the Little River.

Mr. Clement moved approval of the waiver request for wetland setback for 75 ft. for a structural parking setback under Section 9.9.2 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations as presented. Mr. Knowles Seconded the motion. Ms. Woolhouse called for any board discussion of the Motion. There was none. Ms. Woolhouse then called for a roll call vote on the motion:

Mr. Brown: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye

The vote for approval of the first waiver request was unanimous.

SECOND WAIVER REQUEST:

Ms. Woolhouse stated the next waiver request is for a waiver of the 25 foot wide no-cut/no-disturb setback from the Little River for three drainage outfall pipes to replace five outfall pipes of insufficient capacity that will be impacted by the pending removal of the dam, which will lower the water level in the Little River by as much as 4.5 feet. In accordance with Article 9.1.6a of the Exeter Zoning Ordinance, the applicant requests a waiver of that Section of the Conditional Use Permit process for wetlands setback under Section 9.9.2 of those regulations.

Mr. Plumer moved approval of the request as presented. Mr. Cameron Seconded the motion. Ms. Woolhouse called for board discussion.

There was board discussion on what was being waived and how, and Mr. Sharples clarified what he had proposed. Mr. Purnaw clarified the nature of the request, which is based on a Conditional Use Permit, due to the recent change in regulations. The board discussed the change in regulations of a year ago. Mr. Knowles wanted to be sure what the board was waiving regarding the conditional use permit process, stating he was not sure of the exact request. Mr. Sharples said he wrote it in the proposed motion as a request for waiver of Section 9.9.2 wetlands for three setbacks. There was discussion about how to proceed so Mr. Knowles asked that the board table this waiver request for a few minutes and move onto the next one, so that he and Mr. Sharples could look at the regulation language to clear things up. Ms. Woolhouse stated that the board would table this request for now and move on to the waiver request for parking area specifications.

THIRD WAIVER REQUEST:

Ms. Woolhouse stated that this waiver request is for a waiver from Section 9.13.7 regarding installation of unpaved reinforced turf parking in the current ground storage yard. The event parking is designed as 85% open graded stone and 15% loam to allow infiltration of storm water to allow for a vegetated parking area and the remainder of the ground storage area to be a vegetated buffer along the river.

Mr. Clement moved to grant the waiver of Section 9.13.7 under Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations regarding the installation of unpaved reinforced turf parking as presented. Ms. English Seconded the motion. Ms. Woolhouse called for any board discussion and there was none. She then conducted a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

Ms. Woolhouse asked if the board is ready to take the second waiver matter off the table. Mr. Knowles stated that he is ready to go back to that request. The board returned attention to the prior request. Mr. Knowles stated it is in the regulations as presented under the change of a year ago and it is allowed as requested so the board can proceed to vote it as presented earlier. Ms. Woolhouse stated that the motion was already made and seconded and the ensuing discussion on process was resolved, so she took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye

Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The second waiver request was approved as unanimous.

FOURTH WAIVER REQUEST:

Ms. Woolhouse stated the fourth waiver request was for 12.1 Performance and Maintenance Guarantees for site improvements for the new fieldhouse to include new landscaping, lighting, parking and such. Consideration of PEA's connections to the community, PEA requests waiver of performance guarantees for this project. Mr. Plumer states that this is standard and moves approval of the request. Mr. Clement Seconded the motion. Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

FIFTH WAIVER REQUEST:

Ms. Woolhouse stated the next waiver request was from Zoning Ordinance requirement Article 9.2.3.K Aquifer Protection District for use of fertilizer. A waiver is requested for establishment of new vegetation, which will protect against erosion and sedimentation.

Mr. Knowles stated that this request should be combined with following one for Section 9.3.4.F because it's the same language. Ms. Woolhouse agreed and stated that continuing on with Section 9.3.4.F, Shoreline Protection District for use of fertilizer in the Shoreline Protection District and asked for board discussion. Mr. Plumer asked if it was one year and if so, from when? From when the turf establishes itself?

There was board discussion on the timeframe. Mr. Sharples stated that the timeline is for a year in the ordinance. Mr. Clement stated that this is the first request ever on the issue since the regulation change and wants to do it correctly. Mr. Plumer asked if the timeline indicates that things will be all set by the fall of 2018 or the spring of 2018.

Mr. Wakeman stated that the work/vegetation for the whole zone would be complete by December 2018. It will be a year before get to that point to establish turf grass. Would like a year to start that aspect. It's about initial installation start date. Mr. Knowles stated that it is impossible to target and regulate that, so if board wants to grant waiver, grant it to end of 2019 or 2020 or something like that, so that you give a couple of growing seasons to apply fertilizer for establishment of area. Mr. Clement agrees to put an end date rather than a start date. Board discussion ensues of timeline issues. That language should go as part of waiver, or as a condition

of approval. Mr. Clement asks Mr. Sharples which method is cleaner to use? Mr. Sharples suggest include it in the waiver request. Mr. Knowles stated that a condition of approval was a little more enforceable. Additional board discussion followed regarding future maintenance of the parking area. Discussion was about how to word the approval. The board concluded to have it be part of the conditions of approval. Mr. Knowles stated that the language is probably in the SWP. Mr. Plumer moved the approval of the waiver request as presented to an end date of December 2019, or the maximum time allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Cameron stated that this the very first one under fertilizer regs, so the board needs to be careful there is no bad precedent here. Mr. Clement responds that he doesn't think so, well within intent of the regulations.

Mr. Plumer repeats his motion. Mr. Knowles Seconded it. Discussion having been held, Ms. Woolhouse takes a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion as presented was unanimously approved.

SIXTH WAIVER REQUEST:

Mr. Plumer moves the request as presented for approval to expire on 12/31/2019, or the maximum time allowed by the zoning ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Knowles. There was no further discussion so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The motion as presented was unanimously approved.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

Ms. Woolhouse next took up the Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Knowles moved that the board grant a conditional use permit in case #21522. Mr. Plumer Seconded the motion. There was no board discussion, so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The motion as presented was unanimously approved.

Ms. Woolhouse stated that finally the board has site plan approval. Mr. Sharples goes over his proposed approval conditions:

1. A DWG file and site plan shall be provided to Town Planning showing all property lines and monumentation prior to signing the final plan which is a digital file for use in GIS.
2. An electronic as-built plan shall be provided to the Town prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) which shall be a DWG file and a NH State Plane NAD 1982 FIPS 2800 feet coordinates [**←Dave S., could you please verify that language in the draft, the tape was not clear on it, thanks**]
3. A preconstruction meeting to be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the town engineer and prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval prior to the pre-con meeting: the SWP for DPW approval prior to the meeting and a project schedule.
4. Monumentation of the lot shall be provided according to Section 9.25 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations prior to signing the final plan,
5. Any revisions to the Landscaping Plan regarding the Chadwick Lane entrance and area shall be reviewed and approved by the Town Planner prior to signing the final plans, provided that the Town Planner in his discretion shall determine that the overall intent as to the Landscaping Plan, which is to screen abutting properties from headlights, glare, noise and other associated impacts making Chadwick Lane the primary access for this site has not been changed, otherwise the applicant shall return to the board for approval for the final Landscaping Plan. [Added in case changes for abutters]
6. Comments #19 and 23 in the Underwood Engineers Letter dated 14, 2016 shall be address to the satisfaction of the Town Planner prior to the signing of the final plan. [Mr. Sharples stated that this is the letter that he got today. #23 was no detail for proposed sewer and water crossing on sheets in accordance with NHDES which must be provided and #19 was for a proposed sewer manhole. They are two very minor comments but need to be addressed.]
7. The applicant shall submit a striping plan for Court St that addresses the recommendations on Page 26 of Steven Purnaw's Traffic Impact Study dated February 2016. This striping plan shall be reviewed and approved by the DPW prior to issuance of a CO.
8. All appropriate fees to be paid including but not limited to sewer and water connection fees, and inspection fees prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. All municipal and state approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans and all conditions to be met within one year and all site improvements to be completed within two years from the date of final approval. [Mr. Sharples mentioned that PEA was looking for three years per comments tonight.]

Mr. Sharples then reviews the three suggested conditions per discussion tonight: first, the site lines at the intersection of Chadwick and Court St shall be evaluated by Steven Purnaw and the proposed landscaping shall not decrease the existing site lines or stopping distances both north and south of the existing intersection site lines. Second, additional landscaping and light fixture shielding shall be added as necessary once the light poles and fixtures are installed on Chadwick Lane shall not allow glare or light trespass to abutters; and third, turbidity monitoring be performed by a CPESC or NH Professional Engineer for all drainage outfalls or any locations where storm water runoff leaves the site and all rainfall events equal to and excess of 0.25 inches. Turbidity monitoring reports shall be submitted to DPW within 48 hours after event, and if excessive turbidity is encountered then corrective measures shall be taken.

Mr. Plumer suggested that those additional three conditions become items # 10, 11, 12 and #9 become #13. And he agrees that #13 should read turbidity within three years.

Mr. Brown asks if the board can discuss the sidewalks further. [Discussion on the sidewalk issues/concerns. Mr. Brown feels it would be a much more inviting site with sidewalks and they would be used. Mr. Plumer responded that the new striping regulations would concern walkers, bikers and cars. Mr. Clement leaned toward PEA's position that this is not a pedestrian use lane today and doesn't think it will be. PEA folks will be coming across more where the campus is, this is just a little south of the campus here. Won't see any PEA use of Chadwick Lane for bicycle access or pedestrian access. The access will primarily be in vehicles, but don't want to discourage bicycles. Sidewalks a great thing but this is still an industrial area. At that point of project work, not a critical need at Chadwick. Ms. English agrees with Mr. Brown on this point of sidewalks. If people coming from neighborhoods and walking around Gilman Park and around the Academy and its fields, I think they are going to walk via Chadwick. Mr. Clement thought it will be Bell Ave. Ms. English stated that if pedestrians are going to cross the foot bridge and use Academy trails, her sense is they would use Chadwick, and there will be more traffic there. It's a safety issue and agreed it would be more visually appealing for a sidewalk there to establish it as an entranceway. The sidewalk should go to the entrance of the road.

Mr. Knowles stated that folks going that way would still go even if no sidewalk there, but it would be much safer if there was one so they didn't walk in the roadway or on the shoulder. Ms. Woolhouse stated that she does walk down Chadwick if coming down Pine St. But I see that if no sidewalks, there is more room for bikes to use the area as well. Mr. Knowles states that the lane must still be the required width, so there won't be more room for bikes if there's a sidewalk, it has to be the same, and they can't decrease the road width if they add a sidewalk. Mr. Sharples seeks clarification on whether this would be a raised curb sidewalk as that would affect drainage. Points out that it might cause a redesign of the plan. Mr. Brown stated that a grass strip sidewalk is fine. Mr. Clement stated that a new sidewalk must meet ADA requirements of width and slope. Board discussion ensued on the nature of any sidewalk there, whether grass strip, concrete and connection to roadway, as well as whether it would have to be raised curb or not.

Mr. Wakeman offered a comment to help resolve the discussion: PEA wants to come to a good conclusion on this application. We can see the benefit. The preference would be to put it on the north side of Chadwick Lane and to put it at grade with a barrier strip, so as not to affect drainage. That would provide coverage for the walking concerns, create a clear pedestrian path and still maintain the biking lane. If the board is okay with that, PEA will agree to that. Mr. Brown responded that it would be fantastic and would be much more welcoming and safer.

Mr. Sharples reads a motion he wrote that incorporates the offer:

“An at-grade sidewalk shall be constructed along one side of Chadwick Lane from the Court St intersection to the proposed parking area.” Mr. Knowles suggested adding “connected to the other proposed sidewalks as part of the project.” Mr. Sharples was asked by the board to include language that he should review the plan for that element prior to signing of the final plan.” The board concurred with that language. Mr. Plumer suggested that it become #13 and that prior #13 become #14.

Mr. Wakeman asked for a clarification on turbidity. Is the condition in perpetuity or during construction only? Mr. Knowles clarifies that it would be until the site is stabilized. And you don't need to monitor every outfall except above a quarter inch of rain until it stops raining.

Mr. Knowles moved that the board grant site plan approval for case #21522 with conditions #1-14 as read and discussed. Mr. Plumer Seconded the motion.

There was no further board discussion so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

PEA-PB Case #21528

Ms. Woolhouse then moved to the continued public hearing on the application of Phillips Exeter Academy for a non-residential site plan review and Conditional Use Permit for the proposed relocation of the remaining nine (9) tennis courts and associated site improvements in preparation for the proposed development of the Theater and Dance Center on the southerly portion of the campus. The subject property is located off of Gilman Street, in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #83-1. Case #21528.

Mr. Sharples stated that the applicant appeared in March and the matter was continued for more information regarding height of buildings and proposed elevation above flood plain. The plan was revised and the buildings are now at or above the flood plain as required by the ordinance. The staff has no further concerns and he provided suggested conditions of approval the applicant is seeking four waiver requests: wetlands setbacks, form of guarantee, and two uses of fertilizers. He provide a proposed site plan motion and conditional use motion as well.

Mr. Wakeman stated there was quite a bit of time spent on it last time. Can recap if needed or can move on it. Mr. Sharples added one additional comment, that Underwood Engineering submitted its letter today and he is all set with it, has one copy of it here. [Passed the letter to the board for its review]

Ms. Woolhouse asked if there were any questions from the board or public. There were none from the public, but Mr. Knowles asked one last question regarding the total site disturbance. Mr. Purnaw stated that it was 54,000 sq. ft. Mr. Knowles then asked what the phasing was for this project. Mr. Wakeman responded that PEA wanted to move on it this summer and it need to accomplish relocation so their tennis program can function next year.

Mr. Purnaw stated that even though it's less than 100,000sq ft., for this project, it's all encompassing the 49 acres for the alteration so the conditions would also apply to this project. Mr. Knowles stated that the board might want to consider turbidity monitoring as a test to iron out wrinkles before the larger project but he admits they might be required to do it under the EPA SWP anyways, so board might want to add that condition to its approval.

Ms. Woolhouse stated that the board still had public input open and needed to close it. Mr. Knowles moved to close the public hearing on this matter, case #21528. Ms. Woolhouse called for any discussion. There was none, so she conducted a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

There was unanimous approval for closure of the public hearing.

FIRST WAIVER REQUEST:

Ken Costello of SMRT Architects stated that the waiver request here was for Section 9.9.3 Wetland Impact Waiver involves the construction of 9 new tennis courts located east of Court St on PEA campus, the project is a continuation of the addition of five courts in the Summer/Fall of 2015, site improvement of the nine new courts, a 30 ft. x 40 ft. new pavilion structure, relocation of an existing 12 ft. x 18 ft. storage building being displaced by a theater/dance center, the construction of pavements and stone dust walkways and the location of a new drainage line to replace the existing drainage line that outfalls to the Exeter River. The new line will be a properly sized corrugated plastic and will replace the existing asbestos line. The project will install a new outfall for the drainage line to address the lowering of the Exeter River elevation as part of the removal of the great dam. The new pipe will minimally impact the buffer zones. Seventy-five square feet of wetlands will be permanently impacted to install a new flared end section and plunge pool, which is a required modification due to the lowering of the Exeter River. No trees or shrubs are intended to be disturbed, except there is one tree that needs to be removed. The lawn will be restored to like condition upon completion of the work. In consideration of PEA's performance in the community and prior waivers granted to PEA, the applicant respectfully requests waivers to Section 9.9.3.

Mr. Clement moves that the board grant the request for the waiver from Section 9.9.3 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations regarding wetlands impacts. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cameron. There was no board discussion, so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed with unanimous approval.

SECOND WAIVER REQUEST:

Mr. Costello stated that the applicant requests a waiver of Section 12.1 Performance and Maintenance Guarantees on the project for construction of nine new tennis courts to be located east of Court St [as stated earlier for the first waiver request], in consideration of PEA's performance in the community and prior waivers granted for its projects.

Mr. Plumer moves that the request be granted as stated as these waivers are typically granted to PEA. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clement. On discussion Mr. Knowles stated that there is no way the board should think about a performance guarantee here as the town was not going to build on private land if the applicant failed to do so, which is the whole point of a performance guarantee, so he supported the waiver request. There being no further discussion, Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

THIRD WAIVER REQUEST:

Mr. Costello stated that PEA requested a waiver of Section 9.2.3.K for the same project discussed for the preceding waiver requests. Existing lawn areas will be disturbed and will need to be reestablished and this request is for a one year use of fertilizers to reestablish that lawn. Mr. Plumer moved to grant the requested waiver of the Zoning Ordinance for the use of fertilizer in the aquifer protection district, to expire Dec 31st, 2017, or the maximum allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clement. There was no board discussion so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

FOURTH WAIVER REQUEST:

Mr. Costello stated the waiver request from Section 9.3.4.F for the same project as previously discussed for the preceding waiver requests. Existing lawn areas new to be disturbed and will need to be reestablished. The request is for a one year waiver to allow fertilizers to be used for that work. Mr. Plumer moved that the board grant the requested waiver of the Zoning Ordinance for the use of fertilizer in the shore land protection district, to expire Dec 31st, 2017, or the maximum allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clement. There was no board discussion so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Knowles then moved that the board grant a Conditional Use Permit for case #21528. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clement. There was no board discussion. Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Woolhouse then asked Mr. Sharples to give his comments on Site Plan Review. Mr. Sharples read his proposed conditions of approval into the record:

1. A DWG file and site plan shall be provided to Town Planning showing all property lines and monumentation prior to signing the final plan which is a digital file for use in GIS.

2. An electronic as-built plan shall be provided to the Town prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) which shall be a DWG file and a NH State Plane NAD 1982 FIPS 2800 feet coordinates [**←Dave, could you verify that language in the draft please, the tape was not clear on it, thanks**]

3. Monumentation of the lot shall be provided according to Section 9.25 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations prior to signing the final plan,

4. A preconstruction meeting to be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the town engineer and prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval prior to the pre-con meeting: the SWP for DPW approval prior to the meeting and a project schedule.

5. All appropriate fees to be paid including but not limited to sewer and water connection fees, and inspection fees prior to issuance of a building permit.

6. All municipal and state approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans and

7. All conditions shall be met within one year and all site improvements to be completed within two years from the date of final approval.

Mr. Knowles suggested that his turbidity condition be submitted as #7 and that proposed #7 become #8. Mr. Sharples agreed. Mr. Clement stated that the Exeter River is sensitive and is impaired so that condition is a good one to do everything the board can to be sure that it doesn't get worse.

Mr. Knowles moved that the board grant the non-residential site plan for Case #21528 with the eight conditions as read. Ms. English Seconded the motion. There was no further discussion so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.

Mr. Clement: Aye

Mr. Cameron: Aye

Ms. Woolhouse: Aye

Ms. English: Aye

Mr. Plumer: Aye

Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PLANNING BOARD SITE PLAN REVIEW AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Ms. Woolhouse opened the matter of the proposed amendment to Section 6.2 – Formal Application Submissions. Mr. Sharples stated that this came up before his hiring and the board wanted to see electronic submissions. He did research and took some language from some nearby communities such as Portsmouth, NH. He read the Portsmouth language and suggested it be added to the formal application process:

“All application documents, plans, supporting documentation and other materials shall also be provided in digital Portable Document Format (PDF) on compact disc, DVD or flash drive. Digital files shall be complete and exact copies of the corresponding paper

submittals (e.g. plans shall be at the same scale and sheet size as the paper copies). Applicants may submit additional digital files to assist in presentations at public hearings, but such additional files shall not be considered part of the application unless corresponding paper documents are also provided.”

Mr. Clement moved that the board open its public hearing on this matter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cameron. Ms. Woolhouse called for board discussion and Mr. Brown stated that this change is minor for the board and should have been done a long time ago. There was no further discussion before the vote to open the hearing, so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

On board discussion Mr. Brown said well overdue and should pass it. Mr. Knowles said that the board should do the whole thing at once and do it right. But part of it wasn't noticed for this hearing. Mr. Sharples didn't want to hold up this provision by adding in some other things that took more time. He has thoughts on other aspects of submissions. [There was discussion on Mr. Sharples' other related thoughts and the amendment situation and process] Ms. Woolhouse stated that the board didn't want the DWG when the application was just coming into the office. Mr. Sharples stated the purpose of this provision was to get electronic media which the board wants. Mr. Knowles stated that wanted to be sure there was a scanned copy with a stamp on it, not just an AutoCAD printout without the stamp on it. The two might be slightly different. There was further discussion on this language sufficiency. Ms. Woolhouse asked if the applicants still needed to do paper copies. Mr. Sharples stated yes, they still need to submit paper copies as well, for the formal record.

Mr. Plumer asked what implications this had for the Planning Office. Mr. Sharples stated that this would make things easier for everyone, as digital media submissions are on the rise. It can at some point be accessible to the public. There was no further discussion and no public input, so Mr. Clement moved to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Mr. Knowles. There was no discussion on the motion, so Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Knowles: Aye.
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Brown: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

On deliberation discussion, Mr. Clement raised the question of how many public sessions were needed for this amendment to take effect. There was discussion that point and the number of readings required. After Mr. Sharples input on it, the board concluded that one reading was enough to effect the approved change in the regulations. There was discussion about the change making two parts to the language, but Mr. Sharples explained that having two paragraphs made it easier for the language. There being no further discussion on the amendment, Mr. Knowles moved that the board amend Section 6.2 of the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations as presented and discussed this evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clement. On discussion Mr. Knowles changed his motion to add the proposed language, not replacing the existing language. Mr. Clement re-Seconded the revised motion. There being no further discussion, Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Woolhouse asked Mr. Clement to discuss his concern. Mr. Clement stated that he attended a couple of meetings of the SEWA, the Southeast Watershed Alliance, which has developed a Stormwater Ordinance. Exeter doesn't have one. He has copies of model Stormwater Standards and has discussed this with Dave Sharples. It can be adopted as part of Site Plan or as part of Zoning, which would cover more instances of it, not just development. It behooves us with new MS-4 permits and AOC, with river and bay improvements etc., so make this change. Do we want to charge the Town Planner to report to us which way to go with incorporation of it into effect. If zoning, then should be on for March 2017 approval. Mr. Sharples confirmed. There was discussion on process and permits that might result, as well as what work the board might be intending to catch in the change. Mr. Sharples said he would come back with a recommendation on the process of putting it into effect, but that he would need a couple of months on that since the office was busy with the Master Plan process right now.

Ms. Woolhouse stated that there were not enough members to approve the Minutes of the March 24th session, so that was tabled.

TOWN PLANNER REPORT

Mr. Sharples commented on Stormwater Workshops at University of NH, they are very worthwhile on many subjects. There are some dates, one on May 6th that he recommends. They relate to stormwater discussion. If anyone wants to go, just email Mr. Sharples and he will sign them up. The programs usually go all day. He will have his assistant send out a reminder on this. Also there is another NH OEC spring conference which is very good, encourage you to attend that as well.

Mr. Sharples then continued discussion of the Master Plan Steering Committee formation. He has twelve applications, so he has more than just names, also statements of interest. He passed those to the Board members and will provide them to absent members.

There are no applications pending for the April 28th meeting at this point, but would like to advance the MP Steering Committee on that session and he will email the chair on that.

He is going to work on changing submission timeline, doesn't like getting things the same day as meetings. Wants to know how the board would like to receive such things: email? It would sometimes be the same day. There can be no discussion of course. Mr. Clement said it always helps to have it beforehand and all agreed, but sometimes things are late. If after the packets, Mr. Sharples will send things out as soon as he sees them.

Ms. Woolhouse stated a reminder for board elections on First board meeting in May and that the Board of Selectmen will vote on appointments at its session on April 26th. Mr. Clement raised the matter of absenteeism. Any committee member who doesn't make 60% of sessions, board should send a letter to BOS asking for replacement. The board has such a situation at this time, via letter from the chair. Mr. Plumer made a motion that the chair send a letter to the Selectmen by April 25th on the matter of that one alternate's in attendance. Ms. English Seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

There was general discussion on potential interested board members.

Ms. Woolhouse then raised the issue of interested board members for the Master Plan Steering Committee. Mr. Sharples stated that two members of the Planning Board are needed. The ConCom has appointed its member. Mr. Clement moves that the Planning Board form a Master Plan Steering Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Knowles. There being no further discussion, Ms. Woolhouse took a roll call vote:

Mr. Brown: Aye.
Mr. Clement: Aye
Mr. Cameron: Aye
Ms. Woolhouse: Aye
Ms. English: Aye
Mr. Plumer: Aye
Mr. Knowles: Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Woolhouse stated that any interested Planning Board members for Steering Committee should communicate that interest to Mr. Sharples. Can have more than two members join it.

Ms. Woolhouse then stated that someone needs to replace Kelly Bergeron on the Heritage Committee. There was discussion on that matter.

Ms. Woolhouse asked if there were any reports on other committee activities. There was discussion on climate change and coastal risk and hazards. Mr. Clement stated there is a Legislative group involved looking at the future of various aspects of climate change, areas of most impact are coastal communities. Maybe it should be incorporated into the Master Plan.

Mr. Plumer mentioned the expenditure on the Sewer Treatment Plant and that mid-west is having tremors due to sewage being pumped down into the

There were no other business matters discussed.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Plumer made a motion to adjourn the session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Knowles and the vote to adjourn was unanimous.

Session adjourned at 9:53 pm.