1 2 3 4 5		TOWN OF EXETER PLANNING BOARD APPROVED MINUTES March 28, 2019		
6 7	1.	CALL TO ORDER: Session was called to order at 7:00 pm by Vice-Chair Brown.		
8	2.	INTRODUCTIONS		
9 10 11		Members Present: Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen English, Kelly Bergeron, Niko Papakonstantis, Select Board Representative, Nick Gray, Alternate, Jennifer Martel, Alternate and Marcia Moreno-Baez, Alternate.		
L2		Staff Present: Dave Sharples, Town Planner		
L3 L4		Vice-Chair Brown indicated that Alternates, Nick Gray, Jennifer Martel and Marcia Biaz would be active.		
15	3.	NEW BUSINESS		
16	HEARINGS:			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		 The application of Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. for a commercial site plan review and Wetlands Condition Use Permit (CUP) for the proposed construction of a 53,490 SF building (offices, storage, warehouse and wash bay area) parking and associated site improvements on an 11.70-acre parcel Corporate Technology-1 Park zoning district 20 Continental Drive Tax Map Parcel #46-3 Case #18-16 		
26 27 28 29 30		 The application of Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. for a lot-line adjustment between properties located at 20 Continental Drive and 60 Gourmet Place CT-Corporate Technology-1 Park zoning district Tax Map Parcels #46-3 and #46-1 Case #18-20 		
32 33 34 35		Ms. Bergeron motioned to accept the applications of Unitil Energy Systems, Inc., Case #18-16 and Case #18-20. Mr. Gray seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed unanimously.		
36 37 38 39		James Petropulos of Hayner/Swanson, Inc. presented the design plan on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Petropulos noted the cases go hand in hand, one site plan and one lot-line adjustment. The11-acre lot located in Corporate Technology Park zoning district abutted by Gourmet Gift Basket (GGB), undeveloped land to		
10 11 12		the South, created in subdivision in 1990 (referring to the L-shaped parcel). The majority is wooded, wetlands, which have been flagged by Brendan Quigley. Lot-line plan needed to support new building, relocate between subject line and		

GGB which would give the Unitil lot more room and better geography. Made 43 44 sense to shift close to road. Unitil looking to acquire Gourmet Place and convey some land, would be town matter. Proposing a two-story facility, 53,490 SF. 45 46 Currently their operation is in Kensington and they are first responders during 47 outage or emergency. Proposed development would consist of offices, storage, wash bay, two access locations off Gourmet Place with 80 employees and 48 addition 20 spots for emergency. 61% open space, few impact areas, impact 49 50 from wetland, with difficult soil conditions, not a lot of choices for infiltration, catch 51 basin and run to back of property, outlet to surface created wetland and drainage off-site. 52 54

53

Mr. Petropulos reviewed the proposed site lighting and landscaping plan with focus on the front of the building which would have a flat roof, be 26' feet in height and require seven waivers which are fairly straightforward and CUP.

56 57 58

59

55

Mr. Petropulos indicated other permitting necessary, the applicant has secured alteration of terrain permit, been before the Conservation Commission, received a favorable recommendation and think it has been designed responsibly.

60 61 62

63

64 65

66

Mr. Sharples noted the project requires wetlands CUP, and several waivers. The applicant appeared before the TRC (comment and response letter enclosed in packet). Project was reviewed by UEI in February and will have a second review. No significant comments. Mr. Sharples advised the lot line is not ready to be accepted due to changes and uncertainties and may need to schedule a site walk and table until the second meeting in April.

67 68 69

Vice-Chair Brown recommended addressing the waivers and CUP.

70 71

Mr. Petropulos added Gourmet Place is intended to provide access (showing on plan here). There are seven waivers fully explained in package (will paraphrase).

72 73

7.4.7 Significant Trees, less critical than in R-1 zone;

74 75 76 7.5.4 High Intensity Soils Survey (HISS). DES requires site specific soil mapping, provided that so seeking relief from HISS.

77 78 9.2.4 Architectural Guidelines waiver motion, the flat roof and exterior materials are consistent with nearby buildings;

79 80 9.5.1.4 Grading within 5 feet of property line waiver motion, approached FW Webb and they support the project.

81 82 9.7.5.5 Landscape islands with parking lots waiver motion, focus on greenery on perimeter of parking area;

83 84

9.9.2 Wetland Setbacks, 75 foot structural/parking setback from inland stream waiver, not highest quality wetlands, mitigation approximately \$75,000; 9.17.9 Slope Graded Lines, Cape Cod Berm.

85 86

Mr. Petropulos noted seven items for the CUP:

87 88

89

- 1. Proposed use allowed in zone; 2. Use not carried out elsewhere on site, avoid other areas;
- 3. Wetland scientist functional rate assessment, common wooded wetland;

90 91	 Construction and maintenance not detrimental to 2:1 slope on perimeter, flatter design would increase impact;
92	 Buffer impact would leave remaining areas in natural state, will be vegetated;
93	6. No hazardous impact, clean use;
93 94	7. Obtain other permits, are in process of getting those.
94	7. Obtain other permits, are in process or getting those.
95 96	Vice-Chair Brown opened the hearing to the public for comments and questions at 7:34 and being none closed the hearing for deliberations.
97	Vice Chair Brown noted minor items with the public right-of-way, making sure it
98	meets our requirements.
99	Ms. Martel asked about the detention basin, it appears as if going over the
100	property line? Mr. Petropulos responded yes, the owner owns the abutting
101	property as well. Ms. Martel questioned Stormwater area B points to pavement?
101	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Mr. Petropulos explained the underground system will capture the runoff. The
103	slope works front to back. Stores in underground piping system and exits at
104	slower rate, filters out sediments in the subsurface system.
105	Ms. Martel stated there are 2:1 slopes over majority of site, would like to see a
106	more bioengineered approach. Mr. Petropulos indicated it was something they
107	could look into, generating some rock and more vegetation. Ms. English added
108	more natural features.
100	more natural reatures.
109	Ms. English asked about storage of chemicals, with concerns about nearby
110	wetlands and rain seepage. Mr. Petropulos responded the transformers are new
111	and contain oil and are only a hazard if hit. The area is well contained. The
112	drainage system is oversized in case it runs into a problem the water quality unit
113	separates hydrocarbon from water which is a good way to address any incident.
114	Poles are treated because they need to be preserved and small quantities of
115	hydrocarbons could come off but would run through quality unit with high
116	maintenance. Ms. English asked if the poles are covered. Mr. Petropulos
117	answered no, there are a lot of safety procedures, don't deliver wet poles, there
118	are many safety measures.
119	
120	Ms. English asked about the snow storage location(s). Mr. Petropulos stated
121	there is a fenced in area with a gate. DES wants snow in treatment practice
122	rather than slope.
123	rather than slope.
	Ms. English asked about tree cutting area limits. Mr. Petropules advised it was
124	Ms. English asked about tree cutting area limits. Mr. Petropulos advised it was
125	tight to diagram, only the area within the rectangle will be cleared.
126	Mar Provide a short should be to see 2. The second state of the se
127	Ms. English asked about the trees in parking area, it would be nice to create
128	some shade.
129	
130	Mr. Papakonstantis asked about stored equipment and odors. Mr. Petropulos
131	indicated there was nothing problematic.

Vice-Chair Brown asked about practices on site. Tom Murphy indicated 133 134 transformer's containment capacity will have countermeasure plan, stored undercover and tested. PCP acquires, used for test transfer processes, internal 135 136 procedures on spills. Have several consultants as well, visual inspection of pole, 137 PCP soluble with diesel but not water, will be separated in quality unit, dripping is 138 mostly diesel fuel, if drips spill pads absorb oil, is maintained regularly. 139 Mr. Murphy commented on recyclables such as conductors and the different 140 141 dumpsters used to recycle those. No fuel oil will be stored on site and there will be no refueling on site. In 10 years at Kensington never had a release from 142 transformers. 143 144 Ms. Bergeron asked if a three-day supply? Mr. Murphy indicated several size 145 transformers, 40 small units, 25-30 larger ones, largest units are not stored on 146 147 site. 148 149

Ms. English asked where recycling storage takes place? Mr. Murphy indicated the top left corner of the first shop.

Mr. Gray asked if oil dielectric needs to be in transformers in storage? Mr. Murphy indicated there is a risk of corrosion without, have experimented with other solutions, this works best as a dialectic. Mr. Gray asked if it was unlikely the unit gets hit? Mr. Murphy advised oil can also release through valve if it starts to heat up. Mr. Gray asked if there were ever any problems with vandalism? Mr. Murphy responded there were a few incidents concerning theft of metal, have cameras and barbed wire. Last time was in Concord in 2010 which wasn't as secure as it is now.

Ms. Martel asked about traffic volume. Mr. Murphy noted the proposed facility is not as large as Eversource, 8-10 trucks are possible and stored internally. Mr. Murphy added the facility can support 10-20 trucks in the emergency area as mentioned previously.

Vice-Chair Brown asked for feedback on waivers and CUP.

Mr. Gray stated he was okay with waivers as proposed, and fine with practical design of building, strong precedent for trees and soil survey, if neighbor approves of grading then no problems.

Vice-Chair Brown indicated the proposed use of Cape Cod berm on back.

Ms. Martel noted she would like to see how much canopy would be lost when the area is developed, opposes Cape Cod curb, seen so many fail with heavy trucks present. Concerned that would release stormwater and become an environmental nightmare. Everything else fine.

177 178

150

151

152

153

154 155

156 157

158

159

160

161 162

163

164 165

166 167

168

169 170

171 172

173 174

175

176

179 180		Ms. English stated she agreed with Ms. Martel on both waivers and is on the fence about the landscape islands.
181		
182		Mr. Papakonstantis stated he agreed with Mr. Gray but is concerned about
183		significant trees as well.
184		
185		Ms. Bergeron stated she had nothing else to add, wish didn't have to survey
186		entire site.
187		
188		Ms. Moreno-Baez stated she agreed with Ms. Martel, but the others were alright.
189		
190		Vice-Chair Brown agreed the tree waiver was granted too often, have no issue
191		with parking lot waiver, there is less impact without trees there, FW Webb
192		supports grading encroachment, take action on lot line?
193		
194		Mr. Sharples noted he would advise holding off because the road agreement, not
195		looking to make road private so may change, not sure would want adjustment
196		before sorting out that change and can cover at the next meeting.
197		
198		Vice-Chair Brown recommended scheduling a site walk.
199		
200		Mr. Petropulos proposed April 29, with plenty of time to complete plan and
201		comments will be taken under advisement.
202		
203		Ms. English asked if considered alternative energy sources for the facility
204		(indicating she did not expect a response just a suggestion).
205		
206		Mr. Sharples indicated significant tree waiver can be sorted out with the site walk.
207		New plans are needed by April 18 th .
208		
209		Vice-Chair Brown proposed April 11th at 5:30. Ms. Martel indicated she would like
210		to see an inventory along with count.
211		
212		Ms. Bergeron motioned to continue Case #18-16 and Case #18-20 until April
213		29th. Mr. Gray seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed
214		unanimously.
215		
216	3.	The application of VWI Towers LLC for a site plan review for the proposed
217		construction of a wireless communications facility and associated improvements
218		on a 31.48-acre parcel located on Kingston Road (Town of Exeter landfill
219		property)
220		R-1, Low Density Residential zoning district
221		Tax Map Parcel #100-004
222		Case #19-02
223		
224		Ms. Bergeron motioned to accept Case #19-02. Mr. Papakonstantis
225		seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sharples noted the application is for minor site plan approval on 31.5-acre parcel located on Kingston Road for the proposed construction of a telecommunications facility in the R-1 District. The applicant appeared before the ZBA for two special exceptions for height and use and before the TRC (UEI not requested to review) with not much site work to be done. The applicant has not requested any waivers. Conditions have been drafted.

Attorney Brian Grossman presented the proposed structure would be 150' feet with six feet of lightning rod servicing four commercial providers. The structure would comply with building code and be housed by 4500 SF compound surrounded by fence and barbed wire with the electric conduit inside compound. There would be a turnaround for 1-2 vehicle trips monthly. There is 117 feet to the nearest property, utilities come from street utilizing existing access. No additions proposed to landscaping, well shielded by existing vegetation and buildings. There is a petition signed in support of the facility, the plan is suitable for development, will not burden municipal services, is suitably screened, there is no impact to stormwater, a small addition to amount of impervious surface, no offensive lighting, odors, etc. and a great need for communication (wireless) in this area.

Mr. Sharples noted discussed putting utilities underground, otherwise would need waiver.

Vice-Chair Brown recommended adding a condition for that and asked for comments on the application.

Mr. Sharples noted people approached the Town with their issues in service, went to Select Board to talk about possible resolutions. The Town is supporting because this is located on Town property.

Mr. Gray asked about visuals to abutting properties, height and distance. Mr. Grossman advised with the river to the east, 105 feet to the south.

Vice-Chair Brown opened the hearing to the public for questions and comments at 8:54 PM.

Sheila Mullen of 4 Cross Road stated there is some confusion about the abutters notice and opined authorizations were made prior to notice and requests that permitting be delayed until concerns are addressed and request made in writing. Ms. Mullin stated she is opposed to the structure which is basically a 15-story building and not aesthetically pleasing and will lower property values and is unsure how it benefits the Town or any of us. Want to know what other options were explored by the Town. No cell service issue with my home and think there may be a better alternative with a small option used for 5G tech. Ms. Mullin stated she is also concerned about safety, radiation, cancer risk, earthquake

factors, environmental impacts, impact on wildlife, birds, bats and other safety concerns and stated she did not think the use is appropriate.

John Gezer of Cross Road stated there are many studies questioning the health effects. 156' is not unobtrusive in his opinion and it does affect those that live here.

Travis Grieb of 1 Farmington Road stated he agreed with health concerns, the total height is dramatic, and build for future of 5G.

Marie Carr of Cross Road stated the existence of a tower causes long lasting negative environmental impacts, the tower's use could become obsolete and there is no problem with cell service at her house.

Rick Carr of 4 Cross Road stated he has cancer and doesn't want to add to those risks. Who will be liable if those issues pop up? Too many known as well as unknown impacts. Don't feel these issues were addressed at the Zoning Board. Don't want this approved without addressing those first.

Ms. Mullen asked who pays to inspect and how often? The owner can add height to the top without prior authorization. How will it be maintained and how long will the lease be for? What is the potential income? Who would be responsible to deconstruct when it becomes obsolete? How far digging? Would like proof that alternatives were explored. Have a petition against the tower as well.

Attorney Grossman stated in response, it complies with frequency exposure to the extent that can be required. The health concern is less than that of a baby monitor according to health experts. There are no guy wires and lights usually that's a problem with bird and bat strikes. Migratory bird path is already a regulation for communication and building 5G tower for current technology. Other options will not provide strong enough signal given geography. NH building code and other standards require it to comply for earthquakes and wind speeds. There are no wetlands on site. It is powered by standard electricity; structural analyses are run. There will be no additions made without prior authorization. Towers are designed not to fail and deal with stressors by deflection and bending and strength of base, must meet FCC requirements no matter how many carriers. Varsity wireless owns tower, each carrier manages own equipment. Unauthorized use triggers alarm. Lease with Town not sure of payment. A removal bond has been proposed by Mr. Sharples as a condition of removal necessary. Would do Geotech before digging.

Mr. Carr asked how could there be no lights on it considering aviation traffic requirements? Why wasn't the other tower built taller to begin with?

John Gezer stated standards cover a 220-pound man, proximity to tower affects health hazards according to studies.

3	1	9
3	2	0
3	2	1
3	2	2
3	2	3
3	2	4
3	2	5
		6
3	2	7
		8
3	2	9
		0
3	3	1
	3	
3	3	3
3	3	4
3	3	5
3	3	6
3	3	/
3	3	8
3		9
3	4	0
		1
3	4	2
	4	
3	4	4
	4	
		_
3	4	6
3		
3	4	\sim
		ŏ
	1	
		9
3	5	9 0
3	5	9 0
3	5 5	9 0 1
3 3 3	5 5 5	9 0 1 2
3 3 3	5 5 5	9 0 1 2
3 3 3	5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3
3 3 3	5 5 5	9 0 1 2
3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 4
3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3 4 5
3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3 4 5
3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5	901234567
3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5	9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	90123456789
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6	901234567890
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6	901234567890
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6	9012345678901
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6	90123456789012

365

Joe O'Donnell, Walnut Street asked what the life expectancy of the tower would be and whether it would be bonded. Mr. Sharples indicated it would be.

Attorney Grossman advised the threshold for lighting is typically 200 feet, a condition for lighted ground that it doesn't disturb abutting property. Maintenance would be during the day; the lease may be 20-25 years. The new tower is not replacing the old tower, no one tower height could fully address shortage.

Mr. Gray asked about site walk. Ms. English agreed as well as Vice-Chair Brown who added especially with confusion of notice. Mr. Sharples will recheck the direct abutters who were notified.

Vice-Chair Brown scheduled the site walk for May 1st at 6 PM.

Ms. Bergeron motioned to continue Case #19-02 to May 9, 2019 with a site walk to take place on May 1, 2019. Mr. Papakonstantis seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

4. The application of EMMA Properties, LLC for a minor site plan review for the proposed addition of eleven (11) parking spaces and reconfiguration of existing parking striping on the property located at 18 Hampton Road NP-Neighborhood Professional zoning district Tax Map Parcel #86-4 Case #19-03

Ms. Bergeron motioned to accept Case #19-03. Mr. Gray seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sharples indicated the applicant is seeking minor site plan approval for the proposed addition of 11 parking spaces and reconfiguration of existing parking striping on the property located at 18 Hampton Road. There has been no TRC review or UEI review of the application. The applicant has not requested any waivers; however, it appears they will need a waiver regarding the drive aisle width. The drive isle width between the 5-parking stall row is 16' feet wide where Section 9.13.6 requires a 22' foot wide aisle for 90-degree stalls.

Cindy Henderson and Ron Henderson appeared on behalf of EMMA Properties, LLC and presented the application was a result of realizing the parking deficiency exists and need to expand the parking stalls plus 1200' impervious surface. Everything goes down to detention pond which provides infiltration.

Vice-Chair Brown asked if there were any other comments? Mr. Sharples noted most have been addressed and wanted to know parking calculations as well.

Mr. Smith noted todays calculations are 68-71 spaces are needed and they currently have 52. To get to 63 would need closer to today's standards.

366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
403 /110

Vice-Chair Brown opened the hearing to the public for questions and comments at 10:09 PM.

Randy Chouinard asked about removing the sidewalk?

Mr. Smith advised the lawn area.

Mr. Chouinard stated he had no issues with this, have come to Board a lot about parking, overparked at the other property (16 Hampton). Parking downtown constantly becomes a problem.

Vice-Chair Brown closed the hearing to the public for deliberations at 10:09 PM.

Vice-Chair Brown asked how came up with 11 spaces? Mr. Smith indicated it was the number he could come up with while maintaining setbacks which if those were maxed out would require a variance with Zoning.

Ms. Martel stated she echoed Mr. Sharples' concerns.

Ms. English asked about lighting? Mr. Smith advised existing lighting should cover it. Mr. Chouinard added there are a few businesses open late hours.

Ms. Bergeron motioned to accept the waiver for Case #19-03 for driveway aisle width. Mr. Papakonstantis seconded the motion, with all in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bergeron motioned that the request of EMMA Properties, LLC, Planning Board Case #19-03 for Minor Site Plan approval be approved with the following conditions:

- A dwg file of the plan shall be provided to the Town Planner showing all property lines and monumentation prior to signing the final plans. The plan must be in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 feet coordinates;
- 2. Third-party construction inspections fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting;
- 3. A maintenance log and inspection and maintenance checklist for all onsite stormwater management systems shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Town Planner prior to signing the final plans. A completed log and checklist shall be submitted to the Town Engineer annually on or before January 31st. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval;
- 4. If determined applicable by the Exeter Department of Public Works, the applicant shall submit the land use and stormwater management information about the project using the PTAPP Online Municipal

412 413			king Tool (<u>https://pta</u> pted by DEP prior to		PTAPP submittal must be ion meeting.			
414					-			
415		<u>-</u>		ed the motion, with	all in favor, the motion			
416 417		passed t	unanimously.					
417 418	4.	OTHER BUSIN	<u>IESS</u>					
419		APPROVAL O	F MINUTES					
420		March 14, 2019	9					
421			-		minutes, as amended. Mr.			
422		•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	Ms. Moreno-Baez, and Ms.			
423 424		Wartei abstainii	ng, approved 4-0, so	movea.				
424 425		Site Walk March	n 7 2019					
426		One Wark marci	17, 2013					
427		Ms. English mo	tioned to accept the	March 7, 2019 Site	e Walk minutes, as amended.			
428		Ms. Martel seco	onded the motion, w	ith Mr. Papakonsta	ntis, Mr. Gray, Ms. Bergeron,			
429		Ms. Moreno-Ba	ez abstaining, and n	one opposed, app	roved 3-0, so moved.			
430				_				
431		MASTER PLAN	DISCUSSION - Tabl	ed				
432 433	5.	TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS						
434		Field Modification	ns					
435	6.	CHAIRMAN'S	NOTES					
436		Vice-Chair Brown	n asked if the membe	ers each received a d	copy of Riggins Rules that was			
437		sent out. Mr. Sh	arples noted it was re	eferenced and new n	nembers should receive a copy			
438		of those and will	send to everyone.					
439		Next Meeting:	April 11, 2019	Site Walk:	April 11, 2019			
440					20 Continental Drive			
441			April 25, 2019		May 1, 2019			
442					Kingston Road			
443	7.	ADJOURNMEN	TV					
444 445		Ms. Bergeron motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:24 pm. Ms. Martel seconded the motion, with all in favor, so moved.						
446	•	ctfully submitted,						
447		Hoijer						
448	Recor	ding Secretary						