

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, NH

Minutes of June 19, 2017

Members Present: Chair Ivy Vann, Ed Juengst, Alan Zeller, Joe Hanlon, Jerry Galus, and Rich Clark

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development

Chair Vann called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and introduced the members and staff.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Zeller/Galus) to approve the Minutes of June 12, 2017 with all in favor.

Before she read the request for Site Plan Review approval, Chair Vann explained the applicant will present followed by questions from the Board. She noted she would then open the Public Hearing to the audience for questions, comments or concerns. She asked those wishing to speak to please identify themselves for the record. "Please address any questions to me and know the Board is acting in good faith, as always" she said.

Site Plan Review for RiverMead Villages Campus Expansion, 50 Timberpond Drive, Parcel No. R002-044-000: Proposed elimination of an existing driveway; construction of two duplex cottages and two 12-unit independent living apartment buildings; relocation of a maintenance facility with new driveway and curb cut on Old Sharon Road; three small additions to existing main building, and two new parking lots.

A motion was made/seconded (Galus/Hanon) to accept the application as substantially complete with all in favor.

Jeff Kevan stood and introduced himself as the Project Engineer from TF Moran, Inc. He introduced Rivermead CEO Bill James "before I begin Bill would like to say a few words" he said.

Mr. James stood and addressed the Board. "It is a pleasure to be here, I would like to give you a brief overview of the thinking and approach that brought us here tonight." Mr. James noted 20 great years as a strong, good organization, neighbor and employer. "We have a great place to live, it is important to be progressive, it is important to think about improvements for our residents as well as the wishes and desires of future residents." Mr. James went on to say "with that in mind we have completed our Master Plan which we began in 2014. "We have had 100+ meetings with the stakeholders, Residents, Board of Directors, Staff and wait list members. Taking feedback and input from all on social programming, dining, overall living space improvements, improved interior space, gardens and courtyards and how to best accommodate couples." He concluded by noting "we have worked hard to create a strong and creative plan to meet our needs. I hope you see our vision."

Mr. Kevan began by reviewing the core improvements as shown on a projected graphic. He pointed out to the members and audience the existing structures and conditions as well as what was being proposed for the Villages Campus. This included adding 2-unit attached cottages each with attached one-car garages, and two 12-unit buildings (three floors with four units per floor) with underground parking for one vehicle per unit. An 11-space parking lot north of the main building will be replaced with an 18-space parking lot in front of the 12-unit buildings. The project will also include three small additions to the main building increasing the square footage by 1,186 square feet. "This all equates to a total of 28 new independent living residential units" he said.

Mr. Kevan told the members and audience the water and sewer were municipal with both electric and propane gas onsite. He noted there were 206 parking spaces including the driveway areas and a traffic study had been completed. "The original count was four new trips during the AM Peak, four in the PM and six midday Saturday. This brings the total to twelve in the AM Peak, fourteen in the PM and nineteen midday Saturday, "so we are not pressing up against any threshold" he said.

Mr. Kevan went on to review the cut and fill plan, storm management (rain gardens, infiltration basins and leach catch basins) as well as the fact the proposed site was within the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone, the Shoreland Conservation Overlay Zone and the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone. "All the work will be done outside the mandated buffers" he said adding "and the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone's maximum impervious surface is 20% and we are at 18.1%" He went on to say that to accommodate the siting of the two cottage buildings, a portion of the existing access drive that runs west of the main entrance driveway will be eliminated. The 12-unit buildings will be northeast of the existing main building and an existing maintenance building and driveway will be relocated to accommodate this part of the expansion. The new location of the maintenance building will be accessed with a new access driveway that will connect from Old Sharon Road to an existing cul-de-sac behind the main building. This new access road will become the primary driveway for deliveries and will require a new curb cut on Old Sharon Road.

Referring to the cut and fill Mr. Clark asked about how much material would leave the site. Mr. Kevan noted he did not have that number. Chair Vann encouraged a sidewalk with a raised crosswalk. Mr. James told the members it was his inclination to have a sidewalk "it encourages people to walk" but he questioned privacy issues given the proximity of the road to residences. Chair Vann noted "residents walk the road now right?" with Mr. James replying "yes."

Mr. Kevan continued by projecting exterior elevations of the cottages (walk out basements, no bulkheads) with Chair Vann interjecting "this is merely an observation but that is a lot of asphalt."

As the elevations for the 12-unit buildings were projected the members briefly discussed screening. Mr. Throop added there had been a joint review of the plan with himself and the Director of Public Works and the Police and Fire Chiefs. "There were a number of minor things related to water and sewer to be added" he said.

With no additional questions from the Board Chair Vann opened the hearing to the public. Rivermead resident Peter Rotch introduced himself. "I live in the Village" he said adding "let's get back to the path (sidewalk)." He went on to note the road currently existed "so it is feasible."

Mr. Rotch made an argument for those unable to navigate uneven terrain or were dependent on walkers or wheelchairs. "I think the good engineers can figure out a way to get a path in there" he said. There was also a mention that the cross walk, if it is created, should be striped. Mr. Rotch concluded "it gives the walkers a good idea of where they *ought to be* and the drivers of *where they may be*."

When asked about the slope of the new access road Mr. Kevan replied "3:1, maybe 2.5:1" adding "it matches the slope that is there now" to which a member of the audience interjected "which is pretty ugly and pretty steep. It has mesh on it now and is not very well landscaped." Mr. Hanlon asked if they had considered a retaining wall. Mr. Kevan replied "no, and it is not just economics but also the significant vertical drop-off that it creates. It is much safer with a graded slope."

Randy Prudy introduced himself as a resident in favor of the sidewalk. "I am 20 feet from where it would be and it would not bother me at all. A lot of people walk the loop, I support it, I hope you do it."

Mr. Zeller interjected "from a Planning Board standpoint we can encourage them but we cannot mandate them, can we?" Mr. Throop replied, "if it is a matter of pedestrian traffic on site" with Chair Vann in chorus "it is a matter of pedestrian traffic on site. People will continue to walk it, they need a sidewalk." From the audience Mr. Rotch exclaimed "you said it!"

Resident Betsy Harris introduced herself and said she agreed. "A sidewalk is a good thing, I walk at least once a day, sometimes two or three times a day. It would be a very good thing," Chair Vann replied, "we are inclined to make pedestrian access easier, not more difficult."

Mr. Clark asked, "how much fill and where is it going?" adding "I see a mountain and a lot of truck traffic that's all." Mr. Kevan's reply was "it is a small project and it won't take long." Mr. Clark asked "do you have an estimate of how much you will be cutting? Are you going to be using the bridge to Grove Street?" Mr. Kevan replied "I am not sure how we may work that out." Mr. Hanlon asked, "shouldn't this be a condition of approval at some point?" All were in agreement that the Grove Street Extension Bridge was old and needed to be replaced. Mr. Throop said he believed the original analysis listed the bridge as E2 for weight consideration "so you will have to show a truck route on the plan that has been approved by the Department of Public Works." From the audience Mr. Rotch interjected "we call it the death bridge."

"OK" said Chair Vann "are we ready to make a motion?"

Mr. Zeller asked about the Board's authority to require screening for buildings. Chair Vann replied, "we do and we have in rural settings." Mr. Throop added "and in the Retirement Community District there is screening from public rights of way." Mr. Galus asked what the consensus was for the crosswalk with Chair Vann noting it was necessary.

A motion was made/seconded (Hanlon/Galus) to approve the site plan request for expansion of the RiverMead Villages Campus located at 50 Timberpond Drive, Parcel No. R002-044-000 as shown on the plan entitled "The RiverMead Retirement Community at RiverMead – Village Campus Expansion", Powersbridge Road, Peterborough, NH. Owned by/prepared for the Peterborough Retirement Community, plan prepared by TF Moran Civil Engineers at a scale of 1" = 50', dated January 30, 2017, subject to the following conditions prior to signing of the plan:

1. The applicant shall provide revised plans showing modifications as directed by the Planning Board during site plan review, the Office of Community Development Department, the Board's Drainage Consultant and the Public Works Director including but not limited to minor changes to utility designs, drainage designs, grading detail, stormwater management design, erosion control design, landscaping design and construction detail, including a sidewalk where the existing road is to be removed, and screening at the entrance from Powersbridge Road.
2. Copies of all required state or federal permits shall be provided for the file.
3. The applicant shall obtain a driveway permit from the Town for the new curb cut on Old Sharon Road
4. Agreement outlining inspection procedures and responsibilities as approved by the Office of Community Development and the Public Works Director and receipt of payment for any required inspection fees.
5. Provision of a Truck Route approved by the Department of Public Works

With all in favor.

Chair Vann then read the second RiverMead Retirement Community request:

Preliminary Consultation – Design Review for RiverMead Mead Campus Expansion, 150 RiverMead Road: Proposed construction of two 12-unit independent living apartment buildings; four building additions; addition of two new parking lots; and addition of a sidewalk along the main access road.

When finished she looked up and said, “this is a design review so there will be no decision tonight” adding “it is where the applicant can tell us what they want to do and we can tell them what we think.”

Mr. Kevan began with a projected image of the Mead Campus, pointing out the roads (Powersbridge and Morison) noting the lighter grays were existing pavement with the darker grays being additional pavement. He told the members the campus consisted of 26 cottage-style buildings, the main building with 87 independent living apartments and 79 assisted living, memory care and nursing units. He noted the carports and surface parking areas (“the cottages have garages” he said) and that while the campus seemed like it has a fairly solid buffer around it “it is on almost 56 acres.” Chair Vann agreed noting “it looks dense but it is a much bigger parcel.”

Mr. Kevan explained the complex was built in the late 1990s and it was time for renovation and improvement of the core facilities (Health Center, Wellness Center, Common Space and Dining Facilities). He spoke briefly about their Master Plan, drainage (using the current drainage system), two substantial additions (two hybrid buildings to be built after approval, tied into town water and sewer) and the addition of a sidewalk.

Chair Vann asked, “what is the impervious coverage on the lot?” Mr. Kevan replied “I do not have an exact number but it is less than 20%” Mr. Kevan continued by telling the Board “we will need an alteration of terrain permit and with one building (pointing to the upper right corner

encroaching the shoreland protection buffer) we will have to go to the ZBA.” Chair Vann asked “and then you will be back for Site Plan Review?” “Yes” replied Mr. Kevan adding “most likely the August meeting.” Mr. Galus asked about a reduction of pavement in the upper right corner area of the graphic and Chair Vann asked about standard ADA (5-foot striped area) versus Van ADA (8-foot striped area). She told Mr. Kevan “I only ask because you have a total of 354 spaces. The Legislature is looking at changes in the statute where if you have more than 150 parking spaces you would have to create a specific number of van parking spaces.” Mr. Kevan noted the current plan was to have one van parking space in front of each primary entrance.

With no other questions from the Board Chair Vann opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. Rotch stood and advocated for the sidewalk. “We want to keep people out of the road” he said. He also said the focus should be on the major repairs of the Wellness and Health Centers with the two new residential villas placed on the back burner and that the board consider the timing of the sidewalk. “It gets approved, they say *we’ll get on it* and it never gets done” he said. “So as soon as possible” interjected Chair Vann adding “I see it as high on the list, they are an important part of living in a facility like this.” Mr. Throop suggested a formal phasing plan “of what is being done and when.”

Referring to the core items he’d mentioned Mr. Kevan noted “we’ll get these things done and then the sidewalk, Is that satisfactory?” Chair Vann replied “I think so yes, but sooner than later.”

Rivermead Village resident Shirley White introduced herself and pointing at Mr. Clark acknowledged the concerns he had expressed about the Grove Street Extension bridge mirrored hers. “It really hit me” she said adding “I worry about the general traffic and had not thought about the trucks.” She then asked “who is responsible for the maintenance of the bridge” Who takes care of it? I request something be done. That bridge is too narrow to have a car and truck on it at the same time. It is not in good shape” She concluded by looking at Mr. Clark and saying “*hooray* for bringing that up.”

Chair Vann explained that while the town was responsible for the bridge “bridge work is a complicated and expensive business.” Mr. Rotch advised that if one is headed south toward the bridge with a gravel truck coming north “pull over, don’t challenge it.” Chair Vann concluded “well that is out of our scope tonight.”

Next Meeting:

July 10, 2017

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant