

## PLANNING BOARD

## TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire

Minutes of October 13, 2014

DRAFT

**Members Present:** Barbara Miller, Rich Clark, Ivy Vann, Tom Weeks, Jerry Galus, Audrey Cass and Alan Zeller

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

Chair Vann called the hearing to order at 6:30 p.m. noting “this is the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting for October” and introduced the staff and members.

**Minutes:**

Continued to October 20, 2014

**Public Hearing submitted by the Temple Mountain Buddhist Meditation Center:**

Char Vann read the application requesting Site Plan Review and a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed expansion of a religious institution on property located at 729 Wilton Road, located in the Rural District.

Mr. Weeks interjected noting “we need a motion first so I will make a motion to accept the application as substantially complete so we can move forward.” **The motion was seconded by Mr. Zeller with all in favor.**

Dawn Tuomala from Monadnock Survey introduced herself as the project presenter. She also introduced Len Pagano as the project architect and Tom Quinn, Attorney for the Buddhist Temple. Ms. Tuomala noted she would proceed by reviewing each sheet.

**Sheet 1: Existing Conditions**

Ms. Tuomala reiterated the Buddhist Temple had been before the Board for Minor Site Plan Review a few years ago “and now this is their plan for expansion.” She went on to say “we have been to the Conservation Commission as well as the ZBA for a Special Exception for the religious use and a Variance for the appurtenant grading and storm within the 50-foot Wetland Protection Overlay Zone on the

property.” She reviewed the conditions attached to the Special Exception included substantial compliance to updated plans, driveway widening and reconfiguration to be a perpendicular to the highway, overnight retreats be limited to four one-week long retreats, no overflow parking on the driveway or highway and Fire Department approval.

### Sheet 2: Proposed Conditions Plan and Sheet 3: Site Plan

Ms. Tuomala told the members “this has changed from your original plan set” and reviewed the general design of the project which included parking requirements, alternative parking, widening of the existing driveway to 16-foot width with 2-foot gravel shoulder on the western side. She told the members “all the vegetation of the existing gravel of the existing 2-foot shoulder on the *east* side would be removed and the area kept clear of all debris, future vegetation and snow.” She explained how the entrance would be widened to accommodate two cars passing each other and how the vehicles would be stacked, all conforming to all NH DOT requirements. She went on to say “there will be no parking on the highway or along the sides of the driveway.” She pointed out the locations of a dumpster on the site and the fire lanes.

Ms. Tuomala noted the present household for the monks was a three-bedroom home and could accommodate up to six residents. She noted the temple building with the covered walkway as well as the fire lane in the back of the building. As she pointed out a drainage ditch the members had already talked about at length she noted “the ConCom agrees that there is nothing special about it” adding “it doesn’t have a lot of function.” She went on to point out the edge of the approximate wetland noting natural seeps. She also pointed out non-disturb areas, areas of mediation and a 5-foot buffer for the aforementioned ditch “so we do not have to get a dredge and fill permit” she said.

Mr. Weeks asked for confirmation as to whether or not the overflow parking was shown on the plan approved by the ZBA. After a brief discussion Chair Vann noted “I can assure you it was” with Mr. Throop adding “it was in a different configuration.”

Ms. Tuomala then reviewed existing parking as well as the addition of additional and handicapped parking spaces, reiterated the driveway reconfiguration (to be a perpendicular to the highway as possible) and widening to 16 feet with 2-foot gravel shoulders. She identified a culvert at the entrance and told the members they were able to add two feet to each side and put in a guard rail without having to go to the DES. She told the members with all state requirements being met the applicant would move the existing sign back to within the easement of the edge of the

highway.

#### Sheets 4: SWPPP Plan and Conditional Use Permit and Sheet 5: Special Event Parking

Ms. Tuomala pointed out the 1350 square feet of impact noting “five trees will have to come down to accommodate the widening of the driveway” adding “200 square feet impact the wetland further down but we have tried to keep it as minimal as possible and mostly on the west side.”

Mr. Weeks asked why there were no silt fences for the wetlands. Ms. Tuomala pointed out the location of socks that were detailed on Sheet 7 and 8. Ms. Vann asked for clarification for clarification mediation close to the rain garden. Mr. Tuomala pointed out special event parking noting “the alternative parking on the plan is for special events, not weekly services.”

#### Sheet 6: Erosion Control Detail

Ms. Tuomala review the erosion control mix berms, maintenance and inspection, winter construction notes, as well as the construction sequence, reclamation notes and dust control and invasive species on this sheet.

#### Sheet 7: Landscaping and Lighting Plan

Ms. Tuomala told the members “the scheme we came up with has downcast lights at the doors but they will all be under the covered walkway anyway.” She went on to say “the lighting along the stone walkway and the parking area will be 3-foot bollard type and all the lights would be manually controlled with all lights out by 11:00 p.m. Mr. Weeks asked about the details of the lighting plan. Mr. Pagano noted the voltage would be relatively low “and maybe even LED.” Mr. Weeks suggested the maximum was 1650 lumens “or 150 watts or less” and suggested those details be put on the plan.

Ms. Tuomala then reviewed the evergreen and deciduous planting plans. Mr. Weeks noted that because the site has interior parking it would have to be landscaped. “The Board would have to grant a waiver or require it to be installed.” Mr. Pagano asked “so request a waiver?” Mr. Weeks asked “did you?” with Mr. Pagano noting “we can.” Chair Vann suggested the waiver for the internal parking and Ms. Tuomala explained grading plans natural landscaping that will screen the Temple and the adjacent property line. Both Mr. Weeks and Chair Vann reiterated that a cut sheet, not a full lighting plan was going to be necessary.

#### Sheet 8: General Details

Ms. Tuomala noted a drip line instead of a gutter would go around the roof. As this was the general detail sheet she reviewed not only the dripline infiltration system but the driveway infiltration trench, the dry well, the paving detail, the handicapped parking detail, the dumpster pad and enclosure detail and the guard rail detail.

#### Sheet 9: Driveway and Sight Distance Plan:

Ms. Tuomala began by noting the driveway plan was still at NH DOT and that “it is still in conversation” adding “but the opinion is they will give approval of the driveway.” She also noted she had requested a left turning traffic be put on the plan and installed prior to the driveway. She pointed out the location as just past Miller State Park adding “it is at the discretion of the DOT but I have asked for it.”

A brief discussion about alternative traffic calming measures that included police details, warning signs and safety cones followed. Mr. Throop briefly reviewed the statistics of an earlier traffic study “but it gives you a feel for the amount of traffic in the area.”

Mr. Weeks asked about the report from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Throop noted he would get the report the ConCom provided for the ZBA when considering a Variance for the Temple. “It is applicable and I will get it to you” he said. Mr. Weeks noted that the ZBA had struggled with the crossing of a Wetland Protection District adding “the question is is the crossing essential to the production of the land and is there productive use of the land now?” he added “and if there is does the Planning Board have the authority to grant the widening?” Chair Vann replied “it is the whole question of productive use” and a brief discussion of productive use of the land that included entitlement, authority and amplification followed. Mr. Weeks made it clear that he was simply saying “the voters of Peterborough are saying we can grant Conditional Use Permits provided there is productive use of the land” adding “so the question is does the Temple currently have it with their Center there.” “That is a valid point” replied Chair Vann. She went on to say “you have a use and if it does not constrain the amplification of that that use XXX. That is my opinion.”

Mr. Weeks noted if they did not have productive use of the land there was a potential need for a Variance. Mr. Throop interjected “I think you have some latitude on the interpretation” adding CONDITION of widening drive with Chair Vann replying “indeed” adding “we have the authorization to approve the Conditional Use Permit because the larger incursion is already approved and philosophically we do have the right to some enlargement to a use. When you put something on the land it is not necessarily the final product.”

Mr. Galus interjected he was not necessarily interested “this is a technicality with which I am not particularly concerned” he said. “Let’s move on” said Ms. Miller.

Mr. Pagano stood and briefly reviewed the Temple elevations starting with a rendering from the northeast. He pointed out the traditional temple design with the main feature of a wrap-around porch. “It is two stories” he said and pointed out that while the drawing was still somewhat schematic “the mezzanine level will provide restrooms, an office space and sleeping quarters for event attendees.” He went on to review the lower level of the plan pointing out the kitchen, dining room, two restrooms and the mechanical and (fire) sprinkler rooms. He briefly described the FPA 13 Sprinkler Fire Suppression system and the integrated cisterns that would be required.

Mr. Pagano reviewed the Type 5 construction and the 7700 square feet of overall roof area. He noted an average height of 25 to 30 feet (depending on the grade condition) and a peak of 35 to 40 feet. Mr. Zeller asked if the cistern would be charged with rain water with Mr. Pagano replying “that is an interesting idea, I had not thought about that.” Mr. Zeller also asked about maintenance and inspections of the cistern with Mr. Pagano replying a fire protection engineer would be involved and there would be an annual inspection of the system by the proper authorities.

With no further questions Chair Vann asked “what is the Board’s pleasure? Are we read to approve this tonight?”

Ms. Miller told the members she was ready to approve the updated plan with the contingency that the missing information be collected and approved. Mr. Zeller agreed “me too” he said. Mr. Throop cautioned the members having just received a new plan it was premature to approve it sight unseen (not reviewed). “I strongly suggest you do not approve this tonight” he said. Chair Vann reviewed the missing items from the new plan set included a letter from the Conservation Commission, a cut sheet for the lighting and storm water and erosion control plans. She added “my sense is to continue this to our next regularly scheduled meeting.”

Chair Vann noted she felt the Board was comfortable in waiving the screening for the interior parking lot. “I think we all agree inserting landscaping requires more paving” she said.

Mr. Weeks interjected that a copy of the exterior elevations should be included in the plan. “We have seen them” he said, “but they are not in the plan.”

**A motion was made/seconded (Zeller/Galus) to continue the public hearing to the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting in November with all in favor.**

Other Business:

Chair Vann recognized the gentlemen sitting in the audience as potential Planning Board alternates. A motion was made/seconded (Weeks/Zeller) to appoint Matt Waitkins as an Alternate to the Planning Board with all in favor.

Ms. Miller asked about the other two gentlemen with Chair Vann explaining Mr. Waitkins had attended several meeting “and has been waiting around.” Ms. Miller asked if there was a limit on the number of alternates the Board could have with Mr. Throop replying “five.”

Chair Vann then asked perspective alternate Joe Hanlon to tell the Board a little bit about himself. Mr. Hanlon replied he had met Selectman Barbara Miller at the Recycling Center recruiting citizens to join town boards and he began thinking about getting involved in the local government. He told the members he had a background in civil engineering and had been involved with planning boards in the past. “It seems like a good opportunity to get involved in the community” he said.

Chair Vann briefly explained the commitments involved with being a member including the scheduled two meetings a month (meeting and workshop) as well as additional meetings for involved cases, site visits and continuing education, both in-house and out. She also emphasized the importance of alternate attendance even if not assigned to a case.

Chair Vann then introduced Bob Boyd, the second perspective alternate. Like Mr. Hanlon, Mr. Boyd had met Ms. Miller at the Recycling Center and had asked him to consider serving on a town board. “I know very little about the Planning Board” he said adding “my background is in mechanical and electrical engineering.” Chair Vann replied “tonight was a bit nitty-gritty. In the larger scheme of things the Planning Board is charged with the maintenance, improvement and all those things involved with the physical fabric of the town.” She then asked “what is your vision for the physical fabric of the town?” Mr. Boyd replied “get more businesses in town.” Mr. Galus asked how long Mr. Boyd had been in the area with Mr. Boyd replying “6 to 7 years but I lived in Sharon for 14 years” adding he had assisted with the development of Sharon’s Master Plan.

Chair Vann asked “are you interested in learning more?” noting several conferences and reading materials they may take advantage of. “Do you have the time and interest?” she asked them. Mr. Body replied he would have to think about it and that if another potential position on another Board he was interested in came through, most likely he would not the time to devote to the Planning Board. Mr. Hanlon asked about training times with Mr. Throop noting several opportunities through the Office of Energy and Planning, New Hampshire Municipal Association, New

Hampshire Planning Association and the Local Government Center's Law Lecture Series. Chair van also noted internal trainings as well with one actually scheduled for November 17<sup>th</sup>.

Reports from Other Committees:

Mr. Throop gave a brief review of a Minor Site Plan Review application that had been approved for a professional office at 133 Grove Street. Ms. Miller asked Mr. Throop to define minor site plan and he explained the Minor Site Plan Committee was responsible for reviewing projects that entailed development or change of expansion of more than 2000 square feet (but) less the 50% of the existing developed area, a change in use of an existing mulit0family or non-residential use or plans that involve *only* parking, signs, lighting or landscaping.

Chair Vann reported the Master Plan Steering Committee was very close to completing their survey for the new Vision Chapter. "We have been working with Charlie French to develop the survey instrument" she said adding "and we are very close." A brief discussion about how to market the survey followed with suggestions that included banners, internet links, and newspaper advertisements. Chair Vann noted that a certainty was that a survey would be mailed to every residence in town.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m. with Mr. Throop reminding the members their next meeting was October 15, 2014 at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant