

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, NH

Minutes of November 13, 2017

Members Present: Alan Zeller, Joe Hanlon, Bob Holt, Jerry Galus, and Rich Clark and Ed Juengst

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

Vice Chairman Joe Hanlon (Mr. Hanlon) 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 October 9, 2017 with typographical corrections with all in favor.

Mr. Hanlon then read the first case:

Boundary Line Adjustment between two contiguous parcels owned by All Saints Church - 44 Concord Street, Parcel No. U017-151-001 and 46 Concord Street, Parcel No. U016-027-000. The effect of this boundary line adjustment is to modify the parcel sizes related to a subdivision and lot merger conditionally approved by the Planning Board on February 22, 2017. The size of U017-151-001 will increase from 5,114, square feet to 5,921 square feet. As permitted in Planning Board regulations Section 237-9 Public Hearings, the applicant has requested a waiver of the public hearing requirement for this boundary line adjustment.

John Caitlin introduced himself as the representative for the church as well as the architect for the plan. "We are really here at the request of the buyer" he said noting a boundary line adjustment would add an additional 17 feet behind her building. He noted a request for a waiver of the requirement for a public hearing for a Boundary Line Adjustment.

A motion was made/seconded (Holt/Galus) to waive the public hearing in accordance with the provisions of Peterborough Subdivision Regulations 237-9, and RSA 676:4 and grant a waiver of this requirement with all in favor.

With no questions from the Board Mr. Hanlon asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak, where again, there were no questions.

A motion was made/seconded (Holt/Clark) to approve a boundary line adjustment between two contiguous parcels owned by All Saints Church (44 and 46 Concord Street) and to reflect the merging of Parcel No. U017-151-000 into Parcel No. U016-027-000, as show on plat entitled “Subdivision and Merger Plan” prepared by Cardinal Surveying and Land Planning, at a scale of 1” = 20”, dated December 16, 2016 and revised October 27, 2017 with all in favor.

Mr. Hanlon read the second case:

Site Plan Review for RiverMead Retirement Community - Mead Campus Expansion, 150 RiverMead Road, Parcel No. E004-003-000. Proposed construction of two 12-unit independent living apartment buildings; seven proposed building expansions; addition of six new or expanded parking lots; addition of a sidewalk along the main access road; and expansion of storm water management/infiltration systems to accommodate new impervious surfaces. Waivers have been requested to forgo the submission requirements of a lighting/photometric plan, and to allow the use of partial land tomography and lot boundary from a reference plan. A waiver may also be requested pertaining to Section 237-19 D of the Planning Board Regulations restricting cut and fill slopes to not greater than a 3:1 slope.

Jeff Kevan introduced himself as the Project Engineer from TF Moran, Inc. He pointed out landmarks on a projected image of the Rivermead Campus and several additions proposed to the Mead Campus (including expansion of the health club, and wellness center with drop-off parking, small additions associated with building entrances, a memory garden, outside terrace and seating areas, additional campus parking and a sidewalk along the perimeter of the campus). Two large orange squares represented the proposed addition placeholders (Phase 2) for two three-story (12-unit) independent living buildings with parking underneath.

Mr. Kevan reviewed the drainage plan pointing out an old gravel road and where an old town well was located. “It is not owned by the town anymore” he said adding “it is used for storage.” He told the members he had secured a Variance from the ZBA for the wetland setback encroachment of the hybrid, three-story residential buildings, pointing out the vast amount of undeveloped land around them and reminding the members both the hybrids and the sidewalk were phased projects. “I want to make sure you understand that” he said. Mentioning their Master Plan for both campuses he told the members “we want to be up front about our maximum development.”

Mr. Holt asked about a time limit for the phases and a brief discussion about substantial completion followed. “We’d have to take another look in a couple of years” concluded Mr. Kevan as the discussion turned to traffic impacts, steep slopes and erosion control. Mr. Throop noted Planning Board’s Storm Water and

Erosion Control Consultant must review the plans (erosion control maps, outlets, catchment basins) prior to signature of the plan. He also noted a lighting plan (including fixture cut sheets and a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with the zoning ordinance) must be received and reviewed to demonstrate compliance with the zoning ordinance. Mr. Kevan had distributed lighting fixture cut sheets but Mr. Throop noted a photometric plan would also be necessary.

As they began to discuss the waiver requests the members agreed to accept the application as substantially complete. They also agreed to grant the waiver to allow the use of partial land topography and lot boundary from a reference plan. The members denied the waiver to forgo the requirement for a lighting plan for the expansion project as a plan is necessary to demonstrate compliance with Section 245-33 D of the zoning ordinance. "We will deny the waiver and make it a condition of approval" said Mr. Hanlon.

Discussion about the sidewalk followed with Mr. Kevan noting the sidewalk was a future potential amenity they may add. "It is not planned for the initial phase" adding "and we are not tied to it but again we want to show our maximum development." Mr. Throop asked "is it in concert with the other two buildings?" Mr. Kevan replied "I am not sure." A brief discussion about approving a plan with a feature that may be taken off the members agree to have it removed. Mr. Throop noted "when you are ready to address it we will look at it administratively and decide how to respond." Several of the members did recall many residents at the preliminary review had advocated for the sidewalk. Mr. Kevan pointed out a grassy panel to walk along and noted neither the golf carts or vehicles go very fast on the road. "There is no real danger to pedestrians" he said. Mr. Galus interjected "some residents were quite vocal about it (the sidewalk)." Rivermead CEO Bill James told the members there have been many different opinions on the sidewalk at meetings held on campus. "There is a split opinion on them, we are not fully vetted on the project" he said.

A motion was made/seconded (Holt/Clark) to grant the requested waiver to allow the partial land topography and lot boundary from a referenced plan; to deny the requested waiver of submission of a lighting plan. The reason for the denial is that the information provided on the Light Plan is necessary to demonstrate compliance with Section 245-33 D of the zoning ordinance and accepted the application as substantially complete for public hearing provided the applicant submit a light plan demonstrating compliance with the zoning ordinance prior to signature of the plan, and provide any other information identified by the Board during the public hearing as reasonably necessary to enable them to render a decision with all in favor.

A motion was made/seconded (Holt/Galus) to approve the Site Plan request for expansions on the RiverMead (Mead) Campus as shown on plan entitled The

Peterborough Retirement Community at RiverMead, Mead Campus Expansion, located at Powers Bridge Road, Peterborough, NH Parcel No. R004-003-000. Prepared by TF Moran Civil Engineers at a scale of 1" = 40", dated January 30, 2017 and revised November 2, 2017 subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide revised plans showing modification as directed by the Planning Board during site plan review, the Office of Community Development, the Board's Drainage Consultant and the Public Works Director including but not limited to minor changes to utility designs, drainage designs, grading detail, storm water management design, erosion control design, landscaping design and light and construction detail. Such revised plans shall include removal of the perimeter sidewalk from the plan until such time as it is intended to be construction
2. Prior to signature of the plan, the drainage report shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board's Storm Water and Erosion Control Consultant, with said review to be at the applicant's expense.
3. Prior to signature of the plan, the applicant shall provide a lighting plan, including fixture cut sheets and a photometric plan, demonstrating compliance with the Zoning ordinance.
4. Before breaking ground, throughout the construction process, and until all disturbed soils have been stabilized, regular inspections will be conducted by the Planning Board's Storm Water and Erosion Control Consultant at the expense of the applicant as directed by the Office of Community Development Staff.
5. Copies of all State and Federal permits shall be provided for the file.

Mr. Throop suggested the members request a modified plan that removes the sidewalk and a plan showing where (physically) the light fixtures were going. Mr. Kevan interjected that he would just create a photometric lighting plan.

The members agreed with all in favor;

Other Business:

CIP Request:

Mr. Throop noted a request of the CIP Committee regarding any known public sentiment about underground utilities in the Downtown. "I have none" replied Mr. Galus. Mr. Clarke replied "I have sentiment on it." Mr. Throop noted he did not care to debate on whether it was a good or bad idea, "just what you may have heard from the public." Mr. Hanlon concluded "I don't think so" and Mr. Holt suggested reviewed the public input surveys from the Vision Forum in 2015.

Planning Board Workshop:

Mr. Throop reminded the members of the last Planning Board Subcommittee's Workshop on November 27th at 6:30p.m., All Saint's Church (Reynolds Hall) and encouraged them to attend. He also told the members he had been working on an alternative amendment to TNOZ I and TNOZ II in an effort to bring them together.

Next Meeting:

December 11, 2017

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant