

LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2018 AT THE MOOSE HILL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members Present: Art Rugg, Chair; Mary Wing Soares, Vice Chair; Rick Brideau, Ex-Officio – Town Employee; Al Sypek, member; Giovanni Verani, Ex-Officio – Town Manager; Leitha Reilly, member; Scott Benson, Assistant Secretary; Peter Commerford (alternate member); Roger Fillio (alternate member); Ann Chiampa (alternate member) and Jim Butler, Town Council Ex-Officio (arrived at 7:05 p.m.)

Also Present: John R. Trottier, P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works and Engineering; Colleen Mailloux, Town Planner; Laura Gandia, Associate Planner and Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary

Chairman Rugg called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM, explained the exit and emergency procedures, and began with the Pledge of Allegiance. He appointed A. Chiampa to vote for C. Davies.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD WORK

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: N/A

B. REGIONAL IMPACT DETERMINATIONS: Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that she had one project for their consideration.

1. Application for design review of a subdivision plan to subdivide one residential lot into three, Four South Road, Map 3 Lot 25-2, Zoned AR-1, Burton Boone (Owner & Applicant)

Town Planner Mailloux recommended that the Board find that this project is not a development of regional impact as it does not meet the criteria set forth by the Southern New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission.

M. Soares made a motion to find this project is not of regional impact.

R. Brideau seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

C. DISCUSSIONS WITH TOWN STAFF: N/A

III. Old Business: N/A

IV. Continued Plans

A. Application for formal review of a site plan for the redevelopment of a retail site to replace an existing bank with a 3,200 SF bank, 5,100 SF urgent care facility, 4,000 SF retail space, and associated site improvements 42 Nashua Road and Garden Lane, Map 7 Lot 68-1, Zoned C-I, NH Six Realty Trust (Owner & Applicant) – continued from November 7, 2018

Chairman Rugg read the case into record noting that it was continued from November 7, 2018. J. Trottier informed the Board that are two outstanding checklist items of which the applicant has requested a waiver for acceptance purposes only. He said that if the Board grants this waiver, Staff supports accepting the application as complete. L Reilly recused herself from this case. Chairman Rugg appointed P. Commerford to vote for L. Reilly.

M. Soares made a motion to waive the outstanding checklist items for acceptance purposes only as outlined in the Staff recommendation memorandum dated December 12, 2018.

R. Brideau seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

M. Soares made a motion to accept the application as complete as outlined in the Staff recommendation memorandum dated December 12, 2018.

R. Brideau seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Chairman Rugg noted that the 65-day time clock had started.

Karl Dubay, from the Dubay Group, Inc., 84 Range Rd, Windham and Rob Woodland, traffic engineer from Tetra Tech, Five Industrial Way, Salem, NH 03079 addressed the Board. K. Dubay said he had just provided Town Planner Mailloux at around 5 p.m. a letter from Liberty Utilities. He reviewed the plan with the Board noting that the site is going to be redeveloped with a new Citizens Bank, along with a Convenient MD as well as a small retail building next to it. He pointed out that they have the same amount of impervious surface as the old site. He said that they met the parking criteria. He stated that they have the signed off concurrent easement letter from abutter.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to questions from the Board. J. Trottier referenced a 6-page design review comment memo that he summarized for the Board. He said that off-site improvements will be required and they just received documents this afternoon from the applicant's traffic engineer, which will have to be vetted by Staff and the third party consultant. Chairman Rugg stated that because of this information being received after the deadline date (November 21, 2018) for submission of the

plan for tonight's public hearing, the Board will not make a decision tonight and the plan will be continued. J. Trottier continued to review the design review comments noting that there is insufficient detail within the plan set as to what will need to be completed when it comes time to issue a certificate of occupancy, the plans do not illustrate if there will be sufficient parking if the existing bank will remain in operation and that the notes and details contradict each other. He explained that Staff does not recommend conditional approval and recommends the case be continued to January 9, 2019. A. Chiampa asked how the applicant plans to have people enter and exit the development. Robert Woodland, traffic engineer, addressed the Board. R. Woodland said there is currently a ten foot wide paved shoulder on Nashua Road (Route 102) to allow people to turn into the site. He noted that both existing and projected conditions do not meet the warrants for a right turn lane from New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). He stated that he met with the District last week and they have asked him to revise the plan to narrow the width of the access, so people will only be able to make a right turn out of the site. He also said that the improvement along the private road includes widening the roadway to provide a uniform fifteen foot travel way in each direction. He said they will physically prevent a left turn out of the site with the much improved island and the alignment of the improved private roadway. He stated that applying the trip generation would actually lead to a reduction in vehicle trips during the weekday morning, weekday evening and Saturday midday peak hour. He pointed out that they have closed the existing driveway closest to Route 102 and moved the driveway to align with the driveway across the private road. He said that initially they were hoping that the improvements to the private roadway would be done with Woodmont Commons, but now the applicant will provide the improvements. He said the proposed island modifications will be completely compatible with the future improvements with Woodmont Commons. He said that there were other issues with the driveway spacing in the design review comments, noting the northerly driveway spacing is 47 feet whereas the requirement would be 50 feet and the exit only driveway for the bank is 28 feet. He noted the TRB's Access Management Manual which allows for reduction in these distances for low speed and low volume roadways, which these are. He noted that they believe the driveway spacing is safe with the highest level of service and minimal delays. He stated that as proposed the site conditions will be substantially safer than the existing use on the current site. He concluded that he feels they have addressed all the traffic concerns at the site and feel strongly that the proposed development is substantially safer than the existing layout at the site. A. Chiampa asked if the entrance from Route 102 would be closed. R. Woodland stated that they have not been asked to close that and the painted island functionally allows cars to pull into there to wait to take a left hand turn. A. Chiampa said she is concerned about cars stacking up on Route 102 to turn into the site. M. Soares said she is not concerned about that. A. Chiampa asked about the exit out of the ATM lane. R. Woodland said the traffic coming out of the ATM lane is controlled by a stop sign and the proposed volume is very low. A. Chiampa asked how wide the aisle way is going through the development. K. Dubay stated that there are 22 feet aisles in the development, which is the standard. J. Trottier noted that it would be preferable to have 24 foot aisles in this site. K. Dubay said he would prefer to have 24 foot aisles and 6 foot sidewalks which would require a waiver, and he would work with Staff to make this happen. Town Planner Mailloux said that the Board could give their opinions to the applicant

tonight on a waiver request for reducing the sidewalk to 6 feet. K. Dubay informed the Board that the 6 foot section of sidewalk would be just for in front of the bank, as the rest would be standard. P. Commerford reviewed the concerns he has regarding the configuration of the driveways, stating he had asked for parking to be moved up and lose one of the exits out to increase safety. K. Dubay said they had thought about that idea as well, but since this has an urgent care facility in it, the Fire Department recommended there be two exits available with EMS vehicles possibly coming in and out. P. Commerford noted that he recommended 24 foot aisles. M. Soares said that she is thrilled that they are redeveloping the site, but she is not thrilled with the red color for the Convenient MD building. She said that on the computer screen there are different colors for each elevation and asked if the Board would be picking the colors. Kevin Correia, architect, addressed the Board stating that he did not know why the colors would be different as the color is the same throughout, and thought it might be the graphics on the computer screen. K. Correia said the color is a deep burgundy red that is on a non-reflective material. He said that the Heritage Committee also raised the question regarding the color, but they were shown samples and gave their approval. He said he would be happy to bring the Board samples next time as he did not have a sample with him this evening. He said it is a brand color. A. Rugg noted that the Heritage Committee was not unanimous in their voting for the color and they make a recommendation to the Planning Board and the Planning Board will make the ultimate decision. J. Butler said he did not feel comfortable not having a dedicated spot for an ambulance to pull up to here, he was in favor of 24 foot wide aisles and also thinks the color is vibrant for that corner. A. Sypek echoed J. Butler's request for a parking spot dedicated for an ambulance. S. Benson said he also recommended the 24 foot aisles. K. Dubay said he would revisit the ambulance spot with the Fire Department, but a lot of times it depends on the jurisdictional authority. A. Rugg asked what type of courier services they would have for lab pick up. Dave Sanderson, from Convenient MD, addressed the Board and said that FedEx or UPS may come in every other day for that.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the public.

Martin Srugis, 17 Wimbledon Lane, addressed the Board and stated he was also the Chair of the Heritage Committee. M. Srugis said that he was puzzled by the color questions, as Bluebird Storage was just asked to turn the color of their sign red, when it was blue/gray first. He did not understand what he believed to be differences all over town. Chairman Rugg said that this Board likes to see continuity and the Board would like to see the sample color before making a decision. K. Correia said that he actually did have a sample in his car and passed it around to the Board. A. Chiampa said that color is not red but instead is called brick. The Board agreed that the color of the sample was fine.

There being no further public input, Chairman Rugg brought it back to the Board. K. Dubay asked if the Board would consider granting conditional approval tonight and they would continue to address all of staffs' comments. Chairman Rugg said that the Board would be uncomfortable doing so and would like staff to continue to review the comments with the applicant before the next meeting.

M. Soares made a motion to continue the application until January 9, 2019, in order for the applicant to continue to address a number of comments that remain outstanding as outlined by the Staff recommendation memorandum dated December 12, 2019.

R. Brideau seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Chairman Rugg noted that the plan is continued until January 9, 2019, and this would be the only formal public notice.

B. Application for formal review of a site plan for Phase 2 of the Cross Farm Development, an elderly housing development with 86 additional dwelling units, clubhouse and associated site improvements, 200 Nashua Road, Adams Road and Cross Road, Map 6, Lot 59-1, Zoned AR-1, Cross Farm Development, LLC (Owner & Applicant) – continued from November 7, 2018

Chairman Rugg read the case into record noting it was continued from November 7, 2018. L. Reilly recused herself from this case.

Joseph Maynard, from Benchmark engineering in Londonderry and Kim Hazarvartian traffic engineer with TEPP LLC out of Salem, NH addressed the Board. J. Maynard explained that they met with District 5, the NHDOT agency for this area, and asked them the questions that the Board had from the last meeting. He noted that an email was received back from Mr. Bill Lambert explaining that they will not do blinking lights here, it does meet a warrant for a traffic light and the state will not do anything about the speed limit because the 85 percentile speed is in line with the posted speed limit on Route 102. He said the off-site improvement to Route 102 is about 2060 feet where they will add pavement and turning lanes in both directions. He pointed out that there will be a full left turn lane coming from a westbound direction and decel lane coming westbound that turns into a full right turn lane before the property. He reviewed the plan with the Board with a picture he brought. R. Fillio asked how wide the road was on Route 102 where people will turn into Cross Farm. J. Maynard stated it was a 58 foot wide road there. A. Chiampa asked if there would be lighting there. J. Maynard stated there would not be lighting there and the only light would be in the property at the entrance on a pole. P. Commerford asked if there was any way to help people coming out of Cross Farm to give them time to speed up, as the speed limit is 55 mph. K. Hazarvartian said that he did not think an acceleration lane would be something NHDOT would allow, as it is not part of the standard.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to questions from the Board. J. Trottier pointed out that there are a number of waiver request, but Staff recommends the Board defer any action on the waivers at this time. He reviewed the design review comments and stated that Staff would like the applicant to address these comments before addressing the waiver requests. J. Maynard said that the development falls in the Performance Overlay District (POD) on Route 102 and the way the ordinance is

written if this property was being developed in a commercial fashion, they would need larger setbacks than any of the other properties around them. He noted that this development is for a 55 and older type of community, so they have maintained the 55 and older setbacks, which are still greater than the standard residential AR-1 setbacks, but not the setbacks for a POD. He said they have requested a zoning exception request to ask for the 55 and older perimeter setbacks for this property and not the POD setbacks. Town Planner Mailloux stated that Staff still recommends deferring action on this, but is supportive of this request. David Dubaie, traffic engineer from Stantec addressed the Board. D. Dubaie said that the applicant has revised their traffic study to bolster it, which he finds responsive to the comments that the Board requested at last meeting. He said that in his opinion, he believes the applicant has arrived at a proper traffic configuration and mitigation. He noted that the new traffic report includes additional data from seven other areas that were studied that provide a range of data that is consistent, if not lower, than what the applicant presented. He said that the data supports this project is not like a single family home for traffic generation. A. Rugg asked about the exit to Adams Road. D. Dubaie said that in the traffic study there were comments about the way people are most likely to go, and they will go to the fastest way out, which is Route 102. He stated that some more timid drivers who might not want to make left turns onto Route 102, may go to Adams Road. Town Planner Mailloux stated that there is another zoning exception related to the number of building permits issued each year, noting that the applicant has requested 40 building permits per year versus the standard 15. A. Rugg asked what the rationale for this was. John Kalantzakos, Cross Farm, addressed the Board stating that with Nevins, Hickory Woods and now with Cross Farm, the discussion was that people would want these to be built faster so construction would not take a long period of time. He said that since the opportunity is there for the an exemption to the phasing requirements, if they certify the occupancy as required by the Town's zoning, which they have done, they would like to get residents in as quickly as possible and minimize the disturbance. The Board's consensus was that they were not opposed with granting 40 building permits. A. Chiampa said that Adams Road is a scenic byway that is encouraged to be used by the public, so how could residents be restricted from using it.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the public. Chairman Rugg read two letters (Exhibit 1 & 2) into the record. Town Planner Mailloux read a letter (Exhibit 3) into the record.

Chairman Rugg brought it back to the Board, as there was no further public input.

M. Soares made a motion to continue the application until January 9, 2019, as recommended in the Staff's memorandum dated December 12, 2018.

R. Brideau seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

V. Other Business -

- A. Public hearing on a zoning amendment to create special exception criteria in the Londonderry Zoning Ordinance

Laura Gandia reviewed the information regarding the special exception criteria in the Londonderry Zoning Ordinance. She stated that now the Board will have a public hearing on this.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the Board. The Board had no questions.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the public and there was none.

Member M. Soares made a motion to recommend the changes made to the special exception criteria to the Londonderry Zoning Ordinance to the Town Council.

Seconded by R. Brideau

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

- B. SNHPC Appointments

Chairman Rugg noted that the three alternate members have requested reappointment to the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC). He said the members are: Martin Srugis, Suzanne Brunelle and Brian Battaglia. There were no other candidates forwarded by Kirby Brown for this position.

Member M. Soares made a motion to recommend the three incumbent SNHPC alternate members, Martin Srugis, Suzanne Brunelle and Brian Battaglia, for reappointment to the Town Council.

Seconded by J. Butler

The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

VI. ADJOURNMENT


Member M. Soares made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 8:40 p.m. Seconded by J. Butler

The motion was granted, 9-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50 PM.

These minutes were prepared by Beth Morrison.

Respectfully Submitted,



Print Name: C. R. D'Amico
Title: Secretary

These minutes were accepted and approved on January 9, 2019 by a motion made by M. Soares and seconded by R. Bideau.

December 1, 2018

Town of Londonderry
Attention: Arthur Rugg-Planning Board Chairman
268B Monmouth Road
Londonderry, NH 03053

Subject: Cross Farms Development and Adams Road Entrance

Dear Mr. Rugg,

My wife, Pat and I believe, at a Planning Board's December 2018 meeting, your board will again review and discuss the egress methods to a new Londonderry development called Cross Farms. The main entrance on to busy Rte 102 and a second entrance is being considered onto Adams Rd. My wife and I hope you approve the Adams Road entrance and allow Cross Farms residents to travel freely on Adams Road. Please read our letter into the record of the upcoming meeting.

Pat and I have the a long history in Londonderry and we have anxiously awaited the arrival of the Cross Farm development. We first moved to Londonderry in 1973 when the town was a mere 8,000 residents. We were 24 years old at the time and we are now both 69. Over the years we have seen our little town change so much. In 2016 we sold our house to our daughter Suzy (a South school teacher) and her husband Kevin Smith (yes, our town manager). Our son Scott Fawcett owns a well established Londonderry business that Pat and I retired from. Scott's wife Sharon has been active in numerous school activities and is a former PTA president. We have several grandchildren in Londonderry's fine public school system. We all know and love Londonderry.

Many people believe there is potential safety issue with just one usable entrance to this sizable 150 home development. It is already difficult to take a left turn out of Cross Farms and the development is just beginning occupancy. The majority of our Londonderry retail commerce is to the east of the development. Most residents will turn left on to busy Rte 102 against oncoming traffic. We think that is problematic.

Rte 102 is especial busy during the rush hour so this left turn will be delayed. When the development is fully occupied this will create a bottleneck at the main entrance. Automobile accidents, because of stress on older drivers, may cause seniors or anyone to act quicker than they should creating a safety problem. A secondary exit on Adams Rd might reduce this safety hazard. The Adams Road turn would be a safer right turn for motorist heading towards Mammoth Road.

The Adams road entrance will never be used by the residents of Cross Farms as much as they will use the main Rte 102 entrance. Three of four directions are easier to access from the main entrance. Rte 102 runs directly east towards local shopping and to our major highway Rte. 93 north/south. Rte 102 will always be used by residents traveling west to Nashua.

Adams Road offers some attraction, for Cross Farms residents, who want to travel north or within town. Pat and I travel north to visit our local family. So, Cross Farms residents might choose to go north, via Adams Rd, a maximum 25% of the time. Adams Road will also serve as a relief valve if the main entrance is backed up in high traffic periods. That is a good and safer thing for Cross Farms residents and our town.

Page 2.

We understand long term residents objecting to growth and change. However, growth and change have always been part of Londonderry. Historically, the planning board has used good forward vision to do what is best for the entire town. The safety and convenience of hundreds of Cross Farm's senior citizens should not be jeopardized by restricting the access to the "public" Adams Road.

It does not appear to Pat and me, that a single community entrance to a development of Cross Farms size would be prudent planning for the residents of Cross Farms or for non emergency services. There are caregivers, beyond police and fire, that will need quick access to Cross Farms that a second entrance into this large community necessitates. These caregivers may include family members, meals on wheels, nurses or doctors that may have to respond quickly.

Londonderry has always been a great town because of dedicated town residents, like yourselves, making sound decisions and navigating Londonderry through never ending expansion with good planning. The overall town decisions made over our several years here, have always kept Londonderry a attractive place to live. I am told that many other Londonderry long term residents, now in their downsizing years, will be joining Pat and I at Cross Farms. Help us make Cross Farm a safer place to live by approving a Adams Road entrance that is open to everyone. Thank you, for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Pat and Steve Fawcett

c Colleen Mailloux-Town Planner
c Roger Fillio- Planning Board

ADAMS ROAD

DECEMBER 12, 2018

TRAFFIC

- PLANNING BOARD EXPERT FROM STANTEC QUESTION THE SAFETY OF INCREASED TRAFFIC ONTO RTE102
 - STATE FOLLOWS SET OF STANDARDS AND DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT INDIVIDUAL CIRCUMSTANCES
- THAT THE DEAL THE TOWN INTERVENED IN ALLOWING THE DEVELOPER TO ACCESS RTE102; THEREBY MAKING ADAMS A GATED ENTRANCE / EXIT IS UPHELD
- SINCE ADAMS IS SCENIC BYWAY, LIKE ADAMS AND MAYBE CROSS TO HAVE INSTALLED A WALK / BIKE PATH FOR RESIDENTS TO ENJOY

WATER

- CHAIR OF CONSERVATION STATED ALL GROUND WATER IN LONDONDERRY COMES FROM SURFACE OR POOLS OF WATER
 - THERE IS NO ACTIVE AQUIFER
 - 80% FO RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS HAVE PRIVATE WELLS
 - AND SEPTIC; WHICH NEED GROUND PURIFICATION
- WE SHOWED LAST YEAR THE NUMBER OF POOLS OF WATER THAT WILL BE DESTROYED
- WE ALSO SHOWED THE LACK OF ANY CREATIVITY BY THE DEVELOPER STRANGLES A NUMBER OF POOLS OF WATER AND STREAMS
- **NH DES HAS REQUIRED 51 ACRES BE KEPT FROM DEVILMENT..... I HAVE STRONGLY REQUESTING THAT BE 70-75 TO PROTECT THE POND AND SURROUNDING POOLS OF WATER; ESPECIALLY WHEN IT RAINS**
- MANY OF US STARTED TO PULL SAND IN THROUGH THE WATER PUMP THE LAST TIME WE HAD A DROUGHT
- NORMAL WATER SHED BUFFERS DON'T WORK, JUST ASK HOW THEY ARE IN THE NEVINS DEVELOPMENT.....PEOPLE ENCROACH BUFFERS ALL THE TIME

CONSERVATION

- THE GROUP OF SCIENTISTS STATED IN ORDER TO SAVE THE PLANET, WE WOULD NEED TO EXPAND THE AREA OF TREES AND PLANT LIFE BY 30% SO I ASK; DOES THE PROFITS OF THE DEVELOPMENT TRUMP THIS? OR WHEN DOES THE PUBLIC WELFARE AND SAFETY TRUMP THE PROFITS?
- WE ALL AGREE, AND EVEN SOME OF YOU IN PRIVATE; THIS NEEDS TO BE REDUCED, I GIVE YOU A NUMBER 125 THAT WE ALL CAN LIVE WITH

Laura Gandia

From: Laura Gandia
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Laura Gandia
Subject: FW: ADAMS ROAD DEC 2018
Attachments: ADAMS ROAD DEC 2018.pdf

From: Peter Curro <pcurro@londonderry.org>

Sent: Tuesday, December 4, 2018 8:56 AM

To: Arthur Rugg

Subject: ADAMS ROAD DEC 2018

IN CASE I CAN'T MAKE IT..... HERE ARE MY POINTS I WOULD ASK THE PLANNING BOARD WHEN DELIBERATING

MAJOR ISSUES ARE:

TRAFFIC

- THE PLANNING BOARD EXPERT COULDN'T GIVE A SAFE CALL ON FULL BUILDOUT ON 102
- THAT THE GATED ENTRANCE / EXIT ON ADAMS IS SECURE, THE DEAL WAS THE TOWN INTERVENED TO ACCESS 102; AND FOR THAT ADAMS WAS AN EMERGENCY GATE ONLY

WETLANDS

- THE ACREAGE FOR PROTECTION IS EXPANDED TO 75 ACRES; THIS WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO PROTECT WATER SHED AREA, THE POND, ANIMALS, AND PROVIDE SOME AREA FOR GROUND WATER FOR THE WELLS IN THE AREA

TRAFFIC

- SINCE ADAMS IS A SCENIC BY-WAY; AND PEOPLE ENJOY WALKING; RUNNING; THE DEVELOPER INSTALL A BIKE /WALKING TRAIL ALONG SIDE ADAMS

AT SOME POINT, SINCE I CAN'T FOLLOW ALL THIS; ESPECIALLY AT THIS TIME, SOME KIND OF RESPONSE, EITHER EMAIL, BREAKFAST SOMETHING.....

MOST IMPORTANT IS THE POND AND EXPANDING ACREAGE WHICH WOULD REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNITS

THANK YOU

12/12/19

Exhibit 3

Laura Gandia

From: Colleen Mailloux
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:10 AM
To: Laura Gandia
Subject: FW: Cross Farm Development Concerns

For the Planning Board read folder for Cross Farm 12/12

From: Ward, Joseph <Joseph.Ward@crl.com>
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 9:26 AM
To: Colleen Mailloux <cmailloux@londonderrynh.org>
Cc: MICHAEL PETERSON <spyke1066@msn.com>
Subject: Cross Farm Development Concerns

Hi there,

Can you let us know when the next meeting will be discussing the Phase 2/3 of the Cross Farm development?

Do you know if there have been concerns raised about impact the wetlands? I thought the planning board was trying to protect wetlands and the Londonderry water supplies. Looking at the updated plans - this project seems to be too large considering the amount of wetlands on that property and the impact could be irreversible. I remember the initial meetings and the builder was saying there was going to be a buffer of trees around the perimeter of the property and wetlands (they were actually drawn in on the plans). The current plans do not show any of this.

I also know that there are remnants of several farm buildings just behind my house on the Cross Farm Dev property. I have seen lots of old barrels/containers. I am not sure what they will disturb under the ground if they start digging and I am concerned that there could be contamination of downstream water supplies and/or our wells located close by from oil/chemicals that may be preserved under ground.

Is there anyone that I can speak to on the planning board about these concerns or can you convey them to the board?

Thank you,
Joe Ward
14 Constance Dr.