

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 8, 2014 AT THE MOOSE HILL**
3 **COUNCIL CHAMBERS**
4

5 Members Present: Art Rugg; Mary Soares; Lynn Wiles; Laura El-Azem; Chris
6 Davies; Rick Brideau, CNHA, Ex-Officio; Leitha Reilly, alternate member; Al Sypek,
7 alternate member; and Ann Chiampa, alternate member
8

9 Also Present: John Vogl, GIS Manager/Comprehensive Planner; John R. Trottier,
10 P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works and Engineering; and Jaye Trottier,
11 Associate Planner
12

13 A. Rugg called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He appointed L. Reilly to vote for
14 L. El-Azem until she arrived and A. Sypek to vote for Scott Benson.
15

16 L. El-Azem arrived at 7:02 during the following discussion.
17

18 **Administrative Board Work**
19

20 A. Discussions with Town Staff
21

- 22 • Master Plan Implementation Committee
23

24 J. Vogl and C. Davies, Chair of the Master Plan Implementation
25 Committee, provided an update on the Committee's efforts. Since their
26 initial meeting in January of this year, the main focus has been on
27 possible improvements to the Town Center and Town Forest (Map 6, Lots
28 98 and Lot 97-1 respectively). Landscape Architect Bill Flynn presented
29 conceptual ideas at their September 24 meeting regarding potential uses
30 and enhancements that could make the area more of a civic focal point.
31 Suggestions for the Town Common included additional landscaping,
32 fencing and sidewalks along the edges of the lot, and lighting
33 improvements. For the Town Forest, he recommended adding to the
34 existing trail to create a network of walkable areas and thinning out the
35 forest itself for the visual purposes, both aesthetic and practical. A. Rugg
36 noted research done by A. Chiampa as a member of the Heritage
37 Commission on trails and accessibility in the Town Forest. Feedback about
38 B. Flynn's presentation is being collected from Committee members so at
39 the October 22 meeting, he can provide a more comprehensive
40 recommendation as well as some cost estimates. Those results are
41 expected to be brought to the Planning Board and ultimately the Town
42 Council to address an issue voted on at Town Meeting 2014. C. Davies
43 explained that a warrant article had asked voters whether the Town
44 Manager should assume stewardship of the Town Forest, something the
45 majority of Councilors did not support without a specific vision for the
46 area in place. Town Sexton Kent Allen offered to take Board members on
47 a walk through the Town Forest, particularly to view a recently cleared
48 pathway that could become a new trail that would run parallel to
49 Mammoth Road. Also at that the October 22 meeting, the Committee will
50 review the checklist of recommendations in the Master Plan to assess the

1 status of its implementation. The October 22 meeting will begin at 7 PM
2 in the Sunnycrest Conference Room at Town Hall.

3
4 • Planning Webinar

5
6 A. Rugg made Board members aware of information in the Board's Read
7 File regarding an upcoming Planning webinar to take place at Town Hall.
8 He asked them to contact the Associate Planner if they are interested in
9 attending.

10
11 • Housing Assessment

12
13 A discussion arose about housing needs in Londonderry, principally with
14 regard to workforce housing. A. Rugg stated that at their October 6
15 meeting, the Town Council charged the Planning Board with the task of
16 performing a review of workforce housing in Londonderry. He said Staff is
17 already researching the issue and will bring their findings back to the
18 Board. M. Soares commented that the term "workforce housing" can
19 connote something to the general public of a lower housing standard. A.
20 Rugg noted that the term is used because it is part of the original State
21 legislation (see RSA 674:58 through 62), but that it is a relative financial
22 status based on the per capita income of a given community. J. Vogl
23 stressed that all the plans currently before the Board are for affordable
24 housing, *not* low income housing.

25
26 **Public Hearings/Workshops/Conceptual Discussions**

27
28 A. Capital Improvement Plan – Public Hearing for the 2014 (FY 2016 – 2021)
29 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

30
31 A. Rugg explained that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is a statutory
32 requirement for those communities that have adopted a Growth Management
33 Ordinance and/or an Impact Fee system. The intent is to ensure the
34 community's ability to fund its infrastructure and also impart fiscal guidance by
35 acting as a needs assessment for the next six years. He described it as a tool
36 that is adopted by the Planning Board and then used by the Town Council and
37 School Board to make decisions regarding capital improvements. The Planning
38 Board can also make use of it by increasing their awareness of capital needs as
39 plans move through the approval process.

40
41 Following the Board's first review of the plan at the September 10, 2014
42 meeting, J. Vogl stated that there have been two amendments to the CIP
43 document, along with a few minor typographical corrections. The first revision
44 is to the scope of Londonderry Trailways' Rail Trail Phase 4 project; where the
45 cost estimate was once \$800,000, it is now \$250,000. Updates to tables within
46 the document were made accordingly. The second change is the addition of
47 photographs to the submission by the Senior Center that depict the crowded
48 conditions referred to in their narrative. He said Staff recommends adopting the
49 revised CIP.

50
51 A. Rugg asked for comments and questions from the Board.

1
2 L. Wiles asked whether the rankings within the individual priority levels reflected
3 any degree of importance compared to the other projects in that same level. J.
4 Vogl explained that projects within a given level are in chronological order, so
5 they are considered to have equal urgency within their individual priority grade.
6 A. Sypek pointed out for the general public that although there are specific
7 priorities set in the final CIP report, that does not automatically mean those
8 items will be placed on the Town warrant. It is up to the Town Council to make
9 that decision. He also wanted to remind residents that if the two Priority 1
10 projects are placed on the warrant, (the Drop-Off Center improvements and the
11 Plaza 28 Sewer Pump Station replacement), they will not produce any impacts
12 on the tax rate. Lastly, he voiced his preference to see the Senior Center
13 Expansion placed on the Warrant in the interest of completing the ongoing
14 improvements to the building and avoiding any further delays that could
15 postpone their completion indefinitely. L. Wiles agreed that the overcrowding at
16 the Senior Center needs to be addressed, particularly as the senior population in
17 town continues to grow.

18
19 A. Rugg read into the record a letter from Gladys Frederick, Administrator and
20 Treasurer of Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc., requesting that the Priority 1
21 status of the Senior Center had in 2013 be restored in order to adequately fund
22 the expansion (see Attachment #1).

23
24 A. Rugg asked for public input.

25
26 Tony DeFrancesco, Chairman of the Londonderry School Community Auditorium
27 Committee, noted that the description of the project in the CIP document was
28 not consistent with the report presented to the School Board and was therefore
29 not an accurate reflection of the specifics or the rationale for the project.
30 Following some discussion, it was decided that the existing language should be
31 stricken and a note added explaining that it is superseded by an attachment,
32 namely the Auditorium Committee's final report to the School Board. J. Vogl
33 explained that the current description was provided early on in the CIP process,
34 before the Committee's report was presented to the Planning Board in August.

35
36 Lisa Whittemore, State Representative and resident at 40 Griffin Road, spoke in
37 favor of the proposed auditorium. She spoke of the number of years that some
38 residents have been trying to bring an auditorium to the high school since the
39 one intended when the high school was originally built was eventually removed
40 from the plan. She asked if Board members had any thoughts on the fact that
41 the priority level for the building has been raised from 3 to 2 since last year's
42 CIP. A. Rugg explained that the Board had not discussed the proposal in any
43 detail during the CIP workshop at the September 10 meeting because in August,
44 T. DeFrancesco had provided the Board with the information that had been
45 given to the School Board. He added that while individual Board members may
46 have their preferences for particular projects, the Board does not advocate for
47 any of the proposals in the CIP. L. Whittemore asked that her letter of support
48 be added to the record (see Attachment #2). L. Reilly explained the rise in
49 priority as being the result of the need in recent years for the School District to
50 remain competitive as surrounding districts build newer, better equipped

1 facilities, while at the same time, Londonderry has attracted businesses to town
2 whose employees are asking what Londonderry can offer their families.

3
4 There was no further public input.

5
6 A. Rugg noted that two motions would have to be made to make the
7 amendments discussed, i.e. 1) that the Senior Center Expansion be moved from
8 Priority 2 to Priority 1, and 2) that the Londonderry School Community
9 Auditorium Committee's report be made an appendix of the CIP.

10
11 **A. Sypek made a motion to change the Senior Center Expansion to**
12 **Priority 1 from Priority 2. L. Wiles seconded the motion.**

13
14 L. Reilly asked for discussion on the motion. She noted that although the
15 project can be viewed as necessary, it does not fit the definition of a Priority 1
16 project because it is not "an urgent need with regard to health and safety." A.
17 Rugg suggested that a safety concern could be said to exist based on the
18 crowded conditions demonstrated in the photos recently added to the report. M.
19 Soares noted that regardless of the Priority given to the project, the Town
20 Council will ultimately discern the project's importance by deciding whether or
21 not to place it on the Town Warrant. In view of those points, **A. Sypek**
22 **withdrew his motion. L. Wiles withdrew his second.**

23
24 A. Rugg entertained a motion regarding the Auditorium report. **M. Soares**
25 **made a motion to include the Auditorium report as an appendix in the**
26 **CIP. L. Wiles seconded the motion.**

27
28 L. El-Azem asked if supporters for other projects should be given the chance to
29 make changes or additions to their arguments. C. Davies said he believed the
30 justifications for other projects have been adequately substantiated in the
31 document. A. Rugg agreed and added that discussions about certain proposals
32 also took place during the September 10 workshop. He described the addition
33 of the auditorium report as a "correction" that will ensure the accuracy of the
34 rationale for the project.

35
36 Seeing no further discussion on the motion to amend the CIP, A. Rugg called for
37 a vote. **Vote on the motion: 7-0-0.**

38
39 J. Vogl asked for confirmation of the change to be made regarding the School
40 Auditorium. A. Rugg said the existing wording should be lined out and a note be
41 added before it stating that it is superseded by the appendix, that being the
42 Auditorium report.

43
44 **M. Soares made a motion for the Planning Board to adopt the CIP as**
45 **amended. L. Wiles second the motion. No discussion. Vote on the**
46 **motion: 7-0-0.**

47
48 A. Rugg stated that the adopted CIP will be forwarded to the Town Council and
49 School Board.

50

1 B. Richard G. and Virginia St. Cyr (Owners and Applicants), Map 16 Lot 58 –
2 Application Acceptance and Public Hearing to amend the subdivision plan
3 conditionally approved on May 7, 2008 to phase the project at 28 Auburn
4 Road, Zoned AR-I [Continued from September 3, 2014].
5

6 J. R. Trottier stated there were no checklist items and that Staff recommends
7 the application be accepted as complete.
8

9 **L. Wiles made a motion to accept the application as complete per Staff's**
10 **Recommendation memo dated October 8, 2014. R. Brideau seconded**
11 **the motion. No discussion. Vote on the motion: 6-0-0.**
12

13 [M. Soares left the room momentarily and was not present for the above vote.
14 She returned for the presentation by the applicant's representative.]
15

16 A. Rugg noted that the 65 day time frame for the Board to render a decision
17 under RSA 676:4 commenced with acceptance of the application as complete.
18

19 Chris Hickey of Eric C. Mitchell and Associates explained that the original 7-lot
20 subdivision was conditionally approved in 2008 and that the property owners
21 have made requests for the extension of that approval since that time as they
22 have been unable to move forward with fulfilling the remaining conditions of
23 approval. The amendment would act as Phase A of the project, which would
24 subdivide off the existing house lot, while the remaining six lot subdivision would
25 be considered Phase B. This will enable the owners to sell their house without
26 having the financial burden of bonding the improvements or building the new
27 road as would be required by the 2008 conditions. There is one waiver request
28 regarding insufficient sight distance (see below).
29

30 J. R. Trottier read into the record the waiver request from the Staff
31 Recommendation memo:
32

- 33 1. The Applicant is requesting a waiver to Section 3.09.F.2 requiring 250 feet
34 of sight distance for the existing driveway. The driveway is to the existing
35 house constructed over 100 years ago. Planning Staff recommends
36 **granting** the waiver because this is an existing lot. The Town has made
37 some improvements to Auburn Road in this location since the conditional
38 approval in 2008, and the new survey shows that they achieve 200 feet of
39 sight distance to the south. In 2008 only 110 feet of sight distance could
40 be achieved. The Applicant would need to get an easement and
41 permission from the adjacent property owner for grading improvements
42 to improve the sight distance. They meet the requirement to the north.
43 DPW and Engineering Staff **do not support granting** the waiver.
44

45 J. R. Trottier stated that notes will be added to the plan indicating that if Phase
46 B is pursued, all of the original conditions of approval must be fulfilled for the
47 plan to be signed. Because of the six years that has elapsed since conditional
48 approval, off-site improvements will have to be reexamined due to town growth
49 and changes that have occurred on Auburn Road since then.
50

1 A. Rugg asked for comments and questions from the Board.
2

3 M. Soares confirmed with J. R. Trottier that the general and subsequent
4 condition of approval identified as "Final Engineering Review" will ensure that
5 the conditions attached to the 2008 plan will have to be satisfied to achieve final
6 approval. She also verified with him that the plan will be held to the latest Town
7 standards in the event that any changes have taken place to the regulations
8 since 2008. L. Wiles received clarification that while the plan before the Board
9 shows the entire subdivision, the Board would only be approving Phase A
10 pertaining to the existing house lot's subdivision from the rest of the property
11 and would not be granting approval to the remaining six lots. Notes would be
12 included on the plan to specify that point and a note would also state that if
13 Phase B is not signed and recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds
14 on or before October 8, 2016, the 2008 conditional approval will no longer be
15 valid. A. Chiampa asked about restoration of disturbed stonewalls as it was
16 noted in the 2008 minutes that some stonewalls were to be eliminated. A. Rugg
17 said the applicant had met with the Heritage Commission at the time and it was
18 explained that stones removed from walls were planned to be incorporated
19 elsewhere within the subdivision. She also asked whether a truck terminal
20 adjacent to the lot still operated on a 24-hour basis as was stated in the 2008
21 minutes. A. Rugg, Staff and C. Hickey could not confirm that it did, but A. Rugg
22 noted that it would not pertain to the amendment before the Board.
23

24 A. Rugg asked for public input. There was no one present with questions,
25 comments or concerns, but A. Rugg read into the record a letter from Tim
26 Patten of 29 Auburn Road (see Attachment #3) addressed to J. R. Trottier. T.
27 Patten's specific concerns were relative to sight lines exiting to his driveway,
28 speed limits, enforcement, and removal of a berm.
29

30 There was no additional public input.
31

32 **M. Soares made a motion to approve the applicant's request for the**
33 **waiver to Safe Site Distance because this is an existing lot with a house**
34 **constructed over 100 years ago, and the sight distance has been**
35 **improved since 2008. L. Wiles seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote**
36 **on the motion: 7-0-0.**
37

38 **M. Soares made a motion to grant final approval to Phase I of the**
39 **Subdivision Plan for Richard G. and Virginia St. Cyr (Owners and**
40 **Applicants) as amended, Map 16 Lot 58, in accordance with the plans**
41 **prepared by Eric C. Mitchell & Associates, Inc., dated August 11, 2014,**
42 **with the precedent conditions to be fulfilled within two (2) years of the**
43 **approval and prior to plan signature, and the general and subsequent**
44 **conditions of approval to be fulfilled as noted in the Staff memo, dated**
45 **October 8, 2014. L. Wiles seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on**
46 **the motion: 7-0-0.**
47

48 **Other Business**
49

50 There was no other business.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Adjournment:

M. Soares made a motion to adjourn the meeting. R. Brideau seconded the motion. Vote on the motion: 7-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.

These minutes prepared by Associate Planner Jaye Trottier

Respectfully Submitted,

Lynn Wiles, Secretary

Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc.
535 Mammoth Road
P. O. Box 605
Londonderry, NH 03053

October 6, 2014

To: John Farrell, Chairman
Capital Improvement Planning
Town of Londonderry

On behalf of the Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc. I submit the following in support of the expansion of the Londonderry Senior Center.

I formed the Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc. in 2003 and was also on the town evaluation committee who hired Sara Landry, the center's first Senior Affairs Director. I have been serving as the President/Administrator of the Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc. for the past 11 years.

Having been an advocate for the senior population since I moved here 17 years ago at a time when there were few services for elderly (who we now call seniors), I was on the first Elder Affairs Committee in 1999 serving until 2008 working toward resolving issues for our senior population.

Our organization has been housed at the Londonderry Senior Center since it opened its doors on January 7, 2003. Our organization has worked *in partnership* with each Senior Affairs Director in establishing senior programs and activities and to make it more comfortable place for the seniors.

The building was pretty drab when we first started utilizing the senior center, but we seniors with Sara Landry and outside volunteers painted and cleaned up the building for our use.

Due to the lack of the necessary items needed to function and the lack of funding from the Town of Londonderry during those earlier years, our organization immediately started to fundraise for items that were needed for the day to day function of the center to make it a better environment for our seniors.

Over the past 11 years our organization has added \$56,124.80 .00 to the center's inventory for the Town of Londonderry. **The large ticket items we purchased with our funds included, but are not limited to, the hall divider, construction of a meeting room, commercial stove, commercial refrigerator, commercial freezer, new bingo machine, automated defibrillator, picnic tables, storage shed, sufficient chairs and tables to outfit the center, complete upgrade of the stage (including electrical fans, painting, new stage curtain and hardwood flooring), 55 inch flat screen TV and handmade cabinet, benches for the front porch, reception desk, commercial coffee brewer, ADA automatic front door opener, wood alloy blinds for all windows and two dyson hygienic hand dryers for the two restrooms.**

The listing of improvements has been provided to each Senior Affairs Director, Steven Cotten, and the current Town Manager, Kevin Smith, who are well aware all the work and fundraising it has taken to bring the current center up to speed. ***At no time were town funds used nor sought.***

Without these improvements, the Senior Center would have been a pretty dreary place all these years, but we were proud to be able to fundraise and make the center our home away from home.

However, future fundraising by our organization is now constrained by the size of the building and limited space for programs and activities.

Our membership has reached over 400 members for the past six years and we are limited as to the number of seniors the building can handle at one time. We have been overcrowded for many years now.

Additional space is badly needed to separate some of the programs that are all mingled together.

The request for expansion is nothing new. It has been in the hopper since 2008. The initial plan for expansion was sent to the town in 2008 by Sara Landry. There have been several unsuccessful attempts to bring the necessary expansion to the forefront since that time.

In 2011, I requested a grant in the amount of \$60,000.00 from the Alexander Eastman Foundation for the architectural and engineering drawings of the plan. Sara and I had three architects come and evaluate the building to assure that it was on sound footing for expansion and renovations. It was determined structurally sound. Dave Caron, the Town Manager at the time, gave us the "go ahead sign" to pursue this grant. While this request received favorable attention By AEF, it was not approved because - ***the Town of Londonderry had not committed to the expansion.***

The expansion request was in Priority 5 for some time, was changed to Priority 1 in 2013 and then dropped to Priority 2 in 2014.

So, let us fast forward to the present. While the Town of Londonderry recently did much needed repairs on the charred roof and gave the inside a new coat of paint, the building needs to be enlarged.

Don't you think it is time that that this building should get the attention it deserves to serve the ever growing senior population of the town?

It is requested the Priority One Status be restored and action be taken to budget now for the much needed expansion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gladys M. Frederick
Administrator and Treasurer
Londonderry Senior Citizens, Inc.



State of New Hampshire

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCORD

40 Griffin Road
Londonderry NH 03053

August 25, 2014

To all interested citizens,

Londonderry has from the beginning offered our students the basic elemental tools which prepare them to move forward from our little town in the northeast of the country to the greater world of learning, work, culture, and play.

This auditorium proposal addresses a clear need for our community and one that has been a cause célèbre for many dedicated residents.

We in town have given our student athletes many resources and rightfully so, as teamwork and cooperation on the field are great teachers to coming generations. But we must also honor and attend to those skills off the field, abilities whose natural home is off the turf, the pool, or the track.

There is a distinct benefit to having a lecture space, a meeting space, and a performance space where those less physical arts and sciences have a home.

The presence of this key missing element in our town will round out our offerings as a community to our children and provide that unique space where learning, art and performance may unite to enrich the lives of students, teachers and the community alike.

I fully support this proposal and would ask that we include special consideration for our music program, which has been widely recognized throughout the nation and yet has not a single performance venue here at home.

Let us build this space with those community members in mind who wish to hear with clarity the developing talent of our young people under the brilliant leadership of Andy Soucy and his team.

I applaud the work of the resourceful and dedicated group bringing forward this proposal and give it my wholehearted support.

Honorable Lisa I Whittemore

State Representative
Rockingham County District 05
Londonderry N H

Planning Board Meeting Minutes - October 8, 2014 - Attachment #3

From: [John Trottier](#)
To: [Cynthia May](#); [Jaye Trottier](#)
Subject: FW: Planning board meeting 10-8-14
Date: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 4:43:15 PM

I spoke with Tim earlier this afternoon. This should be read into the minutes this evening regarding the St. Cyr S/D.

John

From: Timothy Patten [mailto:tkpatten680@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 4:25 PM
To: John Trottier
Subject: Planning board meeting 10-8-14

John, As per our discussion. I'm unable to attend tonight due to congestive health failure. My concerns are my sight lines exiting to my driveway, the speed limits and enforcement, Finally as we have discussed be, removal of the beam.

Thanks,
Tim Patten
29 Auburn Rd,