LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD 1 2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 2012 AT THE MOOSE HILL 3 **COUNCIL CHAMBERS** 4

5 Members Present: Art Rugg; Mary Soares; Laura El-Azem; Chris Davies; Tom 6 Freda, Ex-Officio; Rick Brideau, CNHA, Ex-Officio; John Laferriere, Ex-Officio; 7 Dana Coons; Leitha Reilly, alternate member; Maria Newman, alternate member 8 9 Also Present: Cynthia May, ASLA; John Trottier, P.E.; Libby Canuel, Building 10 **Division Secretary** 11 12 A. Rugg called the meeting to order at 7 PM. He appointed L. Reilly to vote for 13 Lynn Wiles and M. Newman to vote for Mary Soares. 14 15

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

28 29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

Administrative Board Work

17 A. Plans for Signature – Bauchman Towing, Map 15, Lot 62-2

J. Trottier said all precedent conditions for approval have been met and the staff recommends signing the plans.

D. Coons made a motion to authorize the Chair and Secretary to sign the plans. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the **motion: 9-0-0.** A. Rugg said the plans will be signed at the conclusion of the meeting.

27 B. Plans for Signature – The Nevins Expansion, Map 7, Lot 122

J. Trottier said all precedent conditions for approval have been met and the staff recommends signing the plans.

D. Coons made a motion to authorize the Chair and Secretary to sign the plans. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the **motion: 9-0-0.** A. Rugg said the plans will be signed at the conclusion of the meeting.

- 37 C. Extension Request – Quantem Aviation Services, Map 28, Lot 21-7
- 38 39

40

41

42

43 44

45

C. May referenced a letter from Jeffrey Merritt of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., stating that due to extenuating circumstances, the applicant is requesting an additional one year extension of the approved site plan that will expire on December 14, 2012. She said that staff is supportive of the request.

- D. Coons made a motion to grant a one year extension to December 5, 2013. R. Brideau seconded the motion.
- 46 47 T. Freda confirmed with staff that the reference in the letter to the potential for an additional one year extension per Section 7.06 (c) of the Town Site Plan 48 49 Regulations does not preclude the request for further one year extensions.

1		
1 2		There was no further discussion.
3		
4 5		Vote on the motion: 9-0-0. The extension for one year was granted.
5 6 7	D.	Approval of Minutes – November 7, 2012 and November 14, 2012
8		D. Coons made a motion to approve and sign the minutes from the
9 10 11		November 7, 2012 meeting. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the motion: 9-0-0.
11		D. Coons made a motion to approve and sign the minutes from the
12 13 14 15 16		November 14, 2012 meeting. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the motion: 7-0-2. (R. Brideau and C. Davies abstained as they were absent from the November 14 meeting).
10 17 18 19		Minutes for November 7, 2012 and November 14, 2012 were approved and will be signed at the conclusion of the meeting.
20	E.	Discussions with Town Staff
21 22 23		Master Plan Update
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33		Master Plan Steering Committee Chair L. Reilly reported that the Committee met on November 28 to review the final draft submitted by Master Plan Consultant Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative (TPUDC). Consensus was reached regarding several further edits, which were forwarded to TPUDC to incorporate into a second final draft. The Committee will meet next on January third for final comments. Assuming there are no significant outstanding issues, the Steering Committee will present the Master Plan to the Planning Board for their approval at the January 9, 2013 Planning Board meeting.
34 35		Update on 3 rd Party Review Consultant Selection
36 37 38 39		C. May stated that this issue is still before the Acting Town Manager and the Town Attorney. She will update the Board again at the December 12 Planning Board meeting.
40 41		Electronic Signs
41 42 43 44 45		C. May presented to the Planning Board a letter from the Heritage Commission recommending that the Board take no action to approve any proposed electronic signs (see Attachment #1).
46 47		Woodmont Commons
47 48 49 50		A. Rugg received an email prior to the meeting from Town Attorney Michael Ramsdell as a preface to a letter distributed to Board members from the Woodmont Commons team. The email noted the intent expressed in the

letter of reporting to the Planning Board on monthly basis, continuing to 1 2 hold regular meetings with Town staff and the Town's Consultant, and 3 requesting the 65 day review window be extended to April 15 (see 4 Attachment #2). A. Rugg stated that the letter will be available to the 5 public and posted on the Planning Board website page by December 6. L. 6 Reilly asked for clarification as to what the Board can expect will be 7 presented by the applicant at the December 12 meeting. C. May said the 8 overall intent is to present the plan in more manageable increments at 9 Planning Board meetings, starting with the definition of the land uses 10 allowed on the properties involved. At the public hearing scheduled for December 12, applicant will be explaining all of the goals for future 11 12 meetings and addressing past questions that can be answered at this stage. 13 L. Reilly suggested that for future Planning Board agendas that include Woodmont Commons, an indication be included as to what specific topic will 14 15 be featured. C. May stated that could be done and that re-notification of 16 the abutters is expected to take place soon.

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

• The Nevins (second story structures)

C. May noted that when the site plan for the Nevins Community was approved in 2004, a note was included on page 141 ("Building plans/foot prints") and stating that "All house footprints will be similar in nature with a **maximum of 1-story**, 2-car garage and 2-bedrooms" (emphasis added). There is no record, however, that the Planning Board discussed the issue, nor was the statement made a condition of approval or even included in formal notes on the plan set. Second stories are not prohibited under the Town's elderly housing ordinance. Some Nevins residents, she continued, have converted the space above their first floor into a second floor use, even though it is not a true second floor. No negative impacts would be expected as a result of allowing two story dwellings, nor would it likely to affect surrounding properties. She requested that the Board consider allowing staff to administratively remove that note on page 141 from the plan set. The consensus of the Board was to allow staff to do so.

34 35 36

• Blue Seal Feeds site, 15 Buttrick Road, Map 7, Lot 34-1

37 A. Rugg asked for clarification as to what scenarios the Board had decided 38 would constitute the need for a potential buyer of the above site to appear 39 before the Board at a public hearing. C. May stated that the Board agreed 40 on November 14 that a change in orientation of the parking area, significant 41 drainage improvements, and/or adding lighting to the parking lot would 42 create the need for a public hearing in anticipation of abutter concerns. Any 43 other changes to the site approved site plan, the Board agreed, could be handled administratively. A. Rugg asked for the Board to confirm that 44 45 decision. D. Coons replied that since the approved site plan included future 46 parking that has not been built to date, the applicant should not be required 47 to attend a public hearing unless significant changes to the site are proposed. J. Trottier noted the inherent difficulty in using the word 48 49 "significant," since what may seem significant to a Board member may not 50 seem significant to staff. In consideration of the abutters, particularly since

it is unknown exactly what changes the potential buyer would propose, the
 consensus of the Board was to reconfirm the three scenarios that would
 require a public hearing as stated at the November 14 meeting.

<u>New Plans</u>

4 5

6 7

8 9

14

No new plans were submitted.

Public Hearings

A. NeighborWorks Southern New Hampshire (applicant), Londonderry Lending
 Trust (c/o Robert V. Wallace, Jr.) (owner), Map 12 Lot 59-3, Conceptual
 Discussion of Proposed Workforce Housing (Townhouse Units), AR-I.

Executive Director of NeighborWorks Southern New Hampshire, Robert
Tourigny, together with his colleagues Jennifer Vadney, Neighborhood
Development Manager and Tom Krebs, Project Manager, were joined by Earle
Blatchford of Hayner/Swanson, Inc. to present a conceptual plan for affordable
workforce housing rental townhouse units.

- 21 R. Tourigny described NeighborWorks as a private, non-profit community 22 development corporation that acts as an affordable housing developer. The 23 "Whittemore Estates" site, as the property is commonly known, was previously 24 approved by the Planning Board as an age restricted condominium 25 development. Infrastructure was put in place and Trail Haven Drive was constructed, but only one 6-unit structure was actually built on the southern 26 27 end of the lot. Approximately two years ago, NeighborWorks presented a 28 conceptual plan to the Board that involved the creation of 75 units of 29 affordable housing on a portion of the site using with the existing condominium 30 design. It was later determined that the condominium aspect would not make 31 that particular project feasible.
- 32

33 The Town's inclusionary housing ordinance requires a minimum of 20 acres for 34 workforce housing. Discussions with Town staff have led to this conceptual 35 design of a subdivision that would create a 20.2 acre site on the northern end of the lot where 75 units of affordable workforce rental housing would be built. 36 37 The remaining 29.7 acres to the south where one six-unit condo structure is 38 located would continue as an age restricted condo development with an 39 existing conservation easement to the east. Other than the loss of acreage, no 40 other changes would be made to the southerly portion (see Attachment #3). A 41 1,200 foot long cul de sac with a total of 78 units within a mix of seven and 42 five unit two-story townhouse buildings would be built, along with a small 43 maintenance building roughly in the center of the site. Access to the proposed 44 20.2 acre piece would be from the previously approved curb cut on Mammoth 45 Road and would generally follow the original pattern, running largely over the 46 sewer interceptor placed there by the Town several years ago. Public water 47 and sewer would service the site. The drainage design would also be similar to 48 the approved plan, but would be upgraded to current State standards. An 49 existing State permits for the driveway and sewer would also need minor 50 modifications. A Dredge and Fill permit would be requested to fill a small, low

value, manmade wetland within the sewer easement that has been re-1 2 classified as jurisdictional since the original plan was approved. Four units per 3 acre would fall well under the 10 units per acre maximum in the Town 4 regulations, while the 78% proposed open space would well exceed the 5 requisite 40%, as would the usable open space proposal of 65% compared to 25% required. Phasing requirements in the zoning ordinance limits the 6 7 number of units and buildings to be built in a single phase to 48 and 3 8 respectively. While the plan would only call for 38 units in the first phase, it 9 would be done in more than three buildings, making a variance from the 10 Zoning Board of Adjustment necessary. A Conditional Use permit would be 11 sought for Conservation Overlay District buffer encroachments that would 12 actually total less than what was previously approved. Pictures of existing 13 NeighborWorks projects were presented (See Attachment #4)

14

15 A. Rugg asked for staff input. J. Trottier said the meeting that took place with 16 the applicant and E. Blatchford was very productive.

17

18 A. Rugg asked for Board input and/or questions. C. Davies confirmed with R. 19 Tourigny that NeighborWorks would own the rental community and be 20 responsible for maintenance, which R. Tourigny said would be managed day to 21 day through a third party property manager. NeighborWorks would also 22 employ a full time community services specialist. The applicant would work 23 with Tennessee Gas for all work done within the gas easement. C. Davies also 24 confirmed that while the Planning Board has the ability under the ordinance via 25 a Conditional Use permit to allow additional units to be built in a given phase, 26 requesting additional buildings would be the jurisdiction of the ZBA. C. May 27 noted that when the ordinance was written, such a scenario was probably not 28 envisioned, but said staff agrees that the phasing in question meets the spirit 29 and intent of that ordinance. C. Davies asked if a different type of 30 development, e.g. a Conservation Subdivision, would be more appropriate for 31 the applicant. C. May replied that it could be investigated. R. Brideau verified 32 that the existing Whittemore Estates condos and the proposed townhouse 33 structures would be significantly separate, particularly because of wetlands and 34 topography. 35

- 36 [M. Soares arrived at 7:50 PM].
- 37

38 M. Newman inquired about square footage, rent amounts, and if some units 39 would be handicap accessible. R. Tourigny replied that units would be approximately 1,100-1,200 sg. ft and that 5% of the units would include an 40 41 additional bump-out to accommodate a bedroom on the first floor. Rent for a 42 three bedroom unit would be approximately \$965, including heat & hot water. 43 J. Laferriere requested adding a bus shelter for school aged children, prompting 44 M. Newman to ask if a playground area would be included. R. Tourigny replied 45 that NeighborWorks typically provides passive recreational open space in their 46 projects, but that an actual playground is not envisioned at this time. M. 47 Soares suggested fencing stream areas for safety reasons. R. Tourigny said a 48 stonewall currently stands along the back of the property that could be added 49 onto.

50

A. Rugg acknowledged a resident with a question. Ann Chiampa, 28 1

- 2 Wedgewood Drive, inquired about the lack of green space and/or steps 3
- between the front doors of the units and the sidewalk as seen in the photos 4 presented. R. Tourigny said the green area would certainly be included, space 5 permitting, but that steps are typically not included for accessibility purposes.
- 6 7

8

There was no further public input.

9 R. Tourigny said he anticipates applying for financing in August of 2013 when 10 applications would be available through the NH Housing Finance Authority. Approvals would therefore be sought before that time. 11

12

Other Business

13 14

15 Based on the above discussion, C. Davies suggested possibly amending the 16 inclusionary housing ordinance. He recommended doing the same for the Planned 17 Unit Development to address timing issues and better accommodate long term 18 projects like Woodmont Commons. C. May stated the initial step would be formation by the Board of a subcommittee.

- 19
- 20

21 **Adjournment:**

22

23 D. Coons made a motion to adjourn the meeting. R. Brideau seconded the 24 motion. Vote on the motion: 9-0-0. 25

- 26 The meeting adjourned at 8:04 PM.
- 28 These minutes prepared by Planning & Economic Development Secretary Jave 29 Trottier, and Building Division Secretary Libby Canuel.
- 30

27

- 31
- 32
- 33 Respectfully Submitted,
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37 Laura El-Azem, Assistant Secretary

Planning Board Meeting Minutes - December 5, 2012 - Attachment #1



Memo To: Planning Board, Londonderry, New Hampshire

Town Council, Londonderry, New Hampshire

From: Heritage and Historic District Commission, Londonderry, New Hampshire

Date: November 15, 2012

Re: Zoning Ordinances

The Heritage and Historic District Commission (Commission) recommends that the Planning Board and/or the Town Council take no action to modify or suspend the Town's Zoning Ordinances with regards to outdoor and electronic signs. The Commission feels that the current regulations for signage are adequate to cover any needs for private or governmental entities.

The current sign regulations help to preserve the look and character of the Town of Londonderry. The Commission feels that there are no underlying feelings amongst the citizens for a reversal of the signage rules. The Commission thinks that the citizens like the non-electronic sign status of the Town in which they have chosen to reside.

Recently the Londonderry Fire Department has been considering the erection of a permanent, electronic sign at the Central Fire Station to provide emergency communications to the Town. Such a sign would be contrary to the current zoning ordinances regulating such signage.

The Commission recognizes that the Town Government may choose to ignore the Town's Zoning Ordinances in order to achieve goals that it feels provides a betterment for the citizens. The Commission feels that the current use of temporary signs to address temporary situations is a course of action that has been useful.

The Commission feels that the Fire Department staff should consider other means of providing mass communications. These could include cellular telephone calls, text messaging, possibly increasing the power of the school's FM station and the use of a reverse 911 calling system. A single stationary sign is only good for those people who can get to it and if it contains the information that they want. The Commission feels that the wired and wireless world holds more promise than the line-of-sight visual approach to disseminating news and information.

The Commission strongly recommends that the Town government and it entities adhere to the current Zoning Ordinances.

* * * * *

This recommendation is prepared pursuant to a vote of the Commission in session on November 15, 2012. Approved 7-0-0.

David Colglazier, Secretary

at fa log



ARI B. POLLACK President 214 N. Main Street

P.O. Box 1415 Concord, NH 03302-1415

Direct Dial: (603) 545-3630 General: (603) 228-1181 Fax: (603) 228-8396 pollack@gcglaw.com

December 5, 2012

Via E-Mail

Arthur Rugg, Chair Londonderry Planning Board 268B Mammoth Road Londonderry, NH 03053

Re: Woodmont Commons PUD Application

Dear Chairman Rugg:

Please accept this letter as an interim update on the status of the Woodmont Commons PUD Application and the several technical sessions conducted between Team Woodmont, Town Staff and your review team, led by Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. (HSH). In general, these discussions have resulted in a consensus about how best to schedule, study, and document the various topics and issues relating to the PUD Master Plan so that presentations can be made to the Planning Board in the most comprehensible and efficient manner.

Specifically, meetings held October 23, 2012 and November 30, 2012 focused on land use regulation and the best means of expressing project development standards. A Master Plan "operations manual" was conceived as a means of organizing information from the Application in a format more consistent with Londonderry's existing zoning ordinance and development regulations. A presentation of the form of this document, and how it would be used post-approval, is planned for the Board's meeting on December 12, 2012. Thereafter, a presentation of land uses and the overall conceptual regulating plan is projected for January.

Also, a meeting of traffic engineers was held December 4, 2012. This meeting resolved in a consensus over how Team Woodmont engineers will study trip generation from realistic Master Plan development scenarios, how existing internal and external roadway capacities will be tested, and how "capture rates", to be determined, will evolve over the development timeframe and serve to alleviate the impact of new generation. Our engineers anticipate being ready for a detailed deliverable and subsequent Board discussion on traffic considerations in February.

Arthur Rugg, Chair December 5, 2012 Page 2

In addition, at our various technical meetings, we have discussed the parameters for a fiscal impact study of the Master Plan. This study, which has been commissioned and is underway, will provide a means of assessing the net revenue impacts of the project as a whole, plus yield a flexible model useful in projecting impacts from particular development scenarios both conceptually and post-approval.

Team Woodmont is also preparing a list of requested exceptions, waivers, and modifications sought from existing regulations, design standards and dimensional instructions. The Board will be asked to include this relief in the approval. In the coming weeks, this draft list will be shared with and evaluated by Staff and the review team for refinement and, ultimately, presentation to the Board. A deliverable, followed by a public presentation, is targeted for March.

To manage tasks effectively, our respective teams have discussed a schedule reflective of the above-stated focus areas and goals. The attached schedule was crafted with the following considerations in mind: (1) schedule topics separately to allow focused Board discussion; (2) allow time to prepare, review and disseminate materials sufficiently in advance of the date of the Board meeting; and (3) respect the Board's need to fairly allocate its time amongst other unrelated Londonderry planning matters. Obviously, if the Board desires variation from the proposed schedule, Team Woodmont is available to discuss such variations.

Lastly, to accommodate the proposed schedule of activities, topics and meetings, and to respect the review clock imposed by RSA 676:4(I)(c), Team Woodmont hereby requests an extension of the review clock until April 15, 2013. Rather than offer a series of piecemeal extensions, and now that a definitive schedule has been reviewed and proposed, Team Woodmont, Staff and the review team agree that a singular extension based on the anticipated schedule makes administrative sense. Of course, nothing would prevent the Board from resolving or deciding matters in advance of the end of the extended review period.

In summary, Team Woodmont, along with Staff and HSH, looks forward to providing a more detailed update on these matters at the Board's scheduled meeting on December 12, 2012. Until then,

Very truly yours,

CB.P

Ari B. Pollack

Arthur Rugg, Chair December 5, 2012 Page 3

Enclosure: WC PUD: Application Review and Decision Process

 cc: Pillsbury Realty Development, LLC (and Team Woodmont) William R. Hart, Jr., Acting Town Manager Michael D. Ramsdell, Esq.
 Cynthia A. May, ASLA John Trottier, PE Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc. <u>Woodmont Commons PUD</u> Master Plan: Application Review and Decision Process

and allows for supplementation of the information described in the October 3rd application and based on coordination with the Town's staff and refinements in the previously submitted Woodmont Commons PUD Master Plan Application. The schedule allows time to respond to requests The following chart outlines a series of progressive topics for presentation and discussion with the Planning Board to review prospective the peer review consultant team.

The content of each briefing will include progress updates on the topics listed below, with supplemental information to assist in communicating review consultant, and the Woodmont Commons team to advance relevant studies and briefing documents so that they can be provided in a timely manner, including summary briefing documents and detailed agendas prior to each Planning Board session for which the Woodmont ordinance requirements for Planning Board Review and decision. The chart takes into account working sessions between the Town, its peer Commons PUD is to be discussed. In addition, a brief status update may be provided at other Planning Board meetings as it may please the the intent and characteristics of refinements. The end product will be a refined Master Plan and record that addresses all application and Board.

Proposed MeetingsDecember 2012Meeting 1Meeting 3Meeting 4with Planning BoardExember 3, 12,Weeks of AnuaryWeeks of FebruaryWeeks of FebruaryWeeks of March 5Stif/consultant• Weeks of November• Weeks of Anuary• Weeks of February• Weeks of February• Weeks of March 5Taraffoonsultant• Weeks of November• Weeks of Anuary• Weeks of February• Weeks of February• Weeks of March 5Taraffoonsultant(approximately 3(approximately 3(approximately 3(approximately 3(approximately 3and discussionsmeetings)ameetings)ameetings)meetings)meetings)meetings)Major topicsDocumentLand UseTransportation, for Signage, WaiversSignage, WaiversSupplementation of of ExistingSubmittal of detailed• December 5• One week before• One week before• One week before• One week before• One week beforeSubmittal of detailed• December 121Meeting 2Meeting 3Meeting 4Planning Board• December 12January 2 and 9; February 6 and 13; March 6 and 13; March 6 and 13; March 6 and 13; April 3 and 10						
 Weeks of November Weeks of Signacy Meetings) Meetings Meetings Meetings Meetings Meeting Signage, Waivers Meetings Meeting Signage, Waivers Meeting Signage, Maivers<!--</th--><th>Proposed Meetings with Planning Board</th><th>December 2012</th><th>Meeting 1</th><th>Meeting 2</th><th>Meeting 3</th><th>Meeting 4</th>	Proposed Meetings with Planning Board	December 2012	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Meeting 4
DocumentLand UseTransportation,Design Standards,organization and detailed schedule of meetings, topics, and processLand UseTransportation,Design Standards,dorganization and 	Staff/consultant preparation meetings and discussions	 Weeks of November 26, December 3, 12 (approximately 3 meetings) 	 Weeks of December 3, 12, 19 (approximately 3 meetings) 	 Weeks of January 2 through 31 (approximately 4 meetings) 	 Weeks of February 6 through 27 (approximately 3 meetings) 	 Weeks of March 5 through 26 (approximately 3 meetings)
 December 5 One week One week before One week before One week before Defore Meeting 2 Meeting 3 Meeting 4 	Major topics	Document organization and detailed schedule of meetings, topics, and process	Land Use	Transportation, Infrastructure, Open Space, Environment	Design Standards, Signage, Waivers of Existing Standards	Project Procedures, Supplementation of PUD Application, Submission of PUD
December 12	Submittal of detailed agendas briefing documents, refined PUD documents	• December 5	 One week before Meeting 1 	 One week before Meeting 2 	 One week before Meeting 3 	Meeting 4
	Planning Board Scheduled Meetings	December 12	January	2 and 9; February 6 a	nd 13; March 6 and 13	April 3 and 10

Woodmont Commons Master Plan: Planned Unit Development Prepared by the Woodmont Commons Planning Team















