

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD**  
2 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF August 8, 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; and  
7 Dana Coons

8  
9 Also Present: André Garron, AICP; Cynthia May, ASLA; John Trottier, P.E.; Libby  
10 Canuel, Community Development Secretary

11  
12 **Administrative Board Work**

13  
14 [L. El-Azem arrived during the following discussion at 7:02 PM]

15  
16 A. Discussions with Town Staff

- 17  
18 • Draft RFP for 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of land development applications.

19  
20 At their August 1 meeting, the Planning Board reviewed and made their  
21 final comments on the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) regarding 3<sup>rd</sup>  
22 party review of site and subdivision plans. Since then, comments  
23 obtained from Town legal counsel have been merged into the document.  
24 A. Garron reported that the only remaining review is that of the  
25 Purchasing Agent in order to verify conformance with Londonderry's  
26 policies. He confirmed with the Board that the RFP is to be advertised as  
27 soon as possible, with a window for submittals of at least three weeks.  
28 The document will be placed in the Union Leader and Boston Globe and  
29 will be posted on the websites of both the Local Government Center and  
30 the State Office of Energy and Planning. A subcommittee comprised of  
31 Rick Brideau, Leitha Reilly, Scott Benson, and Maria Newman will review  
32 the submissions and make recommendations to the Board. A. Rugg  
33 stated that if any Board members have further comments, they need to  
34 be submitted by the end of this meeting. (At the end of the meeting, he  
35 asked if members had any further input. None was offered).

- 36  
37 • Master Plan update

38  
39 C. May reported that the August 2 meeting of the Master Plan Steering  
40 Committee (MPSC) resulted in productive discussion, including input from  
41 a resident in attendance. All comments received from both the MPSC and  
42 the public are now being assembled by staff into a cohesive document  
43 that will assist consultant Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative  
44 (TPUDC) in their first revision. A. Rugg noted that the draft is available  
45 on the Town website as well as the Town's Master Plan Facebook page  
46 and comments from the Board and the public can be forwarded to either  
47 A. Garron or C. May. The MPSC will also occupy a booth during the "On  
48 the Common" event during Old Home Days on August 18. C. May  
49 announced that the next draft will be issued prior to the September 12

1 joint meeting of the Town Council and Planning Board, at which time  
2 TPUDC will provide a policy maker briefing.  
3

4 A. Garron added that the MPSC voted their final approval of the UNH  
5 phone survey. GIS Manager John Vogl also developed an overall analysis,  
6 including infographics, from the responses to the survey's four open  
7 ended questions. This will be integrated into the Master Plan. M. Soares  
8 questioned the accuracy of future phone surveys, considering their  
9 reliance on respondents with land lines while cell phones are increasingly  
10 used in their place.  
11

## 12 **Continued Plans**

13  
14 There were no continued plans  
15

## 16 **Public Hearings/Workshops/Conceptual Discussions**

17  
18 There were no public hearings, workshops, or conceptual discussions.  
19

## 20 **Other Business**

21  
22 A. Update from Peter Stamnas of NH DOT regarding the I-93 Widening Project  
23 near Exit 5.  
24

25 I-93 project manager Peter Stamnas and corridor supervisor Jay Levine of the  
26 State Department of Transportation (DOT) were present to update the Board on  
27 the progress of the widening of I-93. P. Stamnas provided an overview, stating  
28 that of the \$610 million total construction cost associated with the entire  
29 widening project, \$279 million (or 40%) worth of the work is underway or has  
30 been completed. Activity is continuing through the recent issuance of \$115  
31 million in bonds, including work between Exits 1 and 3 that is anticipated to be  
32 done by 2016. The final phase remains unfunded and will require an additional  
33 \$250 million. This includes work done from the weigh stations north of Exit 3 to  
34 the point north of Exit 5 where I-293 splits from off of I-93, but does not  
35 include the improvements being done to Exit 5 itself.  
36

37 Improvements to Exit 5 began in 2007. Three "early action" projects totaling  
38 \$30 million have been finished; the park and ride and associated improvements  
39 to Rte 28, the bus maintenance facility, and the exit ramps. The remaining  
40 work, i.e. the completion of the interchange that began approximately 18  
41 months ago at a cost of 37 million, is roughly 40% complete. Phase 1 of the  
42 southbound widening was performed in 2011 and traffic was rerouted to the new  
43 portion by the end of that year. Phase 2 of the southbound widening is now  
44 underway and is close to the point where traffic will again be shifted. In  
45 approximately two weeks, the northbound barrel will be moved and the new  
46 crossovers will be utilized to perform the next traffic swap, something which is  
47 anticipated to take two days. The mild weather during the winter of 2011/2012  
48 resulted in work occurring ahead of schedule and created the expectation that it  
49 will be completed 2014 if not sooner. Completion could even be feasible by the  
50 fall of 2013 since the lack of other work available to contractors in New England

1 has enabled them to focus on this project with more of their own crews. Work  
2 on Rte. 28 is also ahead of schedule and will continue through the fall.

3  
4 L. El-Azem asked if the current width of Rte. 28 around Exit 5 is for construction  
5 purposes or will remain as such. J. Levine replied that Rte 28 will eventually be  
6 two lanes in each direction with dedicated turn lanes in appropriate areas. P.  
7 Stamnas added that the width in those areas will actually be equivalent to an  
8 eight lane road. The four lane portion will stretch east all the way to the  
9 intersection with Symmes Drive. This work can begin once the old bridges are  
10 removed. Work on the western side of Exit 5 is nearly complete, which C.  
11 Davies verified includes the area directly before the ramp. C. Davies also  
12 questioned the sequencing of the lights and the use of a stop sign for the left  
13 and right turns respectively at the end of the southbound ramp since they seem  
14 to create a significant backup of traffic onto the highway. P. Stamnas stated  
15 that the issue should be rectified once the additional lanes are added and the  
16 area is subsequently reevaluated to coordinate the flow around the entire exit.  
17 M. Soares asked if a median will prevent drivers heading westbound on Rte. 28  
18 from taking a left onto Perkins Road. J. Levine said there are no plans to do so  
19 there or at Auburn Road unless it is found they are needed for safety reasons.  
20 D. Coons argued that the additional lanes will only exacerbate a current problem  
21 where people make dangerous and sometimes illegal turns because no  
22 impediments such as a median exist. P. Stamnas suggested the Board send  
23 their written comments to DOT for consideration. L. El-Azem recommended  
24 waiting to see how the changes will affect traffic before sending correspondence  
25 to DOT but D. Coons noted that funding would probably not be available to  
26 make alternations after the fact.

27  
28 M. Soares inquired about the total number of lanes intended for each side of the  
29 interstate from the Massachusetts border to the split with I-293. P. Stamnas  
30 answered that while the footprint will accommodate four lanes on each side,  
31 only three will be paved for now (and should be sufficient) until impaired  
32 waterway issues in Derry, Windham and Salem are addressed. When they are  
33 deemed necessary, the design of the roads and ramps will allow for a fairly  
34 simple addition of the fourth lanes. By the end of 2015, three lanes will exist  
35 from the border up through Exit 3. Assuming the necessary \$250 million is  
36 available, capacity improvements to be done north of Exit 3, where traffic  
37 volume heading north drops by 25%, and up to Exit 5 will begin in 2015 and will  
38 last six years. After Exit 5, I-93 will narrow back to two lanes until splitting off  
39 with I-293. Although no improvements will be made to Exit 4 until funding is  
40 available, P. Stamnas said the design will be in place so work can begin as soon  
41 as financing is secured. T. Freda asked if Exit 4A is still being considered. If the  
42 aforementioned \$250 million is obtained, the associated work will complete a  
43 portion of Exit 4A, however environmental approvals must be obtained first by  
44 Londonderry and Derry. A. Garron noted that the private engineering firm hired  
45 by the towns may have their National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)  
46 review submitted to the Federal resources agencies by the end of 2012. A  
47 record of decision would then be issued, although no funding can take place until  
48 a design is created. Funding for that design will be the responsibility of Derry  
49 and Londonderry. Other funding avenues for the engineering work (e.g. Federal  
50 funding) may be available at some future point, although P. Stamnas was not

1 aware of any at this time. M. Soares asked if funding for construction is  
2 restricted to a governmental agency or if anyone/any entity could provide it. P.  
3 Stamnas was unsure, but noted that such a project is a long term commitment  
4 and requires consideration for ongoing maintenance issues. When asked by T.  
5 Freda about the choices made to upgrade certain sections of I-93 before others,  
6 P. Stamnas explained that improvements have been made according to the  
7 areas of greatest need with regard to safety and issues involving capacity and  
8 the interchange systems of 50+ year old interstate. He noted in particular the  
9 multiple red listed bridges which need repair and replacement. A. Garron added  
10 that traffic growth studies done by the Town aided the State in their planning  
11 and determined the improvements will benefit travelers in the Londonderry  
12 area.

13  
14 The Board thanked P. Stamnas and J. Levine for their update. J. Levine noted  
15 that information is available online at [www.rebuildingi93.com](http://www.rebuildingi93.com) and P. Stamnas  
16 said updates can be obtained through an email notification service available on  
17 that website.

- 18  
19 B. Mill Pond Crossing– Request by residents to discuss the possible relocation or  
20 elimination of a nature trail and recreation field, which were elements of the  
21 approved plan.

22  
23 A. Garron explained that resident Paul Silva, 2 Hunter Mill Way, approached staff  
24 about the possibility of removing the trails that were part of the Mill Pond  
25 Crossing subdivision approved in 1999. Mr. Silva was then informed of a similar  
26 situation at the Tanager Landing subdivision where residents developed a  
27 petition to amend their approved subdivision plan and have the trails removed.  
28 The Tanager Landing residents were directed to meet with both the  
29 Conservation Commission and Londonderry Trailways to ensure that any  
30 concerns on their part were considered. A donation from the residents to  
31 construct a trail in another section of town in exchange for the removal of the  
32 trails was arranged, and a public hearing resulted in the Planning Board's  
33 approval of the amendment.

34  
35 P. Silva stated that when purchasing their home from LaMontagne Builders, no  
36 mention of any trails or a recreation field was made, nor were either identified  
37 on the plans supplied by the builder. (C. May noted that the subdivision plan  
38 recorded at the Registry of Deeds does in fact identify the trails). He said that  
39 trails were first brought up at a Homeowners Association (HOA) meeting five or  
40 six years ago (without any specifications for their use were), at which time the  
41 concept was opposed by the residents. P. Silva stated the builder agreed at that  
42 time to remove the trails from the plans. The issue arose again, however, at  
43 this year's Association meeting when discussing Phase II of the Mill Pond  
44 development. Mike Patterson of 16 Hunter Mill Way stated that while the trails  
45 were designed to traverse the open land owned by the HOA behind the  
46 individual lots, residents do not see any benefit to their presence. They instead  
47 have concerns about security issues, especially since the trails are accessible to  
48 those who live outside the development, as well as concerns about negative  
49 impacts to the existing wildlife corridor.

50

1 A. Rugg asked for input from the Board. C. Davies confirmed that the resident's  
2 petition would apply to just Phase I of the overall development. T. Freda said he  
3 would support a petition to remove the trails, particularly since the owners were  
4 not made aware of their inclusion in the subdivision when purchasing their  
5 properties. A discussed ensued pertaining to the Tanager Landing trails and the  
6 involvement of the Conservation Commission in various subdivision trails in  
7 town. T. Freda and C. Davies questioned the need to involve the Commission  
8 about the removal of the trails since subdivision review and approval is solely  
9 the purview of the Planning Board. Staff noted that per a condition of the  
10 approved Mill Pond subdivision plan, the Commission is explicitly associated with  
11 the trail construction, location, and operation. A. Rugg said that while the  
12 Planning Board has the final say, the input of the Commission should at least be  
13 sought. A. Garron said that the situation may be similar with the Recreation  
14 Commission if they were involved with the aforementioned recreation area.  
15 Because the HOA has not yet been turned over to the homeowners by the  
16 developer, A. Rugg said both would need to agree on the elimination of the trails  
17 and then initiate the process of developing and filing a formal petition before  
18 holding a public hearing with the Planning Board. He encouraged the residents  
19 to confer with A. Garron and also suggested looking into the affect on the  
20 Association's covenants. C. May advised reviewing the trails in Phase II now to  
21 determine if those trails should be removed as well. If that is the case, J.  
22 Trottier stated that the homeowners should coordinate with the developer since  
23 construction of Phase II will begin shortly. M. Soares asked if the original intent  
24 of the nature trails and recreation area could be researched, particularly to  
25 determine whether they were offered in exchange for greater density within the  
26 development.

27  
28 A. Rugg asked for public input. There was none.

29  
30 A. Rugg asked for further input from the Board. There was none.

31  
32 **Adjournment:**

33  
34 **C. Davies made a motion to adjourn the meeting. M. Soares seconded the**  
35 **motion. Vote on the motion: 8-0-0.** The meeting adjourned at 8:22 PM.

36  
37 These minutes prepared by Jaye Trottier and Libby Canuel, Community  
38 Development Department Secretaries.

39  
40 Respectfully Submitted,

41  
42  
43  
44 Lynn Wiles, Secretary