

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2012 AT THE MOOSE HILL**
3 **COUNCIL CHAMBERS**
4

5 Members Present: Art Rugg; Mary Soares; Lynn Wiles; Laura El-Azem; Chris
6 Davies; Tom Freda, Ex-Officio; Rick Brideau, CNHA, Ex-Officio; John Laferriere,
7 Ex-Officio; Dana Coons; Leitha Reilly, alternate member; Maria Newman, alternate
8 member

9
10 Also Present: Cynthia May, ASLA; John Trottier, P.E.; Libby Canuel, Building
11 Division Secretary

12
13 A. Rugg called the meeting to order at 7 PM. He appointed L. Reilly to vote for L.
14 El-Azem.

15
16 **Administrative Board Work**
17

18 A. Plans for Signature – Elliot Medical Facility, Phase 4 & 5, Map 6, Lot 31

19
20 J. Trottier said all precedent conditions for approval have been met and staff
21 recommends signing the plans.

22
23 **D. Coons made a motion to authorize the Chair and Secretary to sign**
24 **the plans. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the**
25 **motion: 8-0-0.** A. Rugg said the plans will be signed at the conclusion of the
26 meeting.

27
28 B. Discussions with Town Staff

- 29
30
 - Update on 3rd Party Review Consultant Selection

31
32 C. May stated that this issue is still before the Acting Town Manager and
33 Town Attorney.

- 34
35
 - Zoning Ordinance

36
37 L. Wiles asked about the possibility of examining the Elderly Housing
38 ordinance to ensure it is representative of the most current Londonderry
39 census data. A. Rugg noted that once the Comprehensive Master Plan
40 Update is complete, one of the first implementation items will most likely
41 be a review of the entire ordinance.

42
43 **Public Hearings/Workshops/Conceptual Discussions**
44

45 A. Vigeant Family Properties LLC (Owner), Map 2, Lot 25 - Conceptual Discussion
46 of a Proposed Business, Zoned C-II (Route 102 Performance Overlay District)

47
48 The applicant was not present to review this conceptual plan. C. May said she
49 received no response to emails sent to the applicant, both after the November

1 14 meeting and earlier this week. The latter included an explanation that the
2 item would not be continued again at this meeting, meaning they would have
3 to contact staff to be placed on a future agenda.

4
5 **Continued Plans**

6
7 A. Pillsbury Realty Development, LLC, Map 10, Lots 15, 23, 29C-2A, 29C-2B, 41,
8 41-1, 41-2, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 52, 54-1, 58, 59, and 62 –Public Hearing
9 for formal review of the Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development (PUD)
10 Master Plan [Continued from the November 14, 2012 Planning Board Meeting.]

11
12 C. May referenced a December 5, 2012 letter from the applicant’s attorney, Ari
13 Pollack, which included a request to extend the review period required under
14 RSA 676:4(I)9c) to April 15, 2013 in order to accommodate the applicant’s
15 proposed schedule of activities (see below). **M. Soares made a motion to**
16 **extend the review clock to April 15, 2013. L. Wiles seconded the**
17 **motion.** No discussion. **Vote on the motion, 8-0-0.**

18
19 Ted Brovitz, the Town’s 3rd party review consultant of Howard/Stein-Hudson
20 (HSH), reported that his firm has attended several meetings with Town staff
21 and the Woodmont development team since the October 10, 2012 meeting.
22 He conveyed that progress has occurred, particularly about the need to fully
23 evaluate the project through supplemental materials. This prompted the
24 Woodmont development team to create a schedule (see Attachment #1) that
25 accompanies a comprehensive outline (see Attachment #2) designed to
26 address the overall application in manageable portions at monthly public
27 hearings.

28
29 A. Pollack introduced Woodmont development team members Mike Kettenbach
30 (Principle of Pillsbury Realty and part owner of the property), Steve Cecil (The
31 Cecil Group), Terry Shook (Shook-Kelley), Rick Chellman, John Michels, and
32 Tom Goodwin (Shook-Kelley). S. Cecil reviewed the team's proposed schedule
33 of events (Attachment #1), noting that it takes into account the Board’s
34 request to obtain materials for each meeting a week in advance for their
35 review. Review meetings with the team, staff, and HSH will take place each
36 month after the second Planning Board meeting in order to produce the
37 materials to be disseminated to the Board and the public (via the Town
38 website) the first week of the following month so the scheduled topics can be
39 addressed on the second Wednesday of the month. At the January 9 Planning
40 Board meeting, the land use components of the plan will be discussed. This
41 will be followed in February by a presentation regarding transportation,
42 infrastructure, open space, and environment, including the impacts of each and
43 subsequent mitigation/improvements. The March meeting will involve more
44 detail oriented items such as design standards and waivers of existing
45 standards. Once the Board’s satisfaction is met regarding those topics, project
46 procedures will be discussed and the entire PUD application submitted for final
47 review.

48
49 A. Rugg asked when the topic of drainage would be discussed. S. Cecil replied

1 that it would be part of the infrastructure presentation. In the event that a
2 topic needs to be continued to a following meeting, C. Davies asked how the
3 proposed schedule would accommodate that. S. Cecil explained that the
4 individual agendas can be flexible, modified if need be, and can include
5 questions as they arise. Questions from both the Board and the public can be
6 submitted to C. May, tracked by staff, and then forwarded to the development
7 team so that they may respond promptly. When the issue was raised again
8 later by L. Reilly about the possibility that an individual meeting might not
9 provide adequate time for a given topic, both A. Rugg and A. Pollack agreed
10 that flexibility would be a key issue and that additional meetings can be added
11 when deemed necessary. S. Cecil added that the review meetings held
12 between the team, HSH, and staff will help them be better prepared so they
13 may be efficient with their time before the Board. With the Town's
14 Comprehensive Master Plan Update nearing the end of its process, C. May
15 suggested reserving the Moose Hill Chambers on the fourth Wednesday of each
16 month for those occasions when the Board feels an additional meeting is
17 warranted. L. Wiles asked if approvals will be a part of the individual
18 meetings. A. Pollack said the intent is to shape individual sections based on
19 the feedback from each meeting and then present one final document for
20 approval at the end of the process. A. Rugg noted that the feedback will
21 include that of the public as well as the Board.

22
23 A discussion ensued about how questions from the Board and public would be
24 handled as the process moves forward, including those questions that were
25 compiled and posted on the Town website in April, 2011. A. Pollack explained
26 that he continues to work with staff and HSH to refine the ongoing list and the
27 team has begun answering what can be addressed at this stage. Responses
28 will be provided at monthly meetings in addition to topics on the individual
29 agendas. C. May noted that quite a few of the questions submitted to date
30 cannot be answered at this time because they pertain to specifics that have yet
31 to be determined. They will, however, be answered when the information is
32 available. She will continue to act as the point person for all questions. Staff
33 will continue to track them, including when they were received, when they
34 were forwarded to the consultants and applicant, and what the response is,
35 even if the response is that an answer is not available at this time. Identities
36 of those asking the questions will be kept anonymous. The aforementioned
37 questions dating back to 2011 will be consolidated into the current spreadsheet
38 along with those submitted more recently, duplicate questions will be removed,
39 and an effective format will be chosen to best convey the information to the
40 Board and the public. Staff will also update the list regularly and in a timely
41 fashion.

42
43 [T. Freda arrived at 7:28 PM and L. El-Azem arrived at 7:44 PM]

44
45 S. Cecil continued by reviewing the six-page draft outline that details the topics
46 to be addressed at each meeting (Attachment #2). To achieve this, the
47 following will be included at their appropriate times:

- 48
49 • Supporting studies pertaining to such topics as fiscal/economic impact
50 and traffic;

- 1
- 2 • Additional supplemental materials to assist the Board and educate the
- 3 public;
- 4
- 5 • References for and/or copies of any example documents used;
- 6
- 7 • A regulatory document that will act as a guide for future specific
- 8 developments within Woodmont Commons, i.e. an "operator's manual"
- 9 for all parties involved in those individual projects;
- 10
- 11 • A description of the manner in which mitigation and necessary
- 12 improvements will be provided;
- 13
- 14 • Responses to questions posed during each meeting.
- 15

16 The remainder of the outline features four main categories:

- 17
- 18 • I. Planning Context (for orientation and general information), including
- 19 (but not limited to):
- 20
 - 21 ➤ The purpose and intent of the Woodmont Commons PUD;
 - 22 ➤ Its location, including the context with existing tax parcels;
 - 23 ➤ The planning process associated with a PUD;
 - 24 ➤ Explanations of the differences between the proposed and current
 - 25 zoning;
 - 26 ➤ Conceptual plans and illustrations;
 - 27 ➤ Ownership issues, current and future;
 - 28 ➤ The organization of the various PUD documents, their
 - 29 relationships to each other, and their uses
 - 30
- 31 • II. PUD Regulations and Standards (this, along with the third category,
- 32 comprises the aforementioned "operator's manual" that will instruct the
- 33 various parties involved with future individual proposals within the
- 34 overall development), including (but not limited to):
- 35
 - 36 ➤ The purpose of various regulations and standards;
 - 37 ➤ Which individual projects are subject to the PUD Master Plan;
 - 38 ➤ Waivers needed from Town regulations;
 - 39 ➤ How future additions to or alterations of individual projects are
 - 40 managed;
 - 41 ➤ A map and boundary description;
 - 42 ➤ Definitions of PUD terms;
 - 43 ➤ Allowed uses, densities and use distribution standards that form
 - 44 the overall Land Use Plan;
 - 45 ➤ High level regulations and standards of the overall area (e.g. for
 - 46 land division, transportation, infrastructure, natural and cultural
 - 47 resources, and utilities) that are established prior to and
 - 48 subsequently govern regulations for individual building or
 - 49 improvement projects;
 - 50 ➤ Project regulations and standards for individual components (e.g.

- 1 site development, building, signage, and lighting standards);
2 ➤ The administration of the various kinds of projects and approvals;
3 ➤ Tracking forms and records of separate project approvals over
4 time.

- 5
6 • III. Mitigation and Improvement Requirements that describe the
7 methods and conditions used to ensure such things as adequate utilities
8 and roadway access will be provided and paid for since certain capital
9 improvements will need to be put in place and their impacts mitigated
10 before specific phases or areas or developed.
11
12 • IV. Supplemental Documents, including various impact analyses that the
13 Board will use to evaluate the overall PUD Master Plan proposal.

14
15 A. Rugg asked for Board input. M. Soares suggested moving the task of
16 verifying abutters from the last category to the first since it is a requirement
17 for a public hearing. C. May explained that regardless of its location in the
18 outline, abutter and consultant team re-notification has been identified to the
19 Woodmont team as being necessary in order to meet State standards and
20 should occur before the next meeting. L. Reilly asked what would be included
21 in the economic impact study. S. Cecil described it as both the net fiscal
22 revenue impacts and benefits that result from different aspects of the project
23 over time, how those affect the town's services and resources, and how that
24 relates back to the potential balance amongst proposed uses and development
25 patterns in the plan. J. Laferriere expressed concern about the possibility of
26 overlooking more specific elements of the project because of the lack of
27 specificity in the schedule and the amount of information to be reviewed at
28 each meeting. He asked that subsections under each heading be fully
29 addressed in the materials the Board and public receive a week in advance. A.
30 Pollack said that request will be satisfied.

31
32 A. Rugg asked for public input. Ann Chiampa, Wedgewood Drive, confirmed
33 that information to be presented and discussed at each second monthly
34 Planning Board meeting will be delivered and made available to the public a
35 week in advance via the Town website. She also requested that presentations
36 at meetings be made in a way so that they can clearly be seen by the
37 television viewing audience. A. Pollack said that the development team will
38 investigate just how to accomplish that. Mike Speltz, 18 Sugarplum Lane,
39 suggested adding a point to the "Open Space Standards," (Section II, item 3.4)
40 related to the use of agricultural soils so as to encourage the development
41 team to make use of and/or preserve the rare prime agricultural soils found on
42 the property in question. He said this could also be addressed in Section II,
43 item 2.2.

44
45 **D. Coons made a motion to continue the public hearing for formal**
46 **review of the Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development (PUD)**
47 **Master Plan to the January 9, 2013 meeting at 7 PM. R. Brideau**
48 **seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the motion, 9-0-0.**

49
50 **Other Business**

1
2 There was no other business.

3
4 **Adjournment:**

5
6 **M. Soares made a motion to adjourn the meeting. R. Brideau seconded**
7 **the motion. Vote on the motion: 9-0-0.**

8
9 The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

10
11 These minutes prepared by Planning & Economic Development Secretary Jaye
12 Trottier, and Building Division Secretary Libby Canuel.

13
14
15
16 Respectfully Submitted,

17
18
19
20 Lynn Wiles, Secretary

Woodmont Commons PUD Master Plan: Application Review and Approval Process

Planning Board: Overview of Meeting and Topic Schedule

The following chart outlines a series of progressive topics for presentation and discussion with the Planning Board to review prospective refinements in the previously submitted Woodmont Commons PUD Master Plan Application, responding to requests and providing additional supporting information as described in the October 3rd application and based on the relate coordination with the Town’s staff and the peer review consultant team.

The content of each briefing will include progress updates on the topics listed below, with summary information to assist in communicating the intent and characteristics of refinements, prior to finalizing a complete refined draft that contains all application and ordinance requirements for Planning Board Review and decision. The chart takes into account working sessions between the Town, its peer 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 Woodmont Commons is a major focus. In addition, a brief status update may be provided at other Planning Board Meetings as a method to respond to questions and report on overall progress.

Proposed Meetings with Planning Board	December 2012	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Meeting 4	Meeting 5
Staff/consultant preparation meetings and discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weeks of November 26, December 3, 12 (approximately 3 meetings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weeks of December 3, 12, 19 (approximately 3 meetings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weeks of January 2 through 31 (approximately 4 meetings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weeks of February 6 through 27 (approximately 3 meetings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weeks of March 5 through 26 (approximately 3 meetings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As required
Major topics	Document organization and detailed schedule	Land Use	Transportation, Infrastructure	Open Space, Environment	Design Standards Overview, Complete Document	Refined PUD Application and PUD Master Plan Review and Approval
Submittal of detailed agendas briefing documents, refined PUD documents		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week before Meeting 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week before Meeting 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week before Meeting 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week before Meeting 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One week before Meeting 5
Planning Board Scheduled Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 12 	January 2 and 9; February 6 and 13; March 6 and 13; April 3 and 10				

Town of Londonderry, NH

Woodmont Commons Master Plan
Planned Unit Development
Master Plan

DRAFT

Prepared by the Woodmont Commons Planning Team

DRAFT

Version 6.4

November 5, 2012, revised December 12, 2012

OVERVIEW

To facilitate the Londonderry Planning Board's review and approval process relative to the previously completed Woodmont Commons PUD application (October 3 submittal), a series of documents will be needed to provide more detailed information and support the PUD Master Plan.. This outline provides a breakdown of key components that will augment the PUD Master Plan application that will be prepared by the Woodmont Commons professional team. The components are intended, in part, to accomplish several important purposes, including:

- Provide studies and additional information to support the Planning Board's review of the overall PUD Master Plan proposal relative to the existing Zoning Ordinance and the criteria within it, such as fiscal/economic impact studies and transportation impact analyses.
- Provide other supplemental information and explanations to support the Planning Board's review and approval, as well as the public's understanding of the PUD Master Plan.
- Provide a copy or reference to companion documents such as a Development Agreement that may be related to the PUD Master Plan and establish mutual obligations between the Town and the Master Property Owners of Woodmont Commons.
- Provide a coordinated and coherent regulatory document that will be used in the review and approval processes for subsequent specific development, improvement or project proposals, serving as an "operator's manual" for the entire PUD Master Plan area.
- Describe the methods for providing appropriate mitigation or accomplishing necessary improvements for advancing relevant stages or types of development.
- Respond to various questions and suggestions raised during the review of the submittals.

WOODMONT COMMONS PUD MASTER PLAN

I. Planning Context

(Explanation: This introductory section will serve as an orientation and informational resource, explaining how the Woodmont Commons concepts and conceptual diagrams emerged through an extensive planning process. It will describe how this approach fulfills the goals of the Town's PUD Ordinance and how it differs from the traditional and underlying zoning. It will also provide an explanation of some of the terminology that is used)

1. Purpose of Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development
 - 1.1 Intent of the Woodmont Commons PUD
 - 1.2 Location *(Including map with boundary location and identification of existing tax parcels)*
 - 1.3 PUD Planning Process
 - 1.4 Difference from Current Underlying Zoning *(Including map of existing underlying zoning and description of significant differences)*

2. Concept Plan and Illustrations
 - 2.1 Background and Description
 - 2.2 Concept Plan
 - 2.3 Other Concept Illustrations
 - 2.4 Interpretation
3. Ownership Arrangement
 - 3.1 Current Ownership
 - 3.2 Ownership Organization
 - 3.3 Covenants, Restrictions and Easements
 - 3.4 Master Property Owners' Association
4. Organization of the PUD Master Plan Documents
 - 4.1 Documents and Relationships
 - 4.2 Use of the Documents

II. PUD Regulations and Standards

1. Introduction

(Explanation: This is the initial section of the "Operator's Manual will establish basic information applicable to any subsequent proposal for Planning Board approval within the Woodmont Commons PUD.)

 - 1.1 Purpose of the PUD Regulations and Standards
 - 1.2 Eligibility *(This section defines the types of projects and approvals eligible to establish entitlement by establishing conformance with the Master Plan Development Standards.)*
 - 1.3 Location
 - 1.3.1 Map
 - 1.3.2 Boundary Description
 - 1.4 Planning and Design Principles *(This section establishes the principles that will be used to govern interpretations of the Regulations and Standards.)*
 - 1.5 Applicability
 - 1.5.1 Projects and Approvals Subject to PUD Master Plan
 - 1.5.2 Projects and Approvals Subject to Underlying Zoning
 - 1.5.3 List of Regulatory Waivers
 - 1.5.4 Pre-Existing and Non-Conforming Uses
 - 1.5.5 Alterations or Additions
 - 1.6 PUD Definitions
2. Land Use Plan

(Explanation: The plan diagrams and descriptions will establish the approval standards for allowed development distribution in terms of use, amounts, density, and location.)

 - 2.1 Description
 - 2.2 Plans *(This includes series of plans and diagrams that include definitions of important sub-areas and overall, applicable physical locations or standards for elements such as buffers, open space, roadway networks and the like.)*
 - 2.3 Land Use Standards
 - 2.3.1 Allowable Uses *(This includes a matrix of uses linked to the Plan.)*
 - 2.3.2 Use Distribution Standards
 - 2.3.3 Allowable Densities
3. Area Regulations and Standards

(Explanation: These standards would be used to review and approve proposals similar to subdivisions or infrastructure projects that establish new property lines and appropriate access and service, prior to individual building or improvement projects which are addressed in the following section on "Project Regulations and Standards.")

 - 3.2 Standards for Division of Land

- 3.2.1 Lots
- 3.2.2 Lot Dimensional Standards
- 3.2.3 Lot Frontage and Access Requirements
- 3.2.4 Fire Safety Standards
- 3.2.5 Public Safety Standards
- 3.2.6 Diagrams
- 3.3 Transportation Infrastructure Standards
 - 3.3.1 Traffic Capacity and Performance Standards
 - 3.3.1.1 Primary Network
(This category would cover the major connectors to perimeter streets and roads adjacent to the PUD. It would include diagrams of the primary network.)
 - 3.3.1.2 Secondary Network
(This category would cover all internal streets and ways. It would include diagrams of the possible secondary networks.)
 - 3.3.2 Street Types and Standards
 - 3.3.2.1 Description
 - 3.3.2.2 Illustration of Street Types
 - 3.3.3 Pedestrian Infrastructure Standards
 - 3.3.3.1 Description
 - 3.3.3.2 Diagrams
 - 3.3.4 Bicycle Infrastructure Standards
 - 3.3.4.1 Descriptions
 - 3.3.4.2 Diagrams
 - 3.3.5 Signage Standards
 - 3.3.5.1 Descriptions
 - 3.3.5.2 Diagrams
 - 3.3.6 Lighting Standards
 - 3.3.6.1 Descriptions
 - 3.3.6.2 Diagrams
 - 3.3.7 Landscape Standards
 - 3.3.7.1 Descriptions
 - 3.3.7.2 Diagrams
 - 3.3.8 Maintenance Standards
(This would include environmental impact mitigation or avoidance, for example, sodium loading.)
 - 3.3.8.1 Descriptions
 - 3.3.8.2 Diagrams
- 3.4 Open Space Standards
 - 3.4.1 Public Accessible Open Space
 - 3.4.2 Natural Vegetation and Features
 - 3.4.3 Buffers
 - 3.4.4 Recreational Areas
 - 3.4.5 Diagrams
- 3.5 Cultural Resources
 - 3.5.1 Definitions
 - 3.5.2 Diagrams
- 3.6 Utility Infrastructure
 - 3.6.1 Water
 - 3.6.2 Sewer
 - 3.6.3 Stormwater Management
 - 3.6.4 Electrical Power and Distribution
 - 3.6.5 Communications
 - 3.6.6 Other Utilities
 - 3.6.7 Diagrams

4. Project Regulations and Standards

- 4.1 Purpose
(Explanation: These are individual projects or project components that would require approval but that are fully entitled by virtue of pre-established approval at the Area Regulations and Standards level. This level describes how entitled development will proceed.)
- 4.2 Eligibility
- 4.3 Site Development Standards
 - 4.3.1 Site Layout
 - 4.3.2 Site Circulation and Access
 - 4.3.3 Parking and Loading Standards
 - 4.3.4 Landscape Standards
 - 4.3.5 Stormwater Management
 - 4.3.6 Site Utilities
 - 4.3.7 Publicly Accessible Open Space
 - 4.3.8 Preserved Open Space and Environmental Resources
 - 4.3.9 Diagrams
- 4.4 Building and Structures Standards
 - 4.4.1 Dimensional Standards
 - 4.4.2 Design Standards
 - 4.4.3 Building Disposition and Configuration
 - 4.4.4 Diagrams
- 4.5 Signage Standards
 - 4.5.1 Descriptions
 - 4.5.2 Diagrams
- 4.6 Exterior Lighting Standards
 - 4.6.1 Descriptions
 - 4.6.2 Diagrams
- 5. Administration
(Explanation: These components provide a clear guide to how the many types of projects and approvals will be handled.)
 - 6.1 Modification/Amendment Thresholds
 - 6.1.1 Changes not Requiring Modification/Amendment
 - 6.1.2 Modification: Definition and Process
 - 6.1.3 Amendment: Definition and Process – Ordinance Section 2.8.3.9
 - 6.2 Procedures
 - 6.2.1 Master Plan Development Reviews and Approvals
 - 6.2.2 Master Plan Project Reviews and Approvals
- 6. Forms and Records
(Explanation: This section will simplify and coordinate the tracking of separate project approvals over time, to make sure that each stage of development is coordinated relative to earlier or parallel submissions.)
 - 7.1 Submittal Forms
 - 7.2 Compliance Tracking Records

III. Mitigation and Improvement Requirements

(Explanation: This section will provide the methods that will be used to evaluate proposals within the PUD Master Plan area and to ensure that appropriate mitigation or improvements are accomplished. This may include specific thresholds or performance standards for particular elements, or required improvements that must be accomplished prior to certain phases, areas, or extent of development proceeding.)

IV. Supplemental Documents

(Explanation: This section will contain updated information and analytical studies used to evaluate the overall PUD proposal by the Planning Board prior to approval of the overall PUD Master Plan.)

1. Updated Abutters List
2. Transportation Impact Study
3. Economic Impact Study
4. Developer Agreement (*by reference or included as a copy*)
5. Miscellaneous Supplemental Information

DRAFT