



**Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 4, 2014
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman
Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
Bruno Federico, Selectmen's Representative
Mary Jane Werner, Alternate
Steve Doyle, Alternate

Members Absent: Jameson Paine, Member
Tom House, Member
Christopher Merrick, Alternate

Staff Present: Lincoln Daley, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call.

The Chairman took roll call and asked Mr. Doyle and Ms. Werner if they would be full voting members for tonight's meeting. Both agreed.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes.

a. May 7, 2014

Mr. Federico made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 7, 2014. Motion seconded by Ms. Werner. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Hearing(s).

a. **Varsity Wireless, LLC, One New Hampshire Avenue, Portsmouth, NH 03801 for the property located at 313 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH Tax Map 22, Lot 29.** Site Plan Review Application and Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 19.7 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to replace an existing 165' tall lattice telecommunications tower with a 185' tall monopole personal wireless facility, associated antennas and cabling, and the installation of ground based telecommunications equipment and associated fencing. (*Continued from May 7, 2014*)

Mr. Frances Parisi, representative for Varsity Wireless introduced himself. He said they are seeking a conditional use permit (CUP) and a site plan review. At the May 7, 2014 meeting it was agreed to have a site walk and to hold a zoning workshop. Varsity

1 Wireless wants to replace the existing tower with one that is more structurally sound,
2 more technically accommodating, to facilitate co-location and to be able to
3 accommodate technologies that will arise in the future.
4

5 He said they had provided supplemental materials and in addition had received a review
6 letter from the Town Planner. Mr. Parisi brought some further supplemental
7 information which included revisions requested by the Planning Board at the previous
8 meeting.
9

10 The site walk revealed several concrete blocks which would impede traffic if Varsity
11 chose to bump out their fence. The blocks would be removed. Mr. Parisi said they
12 would be happy for a condition to be attached that stated adequate traffic flow must be
13 maintained around the area. Mr. Federico said he wasn't at the site walk and asked if
14 the property owner was present. Mr. Parisi said he was at the property but didn't
15 partake in the site walk. Mr. Federico asked if the blocks belonged to him. Mr. Parisi
16 said that they did. Mr. Federico checked that the owner gave Varsity permission to
17 move them. Mr. Parisi said the owner had given them permission. Mr. O' Landy from
18 Varsity Wireless said they had talked about the blocks with the owner even before
19 coming before the Board.
20

21 Mr. Parisi addressed landscaping and the issue of creating some visual mitigation for
22 those driving along the Route 33. They plan to plant some trees along the front and
23 either side of the existing flag pole. He mentioned also that the current owner is
24 intending to update the site including landscaping and will be discussing that with the
25 Planner soon. Mr. Parisi said as they don't know where the current owner intends to
26 place the landscaping, it seems premature to plant the trees and said they would be
27 happy for a condition to be added to put money in an escrow towards the trees or agree
28 to plant the trees within a specified amount of time such as a year.
29

30 Mr. Daley said that during the site walk, they walked both up and down the Route 33 to
31 get a perspective. The general landscape has a curve and it's difficult to see the tower
32 until you round that curve. Heading from east to west it was more visible. Red maple
33 or red oaks might be good choices because of their high canopies.
34

35 Mr. Parisi said at the last meeting the use of alternate structures was discussed One of
36 the requests by the Board was to prove that other structures could not be used by
37 providing some evidence in writing. He continued that they had gotten letters from AT
38 & T and Sprint backing this up. They had compiled data on towers in the area to prove
39 why this particular area needs extra coverage. He said the main problem is Stratham
40 Hill; it blocks some of the coverage.
41

42 Mr. Parisi said the Planner had asked for a photo representation to show what this tower
43 would look like. Mr. Parisi shared some photos showing that as well as other designs
44 available. Mr. Daley asked if there was some way for the arrays to be organized so
45 they are not skewed. Mr. O' Landy explained that each carrier has its own

1 configuration. Mr. Doyle asked if this tower would help get rid of all the wires. Mr.
2 O' Landy explained that they will still be needed.

3
4 Ms. Werner asked if the applicant would be willing to put a time of one year to
5 complete the work in case the property owner changes his mind. Mr. Parisi said one
6 year would be fine. Mr. Baskerville asked if any progress had been made with the
7 Stratham Hill Park Association about potentially clearing some trees. Mr. Parisi said
8 they agreed to something outside of that. They are waiting to hear back from the
9 Association. Mr. Baskerville said he had looked at the drainage information he had
10 requested from the applicant at the last meeting and he has no problems with it.

11
12 Mr. Daley said there were a few minor amendments to make to the plan and the utility
13 easement needs to be finalized as part of the process also. Ms. Werner asked if there
14 was a utility easement on the property already. Mr. O' Landy said they will require
15 their own utilities, but that will happen at a later date. Mr. Daley said the concern
16 would be the septic system which is located in the front of the property so that needs to
17 be taken into consideration. Mr. Parisi suggested making it a condition. Mr. Daley said
18 he was OK with that, but would like to see something in writing that an easement has
19 been drawn up and agreed to by both parties.

20
21 Mr. Daley asked for Mr. Baskerville's thoughts on the foundation. He said he was OK
22 with the letter from the engineers responsible for the structure that the applicant had
23 provided.

24
25 The Chairman turned the topic to the meeting that took place between the applicant,
26 Heritage Commission and Stratham Hill Park Association to discuss visual mitigation.
27 He asked the applicant for an update on that meeting. Mr. Parisi said that he felt that
28 some of the mitigation suggestions were stretching the boundaries of reasonableness
29 such as cutting down trees. He said the idea of adding trees to the property was a good
30 idea, but it will cost several thousand dollars. The Heritage Commission had raised the
31 possibility of doing some signs for the Stratham Hill Park to educate and inform people
32 of the historical perspective of the Park which they feel will draw the eye away from
33 the cell tower. Mr. Parisi said that while they agree with that conceptually, people
34 won't really be looking at the cell tower from that point. However the applicant does
35 want to be reasonable and responsible. He said they had received a letter from the
36 Stratham Heritage Commission requesting \$10,000 be placed in a fund. They received
37 another letter from the Stratham Hill Park Association requesting that \$5000 go into a
38 fund for forestation management of the Park.

39
40 Mr. Daley added that at that meeting, Mr. David Short, Vice President of the Park
41 Association had suggested cutting down trees for the purpose of opening up the view
42 shed on top of Statham Hill Park so people see more of the Great Bay and surrounding
43 towns. Over the years the view has been blocked because of existing growth. You can
44 get a 360 view from the top of the fire tower, but not everybody can climb that tower so
45 it would be nice to see the same view from the top of the hill. The secondary part of
46 that discussion which was held at the Stratham Hill Park Association meeting last

1 Monday was to incorporate the management of the view shed as part of a larger plan
2 involving the management of the Town's forest and Stratham Hill Park. That is where
3 the \$5000 request was generated from.
4

5 Mr. Parisi said he thought the Heritage Commission and the Park Association were
6 going to talk among themselves and divide the money up reasonably. Initially the
7 applicant thought \$5000 total would be the requested amount, but now it's \$15,000.

8 Mr. Paul Deschaine, Town Administrator said there are technical and legal implications
9 of putting the money specifically in the Heritage Preservation fund. There are means
10 by which the Town can accept those funds. Mr. Deschaine would like it placed on
11 record that there be some off site mitigation funds provided to the Heritage
12 Commission on behalf of the Town and the Town will find an appropriate fund to place
13 it in.
14

15 Ms. Becky Mitchell said the extra cost of landscaping the property for the project
16 should remain separate from any mitigation work for the Town because landscaping is
17 a requirement of the Ordinance right from the beginning. She feels that there will be a
18 lot of feedback from the residents once this tower actually goes up and she would like
19 to report to the residents of Stratham that the Commission did the best it could to get
20 the best deal for them. Ms. Mitchell recognizes they will be getting better coverage
21 which is why the Heritage Commission, from the beginning have wanted to be
22 cooperative with this project. The Heritage Commission does feel however, that this
23 will be a detrimental impact to this area of town. They feel this sign will be a good way
24 to educate people on the history of the various homes, occupations and characters that
25 were associated with Portsmouth Avenue, and its vital role in the Town's development.
26 Ms. Mitchell says a sign should not be dismissed as a trivial mitigation.
27

28 Mr. Doyle asked Ms. Mitchell what she sees as the percentage of people interested in
29 the history of the Stratham. Ms. Mitchell said she didn't know, but the Heritage
30 Commission was set up and voted upon by the voters of this community with the
31 obligation to work to protect and educate the community on the history of the Town.
32 She feels that this request fulfills that mission.
33

34 Mr. Houghton asked what the useful life of one of these cell towers is. Mr. O' Landy
35 said more than 20 years. Mr. Houghton said that worked out to \$750 a year for
36 mitigation costs. Mr. Federico asked what the total constructions costs were for a
37 project like this. Mr. O' Landy said somewhere between \$250,000 and \$300,000.
38 Ms. Werner asked how much rent was being paid to the property owner. Mr. Parisi
39 said it wasn't something they felt comfortable disclosing. Mr. Daley asked Mr.
40 Federico if his question about construction costs was related to the projected level of
41 mitigation. Mr. Federico said it was.
42

43 Mr. Doyle asked Ms. Mitchell if the Heritage Commission allocate a particular
44 percentage to the mitigation of a commercial project. Ms. Mitchell said she had
45 researched this and talked to the D.O.T. and she talked about the sign provided as
46 mitigation at Chapman's Landing for the new Stratham/Newfields bridge project. That

1 sign cost almost \$8000 about 8 years ago. Ms. Mitchell also talked with staff members
2 at the Division of Historical Resources that have overlooked similar telecommunication
3 projects and got a percent of the range of money to put toward mitigation. In some
4 cases that was \$30,000. Ms. Mitchell was unable to provide an actual percentage.

5 Mr. Houghton asked what the Heritage Commission's vision was for the mitigation.
6 Ms. Mitchell described the kind of sign they were hoping to have. Mr. Doyle said he
7 didn't see the correlation between the tower and the sign. Ms. Mitchell said it wasn't
8 unusual to take this kind of mitigation. Varsity Wireless agreed that it was a pretty
9 standard request. Mr. Deschaine added that the sign idea should not be diminished and
10 he referred to the sign at Chapman's Landing saying it is really like an historical kiosk.
11

12 Ms. Werner, also a member of the Heritage Commission said she thought that the
13 Commission had made an excellent point because this does impact the Park and
14 properties down the road. She said the planning part of her has tried to change the
15 zoning in that area and the Town spoke loudly and definitively that they didn't want
16 any change. Mr. Federico spoke to the Stratham Hill Park Association and said if the
17 view isn't open, people's view will focus on the cell tower. If the view is 360, the view
18 will open up to show many other things and take the focus away from the tower. Mr.
19 Daley said the other element was the forest management plan so people know which
20 trees should be cut down to help obtain the 360 view.
21

22 Ms. Mitchell said the reason the Park Association and Heritage Commission didn't
23 combine is because they are 2 distinctive proposals and 2 different bodies so it would
24 be very difficult if the money was to go to one single place plus these projects would be
25 on 2 different time frames.
26

27 Mr. Federico asked the applicant if 5% of construction costs toward mitigation was
28 considered a reasonable request. Mr. Parisi said that Ms. Mitchell had done an
29 enormous amount of research, been at all 3 meetings and detailed her request. He feels
30 her request is very reasonable. He felt the Stratham Hill Park Association had a more
31 "give me money" approach and haven't really gone into details. In the spirit of
32 reasonableness and getting this done, Mr. Parisi said he would propose giving the
33 Heritage Commission \$9000 and the Park Association \$2500. Mr. O' Landy said at
34 the onset they gathered around a table and thought they had a number and that was
35 \$10,000. Now that number has increased to \$15,000 and that is new to them. He
36 wanted to know if they came back again would there be another new number. The
37 Board said if the Board agree upon an amount tonight, it will be set in stone. Mr. Daley
38 referred to the \$5000 request from the Park Association and said that the Recreation's
39 Director had provided him with an email of the National Resource Conservation
40 Service which states that for a parcel of this size a forest management plan would cost
41 about \$3000. Mr. Parisi said he gets the feeling that the forest management plan is part
42 of a bigger plan and it's not to negate the visual impact of the tower. He said they don't
43 mind contributing, but don't feel they should pay the entire amount.
44

45 Ms. Mitchell said she would be amendable to the offer of \$9000 for the Heritage
46 Commission and \$2500 to go to the Stratham Hill Park Association. Ms. Werner said it

1 should be bumped up to \$3000 for the Park Association. The Board agreed with the
2 amounts.

3
4 Mr. Deschaine said it was stated that there was no greater impervious surface, therefore
5 there were no additional catch basins required. He asked if there would be additional
6 storm water management requirement for the site. He continued that the storm water
7 management regulations were to be updated and here is an existing site with no storm
8 water mitigation measures in places because it's a grandfathered site; there are no
9 treatment structures or impoundments and this is directly in the MS4 sector of Town.
10 Mr. Daley said they hope to catch that element as part of the site plan review process
11 with Mr. Parisi directly.

12
13 Ms. Mitchell asked if the additional trees would have to be a certain caliper size. Mr.
14 Daley said the minimum required is a 3" caliper for all trees.

15
16 Ms. Werner made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr.
17 Doyle. Motion carried unanimously.

18
19 Mr. Daley said the applicant is seeking waivers that pertain to site plan elements.
20 Section 4.3.1.e requires the existing grades, drainage systems, structures, and
21 topographic contours at intervals not exceeding 2 feet with spot elevations where grade
22 is less than 3%. The applicant is making minimal grade changes so it could be
23 considered an excessive requirement.

24
25 Ms. Werner made a motion that the Board grant a waiver to Section 4.3.1.e of the Site
26 Plan compliance review. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville based on the area being
27 very level. Motion carried unanimously.

28
29 Mr. Houghton referred to Section 4.3.1.f; the shape, size, height, and location of
30 existing structures on abutting properties and access roads within 200' of the site shall
31 be shown on the plan. Mr. Daley added that relevant heights of the structures are
32 missing, but it is difficult to do survey work for each of those structures within 200'.

33
34 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to grant the waiver to Section 4.3.1.f. Motion seconded
35 by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

36
37 Mr. Houghton turned to Section 4.3.2.a of the Site Plan Review Regulations next. Mr.
38 Daley said it was very similar in nature.

39
40 Mr. Federico made a motion to waive Section 4.3.2.a of the Site Plan Review
41 regulations. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

42
43 Mr. Houghton turned to Section 19.4.3 height requirements. The height of a new tower
44 shall be a maximum of 150'. This new monopole structure with whip antenna will be
45 185'.
46

1 Ms. Werner made a motion that the Board grant the waiver from Section 19.4.3 with
2 the condition from the letter that it is 25% over construction. Mr. Daley said just for
3 the record the document provided by Mr. Baskerville this evening states 2 conditions
4 which Mr. Daley read into record. Condition number one: the design of all components
5 of the foundation are to be performed with an increase of 25% above standard code
6 design requirements or as mutually agreed to by the developer and the Town Planning
7 review staff. Condition number two; the design of the connection of the monopole to
8 the foundation are to be performed with an increase of 25% above standard code
9 requirements for all winds and lateral loadings or as mutually agreed to by the
10 developer and Town Planning review staff. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville.
11 Motion carried unanimously.

12
13 Section 19.6.4 Additional Requirements for Telecommunications Facilities; Setbacks
14 and Separation: Towers must be set back a distance equal to 125% of the height of the
15 tower from any off-site residential structure.

16
17 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve that with the same conditions stated for
18 19.4.3 height requirements. Motion seconded by Ms. Werner. Motion carried
19 unanimously.

20
21 Mr. Daley recommended the Board turned to page 4 of the staff memorandum. Section
22 9.7.3.c states that if the applicant is proposing to build a new tower, the applicant shall
23 submit written evidence demonstrating that no existing structure can accommodate the
24 applicant's proposed antenna. There is a list of 6 sub criteria which the Board should
25 read into the record.

26
27 The Board concurred with 19.7.3.c.i.
28 The Board concurred with 19.7.3.c.ii. Ms. Werner added the "why" part was answered
29 via the technology explanation.
30 The Board concurred with 19.7.3.c.iii.
31 The Board felt that 19.7.3.c.iv. wasn't applicable as the old tower is coming down.
32 The Board concurred with 19.7.3.c.v.
33 The Board concurred with 19.7.3.c.vi.

34
35 Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Daley to read the conditions he had listed.

36
37 Mr. Daley read: for the purpose of off-site mitigation, the applicant shall contribute
38 \$9000 to the Heritage Commission for the purpose of constructing an historical
39 informational sign. The Town will determine the appropriate account to appropriate
40 this money to.

41
42 Secondly, for the purpose of off-site mitigation, the applicant shall contribute \$3000 to
43 the Stratham Recreation Department on behalf of the Stratham Hill Park Association
44 for the specific use of a forest management plan.

45

1 Mr. Parisi asked when those payments would be due. Mr. Daley said it could be tied
2 into the building permit.

3
4 Mr. Daley continued: the applicant shall donate 3 trees, species to be determined by
5 Town staff in the approximate locations as shown on sheet Z-2 for the purpose of on-
6 site mitigation. Said trees shall be installed no later than one year after approval and
7 shall be of a minimum of a 3” caliper.

8
9 Ms. Werner added proof of easement as a condition of approval. Mr. Daley added also
10 that the final landscaping shall be reviewed and approved by Town staff.

11
12 Mr. Baskerville said the night of the joint meeting with the ZBA he remembers there
13 being a list of about 12 items that they made conditions of the ZBA approval and he
14 thought the Planning Board said they would be made conditions of the Planning Board
15 approval too. Mr. Daley said those conditions are listed in the binders. Mr. Parisi said
16 one of the issues that came up in the ZBA that they talked about more extensively was
17 the whole foundation issue, and he believes they misstated it in the ZBA decision, but
18 he thinks the Planning Board are stating it correctly.

19
20 Mr. Baskerville suggested running through the ZBA conditions to see if there were any
21 repetitions or if some of them had been satisfied. Mr. Deschaine said they are made no
22 more valid by being included as part of the Planning Board approval and not only that
23 by doing so would restart the clock. Mr. Baskerville said he didn’t want to include the
24 ZBA conditions, but still wanted to go through them.

25
26 Mr. Baskerville suggested adding ZBA condition number 5: no more than one
27 generator will be on site with a critical grade muffler; sound is to be considered if
28 abutters notice an appreciable increase in noise. Mufflers as needed are to be added.
29 The site must meet all decibel codes and regulations. Ms. Werner agreed.

30
31 The other ZBA conditions have since all been met

32
33 Mr. Baskerville made a motion with those stated conditions to approve the conditional
34 use permit for this project. Motion seconded by Mr. Federico. Motion carried
35 unanimously.

36
37 Mr. Daley reminded the Board that there were 2 applications; the conditional use
38 permit and the site plan approval.

39
40 Mr. Baskerville made a motion that based on the same conditions for the previous
41 motion, the Board approve the site plan approval for this application. Motion seconded
42 by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

- 43
44
45 **b. Sarnia Properties, Inc., 953 Islington Street, Suite 23D, Portsmouth, NH 03801 for**
46 **the properties located at 1 & 3 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 4,**

1 **Lot 3.** Site Plan Review Application to amend the September 4, 2013 Planning Board
2 Notice of Decision to allow the conversion of a 6,400 s.f. medical office use to a child
3 daycare facility, the construction of a 3,600 s.f. outdoor play area, and modifications to
4 the parking design and utilities.

5 The Chairman reminded everybody that the applicant had been before the Board
6 recently for a preliminary consultation. Mr. Daley started by addressing the possible
7 regional impact from extra traffic entering and exiting the site. He said the Board needs
8 to remember that this development abuts the Town of Exeter so it could potentially
9 increase the number of trip counts for Exeter too. Mr. Baskerville asked if the first site
10 plan was determined to be regional impact. Mr. Daley said it was. Mr. Federico said
11 his understanding is that the trip count for the day care are much less than what would
12 have been generated by the dialysis center. Mr. Daley said the applicant has brought a
13 traffic engineer this evening to discuss overall impacts to the surrounding area. The
14 summary report provided by the traffic engineer does indicate some increased traffic
15 counts.

16
17 Mr. Daley the first step in the process is to determine if this application is complete
18 followed by the regional impact decision.

19
20 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to accept the application as complete. Motion seconded
21 by Mr. Doyle. Motion carried unanimously.

22
23 Mr. Daley ran through the necessary criteria to determine whether a regional impact is
24 necessary. He added that the applicant only needs to meet one of the criteria for the
25 Board to trigger a regional impact study. There was applicable criterion; proposed
26 development directly adjacent to a municipal boundary. Mr. Houghton confirmed that
27 during the original site plan review, the Board went through the process of regional
28 impact. Mr. Daley said at that time the Board determined there was regional impact.
29 At that time it was for the creation of a medical office facility, a day care and another
30 medical office facility. In this case, the change being contemplated is the increase of
31 children associated with the expanding day care operations. There is the capacity for 98
32 children on site. Mr. Houghton said he wasn't convinced that there was enough
33 change happening to negate the first site plan approval. Mr. Baskerville said he only
34 had one concern; when the daycare hold some kind of event and all the parents come to
35 that. Ms. Werner said with the increased number of cars at 2 specific times a day, the
36 only way to go out will be through Exeter over by McDonalds and then go up to the
37 traffic light. She noticed also that nobody from Exeter was there tonight. Mr. Daley
38 said during those 2 times of day, there may be additional queuing on the Route 108
39 turning onto Stoneybrook Lane. He asked if there could be any mitigation through this
40 site plan review to alleviate some of the concerns for the abutting communities. Mr.
41 Houghton pointed out that if the Board feels a regional impact study is needed, the
42 application will have to be continued. Mr. Baker said that they had notified the town of
43 Exeter.

44
45 Mr. Doyle wondered what the difference will be between what was originally approved
46 versus now with the expanded day care. Mr. Houghton said there will be about 25-30

1 trips more a day. Mr. Federico said he doesn't believe this requires regional impact.
2 Mr. Baskerville said he tends to agree in that it has impact on the abutters across the
3 street, but they were notified, and he doesn't believe the change is great enough from
4 the original approval to warrant it. Ms. Werner and Mr. Baskerville would like
5 Exeter's input as a separate procedure. Ms. Werner said he is concerned also with the
6 condition of the Stoneybrook connector road. Mr. Daley reminded the Board that
7 Sarnia Properties had agreed to repair the road up to a certain point on Stoneybrook
8 connector road.

9
10 Mr. Federico asked Mr. Baker if the traffic engineer had done a count of how many
11 vehicles go through the Stoneybrook intersection. Mr. Baker said they hadn't done
12 that. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Federico felt that there wouldn't be enough additional
13 traffic to warrant a regional impact study.

14 Mr. Baskerville made a motion that these changes to not rise to the level of requiring a
15 determination of regional impact. Motion seconded by Ms. Werner. Motion carried
16 unanimously.

17
18 Mr. Federico made a motion that the Board ensure that the Town works with Exeter on
19 the change. Motion seconded by Ms. Werner. Motion carried unanimously.

20
21 Mr. Todd Baker, representing Sarnia Properties introduced himself. Referring to the
22 plan, Mr. Baker explained that the original plan showed a space for a dialysis company,
23 but they had since backed out of the deal. That facility would have had 18 staff, with
24 18 beds and 3 turn overs a day. There was also some space allotted for a day care
25 facility. The day care space and former dialysis center space have been combined to
26 become a larger day care facility. The new day care will operate from 6:00 am to 6:00
27 pm. Mr. Baker said the changes they are making will improve the site and be better for
28 the tenant. They want to eliminate the drive through area originally intended for the
29 dialysis center and move the parking spaces a little closer together and further away
30 from Stoneybrook Lane. They want to put a playground area in the area where 2
31 dumpsters, a generator, and a transformer previously existed. A guard rail has been
32 added around the outside of the playground for safety. Two play areas will exist.

33
34 Mr. Baker introduced Mr. Mark Andre, Director of Lil' Sprouts. Mr. Andre gave some
35 background to the company and then addressed the traffic issues. He said typically
36 people pick up and drop off over the course of about 3 - 4 hours in the morning and
37 again in the afternoon. He's never encountered any problems with people parking,
38 there are always parking spots available. Mr. Baker said he took some time lapse
39 video from the Lil Sprouts in Amesbury to show the traffic during drop off time. He
40 turned up there on a Friday at 7:15 am and took video until about 9:00 am. He shared
41 the video with the Board.

42
43 Mr. Federico asked if parents had to schedule specific times for drop off and pick up.
44 Mr. Andre said they don't, but they do ask for a time range to help schedule staffing.
45 Ms. Werner asked where the staff would be parking. Mr. Baker showed the spaces on
46 the plan. Mr. Daley said he would encourage designated spots for the employees to

1 help mitigate the traffic. Mr. Baker said he wasn't a fan of "employee parking only"
2 signs so they do try and talk to employees and encourage them to park in appropriate
3 spaces. Mr. Baker then shared the business hours for all the other businesses at the
4 site. Mr. Houghton asked if there were going to be specific spaces that say "pick up"
5 and "drop off only". Mr. Baker showed some spaces on the plan that would be
6 designated for that. Mr. Houghton asked if they ever held any family events. Mr.
7 Andre said that they didn't although they do hold annual graduations, but those are not
8 held at the facility.

9
10 Mr. Jason Plourde from Tighe and Bond introduced himself. He gave the Board
11 handouts showing the roadway jurisdictional. He then referred to the plan and
12 discussed the changes being made to parking and the removal of the drive through
13 originally planned for the dialysis center. The drive through area will now be used for
14 parking spaces and the original traffic flow for trucks will remain the same. Based on
15 the Town's bylaws for day care facilities, there are .35 spaces per person which would
16 mean 40 spaces would be required for the new day care facility. He said that according
17 to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) for parking information for day care
18 facilities, Land Use Code 565, only 21 spaces would be required. The Board
19 previously approved a total of 146 spaces, the applicant is proposing 148 and based on
20 the Town's minimum requirements of 30% reduction for shared parking, the applicant
21 would need 126 spaces. Mr. Plourde said that they will be increasing the traffic during
22 the week day morning and afternoon by one vehicle every 1 to 1.3 minutes. He said
23 that number may sound large, but in reality it really isn't. He pointed out also that the
24 Saturday traffic would decrease now that the dialysis center wasn't opening. Mr.
25 Plourde said that not all those cars will exit the way Ms. Werner referred to earlier. The
26 additional exiting traffic that would be associated with the second part of the day care
27 facility as compared to the previously approved outpatient medical facility, would be 35
28 cars in the morning and 26 cars in the afternoon. Mr. Plourde said that was worse case
29 and would mean one car every 2 minutes and that is all of them exiting out of the same
30 exit point.

31
32 Mr. Daley asked if Mr. Plourde anticipated any queueing concerns at the access point
33 from Portsmouth Avenue onto Stoneybrook Lane. Mr. Plourde said he did not. Mr.
34 Houghton asked how Mr. Plourde came up with his calculations. He said he based it on
35 ITE; trip generation information. Mr. Baskerville said it would be nice if the number
36 of staff and students could be put on the plan. Mr. Daley asked the Board if they
37 would like to set the limitation on the number of students at 98 and should that amount
38 be exceeded, they or any new owners would need to come back before the Planning
39 Board. The Board agreed that that would be a good idea. The Board changed the
40 number of students allowed to 100.

41
42 Ms. Werner asked about the dumpsters and generator area. Referring to the plan, Mr.
43 Plourde showed where the generator and transformer were now shielded by a fence as
44 well as the dumpsters. Mr. Federico asked about the fence. Mr. Baker said the fence is
45 designed to meet the state requirements which is usually a vinyl fence. They have
46 proposed an aluminum fence with 4" wide bars. Mr. Daley strongly encouraged a

1 black fence. Mr. Andre said that wasn't great in summer time as it tends to be hot to
2 the touch which isn't good for children. Mr. Daley said to look for a similar alternative.
3 He pointed out also that the fence is in a Town right of way which means it would have
4 to be maintained by the Town and he's not sure the Town wants that responsibility. He
5 suggested checking with the Highway Department. Mr. Daley said he knows they
6 would like a 3600' s.f. play area; he asked if that is required or could they push the
7 fence back onto the property line to allow for the guard rail to sit on the property line.
8 Mr. Andre said it is not mandatory that they have to have 3 classes out at the same time
9 in the play area, but from an operational standpoint, it is important, and that is the exact
10 space they need. Mr. Baskerville clarified it was the guard rail and not the fence that
11 would be in the right of way. Mr. Daley said that he meant the guard rail. Mr. Baker
12 said they could probably move it out of the right of way. Mr. Daley asked Mr. Baker if
13 there was a possibility of increasing the size of the smaller play area. Mr. Andre said
14 that wouldn't help him. Mr. Daley asked if there was an alternative to the guard rail
15 protection such as bollards. Mr. Federico said it would be good to do that on the street
16 side. Mr. Baker said they could do that. Mr. Daley said they could be incorporated into
17 the landscaping design.

18
19 Mr. Daley said before finalizing the plan, it would be good to reach out to the planner
20 for the Town of Exeter. Several board members agreed. Mr. Baker said they had sent
21 the Town of Exeter a formal abutter's notice. He would prefer if the plan could be
22 approved on the understanding he would make contact with Exeter's Town Planner.
23 The timing is important. Mr. Andre said there is a lot of seasonality in his business so
24 they would like to be up and running by the time the new school year starts in
25 September. Mr. Daley asked if waiting a couple of extra weeks for the site plan
26 approval would affect the opening. Mr. Andre said it could. Mr. Baker showed what
27 had been built so far and explained all the things that need to be done that are unique to
28 the day care facility.

29
30 The Board discussed whether or not to approve the site plan with conditions this
31 evening or to wait until the following Planning Board meeting. Mr. Baker observed
32 that there is an appeal period during which the Exeter Town Planner could comment.
33 Mr. Daley asked if the sign plans would change from what was previously approved.
34 Mr. Baker said they wouldn't change although a different name would go on the sign
35 obviously.

36
37 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr.
38 Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

39
40 Mr. Doyle made a motion that the Board approve the amended site plan approval with
41 the following conditions:

- 42
43 Resolution of the landscaping plans with staff
44 Resolution of traffic safety issues associated with the bollards
45 Number of students to be written onto the plan.
46

1 Motion seconded by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

2

3 **4. Miscellaneous.**

4 Mr. Daley explained that with the adoption of the Town Center form based code, there was
5 a slight alteration to the composition of the review committee. It was changed from the
6 Gateway Technical Review Committee to the Technical Review Committee. It included
7 the additional member of a representative of the Heritage Commission. The Heritage
8 Commission met and they nominated Nate Merrill as their representative. The Board of
9 Selectmen are looking for the Planning Board's recommendation of this nomination. Mr.
10 Daley said he thoroughly endorses Nate Merrill to be a member of the review committee
11 and ask that the Board support that recommendation also.

12 Ms. Werner made a motion that the Board supports the nomination from the Heritage
13 Commission of Nate Merrill to serve on the Technical Review Committee. Motion
14 seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

15 **5. Adjournment.**

16 Ms. Werner made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 pm. Motion seconded by Mr.
17 Federico. Motion carried unanimously.