



1
2
3
4
5 **Stratham Planning Board**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **August 20, 2014**
8 **Municipal Center, Hutton Meeting Room**
9 **10 Bunker Hill Avenue**
10 **Time: 7:00 PM**
11

12
13 **Members Present:** Mike Houghton, Chairman
14 Bruno Federico, Selectmen's Representative
15 Jameson Paine, Member
16 Tom House, Member
17 Christopher Merrick, Alternate
18

19 **Members Absent:** Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
20 Nancy Ober, Alternate
21 Steve Doyle, Alternate
22

23 **Staff Present:** Lincoln Daley, Town Planner
24

25 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call.**

26 The Chairman took roll call.

27 **2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

28 a. August 6, 2014

29 Mr. Federico made a motion to approve the minutes as stated. Motion seconded by Mr.
30 Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

31 **3. Public Hearing(s).**

32 a. **Rollins Hill Development, LLC. P.O. Box 432, Stratham, NH for the property**
33 **located at 20 Rollins Farm Drive, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 3 Lot 24.** Subdivision
34 Application to construct a 48 lot, over 55 Retirement Planned Community
35 Development.

36 The Chairman explained that a public hearing had been scheduled originally for the
37 applicant Rollins Hill Development, LLC., however the applicant requested a
38 continuance as they are still developing their plans and, as such, are not ready to submit
39 their application. The applicant opted to continue their application to October 1, 2014.
40 The Chairman continued that the applicant still wanted to talk to the Board from a
41 consultative point of view and give a high level overview of the development plans.

1 Mr. Federico made a motion to continue the Rollins Hill Development until October 1,
2 2014. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

3 *Mr. Merrick arrived at 7:15 pm.*

4 **4. Public Meeting(s).**

5 a. **Rollins Hill Development, LLC. P.O. Box 432, Stratham, NH for the property**
6 **located at 20 Rollins Farm Drive, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 3 Lot 24.** Preliminary
7 Consultation for a proposed Subdivision to construct a 48 lot, over 55 Retirement Planned
8 Community Development.

9 Mr. Mark Stevens, representative for Rollins Farm Development introduced himself. He
10 said the project is for a single family retirement subdivision coming off of Rollins Hill
11 Farm Road which ends in a hammer head. He said they have taken a section of Rollins
12 Hill Road just to get the grades to work and there will be a cluster of small hammer heads
13 that wind through the property. There are no wetlands impacts so no dredge and fill
14 application is necessary. Mr. Stevens said some of the construction will be within the
15 50' setback so they will be requesting a waiver for that. They have a partially cut road
16 way access through the vegetation to get in and test pit the property. They have hired
17 Steve Porter to do a traffic study for the intersection of Rollins Hill Farm Road and
18 Stratham Heights Road; they have a preliminary draft of that which they will submit as
19 part of the formal application. The applicant has met with the Fire Department a couple
20 of times to discuss fire protection for the area. They have met with the Department of
21 Public Works (DPW) and talked about road design, slopes, road and pavement wear and
22 basically they have to work through that process with minimum impact on the ground.
23 These are smaller roads that basically lead into dead end properties so the width of the
24 pavement and right of way doesn't need to be 60' or 24' in width. He feels that they can
25 show a better application would be a 50' right of way and 22' of pavement. The initial
26 response from the DPW was to show that would work. If the DPW are satisfied, they
27 will approve it.

28 Mr. Stevens continued that they had met earlier with the Police Department, whose
29 concern is the intersection mentioned earlier. When Lindt were in recently about their
30 expansion, the applicant had a meeting with all property owners and it was agreed Lindt
31 was going to tie in to this property at some point with an emergency access road. Mr.
32 Stevens showed where the applicant's suggested tie-in point for that would be on the
33 plan. He said if they took that option, the impact on the ground would be minimal. Mr.
34 Stevens showed where a pond would be located to help control run-off and create some
35 fire protection.

36 Mr. Houghton asked the applicant if the Fire Department gave any feedback relative to
37 the hammer head. Mr. Stevens said the Fire Department and the Police Department
38 didn't have any problems with the hammer heads. The DPW wanted to make sure that
39 the hammer heads were big enough for snow plows to turn around and they wanted to
40 know where they should store snow. Mr. Stevens said they would be designing viable
41 plans to make that work. Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Stevens if they had met with or had
42 any conversations with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Stevens said they had not as
43 they are not impacting any wetlands. However they are planning to talk to them to get
44 their support for the project in September.

1 Mr. Paine confirmed that it would only be the wetland buffer that was impacted. Mr.
2 Stevens confirmed that was the case. Mr. Federico asked for the location of the proposed
3 pond. Mr. Stevens showed it on the plan and said it would be on lots 30 and 34, just
4 above the wetlands. Mr. Stevens said it would address the stormwater runoff in that
5 section, but they have other small grassy detention areas within the development to cope
6 with runoff. They want to keep it as close to a natural sheet flow as they can.

7 Mr. House asked about the little hashed areas on the plan. Mr. Stevens said they are
8 receiving areas for septic systems to meet the state of New Hampshire requirements. Mr.
9 House asked if any sidewalks would be built. Mr. Stevens said they were not proposing
10 any.

11 Mr. Paine and Mr. Daley asked about open space. Mr. Daley asked if the open space at
12 the very front of the property was wet. Mr. Steven showed where wetlands were mapped.
13 Mr. Daley suggested Mr. Stevens review Stratham's regulations regarding how open
14 spaces are determined and classified. Mr. Stevens said he would do so.

15 Mr. Paine asked if the Fire department had provided any input on the Lindt emergency
16 access route. Mr. Stevens said they had attended a meeting when Lindt was doing their
17 site work and it was agreed that Lindt would construct some kind of access, but the
18 location wasn't determined as nobody had the exact topography of the area at the time.

19 Mr. Daley referred to the traffic study being prepared. He asked if part of the analysis
20 determines the development will cause a deterioration of the intersection of Stratham
21 Heights Road and Rollins Farm Road, and if that would require a secondary access. Mr.
22 Stevens said they had prior agreements on this development that a secondary access is
23 not required. Mr. Daley said it would helpful if they could include that as part of the
24 overall submittal.

25 Mr. Daley then referred to the waivers that the applicant would be requesting. He said
26 one would be for the length of the roadway. He asked if the applicant was seeking a
27 waiver for the width of the paved area. Mr. Steven said that they were. Mr. Stevens
28 added that there were issues with grades at some of the curves so there may be a waiver
29 for that also. Mr. Daley said that the regulations do not allow driveways to come off of
30 a T portion of a T intersection. Mr. Stevens said they would look at that. Mr. Daley said
31 as part of the septic design, he knows that the density was determined according to
32 regulations by the NHDES standards for septic design, however the actual design of those
33 systems is governed by Section 20 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance which is more
34 stringent. Mr. Stevens said they had looked at that and disagree with it and they have a
35 legal opinion too. He is surprised to hear this as he thought this had been resolved. Mr.
36 Daley said he wanted to make them aware of the regulations.

37 Mr. Daley returned to the subject of sidewalks. He explained that the Planning Board
38 has a purview of requiring sidewalks as part of a subdivision development. Mr. Daley
39 said that allowing pedestrian connectivity is really encouraged today. An opportunity
40 may exist that the sidewalks connect to a trail system on the property to other trails off
41 of the property. Mr. Stevens said they have provided a right of way between this property
42 and the Town owned property and that will be the only access to that property. It abuts
43 the Vineyards and that is where the concentration of open space and access and
44 development should be as it could be a real enhancement for the Town in general. Mr.

1 Stevens said they would need some help getting through from their property to the
2 Town's property.

3 Mr. Daley said that as this property abuts North Hampton, a portion of one of the lots
4 actually extends into North Hampton, this may require a determination by the Planning
5 Board for regional impact. Mr. Daley explained he has a meeting with the Planner in
6 North Hampton to discuss this further. If regional impact is determined, as part of the
7 formalized process with the Planning Board, it may require the Rockingham Planning
8 Commission (RPC) to come along with North Hampton as an abutter. It will also be part
9 of the formalized process subsequent to the formal acceptance of the application being
10 deemed complete.

11 Mr. Daley said that once the drainage and stormwater management have been submitted
12 as part of the overall final application for review by the Town's consultants. Mr. Daley
13 then made the applicant aware that the Conservation Commission (Con Comm) will play
14 a part because there are a number of wetland areas which the properties do surround.
15 Hydrological connections will need to be maintained and not severed so the quality and
16 functionality of wetlands in that area are not severed. There may be situations where
17 wildlife or natural features may want to be preserved to enhance overall development
18 that the Con Comm, Planning Board and public may want to comment on also. That
19 could be done through a site visit process.

20 Mr. Houghton opened up the floor to the public for their input. Ms. Janet Homan, 3
21 Rollins Farm Drive referenced the applicant wanting to narrow the width of the road and
22 asked if that would make it a private development. Mr. Stevens said as of right now,
23 they weren't considering it a private development, but as a public road system. Ms.
24 Homan said that she thought public roads had to be a certain width. Mr. Daley explained
25 that the Town does have set standards, but under certain situations the Planning Board
26 does have the ability to waive those requirements which they have in the past based on
27 certain conditions.

28 Mr. Shep Kroner, Chair from the North Hampton Planning Board said he was there, as
29 part of the property seems to come over into the Town of North Hampton. They had a
30 work session last night and pulled their members regarding this application, and the
31 unanimous decision of the Board was that this application should trigger a regional
32 impact review with the RPC. Their primary concerns are the impacts on municipal
33 services, potential impacts on hydrology, the effect of so many private wells in such a
34 dense development, and the topography. The proximity of this development to Goss
35 Road is a primary implication from their perspective because of the potential impacts to
36 their wells. They have experienced the loss of several functioning wells when a
37 subdivision was built nearby. Mr. Kroner said they are concerned also about
38 environmental impacts; the subject property is unique, it's one of the largest un-
39 fragmented hemlock forests left on the coastal plain in New Hampshire and also part of
40 the headwaters of the Winnicutt River. The Town of Hampton's community has spent
41 at least \$2 million of tax payers' money in preserving the upland waters to the Winnicutt
42 River. The Federal Government and the State of New Hampshire have also spent a lot
43 of money trying to protect this critical waterway.

1 Mr. Daley asked Mr. Kroner if the North Hampton Planning Board had determined
2 whether an application should be made to them as well. Mr. Kroner said because it is a
3 match line across the Town, the applicant has the potential to do this subdivision without
4 the review of the North Hampton Planning Board, but it depends on whether they are
5 utilizing part of the property that bleeds over from one of those lots. He said they have
6 had situations in the past with Rye; a subdivision built there didn't meet the subdivision
7 regulations of North Hampton so they literally split off the affected lot.

8 A Rollins Farm Road resident wanted to know how many additional auto trips the traffic
9 study indicates would be on Rollins Farm Road as a result of this project. Mr. Stevens
10 said he doesn't have the answer yet as the traffic report isn't complete at this moment.

11 Mr. Bernie Pielich, Attorney for resident Mr. Jeffrey Friedman asked about the prior
12 agreements mentioned by Mr. Stevens earlier and if these agreements were public
13 knowledge or just verbal. Mr. Daley said if there are agreements, then there will be
14 public records which he would be happy to provide copies of for Mr. Pielich. Mr.
15 Pielich continued that he assumed the wetlands had been flagged, but wanted to know if
16 there have been any assessments of functional values on the various wetlands throughout
17 this property. Mr. Stevens said there hadn't been. Mr. Pielich asked if the proposed pond
18 shown on the plan would impact the buffer in any way or within the buffer. Mr. Stevens
19 said the pond hadn't been designed yet so he was unable to answer that question. Mr.
20 Pielich referred to the emergency access road from Lindt and asked if that was going to
21 be part of this proposal or is it separate and distinct. Mr. Daley explained that Lindt came
22 before the Board as part of their last expansion and discussion was had with the Town
23 and Lindt about creating an emergency access road to the end of Rollins Farm Drive. It
24 was approved and is currently being designed. Mr. Pielich asked if the location of the
25 road would be in the general area shown by Mr. Stevens. Mr. Daley replied that generally
26 speaking, it would be. Mr. Pielich asked if a geo analysis had been done yet for the
27 stormwater runoff into the various wetland areas and if so was it going to be forthcoming.
28 Mr. Stevens said it hasn't been done yet, but it is in process and when it is done it will be
29 submitted to the Board. Mr. Pielich asked if this development was in an aquifer district.
30 Mr. Daley said his understanding is that it falls just south of an identified aquifer district.
31 It terminates at the very tip of the proposed property and wraps around the development
32 so there may be some issues and concerns, but they won't know straight away. Mr.
33 Pielich said the topography of the land reveals some pretty steep slopes and he asked if
34 there was going to be extensive terrain alteration to alter some of these steep slopes at
35 high and low points. Mr. Stevens said this is what it all hinges on.

36 Ms. Kathleen Breslin, resident Stratham Heights Road explained that she came into the
37 Town offices to look at the plans and was surprised to find out that as an abutter her name
38 was not on the plan at all and her property did not show up on the plan. Ms. Breslin said
39 she would like to be sure that she will be shown on the plans. Mr. Stevens replied that if
40 she is an abutter, he will make sure she is included on the plan. Ms. Breslin referred to
41 the large open space on the plans to find out whether there would be water draining down
42 onto her land. Mr. Stevens showed Ms. Breslin where he believed her property was and
43 said they were not planning any development out there and if anything it would be trails.
44 Ms. Breslin mentioned also that they have a spring at the bottom of their land and they

1 wouldn't want that getting polluted. Mr. Stevens repeated that there would be no more
2 than trails on that part of the planned development.

3 Mr. Homan, Rollins Farm Drive asked for clarification on what an emergency access
4 road means. Mr. Daley said it is in case an emergency should occur. It would be accessed
5 by fire, police, or Municipal officials only.

6 Mr. Stevens felt this was an opportune moment to discuss the agreements he referred to
7 earlier. He said that if he lived on Rollins Farm Drive, he would be very happy with the
8 development as opposed to what they could be doing because years ago the plan looked
9 different. There was a cul-de-sac at the Stratham Industrial Park and the cul-de-sac at
10 Rollins Hill Farm actually lined up with it. The intent years ago was to run a road that
11 went from the Industrial Park to Rollins Farm Road. That was thought to be the best way
12 to connect the Park with the rest of Stratham. When Lindt came in and did their very
13 large initial development, after the first 100,000 s.f. when they came in and developed
14 their 250,000 s.f. warehouse, the Planning department and previous Planning Board
15 decided that they wanted an agreement to be able to connect through this section of Lindt
16 with this section of Rollins Farm Road. Mr. Stevens said they have held this property
17 for years and the only way they could do it was to go through a section of the Industrial
18 Park which they own and they said they would be more than willing to allow that to
19 happen. This would mean an enormous traffic impact. Mr. Stevens continued that when
20 Lindt came in and wanted to do their next expansion they all met with the Planning Board,
21 Public Works, Fire and Police Department and it was agreed that Lindt would be
22 responsible for building a section of the road. Lindt put \$185,000 in escrow for that
23 purpose. Mr. Stevens said when they met with Lindt recently thinking about what they
24 were going to do with this development, it was decided that it probably wouldn't be in
25 the best interest of everybody to develop a connector road that led from Stratham Heights
26 Road all the way to Route 111. It would put too much pressure on the intersection of
27 Stratham Heights Road, and too much pressure on Rollins Farm Road and change the
28 dynamics of this planned subdivision instead of making it a quaint subdivision. Lindt
29 has issues with the road access because they would have to put up fencing for security
30 purposes. Mr. Stevens said they don't need to build this section of the road in order to
31 get this development approved and they are happy to agree that they don't need the road.
32 He said they are happy to agree that they put some sort of emergency access to get into
33 the back of Lindt in case there was an emergency. Mr. Stevens said it is up to everybody
34 in the room, it doesn't matter to him which is the preferred choice.

35 Resident, 38 Goss Road, North Hampton asked if the proposed emergency access road
36 would be gated. Mr. Daley confirmed that it would be. The resident said he believed
37 that this is the best possible solution; he would not want to see a second access brought
38 in which would create so much through traffic and he thanked Mr. Stevens for
39 considering this.

40 Mr. Rick Foley, Stratham Heights Road said he wanted to acknowledge Mr. Stevens'
41 efforts with regard to the road situation. He then addressed the fact that the applicant had
42 not gone before the Con Comm despite hearing about hemlock trees and wetlands. He
43 said they had already clear cut a significant amount of the property already and asked
44 why they didn't go before the Con Comm before clearing all that land. Mr. Stevens
45 replied that they didn't clear cut and that they were following all the rules and regulations.

1 Mr. Foley said he was struggling with the statement made earlier that this development
2 won't impact the wetlands when almost 20% of the property has wetlands; he feels very
3 concerned.

4 Mr. Bernie Pielich said he thought that Mr. Stevens may have misunderstood his earlier
5 question; Mr. Pielich had no idea what the previous agreements were so he is in no way
6 advocating that they must have a second means of access. He agreed with others that the
7 suggested emergency access road is a much better solution.

8 Mr. Moore, Rollins Farm Drive said he was concerned about water run off accumulating
9 at the bottom of his property. He then said he had a FEMA map which shows wetlands
10 through the entire end of the hammerhead at Rollins Farm, but now it is all filled in. Mr.
11 Stevens said they hired a wetland professional to go out there and do a survey. He flagged
12 all the wetlands and that part was not flagged. Mr. Paine explained that the map Mr.
13 Moore was holding was actually a flood plain map versus a wetlands plan. Mr. Stevens
14 said that they have to build retention basins and sedimentation controls before the water
15 can be discharged into the wetland areas. Mr. Daley said it would be reviewed by the
16 Town and the State also.

17 Ms. Bean, 15 Thornhill Road, said that she was just curious because Mr. Moore is already
18 saying it is filled in and Mr. Stevens is saying he will be doing a study, but what about in
19 the meantime the wall is going to continue to accumulate before Mr. Stevens does his
20 study and it gets fixed. Mr. Moore confirmed the area he mentioned had been filled in
21 and that Mr. Daley should take a look.

22 Mr. John Dozet, 2 Rollins Farm Drive, asked for more details about what a 55 years old
23 and older retirement community entails. Mr. Stevens said in order to build a 55 or older
24 development in the Town of Straham, the Town requires that 80% of the homeowners
25 are over 55 years old, so 20% could be under 55 years old. Mr. Stevens suggested that
26 if anybody is concerned, they should drive through the Vineyards to get an idea of a 55
27 year old or older community.

28 Another resident from Rollins Farm Road asked if the houses are all going to be single
29 family homes. Mr. Stevens said they would be.

30 The Chairman thanked everybody for their questions and comments and reminded those
31 present that the formal application would be heard on October 1, 2014.

32 **5. Miscellaneous.**

33 a. Report of Officers/Committees.

34 There were no items to report.

35 **6. Adjournment.**

36 Mr. House made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 pm. Motion seconded by Mr.
37 Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

38

39

40

