LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF December 2, 2020, Via a Zoom remote meeting

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members Present via a ZOOM remote meeting: Art Rugg, Chair; Al Sypek; Secretary; Jake Butler, member; Ann Chiampa, member; Giovanni Verani, Ex-Officio – Town Manager; Jeff Penta, member; Deb Paul; Ex-Officio - Town Council Liaison; Lynn Wiles, alternate member; and Jason Knights, alternate member; and Roger Fillio, alternate member

Also Present: Town Planner Colleen Mailloux, John Trottier, P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works & Engineering; Associate Planner Laura Gandia; and Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary

Chairman Rugg called the meeting to order at 7:00, and noted as Chair of the Londonderry Planning Board, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically. He started the meeting by taking roll call attendance. He said that when a member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under Right to Know Law. He appointed R. Fillio to vote for C. Davies.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD WORK

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Member A. Sypek made a motion to approve the minutes of November 4, 2020, as presented.

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 6-0-2, with D. Paul and R. Fillio abstaining. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

B. REGIONAL IMPACT DETERMINATIONS: Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that she had one project for their consideration this evening:

1. Application for design review of a condominium conversion at Two Button Drive, Map 7 Lot 132-3, Zoned C-I & RTE 102 POD, Button Woods, LLC (Owner) and DHB Homes, LLC (Applicant)

Member A. Sypek made a motion to find that this project is not of developmental impact.

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0, by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

C. Discussion with Town Staff:

Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that there are three alternate positions open in the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission (SNHPC). She noted that Suzanne Brunelle and Brian Battaglia are currently members, whose term expires on December 31, 2020, and would like to be reappointed.

Member A. Sypek made a motion to recommend reappointed for Suzanne Brunelle and Brian Battaglia to the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission alternate positions.

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0, by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that she had two extension request for them this evening. She stated that the first request is from the Baldwin at Woodmont Commons noting the conditions of approval are set to expire on December 4, 2020. She commented that they are requesting a five-week extension, which would be until January 8, 2021 to finalize the conditions. She recommended the Board approve the request for an extension.

Member A. Sypek made a motion to grant the extension request to meet the conditions of approval on a previously conditionally approved site plan to construct a phased senior living facility with a total of 254 independent living units and 40 assisted living units and associated site improvements, Pillsbury Road & Michels Way, Map 10, Lots 41 and 41-1, Zoned AR-1, Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development, Edgewood Retirement Community (Owner & Applicant) until January 8, 2021

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 7-0-1, with D. Paul abstaining by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that the second request is from the Kake Preserve LLC, Three Aviation Park, where the deadline is December 31, 2020 noting they are requesting a six-month extension, which would be until June 30, 2021. She recommended the Board approve the request for an extension.

Member A. Sypek made a motion to grant the extension request to meet the conditions of approval on a previously conditionally approved site plan for a paved access drive around the existing building, Three Aviation Park Drive, Map 14 Lot 29-10, Zoned IND-II, Kake Preserve (Owner & Applicant) until June 30, 2021

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0, by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Town Planner Mailloux reviewed a letter sent by New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) in November to numerous Boards and Commissions related to the design of the Route 28 and Stonehenge Road intersection project. She mentioned that she would be compiling a response from all the Boards/Commissions to relay to NHDOT. She encouraged the Board to read this letter and reach out to her if they have any questions or comments. Chairman Rugg said that the Heritage Commission reviewed this at the last meeting, noting the Reed/Page Clark House is on the list of Historic properties. A. Chiampa added that she would run this by the Historical Society to make sure there are no additional comments to make. Chairman Rugg asked if D. Paul had any information on the budget noting that the Town Council will have the first hearing regarding this on December 7, 2020. D. Paul replied that there is still some information being adjusted from this Monday's meeting, which she has not received as of yet.

III. Old Business

A. Application for formal review of a site plan for Phases 4,5 & 6 of the Cross Farm Development, an elderly housing development. Phases 4, 5 & 6 include 79 dwelling units and associated site improvements, 200 Nashua Road, Map 6, Lot 59-1, Zoned AR-1, Cross Farm Development, LLC (Owner & Applicant) – continued from the November 4, 2020 meeting

Chairman Rugg read the case into the record noting it was continued from November 4, 2020. J. Trottier told the Board that there are no outstanding checklist items and Staff recommends the application be accepted as complete.

A. Sypek made a motion to accept the application as complete per Staff Recommendation Memorandum dated December 2, 2020.

J. Butler seconded the motion.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0, by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Chairman Rugg noted that the 65-day time clock has started. Joseph Maynard P.E. from Benchmark Engineering, Rick Welch and John Kalantzakos from the Mesiti Group, and Kim Hazarvartian, traffic engineer from TEPP LLC, addressed the Board this evening. J. Maynard informed the Board that Phase 1 was approved in 2018 with 21 units that incorporate a road that came in from Route 102, which was purchased from the state of New Hampshire. He went on noting that Phase 2 was approved in 2019 for an additional 86 units, which included the clubhouse and off-site improvement to Route 102 that has been completed with right and left turn lanes into the property, as well as a connection out to Adams Road. He mentioned that there are currently about 65 units occupied out of the 107 units approved. He noted that they are here tonight for the last part of the project that has been broken down into Phases 4, 5 & 6. He pointed out that Phase 4 has been further broken down into Phase 4A and Phase 4B, stating that Phase 4A allows the developer to construct Cranberry Circle, a short cul-de-sac with about 11 units that is about 250 feet from the nearest through street, which is the intersection of Falling Leaf Road and Pilgrim Road. He added that this allows the developer the ability to construct homes and obtain occupancy permits while waiting for entirety of Phase 4B to be constructed. He went on to say that Phase 4B extends Falling Leaf Road all the way out of Pumpkin Patch Way and connects the road structure all the way back to Phase 1. He said that Phase 5 is the remainder of the units and Phase 6 is the extension of Pumpkin Patch Way to a cul-de-sac, which has 24 units. He mentioned that most of the wetland impacts fall into the later phases. He noted that they did go through an extensive review with the Wetlands Board on this stating that there are specific parts of the property that were deemed to high value in terms of wetlands. He said that there is a 26-acre parcel on the property in a full conservation restriction, as well as area going up to Cross Road that was put in a conservation restriction area. He commented that what they label as Wetland 1, which runs through most of the property, also has a conservation restriction. He reviewed the waiver requests with the Board noting they are asking for waivers related to sight distance, decreasing the speed from 35 mph to 25 mph, driveways to be 22 feet wide, pipe cover, turn arounds, grade of cul-de-sac, sidewalks, waiver on locating all trees that are 12" on the plan, the scale of the plan and placement of the signature block. He noted the waiver for the exemption on phasing stating that they would like to have 40 building permits per year versus the 15 that are allowed. He added that there is an updated traffic analysis for Adams Road as well.

Chairman Rugg asked for questions from the Board. J. Trottier reviewed the fifteen waivers the applicant is requesting with the Board.

1. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.07.g.3 of the Site Plan Regulations to allow drainage pipes with less than 3' of cover in 1 location. Staff ***supports*** granting the waiver as the pipe is located off pavement and because the elevation of the downstream detention pond limits the available depth for coverage.

2. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09R of the Roadways Design Standards and Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations to allow a cul-de-sac grade of 4.75% where a maximum of 4% is permitted. Staff ***supports*** granting the waiver as the steeper grade is for a short portion of the cul-de-sac and will eliminate the need for retaining walls or very tall foundation walls for the units at the end of the cul-de-sac.

3. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Sections 3.09.D and 3.09.R of the Roadway Design Standards which require a proper cul-de-sac terminus at the end of Falling Leaf Road at Pumpkin Patch Way under Phases 4 and 5. Staff ***supports*** *granting the waiver as the Applicant has provided a temporary intersection which the Fire Department has found acceptable for this phase. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

4. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09.R of the Roadway Design Standards and Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations to provide a minimum roadway design speed of 25 MPH where a roadway design speed of 35MPH is required. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver as the streets are private and designed only for local use by the residents. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

5. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09.S.6 of the Roadway Design Standards and Exhibit D3 of the Subdivision Regulations, to provide a minimum sight distance of 280 feet where a minimum sight distance of 365 feet for the internal roadway intersection is required. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver as the reduced sight distance for these private streets will meet AASHTO standards for a 25MPH design speed. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

6. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09.F.2 of the Roadway Design Standards and Exhibit D2 of the Subdivision regulations, to provide a driveway sight distance of 175 feet where a minimum driveway sight distance of 250 feet is required. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver as the reduced sight distance for these driveways located on private streets will meet AASHTO standards for the 25MPH design speed. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

7. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09R of the Roadway Design Standards and Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations, to provide a roadway right of way of 40 feet where 50 feet is required. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver as the proposed streets are private streets and the Applicant is providing a 5-foot utility easement on each side of the roadway right of way. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

8. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.09.F.3 of the Roadway Design Standards and the Town's driveway standards to allow residential driveways to be 22 feet wide for the entire length from the garage to the street. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver because the streets within this development will be private. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

9. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 4.01c to allow a plan scale greater than 1"=40' for the Existing Conditions Plan. Staff ***supports*** *granting this waiver as the plans are legible at the scale presented and the scale at which the* *plans are provided allow for the entire existing conditions to be shown on one sheet.*

*10. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 4.01c to allow a plan scale greater than 1"=40' for the Overall Boundary Plan. Staff **supports** granting this waiver as the plans are legible at the scale presented and the scale at which the plans are provided allow for the entire boundary to be shown on one sheet.*

*11. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 4.01c to allow a plan scale greater than 1"=40' for the future development phasing plan. Staff **supports** granting this waiver as the plans are legible at the scale presented and the scale at which the plans are provided allow for the entire overall phasing plan to be shown on one sheet.*

*12. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 4.03 of the regulations for placement of the Planning Board signature Block. Staff **supports** granting the waiver for the limited sheets for which it is requested.*

*13. The Applicant has requested a waiver from 3.09G of the Subdivision Regulations to not provide sidewalks within the development. Staff **supports** granting this waiver as the Applicant has indicated that sidewalks are not used in similar developments and because the reduced speeds throughout the development are conducive to pedestrian access without dedicated sidewalks. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

14. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 3.10.d.2 and 4.12.c.19.viii to not identify on the plans the location of existing trees that are 12" and larger that should be preserved. Staff ***supports*** this waiver because it would be impracticable to identify on the plan all trees in excess of 12" in particular in the buffer and conservation areas. Any trees in excess of 12" within work areas that are intended to remain should be identified as such on the plan and proper tree protection provided.

*15. The Applicant has requested a waiver from Section 6.01C of the Site Plan Regulations to allow issuance of a certificate of occupancy prior to completion of the wearing course of pavement. Staff **supports** this waiver for the wearing course only, and has included a recommended condition of approval that the wearing course be complete prior to commencing future Phases of this project and appropriate financial guarantee is provided to meet the approval of the Department of Public Works to ensure the installation of the wearing course of pavement. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

Town Planner Mailloux reviewed the request for exemption from Residential Phasing requirements to allow up to 40 building permits to be issued per year where 15 are allowed. She pointed out that in Zoning Ordinance Section 5.1.4, the Planning Board shall grant exemption to the phasing requirements of Section 5.1.4 where the proposed project is for Elderly Housing and the owner of record shall enter an agreement, to be recorded in the RCRD, certifying that the project will be utilized and restricted to 100% elderly occupants (age 55 and older). She commented that the Planning Board approved this exemption for previous phases of this development. She went on noting that the applicant has requested two waivers from the Zoning Ordinance:

*1. A waiver from Section 4.6.6.7.D.4.d.i of the Performance Overlay Zoning District to provide a 75' buffer from the abutting AR-1 zoned property. Staff **supports** granting the waiver requested as the project complies with the buffer and setback requirements of the Elderly Housing Ordinance, and because the spirit and intent of the Performance Overlay District was to apply to commercial properties adjacent to residential zoning districts. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 2 and 3.*

*2. A waiver from Section 5.6.4.g.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to not provide paved sidewalks within the development. Staff **supports** granting this waiver as the Applicant has indicated that sidewalks are not used in similar developments and because the reduced speeds throughout the development are conducive to pedestrian access without dedicated sidewalks. The Planning Board previously approved a similar waiver for Phases 1 and 2-3.*

She noted that they have a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow work within the Conservation Overlay District for a total buffer impact of 53,070 SF is proposed, along with a wetland impact of 15,850 SF for which the applicant has obtained a Standard Dredge and Fill Permit from New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES). She noted that on October 13, 2020 the Conservation Commission recommended approval of the CUP with the conditions that there will be no phosphorous used in the fertilizer applications and the salt truck operators will be certified.

Chairman Rugg discussed the next item to review for the project would be traffic. J. Trottier reminded the Board that they required upon completion of the Falling Leaf and Adams Road intersection an occupancy of a portion of Phases 2 & 3 that additional traffic counts and monitoring be provided on Adams Road and the surrounding road network new information on traffic. He said that those additional traffic counts have been provided with this submission and reviewed by the Town's third-party engineer. Kim Hazarvartian told the Board that they conducted turning movement counts for weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the following intersections, High Range Road/Adams Road; Adams Road/Falling Leaf Road; Adams Road/Cross Road and Mammoth Road/Adams Road. He mentioned that the counts were performed on October 28, 2020, during 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. He stated that on Falling Leaf Road, which has about 60 occupied units at the time, there were 7 vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and 13 vehicle trips in the afternoon peak hour. He pointed out that these numbers were multiplied to account for 186 total units in the development, accounting for 16 vehicle trips in the morning and 32 vehicle trips in the afternoon. He compared these numbers with the previous traffic study that was calculated a couple years ago, noting the morning number was 21 vehicle trips and 25 vehicle trips in the afternoon. He commented that the numbers came out pretty much the same as the traffic study a couple years ago. He said that there are two ways to egress the development with Adams Road and Nashua Road. He stated that the second way in and out with Adams Road helps facilitate emergency response without having to deal with a gate and reduces travel distance and times.

David DeBaie, traffic engineer from Stantec, told the Board that he has reviewed the recent study, which reflects actual units being occupied in the development. He said that he has a concern regarding safety with older residents dealing with the speed on Route 102, which is why he wanted a second access. He commented that the counts are appropriate.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the Board for questions. J. Butler voiced his concern with traffic heading out onto Adams Road and asked for clarification on the vehicle trip counts. K. Hazarvartian reviewed the vehicle trip counts with the Board noting there would be some variation from day to day. He stated in his opinion from a traffic engineering point of view, five to ten vehicles would not affect the way things work at the Adams Road/Mammoth Road intersection. J. Butler mentioned that the Adams Road/Mammoth Road intersection had a couple of accidents just recently and thinks that adding any more cars to this road is going to be a safety concern. He asked about a light on Route 102. Town Planner Mailloux replied that a light has been discussed with New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) but it did not meet signal warrants. She told the Board that as part of approving the last phase of this project there is a note on the plan stating that if a light is ever installed at the Route 102 intersection, then the Adams Road access point will be gated. J. Butler stressed that the believes there should be a gate at Adams Road regardless. A. Chiampa commented that Adams Road is a scenic roadway, therefore, cannot see restricting a development from accessing this road. J. Penta asked if there was any account taken for traffic patterns due to COVID. J. Maynard replied that this is an age-restricted housing and in general there is a percentage of retired residents. He added that in his discussions with K. Hazarvartian they believed the numbers would be a wash and did not think it was an issue. He said that for a noticeable difference on Adams Road, it would have to be five to fifteen vehicles. D. Paul asked if anyone knew what the state gave Route 102 for a grade. She said that she would rather have residents go out onto Adams Road versus Route 102 because it is safer. J. Trottier said that he did not recall if they did look at this in the original traffic study. K. Hazarvartian commented that they looked at Adams Road and Falling Leaf Road. R. Fillio voiced his opinion that most elderly drivers do not leave the house during peak times to avoid traffic. L. Wiles echoed the comments of D. Paul and J. Butler. He said that he believes Mammoth Road is the problem with the Adams Road/Mammoth Road intersection. J. Knights said that he wants to see more sidewalks in town for walking.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to public input.

John Kalantzakos, addressed the Board. J. Kalantzakos asked about the time period of the afternoon peak trip generation. K. Hazarvartian replied that the counts were taken over a two-hour period. J. Kalantzakos told the Board that in his opinion, when he is on site at the development, there are cars that cut through the development already, there are many cars in the development that do not live there. He said that there are also many people walking through the development on a daily basis.

Mike Pettengill, 5 Apollo Road Extension, addressed the Board noting that he agrees with J. Butler on the Adams Road traffic. M. Pettengill said that the comments regarding the traffic study not being affected due to COVID were speculative and believes it should be looked into. He said that he has lived in Londonderry for 30 years and in his opinion, the traffic is different from last year. He expressed his opinion, that this development oversteps the regulations that he believes are very generous already. He said that the housing was supposed to be affordable for elderly residents in town, but that has not happened. He explained that he is concerned about the quality of his well as a direct abutter. He stated that there are no regulations in the homeowner's association (HOA) for the development on the maintenance of their septic systems. He mentioned that there should be a fund to help cover the cost associated with any problems to the abutting residents' wells incurred with blasting. He commented that he would like to see the developer put in a clause in the HOA regarding pumping and maintain septic systems. He asked why the developer should be exempt from following the side and rear setback requirements, as well as the four-season visibility screen from the performance overlay district requirements. Chairman Rugg said that the developer has to follow the blasting requirements that the Fire Department is in charge of.

Lynn Wiles, addressed the Board. He said that the waivers are requesting the speed limit to be 25 mph and asked if the police department can enforce this on private roads. Chairman Rugg replied that he believed it would be the association and not the police, but he was not sure. Town Planner Mailloux commented that she was not sure either and would be get back to the Board.

Susan Malouin, 5 Apollo Road Extension., addressed the Board. S. Malouin asked the developer about remarks in a letter from Gotesman & Hollis regarding trees along Route 102 and in the open space. She asked if the trees that are marked on the plan along Route 102 would be staying or if they plan to only keep the large ones. J. Maynard responded that the tree line that is shown on the plan is representative to the tree line that would exist in the end. He explained that the only time a tree might be taken out of that area is if it were dead, a hazard or cause an issue. S. Malouin asked if they know the percentage of usable open space, which excludes wetlands and a certain distance around buildings, versus total open space. Town Planner Mailloux replied that note eight on sheet two of the plan set, states that the open space required is 67 acres with 81 acres provided, and the usable open space required under the ordinance is 42 acres with 51.8 acres provided. S. Malouin read from the Alteration of Terrain (AOT) permit "the estimated quantity of blast rock will be about 60,000 cubic yards" asking if anyone knew how that correlated to house foundations. J. Maynard replied that 60,000 cubic yards includes trench ledge and large blasting for the road construction, so it hard to equate that to foundations, but noted that maybe 20 foundation holes need to be blasted. He noted that these last phases have the least amount of blasting than any of the prior phases. S. Malouin informed the applicant that the blasting was very loud last time, and now it is going to be closer to her this time. She added that she did not receive any notice of blasting last time. She asked if they have a targeted start date for construction. J. Maynard replied that it might be March-April 2021 for construction to start. S. Malouin requested notices to all abutters and abutting neighborhoods to prepare themselves for the blasting. She said that she is concerned about her well water as the Water Resource Protection Plan (WRPP) demonstrated that the area that she lives in does not really have an aquifer, but just cracks in the bedrock. She added that under section, 6.3.2.e of the CUP it states that "development should not be a hazard to surface or underground water resources" and stated the Board could impose a condition about this. She commented that she wants the Board to impose a condition on the pumping of the septic tanks, as this community drains to two watersheds, of which one is failing. She said that she is in favor of the waiver in relation to driveways to limit impervious surface. She reviewed the impervious surface percentage from 2011 from the WRPP. She said that she strongly objects to the side and rear buffer waivers requested from the applicant. She commented that this is an intensive development with little tree cover between homes and respectively asked for screening to be planted between abutting parcels, but not along the conservation areas. She added that the screening would help protect Adams Road with tree cover.

Chairman Rugg stated that there is a blasting ordinance and stated that the applicant will follow all the requirements. Town Planner Mailloux stated that the notification for blasting is any properties within 250 feet from the blast. J. Trottier mentioned that NHDOT created an email notification system for blasting in the area of exit 4. Town Planner Mailloux added that there was a similar concern with the Lorden Common's development and the developer set up a system to reach out to abutting property owners if blasting was coming up to answer questions and alleviate concerns. J. Kalantzakos asked how to get the email addresses for people who would to receive notices regarding blasting. Town Planner Mailloux replied that people who would like to receive notifications should call or email her and she will compile a list and pass it along to the applicant. Chairman Rugg asked about having a maintenance plan for the septic systems. J. Kalantzakos responded that they require them to pump every two years, as the association is responsible for maintaining and replacing the leach fields. J. Maynard mentioned that there is a note on the plan which states that they have to be pumped every two years. Chairman Rugg asked if two years was sufficient for pumping the septic tanks. J. Kalantzakos replied that was a standard requirement for pumping from septic companies. Chairman Rugg asked about screening. J. Kalantzakos responded that most residents want screening as well, noting there might be couple units on Adams Road that do not want screening. Town Planner Mailloux suggested that if the Board does grant the waiver request to reduce the buffer, noting that in the areas where the buffer is being waived there could be a condition for the applicant to work with staff to develop a screening plan. She commented that the police can pull a resident over on private roads if they thought the speed was excessive.

Chairman Rugg brought the discussion back to the Board as there was no further public comment. J. Butler asked if there could be a dense evergreen screen in the side and rear buffer areas and anyone who abuts Adams Road. Town Planner Mailloux replied that would be a reasonable condition if the Board did grant the buffer waiver. J. Trotter said that you need to look closely at the grading and utility plan of those units in questions because there might be septic systems to be mindful of. Town Planner Mailloux mentioned that the Board can defer this and have the applicant come back with a landscaping plan for the Board to look at. J. Butler voiced his opinion, that he would like this to be continued for a definitive landscape plan, septic system pumping required every two years and to find out if the Mammoth Road/Adams Road intersection is in failure. J. Trottier said that the only way to know the answer to the Mammoth/Adams Road intersection would be to perform a traffic analysis and did not think it had been done since he worked in town. J. Butler said that this information would be helpful as more cars are going to be using this intersection with the development. Chairman Rugg asked if this could be done with the traffic safety committee. J. Butler asked for a record from the police regarding accidents over the last five years at Mammoth/Adams Road. Town Planner Mailloux replied that they would request this from the police. She added that with Mammoth Road being a state road, NHDOT has come out and analyzed the intersection noting it has not qualified for the studies, despite accidents occurring there. She noted that the accidents were caused by driver distraction versus geometry of the intersection or safety of the intersection. David DeBaie commented that the delays that people experience on at the Mammoth/Adams Road intersection are representative of level of service F is about at an unsignalized intersection. He noted that the level of service F is about failing to meet standards, such as time spent waiting. He added that it is not unusual for un-signaled intersections along busy roads to be level of service F. He pointed out that the increase in vehicles onto Adams Road from the development will not affect the intersection or have a safety concern on Adams Road. J. Trottier clarified that the increase was the total number of vehicles going to Adams Road, but it did distinguish if they were traveling east or west. D. DeBaie replied that he was correct. J. Butler clarified that the level of service at Adams Road would be a level F. D. DeBaie replied that was correct. He mentioned that this traffic problem exists today and is not created by this development. He reviewed connectivity with the Board, where streets connect to other streets to allow for greater distribution of traffic. D. Paul asked if trucks are allowed to cut through Adams Road to avoid Route 102. A. Chiampa replied that there are no through truck signs. J. Butler said that there is not a lot of truck traffic on Adams Road. J. Penta said that the burden fell upon the residents and the town and would like to shift that to the developer in receiving the email. Chairman Rugg said that they have to abide by the regulations. J. Penta said that he wanted to shift the burden from the residents and the town in compiling email addresses to the developer. J. Maynard said that as part of the AOT permit and with the phases that have already been approved, they have sent letters to the residents and no one has gotten back to them. He said that NHDES will pick areas based on the blasting areas and that is how they send notices to the residents. J. Penta stated that there were two residents this evening who were not notified and would like to correct this. Chairman Rugg mentioned that it might be a good idea to have Brian Johnson, Fire Prevention Chief, give a demonstration on blasting as he handles the blasting permits for the new Board members. J. Kalantzakos reviewed the established criteria for blasting noting that they were going a step further than what the requirements are. Chairman Rugg noted that if it is outside the requirements, they can only ask so much . He asked to get the consensus of the Board regarding continuing the application for more information on the issues that were presented tonight. A. Sypek said he would like to see a landscape plan and would be in favor of continuing the application. J. Butler stated he would like the application continued. A. Chiampa and J. Penta agreed. G. Verani asked if it would be feasible for a light at the Mammoth/Adams Road intersection as the roads do not line up. Town Planner Mailloux asked if the Board is asking for a traffic analysis at the Mammoth/Adams Road intersection to meet signal warrants or just the crash data to give additional discussion points. G. Verani replied that he would defer to J. Butler for this. J. Butler commented that if it did come back level of service F then the first step would be to not add more traffic to that intersection, which could be done with a security gate at the Adams Road entrance to the development. J. Trottier reviewed that a warrant for a traffic signal was done at the intersection of Route 102 and Cross Farm main entrance, noting the warrants were not met. K. Hazarvartian agreed. J. Butler asked if there was a similar situation at Mammoth/Stonehenge Road as well. Town Planner Mailloux responded that they were contributing more trips at an intersection that had issues already, so they were able to do a rational nexus of their contribution to the intersection. She mentioned that the traffic impact to the Mammoth/Adams Road intersection from this development is not going to be noticeable. She said the item for the Board to determine is if a gate should be installed at the Adams Road access, noting the Board heard that the trips being generated out Adams road will not contribute to the worsening of the intersection, even though there is a problem at the intersection already. K. Hazarvartian remarked that if the Adams Road access was gated off, it would not remove all the traffic from the Mammoth Road/Adams Road intersection, but instead just move the traffic around in another pattern. A. Chiampa expressed her opinion that on Adams Road there are commercial properties on either end of the road and thought the impact from this development on the intersection in question would be minimal. G. Verani commented that there have been many meetings recently where abutters are concerned about wells drying up from blasting and asked if staff had any scientific data to bring to the next meeting to address this. Chairman Rugg said that he thought this information would be hard to get, but encouraged staff to try. D. Paul mentioned that one thing she learned from NHDES blasting stirs up arsenic levels which is worse than the PFOAs.

J. Butler made a motion to continue the application for formal review of a site plan for Phases 4,5 & 6 of the Cross Farm Development, an elderly housing development. Phases 4, 5 & 6 include 79 dwelling units and associated site improvements, 200 Nashua Road, Map 6, Lot 59-1, Zoned AR-1, Cross Farm Development, LLC (Owner & Applicant) until January 13, 2021

J. Penta seconded the application.

The motion was granted, 8-0-0, by a roll call vote. The Chair voted in the affirmative.

Chairman Rugg noted that the application is continued until January 13, 2021, at 7 p.m., noting the meeting will be remote and this would be the only formal public notice.

Town Planner Mailloux summarized the information the Board is requesting: the crash data from Mammoth/Adams Road intersection from the police department, level of service of Mammoth/Adams Road, landscape plan showing the screening, septic maintenance, additional information on blasting, extra notification for what is outside our blasting ordinance and staff will look for any data on blasting and any impacts on wells.

IV. New Plans/Public Hearings – N/A

V. Other – N/A

VI. Adjournment

Member J. Butler made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m. Seconded by R. Fillio.

The motion was granted by a unanimous roll call vote, 8-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 PM.

These minutes were prepared by Beth Morrison.

Respectfully Submitted,

Allen J Sypek

Name: _Al Sypek_______________

Title: __Secretary________________

These minutes were accepted and approved on January 13, 2021, by a motion made by C. Davies and seconded by J. Butler.