



**Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
February 15, 2017
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman
 David Canada, Selectmen's Representative
 Tom House, Member
 Jameson Paine, Member
 Nancy Ober, Alternate

Members Absent: Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
 Lee Paladino, Alternate

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chairman took roll call and asked Ms. Ober to be a full voting member in absence of Mr. Baskerville. Ms. Ober agreed. Mr. Austin said Ms. Paladino is absent, but also recusing herself.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. February 01, 2017

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for February 1, 2017. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Public Hearing(s)

- a. Rollins Hill Development, Phase III Revision**, represented by Mark Stevens, Rollins Hill Development, LLC, P.O. Box 432 Stratham, NH 03885. Subdivision and Site Plan Review Applications to consolidate 9 approved lots to then subdivide and establish a 28-lot condominium development at 20 Rollins Farm Drive, Stratham NH, Map 3 Lots 66-74.

Mr. Stevens talked through the proposed development. He said they are taking an area of the Rollins Hill Development which was originally approved for 9 lots and consolidating those 9 lots into one lot and converting it into a 28 lot condominium, one of which is open space. They don't need any waivers, and there are no wetland impacts. The goal is to try and develop a project that is more affordable than what is currently out in the market and one way to do that is to increase the density so the cost of the land becomes less per unit. A 600 feet deep well has been installed which taps into a completely different aquifer. They received approval from NHDES to do their testing which was

conducted over the weekend. Mr. Stevens explained the process they had to go through for the well with NHDES. This development requires 10 gallons a minute so although they have a well that produces 50 – 60 gallons a minute, DES will only permit them to pump at 10 gallons a minute. This has an estimated impact area of 1,000 S.F. The report and design will be submitted to the DES for review and approval.

Mr. Stevens said all of their information has been sent out for review and they have received comments back. Most of them are housekeeping items with a few substantive comments; they don't have their DES subdivision septic system approval yet or their AOT approval. Mr. Stevens said they also combined a system over a test pit that failed.

Originally the road length for Phase 3 was about 810'. With this new set up, it will be shorter. They will be doing complete ground water infiltration so there will be completely porous pavement, the driveways are short and made of porous pavers, and the run off from roofs will be managed by rain gardens and ground water recharge areas. They have not done an operations and maintenance schedule yet, but are working on it currently. The condominium association will be responsible for plowing, maintenance of roads and landscaping, vacuuming the roads and plowing driveways. One of their concerns for the development is that a homeowner might drop a load of mulch in the middle of the porous driveway and ruin the ability of the porous driveway to work. As for traffic, they had a traffic engineer run a report and there will be no significant increase in traffic.

Mr. House asked if there was a copy of the Civilworks report. Mr. Austin said he had only just received the report himself so he would have to leave it up to the Board whether they feel there is anything that needs to be addressed prior to considering the application complete. Based on what has been heard tonight Mr. Austin feels they have enough to move forward although there are a number of items outstanding that would prevent action at this point. Mr. Austin added that he hasn't received any written department head comments but he did receive some verbal comments with regard to concerns the Fire department. They identified the need for an additional road name for the hammer head that extends to the south or a very clear set of condominium numbering provisions to be included so the responding units know where they are going once they get there, and there is also concern about the 2 hydrants referenced in the plan. The phrase hydrant means something very different in this plan than it does to the Fire department. Mr. Austin said he had no comments from the Highway Agent, but this is a private road.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the plan as complete. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine referred to fire suppression. Mr. Stevens said they have a cistern which he showed on the plan. Mr. Austin added that the new units will be no further away from the cistern than those on the original approval for 9 lots. Mr. Stevens said there is a second cistern on the development also. Mr. Houghton asked about feedback from the Fire department. Mr. Austin said he had verbal comments and the Fire department has no concern about an additional cistern and felt comfortable with the existing one being able to cover this new area. Mr. Austin said he would press the Fire department to put it in writing.

Mr. Austin asked Mr. Stevens if he had thought of a name for the hammer head. Mr. House asked about utilities. Mr. Stevens replied they would be run underground. Mr. Stevens explained the water system and the flushing out of the line. Mr. Austin if there would be an issue moving the hydrants further away from the edge of pavement. Mr. Stevens said he saw no problem with that. Mr. Paine asked about snow storage. Mr. Stevens said they could use front loaders or snow blowers to move the snow to the side of the roads and driveways. Mr. House asked about lighting. Mr. Stevens said there will be a pole light at the end of every driveway. Mr. House then asked about signage. Mr.

Stevens said there will be some simple signage; one for the entire development and then individual street signs.

Mr. Austin said the other piece missing is more the management side; his understanding is that there is going to be a condo association over this phase. All that information will need to be brought before the Planning Board to help clarify the 1 27th of 9/43rds.

Mr. Houghton asked for the highlights of the traffic study. Mr. Stevens said minimal increase and no impact at the intersection of Rollins Hill and Stratham Heights Road.

Mr. House sought clarification that even though there is a mix of condos or individual houses, the whole development is still an over 55 development. Mr. Stevens confirmed that was the case. Mr. Austin said what he noticed from the traffic study was the addendum findings number 1 “this translates into less than one additional vehicle every 2 minutes on Rollins Hill Farm Drive on average during the worst case PM peak hour period.

Mr. John Pelletier, Director of Engineering, Lindt and Sprungli said it isn’t obvious that this development is adjacent to an industrial park. He asked if they would be including some kind of disclosure statement for buyers. Mr. Stevens said the documentation for this property does state that they are adjacent to an industrial park.

Mr. Stevens explained that these lots have 9/43rds interest of the common land, and the other mutual interest 9/43rd have is in the cisterns. They would be responsible for 9/43rds of the costs associated with that. Phase 1 and Phase 2 are now responsible for all their own road plowing, maintenance and landscaping. They have modified the original agreement to show there are 3 phases and assign individual values of ownership to each phase.

Mr. Pete Wiggin, Bunker Hill Road asked what form of document will indicate that the development is adjacent to an industrial park. Mr. Stevens replied that it is in the original paperwork approved by the Town. Mr. Wiggin said he remembered it being taken out of the requirement at a meeting he attended. Mr. Stevens said he believes that related to somebody requesting it be put into a deed.

Mr. Austin commented that the original development had a phasing plan 1, 2, and 3 and he asked if this changed the need to affect that phasing plan. Mr. Stevens said the original phasing plan doesn’t state how the development will be built. It just says how the development could be built.

Ms. Marci Francis, Stratham resident and realtor asked if the condos would be attached. Mr. Stevens said detached. She asked if this was an 80/20 split for the over 55 component. Mr. Stevens confirmed it was 80/20.

Ms. Breslin, abutter asked Mr. Stevens to point out on the plan where this development abuts her land and the location of Lindt. Mr. House also asked Mr. Stevens to show the access road to Lindt from the development which he did.

Mr. Paine referred to the grading plan and the drop off on the south end of the development beyond which is Lindt. He wondered if there would be any landscaping on the backside of that. Mr. Stevens said it’s all natural vegetation so no landscaping will be needed. Mr. Austin directed Mr. Paine’s attention to page P2 of the plan set which shows the proposed grade. Mr. Joe Coronati, Jones and Beach explained that the finished grade at the rear of the houses is at the grade that is out there and there is a significant wooded buffer and wetland.

Mr. Paine asked if anybody went for a walk through the woods if there would be anything preventing them from walking onto the Lindt property. Mr. Austin said there is a fence.

The Board discussed whether to approve the application with conditions or to wait until they had received the outstanding documentation.

Mr. House asked how many bedrooms per house. Mr. Stevens said 2.

Mr. Austin asked Mr. Stevens to address test pits as the test pits in the report are post cut bank. The proposed houses and septic systems will not be at that same grade. Mr. Rob Graham, Rollins Hill Development explained that the grade of this site is the grade that was approved in the previous application. The test pits that were done were deep enough on those lots for that grade and all of the test pits for this plan were redone for these houses at their finished grade. All the test pits were witnessed by Mike Cuomo, RCCD. He continued that one thing he wants to be clear about is which units may share a leach field. As they go through that process, they might elect to pair up more of them in terms of construction costs as they go through their State process. Mr. Graham added that the design for the water flow is actually just for 5 gallons. The source flow requires them to double that amount as a safety factor the DES puts in.

Mr. Houghton asked how the maintenance plan will differ for this phase from the original one. Mr. Stevens said the only thing that will be different is that this will be a condominium rather than an association. It will have exterior maintenance issues; the outside will be the responsibility of the condominium association and it has a lot more restrictions as to what can and can't be done because it's a denser development. From a management of what's important for the Town, it is going to manage the water system, the roadway systems and the lawn care and maintenance.

Mr. Paine asked Mr. Rob Roseen about storm water capacity for this new phase. Mr. Roseen said the soils are really good and all the infiltration testing shows that it can handle all the recharge and is good to hold and store the entire volume for a 50 year storm. The main difference on the individual lots is that there will be a reservoir under the permeable driveways which is reflected in the Operations and Management plan.

Mr. Houghton said that he was largely comfortable letting the applicant work with staff to resolve the outstanding housekeeping items. He thinks the condominium association agreement does need to be reviewed in detail with Town Counsel to make sure it covers all the important things. Mr. Austin added that Mr. Paine had mentioned sidewalks. Under Section 4.4.5 the Board does have the ability to include sidewalk, however the Board didn't stipulate that for the original approval. Mr. Canada agreed with Mr. Stevens that there won't be much traffic plus sidewalk adds more impervious surface so he is not sure it is needed. Mr. Paine was OK without sidewalk.

Mr. Stevens suggested that the Board approve this application with conditions precedent of subservice sewage disposal, alteration of terrain approval, well design, satisfactory review by staff and Town Counsel on the condominium documents and operation and management plan, and then subsequent issues on housekeeping items.

Mr. Austin sought clarification about the length of road. Mr. Stevens said the distance is 75' shorter than the existing approval.

Mr. House made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. House made a motion to approve the application for Rollins Hill Development Phase 3 revision for a subdivision site plan from the 9 approved lots to 28 lot condominium development with 27 house lots, 1 common land lot at 20 Rollins Hill Farm Drive Map 3 Lot 66-74 with the conditions precedent of all State permits, acceptance of previous waivers from the previous development, satisfactory review of the condominium documents by Town Staff and Town Counsel, housekeeping items as directed by staff, road name for the hammerhead and the list of items required by Civilworks report dated February 15, 2017 and review by the Fire Department and Road Agent. Mr. Houghton added the review of the condo association documents to include storm water, drainage system maintenance and inspection plan. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Meeting(s):

- a. **Rollins Hill Development—Loop Road, represented by Mark Stevens, Rollins Hill Development, LLC**, P.O Box 432 Stratham, NH 03885. Discussion of “loop road” for Lots 6-12, Phase I, Rollins Hill Development.

Mr. Austin started by addressing issues that had arisen from some items in the Notice of Decision and how that transpired to a development agreement for the physical manifestation from paper to ground. A memo was put together highlighting these issues and presented to the Board of Selectmen. Those issues include the loop road which is on the agenda tonight. The Selectmen suggested staff put together a list of action items which Town Staff could coordinate with the developer in order to resolve those issues, which Mr. Austin will present on February 27, 2017.

Mr. Austin referred to the loop road which the Planning Board said should come back to them for a functionality review.

Mr. House said his recollection is that the loop road started on the main street, came around, and ended on the main street and not a dead end. Mr. Stevens said there was a discussion back then that was never concluded. Mr. Stevens continued that the documentation provided on Rollins Hill was unprecedented in comparison to anything he has ever done in any community. It was primarily driven by the former Planner, Mr. Deschaine and their attorney. He believes they are in complete and full compliance.

Mr. Stevens said the reason for the loop road is because of the steep grade. He talked about the design in front of the Board saying they want to design it so it ends up as a dead end road so they don't have to chase the grade. If they build the road in accordance with the design in front of the Board, they can put it in with just a 2' cut. They have tried 7 different designs to have as minimal impact on the ground as possible. With this design they will use the old road so no more trees will need to be removed. This is why they want to do a single 2-way road instead of a single lane to avoid cutting 10'. There were going to do an 18' driveway, but they were informed it had to be 20' in order to meet a code they are not aware of so they have modified that.

Mr. Austin informed the Board that it was the Code Official who determined that the road providing access to a structure needs to be 20' wide and paved. He doesn't know if it can be considered a shared driveway to that number of houses without becoming a street. Mr. Austin wondered if a turnaround would be needed for fire trucks. He asked the Board if they were comfortable with this design provided Fire, Building, Civilworks is amenable.

Mr. Paine asked what the percentage of the slope was in that area. Mr. Stevens said one section which is 110' long is at 11%. They can reduce it, but they will end up having to take more material off the top. Mr. Paine said with regards to the structure, does Mr. Stevens consider it a drive or a road. Mr. Stevens said they can call it whatever they want, but it is going to be private to the people who live there. Mr. Stevens suggested making an easement for one of the lots to give them the right to travel over to the extent they need to, across another driveway and also locate a sign that says it is the access to these lots. Mr. Paine asked with regard to this area, if there was any consideration for its own association. Mr. Stevens replied that even though this street is just servicing these houses, he sees it as benefitting the whole development. Mr. Paine asked Mr. Stevens to indicate where these lots sit in relation to the other lots.

Mr. Stevens said each lot has 3 forms of identification; a lot number based on the subdivision plan that was approved, a new Tax Map number assigned to it by the Town and a street address assigned by the Post Office.

Mr. House referred to fire trucks and the drive and the bottom of the hill and asked if there was enough of a pitch for them to make it up the hill. Mr. Stevens said there was. Ms. Ober asked if there was enough room for a fire truck or a plow to turn around in the proposed drive road. Mr. Stevens said they could do a modified K-turn. He put a bump out in the last house so their drive doesn't get used and they have their privacy. Mr. House said his real concern is whether or not a fire truck can drive down, turn around and come back out again. Mr. Stevens showed how a fire truck would be able to go in and get back out again. Ms. Ober said once the Fire department sees this design they will know if it works or not. Mr. Stevens said if they have to modify it they can deal with it. Mr. Paine asked where the water would go in a storm event because of the 11%. Mr. Roseen said there are 2 elements to the design that address the storm water. The internal construction of the road itself is built like a waffle which provide grade controls which are placed every foot or two. There are roughly 30 of those located across the contour. This causes the pavement to hold the water and prevent it from pouring down. The surface aspect of the road is that there is back up. They have redundancies in terms of catch basins and dry wells that are located about every 75' to 100' and the road itself has a 1% cross slope to the hillside of the road and these catch basins and dry wells are on the edge of the road. The dry wells are connected by stone to the sub base again. Mr. Paine asked about storm events. Mr. Roseen said it's all designed for a 50 year storm.

Mr. House asked about snow storage. Mr. Stevens said they will probably put a little blip in at the end that will give the ability to push snow down there if they need to and it will provide an extra area for a fire truck to back up into. They did put a fire truck template on the plan and if they don't use driveways, they will really have a big impact on how this works.

Mr. Stevens said he wasn't looking for approval this evening, but some basic guidance. Mr. Austin said the plan in the binders is different to the one provided by the applicant tonight. Mr. Austin suggested the design goes to the Fire department, Highway Agent, and Civilworks. Mr. Austin asked Mr. Deschaine if this would become a road by statute and if so then does the Planning Board need to consider a waiver as it exceeds the 8% requirement for roads in a subdivision or if it is a simple matter of the Planning Board determining it is a common driveway with easements required and is signed to the Fire Department's satisfaction. Mr. Houghton said he did remember the earlier discussions talking about a loop road. Mr. Austin asked if the Board is amenable to the road not looping around and moving forward with department and Civilworks review as conceptually shown on the plan, which will give the applicant the ability to move forward, and respond to any comments. Mr. Canada said he thinks the key issue is the Fire department; if they don't have a problem then neither will he. He would also vote to give it a waiver if it turns out that this has to officially be a road. Mr. Paine agreed subject to department reviews and added that Mr. Stevens had tried to minimize impact. Mr. House and Ms. Ober said they had no problems.

Mr. Stevens referred to the memo mentioned earlier and proposed sitting down with Mr. Austin to go through the items to see if he can address them. Mr. Stevens said he was aware that there were issues concerning the bond. He understood that the Town had lost the original bond, then found it after he had drawn up a new bond.

Mr. Austin said there is one condition of approval in the notice of decision which staff needs an interpretation for. It states that all utilities must be underground and the Town needs clarification if that includes propane tanks. Mr. Stevens said the tanks should be underground. Mr. Austin said that at least 2 foundations have gone into ledge and you can't put a propane tank in a ledge hole. Mr. Stevens said it can be done and repeated that they should be underground. The Board agreed they should be underground.

Mr. House made a motion that propane tanks are utilities. Mr. Paine seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Miscellaneous

Mr. Austin asked the Board if they had any comments for the C-Rise project as presented by Ms. LaBranche at the previous Board meeting. The Board had no comments.

5. Adjournment

Mr. House made a motion to adjourn at 9:05 pm. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

- 1
- 2
- 3