

THURSDAY JANUARY 12, 2023

**TOWN OF EPPING, NEW HAMPSHIRE
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
EPPING TOWN HALL**

PRESENT – Susan McGeough, Heather Clark; Michael Vose, Sean Morrison; Selectboard Representative Joe Trombley; Alternate Dave Reinhold; Planner Casey Wolfe; Secretary Phyllis McDonough.

GUEST: Selectmen John Cody and Tom Gauthier.

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman McGeough called the meeting to order at 6:00.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Amendments

Chairman McGeough read the public notice for zoning amendments:

1. The first proposed amendment, if approved, will remove and add new language to Article 7, “Aquifer Protection District & Wellhead Protection Area.” The intent of this amendment is to increase protection of public and private drinking water sources.

Jennifer Rowden from Rockingham Planning Commission explained she started to work with the board earlier in the year to amend the groundwater protection district zoning, at the request of the Town’s Planning Board a grant was applied for in 2021 which is fully funded through DES.

Rowden explained that in order for any of the amendments to go into effect this public hearing meeting would have to vote to move the amendments to the ballot and then at the March vote it would have to pass by a majority vote.

Clark thanked Rowden for all her hard work that has gone into this ordinance.

Rowden spoke about reducing salt on roadways and parking lots.

Austin Turner asked that the board while reviewing the updates to the ordinance that they consider the impact on the housing developments.

Selectman Cody referred to the prohibiting uses of road salt and deicing chemicals unless fully enclosed and covered. Selectman Cody referred to the NH environmental fact sheet that specifically states that there needs to be impervious base of asphalt or for the facilities to store salt, asked if that could be added so it doesn’t seep into the ground water.

Rowden agreed to add that clarifying statement.

Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to approve the language on the aquifer protection ordinance and to add the change from Selectman Cody. The motion carried unanimously.

Information on the groundwater protection ordinance is available in the Planning Board office.

PUBLIC HEARING: Site Plan
Owner/developer: 470 Church St., LLC
Location: 581 Calef Highway Map 005 – Lot 029-001

Chairman McGeough announced this hearing is continued.

Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to continue the hearing to February 23, 2023. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING: Lot Line Adjustment
Owner/developer: Steven and Kristen Minnon
Location: 132 & 134 Blake Road Tax Map 020 – Lots 019 & 019-001

Chairman McGeough read notice of a Lot Line Adjustment.

Ryan Lavell, representing the applicants came before the board to explain the request. He stated the reason for this request is the existing driveway on the plan on Map 20 Lot 19 is too close to the property line.

Vose noted that the changes made by staff have already been made.

Planner Wolfe recommended if an approval is made, to leave her comments as is.

Chairman McGeough opened and closed the public hearing as there was no public comment.

Clark moved Morrison seconded the motion to accept the plan. The motion carried unanimously.

Vose asked if the all changes recommended by the planning staff can be/have been made. Applicant said yes.

Clark moved Morrison seconded the motion to approve the lot line adjustment with staff recommendations as written. The motion carried unanimously

DESIGN REVIEW HEARING: 315-unit multi-family housing
Location: 46 Martin Road Map 036 – Lot 023

Chairman McGeough read notice of a Design Review.

Austin Turner, Project Engineer from Bohler came before the board with the design review, accompanied with James Prieto, Project Manager, to explain recent changes to their plan for workforce housing that went before the Board of Appeals, and now this is a three-story project.

Turner explained they had been before Water & Sewer Commission and received a hand written agreement for a sewer allocation, approximately 72,000 gallons a day, which will not cover the entire proposed development. With the problems that the Town is having with the sewer system, the Applicant suggested that approximately 130 to 140 units be served by private, on-site septic systems.

Next Turner asked for possible feedback on requirements in the site plan regulation application, specifically regarding the eleven (11) waivers they will be requesting.

Chairman McGeough stated she is not in favor of reviewing the waivers at this time, as the board does not have a formal submittal and does not feel it appropriate for the board to be addressing the waiver requests without a plan.

Vose stated he would be in favor of what some of the waivers are.

Selectman Trombley, stated from experience there is seldom feedback to be had, and without a plan discussion would be difficult. He stated the board has the due diligence to maintain what's in the regulations. He stated he agrees with both the Chairman and Vose and offered that the Board be very careful on any feedback without visuals, as it can impact the final decision.

Chairman McGeough asked Planner Wolfe if the board gave feedback without seeing the plan, what type of legal ramifications would there be if the board felt compelled to change their feedback upon receiving a more formal submittal.

Planner Wolfe explained this is a design review meeting and nothing that is said at this meeting is binding. She explained that typically a design review meeting would not dive this deep into the plan, but there is nothing that says this cannot be done.

Selectman Trombley suggested to hear the waiver requests but refrain any feedback except for what the applicant finds as a specific item that he would like some feedback on

Vose moved Morrison seconded the motion to hear a brief description and if the Applicant requests feedback on the waivers, it is understood the board may decide not to give that feedback. The motion carried 3 – 2. Chairman McGeough and Clark opposed.

Turner read the waiver requests:

- Section 20: Proposed Site Conditions Q
- (3) Information on air, water, or land pollutants discharged
- (4) Estimates of noise generation

- Section 22: Driveway/Vehicular Pedestrian Access, H
- The Board may require the frontage of the property and the driveway to be curbed if it will improve control and safety. Curbing shall be granite.

Chairman McGeough stated the curbing shall be granite, as it is what our regulations call for.

- Section 22: Driveway/Vehicular Pedestrian Access, I
- Sidewalks shall be provided for pedestrian traffic to provide a connection between the main entrances of business, housing or industrial establishments, parking areas and along public roadways. In the event that pedestrian patrons or employees are anticipated, sidewalks shall be provided from the street to the main building entrance. All sidewalks adjacent to parking areas or access drives shall be at least six inches above finished grade and curbed with vertical granite curbing.

- Section 24: Parking Lot Design, C

Minimum parking space sizes shall be 9.5 feet wide by 18 feet long.

- Section 24: Parking Lot Design, D

Traffic Control Islands. In any parking lot, no more than three aisles, double or single, may run generally parallel to one another without separation by a raised, curbed traffic control island which runs parallel to and the full length of the aisles. Traffic control islands shall be a minimum of twelve feet in width. At the ends of each traffic control island there shall be 12-foot-wide raised islands which shall extend (on both sides, if parking rows are double) the full length of the parking stalls. The applicant, if desired, may shorten the main traffic control islands no more than 14 feet at each end to better allow for the removal of snow. If the main traffic control island is proposed to be shortened, pavement markings will be required to prohibit through-traffic. The Board may require additional traffic control islands to prevent or correct traffic safety problems. Curbing shall be granite.

- Section 24, Parking Lot design, F

The parking lot shall be designed to drain to the outside edge of the parking area to minimize ice formation and reduce environmental impacts from de-icing chemicals.

- Section 28: Signs, C.10

In addition to the maximum number and size of permitted signs, identification signs may be erected over or by the doorway or entrance to such portion of the building. The sign area shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the area of such doorway or entrance to such portion of the building.

- Section 28: Signs, D.2 – Free Standing Signs

*Corner lots shall be allowed two free standing signs.

- Section 28: Signs, D.3 – Building Signage

- Section 33: General Appearance Criteria – Architecture

- Section 45: Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Design – Architecture

Vose suggested that this design exceeds the specifications that are in the ordinance.

Selectman Trombley noted the best thing not to do is request waivers as the Boards duty is to uphold the ordinances that the people in town voted on.

Selectman McGeough explained Board member, Mike Sudak, who could not be present for the meeting sent a letter. The Chairman read for the record a couple items by Sudak for the applicant to look at.

“To include a more thorough investigation of these ‘downstream’ intersections and how the trips generated from this development would affect the neighboring communities, both in anticipated traffic load and impacts to infrastructure.”

“Provided information of a joint meeting between the Selectboards of Epping and Fremont.”

Chairman McGeough opened the public hearing. She asked of anyone getting up to speak that if they hear their question asked by another member of the public, there will be no need to repeat that question.

Murray from Fremont questioned regional impact.

Dianne McPherson stated her concern is with the water and aquifer as she has a well.

Jason Soares explained the general stats about housing shortages.

Mary Housel asked if test pits are being done and how many. Turner explained the results will be provided. Turner stated it all depends on the size on how many test pits will be done; approximately ten (10) have been done recently.

Victoria Shrtino stated she lives in Kensington would like to move to Epping, but can't afford.

Richard Cooper stated his concern is also about water.

As there were no further questions or comments the public hearing was closed and the discussion ended.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| PUBLIC HEARING: | Amended Site Plan |
| Owner/developer: | Lewis Builders Development, Inc. 470 Church St., LLC |
| Location: | 140 Pleasant Street, Tax Map 028 – Lots 38, 38-1, 39 & 40 |

Chairman McGeough read notice of an Amended Site Plan.

Vose moved Clark seconded the motion to accept the plan. The motion carried unanimously.

Joe Coronati and Joshua Manning came before the board with a requested review to amend a site plan. Coronati explained the road (Lunas Ave.) is paved to the end of the cul-de-sac. That is what has been worked on, and now the developer would like to continue the road to ultimately have it be a loop road with both entrances on Route 27. He explained they are now building the road out to Route 27 to finish Sunset Ridge Road.

Coronati explained when doing the design curbing was proposed, and sections of what's left to be built is about 5,000 feet of curbing and about 7,300 feet of ditch lines.

Coronati explained they are requesting a waiver to not have granite curbing but to have asphalt/cape cod curbing as there has been a shortage of curbing.

Vose questioned this being a granite state, why is granite hard to come by. Manning explained it's just being consumed by so many that they can't keep up with it. Vose stated asphalt doesn't last as long as granite will, and questioned if that require the homeowners to spend more. Manning stated it's comparable.

Reinhold stated from personal experience that within the first two years the curbing will be destroyed by plowing and will have holes in it.

Morrison questioned what is the driving force behind requiring granite curbing, if it comes from the ordinance or if the Applicant added the wrong curbing when they submitted their plan.

Clark replied that it was part of their plan and in order for them to adhere to the regulations they have to have granite curbing with no exceptions.

Clark mentioned the challenges when the application came before the board in the past, and added that the expectations of homebuyers in this development would be to see granite curbing in the granite state.

Selectman Trombley questioned if they're only looking for the curbing and not the guardrails. He advised to look at concrete one thing that will remain consistent will be granite.

Vose noted the reason for the request is not because of money it's because of the supply chain issues as stated, and if they cannot get the granite, will it add delays. Manning explained the delays will hold up the building in other areas of the project.

Clark questioned if there is 700 feet already done. Manning explained the road was paved to binder, and that happened this last fall. Clark asked about when the rest of the road was done. Manning stated earlier in the year.

Mary Housel asked when first started bidding the job you receive quotes on the curbing.

Abutter Dennis Saraiva stated this community is beautiful and the granite curbing was a factor when looking at the development.

Abutter Tom Gauthier likes the granite curbing and added that asphalt will have to be taken care of.

Vose move Clark seconded the motion to deny the request to amend the site plan. The motion carried 4 to 1. Morrison opposed the motion.

ZONING AMENDMENTS -- Zoning Amendments discussion was continued, and a lengthy discussion ensued.

2. The second proposed amendment, if approved, will remove and add new language to Article 6, Section 6.10, "Multi-family Housing & Duplex Housing Regulations." The intent of this amendment is to add clarity to the building height versus the number of habitable stories allowed.

Morrison moved Clark seconded the motion not to move to the ballot. The motion carried unanimously.

3. The third proposed amendment, if approved, will add a definition for "height, building" to Article 12, "Definitions." The intent of this amendment is to provide a definition for the term "height, building" which is a term used throughout the zoning ordinance, but not defined.

Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to move to the ballot. The motion carried unanimously.

4. The fourth proposed amendment, if approved, will add a new section to Article 6, "Supplementary Regulations for Certain Uses." The new section, if approved, will be titled Section 6.18 "Temporary Structures." The intent of this amendment is to better define when activities, uses, and structures qualify as temporary and the required level of approvals.

Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to move to the ballot. The motion carried unanimously.

5. The fifth proposed amendment, if approved, will add the definition for “temporary structure” to Article 12, “Definitions.” The intent of this amendment is to provide a definition for the term “temporary structure” which is a term used throughout the zoning ordinance, but not defined.

Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to move to the ballot. The motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES OF 12/8/2022 FOR APPROVAL – Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

EXPLANATION OF INVOICE FROM WALCOTT CONSTRUCTION FOR PAVING OF LANGDON SD \$30,375 – Reinhold explained this payment for paving was held in offsite improvements and was paid before the end of the year.

INVOICES FROM TIGHE & BOND – 581 Calef Highway \$1,020; Chinburg \$1,875; The Housing Partnership \$255 – Clark moved Vose seconded the motion to approve payment to Tighe & Bond. The motion carried unanimously.

SIGNATURES ON ANNUAL REPORT – The Board duly signed the annual report.

ADJOURNMENT – Vose moved Clark seconded the motion to adjourn at 8:50pm. The motion carried unanimously.

NOTE: THE NEXT MEETING DATE IS FEBRUARY 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

Phyllis McDonough

- Section 20: Proposed Site Conditions Q
 - (3) Information on air, water, or land pollutants discharged
 - (4) Estimates of noise generation
- Section 22: Driveway/Vehicular Pedestrian Access, H

The Board may require the frontage of the property and the driveway to be curbed if it will improve control and safety. Curbing shall be granite.
- Section 22: Driveway/Vehicular Pedestrian Access, I

Sidewalks shall be provided for pedestrian traffic to provide a connection between the main entrances of business, housing or industrial establishments, parking areas and along public roadways. In the event that pedestrian patrons or employees are anticipated, sidewalks shall be provided from the street to the main building entrance. All sidewalks adjacent to parking areas or access drives shall be at least six inches above finished grade and curbed with vertical granite curbing.
- Section 24: Parking Lot Design, C

Minimum parking space sizes shall be 9.5 feet wide by 18 feet long.

- Section 24: Parking Lot Design, D

Traffic Control Islands. In any parking lot, no more than three aisles, double or single, may run generally parallel to one another without separation by a raised, curbed traffic control island which runs parallel to and the full length of the aisles. Traffic control islands shall be a minimum of twelve feet in width. At the ends of each traffic control island there shall be 12-foot-wide raised islands which shall extend (on both sides, if parking rows are double) the full length of the parking stalls. The applicant, if desired, may shorten the main traffic control islands no more than 14 feet at each end to better allow for the removal of snow. If the main traffic control island is proposed to be shortened, pavement markings will be required to prohibit through-traffic. The Board may require additional traffic control islands to prevent or correct traffic safety problems. Curbing shall be granite.

- Section 24, Parking Lot design, F

The parking lot shall be designed to drain to the outside edge of the parking area to minimize ice formation and reduce environmental impacts from de-icing chemicals.

- Section 28: Signs, C.10

In addition to the maximum number and size of permitted signs, identification signs may be erected over or by the doorway or entrance to such portion of the building. The sign area shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the area of such doorway or entrance to such portion of the building.

- Section 28: Signs, D.2 – Free Standing Signs

*Corner lots shall be allowed two free standing signs.

- Section 28: Signs, D.3 – Building Signage

- Section 33: General Appearance Criteria – Architecture

- Section 45: Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Design – Architecture