

**Town of Epsom
Planning Board
3/11/09**

In Attendance: Dan McGuire, Chairman; Jay Hickey; Phil Demeritt; Keith Cota; Darlene Phelps, Recording Secretary

Also in Attendance: Barbara Clark; Joe Wichert; Jeff Lewis; Donna Berberian; Kurken Berberian; Marilyn Key; Don Bartlett; Stephen Naugle; Russ Bartlett; Patricia Eldridge ; Deborah Sargent; Seth Bostock

Betsy is sitting in this meeting for

6:40 PM Administrative Session

We have three new elected members as a result of yesterday's elections. The current board welcomes John Keane, John Dodge & Bruce Coutu. Each member of the board introduced themselves.

The minutes of 2/25/09 were reviewed. Phil made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Keith seconded the motion. Dan, Keith & Phil in favor. Betsy abstained. Motion carries.

Mail was reviewed. A Dredge & Fill Application has been received from the State for Woodcote Estates Phase IV. This particular development has not come before the board yet, and being so, Keith recommends that we send a letter back to the State explaining that there is no application before the Planning Board at this time. After a brief discussion, Keith made a motion to respond to the Application for Woodcote Estates Phase IV (R-9 Lot 19 & 23) informing DES that there is no application before the Epsom Planning Board for this property and we recommend that they delay the processing of this application. The letter should be cc'd to the Conservation Commission & the BOS, along with the applicant. Phil seconded the motion. All in favor.

7:10 PM Informational / Landt / McGourty – Modification to Lot Line Adjustment / R2-62/R2-63

The Planning Board previously approved a minor lot line adjustment in spring 2008, which created a new lot. However the plan was never recorded. When the corners were set – the property owners discovered that they didn't like where the new lot line is. They would like an adjustment so that all of the landscaping set by Dr. Landt will remain on his property. Joe wants to know if we will require another Public Hearing or if this can be an administrative adjustment, since the change is very minimal (2103 SF is the new amount of land being transferred). Keith suggested that the applicant send a letter with a small copy of the plan notifying their abutters that there is a small adjustment to the lot-line adjustment. Betsy made a motion to have the property owner notify the abutters of the plan change, along with copies of the plan, stating the application will be brought forth for discussion on April 8. A copy must be sent to Town Office as well. Phil seconded the motion. Phil, Keith, Betsy & Jay in favor. Dan opposed. Motion carried.

7:25 PM / Continued Public Hearing / Bartlett Subdivision / Goboro Road / R13-36-1

Betsy made a motion to re-open the continued public hearing. Phil seconded the motion. All in favor.

Dan stated that a letter has been received from CNHRPC in regard to this application. Dan read the letter aloud to the public. The following suggestions have been made:

1. A Fiscal Impact Study of the proposed development to determine how the proposed development will impact the existing fiscal situation. In addition, a Community

Services Impact Study could help to determine how the increase in homes will impact police, fire and other community services.

Seth Bostock responded that the Growth Ordinance restricts the amount of building that can take place – and the project will not be built out in full right away. He stated that this project is expected to be built in 6 phases (that's 7 per year). Jay responded that our Growth Ordinance limits 5 per year. Russ Bartlett responded that they have received some input from the Fire Chief, whose input was about cisterns, and the Police Chief's input was additional signage on Goboro Road.

Keith suggested that they complete the Fiscal Impact Study, and the Community Services Impact Study.

2. The Board should consider feedback from Chichester. Joe Wichert stated he did contact the Town of Chichester. Keith also stated that this Planning Board did provide notice to the Town of Chichester. To date, we have not received any feedback.
3. A Traffic Impact Study with particular focus on the impact to Route 28 at the Chichester Town line, and to Route 4. CNHRPC is estimating 402 trips per day increase in traffic; however that is with a full build-out. Joe Wichert said they do have a traffic study to present to the board tonight. The Board should consult with the Fire Department regarding the turning radii and access associated with the development. Since the cul-de-sac is no longer part of the plan, the turning radius is a moot point.
4. The Board should take special care to ensure the proposed development does not negatively impact any surface or ground water in the area. Special care should be given to surface runoff and recharge, and be aware of any potential flooding issues. We should require a Drainage Study and have it reviewed by the Town Engineer. The applicant has already completed a Drainage Study. There is a question about who will own the open space and will it be intended for public use.
5. The Board should be aware that there is a potential impact to the Pembroke School System as well, and any comments from them should be taken into consideration. Russ Bartlett called SAU 53 and stated that all schools in the communities that send students to Pembroke Academy, have had a decline in enrollment over the past several years. He also stated that even though there has been a 14% increase in town population, there has been a 13% decline in school enrollment in Epsom. Joe Wichert stated that the new estimate is .5 children per household. With a full build-out of this project, there is a potential of about 20 new students – which will be spread from elementary school to the high school. Keith does not feel we need to involve Pembroke in the planning for this development. Donna Berberian asked for clarification on the Growth Ordinance, last year the GMO limited the number of new homes to 25. Phil would like to require input from Pembroke School System. Betsy, Jay, Dan & Keith do not feel we need to require this. The Board, however, would like to see an analysis of how many kids will likely be in the entire school system throughout the build-out.
6. CNHRPC also made suggestions about our 50-Year Storm frequency and whether they are sufficient or should we require 100-Year calculations. There was discussion relative to this. Keith stated that their Drainage Analysis reports on these issues, and feels that SFC should review that report.

During the past week, a lot of discussion has taken place in regard to the road. Dan explained "super-elevation", and the debate about what is the better option for this development. Keith reported on his review of the road design. He stated that our regulations require super-elevation, and their road design does not include any super-elevation, and is not achievable in some curves as they are too short. Keith's primary concern is with the horizontal/vertical relationship of the road, and feels it is unacceptable in three locations. He is also concerned

about the “sag” in the road in certain areas. Keith did give an explanation of these terms for the benefit of the Board and the Public in attendance.

Jeff Lewis, Road Design Engineer for this project, thanked Keith & Dan for the opportunity to sit down & discuss the road design earlier this week. He stated that he has completed projects in Epsom in the past and the requirement for super-elevation has not been enforced. Jeff explained that there are various ASHTO standards, and we need to specify which standard the design should adhere to. He reviewed the curves in the road, and stated that some curves were placed in the road in order to limit the wetlands impact. He wonders if the Board would be willing to accept super-elevation only on the tighter curves, as he doesn't feel it's practical to do that on every curve. His response to the horizontal/vertical relationship, he stated they like to keep those in place to keep the traffic going slower – and also said that in this development – it will be local traffic only – random drivers that don't know the road won't be travelling this road. He reviewed the problem areas and proposed ways to address the issues.

Jay stated that the applicant did not design the road to our specs, and feels it was very poor work – as most members of this board are not engineers. We expect that the designer will follow our regulations. Russ Bartlett responded that SFC has reviewed these plans and has not ever mentioned these issues. Seth Bostock stated there is nothing underhanded going on – but the Board and/or SFC needs to clarify what ASHTO standard they should be following. Keith stated that there is a different interpretation of the ASHTO standards. Keith also believes that this road needs to be designed for 30 MPH, and following our road standards. Keith recommends ASHTO 2004 Exhibit 3-25. Seth requested that SFC review this to be sure that this is their recommendation as well. Keith stated that as Selectmen, he feels strongly that a new road being built in this town must be built to our standards.

Betsy made a motion to design the road according to our standards and following ASHTO 2004 Exhibit 3-25. Phil seconded the motion. All in favor.

Seth Bostock asked if we would be willing to ask for SFC opinion before deciding on this. Joe Wichert stated the road was designed for under 400 trips per day.

Kurken Berberian asked how the open space will be accessed, and stated there is likely to be additional traffic and parking issues once the public is made aware of the open area.

Dan asked if anyone would like to reconsider their vote. No one wants to reconsider. Keith stated that some references have been made to emails that Keith has sent him. Keith stated for the record that he will provide copies of those emails to be included in the file.

In regard to the plan showing driveway locations; Betsy feels strongly that driveway locations should be shown on the plan, to ensure that they are built to our specs, particularly on this plan which shows a lot of cuts & fills. Jeff stated that they provided some driveway profiles, for the difficult lots, and provided some additional ones upon the recommendation by SFC. He would like the Board to specify which lots need a full driveway profile done on the construction plan, and the rest of the lots listed as to either a range of area to be built or whether there are no restrictions. Since our regulations require driveway profiles on all driveways, Jeff stated he will have to obtain a waiver for the ones that may not need a full profile.

Betsy stated that since the snow is going – it is likely time to plan a site walk.

Dan stated that our regulations state no road should exceed a grade of 8%. Jeff replied that they are not requesting a waiver because their road does not exceed 8%.

Phil stated that according to the Fire Department, a cistern would need to be installed before any CO's are issued, and upon completion of 8 homes. Joe said they are still working with the Fire Department, as they did not anticipate installing a cistern upon building one home.

9:45 PM – 9:55 Break

Joe stated that by removing the cul-de-sac, it reduced their project to a 40 lot subdivision.

Joe provided a copy of the Traffic Study to the Board. Phil noted that their Traffic Study shows there is no traffic on Fridays and asked if they'd like to go back to the person who did the report. Jeff said he stands by the report. Phil also stated that he finds a discrepancy in the number of accidents shown in the report. Betsy would like DOT to review it.

Joe stated they showed the house on the plan that Mrs. Naugle expressed concern about at a prior meeting. In regard to comments about guardrails – Gordon Ellis & Keith have expressed concern about moving them about 3' out. If this is required, then it increases wetlands impact. Should he ask for a waiver for those?

He recognizes they need to submit a summary Fiscal Impact Study / Community Services Impact Study / School Attendance Study. They will submit this information to the Planning Board, and will provide a copy at the same time to SFC.

They will be asking for a waiver for the plan scale to be 1" = 40, vs. the 1" = 50, which our regulations state.

He is requesting a 90 day extension for approval. Betsy made a motion to grant a 90 day extension. The deadline is now extended to July 22 based on the request of the applicant. Jay seconded the motion. All in favor.

Joe said there is a wetlands crossing about in the middle of lot 6, and wants to know if there are any issues with a shared driveway. The board assured him that they are allowed per our regulations.

Jeff asked who will be reviewing the revised plans. Keith & Betsy stated that all board members have the right to provide comment, along with SFC.

Dan stated that he will contact SFC to advise them that they missed significant details on the plan – and that they have charged a great deal of money for that review. Dan should also ask them how much they feel it will cost to review the Traffic Study.

Seth asked for a continuance until April 8. Betsy made a motion to continue the Public Hearing until April 8. Jay seconded the motion. All in favor.

10:25 PM Old / New Business

Dan asked if we should respond to Rokeh Engineering and John Turner Consulting. Phil stated he reviewed the information from Rokeh & liked them. Betsy suggested that since we don't have any need for a new engineer right now – we should wait to see Rokeh come before us as he is doing the Woodcote project. Dan will send a letter to each of them & acknowledge that we have their information but at this time, do not have any projects to send them.

Dan stated we will be reviewing the Master Plan at our meeting on March 25.

Betsy made a motion to nominate Norm Gentry as an alternate to the board for three years. Jay seconded the motion. All in favor.

Jay passed out school enrollment figures for the purposes of GMO. He stated that CNHRPC will be charging to determine the indicators of growth for the GMO this year. Jay will call them and ask how much it will cost and whether it's something we can do on our own.

Phil noted that at our next meeting, we will be electing a new Chairperson & Vice Chairperson and to please consider serving in one of these positions.

10:40 PM Betsy made a motion to adjourn. Phil seconded the motion. All in favor.