



**Town of Plaistow, NH
Office of the Planning Board
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH 03865**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 16, 2018**

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM

ROLL CALL: Tim Moore, *Chair*
Lisa Lambert, *Vice Chair*
Laurie Milette
James Peck
Steve Ranlett, *Selectman's Rep*
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate*

Also present: Dee Voss, *Planning Coordinator* and P. Michael Dorman, *Chief Building Official*

Agenda Item 2: Minutes of May 2, 2018 Planning Board Meeting

★ *Steve Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2018 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.*

Agenda Item 3: Public Hearings

PB 18-06: An application from FAOCOM Realty, LLC for an Amended Site Plan. The amendment proposes to add a 1,080sf addition to the existing maintenance building. The property is located at 87 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 27, Lot 29 in the C1 district. The applicant is the property owner of record.

Charlie Zilch, SEC and Associates, was present for the application.

C. Zilch offered the following information for discussion for the Board regarding the proposed plan.

- The amended site plan is for Diesel World
- 85 and 87 Plaistow Road were formerly combined into one lot
- This is a 7AC parcel, with 400' of frontage
- There are two (2) buildings on site: an office/sales building in the front and a service building in the back. The service building is to be the site of the new 18' addition
- The proposed addition intrudes into the wetlands buffer, which required the applicant to seek a variance. That variance was granted
- The addition will have the same roof line, same siding, and be constructed from the same materials as the existing structures
- The proposed addition is to provide additional work space, no new employees will be added
- No additional lighting or landscaping is proposed

C. Zilch stated that there two (2) additional changes proposed on the plan:

- Closure of the southernmost driveway
- Additional freestanding sign

There was a continued discussion regarding the applicant proposing to gate the southern driveway and provide additional parking for two (2) display vehicles. Staff's recommendation is

that the driveway not be gated, but closed and landscaped. It was noted that the current site was under landscaped, for which waivers were previously granted.

S. Ranlett offered that he does not support a gate.

M. Dorman suggested that there could still be display parking with the elimination of southern driveway, and the additional landscaping as there were no lines to designate where the display parking should be.

There was concern expressed that firetrucks will not have immediate emergency access and snow removal will be more difficult with a gated driveway.

There was discussion regarding the request for an additional freestanding sign. It was noted that a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) would be needed for an additional freestanding sign. It was also noted that the site plan could not be recorded until a variance was granted. The applicant will bring back an amended site plan for the additional freestanding sign if they are able to get variance approval from the ZBA.

★ S Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to accept the application for an Amended Site Plan as complete. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

Waiver Requests:

Article I, §230-14.1.F – Requirement for an Escrow Account The applicant noted that there is nothing to be reviewed by engineering or legal so there is no need for an escrow account.

D. Voss noted that a \$5,000 bond is requested for the timely completion of work on the site. The bond will be released upon completion of the project.

★ S Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to grant the request to waive Article I, §230-14.1.F Escrow Account for the reason stated in the request. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

Article I, §230-14.1.HH – Additional Plans (Landscaping) – The applicant has noted that all landscaping is noted on the Site Plan and the request is to not have to provide a separate Landscaping Plan.

★ S Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to grant the request to waive Article I, §230-14.1.HH Additional Plans (Landscaping) for the reason noted in the request. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

Article I, §230-14.1.II Additional Plans (Lighting) – Applicant has noted that all lighting is already established and is requesting that no additional Lighting Plan Sheet be required.

★ S Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to grant the request to waive Article I, §230-14.1.II Additional Plans (Lighting) for the reason stated in the request. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

★S. Ranlett moved, second by L. Milette, to approve the Amended Site Plan for 87 Plaistow Road with the following conditions:

- **The southernmost driveway is to be eliminated and landscaped**
- **The second freestanding sign is to be removed from the Plan**

D. Voss reiterated that no engineering or review is required; but Department of Building Safety is requesting \$5,000 bond for this account. It will be stated in the Notice of Decision that there will be a \$5,000 bond, refundable upon project completion.

D. Voss also noted that there will be a Public Safety Impact Fee of \$1.01/SF for the net expansion of the building.

There was no additional discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-1 (Lambert abstained).

PB 18-07: An application from D&H Construction of Plaistow, Inc. and James and Lisa Goulet, for a Lot Line Adjustment. The plan proposes to convey 0.53AC from 12 Hoyt Farm Road, Tax Map 48, Lot 33-4, owned by D&H Construction of Plaistow, Inc, to 47 Forrest St, Tax Map 48, Lot 37, owned by James F. and Lisa J. Goulet. Both parcels are located in the LDR district.

Charlie Zilch, SEC and Associates, was present for the application and noted the following:

- The application proposes to convey 0.53AC from Parcel A (12 Hoyt Farm Rd.) to Parcel B (47 Forrest St.)
- 47 Forrest Street is an existing non-conforming lot
- Reducing 12 Hoyt Farm Road by the 0.53AC will not make that lot non-conforming
- The application complies with all zoning and subdivision requirements
- There are no state approvals required
- There are no waivers needed

★S Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to approve the application for lot line adjustment to convey 0.53AC from Parcel A (12 Hoyt Farm Rd.) to Parcel B (47 Forrest St.). There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-1 (S. Ranlett abstained)

PB 18-08: An application from Exeter Med Real, Inc., for a Preliminary Design Review of a Site Plan. The Plan proposes to merge two (2) lots for a total of 6.41AC and construct two (2) new buildings; a two-story 39,600sf medical office building and a two-story 18,360sf building with first floor retail and second floor medical offices. Property #1 is 127 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 29, Lot 57, the property owner is Hope Pentoliros (deceased) Andrew G. Christianson, Trustee for the Estate. Property #2 is 129 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 29, Lot 58 Keith R. & Marjorie G. Weston, property owners. Both parcels are located in the C1 district.

Applicant's Representatives in Attendance:

Rick Friberg, PE, LEED AP, The Engineering Corp (TEC) - Regional Office Manager
Jessica G. Johnson, AIA, LEED AP, SMRT - Senior Architect
Justin L. Pasay, Donahue, Tucker, & Ciandella, PLLC - Attorney at Law,
Philip Chaput, MBA, CEM, LEED GA, Exeter Hospital - Facilities Planning & Project Management
Robert Corson, Exeter Med Real/Core Physicians, Facilities Planner

Also in Attendance:

Steve Desisto, Coldwell Banker

Abutters in Attendance:

Marylou Poirier, 3-1/2B Jesse George Rd
David Poirier, 3-1/2B Jesse George Rd
Samantha Caruso, 3B Jesse George Rd
George Guilmette, 3B Jesse George Rd
Alexandra Pecci, 7 Jesse George Rd
Brian Pecci, 7 Jesse George Rd

William Shaffer, 9 Jesse George Rd
Patrick Holding, 13 Jesse George Rd

R. Corson noted the following:

- History of Core Physicians and the provided services
- Current locations and services in Plaistow
- Goals of the project, to have a single location to provide multiply services based on their community needs assessment
- Provide additional health services as well as room for growth

R. Friberg explained the technical aspects of the proposed plan noting the following:

- There are two (2) parcels involved, 127 and 129 Plaistow Road
- The parcels front onto to Plaistow Road, Jesse George Road and Old Road
- Along with local permitting there will be State permits needed
 - o Alteration of Terrain
 - o New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) driveway permit
 - o New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) septic permit
- The project will be constructed in two (2) phases
 - o Phase 1: 39,600 sf, two-story medical office building
 - o Phase 2: 18,368 sf, two-story building with retail on the first floor and medical offices on the second
- Stormwater and drainage designs have been submitted for review
- The property is located in the Aquifer Protection District
- The site is proposed to have two (2) driveways, one (1) on Old Road and one (1) access to Plaistow Rd/Route 125 via the signalized intersection at the Irving station
- Traffic study is still pending
- They have received a copy of the Staff checklist review as well as comments from CLD | Fuss & O'Neill (Planning Board review engineers)

R. Friberg noted Plaistow Zoning Ordinance (PZO) §220-55.2.J Access Management requires that if a property has frontage on both a state and local road that access should be via the local road. He offered that it would be too impactful to the neighborhood to have the curb cuts on Old Road and Jesse George Road, particularly with the availability of the signalized intersection on Route 125.

R. Friberg cited PZO §220-3.B General Provisions, which recommends one (1) building per lot, but does not prohibit more than one (1) if the Planning Board feels that more than one building improves the health, safety and welfare of the community. He noted that they could still phase this project by building a single building and then adding to it as growth is needed. The end result would be an "L" shaped building. Mr. Friberg offered that the advantages of two (2) buildings would be that construction of the second building could be isolated from the operational first building; and the aesthetics of the property would be more appealing. Mr. Friberg also noted that there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Town and NHDOT regarding the maintenance of the sidewalks. He noted there would have to be an amendment to that memorandum, that would re-affirm the MOU, as part of this project.

S. Ranlett added that Exeter Med would be maintaining the sidewalks on their own property, the amendment to the MOU would be in reference to a small section of public sidewalk near the signalized intersection.

There was a brief discussion regarding the location of the sidewalk area in question.

S. Ranlett suggested that the access to Old Road be an entrance only. He added that he was not in favor of a two-way access there.

G. Adams suggested that there be an additional curb cut onto Route 125 from the northern end of the parking lot to reduce traffic at the signalized intersection. It was discussed that NHDOT was not likely to grant such a curb cut because of the close proximity to Jesse George Road. It was also noted that Access Management favors less curb cuts, not more.

J. Peck asked approximately how many people are expected to occupy each building. It was noted that there would be approximately sixty (60) staff in the larger building and twenty (20) in the smaller.

There was discussion regarding the number of parking spaces. It was noted that would be determined by following the Planning Board's Site Plan regulations.

J. Peck asked about snow removal. The snow storage areas were pointed out on the Plan.

There was additional discussion about traffic to the site; size of trucks, turning radii to Old Road and restricting that access to an "entrance only." It was noted that there wouldn't be a lot of large trucks on the site, only the occasional mammography or MRI trailer, but most deliveries were by box truck. The applicant team will review all turning radii to make sure that proper models are followed. It was noted that CLD did not call out the turning radii in their report. Concern for truck traffic on Old Road was expressed, particularly for trucks. It was noted that lumber trucks travel the road daily without issue.

There was discussion about landscaping; the well and septic. It was noted that there is a landscaping plan; an existing well that has been tested and is adequate to support both buildings and each building will have its own septic.

There was discussion about the availability of potable water to this site. It was noted that water should be online in 2020.

There was discussion about lighting. It was noted that lighting would be full cut-off LED in compliance with the Site Plan Regulations.

There were a number of abutters present. The concerns they expressed were:

- The this was not a "proposed plan," but a "done deal"
- Increased traffic in their residential neighborhood
- Increased stress on their wells
- Screening for the property so they wouldn't have to look at commercial buildings
- Potential decrease in their property values
- Would the Planning Board consider limiting the development to a single building
- Parking lot lighting on the site impacting their residential neighborhood
- Noise from a running MRI trailer
- Hours of operation
- Timeline for construction
- Review and oversight for compliance
- Is part of this development proposed in the residential district
- Could Exeter Med expand in their current locations instead of impacting the neighborhood
- What does "razing" the site mean. It was noted that it meant tearing down the existing structures to build new

There was discussion regarding the Plaistow Zoning Map. It was suggested that the map posted online showed that the property was located in both the Commercial I (CI) and a residential district. It was explained that formerly the property was located in two (2) districts, because the CI was previously defined as 500 feet on either side of the Route 125 centerline. It was also explained that the entire CI district, as well as the Commercial II (CII) had been redefined to

follow the rear property line of all properties that front on Route 125 (or Route 121A/Main Street in the CII district). That change was done by a vote of the residents at Town Meeting many years ago. There were questions about that notification process. It was noted that all legal requirements for notification were followed. Notification of every property owner/abutter is not a requirement of the law when a change is district-wide.

T. Moore explained the process for review of a new commercial site plan. He noted that it is unfortunate that this commercial property abuts a residential neighborhood, but applicants who meet the Site Plan Regulations are able to develop their commercial properties. He also noted that the Planning Board does have the authority to regulate hours of operation, location and type of landscaping and lighting, access and egress to the site. He also noted that any site plans are under great scrutiny when they are filed with the Planning Office. They are prepared by licensed engineers; reviewed by Staff for compliance with local ordinances and regulations; reviewed by State entities for those related permits; reviewed by Planning Board Review Engineer for the technical aspects of the Plan; and then reviewed by the Planning Board. T. Moore also noted that there are frequent inspections by both the Code Enforcement Officer/Building Inspector as well as the Planning Board Review Engineer during the construction process to make sure they are in compliance with the approved plan. It was noted that the Site Plan Regulations are available on the Town's website and the proposed plan can be reviewed in the Planning Office.

R. Corson noted other location in Exeter and Epping that are owned by Exeter Med Real as examples of how their properties are maintained. He offered that Exeter Med would be happy to meet with the abutters and see how their concerns could best be addressed. He noted the well had been tested and was adequate for their use. He added that they would likely hook into the Town water as soon as it became available, which would hopefully address the neighbor's concerns about water. Mr. Corson offered that they would do their best to address all the neighbor's concerns. He added that most of the staff that work at Core are local and have a vested interest in this property. It was noted that Exeter Med lease their current locations (24 and 166 Plaistow Road) and there is no possibility of expansion at either location. It was also noted that this plan would bring all their services to a central location, which would be an advantage to all those who use their services.

M. Dorman noted that the Fire Department would prefer two (2) smaller buildings over one larger to better access if there is a fire.

There was additional discussion regarding the driveway on Old Road. M. Dorman suggested that it could be a two-way access as only those who live on that side of town would have the need to use this driveway. S. Ranlett offered that he could agree with that if the driveway is constructed in a way to make it difficult for truck traffic.

S. Ranlett offered that MRI trailers are now plugged in and there shouldn't be the humming noise associated with them any longer.

S. Desisto commented that of all of the possibilities that could be built on a C1 property, a medical facility such as that being proposed will have the least amount of impact on the community. He noted that site could be a Kohl's, or a supermarket.

R. Corson offered again to meet with the abutters and made his business cards available to all.

T. Moore explained that the process would be to close this public hearing. The applicant will have the opportunity to take all the comments and feedback and make appropriate changes to their plan before re-submitting their final plan application. He stated that abutters will be re-notify when that application has been scheduled for public hearing.

The public hearing was closed.

T. Moore called for a recess at 8:39pm, the meeting was called back to order at 8:47pm.

Agenda Item 4: Site Plan/Subdivision Regulation Amendment Review

It was noted that the Board has previously reviewed the proposed amendments and the public hearing to adopt the changes is scheduled for June 6, 2018. The adoption of the revised Recreation Impact Fee Methodology.

Agenda Item 5: Old Business

There was no old business to be discussed at this meeting.

Agenda Item 6: New Business

L. Lambert commented that she thought that tonight was a very good meeting as far as the Board's demeanor and showing respect toward each other, applicants, and attendees.

There was discussion about the possibility of giving more of an explanation of the process before a public hearing so that abutters will have a better understanding.

Agenda Item 7: Communications, Updates, & Other Business

Westville Road Bridge Reconstruction

D. Voss explained that Westville Road Bridge Reconstruction project has gone to bid. There was discussion regarding the timeline and road closures. It was noted that many contractors already have their summer work planned, so the timeline had been pushed out a little later in order to attract more favorable bids.

Safe Routes to Schools

Two (2) bids were received earlier in the day. Both bids were over the approved budget and options for the project are being considered.

The next Planning Board meeting will be June 6, 2018.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:56p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Samantha D. Cote
Recording Secretary