

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, February 19, 2020, at 7:00 p.m., at the Derry Municipal Center (Third Floor Meeting Room) located at 14 Manning Street in Derry, New Hampshire.

Members present: John O'Connor, Chairman; Lori Davison, Vice Chair; Brian Chirichiello, Town Council Liaison; Mark Grabowski, David McPherson (Secretary Pro-Temp); Mark Connors, Members; Jim MacEachern, Alternate

Absent: Randy Chase, Maya Levin, Dave Granese

Also present: Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning & Economic Development Assistant

Mr. O'Connor called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting began with a salute to the flag. Mr. O'Connor then noted the location of emergency exits and introduced the Board members and staff present.

*Mr. McPherson was appointed Secretary Pro Temp
Mr. MacEachern was seated for Frank Bartkiewicz*

Escrow

#20-08

Project: Subdivision of Map 01, Lot 28
Developer: McMaster Development, LLC
Escrow Account: Same
Escrow Type: Cash Escrow
Parcel ID/Location: 01028, 81 Frost Road

The request is to approve a final release of cash escrow in the amount of \$8,877.60 for the above noted project. The amount to retain is zero. This escrow is non-interest bearing.

Motion by MacEachern seconded by Chirichiello as presented. The motion passed with all in favor.
--

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the February 05, 2020, meeting.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Chirichiello to approve the minutes of the February 05, 2020, meeting as written. The motion passed with all in favor.
--

Correspondence

None.

Other Business

Presentation of the FY2021-2026 Capital Improvement Plan

Mrs. Robidoux advised each year the Board hears a presentation of the Capital Improvement Plan by the Town Administrator and Finance office. This is an overview of proposed town expenditures over the next few years.

Town Administrator Dave Caron presented. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is an option under the statutes but is required by the Town Charter. This the first step in preparing the annual budget for FY21 which runs from July 1 through June 31, 2021. Mark Fleischer, Senior Accounting Manager, is also present this evening. The Town Departments provided their requests to the Finance Department and they were reviewed in relation to existing services and available revenues. The items are presented to the Planning Board for its input. The items will be added into the budget before April 01, 2020 so that the budget can be presented to the Town Council. The Town Council will need to adopt the plan with or without modification by June 01, 2020.

Items in the CIP typically are a tangible project or an asset having a cost of at least \$100,000 and have a useful life of three to five years; most are much longer than that. A large majority of capital projects are funded through various capital reserve funds (CRF) or trusts, which are replenished through a transfer from the Unallocated Fund Balance (General Fund Surplus). Cable projects are funded through the franchise fee paid by cable customers and Water and Wastewater projects are funded by their customers. Water/Wastewater projects can also be funded through the State Revolving Loan Fund.

A few years ago, Town Council adopted a policy to fund the CRF up to \$1.5 million annually. The amount transferred goes through a two step process. It is dependent on the amount in the General Fund Surplus at year end; funds are then distributed based on the value of the improvements or the payments which are being funded by the CRF for the various departments. The town has had a good luck this year and hopes to transfer \$1.5 million from the Surplus. Prior years, the transfer has been at \$1.2 million. As the economy moderates in the future, this funding may be unsustainable. The current CIP presumes an annual funding of \$1.0 million. Over the mid to long term, this level of support is insufficient to meet the capital needs of the community. This type of funding may not be able to be sustained based on the economy. The FY20 budget included a \$250,000 appropriation to the Capital Reserve Funds to reduce the reliance upon the General Fund Surplus. They will probably do the same for the FY2021 budget. \$1.02 million of the General Fund Surplus is about 2% of the operating budget. In Fiscal 2020, twenty-four projects planned in the CIP where funded. This year, \$1.27 million is anticipated to be transferred at year end.

The FY21-26 is a 6-year plan. Water/Wastewater and Cable projects are not funded from the General Fund Surplus. Of note, the water expansion project, bringing water to Windham, is not included in the plan as that project is funded by the State. The town has had three projects. The first is the continuation of the water expansion along Route 28 South. The original funding was provided in the FY16-17 budget; the purpose was to address MTBE contamination along Route 28. There are two projects in process, the first is the pipe project that will continue water from Berry Road to the Windham town line. The second project is the construction of a pump station on Manchester Road so that the required water volume can be carried through those pipes. The Town of Derry will realize a wheeling charge of \$1.00 per cubic foot which equates to about \$1 million in additional revenue; of that 25% will be allocated to operating costs.

Public Works, Fire Department, Police Department and Library projects are funneled through an expendable trust through the General Fund. Public Works road projects are budgeted at \$1.4 million per year. The Fire Department is requesting \$5.7 million to replace equipment; the Police Department would like to replace their cruisers, and the Library has infrastructure work to be done. The Expendable Trust was set up to implement repairs to municipal buildings. Fiscal 20 projects include \$900,000 in HVAC upgrades for this building, controls and a chiller at the Derry Public Library. Project bids were opened yesterday for the HVAC update. In Fiscal 21 other HVAC upgrades are planned for the Police Department, the Adams Memorial Building and Vet's Hall. It is hoped the town can use funds remaining from Fiscal 20 for those projects.

Major projects in Fiscal 2021 include the Police cruiser video system replacement, Fire Department cardiac monitor replacement, oxygen meters, and self-contained breathing apparatus replacement. The Town is applying for a grant to help fund 90% of that project. The Fire Department has also proposed the purchase of a Quint. The current tower is out of service; it experienced significant deterioration in the hose pressure system. It is not in the best interest for the Town to repair it. A new one would cost \$1.7 million. The Quint would cost \$1.5 million and is more functional than the old tower. This saves the town \$500,000 over the life of the machine. Currently, the Town has five ambulances and they are cycled out every 12 years; engines are replaced every 10 -15 years. The transmission on the tower was fixed last year but there have been issues with it and it will not pass inspection. The Town does not want to invest more in it than it would get back; it is over 20 years old at this point.

Public Works replaces its dump trucks every 12 years. The Town has determined that with MACK trucks, the initial investment is offset by longevity. There are a number of projects in Public Works. The Pavement Management program continues; \$25,000 will be invested to update the traffic signals outside of the Exit 4A corridor. The controls in those systems will need to be updated over a four year period; sidewalks are scheduled to be replaced on Manning Street (funded through the Commerce Corridor TIF); sidewalk replacement on East Derry Road will be possibly funded through a State infrastructure grant.

The Town received \$496,000 from the State of New Hampshire surplus; the Town anticipates an equal amount in Fiscal 21 which will be incorporated into the budget; Town Council will decide where to invest the funds. Other major projects include an excavator, skid steer, sidewalk plow and loader at the Landfill. Mr. O'Connor asked if the Town treats the roadways with liquid brine in advance of the road salt. Mr. Caron explained the Town utilizes road salt only. There are

areas where there has to be low salt application; the Town is vigilant in how it applies salt to the roadways.

For other major projects, Mr. Caron said it is hoped that the upgrades to the HVAC systems can be completed in Fiscal 20. They have planned to look at ADA accessible stairs for the Derry Public Library and other outside work at that facility. Also planned are upgrades to the tennis courts at Hook Park and Alexander Carr. The Sewer truck is over 15 years old and its replacement will be funded through Water/Wastewater funds. The Town will need to budget its share of the \$1.3 million upgrade to the Cohas Pump Station for Manchester Water Works. The Cable studio will upgrade its lighting and workstations this year.

A Tax Impact Analysis was performed to determine the impact of this Plan on the tax rate. For comparison, in FY20, the impact was \$1.34, which includes the current debt service. After 2023 it drops. It drops further in FY 2024, but they can't vary from the impact and are mindful that there are adequate funds for lease payments.

Mr. Connors confirmed the net tax impact is included in the current town tax. Mr. Caron explained the town operates under a tax cap. There was a Superior Court decision that stated communities with a tax cap need to have a general override provision (in Derry that would be 2/3 of the Council). The Council is placing a Charter amendment on the ballot; this override provision keeps the tax cap in place. The town needs voter support on this amendment.

Mr. O'Connor stated this was a very complete Plan. He had a question about the library projects – does this include the Taylor Library? Mr. Caron advised the funding is for the Derry Public Library only. The Town has received a request from the Taylor Library to replace its underground fuel storage tank; the Taylor Library has the funds to do that, but the project is not in this document. Mr. O'Connor asked if there was any discussion about combining the Fire and Police Headquarters; with the construction of Exit 4A, the Police Station may need to be relocated. Mr. Caron explained with the tax cap, it is hard to budget for large capital expenditures such as a new police station or fire station. For a \$10,000 million police station, bonded at 5% over 20 years; the first year debt service is \$1 million. The Town only has the ability under the tax cap to raise \$500,000 per year. Staff will be looking at funding models for large capital projects over the next year. They can't be funded under the tax cap currently. The access is difficult at the Police Station. The Fire Departments are old and need replacement, and the Town needs to find options to fund these types of projects.

Mr. O'Connor asked if it was wise to fund the HVAC upgrade at the Police station if the headquarters might move. Mr. Caron said they need to address the HVAC system. The gasses required to run them are no longer available and the system needs to be upgraded. The project for the Municipal Center and Library will cost \$900,000; the project for the Police Station and the Adams Memorial Building will cost \$50,000. The Police station upgrade will have a return on investment. The money has been in the CIP for the Police Station, but that amount was removed and replaced with a \$1 placeholder. The hope is to have a plan for the Town Council during the next budget cycle.

Mr. Connors noted in the Midwest, it is common to have County based municipal services. Does that save money? Mr. Caron said it is likely that type of regionalization will not happen in New England. Our Town Meeting structure is ingrained in our system, although there is some regionalization of services.

Mr. Connors asked if the items in the CIP are items that have already been voted upon or are things the town hopes to do. Mr. Caron said there is no mandatory basis for the CIP. FY2020 has been included for comparison purposes and to show what was approved. This CIP will be part of the FY21 budget; the CIP is an effective planning tool.

Mr. Connors asked if the items for the Alexander Carr building and equipment should be tabled until the results of the Recreation Study are made available. Mr. Caron said they kept the items in the CIP; they expect the report to be finalized in a few weeks. The plan is to have the report before the Town Council on March 24. The report will highlight the objective view. The items will be discussed during budget workshops. There is \$1.8 million in the recreation bond; funds are potentially available through the Alexander Carr Trust, which was set up for maintenance of the Park. That fund has a surplus, and it may be beneficial to request permission to use those. The State has a grant in the amount of \$500,000. Town Council will provide direction on how to fund the projects using those sources for recreation facilities.

Mr. Connors noted a section of the CIP where an item was noted twice. Mr. Caron will address that.

Mr. McPherson noted when the Town consolidated fire districts, the West Derry precinct was supposed to get a new fire station. ~~East Derry~~English Range Road has the newest station, and that building is over 17 years old. Prior to that, the ~~English Range~~Warner Hill Road station was constructed, and that building is 30 years old. Central Fire Station is 50 years old. The life expectancy of steel buildings is 30-40 years. None of the fire houses are ADA compliant; he would recommend the Town Council look at following through on the building schedule. Mr. Caron said the Fire Chief conducted a study to see if he could arrive at a three station model; based on response times, that will not work. Central Station is not in the correct location; they are looking at Bypass 28 /Tsienneto Road area to increase response times. The town needs to identify financing and land for the projects. Mr. MacEachern stated he recalls the land north of the Irving Station on the Bypass as one of the areas to place a fire station when they conducted a study back in 2000 at which time, they discussed regional dispatch. Mr. Caron said based on the most recent research, that is still a valid assumption.

Mr. MacEachern noted Section 9.4.B in the Town Charter allows for the exemption of bonding outside of the tax cap; it is allowed, but it has not been done. That was placed in the Charter for reasons like this so the net impact of a bond would not be visible after the first year. The town always knew when bonds would be due and planned capital projects based on that so that the bond amount remained flat.

Mr. Caron stated this is one of the reasons the Town Council supported the Recreation Bond. Some bonds will fall off in FY25. The town has little debt service for a community of this size. Mr. MacEachern said the town has that allowance when something major happens. The first few

years may be hard, but then it levels out. If a major facility has to be constructed, there could be revenue from the sale of the Police Department land. Mr. Caron said the town targets the FY18 debt service level as its goal. The town is aware of the authority for bonding, but it is not the preferred. Mr. Connors thanked the town department heads and the Finance Department for their work on the CIP.

Public Hearing

Stinson Hills, LLC PID 35011-001, 14 Folsom Road Acceptance/Review, Site plan 28,800 SF Medical Office Park

Mr. O'Connor advised a direct abutter did email questions to Mrs. Robidoux; he was unable to attend the meeting this evening. Mr. Pratt was provided those questions and will address them. Mrs. Robidoux provided the following staff report. The project is located on Folsom Road, south of the police station. The lot was cut out years ago and purposely left with a fifty-foot right of way to allow for future development. The purpose of the plan is for a 28,800 professional office building, the mix of uses will likely be medical and office. Tenants have not been secured yet, so the make up of tenants is still up in the air. The property is located in the General Commercial zone. The Technical Review Committee did meet and has worked with Fuss & O'Neill, the engineering firm on the project. There were a lot of questions about utilities and drainage. Public Works worked very closely with the engineer of record. The Town has secured an easement in one corner of the property. Mr. Pratt will discuss that further. The purpose of the easement is for any future drainage needs the town might have as Exit 4A comes through. That was the major concern from Public Works. There are several waiver requests. The first is to allow a roadway/access grade greater than 6%. Because of the construction of Exit 4A, a portion of their driveway will be taken, and it would be difficult to meet the required slope without that adjustment. The second waiver request is from the parking density requirements by use. Without knowing the exact mix of tenants, the developer is asking for the ability to calculate parking based on what they think the mix might be. Staff reviewed the proposed uses and agrees adequate parking has been provided. The third waiver is from the 15' street tree requirement. The applicant is providing trees along the access way and staff supports that waiver as well. The fourth waiver is to not provide the required number of deciduous trees per the building perimeter. Staff is in support of this waiver as well. The NH DES Alteration of Terrain permit has been obtained and a copy is in the file. NH DES has looked at this project very thoroughly and all of their concerns have been addressed. Staff recommends approval of the waiver requests and the site plan. Mr. O'Connor added the Conservation Commission performed a site walk and the applicant also visited the ZBA. He asked Mr. Pratt to provide more information on the visits to those two entities.

Brian Pratt, of Fuss & O'Neill presented for the applicant. The applicant's representative, Dana Finn was also present. Mr. Pratt stated the lot is located on a 3 ½ acre parcel, identified as 14 Folsom Road. The lot is located near the intersection of Crystal Avenue and Folsom Road. There is a 50-foot-wide strip of frontage provided to access the parcel. The site plan calls for a

26-foot-wide drive that provides access to eight buildings. The buildings are 60 x 60, for a total project of 28,800 square feet. The developer anticipates a mixture of professional office, medical office and office. No specific tenants have yet been identified. If the plan is approved, the developer will begin to market the project. Parking has been provided on site. There is a single row of parking to accommodate the buildings to the south of the lot. There is a double row of parking in the middle and satellite parking to the side. Folsom Road will be widened, and the plan has been designed to fit both scenarios – Exit 4A build and no build. The dashed line on the plan indicated the proposed edge of pavement and right of way. The road, when widened, will be 72 feet closer to the site which creates a shorter access drive.

With regard to stormwater, they worked closely with NH DES and Town of Derry DPW to make sure the stormwater meets DES and Derry requirements. The site is higher than Folsom Road and they needed to make sure they did not increase water to Folsom Road. There are several catch basins with perforated pipe that will help infiltrate the water that goes to Folsom Road. There is an infiltration system that collects water to the west. There is an underground infiltration system and detention basin to the rear of the units. There will be no increase in peak flow or pollutants off site and all stormwater will be treated on site. The project has access to public water and sewer as well as natural gas. Lighting will be LED, downcast, Dark Sky Compliant. The landscaping is fairly robust and includes interior islands with trees and trees around the perimeter. The developer wants this site to look nice to benefit the tenants. There is good site distance. Mr. Pratt advised they did a traffic study and met with the Highway Safety Committee; there are no adverse traffic impacts to the neighboring street network from this project. Highway Safety wanted to make sure there were no left turns out of the site and a No Left Turns Allowed sign will be installed at the exit. The Conservation Commission met several times to discuss this project and conducted site walks. Items were tweaked to address their concerns, such as the addition of catch basins and the relocation of snow storage areas.

A typical elevation has been provided to show the Board what the buildings might look like. The buildings have not yet been fully designed by an architect, but they feel it will look as presented. The buildings are currently proposed as light gray with black shutters and architectural shingles. It is possible the colors or design may change.

There are several waiver requests. The first has to do with driveway slope. In order to accommodate the future widening of Folsom Road, they have to provide a flat platform (about 80 feet) that ties into the future edge of pavement. They need a 7% grade rather than the required 6% grade in order to accomplish that and tie into the higher elevation; it is only for a short distance. This request is to address the requirements, and it is not a safety item.

The second waiver is from the parking density requirement. They are not sure who the final tenants will be. If there is a blend of office uses, the parking will be okay. They are providing 118 spaces on site, which equates to one space per every 244 square feet.

The front tree strip waiver is because the property is not located on the town street; which would push the tree strip back to the property line behind the abutting property (16 Folsom). The proposal is to put trees internally on the site or where they would be seen, rather than on the back of someone's property. They also have a waiver for the number of trees on site. They are

proposing 8 buildings. If they followed the regulation, they would be required to have 64 trees on site; they physically can't fit 64 trees on site, but they are proposing 30 trees spaced appropriately. Trees line the site driveway, are in islands around the parking lot and are around the basin.

Mr. Pratt advised the applicant did go before the ZBA for two variances. The first was for the sign location. The requirement is to be 10 feet from the side property line. They have a fifty-foot right of way, with only 13 feet available on either side; this leaves them unable to maintain the required ten-foot setback and keep the sign from being hit by plows, etc. They asked for a variance to allow the sign to be 5 feet from the property line, which was granted. They also asked for a variance from the total required square feet for the sign. The regulations are based on the frontage. They only have 50 feet of frontage which would limit them to 100 square feet of signage for the entire site. They requested a variance to allow 200 square feet of signage. The ZBA granted the variance with the condition that each building is limited to 16 square feet on each building, and a limit of 8 square feet per tenant. They are planning for a 70 square foot sign on the front.

They do have an AoT permit from DES. They worked closely with DES and DPW on the stormwater design. The most recent comment was related to the potential future stormwater plans for Exit 4A. There is a possibility the state may install a detention basin to the rear of the property. They have provided an easement to the town to allow for that future basin. That is where their proposed infiltration basin is located for this project.

VHB comments have been received and reviewed. The comments are mostly housekeeping in nature and easily addressed; the design of the plan will not change.

Mr. Pratt advised he had been contacted by Mrs. Robidoux earlier today with regard to abutter comments she had received via email from the owner of 101 Franklin, LLC, Steve Trefethen. The first question had to do with surface drainage to the west and on the parking lot. Derry and DES reviewed the plan. Fuss & O'Neill analyzed the predevelopment condition. There were discharge points off to the side, the rear, and at Folsom Road. The infiltration basin to the west will collect stormwater. Post development, peak flows will be decreased, and the area has a level spreader. The second question had to do with the status of tenants. No tenants have been lined up for this project. The abutter also had a concern that the buildings could be broken into smaller units and there could be more than 8 units. They are designed to have that capability. The fourth question was would there be enough parking if the units were divided into smaller units. The developer believes the site will have enough parking. The fifth question from the abutter concerned the amount of signage required if there were more than 8 tenants. Mr. Pratt said the ZBA was very specific in its approval of the variance and if it was found they needed a larger sign, they would have to go back to the ZBA and request additional relief. Mr. Pratt believed the tenant signs would just be smaller to be in line with the approval. Based on other comments from the abutter in the email, it appeared he was in favor of the project overall.

Mr. Pratt noted the project can accommodate circulation of a fire truck through the site, and he believed they adequately addressed all of the TRC, Conservation Commission and Highway Safety Committee comments.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Davison to open the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor and the floor was open to the public.

Janice Mobsby, 9 Folsom Road, noted there currently is significant runoff in the area of this project. How will the parking lot design direct water? Will it go to Folsom Road or to the infiltration basin? If water runs off the driveway, she believed the flow could be significant.

Mr. O'Connor noted Folsom Road will be reconstructed for Exit 4A; Franklin Street will have a detention pond; as a result of the construction it appears the current runoff issues and brook flooding will be addressed. Mrs. Mobsby noted when she looks out her window, she will be looking at the new electrical transformer and the parking lot. Will the area to the back be kept as natural area for the runoff, or will it be an engineered area for the development of the project? Mr. Pratt provided an overview of the hearing plans for the development of Exit 4A. While he was doing that, Mr. MacEachern asked if the all of the traffic calculations in the traffic study were based on an Exit 4A build scenario. Mr. Pratt said they reviewed the traffic under both conditions (Exit 4A build and no-build). They did the same for the stormwater calculations. The project works either way. With regard to stormwater, the State of NH will be putting a large detention basin in behind 101 Franklin, LLC. The engineering is not yet complete for the Exit 4A project, but that detention area will capture and treat the road runoff. Mrs. Mobsby said she was concerned with the runoff from this project. Mr. Pratt explained the road pitches to Folsom Road. There is a catch basin that diverts it through the site, back to the infiltration to the rear. Catch Basin 91 will lead to Folsom Road and has a perforated pipe. That water will be captured and infiltrated. It will not increase runoff onto Folsom Road. Once Folsom Road is widened, runoff will tie into the catch basin on Folsom and they will tie into the closed drainage system. They don't anticipate any adverse impact to Folsom Road drainage.

Mrs. Mobsby stated the water now runs naturally in the area of the proposed driveway. She wanted assurance that the drainage will meet the regulations. It has been said that traffic won't have any impacts on the side streets. How will people who live in East Derry get home from this site without having to go through the side streets when there is no ability to take a left turn out of the site? Will people use Manchester Avenue as the first available left? Board members noted there will be a center median on Folsom after reconstruction which will impede access to Manchester Avenue from the site. The first ability to take a right or left would be onto Franklin Street. People could circle back through A and B Streets. Mrs. Mobsby asked what the transformer would look like that will be in the front corner of the property. Mr. Pratt stated it is a standard 5-foot-tall green electrical transformer box on a pad. There will be trees along the corner of the property and trees will line the access drive.

Mrs. Mobsby said she is in favor of this type of project. The developer did a lot of planning, she attended the ZBA hearing, and she trusts the project will be a professional park that will be an advantage to Derry. She just wanted the development to be done well and take into consideration the residential nature across the street from the development.

There was no further public comment.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by McPherson to close the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor and review of the plan returned to the Board.

Mrs. Robidoux advised that all of DPW's comments and concerns have been addressed. The main issue had been the detention basin to the rear and that was addressed.

Mr. MacEachern noted the trees planned behind Units 2, 3 and 4. The proposed trees were not entirely across the property line. Is this because they anticipate someone purchasing the property and developing it? Mr. Pratt said there is a small existing tree line that will remain. They will supplement the property line with evergreens. Mr. MacEachern noted that anyone looking at the project from Folsom would see the back of the buildings and at some point something will come in to the front of the project. Mr. Brian said the project sits back about 150 feet from the roadway once the road is widened.

Mr. Connors stated his concern is when Exit 4A is constructed, will the drainage affect the properties on Tinkham Avenue. That area is prone to flooding. Mr. Pratt said their project decreases the flow to the drainage swale located between the project and Tinkham Avenue. The site is 8 feet higher than the properties on Tinkham; there is depth to the water table in that area. Mr. Connors asked if the water will go to that drainage swale. Mr. Pratt said the drive aisle water is captured and will go to the infiltration basin. In the parking lot, the water is caught, as is the roof runoff; that water goes to the underground system and then to the detention basin. With a 50-year storm, the water is designed to overflow to the drain channel off site near Folsom Road. There are catch basins to the side of the road to catch the water and sheet flow.

Mr. Connors felt the 60 x 60 buildings were an odd size; would there be multi-levels? Mr. Pratt said the buildings have basements that will be used for mechanical systems and storage; they are one story. The size of the buildings is limited because of the parking requirements. The inspiration for the design came from a site the developer visited that worked and functioned very well. Mr. Connor asked if the drive aisle will be 7% all the way to the road. Mr. Pratt explained where the drive aisle meets Folsom, there is a fifty-foot section that is at 3% grade to meet the regulations; this occurs if the road is widened or not widened. They need the waiver for the next section which will need to be 7% with the road widening so that they can tie it into the existing driveway.

Ms. Davison asked if the buildings interconnect. Mr. Pratt said there are roof connections and side doors that will connect to keep visitors and tenants sheltered from the weather. If a tenant wanted to connect two buildings to make a larger space, then they would come back to town staff to discuss it.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by McPherson to accept jurisdiction of the site plan application before the Board for Stinson Hills, LLC, PID 35011-001, 14 Folsom Road.

McPherson, Grabowski, Chirichiello, Davison, MacEachern, Connors, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Chirichiello to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-26.C.4.d, to allow a driveway grade greater than 6%, and Section 170-64-B.1, to allow less than the required 15' tree strip as after review of the waiver request the Board finds that specific circumstances relative to the plan, or conditions of the land in such plan, indicate the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.

McPherson, Grabowski, Chirichiello, Davison, MacEachern, Connors, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Chirichiello to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-63.B.4, to allow less than the potential maximum required parking space and Section 170-64.B.2, to include less than the required deciduous or ornamental trees as after review of the waiver request, the Board finds that strict conformity to the regulation would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. Discussion followed.

Mr. Connors asked how far off are they from the parking calculation. They are providing one space per 244 square feet. Mr. Pratt said if the use was all medical office, they would be required to provide 144 spaces. They believe it will be a mix of office uses with low density use. Mrs. Robidoux added that if the calculations do not work when the staff reviews the Change of Use applications, they would need to come back to the Board. Mr. Pratt noted that the units would be rented and there would be rental agreements limited the number of parking spaces per units. Mr. MacEachern called for the vote.

McPherson, Grabowski, Chirichiello, Davison, MacEachern, Connors, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Davison to approve, pursuant to RSA 676:4, I, Completed Application subject to the following conditions: Comply with the Vanasse, Hangen, Brustlin report dated February 13, 2020, or later; subject to owner's signature; subject to recording of drainage easement and deed for the easement; subject to on-site inspection by the Town's Engineer; establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project; obtain written approval from the IT Director that the GIS disk is received, is operable and complies with LDCR Section 170-61.C; note approved waivers on the plan; subject to receipt of state or local permits relating to the project – this includes submission of Change of Use applications for each tenant; the above conditions to be met within 6 months; snow and ice removal shall be performed by a "green sno pro" certified contractor following Best Management Practices for the application of de-icing materials.

McPherson, Grabowski, Chirichiello, Davison, MacEachern, Connors, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. O'Connor asked when the developer anticipated starting the project. Mr. Pratt said it would depend on the progress of Exit 4A; if construction is pushed out a number of years, the developer will start earlier. He does not want to have his tenants inconvenienced by the road construction.

Workshop #2 – Planning Board goal setting - 2020

Mr. O'Connor noted this discussion had been postponed from the last meeting. The purpose is to discuss the Planning Board goals for 2020. Mrs. Robidoux compiled a list of items for discussion. There are three to four years of legislative updates that should be incorporated into the regulations; many of them could assist the Board. Some of the legislation has been opposed such as the mandate that all Planning or Zoning members be required to take a test and pass it in order to sit on the respective board. With regard to workforce housing, some regulations are being mandated. The Board will want to look at its calculations for Derry and make sure that the town is not forced to do something it does not have to do. The Exit 4A corridor will need to be reviewed again and the Board should look at the development at Woodmont and review the changes that have been made to that plan. The Board may want to look at the minimum lot acreage in the residential zones; maybe the current 3 acres zones should be 2, 2 ½ acres, or perhaps 5 acres. The Board will also need to look at the Implementation Plan for the Master Plan and begin to prioritize that list. Mr. O'Connor said he did not want to bog the Board down this year, but it will need to look at some things. At some point the Board will schedule workshops for these items.

Mr. McPherson requested the Board take another look at the sign regulations, especially those for electronic signs. The Board did look at it a few years ago with regard to height, limits and use of electronic signs.

There was no further business before the Board.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Chirichiello to adjourn. The motion passed with all in favor and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

Approved by: _____
Chairman/Vice Chairman

Secretary

Approval date: _____