

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
April 7, 2014**

The Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7pm.

The Secretary Paul Dadak called roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paul Dadak, Paddy Culbert, Jason Croteau, Selectmen Representative Robert Haverty, Alternate Joseph Passamonte, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Tim Doherty, Alternate Mike Sherman

Mr. McNamara appointed Mr. Passamonte to vote in Mr. Doherty's absence.

NEW BUSINESS

PB Case #2014-0006

Map 32 Lot1-146-24 - SKYVIEW ESTATES, LLC. - Skyview Estates Phase II - of Aspen Drive – Conceptual Discussion of Proposed Conservation Subdivision consisting of 19 Single Family Parcels and one Open Space Parcel

Mr. Montbleau stepped down.

Mr. Dadak read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Mr. Peter Zohdi of Herbert Associates, representing the applicant, presented the conceptual conservation subdivision for discussion. He provided the Board members with a plan set. Mr. McNamara asked if the plan set given out was the same plan reviewed in the past. Mr. Zohdi stated it was slightly different. He began the discussion by providing a brief history. During the phase I review and approval the Board was advised that phase II would consist of nineteen additional lots. The applicant has met with the State for an Alteration of Terrain permit who advised that both phases had to work together. Mr. Zohdi noted that the water system had been designed by Bruce Lewis and was currently working. The soils were delineated by Jim Gove of Gove Environmental; no waivers will be requested for wetland or Wetland Conservation District crossings. Mr. Zohdi reviewed the plan set with the Board and summarized the major components. He said the difference between the original phase II plan and the plan just submitted was the change in one of the lots so the right-of-way to the Burton land could be built in the future. He explained he had to request a waiver for the road intersection to allow a 4% slope for approximately 139ft. To build the road would require a lot of fill. One of the lots was changed to accommodate this change and a lot was created in another location; the total number of lots for phase II remained at nineteen.

Mr. Gowan explained to the Board that there had been a difficult situation on Marie Avenue with a 50ft. right-of-way that had houses built too close so it made it impossible to build. He said the alteration of the plan made it so that same situation wouldn't repeat itself in the proposed development. He thought Mr. Zohdi took a step in the right direction by making the alteration to the plan.

Mr. Zohdi said they would be requesting waivers from the regulations, which were currently:

- Section 11.06 – sidewalks.
- Section 11.04 A & B – lot shape for lots 61, 64, 66 & 67. Excluding the cul-de-sac lots.

He then discussed the area in station 5+50 where the K value was 34.29 and the requirement was 40. He noted they previously obtained that type of waiver. He said there was approximately 1,300ft. of road. He spoke to Mr. Gowan about possibly having 22ft. road travel way with 1ft. shoulders on each side (for a total of 24ft.). Mr. Culbert wanted to know the width of the travel way within the other portion of the subdivision. Mr. Zohdi replied it had a 26ft. travel width.

Mr. Gowan felt the Board would benefit from Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) providing his opinion on the items being discussed. In regard to the waiver for lot shape, he felt lot 64 had the classic 'pie shape' the Board had objected to in the past. The other lot shapes around the cul-de-sac he didn't feel were as bad. Mr. Gowan's concern with road width was an increase in traffic with a potential future connection to the Burton property.

For the record and the benefit of the public, Mr. McNamara advised that the discussion was conceptual; a plan had not been formally submitted to the Board. He said the reason the applicant came in front of the Board was to get feedback on some of the points being raised. He believed after the Board had given guidance, a plan would be submitted at some point in the future. Mr. Gowan said typically the Board's engineer wouldn't come in for a conceptual review discussion; however, the applicant felt anything that would benefit the Board and the application made sense to pursue. He said Keach Nordstrom had been contacted to attend the meeting.

Mr. McNamara invited Mr. Keach forward and asked if he had the opportunity to review the plans. Mr. Keach replied he received a set of drawings, but had not done a detailed review. He said the layout for phase II was close to identical to what was presented to the Board simultaneous with the Special Use Permit request and approval/re-approval of phase I. He felt the allocation of space and density questions had been resolved as part of that Special Use Permit. During the past fall, Mr. Keach met with Mr. Gowan, Mr. Zohdi, Mike Gospodarek (of Herbert Associates) and Mr. John Gargasz (the applicant) to discuss some of the items to finalize the vertical alignment of Vale Drive and the 'paper street' that leads to the southern portion of the undeveloped property that could knit into Marie Avenue. Mr. Keach heard Mr. Zohdi speak about making one of the lots open space and replacing it on the north side of Vale. He said in order for the area to be developed in the future the fill area would extend outside of the platted 50-foot right-of-way to provide sufficient land width. The relationship of the geometry was included in the plan set and showed the profile detail for the K value. Mr. Keach explained that the Subdivision Regulations have a K value that corresponds to a 30mph design speed; however in this instance, he encouraged Mr. Zohdi so sharpen the curve and seek a waiver so the vertical elevation of the road (and center line curves) would be closer to existing grade so as to not

exacerbate the fill (to the Burton land). He would like to see a schematic of the vertical geometry for the entire length of where the road will one day meet. Doing so will give the Board confidence that a future road could be built at its full length. He recalled Mr. Zohdi had volunteered to provide that information. Mr. Keach reiterated that the plans in front of the Board was a reflection of the Special Use Permit that was granted for the conservation subdivision several months ago, even with the lot adjustments. He encouraged the plan to advance so an application could be submitted and the details could then be reviewed/discussed.

Mr. Culbert wasn't in favor of having a reduced roadway width of 22ft. He said doing so would create a road that varied widths going from 26ft. down to 22ft. then back to 26ft. Mr. Keach said the phase I roads were constructed for 26ft. He encouraged the applicant to meet with the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') for their opinion regarding the road width. He said he was an advocate of low volume streets having reduced pavement widths for reasons such as environmental, long-term municipality costs for maintenance, traffic calming etc. However, before weighing in with an opinion on the plan, he wanted to hear the HSC recommendation. Mr. Culbert reiterated his concern with the road width varying from 26ft. down to 22ft. and back to 26ft. wide.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion for public input. No one came forward to speak.

Mr. Culbert questioned if it was possible to flag the open conservation land. He wanted those areas to be kept in their natural state as at present. He didn't know where those areas were, or what they consisted of. Mr. McNamara asked if Mr. Culbert was referring to phase I and phase II. Mr. Culbert answered yes, he was interested in both phases. Mr. Gowan felt it was important to be cognizant that the Conservation Subdivision Regulations allow some uses of the open spaces, which were not necessarily 'preserved' as un-cut. He commented that some of the open space/commonly owned property in phase I had some clearing. Mr. Culbert said he would agree to the areas being removed, but he wanted to know where those areas were located. He wanted the areas in phase I and II to be flagged. Mr. Gowan said he would walk the site to view what was going on, but was unsure if flagging the areas would make them easier to observe. Mr. Culbert said when the plan was submitted he would be requesting a site walk and felt it might be easier to flag the areas now. Mr. Gowan asked if Mr. Culbert wanted a site walk prior to phase II approval. Mr. Culbert answered yes. Mr. Gowan said it would make sense to make a determination about walking the site once a plan was submitted. Mr. Culbert questioned what would prevent loggers from cutting trees that didn't need to be cut. Mr. Gowan preferred not to speak to that point unless it was in the context of providing feedback. He said at present, the Board was discussing a future phase. He noted that the Town managed their forests by consulting with a forester and doing routine cutting for the health of the forests. He noted if there was going to be a restriction for cutting within the open space, that topic would need to be clarified during the Board's decision making process. He said currently there was no such restriction.

Mr. McNamara said if the Board decided to conduct a site walk he would also appreciate having the conservation land staked to better understand where it was located and how it integrated with the rest of the development. Mr. Zohdi said it wouldn't be a problem.

Mr. McNamara spoke to the Board about providing feedback to Mr. Zohdi. He said there had been discussion regarding the slope and K radius and Mr. Keach seemed to be in favor of a waiver for such. In terms of street width, Mr. McNamara wanted to hear from the HSC prior to

giving a suggestion. Mr. Zohdi told the Board he would be meeting with the Fire Department on Friday morning. Mr. Culbert asked Mr. Gowan to make them aware that the road width would be going from a 26ft width to a 22ft. width and possibly back to 26ft. Mr. Gowan understood the concern and would share it with the HSC. With regard to the waiver for the sidewalk, there was a consensus in favor of the waiver. The Board discussed the proposed lot shapes. Mr. McNamara felt around the cul-de-sac it was virtually impossible to obtain a good rectangular shaped lot in compliance with the regulations. He was concerned with the 'pie-shape' of lot 64 (on the revised plans). Mr. Culbert said he wouldn't object to the lot shape provided it was site specific on the plan.

In looking at lot 61, Mr. Passamonte questioned if having 50ft. right-of-way was acceptable between lots when a lot was located behind another lot. Mr. McNamara asked if he was referring to frontage. Mr. Passamonte answered yes. Mr. Gowan responded having 50ft. of frontage was allowed in a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Zohdi reiterated he would be meeting with the Fire Department on Friday. He would then meet with the HSC and asked Mr. Gowan to add him to the agenda. Mr. Gowan said he would attend the meeting at the Fire Department.

Mr. McNamara asked if the Board's input was sufficient. Mr. Keach felt it was. He said they would now wait to hear what the Town's officials had to say and move forward from there.

Mr. Montbleau returned to the Board

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Culbert made a motion to leave the present officers in their positions.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To have the present officers of the Board continue in their positions. Chairman-Peter McNamara; Vice Chairman-Roger Montbleau; Secretary-Paul Dadak.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

DISCUSSION

For public information, Mr. McNamara explained that the Planning Board had undertaken a study to draft new Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations with the help of a grant that Mr. Gowan obtained. He said Steve Keach and Mark Fougere were hired to draft a document; the Board was provided with a copy to review for feedback purposes. Mr. Gowan explained that the direction and purpose was to combine the Site Plan Regulations, Subdivision Regulations and their appendices into one document. He said the Subdivision Regulations were in pretty good shape, therefore he asked Mr. Keach and Mr. Fougere to begin with the Site Plan Regulations. Presently the Design and Construction Standards and Architectural Design Standards are separate, but will be collated together as part of the new document. The Board's first meeting in May would be used as a workshop to review the proposed draft. Mr. McNamara added that the proposed draft contained a lot more specificity that the regulations currently contained.

Mr. Keach came forward and provided an overview of the information that was included in the draft document, why it was included and how it might be implemented by the Board. Mr. Gowan asked that the Board review the information prior to the May 5th workshop meeting. He said additional elements will be forwarded for inclusion. He told the Board to forward any questions they may have to him and he will pass them along to Mr. Keach and Mr. Fougere. Once the workshop session was conducted, a public hearing will be scheduled.

MINUTES

March 17, 2014

MOTION: (Dadak/Montbleau) To approve the March 17, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary