

**CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, February 23, 2015

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Members Present

Gary Spykman, Chairman
Michael Welsh, Vice-Chair
Kendall Lane
Eleanor Vander Haegen
James P. Duffy
Christine Weeks
Nathaniel Stout
George Hansel

Staff:

Rhett Lamb, Planning Director
Karen Purinton, Planner

Members Not Present:

Andrew Bohannon

I. Call to order – Roll Call

Chair Spykman called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken.

II. Minutes of previous meeting – January 26, 2015

Christine Weeks offered the following corrections:

Page 9 or 46 to indicate what the vote was. It was agreed that this was a unanimous vote.

Page 3 of 46, fourth paragraph, change the word *extending* to *increasing*.

Page 3 of 46, fourth paragraph, change the word *congestive* to *congested*.

Page 4 of 46, third paragraph word should be spelled as highlighted.

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane to accept the January 26, 2015 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Michael Welsh and was unanimously approved.

III. Planning Board Steering Committee membership

Mr. Lamb stated that the role of the Steering Committee is to review the agenda before it is finalized as well as decide whether a site visit for an application is necessary or not. He indicated that the Steering Committee is looking for a third member to replace Abigail Abrash Walton. Chair Spykman added that with Vice-Chair Welsh looking to end his term the Committee will be looking for two people. It was suggested that those interested in serving on this Committee contact the Chairman or the Planning Director. The election of the new Steering Committee member will happen next month.

IV. Capital Improvement Plan

Chair Spykman explained that one of the tasks of the Planning Board is to make sure that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is in line with the City's Comprehensive Master Plan. Mr. Lamb stated that each year City staff prepares a document for City Council review and prepares a list of projects that are more than \$25,000 for scheduling and funding over a six-year period. The first year of the CIP would turn into the capital portion of the annual budget. He indicated that one of the priorities of the CIP is the update to the landuse code and that project has been funded during the last two years of the CIP

and as the Marlboro Street project is being wrapped up, funds will be expended to implement this project.

Mr. Lamb then introduced the Finance Director Steve Thornton. Mr. Thornton stated as follows: *The focus of the Capital Improvements Program process is planning for our City's future. The foundation of that planning effort is the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) vision as expressed through its focus areas including; a quality built environment, unique natural environment, a vibrant economy, strong citizenship and proactive leadership, a creative and learning culture, and healthy community.*

Each year's CIP builds upon prior versions of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Many of the projects have been included in CIP's for several years pending funding and the appropriate project timing. There are also projects which are new or which have been modified to meet new community needs. This year is no different as the proposed 2016-2021 CIP tries to identify the best mixture of planning, projects, and funding in order to advance the vision of sustainable community advanced through the CMP.

This balance between funding good projects which contribute to the vitality of the community and affordability is not easy to achieve. Over the last few years it has called for reductions in operating staff, tradeoffs between competing operating budget needs, and deferring or scaling back proposed projects. In addition, the City has developed partnerships with community organizations to help plan and fund projects. Examples of such partnerships include new courthouse, the proposed ice rink, the proposed Library Campus Development Project, and the development of a new skate park.

All of this is in keeping with the City's commitment to sustainability and the vision of a community which promotes commerce and job creation, and defines quality of life as a great place to live, work, and play. The following information helps to explain the details embedded in this approach to realize the City's goal to be the best community in America by the year 2028.

As prescribed by the City's fiscal policy, anticipated capital expenditures are identified in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Each annual CIP includes projects with an estimated cost in excess of \$20,000, and anticipated useful life of at least five years.

Each CIP covers a planning period of six years, in this case beginning on July 1, 2015, and ending June 30, 2021 (fiscal years 2016-2021). The CIP provides the City with a tool to identify, schedule, and discuss needed improvements, and to forecast and plan for the impact of those improvements.

The first year of each CIP, in this case FY16, is incorporated into the City's annual operating budget for implementation. The capital planning process allows projects to be fully considered in context of the community's vision, values, and goals, along with impact on property taxes, water rates, sewer rates, and other user fees.

The CIP book document is organized by fund, such as the general fund which accounts for most of the activity, water fund, sewer fund, parking fund, solid waste fund and fleet services fund. The CIP consolidates individual projects into a capital program, and presents projections of future revenue and operating cost along with estimated tax and rate impacts over the life of the CIP. Mr. Thornton then referred to pages 10 -17 for some general fund financial information.

Pages 10 – 11 has a summary that includes multi-year projections of both operating and capital revenues and expenditures.

Pages 12 – 16 provides a summary of the fund's capital program projects requests and proposed funding sources by year.

Page 17 shows debt summaries, detailing current outstanding debt and the amount and annual financial impact of projects financed by new issues during this CIP cycle.

Page 18 – 80, General Fund – the project request worksheets developed by City Departments reflecting alignment of the project to the CMP focus areas. Each project requests provide details such as a project description, goal, and justification, cost, funding source and project schedule

Mr. Thornton then went over some highlights of the CIP. The FY 16-21 Proposed CIP includes City infrastructure and equipment investment, over the course of the next six years of approximately \$74 million with funding comprised of taxes, user fees, bonds, federal and State grants, and other miscellaneous sources.

About 34% of that investment –approximately \$24.8 m – relates to the City's water and wastewater treatment, collection, and distribution systems, and is funded through user fees. Major projects included in the proposed CIP include the replacement of three major sewer lines (the Silent way-Edgewood Interceptor, the Perham Street main, Colony Court main), as well as several smaller water and sewer mains, a significant program to clean and line water mains, and the Headworks Treatment project at Martell Court, rehabilitation / reconstruction of the Woodward and Babbidge water supply dams in Roxbury, and ongoing replacement or refurbishing of equipment and technologies installed at the WWTP when it was built in 1985.

In the Water fund, several new projects have been programmed as a result of the Tighe and Bond study of the City's water infrastructure, as presented to the City Council recently. These include examinations of the major water tanks and a study to determine if the West Street Wellfield should be rehabilitated or replaced. These efforts will generate additional work to be included in future CIP's.

The General Fund CIP proposal totals \$38.5m over the six year span of the CIP, or 52% of the total. In the General Fund, the bulk of it which is nearly \$23.5 million belongs to the City Public Works highway infrastructure, primarily roads, bridges, and drainage program. Major projects include the reconstruction of Winchester Street (largely funded by the state), and includes construction of a pedestrian bridge over Route 101 which will improve the multiuse trail system, improvements to Goose Pond Dam, and major programs to resurface roads, address storm water related issues, and the replacement of four bridges, Main Street / Route 12 over Beaver Brook, Winchester Street / Route 10 bridge, Roxbury Street bridge over Beaver Brook, and the Island Street bridge.

The Public Works CIP request also proposes a study of downtown infrastructure (drainage, parking, landscaping, sidewalks, and streets) and aesthetics to include significant public input to develop plans for beautifying and revitalizing the downtown area.

Other projects of note in the General Fund portion of the CIP:

- a. Rebuilding Runway 14/32 and relocating Taxiway A at the Airport.*
- b. The Revaluation project advanced by the Assessing Department.*
- c. The Municipal Buildings Improvements program developed by Facilities as a result of the Building Conditions Assessment project funded through a prior CIP.*
- d. The replacement of four pieces of Fire Department apparatus and two ambulances.*
- e. Improvements in Wheelock Park (funded through a sale of property to Public Service of New Hampshire) and at Carpenter Field, construction of a skate park (to be funded through a capital campaign), and Phase 3 of resurfacing and improvements to the Cheshire Rail Trail north.*
- f. A "Climate Adaptation and Vulnerability" study advanced by the Planning Department.*

The proposed CIP includes several projects and programs designed to mitigate the impact of more frequent and severe storm events. These programs range from the broadly focused Climate Vulnerability Assessment, to the more area locally focused Beaver Brook Hydrologic and Hydraulic Study and Storm Water System Management studies. Also included are programs to address ongoing maintenance and repair issues in the drainage system. A major new program (Flood Management) has been developed to address specific areas in the community that have experienced repetitive flooding and pooling problems. To advance broader programs, partnerships with residents, property owners, government agencies, state and federal officials will be required. As costs for mitigating storm water issues rise in coming years, the concept of developing a storm water utility fund as a mechanism to fund such activity will be investigated.

General Fund financial projections include allowances (for planning purposes) for debt service over 20 years for two projects. The first is the ice rink project advancing at the Marlboro Street municipal facility, which is not included in the CIP because it is planned to move forward this year. The second is the library campus project being developed by the Library Trustees and Trustees of Trust Funds. This project is included in the CIP with no cost attached, and serves as a placeholder for the project. The financial allowance is designed to cover specific improvements to be included in those projects that relate to City activities. Such costs are not specifically identified at this time, and will be brought to Council separately or through a future CIP.

The General Fund CIP request also includes a project for Council Chambers and Data Center improvements. No funding allowance is included in the CIP for the project. As design advances and alternatives are developed, along with associated costs, information will be brought to the Council for consideration.

A parking deck and intermodal transportation facility is also under consideration at the site of the current Gilbo Avenue parking lot. The project remains in the conceptual stage, pending further development in the Wells Street Parking Structure & Infrastructure Improvement Tax Increment Financing District, and investigation of additional funding opportunities including grants and new market tax credits. This project, when it is advanced through City Council, will form a significant component of downtown revitalization efforts.

Recently two concepts have been advanced to the City and are under review. The first is a potential partnership between the City Parks and Recreation Department and the Keene Senior Center. The partnership would address issues related to serving an aging population, and would be led by a Mayor's Task Force on Aging. The second is an idea known as Gigabit Keene. Gigabit Keene will explore economic development opportunities that would be enhanced through access to dependable high speed internet throughout the Keene City limits, the technologies and strategies to develop a high

speed internet system within the City, and research and develop a sustainable business plan for such a system

Mr. Thornton stated that the Finance Committee will continue to review the CIP this Thursday and a public hearing on the CIP is set for March 5 at 7:00pm. Recommendation from the FOP Committee will be considered on March 12, 2015 and input from the Planning Board will be sent to the City Council for their consideration on Thursday, March 19, 2015.

Mayor Lane stated that there are four projects he wanted to highlight that are of significant impact to the City and they are listed on page 80; Stormwater System Analysis which is scheduled for funding this year and is ongoing and asked whether Mr. Thornton had any other insights he would like to share with the Planning Board on this particular project. Mr. Thornton stated that this project fits in with the climate vulnerability assessment and the Beaver Brook Hydrologic study and added that this particular study looks more closely at certain areas to alleviate flooding.

The Mayor then referred to page 59, Hydrologic Study and stated that the City was under the impression that the Army Corps of Engineers would fund this but they have opted out and the City has been forced to undertake the funding to look at the entire Beaver Brook Water Shed.

Mr. Lamb stated that one goal is to evaluate whether there is more flood storage available in the Beaver Brook Watershed. He added that the vulnerability assessment would look at recent rainfall patterns and look at the interest of the citizens who live in these areas.

The Mayor then referred to page 63 Downtown Revitalization Study. The Mayor noted that City invested nearly 2.5 million dollars in 1987-1988 in the downtown. At that time many of the business were closing down, there was no access to second floors to many of the buildings. Today it has become a vital part of this community and people travel from all around the northeast to talk to city officials about it. However, this is now 30 years old and as a result the Public Works Director has requested that a group be put together to revisit the downtown and look at the needs of the downtown; drainage, traffic pattern, trees etc.

Vice-Chair Welsh stated that at many times during the Marlboro Street Re-Zoning study the committee and the consultants were craving for details about Beaver Brook and felt this assessment will provide that and felt it would pay for itself. Vice-Chair Welsh noted that he didn't see landuse code included in the CIP. Mr. Thornton stated that it has been funded and has moved out of planning into implementation.

Mr. Stout referred to the new surcharge on motor vehicles that is before the Council and asked whether this has any impact on the CIP. Mr. Thornton stated that there is always concern about funding these projects and if the Council approves this charge, that capital reserve will help pay for some of these projects. Mr. Stout noted that over the last 15 years the CIP has been shrinking and projects have been moved out. He agreed that the Beaver Brook does have importance but the projects like upper Washington Street seem to be delayed and felt the practical aspects of the City's infrastructure is often ignored. Councilor Duffy stated that the City has not ignored that project it is about when the construction company can start the work. He noted that with reference to flooding it has cost the city a few million dollars to deal with this problem since 2005.

Mayor Lane agreed that the City has more infrastructure projects than it can handle and the City is constantly struggling to find funds to support our infrastructure and added that the CIP does get

smaller. Ms. Weeks commended the Councilor who proposed the \$5 surcharge on vehicle registrations. She felt it was an innovative way to fund certain infrastructure projects.

A motion was made by Christine Weeks that the Planning recommend moving the CIP to the City Council with a positive recommendation. The motion was seconded Michael Welsh.

Mr. Hansel stated that he is in support of this based on the Stormwater System Analysis that Mayor Lane highlighted. He felt that doing this bird's eye view study might save the taxpayers money in the long run.

The motion made by Christine Weeks and was unanimously approved.

V. Public Hearings

1. SPR-172 – 510 Washington Street – Site Plan Modification – Applicant and owner Toby Tousley proposes the installation of eight gas pumps underneath a new 20'x48' canopy at an existing convenience store and Laundromat located at 510 Washington Street. The site is 3.17 acres in size and is located in the Commerce / Low Density Zoning Districts (TMP# 012-02-008).

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Karen Purinton recommended to the Board that SPR-172 was complete. A motion was made by Michael Welsh that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by James Duffy and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Toby Tousley of 499 Washington Street addressed the Board and clarified that he was not proposing eight gas pumps but instead was proposing only four. He noted that this property has three curb cuts, one of which is a shared curb cut. Two existing curb cuts are being proposed to be moved to the north. Mr. Tousley stated that he will work with the City when the City is working on the street project and added that the proposed change will not change the flow of water, everything will remain the same.

With reference to snow, he indicated that there is adequate space for snow storage.

Ms. Weeks asked about traffic flow and parking. He indicated that there is parking at the location that is being used but not designated and that area is going to be striped.

He also felt this will help alleviate the traffic congestion from Main Street and West Street and that is because people who travel this route to work places like the hospital will not have to travel to a gas station on West or Main Streets. Ms. Weeks asked whether there would be any traffic behind the building. Mr. Tousley stated that the only traffic that might use the rear portion would be large delivery trucks. Ms. Weeks asked whether this site has ever been used as a gas station in the past and whether there was any concern about toxic waste. Mr. Tousley answered in the negative and added that back in the 60's Fran's Auto used this site. She asked whether a permit would be required to locate gas pumps and whether any type of testing would be done at that time. Mr. Tousley stated that a City and State permit would be required but was not sure whether any soil testing was mandated or not.

Dr. Vander Haegen asked whether there would be an oil gas separator installed in the drain pipe. Mr. Tousley stated that one already exists.

Chair Spykman asked whether the existing parking spaces to the left of the building that are diagonally located will remain. Mr. Tousley stated that this area will not be used.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Purinton stated that there was an earlier project from a few years ago which had the building being demolished and involved a new building where the pumps are being proposed today. The approval for that application lapsed after one extension. When staff first saw this new application, their concern was the parking as this site abuts a residential area to the rear and a gas station is a different type of use compared to a convenient store/Laundromat.

Zoning – portion of this site is in the commerce zone which allows for the gas pumps and a portion is in the low density zone. She noted that the privacy hedge being proposed is a zoning requirement.

She went on to say that the Engineering Department has received the information the Board has in front of them and that will be included in the Washington Street redesign. The curb will be moved so that it will now be located on the applicant's property and not on the public right of way. She added that the applicant has indicated his willingness to work with the Engineering Department on this application.

With reference to snow storage and silt fencing, Ms. Purinton stated that the applicant has mentioned that there is ample space on site for snow storage and the silt fencing will be located only during construction.

Lighting – There are a couple of issues specific to gas stations. Ms. Purinton stated that there is a specific section in the ordinance that talks about gas stations. This is a high intensity use but the average lighting for the overall site is a little lower than what is seen for a high intensity use such as a gas station, but because this site is located next to a residential area, this lighting would be acceptable. She went on to say that the use of LED lights is why it is so bright under the canopy and zero at the property line and added that the Board has an exception for LED lights under its standards and hence staff feels comfortable recommending approval of this lighting.

Parking – The parking that is currently located to the north is in the right of way and this is of concern to staff. She then referred to the three curb-cuts in front of the store which will make the two parking spots to the left of the building hard to access and congested.

Ms. Purinton added that the NHDES permit will be required for the location of underground tanks.

She went on to say that when the prior application was submitted, Mr. Tousley wanted to hold on the design and there was a condition of approval that stated that when the applicant chose a design he will come back through a modification process to have a public hearing, and a note would be indicated as such on the plan; that is how the motion for today has been drafted.

Mayor Lane noted that there is no obvious traffic pattern when you access the gas pumps, particularly with three curb-cuts there could be traffic entering from both sides and there is parking in the same basic area and asked how this conflict can be resolved. Ms. Purinton stated that the Board could ask for arrows on the pavement, one way access could be located and also ask the applicant how he plans on handling traffic. She felt that there is ample parking but there could be a risk to those who are not familiar with the site.

Mr. Lamb added that the area at the canopy is of less concern to staff. However, the area between the building and the proposed parking spaces along Washington Street is quite tight. He noted that the

Board regulations will indicate that you need roughly 18 feet here and felt the Board should talk to Mr. Tousley to find out what the proposed width is.

Chair Spykman added that if this was one-way traffic with parking or two-way traffic without parking, it could possibly avoid some of the issues. Mr. Lamb agreed but the problem could be having drivers follow the one-way travel requirement.

Ms. Weeks asked whether there was handicap parking. Ms. Purinton stated that one exists at the right of the building.

Vice-Chair Welsh asked whether the current standards are sufficient for the uniformity ratio as it pertains to lighting. Ms. Purinton felt that it is not advisable to respond regulatorily to a single project but there have been other applications where it has been difficult to achieve this ratio and felt it would be wise to revisit this issue in the future.

Mr. Hansel asked whether the parking space at the right of way was necessary. Ms. Purinton answered in the negative and added that there is ample space elsewhere on the site to locate another parking space and also added that there is a sidewalk in this location.

Ms. Weeks stated that she finds it a much safer option for convenience stores that also have gas stations to have a sidewalk in front of the parking spaces so that people are not walking behind vehicles to access the store.

Mr. Tousley addressed the Board again and stated that his family has owned this property for nearly 40 years and there has been no issue with the existing three curb cuts. Mayor Lane asked for the distance between the building and the canopy. Mr. Tousley stated that it was 60 feet from the canopy to the overhang. Chair Spykman asked whether there would be enough space to locate a walkway between the building and the parking spaces. Mr. Tousley felt that the walkways the Chair was referring to is not likely to ever be used.

The Chairman then asked for public comment.

Mr. Carter Chamberlain of 11 Fox Avenue stated that he was here to ask for conservative lighting. He indicated that he lives past the wooded area which is a haven for certain wildlife and pointed out that the Community College has installed lighting that is not obtrusive. Chair Spykman stated that the Board's standards do call for full cut-off fixtures which will point downward and which will not be visible from the side nor would it point up.

Mr. Bob Sutherland of 66 School Street was the next speaker. Mr. Sutherland clarified that the timing of this project will coincide with improvements being made to upper Washington Street. Chair Spykman stated that the work on Washington Street is slated to happen mid-summer but the applicant has up to three years to begin work on his project. Mr. Sutherland asked whether signage will be added to this site and whether public restrooms will be available. Chair Spykman stated that the issue with restrooms will be connected to the convenience store which is not before the Board. Mr. Lamb stated that signs are handled through Code Enforcement in accordance with the Zoning Code.

The Chairman read into the record a statement from Dennis and Eileen Flagg of 504 Washington Street who are in support of this project.

With no further comments, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Weeks stated that she would be voting in favor of this application and agreed that it would take traffic off West Street and Main Street. She added that for those who travel via Route 9 (leaving or coming in) it would be nice to have a gas station at this location.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board approve SPR-172, Modification 2, as seen on the plan titled "Laundromat, Convenience & Gas, 510 Washington Street, Keene, NH" prepared by SVE Associates at a scale of 1"= 10' and dated February 6, 2015 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature by Planning Board Chair, owner's signature appears on plan.
2. Prior to signature by Planning Board Chair, submittal of revised plans indicating:
 - a. Snow storage location on site.
 - b. Location of silt fencing to be installed on-site during construction.
 - c. Location of a bike rack.
 - d. Removal of the parking space seen in the City right-of-way parallel to Washington Street.
 - e. A note is added to the plan indicating condition #4 of this approval.
3. Receipt of NHDES Underground Tank Permit is submitted to the Planning Department.
4. Prior to commencing public operations of the gasoline fueling stations, applicant shall submit plans for design of the proposed gas canopy which shall be reviewed by the Planning Board at a public hearing according to the Site Plan modification process.
5. Prior to signature, submittal of security for landscaping, sedimentation and erosion control, and "as built" plans in a form and amount acceptable to the City Engineer.

The motion was seconded by Michael Welsh.

Mr. Lamb explained that the intent of condition 4 is because Mr. Tousley does not have the plans for the canopy yet and has agreed to a revision through the public hearing process before the site would be operational

The Chairman reopened the public hearing to hear from Mr. Tousley about landscaping. Mr. Stout stated that he hoped Mr. Tousley will be working in coordination with the contractors for the Washington Street project. Mr. Lamb stated that once Mr. Tousley's plan is approved those plans will be given to the Engineering Department so that if the City's project comes first it will be constructed according to that design and the other way around if Mr. Tousley's project should come first. Mayor Lane stated that his understanding was that the landscaping in front of this site will be taken down and was not sure what the plan was for replacing this landscaping. Chair Spykman stated that his understanding is that any landscaping that is going to be take out is going to be relocated.

The public hearing was closed again by the Chairman.

The motion made by the Mayor carried on a unanimous vote.

VI. Advice and Comment

1. Applicant The Local Farms Project, LLC proposes the Keene Energy and Agriculture Project (KEAP)

Councilor Duffy, Mayor Lane and Mr. Hansel were recused from this item.

Mr. Lamb explained that the purpose of Advice and Comment is for preliminary conceptual consultation (4b of the Board's Regulations). This is an informal review, no action on the application and no motion. He added that this is not a public hearing so no formal notification has been made and staff has not done their review of the application. The purpose of this presentation is for the Board to

provide comments to the applicant. The Board can invite public comment but they are not obliged to do so.

Mr. Don Marsh, Site Engineer for the Keene Energy and Agriculture Project (KEAP) addressed the Board next. Mr. Marsh stated that this project is intended to use methane gas from the existing closed city landfill and continue to produce electricity and then take the heat and warm water to grow fish and then add fish waste nutrients, to grow greens (lettuce and basil) in a one-acre greenhouse. Because of their necessity to be located close to the landfill and because of the Transfer Station Operation, their location conflicts with two of the Board's standards; the surface water standard (a wetland just over the property line to the west on the Barrett property) and the steep slopes ordinance (these have been identified to be 15% and 25%).

Mr. Marsh went on to say that the building itself meets the 75-foot setback, but there is excavation that is going to happen within ten feet of the wetlands but this is all located in the cut slopes hence the long term run off will flow away from the wetlands. He noted that there are some very steep slopes at the beginning of the driveway which is the majority of the impact on the prohibitive slope and these are man-made. The area of the generator pad also has a small amount of impact on the prohibitive slope.

Mr. Marsh further stated that the facility will need about 4,000 gallons of water a day and on a yearly basis they would use about 1.4 million gallons and they are proposing a 50,000 gallon rain water tank to buffer between storms and they also plan to use the City's well.

Mr. Marsh then referred to parking. He noted that the Code Enforcement Department has designated this as a greenhouse which is a permitted use in the rural zone. If industrial requirements were used for this greenhouse, about 50-60 spaces would be required based on the square footage. In this case there will only be about three or four workers in the greenhouse and with other workers the total will only be about 25 people. This facility will also own a bus because there is an educational component attached to this facility. 26 spaces have been identified together with available parking in the upper tier which city staff has agreed to, should there be a need for more parking.

Mr. Stout asked how sewage was going to be handled. Mr. Marsh stated that they are planning for an on-site wastewater system located on the north part of the site.

Dr. Vander Haegen reminded Mr. Marsh about bike racks. Mr. Marsh stated that staff has already requested this.

Vice-Chair Welsh asked about the last portion of slope and whether it would be paved for safety of large vehicles accessing the site. Mr. Marsh noted that this slope will be less than 10% and they would like to have it paved but budgetary reasons might hold them back for the present time.

Vice-Chair Welsh asked about lighting for the site. Mr. Marsh stated that they have a preliminary security lighting plan; full cut-off fixtures. However the entire green house will have high pressure sodium lights that will need to be on all night. They might be visible from offsite, for 30 seconds travelling north on Route 12 and Forge Road and when you travel further up through a break in the tree line. He added that in foggy conditions that light will be enhanced as well. Vice-Chair Welsh stated that he would like an interpretation from staff about lighting in instances like this.

Mr. Stout noted that the landfill has specific hours of operation and asked how that will work with this project. Mr. Marsh stated that they have not figured out that aspect yet. It is likely they will be given a second key.

Ms. Weeks stated that she saw quite a few grammatical and spelling errors in this application as well as many blank spots. Mr. Marsh apologized for these errors and added that this is a document that was done via voice recognition.

Vice-Chair Welsh stated that what he got from this application is that the applicant is aware of the Hillside Ordinance and is aware of the Surface Water Protection Ordinance but would like more specific discussion on the ordinances before he could give a “thumbs up or down” on this proposal. Ms. Weeks stated that she would be interested in knowing staff’s comments on the Hillside Ordinance. She also referred to item 15 which talks about 15 trucks entering and existing the site for the entire construction period and asked whether that was for each day. Mr. Marsh stated that it was for the entire construction period.

Mr. Lamb stated that it would be good to know the dimensions of the building and how that building will fit between the steep slopes and the wetlands. The Chair asked whether the applicant has considered something narrower and longer, he indicated that he is less concerned about the steep slopes because they are already disturbed but the impact into the 75 foot buffer is of concern to him. Mr. Marsh stated that 210 feet wide is the standard arrangement for a greenhouse for the way in which the plantings are handled.

Dr. Vander Haegen clarified that it is the construction process that will impact on the 75 foot buffer. Mr. Marsh added that that the construction process and the 30 foot road is what will impact the 75 foot buffer.

Chair Spykman asked Mr. Marsh to explain the head house. Mr. Marsh explained that this is the facility where there will be a refrigeration room, break room, office space, fish tank, and the cleaning and packaging area. This will be a steel frame building.

Mr. Marsh then talked about landscaping. He indicated that the Board’s standards for tree planting is logical for downtown development but in this case trees need to be taken to construct the green house. South of the facility up to the property line will be cleared. The rest of the area has been divided into four zones.

Zone A – further down the hill, trees less than 50 feet will be maintained

Zone B – less than 40 feet will be maintained

Zone C – less than 30 feet will be maintained

Zone D – closer to the green house, less than 20 feet will be maintained

Dr. Vander Haegen asked how long the methane gas that is being produced will last. Mr. Marsh stated that it diminishes fairly quickly in the first 20 years and then tapers off. What Mr. McCormack has found is that the energy that needs to be produced is fairly low, so in other words you don’t need a very large landfill. He felt after 50 years it will be marginal.

Chair Spykman stated that there is no obligation to open this to a public comment, but he will give the public an opportunity to offer comment.

Mr. Bob Sutherland of 66 School Street referred to language from the RFP where the consultant Mr. Bartok indicates that this is not an ideal site because of the cut and fill that is needed. There is also concern expressed regarding access to this site as well as the sunlight the site would need. Mr. Bartok also suggests space for expansion. With regard to drainage – there is also concern raised, especially with the amount of rain and snow this region sees. Mr. Sutherland also suggesting that the proposed 26 spaces might not be necessary. He felt that the problems need to be addressed. Mr. Marsh in response

stated that snow melt is something they can always use for the green house. He added that this project is also subject to the Alteration of Terrain Permit from DES.

Chair Spykman clarified that the reason this site was chosen was for reasons of constraint; a site that would have allowed the applicant to address all the other issues that was discussed. Mr. Marsh stated that his understanding is that up to 15 degrees is acceptable. He agreed that there might be some shading and agreed that there are some issues that go along with this site but this is a city private partnership and felt this is the best place for this project. This concluded the presentation.

Mayor Lane, Councilor Duffy and Mr. Hansel rejoined the Board

VII. Planning Director Reports

1. Save the Date – OEP Spring Planning & Zoning Conference – Saturday, May 2, 2015; Land Use Workshop to be held at the Courtyard by Marriott – Grappone Conference Center, 70 Constitution Avenue, Concord, NH

Mr. Lamb stated that he would emphasize this conference especially for new members but it is a good conference to obtain updates from the State. There is a Planning Board budget to cover the cost of attending the conference.

2. Climate Adaptation Plan Progress – Cities for Climate Protection

Ms. Purinton stated the Climate Adaptation looks at greenhouse gas emission and carbon issues for the community. One of their goals is to communicate with other committees of the City and remind the City that they exist.

Councilor Duffy stated that he appreciates this committee communicating to the Board and would like an item on the Board's agenda to discuss this issue.

3. East Side Forum – February 24, 2015

Mr. Lamb reminded the Board about this forum which starts at 6pm.

VIII. Upcoming dates of interest – March 2015

Planning Board Meeting – Monday, March 23, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee – Wednesday, March 11, 4:30 PM

Joint PB/PLD – Monday, March 9, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits – TBD

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl
Minute Taker

Reviewed by: Rhett Lamb, Planning Director
Edits, Lee Langella