

Hopkinton Planning Board
Minutes
November 8, 2005

Chairman Bruce Ellsworth opened the Hopkinton Planning Board public hearing of Tuesday, November 8, 2005, at 7:00 PM in the Town Hall. Members present: Jane Bradstreet, Timothy Britain, Michael Wilkey, Edwin Taylor, Celeste Hemingson, Clarke Kidder and Cetti Connolly.

I. Review of the Minutes and Notice of Decision of October 11, 2005.

II. Conceptual Consultations—There were no conceptual consultations.

III. Application—

With seven (7) regular voting members present, Mrs. Connolly participated as a non-voting member.

#2005-21 Kenneth M. Desjardins Builders—Due to the fact that there were pending issues to be resolved, the Board, at the request of the Applicant, continued review of the Application to the December 13, 2005 public hearing. Applicant will request approval of nine (9) single-family residential conservation (cluster) subdivision lots accessed by a proposed new roadway. The property is owned by Robert L. Drennan, located off College Hill Road in the R-4 (residential/agricultural) district, shown on Tax Map 212 as Lot 4.

#2005-22 Herrick Mill Work, Inc.—At the request of the Applicant, review of the application was continued to the December 13, 2005 public hearing. Applicant will request Site Plan Review approval to construct a new 50,000 square foot warehousing and distribution facility. The property is located at 290 Burnham Intervale Road in the M-1 (industrial) district, shown on Tax Map 220 as Lot 23.2.

#2005-26 Polly & Ron Finlayson—Ronald Finlayson addressed the Board to request Site Plan Review approval to convert space formerly utilized for commercial purposes into a residential unit and to convert space formerly utilized for retail purposes into three (3) business/professional office units. The property is owned by Boundstone Properties, LLC, located at 220 Burnham Intervale Road in the M-1 (industrial) district, shown on Tax Map 220 as Lot 25.

In reviewing the site plan, Mrs. Connolly expressed concern in converting commercial spaces to a residential use. In response, Mrs. Hemingson noted that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had already given permission for the conversion. Chairman Ellsworth referred to the Zoning Ordinance which allows two-family dwellings in the industrial district. Furthermore, it was noted that the Applicant currently has the required parking spaces for the proposed conversion.

Motion made by Mrs. Hemingson, seconded by Mr. Kidder, to accept Application #2005-26 for consideration. Motion carried unanimously.

There was no one present wishing to provide public testimony.

Mr. Finlayson advised of the adequacy of his septic system for the residential units, noting that the previous owner had tried applying for three residential units; however, the septic system would have had to have been improved.

Lastly, Mr. Finlayson advised of his conversations with the Fire Inspector and compliance with the Fire Codes. Mr. Finlayson will confirm with Fire Inspector that adequate egresses are provided.

Motion made by Mr. Britain, seconded by Mrs. Hemingson, to approve Application #2005-26 with the following conditions:

1. Confirmation of adequacy of septic system.
2. Fire Department approval of floor plan of conversion including adequacy of ingress/egress.

With seven members voting, six voted in favor (Ellsworth, Bradstreet, Britain, Wilkey, Taylor and Kidder) and one voted in opposition (Hemingson).

#2005-27 Francis Chase—Gerrit Crabbendam addressed the Board to request approval of six (6) single-family residential lots accessed by a proposed new roadway. The property is owned by Francis & Ellen Chase, located off Irish Hill Road in the R-4 (residential/agricultural) district, shown on Tax Map 237 as Lot 36.

Mr. Crabbendam noted that the Traffic Study and Drainage Report were included in the submittal of the subdivision application. Based on review of the Traffic Study it appears that the subdivision will create an additional nine (9) vehicle trips during peak hours. Mrs. McCarthy noted that the general standard is that there would be 10-trips per house per day. She believed that the subdivision would create a low volume of traffic.

Chairman Ellsworth asked Mr. Crabbendam to explain the proposed conventional subdivision versus a conservation subdivision. In response, Mr. Crabbendam explained how he had originally proposed a conservation subdivision. The requirement that there be fifty percent of the land dedicated as open space with restricted use prohibited them from meeting the requirements for a conservation subdivision. Mr. Kidder noted that the requirements could have been met if the Applicant had reduced the number of lots proposed. Mr. Crabbendam agreed.

Chairman Ellsworth questioned whether the proposed minimum lot sizes excluded wetlands. Mr. Crabbendam replied yes and referenced a notation on the plan addresses lot sizes and wetlands.

Mr. Crabbendam discussed the proposed detention pond and treatment swale designed for a 25-year storm. Mrs. McCarthy questioned whether the detention pond is necessary because of the property abutting property owned by the Town and State. She suggested that the detention pond be removed from the design and that the drainage system be redesigned to not exceed a 2-year storm. Mr.

Crabbendam agreed, but indicated that his preference would be to construct the detention pond.

Mr. Crabbendam noted that in speaking with the Fire Chief he had requested that all of the homes be equipped with sprinkler systems.

Chairman Ellsworth advised of the road design requirement of a minimum of 18-feet of pavement with one-foot shoulders. Mr. Crabbendam provided 20-feet of pavement width with four-foot shoulders.

In reviewing the subdivision plans, the Board asked that the setback line along the cul-de-sac be labeled. Mr. Crabbendam agreed.

Doris Filson of Irish Hill Road addressed the Board expressing concern with the proposed roadway being located across from her driveway. She further questioned whether the Applicant would need to construct a fire pond as a result of the subdivision. Lastly, she expressed concern with the additional noise that may be created from the traffic along I-89 as a result of the owner clearing the property. Mrs. Filson noted that her residence is located approximately 300 feet from Irish Hill road. In reviewing the plan, Chairman Ellsworth advised Ms. Filson that there is another parcel located between the property in question and I-89, so there would be some type of buffer between the subdivision and the highway. With regards to Ms. Filson's concern about the location of the proposed roadway, Mr. Crabbendam noted that the cut of the roadway would extend in front of Ms. Filson's property; however, the actual travel lane of the roadway will not be placed across from her driveway. Mr. Chase addressed the Board advising that he has no intentions of clear cutting the property and hopes to leave as many trees as possible.

In reviewing the plans, Mr. Crabbendam noted that there would be one wetland crossing as a result of the location of the proposed roadway.

Ms. Filson readdressed the Board expressing concern as to whether there would be sufficient water pressure to support the residences. She further questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the sprinkler systems within the homes. Chairman Ellsworth advised of the need for specific recommendations concerning the sprinkler systems from the Fire Chief. Mr. Taylor advised that the design of the sprinkler system would have to be in accordance with applicable code.

Mrs. Hemingson expressed concern with the proposed roadway design of 20-feet of pavement with four-foot shoulders and then with additional shoulders beyond the ditch line. She recommended that the size of the shoulders be reduced so as to minimize the appearance of the roadway width which in turn should discourage people from driving fast. Additionally, the shoulder reduction should reduce the number of trees to be cut.

In reviewing the road construction plans, Chairman Ellsworth noted that the Town's regulations require a minimum centerline turning radius of 60-feet while the plan presented had shown an outside radius of 51-feet and inside radius of

41-feet. Following discussion, the Board informed Mr. Crabbendam that the plans would have to be revised to comply with the Town's regulations.

Mr. Britain requested that the road design be revised to reflect an 18-foot paved roadway with one-foot shoulders in accordance with the minimum requirements outlined in the Road Design Standards. Mr. Britain believed that the standards for an 18-foot roadway were written for developments of this size. Additionally, the development is proposed off of an existing dead-end roadway that has a partial paved and gravel surface. Following discussion, the Board unanimously agreed that the proposed paved roadway width shall be 18-feet with one-foot shoulders. Mr. Crabbendam was then informed that that the construction of the shoulders must be of the same compact gravel as the base of the roadway. Mr. Crabbendam and Mr. Chase concurred.

Ms. Filson questioned whether the gravel portion of Irish Hill Road will be paved as a result of the subdivision. Chairman Ellsworth replied no.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Britain, seconded by Mrs. Hemingson, to continue Application #2005-27 to the December 13, 2005 hearing so that the Applicant and Planning Board may address the following:

- Applicant to provide revised plans showing a cul-de-sac turning radius of 60-feet in compliance with the Town's Regulations.
- Applicant to provide revised plans eliminating the detention pond and provide a recalculation of the drainage based on a two-year storm.
- Applicant to provide revised plans showing a roadway width of 18-feet of pavement with one-foot shoulders.
- Applicant to provide a phasing plan in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.
- Applicant to provide State Subdivision Approval for the individual septic systems.
- Applicant to provide State Wetlands Permit for the proposed wetland crossing.
- Applicant to coordinate review and comments from the Conservation Commission, Fire Department, Road Committee and Police Department. In particular, the Board would like information from the Fire Department concerning the design requirements for the sprinkler systems.
- Applicant is to provide information from the State Water Wells Board concerning the wells in the area.
- Planning Board to coordinate review of all engineering data, traffic study and drainage and erosion control data for review by the Town's Consultant Engineer, Vollmer Associates.

Motion carried unanimously.

V. Other Business.

- Application #2005-15 Subdivision of Andres Hogblom—Property jointly owned by Anders Hogblom and H.J. Parmelee, located off Patch Road in the R-4 (residential/agricultural) district, shown on Tax Map 260 as Lot 19. Planning Board was in receipt of a letter from Mr. Parmelee requesting that the Board

revoke the approved subdivision plan filed at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds on August 29, 2005, plan #17531. In reviewing Mr. Parmelee's request, the Planning Board reviewed the application and minutes of the August 9 hearing. It was noted that Mr. Hogblom neglected to include Mr. Parmelee's name on the application as co-property owner. Following discussion, the Planning Board agreed to proceed in the revocation process in accordance with RSA 676:4-a.

- Capital Improvement Plan for year ending 2006—Planning Board to review the Capital Improvement Plan at their meeting of December 13.
- Zoning Amendments for year 2006—Mr. Wilkey and Mr. Britain will work on amendments to the Growth Management Ordinance that would provide clarity as to the indicators of growth impact. Additionally, Planning Board will recommend re-adoption of the Growth Management Ordinance for an additional five (5) years.

VI. Adjournment.

Chairman Bruce Ellsworth declared the meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, December 13, 2005 at 6:30 PM in the Town Hall.

Karen L. Robertson
Planning Director

In accordance with RSA 677:15, any person(s) aggrieved by any decision of the Board concerning the application(s) may present to the Superior Court a petition, duly verified, setting forth that such a decision is illegal or unreasonable in whole or part and specifying the grounds upon which the same is claimed to be illegal or unreasonable. Such petition shall be presented to the court within thirty (30) days after the Board's final decision regarding the application in question has been filed and becomes available for public inspection in the Planning Office.