

**Hopkinton Planning Board**  
**Minutes**  
**October 10, 2006**

Chairman Bruce Ellsworth opened the Hopkinton Planning Board public hearing of Tuesday, October 10, 2006, at 7:00 PM in the Town Hall. Members present: Vice Chairman Timothy Britain, Celeste Hemingson, Jane Bradstreet, Michael Wilkey, Edwin Taylor and Cettie Connolly. Members absent: Bethann McCarthy and Clarke Kidder.

---

**I. Review of the Minutes and Notice of Decision of September 27, and August 8, 2006.**

Review of the Minutes and Notice of Decision of September 27 were deferred to the November 14, 2006 meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Wilkey, seconded by Mrs. Bradstreet, to accept the Minutes of August 8, 2006, as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made by Mrs. Hemingson, seconded by Mr. Wilkey, to accept the Notice of Decision of August 8, 2006, as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**II. Conceptual Consultations—**There were no conceptual plans presented.

**III. Applications—**

#2006-15 Moser Engineering—Applicant requested Site Plan Review approval to construct a retreat center to be used for dormitory style lodging and meetings. The property is owned by Saint Methodois Faith and Heritage Center, LLC, located at 329 Camp Merrimac Road in the R-2 (medium density residential) district, shown on Tax Map 202 as Lot 8. This is a continuation of the September 27, 2006 hearing, so that the Board may receive written comments from the Town Departments.

Mark Moser addressed the Board advising that the Applicant has agreed to the requested road changes as outlined in the memorandum from Harold Blanchette, Public Works Director, dated October 10, 2006.

The Board briefly discussed Mr. Blanchette's concern of a four-way stop at Clement Hill Road and Pine Street. He suggested that it would be difficult during the winter for vehicles to stop and start on the incline on Pine Street heading towards Camp Merrimac Road. It was agreed that the decision concerning whether additional stop signs at the intersection are appropriate should be made by the Public Works Director and Police Chief. Michael Sintros, Director of St. Methodios, agreed that St. Methodios would provide the resources for two (2) additional stop signs at the Pine Street intersection.

Mr. Moser then referenced the Fire Chief's memorandum, dated October 9, 2006, stating that the Owner had met with the Fire Chief to review the proposal and agrees to the installation of a sprinkler system, fire alarm system, and a dry hydrant. However, he was surprised by the comments raised with regards to access in front of the building, noting that the Fire Chief had not previously expressed concerns with fire truck access to the building. The Planning Board reviewed the plan showing the direction of the traffic flow and the proposed 30-foot driveway in front of the building. Following brief discussion, Mrs. Robertson telephoned Chief Schaefer asking for clarification concerning his comments. As a result of the telephone call, Mrs. Robertson reported that Chief Schaefer wanted the area in front of the building to be dedicated as a fire lane. With regards to Chief Schaefer's concerns with the flooding of a portion of Camp Merrimac Road, Mr. Moser stated that he had discussed the issue with the Public Works Director and the Owner has agreed to replace the culvert at that particular location in the road so to address the issue of flooding. Lastly, in Chief Schaefer's letter he expresses concern with the inadequacy of the roadway width. In response, Mr. Moser advised that the Owner has agreed to the improvements to Camp Merrimac Road as outlined in the report of Vollmer Associates and the memorandum of the Public Works Director. Once the improvements have been made the roadway width should be no less than 20-feet.

Chairman Ellsworth noted that the email from the Police Chief concerning the proposal is self-explanatory as he did not see any significant issues that would effect his department.

Mrs. Hemingson questioned whether the Planning Board could have reviewed the proposal under the Town's Architectural Design Standards. If the Board decides not apply the Architectural Design Standards, then the Board should specifically indicate so. She expressed concern with Section 4.a.6.2.b of the Ordinance that considers the size of a proposed building compared to others in the area. In response, Mr. Britain stated that the Applicant had received a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the use and as part of the application the Applicant had presented and the Board had approved the size of the building. He questioned how the Planning Board could scale back the size of the building and remain in compliance with the Zoning Board of Adjustment approval. Mr. Taylor stated that a number of things need to be taken in consideration when looking at the architectural design of a building in a residential neighborhood. In this particular case, the size of the building is not in character with the sizes of the single family residences along the lake. Chairman Ellsworth concurred, but stated that while the Ordinance is an attempt in keeping the character of a neighborhood it does not mean that any future construction in the area would have to be scaled to the same size as one room camps or cottages along a lake. He suggested that the Ordinance requires the Planning Board to look at the quality of construction, lighting, etc., when reviewing the architectural design of a building. It was suggested that the Applicant has done the best possible in trying to design a building in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Moser advised that the property owner has had several discussions with neighbors concerning the exterior appearance as well as the height and placement of the building. Additionally, there had been discussions about the height and number of trees to remain around the building in an effort to provide screening. When designing the building the architect felt that it would be best to use dormers, rather than having an appearance of a full second story.

At this point in time, it was noted by the Planning Board that when referencing the existing roadway width of Camp Merrimac Road the Planning Board is relying on the measurements provided by William Rollins of Vollmer Associates.

Motion made by Mrs. Connolly, seconded by Mrs. Bradstreet, to approve Application #2006-15 with the following conditions:

- 1) The Applicant complies with the Department of Public Work's letter, dated October 10, 2006, with respect to signage, with the exception of signage at the intersection of Pine Street and Clement Hill Road. A decision concerning signage at that particular intersection is to be made by the Public Works Director.
- 2) The road improvements outlined in the report of Vollmer Associates and of the Public Works Director shall be implemented at the Applicant's expense. The travel way of Camp Merrimac Road shall be 18-feet.
- 3) The proposal to address lighting and other issues outlined in the Owner's letter, dated September 11, 2006, shall be implemented.
- 4) The Site Plan Review requirement of boundary line information be waived.
- 5) A sprinkler system is to be installed in the entire building with Fire Department connection.
- 6) A fire alarm system is to be installed with connection to the sprinkler system.
- 7) A dry hydrant is to be installed in a location near or on the beach.

Motion carried unanimously (Britain, Ellsworth, Hemingson, Wilkey, Taylor, Bradstreet, and Connolly).

#2006-16 Da-Mont Investments, Inc.—Surveyor Joseph Wichert addressed the Board representing Barry Upton, requesting approval of five (5) single-family residential lots accessed by a proposed new roadway. The property is located off Branch Londonderry Turnpike in the R-3 (low density residential) district, shown on Tax Map 266 as Lot 62. This is a continuation of the September 27, 2006 hearing in which the Planning Board had continued the application to allow comments from the Town Departments and Vollmer Associates.

Mr. Taylor questioned the location of the flooding of Branch Londonderry Turnpike in connection with the proposed development. Mr. Wichert estimated that the flooding referenced in the Public Works Director's memorandum is between the brook and Stickney Hill Road, approximately 500-feet from the development.

Engineer Jeff Lewis of Northpoint Engineering reviewed with the Planning Board comments provided by the Town's consultant engineer, Vollmer Associates. Mr. Lewis was not opposed to modifying the plans to address Vollmer's comments.

Mr. Wichert gave a brief overview of the design of the proposed subdivision and new road, explaining that they had originally considered a six (6) lot subdivision; however, they elected to omit a lot and construct a gravel road of approximately 800-feet in length. Mr. Wichert noted that he and Mr. Lewis had made attempts to meet with Town staff to review the proposed subdivision, but have been unsuccessful.

In reviewing the written reports of the Fire Chief, Public Works Director and Road Committee, concerns raised include the lack of water supply, need for sprinkler systems or the installation of a dry hydrant, the condition of Branch Londonderry Turnpike and the construction of a gravel road that is 18-feet in width. In response, Mr. Wichert noted that he would have to consider the cost in the installation of sprinklers or the construction of a dry hydrant. He questioned whether the location proposed for the dry hydrant is owned by the Town or whether the Town has an easement at that particular location. He will follow-up with the Fire Chief concerning the matter. With respect to concerns with the width of the proposed road, Mr. Wichert agreed to increase the width to a 20-foot travel way with one-foot shoulders. If the developer is requested to pave the subdivision road, they would then consider increasing the number of lots to six in an attempt to off-set the cost of paving. Lastly, the design proposed includes the replacement of existing storm drainage on Branch Londonderry Turnpike, at the entrance of the development, from a 12-inch to 18-inch pipe in an effort to accommodate the water that currently floods the road.

Mr. Britain believed the primary concern is access to the development should Branch Londonderry Turnpike be closed due to flooding. Mr. Wichert stated that the drainage replacement will help the flooding situation. Mr. Upton noted that in the thirty (30) plus years that he has lived along the road that the road has flooded twice; however, there have been occasions when the road has washed out and residents have had to enter and exit their properties through the Town of Bow, towards Clinton Street.

Mr. Wilkey believed that the Fire Department's concern is that they will not be able to respond to an emergency should the road be closed. In response, Chairman Ellsworth discussed the mutual aid agreement that towns have in providing emergency assistance. Following brief discussion, the Planning Board agreed to view the property and the condition of Branch Londonderry Turnpike.

The Board then briefly discussed whether the subdivision road should be gravel or paved. The Board unanimously agreed that the intent of the gravel road design standards is for subdivisions of this nature that is subdivisions that consist of no more than five (5) lots off of an existing gravel scenic road. Therefore, it was agreed that the subdivision roadway shall be gravel. Conservation

Commission Jed Merrow spoke of the Commission's preference of an impervious surface such as gravel.

Mr. Wichert asked the Board their preference for the roadway width. Following discussion, the Board requested that the subdivision road be constructed with a width of 18-feet with one foot shoulders. It was also agreed that the roadway should contain a hammerhead turn-around as outlined in the road standards and as preferred by the Public Works Department.

In considering the discussions, Chairman Ellsworth suggested that there are three (3) remaining issues:

- 1) Revisions to the plans and final report from Vollmer Associates.
- 2) Evaluating whether a dry hydrant or sprinkler system should be installed.
- 3) Subdivision approval from the NH Department of Environmental Services.
- 4) Regional notification to the Town of Bow and City of Concord.

Mr. Merrow expressed the interest of the Conservation Commission that there be signs posted along the wetland boundaries. While the Town has no specifications for signage, Mr. Wichert was familiar with signs used in other communities.

Mr. Wilkey thought that consideration should be given as to how the school bus would access the subdivision road should Branch Londonderry Turnpike be closed due to flooding. Chairman Ellsworth noted that there are existing homes along Branch Londonderry Turnpike in which children do use the school bus. Mr. Wilkey understood, but noted that the increase in homes would be from two (2) to seven (7) as a result of the subdivision.

Again, the Board agreed to a site walk of the property, and requested that the Public Works Director be contacted concerning the frequency of flooding of Branch Londonderry Turnpike.

Motion made by Mrs. Connolly, seconded by Mrs. Bradstreet, to continue Application #2006-16 to the November 14, 2006 hearing, so to allow the following:

- 1) The Applicant an opportunity to revise the plans as recommended by Vollmer Associates.
- 2) Review of the plan revisions by Vollmer Associates.
- 3) Site Walk of the property.
- 4) Additional comments from the Public Works Director concerning the flooding of Branch Londonderry Turnpike, and
- 5) Further review by the Applicant as to the construction of a dry hydrant or the installation of sprinklers.

Motion carried unanimously (Britain, Ellsworth, Hemingson, Wilkey, Taylor, Bradstreet, and Connolly).

**IV. Any other business to legally come before the meeting.**

- Capital Improvements Plan— The Planning Director was in receipt of the capital projects as requested by the Town departments and as recommended by the Board of Selectmen. The Planning Board will review and take action at their November 14, 2006 meeting.

**V. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chairman Bruce Ellsworth declared the meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM. The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, November 14, 2006 at 7:00 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.