

**Hopkinton Planning Board**  
**Minutes**  
**May 9, 2006**

Chairman Bruce Ellsworth opened the Hopkinton Planning Board public hearing of Tuesday, May 9, 2006, at 7:00 PM in the Town Hall. Members present: Bethann McCarthy, Celeste Hemingson, Clarke Kidder, Michael Wilkey, and Edwin Taylor. Members absent: Timothy Britain, Jane Bradstreet and Cettie Connolly.

---

- I. Conceptual Consultations** – John Nesbit and Surveyor Jacque Belanger addressed the Board to discuss a proposed lot line adjustment involving properties owned by Mr. Nesbit and his abutter Wayne Patenaude, located off Rolfe Pond Drive.

Following discussion, the Board agreed that the actual size of the property must be determined prior to application for lot line adjustment. If the Patenaude property is presently non-conforming in size, a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment might be required in order to reduce the size of the non-conforming lot.

**II. Applications –**

#2005-28 Shadrack Wilson, Jr. – Engineer Mark Moser addressed the Planning Board representing Mr. Wilson presenting plans of a proposed subdivision creating ten (10) single-family residential lots accessed by a proposed new roadway. The property is located off Clement Hill Road in the R-2 (medium density residential) district, shown on Tax Map 209 as Lot 45.1. This was a continuation of the April 11, 2006 public hearing.

Mr. Moser was in receipt of the letter from Vollmer Associates, dated May 3, 2006, outlining their review of the subdivision plans. Mr. Moser was confident that items listed in Vollmer's letter would be satisfied. However, there was one item referenced by Vollmer Associates that Mr. Moser questioned whether it was necessary. Vollmer noted that there was no high intensity soil (HIS) mapping.

In reviewing the letter from Vollmer Associates, Mr. Moser noted that the applications for a Dredge and Fill Permit and Site Specific Permit have been submitted to the State.

The Board then discussed the installation of residential sprinklers and agreed that all residences beyond 1,000 feet shall have residential sprinklers. Additionally, it was noted that should local or state rules change during any point of phasing, then the installation of residential sprinklers may be a requirement.

At this point, the Planning Board reviewed a draft deed referencing the ownership interest in the area within the center of the cul-de-sac.

Lastly, Mr. Moser reviewed each item outlined in Vollmer's letter noting where changes or additions would be made to the plans in addressing Vollmer's comments.

Chairman Ellsworth confirmed that the same material would be used in constructing the shoulders as will be in constructing the base of the new road.

Mr. Kidder informed Mr. Wilson of the Town's ordinances for new road names and the installation of speed limit signs. Both items will require approval by the Board of Selectmen.

The Board briefly discussed Vollmer's request that the road cross sections be revised so that they are at a scale of 1"=10' both horizontally and vertically as is required in the Regulations. Mr. Moser was agreeable to revising the scale; however, he believed that it should not be necessary as contractors do not generally refer to the profiles. Chairman Ellsworth inquired as to whether the Applicant is requesting that the Board waive the scale of the profiles. Mr. Moser replied yes.

Mrs. McCarthy believed that if the profiles are used by the contractors then the scale should be revised.

Motion made by Mr. Kidder, seconded by Mr. Wilkey, to grant the Applicant's request for waiver of the scale of the road cross sections. With six members voting, five voted in favor and one (McCarthy) voted in opposition.

The Board then briefly discussed whether HIS mapping should be required, with some members questioning what would be gained by the mapping and others believing that the requirement of the mapping may be outdated. Mr. Moser noted that in speaking with Vollmer Associates it was noted that their reference for HIS mapping was based on the Town's Subdivision Regulations requiring the mapping. Mr. Kidder would have preferred to have received a letter from Vollmer indicating their reason for recommending the mapping, rather than hearing about a conversation second hand. Following discussion, it was agreed that the Planning Board would ask that Bill Rollins of Vollmer Associates attend the next Planning Board meeting to discuss this issue further.

Chairman Ellsworth summarized the Board's review, explaining that the Board would like resubmission of the plans with revisions addressing comments raised by Vollmer Associates with the exception of revisions to the roadway profiles. Additionally, the Board will reach out to Vollmer concerning HIS mapping.

At this point, Mr. Moser on behalf of the Applicant agreed to table further review of the application to the Board's June hearing.

#2006-8 McLane Northeast, Inc. – John Scott, civil engineer for Rist Frost Shumway Engineering, addressed the Board introducing additional representatives of McLane Northeast. Mr. Scott presented plans to construct a 19,196 sq. ft. addition on the northeast corner of the existing building for the purpose of expanding their freezer facility. The property is located at 932 Maple Street in the M-1 (industrial) district, shown on Tax Map 228 as Lot 34.

Mr. Scott recalled coming before the Board in 2001 with a build-out plan for the facility which included the addition of freezer space. Since that time, McLane's Site Specific Permit has lapsed and a request for reinstatement has recently been submitted. Changes to the site now include relocating the well, water supply line, fire lane, card board compactor and the infiltration detention ponds.

Mr. Taylor inquired as to the Fire Department's review of the plans. Mr. Scott noted that the plans were reviewed and approved, noting that changes were made as a result of the Fire Department's review.

Mr. Taylor advised of the Town's Lighting Ordinance which requires full horizontal cut-offs. Mr. Scott agreed to review the Ordinance to insure that all new lighting is in compliance.

Mr. Scott reviewed the method by which the drainage from the roof will be handled. He explained that additional staffing of the facility is not anticipated; therefore, there should be no need for additional parking. At this point, the Board discussed the available parking spaces and concurred that additional parking as a result of the size of the addition will not be required.

Motion made by Mrs. Hemingson, seconded by Mr. Wilkey, to accept Application #2006-9 for consideration. Motion carried unanimously.

Abutter Scott Crathern expressed concern with non-McLane trucks parking at his facility located across the street from McLane, noting that as a result of the parking there had been trash left around and damage to the lawn and parking areas. While McLane no longer utilizes the Crathern facility for parking, Mr. Crathern suggested that there should be a place for non-McLane trucks to park while waiting to enter the facility. In response, McLane's representative Bill Pattern advised that the drivers of non-McLane trucks have been told to go to the truck stop and not to park at the Crathern facility. Additionally, the McLane security guards have been instructed that in the event that trucks park at the Crathern facility the drivers are to be told to move.

Lastly, Mr. Crathern suggested that additional screening or an extension of the berm should along what was suppose to be second driveway to the facility. Mr. Crathern believed that the State had refused use of the truck service center entrance. A representative of McLane stated that he was not aware of the State's denial of the use

of the second entrance, but rather was aware of the State's requirement that soil sampling be completed in the area before McLane is able to surface the entrance. McLane representatives agreed to look into the matter and to consider other options should the State not allow use of the entrance.

Byron Carr inquired as to the design and size of the detention ponds, the proper maintenance of the swales, the affects that the slope of the parking area may have on the oxbow, and the noise that may be created as a result of the addition. He suggested that the sides of the new addition that face the river be painted a dark green, rather than white as is the color of the existing facility. In response, Mr. Scott explained how the storm water management was designed for a 25-year storm with the detention ponds constructed with piping 2-feet from the bottom of the ponds per the requirements of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. With regards to the affects, if any, on the oxbow, Mr. Scott explained how the oil and grease is separated as a result of the system installed within the truck and wash center. Additionally, McLane has a Ground Water Discharge Permit and an Alteration of Terrain Permit for which they received from the State. Any possible erosion to the oxbow is addressed in the Operational Permit issued by the State. All run-off is intended to travel along the swale into the detention ponds.

Mike Hallquist, Senior Project Manager representing McLane advised that the compressors for the new addition will remain the same as is located on the existing building. He stated that the compressors are quiet as they are self-contained units.

Mrs. McCarthy inquired about the color of the new addition. In response, representatives of McLane indicated color will absorb heat at a greater rate than white; however, they were agreeable to painting the side(s) of the new addition a color that would better blend in with the vegetation. Following discussion, it was agreed that the decision as to the actual color would be coordinated with Chairman Ellsworth.

Chairman Ellsworth asked McLane representative whether they foresee a need to further expand in the future. In response, representatives stated that they do not foresee a need to expand at their facility in Hopkinton.

Motion made by Mr. Wilkey, seconded by Mr. Taylor, to approve Application #2006-8 with the following conditions:

- That the Applicant complies with the Town's Lighting Ordinance;
- That the Applicant receives all necessary permits from the NH Department of Environmental Services;
- That the Planning Board receives confirmation concerning compliance with the Shoreland Protection Standards, and
- That the color of the siding of the new addition that is directed towards the

Contoocook River be camouflaged or less visible than the color of the main facility.

Motion carried unanimously (McCarthy, Hemingson, Kidder, Wilkey, Taylor and Ellsworth).

### **III. Review of the Minutes and Notice of Decision.**

Review of the Minutes and Notice of Decision of April 11, 2006 were deferred.

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

- Planning Board agreed to contract planning services to assist in revising the Conservation Design Ordinance. Three (3) companies will be approached in providing cost estimates. Revisions to include the following:

- Lot size and dimensional/setback requirements
- Applicability limitation on number of parcels
- Conventional development sketch plan no longer required
- Percentage of open space and buildable area
- Allowable uses in open space
- Conservation Easements where suitable
- Management plan for open space
- Layout of open space and/or amenities to be protected
- Site inventory/assessment as a basis for design
- Incentives for better designs for greater protection or public access
- Pre-conceptual and Conceptual consultations
- Establishment of specific design criteria for formal plan review
- Site walks when necessary

### **V. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chairman Ellsworth declared the meeting adjourned at 9:12 PM. The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, June 13, 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

---

*Notice of Decision is subject to Planning Board review and approval.*

after the Board's final decision regarding the application in question has been filed and becomes available for public inspection in the Planning Office.