



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PO Box 120, Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

www.WindhamNewHampshire.com

Planning Board Minutes

May 2, 2012

Board Members:

Margaret Crisler, Chairwoman – Present
Ruth-Ellen Post, Vice-Chair – Present
Pam Skinner, Member, Member – Excused
Kristi St. Laurent, Member – Seated at 7:25 pm
Jonathan Sycamore, Member – Present
Lee Maloney, Alternate Member – Excused

Carolyn Webber, Member - Present
Ross McLeod, Selectman Member – Excused
Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate - Present
Sy Wrenn, Alternate Member – Present
Vanessa Nysten, Alternate Member - Present

Staff:

Laura Scott, Community Development Director
Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner
Cathy Pinette, Planning Board Minute Taker

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance

Chairwoman Crisler called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and attendance.

Ms. Nysten was appointed to sit for Ms. St. Laurent.

Village Center Project Kick-Off

- Ms. Scott stated that Board members had a copy of the agreement for the RPC Village Center Grant in their packets and there were additional copies in the lobby for members of the public. Mr. Glenn Greenwood, Assistant Director of the Rockingham County Planning Commission was in attendance to discuss the project.
- Mr. Glenn Greenwood, Assistant Director of the Rockingham County Planning Commission stated the project would take approximately 8 months. The history on the Rt. 111 Corridor planning project was rather extensive and he will speak with Cliff Sinnott, RCP Director, for more information. The project was very progressive compared to other studies and the Board should be commended. He will need from town representatives open minds and lots of contact. He will need to have some serious discussions with the subcommittee. He would like the sub-committee to represent the community in a full body way. He advised the Board to look again at the Rt. 111 study. Ms. Scott stated it was on the website. Mr. Greenwood stated the contract in the packet shows that NH DOT is very supportive of the project, it is a small grant and the more the sub committee can do, the more he can do with the grant money. He would like to have it done by the end of October or mid November. He envisions meeting one time per month for the first two months and then two times per month after that. They

will be looking at a wide range of zoning proposals. The Chairwoman stated that Ms. Scott has brought the Board up to date but there have been no formal discussions.

- Ms. Post asked what the role of the sub-committee and the Planning Board will be and what interface will take place. Ms. Post stated that any proposal that is on the town ballot will be owned by the Planning Board. Mr. Greenwood stated yes, it will be owned by the Planning Board. He also stated that the work the sub-committee does will be to bring the information to the Planning Board; the sub-committee will be an advisory board. Ms. Scott stated that the sub-committee is appointed by the Planning Board and the Board will adopt the ordinance. The Chairwoman stated she was on the Board when the Village District concept was planned. The Chairwoman asked what the goal of the study was; what area will be the focus, Wall St, or the Historical area. Mr. Greenwood stated that the initial phase establishes those answers. The basic concept of the rural oasis needs to be flushed out. The contract states the RPC will provide maps of the areas.

Ms. St. Laurent arrived at 7:25 pm and was seated.

- Ms. DiFruscia stated that this is an elaborate transportation use link that Mr. Greenwood is speaking about. Mr. Greenwood stated that the project could not go through without linking with DOT as they were funding it. DOT would like to see how community transportation networks work in communities. He envisions that the proposals for zoning changes interface with transportation networks in town. This kind of overreaching endeavor will make a substantial change in Windham and we need to integrate both.
- Mr. Sycamore asked if there was anything in the corridor study that was flexible. Mr. Greenwood was not well versed in the study to answer this question.
- Mr. Wrenn stated that there were lots of details that needed to be worked out as the study was conceptual.
- Ms. Webber asked if the building of the Village District would propose where the roads would go. Mr. Greenwood stated yes, the regulations would govern how that would take place. There will be ideas in the zoning that might say how that takes place. An endeavor like this is dependant on a strong public and private ownership.

The Chairwoman opened the discussion to the public at 7:30 pm.

- Mr. Bob Young, resident and Chairman of the EDC, stated he was unclear as to what the scope is according to the contract. The Corridor Study is 110 pages and the Village Center portion is only 15 pages. He asked if the Board was talking about the whole study or just the Village Center portion. Ms. Post read Appendix A of the Contract "Project Description". See contract for verbiage. Ms. Scott stated that there will be a webpage on the Town's website with the contract and information. This study is looking at the rural oasis part of the study.

Public comment was closed at 7:35 pm.

- Mr. Sycamore asked what the time frame was for the RT. 111 work. The roundabouts are not on the 10 year plan for the Town. The I93 project stops at approximately the same time as the Wall St and RT 111 work stops. The Chairman asked Mr. Wrenn if they were still looking at

Wall St extending to North Lowell Rd. Mr. Wrenn stated he does not think so as the wetland impact would be very extensive. Ms. Scott stated that it was set aside due to the natural resource impacts and getting the correct permits. Mr. Wrenn stated it would also impact existing residences.

- Ms. St. Laurent stated that this is why we should look at development on this stretch of RT. 111. It makes sense to look at it now before it is all developed.
- Mr. Wrenn stated that this was a conceptual plan. They had talked about the Village Center being on the North side of RT. 111, parallel to RT. 111. There was also a concept of looking at two Village Centers. The Chairwoman stated that this would be challenging due to ledge and wetlands.
- The Chairwoman stated Ms. Scott made recommendations for the sub-committee. Ms. Scott's memo stated 2 Planning Board members, 1 WEDC member, 1 DDC/HC member, 1 business owner and 2 citizen's at large. Ms. Post stated that it was critically important to have people who own property in the area to have input. She suggested 2 business/land owners and 1 citizen at large.
- Ms. Webber agreed with Ms. Post stating that there are three houses currently for sale in the area and it would be difficult to have them participate.
- Ms. Nysten stated she would like a land planner on the Committee. The Chairwoman stated that the Community Development staff would be working on this also. Ms. Nysten stated perhaps an engineer from the community. Ms. DiFruscia agrees with Ms. Post on the sub-committee member numbers and suggested the Board could make a decision on the qualifications of the citizen at large.

Motion to change the Subcommittee make up to 2 Business/Land Owners and one Citizen At Large by Ms. Webber. Seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- Ms. Post asked that we publicize that we are looking for volunteers for the sub-committee. Ms. Scott will advertise in the newspaper for applicants with a May 11th deadline and interviews will be scheduled for the 16th, she will also send a letter to the EDC and Historical Committee.
- The Chairwoman asked for volunteers from the Board. Mr. Wrenn volunteered. Ms. Scott will ask Ms. Maloney if she is interested in serving.
- Mr. Greenwood stated there would be two more meetings with the Board on updates.

The Board took a 5 minute recess at 8:00 pm

Recreation Master Plan

- Ms Cheryl Haas, Recreation Coordinator spoke regarding the Recreation Master Plan. The 2011 numbers have been updated and trends and needs for the future. Her goal is to update it every year or two.

- The Chairwoman asked if the Board accepts the plan with minor changes we can do it this evening; otherwise we would have to have a new public hearing. Ms. Post stated Ms. Haas did a great job on the Plan. Ms. DiFruscia agreed and stated it was very comprehensive. Ms. Nysten also agreed and stated Ms. Haas did a great job and she hadn't realized some of the places even existed. Ms. Nysten asked if the Plan will be put on the website. Ms. Scott stated it would be on the Community Development page and the Recreation Department page. Ms. Haas stated she also added the driving range and golf course. Ms. Webber stated Ms. Haas did a great job.

The Chairwoman opened the hearing to the public. Hearing no comments, the public comment was closed.

Ms. DiFruscia made a motion to adopt the Recreation Master Plan as written. Ms. Post seconded. Motion passed 7 – 0. Mr. Wrenn asked that a date be placed on the Plan and Ms. Haas stated there will be.

School Impact Fees

- Mr. Roger Hohenberger, BOS, and Ms. Stephanie Wimmer, Windham School Board, spoke about the Procedure for the Computation of Impact Fees for the Windham Public School District Revision Year 2012. They did a PowerPoint presentation for the Board. Changes included new elementary fund in anticipation of the Article passing which it did not and that information will be redacted, updating the high school numbers, figures for kindergarten, updating the space requirements for kindergarten, updating the space requirements for the elementary students and reaffirmation of housing. There was a great deal of information gathered from the Master Plan. Mr. Hohenberger stated that the school population is growing whereas other district numbers are dropping. They anticipate a plateau of 3,000 students in 2018. The build out analysis of Res. A & Res. C is 1415 new houses. The high school was built for approximately 300 more students and we have as a Town anticipated the additional space for these new houses. The Kindergarten has an additional 57 spaces for additional students. We have already paid for these anticipated students coming into the system. Mr. Hohenberger explained how he came to the impact fee for the Kindergarten which is outlined in the Report on page 5. The information for the High School is located on page 3 of the Report.
- Ms. DiFruscia questioned the number of students per single family homes. She stated that the Town has Workforce Housing and condominiums now and that will need to be looked at as it could have a significant impact. Mr. Sycamore asked if it would be proactive to add those figures in now. Mr. Hohenberger stated that he could not speculate on those numbers. The total impact fee for new school construction is \$4,288.00.
- The Chairwoman stated that even though the warrant article failed for new school construction she thinks we should be looking at the new figures proposed by the School Board. Ms. Wimmer stated that impacts fees are for future classroom needs. Ms. Scott stated that some towns had to give refunds on impact fees that were collected and not used.
- Mr. Wrenn asked Mr. Hohenberger how they captured the transfer of houses sold in the past. Mr. Hohenberger stated that they went back to 2000 to see if there were any children put into the school system.

- Ms. Nysten asked if there were school impact fees for age restricted housing. Mr. Hohenberger replied, no.

Mr. Sycamore was excused at 8:45 and Ms. Nysten was appointed for his seat.

- Mr. Hohenberger stated there was a correction on page 4 of the Report. The average cost of new school construction is \$128.70 per square foot for Kindergarten, not \$133.08 as stated in the Report.

The Chairwoman opened the discussion to the public at 8:47.

- Mrs. Bates, a resident, asked if these figures included private and home schooled, or was it just the students in the Windham schools. Mr. Hohenberger stated, just the schools.
- Mr. Karl Dubay, a resident, commended Mr. Hohenberger and Ms. Weiner for a great job. He asked about the number of students coming out of the public schools and entering private schools. Mr. Hohenberger stated Windham was an affluent community and there are people who send their children to private schools. Mr. Dubay stated he knows affluent Windham residents who send their children to Windham schools, and less affluent people who send their children to private.

Public comment was closed at 8:49 pm.

Ms. St. Laurent motioned to accept the Computation of Impact Fees for the Windham Public School District Revision Year 2012 with one minor revision on page four and thanked Mr. Hohenberger and Ms. Weiner for a great job. Motioned seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed 7 – 0.

The Board took a 10 minute recess at 8:50 and was back in session at 9:00 pm.

Chairwoman Crisler was excused at 9:00 pm and Vice-Chair Post was seated for the Chairwoman.

Design Review Regulation Workshop

- Ms. Scott stated that Ms. Fitzgerald made the changes the Board requested and her contract was now done. The next steps include: Finalizing the draft regulations in order to post for a May 30th public hearing, decide what sections of the Plan are to be reviewed by town counsel, if any, review and agree to language for inclusion in Section 1200 of the Site Plan Regulations and decide if the Board wants to establish an advisory Design Review Committee or if the Board will be responsible for reviewing Site Plan Applications for compliance on the Regulations.
- At this meeting, the Board should review and discuss Chief Lewis' recommendations and comments from the EDC. The comments from the EDC were not received in time for the Board packets but Mr. Young was in the audience. Ms. Scott does not recommend referencing the CPTED in the design regulations due to the fact that the contents and suggestions of this document are unknown.
- Vice-Chair Post read the changes for the Board and asked if the Board was in agreement with them.

- Ms. St. Laurent stated that in Section 504.2.6 anything you put along the way will impair visibility. Ms. Post suggested stating in a positive way that this would be for safety and security. She suggests a combination of these elements that allows reasonable visibility from the street for safety and security purposes.

The Vice Chair opened the hearing to the public.

- Mr. Karl Dubay, a resident, sees Section 703.1 causing problems. He stated this section is causing problems with scale and proportion. Ms. Post asked if he had language he would suggest. Ms. Scott suggested changing “shall” to “should”. Ms. Nysten stated that if it is an extremely large building there are architectural ways to break it up.
- Mr. Ralph Valentine, a resident, stated he thinks we need another caveat. Ms. Post stated that is why we should change “shall” to “should”
- Section 704.4 adds “s” to the word “building”.
- Section 705.2 delete “of”.
- Ms. Bev Donovan, a resident, stated the way she reads Section 705.2 it appears the Board was eliminating “casting shadows”. Ms. DiFruscia suggested deleting that. Mr. Valentine suggested “by” in front of “casting shadows”.
- Section 705.4 delete “2nd façade”, add an “s” to “section”.
- Ms. Nysten stated that one way to make the building not look so massive is to have indentations to make the building appear smaller.
- Omit the word "width" in Section 705.4.
- Section 706.3, Mr. Bob Young, EDC Chair, questioned “blocks” and “units”. Ms. St. Laurent stated we are staying away from cinder blocks. Mr. Wrenn’s interpretation is that we are not allowing standard masonry units in front of the building. Mr. Young stated we should stick to one word for the verbiage. The consensus of the Board was to make the wording uniform and use the word “concrete masonry units”. Mr. Valentine questioned the wording of “open space”. Ms. Scott suggested “public space” Mr. Wrenn agreed with Ms. Scott. The wording will be changed to “public space”. Ms. Scott stated that the document should be consistent and recommend the Board should change “open space” to “public space”. Ms. Nysten agreed as long as it fits properly in the section.
- Ms. Bev Donovan, a resident asked why the Board would not want to use concrete block in industrial settings. Ms. Post stated they could not be an unfinished block. Mr. Wrenn stated that most concrete block is painted or stained.
- Section 706.5, Mr. Young stated “Hardy Plank” is a brand name and not sure it should be referenced. Mr. Wrenn stated that it was being used as an example. Add “such as Hardie Plank” and correct the spelling of “Hardie Plank”.

- Section 706.4, Mr. Dubay a resident, suggested changing “shall” to “should” in the second to last sentence. Ms. St. Laurent asked about stucco, and IEFS. Mr. Dubay stated IEFS is a product like stucco and it looks good on some buildings. Mr. Wrenn stated that IEFS is easily punctured. The intent of the regulations was to put a more durable material near the ground level where it wouldn’t get damaged. There is a waiver process for that. It was decided to keep the word “shall”.
- Section 707.3.3, Mr. Valentine, a resident, stated that the Board had decided to delete the words “but not bright”, the Board agreed.
- Section 710.3, capitalize Dark-Sky Friendly and be consistent with verbiage.
- Section 503.2.5, Mr. Dubay, a resident, stated that no one wants to put their bike in a parking area. The words “within parking area” will be deleted and “in an appropriate location” will replace that.
- Section 504.2.1 Mr. Dubay, a resident, spoke regarding the fact that the Regulations state 20 parking spaces shall be located between the buildings and he would like to suggest changing “shall” to “should”. Ms. Nysten stated Chief Lewis had addressed this with the Board. Mr. Wrenn stated he believes there needs to be more flexibility per Chief Lewis’s suggestions. Ms. St. Laurent stated it would feel cozier. Ms. Post polled the Board as to “shall” or “should”. Ms. St. Laurent, Ms. Webber, Ms. DiFruscia, and Ms. Nysten agreed to keep the word “shall”. Mr. Wrenn thought it should be “should”. It was decided to keep the language as written.
- Section 504.2.7, Mr. Dubay, a resident, stated that this section does not define how to interpret 25% of the parking area. Ms. Post stated that the Board is limiting its focus tonight on the items that were previously changed and in red. Ms. DiFruscia believes we addressed this. Ms. Nysten stated the Board agreed that the 25% included the buffer. Wording will be changed to add “including adjacent buffers and setbacks” at the end of line one in this Section.
- Mr. Valentine, a resident, had additional comments related to other sections. Ms. Post asked the Board if they wanted to allow him to address them. Ms. DiFruscia, Ms. Webber, Ms. St. Laurent, and Ms. Nysten stated no, because she wanted to have time to read and digest the suggestions, and Mr. Wrenn stated he would like to hear them. Ms. DiFruscia stated that the Board had asked Mr. Valentine to look at the screening and parking in regards to what Chief Lewis spoke about. Ms. Webber wants to get this document finalized and have a public hearing. Mr. Wrenn asked if they were substantial changes we would need to have another public hearing. Ms. Nysten stated that The Board addressed parking and screening.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to move to a public Hearing on the Design Review Regulations on May 30th. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 6 – 0.

- Ms. Post asked what sections the Board wanted legal counsel to look at. Ms. Scott stated Attorney Campbell has looked at sections 100 – 400. The Board did make changes after Attorney Campbell’s initial recommendations. Ms. Nysten thinks he should look at the whole document and make sure it is enforceable and not overreaching. Ms. Webber agrees. Ms. DiFruscia and Ms. Post do not think it is necessary. Mr. Wrenn stated the other sections are

architectural language, not legal language, but he would defer to Ms. Scott. Ms. Scott stated she didn't think it was Attorney Campbell's style to comment on things like colors. The substance is in the front section. She does not think he will weigh in on this. It was decided that attorney Campbell would look at sections 100 – 400.

- Ms. Nysten questioned if with the Site Plan Regulations there was a conflict with the Gateway District and our zoning regulations. Ms. Scott stated that the Board could ask town counsel, she is not sure any conflicts exist. Ms. DiFruscia did not see any conflicts. Ms. Post stated staff could look at performance standards and get confirmation from Attorney Campbell if there was a conflict.
- Ms. Post asked the Board if they would be adding to/changing 1200: Design Review Regulations into the Site Plan Regulations. The Board's consensus was yes.
- Ms. Post asked if the Board wants to establish an advisory Design Review Committee or if the Board will be responsible for reviewing Site Plan Applications for compliance on the Regulations. Mr. Wrenn stated a committee to review the nuances of the design regulations will streamline the process for the applicant. Ms. DiFruscia suggested a committee of 5. The consensus of the Board was to form a committee. Ms. Scott will speak with Attorney Campbell to see if we need to add the "sub-committee" to the document. Ms. Post stated we needed to add it to the Bylaws, Ms. Scott agreed.

Old/New Business

Ms. St. Laurent made an announcement about Box City.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by Ms. DiFruscia. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 6 – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 pm

These minutes were approved 6/6/12 and respectfully submitted by Cathy Pinette, Planning Board Minute Taker.