

UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
August 4, 2021

Present: Ron Poltak, Chairman. Jill Dross, & Michael O'Callaghan, Member. Paula Marzloff, Alternate Member. Minutes prepared by Denise Royce.

Also Present: Joseph Mendola, Joseph Robinson, Carl Norwood, David Scarpetti & Jason Hill.

Absent: Jeff Porter, Members. Jess Edwards. Michael Rolfe, Selectmen's Representative.

The meeting was being held at the Auburn Safety Complex. Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Mr. Poltak moved on to ask all the Board members to introduce themselves to everyone present tonight.

Mr. Poltak began by elevating Mrs. Marzloff to a full voting member for tonight's meeting in the absence of one of the Planning Board members. Mr. Poltak moved on by asking the Board for an approval of the last meeting minutes for July 7, 2021 and stated that a motion to approve would be in order.

MINUTES

Mrs. Marzloff moved to approve the minutes for July 7th, 2021, as written. Ms. Dross seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Poltak moved into the informal discussion before them tonight for 404 Hooksett Road and informed the applicant that they were aware of the property and turned the meeting over to the applicant.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Informal – Joseph Robinson
William J. McEvoy, Owner
404 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 16
Discuss Potential Site Plan Review

Joe Mendola began by saying that he was here representing the development team. Mr. Mendola introduced Carl Norwood, Joe Robinson and Dave Scarpetti who was here

representing the seller. At this time Mr. Mendola turned the meeting over to Jason Hill. Mr. Hill began by passing out copies of the proposed mixed-use development of the property along with copies of what the storage buildings would look like to each of the Board members to review. Jason Hill, Project Manager for TF Moran presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Hill began by giving an overview of the location of the property and its current status which was an open field with a house with 3 apartments in it (two, one bedroom apartment and one, three-bedroom apartment), a barn and a large garage. Mr. Hill indicated that, the property is located within the Commercial Two zone and abuts a Residential One zone. Mr. Hill went on to say that what they are proposing to do is to preserve the existing apartment building and to develop the remaining portion of the property as a self-storage facility so it would be a mixed-use development. Mr. Hill went on to say that the existing barn and garage would be removed and then the rest of the site would be developed as self-storage units. It would consist of several buildings of different sizes and would all be single level storage units. Mr. Hill talked about what the buildings would look like while the Board looked on the photos passed out to them at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Hill explained that the idea is to utilize the site for the storage facility and would provide some screening along the back where it abuts the residential zone with either landscaping or fence as well as a perimeter security fence with a gate at the front with a kiosk office which would be unmanned. The other major feature of this project is that they would not need septic or water as there would be no office. Mr. O'Callaghan wanted to confirm that there would not be any office space needed as it was noted on the proposed plan for a 1,200 square foot office space. Mr. Hill said that was correct, there would not be any office space.

Mr. Hill moved on to talk about a farm ditch that was located along McEvoy Drive and explained what they would propose to do by relocating the culvert and that they would go to the state if it was necessary. Mr. Hill explained that they have had their wetland scientist go out and evaluate the farm ditch to be a Level 3 wetland which they are seeking relief from the ZBA on August 24th. It was a ditch that was cut in for farming and has limited function and value. Mr. Hill stated that, they are going before the Zoning Board of Adjustment to seek relief. Mr. Poltak informed Mr. Hill that he would like to know what they would be going before the ZBA to seek relief from once he was done his presentation. Mr. Hill understood and moved on to talk about lighting, which the lighting would be dark sky compliant with LED lighting cutoff with security lighting at night and that it would not be visible from abutting properties.

Mr. Hill talked about the circulation driveways which would all be two-way driveways that would go all around the perimeter. They are proposing a 15-foot buffer between the edge of the commercial zone and the residential zone. Mr. Poltak explained that the Town of Auburn has a 50-foot buffer area between zones. Mr. Hill stated that, his understanding was that you could not have any buildings, but that you could have a driveway to be built in that area as long as there was some sort of buffer. Mr. Poltak did not interpret it that way but asked Mr. Hill to go on. Mr. Hill stated that, they currently have a 25-foot driveway around the perimeter with approximately 15-feet of buffer for fencing and/or landscaping trees. Mr. Hill believed it would be low traffic generator for this site. Mr. Hill believed that they would figure out the drainage once they get into development and that they would

not be looking for waivers for drainage. Mr. Hill stated to the Board members that they would do whatever type of drainage that would be required and that they would figure it out once they have done test pits.

At this time, Mr. Hill indicated that he would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have. Mr. Poltak first asked what they were going to the ZBA to seek relief from. Mr. Hill went through the four (4) request and started out with the fact that, they would be going for a Special Exception to allow the mixed residential/commercial use, a Variance from the Level 3 wetlands, a Variance to exceed the 40% lot coverage, and a Variance to allow a warehouse establishment use. Mr. Hill pointed out that, they are meeting with the ZBA on Tuesday, August 24th. Mr. Hill also commented that, this would also require an Alteration of Terrain permit for the site as well. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the AOT permit required. Mr. Hill also talked about the septic and the fact that there is already a septic plan in place in the event the current septic fails. Again, Mr. Hill stated that, they would not be utilizing the well and septic more than the house would be utilizing. Mr. O'Callaghan asked if they would be having an irrigation system running off this well to water the landscaping. Mr. Hill commented that, they have not gotten to that level yet and they would opt not to do that and would try to use drought tolerant species of plants which would be guaranteed for a year in the event the plants don't make it and would be using manual watering and did not anticipate any irrigation being put in.

Mr. Poltak pointed out his concerns and pointed out that the 40% impervious requirement was important to the Board and if he was asked about the 40% to 69% impervious which is what they are proposing that he would be opposed to anything above 40% to 45%. Mr. Poltak talked about a 55 and older development that is being developed and the issues that came up with that which was regarding wells and groundwater resources. Mr. Poltak informed the applicant that there would be intense discussions on what is being proposed as water recapture or surface water runoff (stormwater). With that said, Mr. Poltak asked what their reaction was regarding permeable pavement. Mr. Hill commented that, it would depend on the soils but would be open to it, but they haven't done any test pits yet, so they have no idea regarding what type of soils are there. A brief discussion ensued regarding permeable pavement. Mr. Hill thought that, if they did permeable pavement that it would eliminate the need to put catch basins in. Mr. Hill pointed out that, their first thing is to get through the Zoning Board of Adjustment and then doing test pits to determine where the recharge areas would be on the site. Mr. Hill added that, although there is the 40% coverage requirement that we can put much more intense uses out there that would have more of a quantitative affect with less of an impervious footprint so even though we are increasing the coverage if you look at the net intensity of the use that should weigh into the particulars of this request. Mr. Hill believed this use was a good one in an area that transitions between residential and commercial. Again, Mr. Poltak commented that, storm water runoff was a big concern and when you look at this proposal there is a lot of building and a lot of rooftop and a lot of pavement and were going to have to find a way to deal with the stormwater runoff.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak reiterated about the perimeter road and that this becomes a total service area and read from the regulations that states "An area of a lot used principally

for vehicles to make deliveries to or pick-ups from any structure except a single-family detached dwelling is called a "Service Area" in our regulations. Mr. Poltak went on to read, "Parking spaces and driveways shall not be considered part of a service area. The service area extends around the warehouse buildings for access. 50-foot buffer required under AZO 4.07(6) does not appear to be maintained. Mr. Poltak indicated that, they will want that nature buffer that surrounds that site now that we will want to maintain that 50-foot buffer all around. Mr. Poltak stated that, they may want to rethink that road around the buildings. A brief discussion ensued with regard to AZO 4.07(6) and the road around the building.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak asked about snow storage on the site because he did not see an area for snow storage. Mr. Hill commented that, they would have to move the fence so there would have to be a modification with the fence design. Mr. Hill also informed the Board that, he has not spoken with the Fire Chief to date but would have to do that to obtain approval from the Fire Department. Mr. Poltak again stated that, the perimeter road was not being embraced by him. Mr. Poltak summarized that, there was no increase in the housing side of things and if the septic system needs to be upgraded then they would deal with DES. Mr. Poltak informed the applicant that, he was a stickler when it comes to landscaping and that it was a real big issue with him and expects an up-to-date professionally done landscaping plan that maximizes shielding in the front of this facility. Mr. Poltak believed if they kept the buffer and get rid of the road then they would not have a problem with shielding all the way around. Basically, Mr. Poltak stated that, their take home for now is intensity, perimeter road and stormwater runoff is a major issue and they want to make sure that they recharge what falls on this property into the ground and minimize runoff off of the property.

Mr. Poltak turned to the Board members for further comments. Mr. O'Callaghan asked about the 50-foot buffer. Mr. Poltak commented that the 50-foot buffer is to remain more natural and the perimeter road is not a go. Mrs. Marzloff wanted to try to find a way to separate the house from the business and the entrance being utilized by both residential and commercial. Mr. Hill believed that they could work on that and possibly split the entrance off so that the commercial side would veer off to the left and the residential would veer off to the right.

Discussion ensued with regard to hours of operation and Mr. Mendola commented that they put it on a timer and if someone is there after 9:00pm then they should not be there. Ms. Dross asked about the residential building and who would maintain it. Mr. Mendola commented that their management team would also oversee the building. Ms. Dross also believed that the separation between residential and commercial would be a lot easier and that way the headlights would not be pointing to the residential when they're going into the storage facility. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the septic system and location. Ms. Dross wanted to know what the purpose of the perimeter driveway. Mr. Hill believed it was to accommodate Fire circulation vehicles instead of backing up quite a distance.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Hill if he had any questions from the Board members. Mr. Hill said no. Mr. Poltak asked what their timetable would be from start to finish. Mr. Mendola commented that, they would probably do this in phases by putting the foundations and do two or three buildings at a time. Mr. Hill asked Mr. Poltak what the approval timeframe was and if it was a two-step process. Mr. Poltak explained that, when they file a complete application, they would decide the same and a motion to accept the application would occur. They would then schedule a public hearing where notification of abutters would occur and believed it was up to 90 days depending on how complete the application was. Mr. Hill asked if the Board members did site walks. Mr. Poltak stated that, everyone is aware of the property and that the property was pretty open and did not believe a site walk would be necessary.

Mr. Hill thanked the Board members for their time and input and look forward to working with the Board and hoped to get an application before the Planning Board sometime in October. Mr. Poltak thanked the applicant and stated that he looks forward to working with them and the discussion ended.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Poltak informed the Board that, the Planning Board will not be having a second meeting in August. Mr. Poltak stated that, they would be holding the next meeting September 8th of which the location is yet to be determined.

At this time, Mr. Poltak thanked everyone for their participation tonight and indicated that a motion to adjourn would be in order.

Mr. O'Callaghan made a motion to adjourn. Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:06pm.

The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 8th, 2021 at 7:00 pm. This meeting will be held at the Auburn Village School, 11 Eaton Hill Road. This date is subject to change.