

1 **AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**

2 **Wednesday June 6, 2018**

3 In attendance: P. Lyon-Selectman Ex-Officio, M. Peterman, M. Dell Orfano-Chair, C Harris, E. Hahn,
4 R. Hart and Community Development Director G. Leedy

5
6 M. Dell Orfano called the meeting to order at 7:34pm and stated that E. Hahn will vote for S. Wilkins

7
8 **NEW BUSINESS**

9 **1.Craig Fraley, Town of Amherst Recreation Director–Bocce Ball Proposal &Placement of Court –**
10 **Buchanan Park, Middle Street, Map & Lot: 017-083-001**

11
12 The land was donated, and the deed states no fixed structures or playgrounds were to be put on the
13 land. He reached out to the donor and he said bocce doesn't fall into those categories. Construction
14 would start in July. This is a permitted use, and has been endorsed by the Historic District Commission.
15 This would replace the cornhole setup at that site and they will move those elsewhere.

16 The supplies would be left on site for resident use.

17 This will be a permanent fixture- but could be removed if/when it's ever needed to be.

18
19 Gordon confirmed the land donor's confirmation is in writing- by email- and the deed covenant is to the
20 benefit of the Town.

21
22 **2.CASE #: PZ9870-051418 –John W. & William R. Day and Virginia Barbera (Owners & Applicants) –**
23 **Brookwood Drive, PIN #: 005-160-000 & 005-162-002 –Request for approval for a Subdivision**
24 **Application for a Planned Residential Development for 10 single family homes. Zoned**
25 **Residential/Rural.**

26
27 **Project Details**

28 Owners: John W. & William R. Day and Virginia Barbera

29 Applicant: John W. & William R. Day and Virginia Barbera

30 Location: Brookwood Drive, Lots 005-160-000 & 005-160-002 Zoning: Residential/Rural (RR) Abutting

31 Uses: Residential

32
33 **Project Background**

34 This application is a for a review of the plans for subdivision/consolidation of Lot 5-160 and 5-160-2 for a
35 residential development under the IIHO zoning provisions. In December 2017, the property was
36 approved for a Conditional Use Permit, allowing up to ten (10) units of single family housing. The CUP
37 approval included requirements for dedication of land to open space/conservation, and improvements
38 of the property to include trails accessible to the public and connective walkability provisions.

39
40 **Project Description**

41 The applicant is proposing a 10-lot subdivision on approximately 24.35 Acres. The proposed lots are
42 cluster lots proposed under the provisions of the IIHO zoning. These lots average approximately 15,000
43 SF in area and have frontage on a private road. It is understood that the area outside of the lots will be
44 covenanted in open space. Additionally, a public trail loop is shown to be constructed and available for
45 public access.

46
47 Tom Carr from Meridian presented the case.

48 This is a design review to discuss the plans to make sure they are in line with the approved CUP.

49 He showed on the plans the two properties that are combined.
50 In December they received approval for 10 single-family units.
51
52 The open space area will have a gazebo and trail open to the public. There is an option for a future trail.
53 There is a private trail the residents can use to access the common area.
54
55 As they've worked on the plans, here are more details:
56 22' road with cape cod curbs and closed drainage.
57 2 changes:
58 Water system: They planned on two community wells, but building it was going to cost \$50,000.
59 They are now proposing five wells with each supporting two homes. It is easily done with two pumps in
60 each well.
61 Septic system: More test pits have been done and the soil was different than expected. The original plan
62 would change the topography. The new proposal is for three stand-alone septic systems and three
63 shared systems placed in low areas to preserve the topography.
64
65 The land owners are planning to get the project permitted and sell it to developer(s). That's why they
66 haven't known what style of homes will go there. They won't know until later in the subdivision review
67 process when they have architectural drawings. They won't be presenting a particular home to a
68 particular lot. There will be styles of homes to choose from and each lot will have an area blocked off
69 where the home will need to fit.
70
71 C. Harris asked if there will be an association. Yes, and they will manage the wells and septic.
72 Tom added we're in good shape because the Amherst regulations are stricter than the state regulations.
73 C. Harris confirmed an easement will need to be on lots 2 and 3 to access the trail area.
74
75 P. Lyon asked about the size of the homes.
76 About 26x36 with 24x24 garages. Those will fit well in the building boxes. Probably 3 bedrooms each
77 maximum. The buyer will be able to choose their house design from specific options.
78
79 Tom will meet tomorrow with the applicant's attorney to finalize the intent of the covenants, the open
80 space and the condo documents.
81
82 M. Peterman said there's not much innovation in the project. The new homes won't fit with the homes
83 in that area. Try to be innovative in the design of the homes. Tom encouraged her that the plans that
84 are coming for next months meeting are diverse enough to ease her concerns. The architectural
85 drawings will be part of the recorded plan set and will need to be followed by any and all developers
86 building on these lots unless another approval is granted. Any deviation from those styles would have to
87 go through an approval process.
88
89 Ken Clinton, Meridian
90 He discussed with Gordon that if someone wanted a slightly different style of home, could the CDO have
91 that authority to approve it? Or, if not, the applicant would come back for approval of the new style.
92
93 E. Hahn asked for more clarification on the building unit.
94 The homes will have to fit inside the box but can be at various angles. Driveways can be in different
95 locations. Next month Tom will bring 3 architectural drawings, and each can be mirrored. That gives 6
96 options for the 10 lots.

Tom set the placement of each building box 25' from the road so there's room for parking in the driveway. 20' from each home side to side. 15' from leach fields.

E. Hahn commented that if any home chose to be side-on, that would necessitate more impervious area for the longer driveway.

Tom stated the boxes define where the homes could go and defines what portions of land will not be developed.

Public Comment:

1. John Parker, 1 Brookwood Drive

They are new residents. He wondered if it was ever considered to put the egress off New Boston Road. Tom explained that it was considered, but there would have to be a wetland crossing.

2. Chris Shaver, 2 Brookwood Drive

She wondered if the entrance could be moved further down the road. Tom explained that there is a separate buildable lot in that area that is not part of this project.

M. Dell Orfano commented that he prefers variety within the architectural style of the buildings.

M. Dell Orfano confirmed the applicant will submit for formal review next month.

Tonight, the board is checking this plan is compliant with the initial CUP.

No action is needed by the board tonight.

3.CASE #: PZ9871-051418 –Arboleda Realty, LLC (Owner & Applicant) –345 Route 101, PIN #: 008-057-000 –Design review for a Non-Residential Site Plan to depict the facility expansion design as proposed. Zoned Residential/Rural.

1.Project Details

Owners: Arboleda Realty, LLC

Applicant: Arboleda Realty, LLC

Location: 345 NH Route 101, Lots 008-57-000& 008-058-001Zoning: Residential/Rural (RR)Abutting

Uses: Residential

Project Background

This application is a for a design review discussion of the plans for expansion of the LaBelle Winery facility. Lot 58-1 was recently created by a subdivision/lot line adjustment, and is intended to be incorporated into lot 57 once the application for Non-residential Site Plan is developed. The Amherst ZBA has also granted a variance for expansion of an existing non-conforming use, which contemplates merging these two lots.

Project Description

The applicant has purchased Lot 58-1 from Camp Young Judea and B&M Railroad and created it via a lot line adjustment approved several months ago. The applicant wishes to discuss issues regarding development of NRSR documents for the property and seeks input from the Board. The applicant wishes to discuss the proposed architecture for the building, as well as some proposed details of the site plan.

144 Ken Clinton from Meridian presented the case. He stated this is a design review – a continuation of the
 145 preliminary design from last month. Four main issues he will address:
 146 1. grading / drainage
 147 2. Architect Rolf Biggers will share some of the building design
 148 3. He wanted to have a noticed meeting, so abutters can comment
 149 4. Any further board comments
 150 He will submit in a few weeks for the July meeting.
 151
 152 He went through the plans brought in. The lot line was adjusted from Camp Young Judea. One condition
 153 of variance is that the facility be all on one lot- that additional lots acquired are combined into one.
 154 He described what on the lots will be disturbed with the expansion. Some existing gravel parking lots will
 155 be expanded, reconfigured and paved.
 156
 157 He discussed buffer impacts with the Conservation Commission. He addressed their concerns by
 158 reducing the buffer impact and increasing the distance from the wetlands to the area of disturbance.
 159 He discussed storm water basins one and two. Drainage already exists in the existing parking areas. They
 160 don't want to rip it up and start over. They want to use what's there and add catch basins and pretreat
 161 that water before it reaches the catch basins.
 162
 163 The results are as follows: Basin 1 was moved 22 feet away from wetland.
 164 Reduced buffer impact in size by 1/3
 165 The basin 2 area was reduced ½ the size and a bit further from wetland.
 166
 167 R. Hart was at that ACC meeting and appreciates the efforts that have been made.
 168 G. Leedy understands that the ACC discussed the potential of using pervious pavement. The slope
 169 prevents that material from being used.
 170 E. Hahn said the dumpster bin is shown at the bottom of the grade and in a significant flow area. The
 171 trash that doesn't make it on the truck will end up right in that basin. Ken believes his concerns will be
 172 properly addressed at the next meeting.
 173 P. Lyon wondered why they need the existing basin and the new one. The old one was approved using
 174 the stormwater standards at the time. It will still function for part of the parking lot. With the expansion,
 175 they need one designed using today's standards.
 176
 177 Rolf Biggers of BMA Architects handed out some designs. There are four areas to the new building:
 178 Distillery- creation of spirits
 179 Tasting room on left
 180 Events/function room on right
 181 Kitchen in back
 182
 183 This design is similar but subdued from the main LaBelle building. They are looking to make sure the
 184 board agrees they are moving in the right direction. These are preliminary drawings.
 185 He described the plans.
 186
 187 The first-floor square footage is 9,425. The basement is 7,950.
 188 Height to the ridge is 51 feet with the cupola above that.
 189 This building sits down in a low elevation area verses the winery which sits up on the hill.
 190 Capacity:
 191 Ballroom 173

192 Tasting room 43
193 82 people throughout the rest of the areas
194
195 Possible staff office space in the lower level along with storage space. It is a walk-out for egress.
196
197 The board discussed how to deal with the height restrictions. Take the average elevation to the average
198 height of roof. Gordon thought there might be some information in the original winery approvals that
199 would allow the height variance to run with that property.
200
201 The heights Rolf gave were at the lowest point of the walk out therefore the most extreme
202 measurements.
203 G. Leedy said the variance for this project was granted as an expansion of an existing non-conforming
204 use that was allowed by variance.
205
206 Public Comment:
207 None
208
209 Ken will pass an email through Gordon to the ACC with the updated information.
210
211 **OTHER BUSINESS:**
212 **4. Minutes: May 2, 2018**
213 **C. Harris moved to defer the minutes of May 2nd. S. M. Peterman seconded.**
214 **All in favor**
215
216 **C. Harris moved to adjourn at 9:05pm. M. Peterman seconded. All in favor**
217
218 Respectfully submitted,
219 Jessica Marchant