

1 **AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**

2 **Wednesday April 4, 2018**

3 In attendance: A. Rosenblatt- Chair, P. Lyon-Selectman Ex-Officio, M. Peterman, M. Dell Orfano,
4 S. Wilkins, C Harris

5 A. Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:33pm.

6 **NEW BUSINESS 1. CASE #: PZ9640-030518 – Ducal Development LLC (Owner & Applicant); 137 Hollis**
7 **Road, PIN #: 001-012-000, 001-013-002, 001-013-003 – Request for a design review to depict the**
8 **preliminary design of a 28-unit planned residential & senior housing development. Zoned Residential**
9 **Rural.**

10 The property (PIN #001-012, 001-013-001, 001-013-002) is located at 137 Hollis Road in the Rural
11 Residential district. The lot is approximately 30.6 acres in three parcels. The property is the site of an
12 existing single-family home, with a detached two-car garage, and a detached barn building.

13
14 The applicant was granted a Conditional Use Permit for a mixed residential development on the
15 property for a minimum of 26 units and maximum of 32 units. As a result of design work done to date
16 and refinement to the plans, the applicant wishes to discuss modification of the Conditional Use Permit.
17 The revised proposal is to build 28 units of housing in a mix of elderly, non-age restricted, attached and
18 detached units and rental and for-sale homes, including reuse of the existing house on the property.

19
20 Ken Clinton from Meridian presented the case. Errol Duymazlar and John Callahan from Ducal
21 Development as well as the architect were all present.

22 While creating their design, they've had to make some adjustments. They are back before the board for
23 a design review to share the access and wetland impact and wetland buffer impact as well as some
24 changes to unit placements which then affect density calculations. They are here tonight for the board
25 to comment if the unit configurations and density summary are determined to be essentially the same
26 as the approved CUP before they finalize their design plan and come in with a final application.

27 If the board has any concerns Ken can answer questions or take information back to design planners.

28
29 They also have some design matters involving the wetlands buffer and he will explain his approach for
30 handling storm water.

31
32 In the approved plan, the road/ access layout originally included a spur with four units off of it. The
33 length of that access road with four units was unnecessary so they eliminated it. They spread those four
34 units out around the loop. When they looked at leech field placement, they needed more space
35 between units to conform to regulations. They decided to bring more units to the front. They were going
36 to have two duplexes (4-units total). Now the plan is to add onto the building for a total of 8 units in the
37 front.

38
39 Ken reviewed the list of bonuses he previously requested and what he is looking for now. The major
40 changes are:

41 -Removing the spur and changing the front units from 4 to 8

42 -Senior housing went from 12 units to 8 units

43 -Attached units went from 10 to 8

44 -handicap accessible units went from 3 to 1

45 -one-bedroom units increased from 4 to 8

46 - two-bedroom units increased from 8 to 9

-community space open to the public was originally about 1 acre with possible improvements for gathering. When the spur was removed and units spread out, that land size was shrunk down so much as to not be worthwhile as a community accessed space. They removed that item.

- they have a community area restricted to residents
- they have open space improved and open to the public which has increased from just under 20 acres to just over 20 acres.
- they have added four public parking spaces near the trail head.
- rental units increased from 4 units to 5 units
- they are still redeveloping the existing house
- they will still have a water line which gains the utility bonus

The original plan allowed a density of 32 units. The board approved between 26 and 32 units if all bonus requirements are met. The new plan allows a density of 30 units. The applicant is seeking 28 units.

There is one wetland crossing – a seasonal stream at the property entrance. They will have to come in for a CUP to cross it. There's also a small area of wetlands not part of that stream- a shallow depression. That is a perfect location to treat the storm water. They will use a 'wet basin' method by taking wetlands and improving it in size and functional capacity and making it the wet basin to handle storm water. DES has been notified of the plans and the reviewer is supportive of the plan.

The DOT permit has been filed for two property entrances. The application includes three parcels. They are reducing the three current curb cuts down to two.

Ken explained that the current home is in such poor condition that it would be best to tear it down, but the ordinance doesn't allow for that in the bonus for 'redevelopment of an existing structure' so it will be renovated instead. He showed photos of what is on site now and what the project will look like.

S. Wilkins said the redevelopment of existing structure bonus was meant for structures that are worthy of being preserved- not for structures that should be razed. She wondered if it's really worth it to the owners to get those bonuses based on how much work they have to do to renovate that house. Some discussion occurred about the intent of the ordinance.

S. Wilkins asked if the wetland area that treats the storm water will have water on the bottom year-round. Yes, and it will have plantings in it that will attract wildlife.

M. Peterman confirmed the units in the front are all one-bedroom units. In the back there are detached 2, 3 and 4 bedroom units.

She asked how many units will be for rent or sale. They will choose five units to be selected for rentals. They will address that and enforcement of it in the final review.

M. Dell Orfano was concerned about the cost to redevelop that house. He wondered if retaining the curb appeal of the existing structure was important to Gordon in Ken's conversations with him. Yes, the size and shape and appearance.

M. Dell Orfano asked if it is it fair to say the house will look like a brand new building when renovations are done. Ken said there will be new siding and roof. M. Dell Orfano asked how much of the building needs to be retained for it to be redeveloped. Ken said Gordon told them they could change the foundation.

Errol Duymazlar from Ducal Development clarified they will have to raise it up and fix the foundation. There will be garage space in the lower level. The detached garage and the barn will be razed.

S. Wilkins has no desire to set a precedence of giving a bonus for redeveloping a building that has no attributes worth saving or for suggesting an applicant demo the structure and rebuild new.

She confirmed the 'community space open to public' is no longer in this plan.

Open space increased from 18 acres to 21 acres. It was asked if a portion of that is developable. Ken said by the time you get there, it's not worth development.

P. Lyon confirmed the possible maximum unit went from 32 to 30 and the applicant is currently asking for 28 units.

C. Harris agrees the ranch house is an issue. It should be gone. As long as a ranch style house replaces it, he is fine with that. He doesn't want to redo something in poor condition. He wants to have something in 100% great condition for the new owners. He wouldn't take away bonuses for not reconstructing the old building.

S. Wilkins said if they are using that as a bonus, it has to be a spruced up version of what's there.

A. Rosenblatt checked what the applicant needs from the board tonight:

Ken said this is a design review meeting with comments. They are approved for 26-32 units if some of the subjective bonuses were sufficiently met. Tonight he is looking for:

- comments and concerns to the plan changes

- any concerns about the storm water

They need to go to the Conservation Commission before they come back for final CUP.

If the board decided it does not agree with the new plan, does that change the applicant's plan? Ken said they would have to alter the whole plan to address not having one large storm water area. They would have to put in drainage which affects setbacks.

A. Rosenblatt had several thoughts to share.

1. The board interprets the ordinance- not Gordon. He may give advice and try to anticipate the board's opinions.

2. This is not a formulaic ordinance – the board can apply a bonus when and if the Town gains a benefit.

3. At the last hearing, the board agreed to a minimum of 26 and up to 32 units. He posed two questions to the board:

- 1) Does the new reconfiguration meet requirements for a minimum of 26 units?

- 2) if so, what number does the board find appropriate within the range?

Nothing has changed in a material way for him to believe any less than 26 units should be allowed.

With respect to the structure, he agrees with Sally, but he doesn't agree that the applicant should get the bonuses for keeping a structure that the Town doesn't even want to keep.

C. Harris pointed out this plan includes a mixed style of living that we've asked for before, but this is the first time we've seen a plan include it.

M. Peterman said 'determination of what the Town wants' is subjective and that impacts giving bonuses. When we wrote the ordinance, we looked hard at what would gain bonuses and some of them were wish-list items such as open space open to the public which probably won't be used by the public unless there is something there to attract them to it.

With this building, we didn't anticipate this type of building for redevelopment, but what we're getting with the mixed use is a benefit to the Town. The Town desperately needs rental properties and properties that cater to multiple demographics. That's what they are trying to do by reusing this building.

S. Wilkins asked the applicant to consider more rental units- especially the larger, 3-bedroom units.

Public comments:

1. Robert Ellis- 7 Farmington Rd

Thinks it's great what they're doing. Nice to get the trails cleaned up. There's some area in Milford nearby and people use it. Ken stated the land is not official Town conservation land so they can't officially promote people use it in connection to their trail.

2. Dana LaFleur (Wilton) son of abutter at 139 Hollis st

How would the board give bonuses for a new building? S. Wilkins said they would have to recreate it.

Mr. LaFleur said it seems like they would have to reuse it.

Is there a letter from Pennichuck that they will supply water for the project? Not yet- but it will come as needed.

What's the pricing on the 4 units in the front? Don't know yet and it's not part of the Planning Board purview.

A few other questions he posed:

Can the applicant get credit from a landlocked parcel?

Would they be willing to put up fencing between the new and existing neighbors?

He understands change and improvements, but the property is a field now and this will be a lot of new people and noise added to the area. The fence would help.

M. Dell Orfano asked for feedback from the board. If they disqualify the reuse of the house and ask for new construction, and they look at the needs of the Town in terms of types of units needed, they could determine the density based on the positive benefits the Town will gain. That would satisfy the precedence issue.

S. Wilkins said if the applicant is gaining credit for reuse, they need to recreate it. We can determine density, but that's based on if they meet the standards of the bonuses.

Ken has enough to go on to formulate an approach and put together a compromise that, as a whole, meets the needs of the Town.

When he's ready he will file a final application. In the meantime, he will discuss with the applicant if there are any other bonuses to bolster. He is planning to meet the 28-unit bonus standards. Based on the current meeting structure, they will probably be ready for the June meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS:

2. Minutes: March 21, 2018

C. Harris moved to approve the minutes of March 21st as submitted. S. Wilkins seconded.

All in favor

C. Harris moved to adjourn at 8:52pm. S. Wilkins seconded. All in favor

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Marchant