

**TOWN OF RYE – PLANNING BOARD**  
**SITE WALK**  
**Saturday, November 18, 2017**  
**9:00 a.m.**

*Members Present: Chairman Bill Epperson, Vice-Chair Patricia Losik, J.M. Lord, Jerry Gittlein, Mel Low, Alternates Steve Carter and Katy Sherman*

*Others Present: Planning Administrator Kimberly Reed, Conservation Members Sally King and Susan Shepcaro, Hydrologist Danna Truslow and Rye Water District Representative Ralph Hickson*

*Present for the applicant: Marty Chapman, The Housing Partnership, John Chagnon, and Doug LaRosa, Ambit Engineering, Tim Stone, Stone Environmental and Attorney David Brown*

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Epperson called the site walk to order at 9:00 a.m. Steve Carter was seated for Jeffrey Quinn.

**II. Site Walk:**

**Major Subdivision, Lot Line Adjustment and Conditional Use Permit by the Housing Partnership for Property located 0 Airfield Drive, Tax Map 10, Lot 15-4,** for construction of a residential development consisting of a mixture of multi-family dwellings with a portion being dedicated as Workforce Housing. Property is in the Commercial Zoning District and the Multi-Family Dwelling District Overlay and in the Aquifer and Wellhead Protection District.  
**Case #07-2017.**

The group gathered at the proposed location of the dividing line between the two lots; one lot to remain under the ownership of Rickert and the other lot to be developed by The Housing Partnership. The group walked to the location of where the proposed road comes in to the development. (John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering, pointed out the stake that marks the first driveway. He noted the center line of the road).

Doug LaRosa, Ambit Engineering, noted that they are walking along the 30ft setback in front of the proposed buildings. He also noted the utilities are in a private road that was constructed for Rickert Development and also serves White Birch. They will be tying into the underground electrical and water. The roadside ditches will be utilized to collect drainage and bring it down to the proposed drainage area.

Member Gittlein stated that someone on the Board had suggested to inquire having the owner plant trees on the other side. He asked about the outcome of that suggestion.

**Attorney David Brown, representing the applicant,** stated that he talked to Mr. Rickert who thought it was a good idea and will speak with Mr. Chapman about it.

The group walked to the first septic field. Mr. LaRosa pointed out the location for the common area behind the buildings.

Vice-Chair Losik asked the location of the test pits markers.

Mr. LaRosa pointed out the location of the test pits.

Vice-Chair Losik asked if there were two qualifying test pits for each leachfield.

Mr. LaRosa noted there are four pits that are all suitable and one within 15ft. He explained there are four test pits around leach system A, which are all well drained test pits with no estimated seasonal high-water table.

Vice-Chair Losik asked if they are going to show two test pits.

Mr. Chagnon commented that every test pit that was done in the vicinity was exactly the same.

Vice-Chair Losik pointed out that the Land Development Regulations (LDR) states that there should be two qualifying pits per field.

Mr. Chagnon stated they only did one pit that they based the design on.

Vice-Chair Losik stated this would be a question for the Board and Attorney on whether there has to be a second one or not.

Chairman Epperson stated he would ask Attorney Donovan if he would like to see another test pit to cover the regulations. He commented that it looks like it is pretty consistent soil.

Member Lord stated they can probably get a statement from the soil scientist.

Vice-Chair Losik commented this would be for any of the other ones that are only showing 1.

Mr. Chagnon asked if this is per system or 4k for the two pits.

Chairman Epperson commented 4k.

Mr. Chagnon explained they are not really doing 4k's. They are designing individual systems.

The group continued to the rear right corner of the property towards units 5, 6, 13 and 14. The location is station 4+0 on road A.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the 2<sup>nd</sup> leachfield between units 4 and 10.

Referring to test pit 13, Mr. LaRosa noted that there is no refusal to 100 inches and no estimated seasonal high-water table. Test pit 14 there is no water table to 108. Test pit 15 there is none to 108. He noted that they are standing next to test pit 14 near unit 5. Looking towards White Birch is a fluorescent green flag, which is the end of leachfield B. To the right is a blue flag, which is the corner of the building for units 3 and 4. (He also pointed out the corner of the building for units 1/2, plus the back of units 5/6.)

Member Low asked about the abutting property.

Chairman Epperson pointed out it is the Learning Academy and the Washington Road office park.

Member Low commented there is a pretty good buffer. He asked if the buffer will stay.

Mr. LaRosa stated they will see where the end of the buildings are before they say “yes”.

The group continued.

Mr. LaRosa stated they are about 100ft off the rear property line at the southwest corner of the property. (The group was in the area of the abutting Learning Skills Academy.)

**Susan Shepcaro, 45 Recreation Road**, asked for the location of the Indian burial ground.

Chairman Epperson explained that they think the burial ground is off Breakfast Hill Road. The developer is looking into that with some depth.

The group continued to the southwest corner.

Mr. LaRosa noted the stonewall is the property corner. Approximately 50ft away, will be a building corner for units 13/14. He noted the buffer between commercial and residential is a 24ft rear setback. It is not until the property gets to Random Road that there is a 50ft buffer that goes all the way around.

Chairman Epperson asked the distance between the rear property line and the back of Learning Skills.

Mr. LaRosa replied it is about 40ft.

Chairman Epperson commented that he is trying ascertain if there is enough room for a vegetative buffer between the Learning Skills and units 13/14.

Planning Administrator Reed commented this is something that could be discussed at the Planning Board meeting; a potential vegetative buffer between unit 13/14 and the Learning Skills Academy.

Mr. Chagnon commented that there is going to be a depression. The building (bldg. for 13/14) is going to be lower. He noted the property is pretty flat with a sudden rise and another plateau. Starting at Airfield Drive, they will be creating a consistent slope.

Chairman Epperson asked the maximum grade of the road.

Mr. Chagnon replied it is 2%.

(Recorder stopped)

Note: From the Planning Administrator's notes there were discussions on the finished floor elevations and grading. There were also discussions on drainage. Chris Brown, for George Jarvis, expressed concern on the foundations being wet, which was explained by Mr. Chagnon that Technics will keep the foundation dry. Mr. Brown also questioned saturation of the leachfields.

(Recorder continued)

Planning Administrator Kimberly Reed noted that Chris Brown, 53 Harborview Drive, asked about the saturation of the leachfields. They talked about the percolation and the drainage. There are going to be drainage system to control the flow rate so the soils could take it in. The developer does not think it is going to be a problem. *(This question was asked while the recorder was shutoff.)* She asked Member Lord to explain to Alternate Sherman.

Member Lord stated there is going to be a high grade in the location of the three trees. It is going to run down along the outside of the road. The road will probably sheet in both directions. From the center line everything is going to flow down and out. There is about 2.5ft of rise. There will be one big sheet flow that will go down across the area over the leachfields. (He pointed this out on the plan.) He continued there shouldn't be an issue with saturation. A lot of the water is going to go in the ground.

The group continued on.

Mr. LaRosa pointed out that they were standing at the rear corner of proposed building 16. He noted that the distance between the corner of the building and the rear property line is 65ft.

**Bruce Peacock, 30 Random Road**, expressed concerns about the distance of the development to Random Road.

Member Carter asked what is going to be put in the back for a drainage system.

Mr. LaRosa explained that on the bottom of the retaining wall it is customary to build a footing drain. That is shown in their detail. He continued there will be a high point behind units 15 and 16. The water will flow either east or west and down to the drainage ditch along the roadway, going to Airfield drive one way and going to 'Drive C' the other way. He further explained there

is a drainage ditch along 'Drive A' going into a structure and under 'Drive C' and out to the end of the property. The drainage will go into a settlement basin and then into a rain garden.

Chairman Epperson asked the depth of the ditch.

Mr. Chagnon stated that behind the units it is not a ditch per say, it is grading to get the water to flow. Near the road there are ditches off the edge of the road.

Mr. LaRosa explained the ditch goes from Station 3+50 to Station 0 on the right side of 'Drive A'.

Chairman Epperson asked if they have observed standing water.

Mr. LaRosa stated that he has been out there on numerous occasions. The ditches along existing Airfield Drive after a rain have had no standing water. He anticipates no standing water.

Chairman Epperson commented that they need to make sure they do not create an attractive nuisance.

Member Low asked how much of a tree buffer can be retained.

Mr. LaRosa replied none.

Mr. Chagnon explained that it depends on the area of the lot. Along the back, there has been discussion that it might be better to take more trees and replant something that is more youthful and vigorous.

Chairman Epperson noted that as soon as vegetation is taken down around any of the big trees, any big storm is going to blow them down. In his opinion, it is better to take them down and replant something more attractive.

Member Low commented he is more concerned about the buffer than the drainage.

The site walk continued. Mr. LaRosa stated they are going to look at leachfield F. He pointed out that they are near test pit A6 and A5. He pointed out the lower end of leachfield F.

**Danna Truslow, hydrologist**, asked the difference in the current grade and the proposed grade.

Mr. LaRosa stated the existing grade for underneath the leachfield is 98. The proposed grade is 96.

The group continued to walk towards the intersection of 'Road B' and Station 7+00. Mr. Chagnon pointed out the location of the property jog walking towards White Birch. He stated there is a large area in the triangle that is undisturbed. He noted that this is the area that starts the 50ft buffer.

Mr. LaRosa stated the 50ft buffer starts at the end of the stonewall, on the west side, and goes all the way down. He noted the existing grade at the top of the hill is 96 and it drops down to 86.

Member Gittlein asked if the actual road will be 10ft down.

Mr. LaRosa confirmed.

Planning Administrator Reed noted that this will make for a natural buffer.

**Leslie Hill, 18 Random Road**, questioned the road.

Mr. Chagnon reviewed the proposal for the road in this area.

An abutter asked if all the trees are going to be removed along the property line.

Mr. LaRosa explained there is a 50ft buffer on the west side of the wall so those trees will remain.

An abutter questioned the location of the homes.

Mr. Chagnon stated they are at the location of intersection 'Road A' and 'Road C'. The elevation is 96 and the proposed road is 89.5. The homes start on the other side of the road.

Planning Administrator Reed asked the distance of the closest house.

Mr. Chagnon explained the house is probably 100ft from the property line.

Chairman Epperson noted that the closest abutting house is about 110ft.

Mr. LaRosa stated the property line from building 25 is 96ft.

The site walk continued.

Vice-Chair Losik pointed out there are plantings that are designated to be Evergreen Arborvitaes along Random Road. (She pointed the area out on the map.)

Mr. Chagnon commented the plan is for arborvitaes. It might be good to plant trees because they will eventually get taller.

Vice-Chair Losik commented that they may use arborvitaes up on the higher topo for more vegetation.

Mr. LaRosa noted that they specified Black Pine along Airfield Drive A between Rickert and this property.

Planning Administrator noted the changes to the landscape plan; deciduous trees closer to the road and arborvitaes planted in the 50ft buffer near the property line.

The site walk continued to the rear corner of unit 40.

Mr. Brown pointed out the location of his parents' house on Random Road. He asked if they measure from the structure or the deck.

Mr. LaRosa stated the deck is a structure and is included in the measurements. He continued the corner of the deck is a few feet off the 50ft buffer. It is about 51 to 52ft from the corner of the deck to the stonewall.

Mr. Brown commented it is then about 110ft to the house.

Mr. LaRosa stated from the corner of the deck to the corner of the Jarvis' home is measuring over 150ft.

Ms. Hill asked if they are going to be removing bedrock and how it will be done.

Mr. LaRosa explained that full basements are being planned so the bedrock will have to be removed. There are two methods to remove it. If it is porous enough a rock hammer could be used to chip it out. If it is too hard there will need to be blasting. That will entail a blast study and a certain set of guidelines.

Chairman Epperson commented they would prefer it to be hammered.

Ms. Hill asked who will pay if there is damage to the surrounding homes.

Mr. LaRosa explained if there is blasting there is a procedure that must be followed. A blast study must be performed to document the existing conditions of the abutting properties. If there is any damage it is covered. He noted the goal is to not blast.

Chairman Epperson stated the Planning Board has pushed back on blasting pretty aggressively.

Ms. Hill commented that blasting was necessary for White Birch.

Mr. LaRosa stated that White Birch had to be blasted because it was a mass.

Chairman Epperson asked if there are test pits in this location.

Mr. LaRosa commented that the test pits are 20 and 11.

There was review on the map of the group's location.

**Addie Tarbel, 45 Random Road**, asked about the location of stakes.

Mr. LaRosa explained that units 25 through 28 are not staked out.

Planning Administrator Reed explained they are going to continue on the site walk and will come back. She noted that they are going to be continuing to the units that are abutting White Birch.

The group continued on to the location for building for units 38 and 37.

Mr. Chagnon explained they are at the northeast corner of unit 37 deck. This is the closest point to the White Birch property line. He commented that from deck to deck is about 90ft.

Planning Administrator Reed noted they are now in the commercial to commercial area and the buffer is a 25ft buffer.

There was review on the map of where it changes from commercial to residential on the property.

Mrs. Truslow asked when it will be determined in the process that blasting is needed.

Chairman Epperson stated that the Planning Board discourages blasting. He continued that test probes will be need to be done to find out the consistency of the bedrock.

Mr. Chagnon explained they need to look at the plateau again and reevaluate some things about the rock. He thinks the rock might be limited to one end.

Speaking to Marty Chapman, Chairman Epperson asked where the blasting took place for White Birch.

Mr. Chapman explained that it was mainly across the entrance road.

Mr. LaRosa commented that it is site specific because ledge varies quickly. The determination is usually made at the construction stage.

The group continued on to the back of proposed unit 35.

**Note:** Member Low left the site walk at 10:55 a.m. Alternate Katy Sherman was seated.

The group continued the site walk on to the location of the detention pond.

Mr. LaRosa commented that the basin will be filled in and turned into a raingarden.



Planning Administrator Reed asked if the fence will be removed.

Mr. LaRosa commented that the plans do not show the fence being moved.

Chairman Epperson commented that he would leave it.

Mr. LaRosa explained this is a porous drainage basin where water flows right threw. He has been on site after heavy rain storms and there has been no water standing in the basin. A raingarden is a layer of filter material that would be put over the basin and built up. The water would flow into the same location that it is going to now, except the filter would treat the water as it goes through. He noted that the detail on the plans show a list of plants that can be planted in it. He continued the existing grade is about 74 and the proposed is 70-75. It is going to be raised up 3.5ft.

Vice-Chair Losik commented that the bottom is being raised and it is being planted. If the drainage characteristics are proactive enough, does the fence have to stay?

Chairman Epperson stated that originally, he was thinking if this was going to be the same way, and there was any possibility that there would be any possibility of any water being in it at all, it would be an attractive nuisance. If this is being raised up and planted, with no standing water, there is really no reason to have a fence.

Mr. LaRosa explained the fence would have to continue across the top of the berm. The pond on the other side isn't changing and it does have standing water in it at times. He pointed out the outlet pipe inside the drainage structure. They are going to hook on to that with an outlet control device similar to a catch basin structure. He further explained the overflow of the riprap is probably the highest. He designs an outlet control device rim that has a grade on the top 6 inches to a foot below that, depending on what is needed to maintain drainage flow. The original design showed no water coming out of this ever in a 100-year storm.

Vice-Chair Losik asked for an idea of the plantings. She mentioned dogwood, blueberries and Joe Pye Weed.

Mr. LaRosa explained this is not going to be wet. He would go with some of the dryer species. He likes the blueberries.

Mrs. Truslow stated it is a good idea to put the raingarden in. She asked if the fence is required because of the slope or the pond.

Planning Administrator Reed explained the Selectman Jenness wanted the fence because she was afraid that if there was going to be a pond in this area it would cause a safety hazard for children.

Mr. LaRosa explained it is 6ft deep.

Planning Administrator Reed continued that the history shows there has been no water. She pointed out that this is going to be raised up with plantings added. On the other side, the fence will stay for the detention pond.

The site walk continued.

Note: Member Gittlein was excused from the site walk at 11:05 a.m. There was still a quorum to continue the site walk. Members remaining; Bill Epperson, Pat Losik, J.M. Lord and Steve Carter.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the stake that marked the center of the road.

Mr. LaRosa pointed out Station 16+00 Road A intersecting with 1+30 Drive C.

Mr. Chagnon noted that they are standing in the middle of the road. He pointed out the location for the proposed homes that are not staked.

The group continued towards the location of the inner units to review the back of the buildings as it relates to Leslie Hill's property.

Mr. Chagnon pointed out the corner of the proposed building. He noted there will be plantings of deciduous trees on the road. (He reviewed the location of the proposed homes with Ms. Hill.)

Mr. Brown asked if there will be street lights.

Planning Administrator Reed explained that the Town of Rye likes dark skies. It is not written but it is preferred.

Mr. Chagnon stated that he believes the plan shows a motion activated light on the garage door.

Mr. LaRosa commented the plan shows lighting will be limited to building mounted lights.

The site walk continued.

Mr. LaRosa noted that they are in the location of proposed leachfield E. The goal is to spread the fields out as much as possible.

Vice-Chair Losik noted the topography changes and there are differentials in the landscaping. These have different feels. These are little subgroups.

Mr. LaRosa stated that was the goal. The goal was to make it so it was not lined up like soldiers. He pointed out that there is a section in the ordinance that says there cannot be 400ft of road in a straight line. They have also accomplished that.

The group continued towards the starting point of the site walk.

Speaking to Water Commissioner Ralph Hickson, Planning Administrator Reed asked the perspective from Rye Water District.

Commissioner Hickson stated it is good. The Water District has no issues. The Water District had given the developer some items and they have addressed all of them.

The group stopped at the location for units 21 and 22.

Planning Administrator Reed noted to the group that the Rye Water District had given the developer a list of 12 items of concern, which have all been addressed.

Mr. LaRosa pointed out the flag for leachfield C. He also pointed out the corner of unit 17. He noted that Airfield Drive is a private drive that has a maintenance agreement on it that this development will become a part of.

Planning Administrator Reed noted that when The Housing Partnership was doing the White Birch development, it was all one parcel that ended up being a four-parcel subdivision. One went to Conservation Commission, one went to The Housing Partnership for White Birch, one was this parcel and one was left for the skate park. The road at that point in time went through some rigorous scrutiny and was built to town standards.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman Epperson called for a motion to adjourn.

### **Adjournment**

**Motion by Patricia Losik to adjourn at 11:30 a.m. Seconded by J.M. Lord. All in favor.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dyana F. Ledger

