

# **Londonderry Heritage/Historic District Commission Meeting**

**MAY 27, 2021 - 7:00 P.M.**

## **LONDONDERRY CABLE STUDIO - 281 MAMMOTH ROAD**

### **Approved Minutes**

- I. Chairman Krys Kenney called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: Krys Kenney, David Colglazier, John Mahon, Jim Butler, Art Rugg, Sue Joudrey, and Kristen Endyke. Laura Gandia represented Town of Londonderry staff. There are openings on the Commission for three alternate members.
- II. Approval of minutes from prior meeting: A. Rugg made a motion to accept the minutes of March 25, 2021 as presented. J. Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-0. Note: The May 4, 2021 “special meeting” regarding the medical office building in III.A. below lacked a quorum and was therefore deficient. Minutes from that meeting are appended to these minutes for the record.

### III. Design/Formal Review Applications:

- A. Application for design review of a site plan amendment for Block 2 of Woodmont Commons to construct a 19,792 SF two story medical office building, Map 10 Lot 41, Pillsbury Road & Michels Way, Map 10 Lot 41, Zoned C-I & PUD, Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development, Pillsbury Realty Development, LLC (Owner) and LD 2020 LLC (Applicant) – continued from 3/25/21 – Jeff Kevan, TFMoran, and Chris Nickerson, E. Nickerson Associates, presenting.

Issues with regard to the proposed placement of this building and its adjoining parking lot were resolved to the general satisfaction of the Commissioners following a report by the applicant and confirming memo from Town Planner Colleen Mailloux after consultation with the town’s attorney. In brief, since this is a “flex building” in a “flex block”, a parking lot partially on Michel’s Way is permitted by the Woodmont master plan. J. Kevan reviewed the centered placement of the building on Michel’s Way. He also detailed the 6’ wall (2’ of brick topped with a 4’ foot decorative fence) to screen the parking lot on Michel’s Way and around the corner and down Governor Bell Drive to a point near Settler’s Way. This wall would feature several indentations where the 2’ wall would not be topped with fencing to allow pedestrians a “sitting area”.

C. Nickerson reviewed the materials and design of the building. He emphasized changes made to meet the Commission’s desire for a more traditional building than originally presented while retaining some transitional elements with a modern flair to meet the applicant’s need to demonstrate the advanced technology that their patients would be seeking. In particular, a taller, more ornate cornice will conceal necessary equipment on the flat roof as there will be limited ground level space for any equipment. C. Nickerson spoke about featured corner windows with a bright red trim and offered several alternate muted reds to the Commission after some mixed feedback from the Planning Board.

J. Butler noted a preference for a more traditional brick like the Redland Oxford in the P.U.D. vs. the darker brick presented without objection from the applicant and with general agreement from the other Commissioners. There was also general agreement that the red color of the mullions in the featured corner windows should be coordinated with the color of brick selected for the building and surrounding wall.

#### **Actions:**

- Applicant to identify lighter-colored red brick as discussed by the Commission.
- Applicant to coordinate the color of the mullions in the featured corner windows with the selected brick.

- Per input from Ann Chiampa, 48 Wedgewood Drive, applicant to match number of mullions in featured windows with those of the panels above them.
- J. Butler made a motion to recommend this project as presented to the Planning Board with actions above noted. D. Colglazier seconded the motion. The motion passed, 7-0.

- B. Application for design review of a site plan for a proposed one story 3,736 SF bank and associated site improvements, Michels Way & Garden Lane, Map 10 Lot 52, Pillsbury Road & Michels Way, Map 10 Lot 41, Zoned C-I & PUD, Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development, Pillsbury Realty Development, LLC (Owner) and Enterprise Bank (Applicant) – continued from 3/25/21 – Presenting: Jeff Kevan, TF Moran

No action required. J. Kevan mentioned some difficulties in meeting transparency requirements – i.e., putting a storefront on a bank is not practicable. General agreement that the traditional design of the building was favored by all on the Commission.

- C. Application for a site plan amendment for a change of use from an existing spa to a professional office, and for a 672 SF building addition and associated site improvements, 213 Rockingham Road, Map 15 Lot 23-1, Zoned C-I & RTE 28 POD, Gagne Family Trust (Owner & Applicant) – Karl Dubay, the Dubay Group, presenting.

K. Dubay noted that this is a 1940's residential-style building. The owner purchased this building and intends to operate a management support office for her home healthcare business. The building is about 1000 sq. ft. and the applicant is looking to add a 700 sq. ft. extension in the rear to accommodate several small offices and a meeting room. There is a rain garden planned for the rear of the property to handle rain flow from the roof of the proposed addition. A landscaping upgrade to include several trees between the building and the street is in the plan. The business sign will be moved back from the right-of-way. The parking lot will be repaired and relined.

D. Colglazier noted the removal of a burning bush near the foundation and suggested replacement with a lilac. J. Mahon noted the presence of dumpsters and was advised that they would be removed post-construction. A. Rugg asked about signage and was advised that the sign would need to be moved out of the right-of-way and lowered to meet the 10' requirement. The Commission also asked that the sign be disconnected from electricity so as not be illuminated without objection from the owner.

Actions:

- Plant lilac to replace burning bush slated to be removed.
- Disconnect internal illumination of business sign as part of sign relocation.
- Relocate said sign outside of right-of-way and lower height to 10'.

- D. Application for design review of a site plan application for the construction of a 5,000 SF clubhouse and associated site improvements, 5 Lund Street (Litchfield) Map 8 Lots 12 & 13, Londonderry, Zoned AR-1, Londonderry Fish & Game (Owner & Applicant) – Jason Lopez, Keach-Nordstrom Associates presenting.

This building features a clapboard and shake exterior with metal-seam roof and stone columns to the front. It is located in a heavily-wooded area and the applicant will seek a waiver on landscape requirements. The applicant will also seek a waiver to add a gravel parking lot versus a paved lot.

Action:

Accepted as presented.

- E. Application for design review for a site plan for a trucking terminal and associated site improvements, 15 Rockingham Road, Map 13 Lot 99, Zoned C-II, Alfred, Jr. & Nicole Pittore (Owners) and Pittore Bros. Paving (Applicant) – Nathan Fogg, Eric C. Mitchell & Associates, presenting.

Pittore Paving is an existing business on Route 28. Site plan work dates back as far as 2008. Work to date includes the installation of a new appropriately-sized driveway off Rockingham Road. The plan calls for the removal of the old driveway and of a significant amount of paving in the front and rear of the property to meet buffer and screening requirements. A proposed sign is near the new driveway and meets size and height requirements. A. Rugg noted that planned white pines often lose lower branches limiting utility as a screen over time and suggested akin to spruce or arborvitaes as a better choice. J. Mahon suggested that the signage not be lit or feature internal illumination without objection from the applicant. J. Butler and others asked about the parking area abutting the future Rail Trail. There were general concerns about the adequacy of screening here. L. Gandia noted the parking location and landscaping requirement for commercial parcels abutting an AR-1 parcel (Rail Trail).

Actions:

- No illumination on signage.
- Replace white pines with better buffer trees like spruce or arborvitaes.
- Applicant to return to Heritage Commission with updated landscape plan showing screening between the Rail Trail and this property.
- Planning staff to review the green buffer encroachment.

- F. Application for design review of a site plan for proposed outdoor seating areas and modified landscape island for truck turning, Four Orchard View Drive, Map 7 Lot 40-2, Zoned C-I, Vernco Apple, LLC (Owner & Applicant) – Aaron Mackey, Allen Major & Associates presenting.

This application seeks to make permanent current outdoor seating in two sections of the Apple Tree Mall and to move a fire hydrant to allow for better, safer truck turning.

Action:

Accepted as submitted.

#### IV. Staff Reports:

- A. Application for design review of a subdivision plan to subdivide one lot into two, 23 Noyes Road, Map 12 Lot 187, Zoned AR-1, James & Patricia Fudala (Owners & Applicants)

Stonewall on the property to be retained, if possible, or relocated, if required. J. Butler suggested that as apparent break in the stone wall on the plan could be repaired using stones moved from where the driveway is planned.

- B. Rezoning request to rezone 22 Young Road (Map 6 Lot 53) Edgar & Winnifred Pitts, Trustees (Owners) and Cedar Crest Development (Applicant) from C-I (Commercial I) and RTE 102 POD (Route 102 Performance Overlay District) to R-III (Multi-Family Residential III), and 20 Young Road (Map 6 Lot 58-2) Tony & Heidi Bennett (Owners) and Cedar Crest Development (Applicant) from AR-1 (Agricultural-Residential 1) to R-III (Multi-Family Residential III)

Informational to the Commission.

#### V. Other business

A. David Ellis – Dismore Corner discussion

Rescheduled to July 22, 2021 meeting.

- B. Kay Webber, 24 Peabody Row is a 61-year resident of Londonderry and a member of the Historical Society. She commented negatively on several properties that were approved by the Heritage Commission with non-traditional colors versus the desired earth-tones and traditional appearance. The Commission responded that some of these outcomes were the result of compromises reached with various applicants particularly those with strong branding that they want to emphasize in their architecture. The Commission has had some past success modifying applicant's designs and colors by showing examples of other properties owned by them in other locations with a more acceptable appearance. There was also a discussion about getting plans earlier in the process so that Commissioners could do advance research before meeting.

VI. Public input

None

- VII. Adjournment – A. Rugg made a motion to adjourn. J. Mahon seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:45 p.m.

\*\* These minutes were approved on July 22, 2021 by a motion made by A. Rugg and seconded by D. Colglazier \*\*

***SPECIAL MEETING***  
**MOOSE HILL CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**DRAFT MINUTES**

I. Acting Chairman John Mahon called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: David Colglazier, John Mahon, Jim Butler. This was sufficient for a quorum. There are currently no alternate members on the commission. Laura Gandia, Associate Planner, attended for the Town of Londonderry.

II. Design review applications:

A. Application for design review of a site plan amendment for Block 2 of Woodmont Commons to construct a 19,792 SF two story medical office building, Map 10 Lot 41, Pillsbury Road & Michels Way, Map 10 Lot 41, Zoned C-I & PUD, Woodmont Commons Planned Unit Development, Pillsbury Realty Development, LLC (Owner) and LD 2020 LLC (Applicant). Jeff Kevan, TF Moran, and Chris Nickerson, Berard Martel Architecture presented.

**Discussion:**

Chris Nickerson opened with a brief overview of the proposed building and lot which he called a “boutique medical building”. He stated that the applicants would address the Heritage Commission’s specific requests from the March 25, 2021 meeting. From that meeting’s minutes, these were:

- Modifications as discussed to the façade of the building.
- Reorientation of the building and the parking lot to address the commission’s concerns.
- Samples of all building materials for commission review.

J. Kevan advised that moving this building to a different space in Woodmont to eliminate the Commission’s concern about the location of the parking lot on Michael’s Way was not possible because all of the other space in Woodmont was being addressed by other developers. Beyond this, J. Kevan stated that this building along with proposed Building 2.01, an office over retail space on Main Street, and proposed Building 201, also on Main Street, a single-story retail building, constituted a “Flex Block” as defined in the P.U.D. Master Plan for Woodmont. J. Kevan further stated that surface parking lots in Flex Blocks were excepted from the Master Plan requirement to “generally not abut any streets other than lanes and should generally be located behind buildings, citing Page 147 of the Woodmont P.U.D. Master Plan.

Based on feedback from the Planning Board, J. Kevan then reviewed two options for this building and parking lot location:

- Option B positioned the building on the corner of Michel’s Way and Governor Bell’s Drive with the majority of the parking lot along Michel’s Way shielded by a 2’ brick or stone wall topped with metal fencing.
- Option D positioned the building centralized on Michel’s Way with the parking lot on either side of the building and with some parking to the rear. The parking lot on Michel’s way would again be shielded by a 2’ brick or stone wall topped with metal fencing. J. Kevan indicated that the Planning Board preferred this option.

J. Butler restated his objection to the parking lot’s location on Michel’s Way. He suggested that fencing should be extended in either option on Governor Bell Drive all the way to Settler’s Lane. J. Mahon stated concerns about the applicant’s interpretation of the building being part of a Flex Block and therefore excepted from the need to have parking behind the building and away from Michel’s Way. J. Kevan and C. Nickerson stated that they had the impression that Town Planner Colleen Mailloux agreed with their interpretation. C. Nickerson also detailed the Commission on his time pressure constraints and need to move the process forward. He also

suggested that the Commission voice a preference for either Option B or Option D. D. Colglazier stated a preference for Option D, the centered building. J. Mahon stated that, if the applicant's interpretation of The Flex Block exception was incorrect, neither Option B or Option D would be acceptable. He also suggested a need to have the Town Planner and the attorney for the town provide their opinion to the Commission in person or in writing on the Flex Block issue before he would state a preference between Option B and Option D. With regard to materials for the building, C. Nickerson and J. Kevan presented samples and pictures of five different types of proposed materials for the building's exterior. The Commissioners present preferred Monterrey Taupe Hardie Plank siding vs. Navaho Beige. There was also a preference for Brown thin brick material over brown Hardie Board. Granitex siding was preferred over white Hardie Board. The lighter colored stacked stone siding was preferred over the darker material. Alucobond panels were preferred vs. gray Hardie Board.

Action:

J. Butler made a motion to defer further discussion regarding building placement preference until a later date pending an interpretation from Colleen Mailloux and the Town's Attorney as to the issues surrounding the Flex Block parking lot exception. D. Colglazier seconded the motion. The motion passed, 3-0. Laura Gandia was asked to follow-up and advise. All three Commissioners present stated that, pending a timely receipt of opinions from the Town Planner and the Town's Attorney, they would be willing to meet again in another Special Meeting as required.

III. Staff Reports: N/A

IV. Other business: N/A

V. Adjournment: J. Butler made a motion to adjourn. D. Colglazier seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.