



**MINUTES**  
**Strafford Regional Planning Commission**  
**Regional Impact Committee**  
**150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A**  
**Rochester NH 03867**  
**April 16, 2012**

**RIC Members Present:** Chairman Edmund Jansen, Jr. (Rollinsford); Tom Clark (Dover); Sandra Keans (Rochester), Brandon Anderson (Durham)

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Copeland, AICP, Executive Director; Gregory M. Jones, Data Collection/Analysis Technician, Mathew Sullivan, Regional Planner

**Others Present:** Art Nickless, President, Norway Plains Associates, Inc., Mary Ellen Humphrey, Rochester Economic Development, Kenneth Ortmann, Director, Rochester Department of Planning and Development

**1. Introductions**

Chairman Jansen called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM and noted a quorum was present. Attendees introduced themselves.

**2. Committee Membership**

Copeland reminded members that the last Regional Impact Committee (RIC) meeting was held on January 28, 2011 and stated that the current members of E. Jansen, B. Anderson, T. Clark and S. Keans constituted quorum. Copeland reminded the Committee that the Regional Impact review is pursuant to New Hampshire RSA 36:54. The purpose of this legislation is to:

- I. Provide timely notice to potentially affected municipalities concerning proposed developments, which are likely to have impacts beyond the boundaries of a single municipality.
- II. Provide opportunities for the Regional Planning Commission and the potentially affected municipalities to furnish timely input to the municipality having jurisdiction.
- III. Encourage the municipality having jurisdiction to consider the interests of other potentially effected municipalities.

Copeland reminded the Committee further that the Regional Impact Guidelines for Communities document was formally approved on September 29, 2011. This document outlines the Committee Bylaws, processes in which the Regional Impact Committee is to conduct its business, and lists the review standards to be followed during the regional impact review.

### **3. Action Item**

Copeland introduced Art Nickless, President of Norway Plains Associates, Inc. (2 Continental Boulevard; Rochester, NH 03867) and asked that he provide the Committee with a synopsis of the Snecma SAFRAN Group/Albany International Site Plan application to construct a proposed 343,312 square foot manufacturing facility on a 49 acre tract of land within the City of Rochester's Granit State Business Park.

Nickless informed the Committee that the proposed facility will be used for manufacturing of jet engine components by SAFRAN Aerospace-Defense Security in coordination with Albany International Corporation. Nickless stated that the project is located on City owned land (Map 242 Lot 6) and that the City of Rochester will be completing installation of utilities (sewer, water, gas, roadway and bridge over railroad) to be paid for by the City's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Nickless stated that the initial site work has been approved by the States Attorney General to be paid for by the New Hampshire Housing and Finance Authority (acting as project's financial agent). Nickless informed the Committee that temporary access to the site will be from Haven Hill Road at the site of a historic farm crossing. The access way has been upgraded to accommodate construction vehicles and will be utilized until the main access way and associated infrastructure (bridge over railroad and utilities etc.) are completed. Nickless informed the Committee that the site work, roadway and bridge construction work has been awarded to S.U.R. Construction (233 Chestnut Hill Road, Rochester, NH 03867). Nickless stated that no serious hazardous byproducts will result from the project other than acetones needed during the manufacturing processes. A New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) Standard Dredge and Fill Permit to fill approximately 2.96 acres of on-site wetlands has been approved with associated on-site and off-site mitigation (off-site mitigation is in the form of a permanent conservation easement at the Henderson Farm). The project team currently awaits NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit approval (submitted to NHDES on 4/16/12) and is working with NHDES to address wetland recharge concerns. The project also awaits City of Rochester Planning Board approval. Nickless opined that the existing traffic light at the intersection of Route 108 and Airport Drive is under-utilized and noted that Airport Drive is the current nomenclature for this roadway.

K. Ortmann, City of Rochester Planning Director, informed the Committee that the project's drainage report has not yet been submitted and asked that the report be forwarded to SRPC once completed. Nickless agreed and noted that the drainage report will address potential impacts to abutting sites/communities.

Copeland directed the Committee to the Strafford Regional Planning Commission's (SRPC) April 16, 2012 Regional Impact Review letter. She stated that the review letter contains questions to be asked on every regional impact project before the Commission in order to set the dialog with the Town and applicant, as well as to address potential regional concerns. The

4/16/12 review questions, SRPC comments/recommendations, applicant and Committee member responses are as follows:

Traffic-Access-Parking

1. Will the development cause an increase in traffic that will diminish the capacity or safety of the street system in the adjacent town/city?

**Copeland stated:**

The application contains information regarding maximum employment of 400. There would be two shifts per day Monday through Friday, with a maximum shift of 217 employees. . The assumption was made by the regional planning commission that there would be 200+ turning movements from Route 108 onto the access road for the first shift, and 400+ turning movements from and to Route 108 at the shift change, and a final 200+ turning movements onto Route 108 at the end of the second shift. This is a total of 800+ additional turning movements along Route 108.

There was no information on truck traffic for the applicant's operations and use of site, and for the period during construction.

The traffic count at the Rochester/Somersworth city lines on Route 108 is an average daily traffic of 15,007 vehicles and at Hillcrest Drive and Route 108 the average daily traffic is 14,789. Peak traffic in the morning is between 7:00 and 8:00 am with an average of 750 eastbound vehicles and 300+ westbound vehicles. Peak traffic in the evening is between 4:00 to 5:00pm with an average of 760+ westbound vehicles and 450+ eastbound vehicles at the Somersworth/Rochester city line, and similar for the Hillcrest count area.

*K. Ortmann noted that the first Somersworth roadway to be affected by the proposed project would be at the intersection of West High Street and Whitehouse Road. No other comments were made relative to this item.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

2. Will the development exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the adjacent town/city for designated roads or highways?

**Copeland stated:**

There is no information about level of service. The existing traffic volumes are discussed in the prior section. There may be concerns from abutting residents and businesses about safety of turning movements to and from their properties with the increased traffic from the development.

*There were no additional comments from Committee members or guests relative to this item.*

3. Will the development substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., construction, gravel operation equipment)?

**Copeland Stated:**

This does not seem to be an issue (substantially increase hazards due to a design feature). NH North Coast's use of the rail line is unknown at this time, including any need for double stack capacity at bridges. Given current use of the line, this would not be an issue.

*Nickless informed the Committee that the bridge over the proximate railroad tracks was designed by Hoyle Tanner & Associates (100 International Drive; Portsmouth, NH 03803). Nickless stated further that Hoyle Tanner & Associates has been in constant contact with New Hampshire Northcoast Railroad as well as the NHDOT Rail and Transit Bureau.*

*K. Ortmann opined that the SRPC recommendation should read "NH North Coast's potential future use of the rail line is unknown".*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

4. Will the development result in inadequate emergency access?

**Copeland stated:**

It is not clear where a second access point would be located. The regional planning commission is assuming that the construction access would be made permanent for a secondary access.

*Nickless informed the Committee that no emergency access is proposed as Airport drive is sufficient to service the site. The emergency access road will be eliminated upon completion of main access way. Nickless stated that there have been no concerns regarding emergency access posed by the Rochester Planning Board.*

*T. Clark inquired as to the Rochester Fire Departments opinion on emergency access. K. Ortmann stated that the Rochester Fire Department has not indicated any issues with the lack of a secondary emergency access way.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

5. Will the development result in inadequate parking capacity?

**Copeland stated:**

The applicant is seeking a variance to reduce parking from required spaces per Rochester regulations of 573 spaces .The application identifies 369 (or 378) parking spaces on site.

The site plan appears to support adequate parking capacity for employee and guest parking as well as trucks. There is a turnaround area for trucks accidentally turning into the site.

*Nickless stated that the building size is due to the size of equipment proposed to be housed at the site and not due to the number of proposed employees. The granted Variance allowed the applicant to utilize the least stringent parking requirements. K. Ortmann agreed.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

6. Will the development conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?

**Copeland stated:**

The application makes no mention of a bus transit stop either on Route 108 or at a pull off on the access road. There is no mention of bike racks in the parking area. Some manufacturing facilities also set aside motorcycle parking.

*Nickless stated that there is an existing Cooperative Alliance for Seacoast Transportation (COAST) bus stop existing across the street from the Granite State Business Park (GSBP) which serves residential uses in the area. K. Ortmann confirmed the existence of said bus stop and the group agreed the addition of a cross walk would be beneficial to the project and satisfy the SRPC alternative transportation inquiry.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

#### Conflicts with Policies, Plans and Programs

#### Noise

7. Will the development expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Copeland stated:**

Applicant states that the property is 3000 feet from existing uses. There is no information on operations that may generate noise, such as truck backing up and loading, HVAC, and construction noise, which would be limited in duration. Abutting properties include homes, airport, manufacturing, farms and wooded lands.

*Nickless opined that the existing surrounding land uses (railroad & airport) result in greater noise levels than will result from this project. Nickless does not anticipate this to be an issue for the project or surrounding land uses.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

8. Will the development expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

**Copeland stated:**

This information is not known.

*Nickless stated that the owners of the proposed manufacturing facility are more concerned with impacts to the facilities operations as a result of existing excessive ground vibration caused by the railroad and in addition to electromagnetic fields associated with the proximate power lines which may also be an issue for the proposed operations of the facility.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

9. Will the development substantially and permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

**Copeland stated:**

See sections above on NOISE. The development would be located off a state highway, which functions as a regional commute route with current traffic levels exceeding 15,000 vehicles per day with some truck traffic. It seems from the nature of existing development and land uses that the

proposed manufacturing development would not substantially increase ambient noise levels. There may be a permanent increase in ambient noise levels from traffic and manufacturing activities.

*K. Ortmann opined that the manufacturing activities will not have permanent impacts on ambient noise levels. Ortmann opined that there may be permanent ambient noise level increase associated with increased traffic levels. Ortmann inquired as to whether or not the increase in noise levels associated with traffic during high volume hours can be considered "permanent".*

*T. Clark opined that the increase of noise associated with 800+ trips per day into the facility would constitute a permanent increase. Copeland stated that she will investigate the inquiry.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

10. Will the development substantially increase temporary or periodic ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

**Copeland stated:**

See sections above on NOISE. It would be located next to a general aviation airport and other manufacturing facilities within a business park. There are residences, farms and woodlands nearby. It seems that the development would not substantially increase temporary or periodic ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels for the airport or other manufacturing facilities.

11. Is the development located within an airport zone or within two miles of an airport or airfield, where the project would expose residents or employees in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**Copeland stated:**

From a brief review by the regional planning commission, the Part 77 zones appear to not be impacted. Has Pease Development Authority Master Plan for this airport been reviewed for future development plans that may change the type of planes using the site?

*Nickless stated that a desire for a service type change to accommodate larger aircraft has been stated within the Sky Haven Airport Master Plan. Nickless stated further that the proposed manufacturing facility is outside of the protected airport approach zones but the project will be required to submit a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) project notification due to the project's proximity to the airport.*

*K. Ortmann noted that potential additional use of the airport associated with the proposed business would likely result in the retention of existing runway pavement width as the current width exceeds what is required by FAA. Ortmann stated further that the noise standards for new aircraft result in noise levels less than that of older prop aircraft.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

Hazardous Materials or Substances

12. Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Copeland stated:**

No information provided regarding the creation of a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. There are several waste containers shown on the site plan.

Are there Stormwater Pollution Prevention and Spill Prevention Control & Counter Measures being established for the site?

*Nickless stated that the NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit will address many of these concerns. In addition, an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as well as a Spill Prevention Control & Counter Measures plan will be completed for the site. Nickless informed the group that S.U.R. Construction will be contracting Stony Ridge Environmental, LLC (229 Prospect Mountain Road, Alton NH 03809) to complete site inspections and ensure environmental compliance during project construction.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

13. Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Copeland stated:**

The site plan and application indicate the discharge of other than domestic waste and the use of onsite treatment structures and specified waste containers.

*Nickless stated that other than domestic waste, no other materials are proposed to be discharged via the City sewer system.*

*Copeland directed the Committee and guests to page two (2) of the applicant's Non-residential Site Plan Application under **Utility Information** where it states:*

If City water, is it proposed for anything other than domestic purposes? Yes  No

If City water, is it proposed for anything other than domestic purposes? Yes  No

*After review, Nickless apologized for an apparent oversight during the completion of the application. He assured the Committee and guests that there will be no other material discharged into the City of Rochester's sewer other than domestic waste.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

14. Will the development produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**Copeland stated:**

No, the development will not produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

15. Will the development be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the NH Department of Environmental Services and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Copeland stated:**

There are three (3) Hazardous Waste sites located on the abutting airport property and one (1) Groundwater Contamination site located on the City of Somersworth's City Well Parcel (See Map).

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

Ecology and Resources

16. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Copeland stated:**

NH Natural Heritage Bureau shows no threatened or endangered species within a proximate location of this property.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment*

17. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the NH Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Copeland stated:**

None of the property is located within a *Conservation Focus Area* as delineated by *The Land Conservation Plan for New Hampshire's Coastal Watersheds, 2006*.

The *NH Wildlife Action Plan* shows the property in proximity to lands categorized as the Highest Ranked Habitat in NH, as well as Supporting Landscapes in Somersworth.

The GRANIT statewide conservation lands map shows two permanently conserved properties directly abutting the property. Additionally the City of Somersworth has two permanently conserved properties south of the property.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

18. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Copeland stated:**

The property is located within the Rochester Conservation Overlay district. The applicant received a wetlands permit from NH Department of Environmental Services, Wetland Bureau. In addition, the applicant has a received an Army Corps of Engineers Authorization Letter. Wetlands are shown on the map and the amount of acres/square footage impacted is indicated. No information relative to

buffer impacts has been provided. *This SRPC comment will be revised upon review of the applicant's recently submitted information.*

The Site Plan Application proposed to fill 123,513 square feet of on-site wetlands resulting in the post development disposition of 262,321 square feet of remaining wetlands.

A drainage study for the proposed project has not yet been submitted to SRPC for review. The regional planning commission routinely recommends the inclusion of maintenance schedules for the proposed storm-water treatment structures. *This SRPC comment will be revised upon review of the applicant's recently submitted information.*

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

19. Will the development interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**Copeland stated:**

The information is incomplete. A review of the stewardship plans on the conservation easements in Rochester and Somersworth may have information about species and wildlife corridors and nurseries.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

20. Will the development conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a conservation easement, tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**Copeland stated:**

The development abuts two conservation easements to the north. It would be helpful if the City and applicant met with the conservation easement holder to ensure that the stewardship plan for these properties would not be substantially impacted. The City of Rochester may want to meet with the holders of the conservation easements on the property to the east for the same reason noted above. The Rochester Conservation Commission minutes of March 28, 2012 have been supplied by the City. *This SRPC comment may be revised upon review of these minutes.*

*Nickless stated that the property owner for one of the abutting conservation lands attended the last Rochester Planning Board meeting and did not indicate any concerns with the continued operation of the property. The concerns raised by this landowner were relative to safety on Haven Hill Road. Nickless informed the Committee that the Strafford Rivers Conservancy will likely be holding the conservation easements offered as mitigation for this project.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

21. Will the development conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

**Copeland stated:**

See discussion above for the NH Wildlife Action Plan and for Strafford Rivers Conservancy easements in Rochester and easement holders in Somersworth. The Rochester Planning Board and Conservation Commission would be addressing their City plans. The Rochester Conservation

Commission minutes of March 28, 2012 have been supplied by the City. *This SRPC comment may be revised upon review of these minutes.*

*Nickless informed the Committee that the Strafford Rivers Conservancy will likely be holding the conservation easements offered as mitigation for this project.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

22. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Groundwater Quality?

**Copeland stated:**

State maps show a stratified drift aquifer just off the property to the east. The City of Somersworth has a wellhead protection area for a well. The entire applicant's property falls within the City of Somersworth wellhead protection area.

*Nickless stated that a drainage report has been completed for the project and will be supplied to the Planning Commission for review. Nickless informed the Committee and guests that the project team has met with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), United States Department of Fish and Wildlife (USFW), NH Department of Environmental Services, Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), and City of Rochester land use staff to address this issue. Nickless stated further that the State Alteration of Terrain permits have recently elevated in stringency requiring gravel wetlands for recharge and water quality improvement. In addition, a site specific soil inventory must be completed on the property to ensure recharge capability and suitable site conditions exist. Nickless opined that the local, state and federal review of this issue will satisfy this question. SRPC will be supplied with pertinent materials relative to this issue.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

23. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Air Quality?

**Copeland stated:**

The application does not address. Most air quality effects would come during construction - from vehicles accessing the site and site alteration activities, and should be addressed through the conditions of approval. A construction note pertaining to dust control has been included with the proposed plan set.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

Hazards-Public Health and Safety

24. Will the development expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides or flooding?

**Copeland stated:**

The proposed development is not within a 100 year or 500 year floodplain. Given the slopes on the property landslide potential is limited. See map.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

25. Will the development result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Copeland stated:**

The proposed development has elevation changes of twenty to thirty feet from north northwest to south southeast. With proper precautions during construction and site alteration, substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil should be limited by the perimeter controls. The use of a silt sock rather than black plastic silt fencing may be better for onsite containment of soil and removal upon final site stabilization. The proposed development indicates where pervious surfaces will be maintained.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

26. Will the development be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

**Copeland stated:**

This is highly unlikely based on soil types and proposed alteration of site. No information available about ledge on site.

*Nickless informed the Committee and guests that hundreds of soil borings have been completed on the site and that only a small amount of ledge was located. Nickless was unsure if blasting activities would be required for this project.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

27. Will the development be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**Copeland stated:**

The application indicates that they would use sewers. The applicant is discussing with the City.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

Facilities

28. Will the development require new or expanded public facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards for any of the following public services?

**Copeland stated:**

- Fire protection?

Unknown at this time

*Nickless informed the Committee and guests that the facility will have a fire suppression system installed and a potential water tower may be installed for water pressure purposes.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

- Police protection?

Unknown at this time

- There were no additional comments at this time*
- Schools?  
No direct impact  
*There were no additional comments at this time*
- Parks?  
No direct impact  
*There were no additional comments at this time*
- Solid Waste  
Site plan shows various locations for waste containers but type and quantity not indicated. No containers shown specifically for recycling.
- Other public facilities  
Discussion with airport through Pease Development Authority may be considered.

*K. Ortmann stated that the development will not require new or expanded public facilities in the adjacent municipalities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time or other performance standards.*

*T. Clark reminded the Committee and guests that there is always potential for mutual aid in the event of a fire.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

29. Will the development cause an increase in new or expanded utilities, treatment facilities, storm water, water supplies, etc., that would result in a negative financial or environmental impact to the adjacent municipality?

**Copeland stated:**

No information received about quantity of City water usage in gallons per day. The plan lays out an extensive stormwater plan for onsite management of stormwater but does not provide for use of pervious pavement or other alternative(s). The proposed development uses only impervious surfaces for parking.

*Nickless informed the Committee and guests that this information has been difficult to retrieve. The manufacturing facility will not utilize City water for operations and the use of pervious pavement on the parking areas is not advisable due to heavy truck traffic and associated non-point source pollution.*

*K. Ortmann reminded the Committee and guests that this question pertains to impacts to adjacent municipalities which is not anticipated.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

Scenic and Visual Character

30. Will the development convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use?

**Copeland stated:**

There are no Prime Farmland or Statewide Importance soils on the property.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

31. Will the development conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?

**Copeland stated:**

The applicant has submitted a variance for construction of an access road in the agricultural zone.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

32. Will the development involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

**Copeland stated:**

Existing forested lands will be converted to industrial use.

*K. Ortmann informed the Committee and guests that the subject property has been previously harvested for timber and that only a portion of the site remains forested. Nickless stated that these areas will be clear-cut as well. Cleared areas will be used for construction trailers etc. during construction.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

33. Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Copeland stated:**

No substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista from a regional perspective.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

34. Will the development have substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Copeland stated:**

There will be clearance of forested lands on the site; however the airport is already a cleared area that runs parallel to Route 108. Route 108 is not a state scenic highway.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

35. Will the development substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Copeland stated:**

The development will change the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. It will appear more like the airport and other manufacturing facilities along Route 108 and in the Granite State Business Park. No landscaping plan available to review visual mitigation steps.

*Nickless informed the Committee and guests that a landscaping plan has been completed for this project and will be submitted to SRPC for review. The development is consistent with surrounding buildings and will not constitute degradation to the surrounding properties.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

36. Will the development create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**Copeland stated:**

No lighting plan provided in the application. A utilities plan was received on April 16<sup>th</sup> that has not been reviewed. *This comment will be revised upon review of said plan.*

*Nickless informed the Committee and members that the lighting plan is complete and utilizes shielded and downcast lighting fixtures to comply with the dark skies initiative and protect surrounding properties from potential light pollution.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

37. Will the development conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation including, but not limited to the master plan or zoning ordinance?

**Copeland stated:**

Yes, the applicant is seeking several variances for parking and access based on current Rochester zoning. It reflects the Master Plan language for development of the Granite State Business Park.

*K. Ortmann stated that the Variances were granted on April 11, 2012. The SRPC comment should be revised to reflect the actual issuance of these Variances.*

*The Committee had no further comment on this item.*

38. Will the development conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**Copeland stated:**

Stafford Rivers Conservancy should be contacted in regards to the stewardship plan for the properties in Rochester with conservation easements. City of Somersworth should be contacted regarding conservation easements in Somersworth.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

Housing and Population Growth

39. Will the development induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**Copeland stated:**

The development will not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly or indirectly. It will help with increasing the number of employed persons, who may now be able to stay in the region.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

40. Will the development displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**Copeland stated:**

The proposed development does not displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating replacement housing elsewhere.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

41. Will the development displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**Copeland stated:**

No, it does not displace substantial numbers of people.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

42. Is the development compatible with existing or planned cross border development?

**Copeland stated:**

It may be beneficial to discuss with the City of Somersworth their plans for the area zoned recreation and agricultural that is within the shared wellhead protection area. Additional discussions with Strafford Rivers Conservancy and the two cities' conservation commissions may be helpful to ensure the wellhead protection area is secure.

*There were no applicant or Committee member responses to this comment.*

A discussion ensued as to the proper manner in which to proceed with the Committees recommendation for this project to the City of Rochester Planning Board. Copeland stated that the two main SRPC concerns are for the protection of proximate wellheads and associated water quality as well as the lack of information on traffic impacts associated with this proposal.

Chair E. Jansen opined that the project does not pose any serious risk regionally.

**T. Clark made a motion that upon receipt and review of the applicant's drainage study, landscape and lighting plans, the Strafford Regional Planning Commission's Regional Impact Committee will submit the staff review letter and recommend to the City of Rochester that the project will have no substantial adverse regional impact. B. Anderson seconded the motion which passed with a vote of three (3), to zero (0) against with one (1) abstention.**

**4. Other Business**

There was no other business at this time.

**5. Adjournment**

**S. Keans made a motion to adjourn the April 16, 2012 Strafford Regional Planning Commission Regional impact Committee meeting at 5:00 PM. T. Clark seconded the motion which passed unanimously with a vote of four (4), to zero (0) in favor.**

Respectfully submitted

Gregory M. Jones  
Data Collection/Analysis Technician