

Minutes  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 7, 2009

Members of the Planning Board in attendance were Charles Moreno, Chairman, Don Rhodes, Paul Eaton, James Graham, Lynn Sweet, and Kate Sawal, Alternate Member.

The Chairman called the public meeting to order at 7: 38 PM and announced the members present. The closing date for applications to appear on the agenda for the June 4, 2009 regular meeting will be 5 p.m., Tuesday, May 19, 2009. The Chairman reminded the audience that the Board has a policy setting time limits for meetings and that the Board will not consider any new business after 10:30 PM.

The first order of continuing business was the application of DAMARA MASS, INC. for 6-lot conventional subdivision of their property located at Canaan Road and Back Canaan Road (Tax Map 4, Lot 83-1). Ron Haskell of Geometres Blue Hills presented revised plans. Charlie Burnham and Chris Reagan, abutters, were present. Mr. Haskell talked through the various revisions, noting where the items requested by the Board at the last meeting were located on the revised plan sheets. The Burnham's address and one typo on page 1 still need correction. There was some discussion of the 'catch-22' nature of the problem of locating underground utilities on the plans. It was suggested that PSNH approval should be a condition of approval of the final plans, and it was noted that the location must be determined before any road construction begins. Kate Sawal noted that she had checked the location of the end of pavement on Back Canaan Road, and that the plans should be corrected. The Chairman asked Board members if this was the time to begin a discussion of whether Back Canaan Road should be required to be paved up to the entrance to this development due to the traffic impact of the proposed new homes. Back Canaan Road is a designated scenic road. It was agreed that the Road Agent had indicated that he would like to see the paving, because of the traffic impact and maintenance issues. Other Board members noted the scenic value of maintaining the dirt road. Lynn Sweet suggested that the Board might defer to the Road Agent on this question. It was agreed that the distance involved would be about 100 yards. The abutters noted that since the road is a scenic road, a public hearing would be required before the road could be paved, and the question could be addressed at that time.

Board members then turned to a letter received from a group of concerned neighbors to the proposed development. It was agreed that the question of underground utilities had already been discussed. After a brief discussion it was agreed that no street lighting plan had been submitted or requested, and Board members agreed that they hoped that there would not be additional lights installed and agreed that the Town would not be requiring any street lights in this location. Regarding the abutters' concerns that the development might be left unfinished, Board members advised the abutters present about the intent of the requirement for the posting of a financial guarantee prior to the final approval of any plan involving infrastructural improvements. Regarding the old farm dump located on the large parcel, it was agreed to ask Normandeau Associates, the town's consulting engineers, to check into this issue. Regarding paving Back Canaan Road, the Chairman asked the abutters present about their feelings on this issue. They noted the location of a brook that passes under the road near this location, and asked whether any road improvements would require widening the existing road ROW. After some discussion on road standards, Board members suggested it probably would not be appropriate to widen the road surface in this area, The abutters said that they felt that the neighborhood might agree to paving the stretch to the new development when it comes up at a public hearing, if this was the case. Mr. Reagan then noted that there are double stone walls along the edge of the road in the area of the proposed entrance to the development. Stone walls are protected under the Town's scenic roads ordinance; Mr. Haskell agreed that he was not personally familiar with the area. It is unclear if the Town would have any control over the double wall, although the NH Division of Historic Resources will be looking at the site as required as part of the wetlands review. Mr. Haskell suggested notes on the plan identifying the double wall segments. Lynn Sweet noted that this issue can also be addressed at the time of the scenic road hearing. There were no further comments. It was agreed that the revised plans will be forwarded to the Town's engineers for review once the check for escrow funds has cleared. Further discussion of this application was continued to the next meeting. In closing, the Chairman offered to make a copy of the abutters' letter available to Mr. Haskell.

Board members then called on Jon Berry, accompanied by Mark Belair, who had requested an opportunity to meet with the Board regarding a proposal for multi-family redevelopment of Mr. Belair's large

building located on his 16± acre property on Roller Coaster Road. Mr. Berry noted that Mr. Belair hopes to convert his commercial building into residential units, perhaps phasing the redevelopment process, as he moves toward retirement. They have had the Building Inspector inspect the site and will be working with an architect. Mr. Belair's lot totals approximately 16 acres including his residence. The lot is restricted to no further subdivision by the 1980s boundary adjustment plan that created the lot. However, Mr. Belair's preference would be to divide the lot so that the multifamily building is on a separate lot from the residence. They are exploring how many units they feel could be created given density restrictions. Variances and Non-Residential Site Plan review would be required. Legal concerns were discussed. It was noted that many subdivision plans were restricted to no further subdivision during the 1980s because full surveys and lot assessments had not been completed; others were restricted to maintain open space. There is no record regarding the history of this plan and no indication of why the original restriction was made. It was agreed that the Roller Coaster Road has been significantly developed for residential use in the years since the plan was originally approved. Various concerns were noted, including the location of the property close to the town center and new statewide concerns with the provision of workforce housing. It was agreed that Mr. Belair may need to contact the original subdivider in order to address whether they would be willing to lift the restriction on the lot.

Board members then met with Lester Huckins, who was present to meet with the Board regarding the conditional approval of the proposed 3-lot subdivision of the land of the Bertha Huckins Revocable Trust earlier this year. Don Rhodes noted that he had gone to inspect the new road for completion, but had found that there were differences between the road as built and the original plans. Some of the new private road has been constructed, although not following the proposed plans, and instead developing the new road as an extension of the existing driveway access to proposed Lot 2. Board members reviewed the situation, and a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the function of a private road ROW and whether the new private road ROW could be shifted in location in order to accommodate the desired location for the new house while still meeting requirements for frontage and setbacks. Signage for the new road and home location will be required for e-911. The new home foundation has been started, complicating the proposal. It was noted that both Hillside Drive and the new proposed private road on the new plan are private roads showing on approved subdivision plans, so there is no legal restriction to building. It was noted that the Town's restrictions regarding the number of homes on a gravel road had been eliminated in an overhaul of the town road specifications a few years ago. It was noted that the current regulations only allow 10 lots on a dead-end road. There would only be 4 homes located off Hillside Drive or the new road, so the plan would meet current requirements.

Board members then reviewed recent correspondence. There being no further items before the Board, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.