

Minutes of the Antrim Planning Board Work Session, February 16, 1989

Present: Mike Oldershaw, Sr.; Judith Pratt, chairman; Edwin Rowehl; Rod Virner; David Essex, alternate.

Judith Pratt opened the work session at 7 p.m.

PROGRESS REPORT FROM ROBERT PANTON, SOUTHWEST REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

Panton reported that the population and housing analysis update for the town is 75 percent completed and that the Commission should have a draft ready by the end of February. The field work for the transportation plan is finished, and a draft of that report should be ready by mid-March, Panton stated. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is 75 percent completed, he said. Mike Oldershaw observed that CIPs often turn out to be nothing more than wish lists, and asked whether Antrim's CIP is a wish list. Panton said he didn't believe so and that town department heads have come up with "real needs" that each feels is necessary. Panton said that his method was to examine spending trends going back to 1980 and then to prepare a capital improvements schedule for each department, with a total for each future year. Then the total number of improvements is calculated along with how much it would add to the tax rate. Panton finally noted that a draft of the property line base map would be ready by the second week in March.

SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS

Panton presented the board with a first draft of Site Plan Review regulations. He explained that site plan review gives the Planning Board more control over development. He also suggested that the board have a hills overlay made by the Hillsborough County Conservation District to be included in the site plan review process. Oldershaw asked if the proposed regulations include an "as built" provision. Panton replied that he didn't believe it did, but that the board could insert one. He explained that an as-built provision requires developers to present the board with a representation of the project in its completed stage, allowing the board to make sure no major changes have been made from the board-approved plan.

Panton advised the board to look over the site plan regulations for one or two months and discuss them with him at a later date. Ed Rowehl noted that this year's town meeting warrant contains an article asking voters to give the Planning Board site plan review powers over multi-family dwellings.

A discussion followed on the ways that site plan review can be carried out. Judy Pratt pointed out that the work sessions were designed to let the board look at building plans early in the application process. She asked Panton if the Southwest Region Planning Commission assists Planning Boards in reviewing site plans. Panton replied that the Commission provides such assistance to three towns, including Rindge, which he travels to two days per month to look over applications. He noted that such a system makes it more likely that applications will be complete, increases efficiency, and prevents the board from being bogged down by examining site plans.

Oldershaw asked which area town's regulations served as the model for

the proposed site plan regulations for Antrim. Pantan replied that three or four towns served as models, including Bennington and several other towns with good plans. He noted that the Commission is working on model site plan review regulations for distribution throughout the region. Oldershaw observed that site plan review only works if the Board of Selectmen enforces the zoning regulations.

Pantan then noted that the town could use its own engineer to review site plans, and that the developer could be made to pay the engineer's fees. He said Antrim might consider having two or three engineers on call. Rindge, New Ipswich, and Peterborough use such a system, he said. Some towns, Pantan said, include a notice in the application stating that the applicant could be assessed a variety of charges for expert studies.

Pratt pointed out that the Planning Board currently is not allowed to keep any of the fees it collects. Pantan agreed, noting that New Ipswich and Rindge have generated "substantial revenue" from fees, which goes into the general fund. Pratt said the Planning Board currently collects fees only for advertising hearings and notifying abutters. Pantan recommended that the board set up a schedule of administrative review fees similar to what is now done for building permits. Rowehl asked if doing so requires town meeting approval; Pantan replied that it didn't. Pratt asked if such a change requires a public hearing; Pantan replied that a hearing is optional.

Pantan noted that some towns require an applicant to make a "threshold downpayment" of \$200-\$300, which is placed in an escrow account to pay for extra engineering costs and other charges. Some county planning agencies, he said, charge their staff time to the escrow account. Oldershaw asked if Pantan could show the board some fee schedules from other towns; Pantan replied that that was a good idea. Pantan then pointed out that in some cases, applicants whose plans have been turned down refuse to pay the fees. If engineers are not paid by the applicant, the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen have no authority to pay the engineers. To get around the problem, New Ipswich and Peterborough have appropriated a substantial account for engineering fees, according to Pantan. Otherwise, the only recourse is to attach the property. Pantan said he would try to get fee schedules from Bennington, New Ipswich, Rindge, Jaffrey, and Peterborough. Oldershaw said he would be curious to see Keene's schedule.

Pantan said that Rindge uses three engineers who aren't on retainer and uses the Moore firm in Concord for environmental matters. Oldershaw said that when he was on the Milford Planning Board, the Thomas Moran firm provided good work.

#### GENERAL DISCUSSION

A brief discussion about the advisability of using a tax map to track development trends followed.

Next, Oldershaw said he would like Pantan to provide information on back lots. Pratt noted that the Board of Adjustment wants the board to look over a case involving back lots at its Feb. 23 meeting. Pantan said the Commission performed a technical study on back lots for the region and that he would send the board several copies during the following week. He noted that some towns don't allow backlots at all, although it may be necessary to allow them in some circumstances. He warned against

allowing many backlots to be part of a huge development. There is also a Commission study on the road effects of back lots, Panton said.

Pratt said the board needed to discuss how to draw zoning district lines. Panton pointed out that Marlborough used a property line map to show the business district in its downtown area. He suggested that Antrim plot its zones on a tax map, noting that Chesterfield had done so successfully. Panton said instituting a property line map does not require a full vote of the town.

#### SHAWN HICKEY SUBDIVISION, SCHOOL AND WEST STREETS

Shawn Hickey appeared before the board to talk about his two-lot subdivision at School and West streets. He said he received confusing instructions from Barbara Elia and Judith Pratt as to when he should submit a formal application and seek a public hearing. After some discussion, Oldershaw pointed out that the usual procedure was to vote on acceptance at a public hearing and then hold a continuance on the matter until the following meeting. He told Hickey that it was possible for the board to accept an application and approve the subdivision at the same meeting.

Hickey explained that he wished to create a 21,412 sq. ft. lot in one end of a 1.24-acre lot currently containing a duplex. He said the second lot (the one with the existing duplex) would be 32,779 sq. ft., which he said meets the proposed zoning ordinance's requirements for 30,000 sq. ft. duplex lots in the Village Business District. Rowehl noted that the frontage for the duplex lot would have to be grandfathered. Hickey presented a list of abutters, and Pratt informed him that he must pay the \$43 fee plus \$2 for every abutter, or \$59. Oldershaw expressed concern about a driveway cut being made so close to the street corner. He also suggested that Hickey highlight the lots' perimeter so abutters can easily see the plan at the public hearing. A March 9 hearing date was set.

#### HARRY PAGE (OLD POUND PARTNERSHIP ROUTE 202 SUBDIVISION)

Harry Page asked the board when it would hold a public hearing on the Old Pound Partnership's subdivision at Route 202 and Cross Road. Pratt reminded him the hearing was scheduled for Feb. 23. Page said he thought the only serious issue was maintenance of Cross Road.

#### EDWARD W. AND EVA M. SPRAGUE SUBDIVISION, MAIN STREET AND MAPLE AVENUE

The board reviewed plans submitted by Edward W. and Eva M. Sprague for a two-lot subdivision of 13.65 acres located at Main and Maple streets. (Their son, Craig Sprague, first mentioned the proposal at the board's Jan. 26 meeting.) Board members agreed that the plan was incomplete and that the applicants should be informed how to complete the plan and application.

#### ROBERT HALVERSON SUBDIVISION, OLD NORTH BRANCH ROAD AND ROUTE 31

After reviewing Robert Halverson's proposed subdivision at Old North Branch Road and Route 31, the board agreed that the 112 feet of frontage did not meet zoning regulations. Pratt said she would so inform Halverson.

#### RICHARD P. HERMAN SUBDIVISION, LIBERTY FARM ROAD

The Planning Board briefly reviewed a blueprint of Richard P. Herman's

proposed subdivision on Liberty Farm Road, but delayed discussion until further information is received.

AMENDING AND ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES; PLANNING BOARD CANDIDATES;  
ADJOURNMENT

Oldershaw moved that the minutes for the Feb. 9 public hearing be amended to include the complete text of Phil Dwight's reading of the Planning Board's proposed warrant articles and ballot questions. (Text of warrant articles and ballot questions is attached to these minutes and to the Feb. 9 minutes.) After a second was heard, the board voted unanimously to accept the Feb. 9 minutes as amended.

The Feb. 2 minutes were unanimously approved after a brief discussion about efforts to recruit new Planning Board members. Rowehl said he had talked to David Essex about becoming a full member before the April 1, 1989 expiration of his current term. Rod Zwirner said people in town were complaining to him about not being able to get on the board due to the prejudices of the selectmen. Oldershaw noted that he had already submitted a list of potential candidates.

After a unanimous vote, Pratt adjourned the work session at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Essex, Alternate  
Antrim Planning Board

To see if the Town will vote to revoke the Official document known as the 1974 Antrim Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and adopt in its place the comprehensively revised Antrim Zoning Ordinance, (posted on October 27, 1988 and amended on December 15, 1988 and on January 26, 1989, and on file at Town Hall) Articles 1 through 8, and Articles 10 through 25; (excluding Article 9, the Rural Conservation District), as proposed by the Antrim Planning Board.  
By Ballot

To see if the Town will vote to adopt Article 9 (providing for a Rural Conservation District) of the comprehensively revised Antrim Zoning Ordinance (posted on October 27, 1988 and amended on December 15, 1988 and on January 26, 1989, and on file at Town Hall) as proposed by the Antrim Planning Board. Adoption of this Warrant Article will be contingent upon the passing of Warrant Article #\_\_\_\_, above.  
By Ballot

To see if the Town will vote to adopt by reference, pursuant to RSA 674:52, the BOCA National Building Code, as amended, (posted on January 26, 1989, and on file at Town Hall) as the Antrim Building Code.  
By Ballot

#### BALLOT QUESTIONS

1. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. One as proposed by the planning board for the own zoning ordinance as follows:

To see if the Town will vote to revoke the Official document known as the 1974 Antrim Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and adopt in its place the comprehensively revised Antrim Zoning Ordinance, (posted on October 27, 1988 and amended on December 15, 1988 and on January 26, 1989, and on file at Town Hall) Articles 1 through 8, and Articles 10 through 25; (excluding Article 9, the Rural Conservation District), as proposed by the Antrim Planning Board.

2. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. Two as proposed by the planning board for the own zoning ordinance as follows:

To see if the Town will vote to adopt Article 9 (providing for a Rural Conservation District) of the comprehensively revised Antrim Zoning Ordinance (posted on October 27, 1988 and amended on December 15, 1988 and on January 26, 1989, and on file at Town Hall) as proposed by the Antrim Planning Board. Adoption of this Warrant Article will be contingent upon the passing of question #ONE, above.

3. Are you in favor of the adoption of the building codeas proposed by the planning board?