

1 ANTRIM PLANNING BOARD

2 Regular Meeting

3 March 1, 2018

4 MINUTES

5
6 **Members & Staff Present:**

7 Chris Condon (Chair), Jeanne Cahoon (Vice Chair), Bob Holmes, John Robertson (*fill-in for Bob*
8 *Edwards, Ex-Officio*), Steve MacDonald, Janet McEwen, Lynne Rosansky and Kristin Bixby
9 (Assistant to Land Use Boards).

10 **Others Present:** Scott Burnside, Landsite Corporation; Timothy Goldthwaite, Meridian Land
11 Services; Rick Davis, Antrim Stone Church; and property abutters and neighbors Shane Demers,
12 Cindy Demers, Suzanne Houghton, Anne Truslow, Victor Rosansky, Liz Robertson; Rich
13 Guillemette.

14 **CTO:** Chair Condon called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. and introduced the Board and staff.
15 Mrs. Rosansky has recused herself from this portion of the meeting due to the fact that she is an
16 abutter to the property in question.

17 **Public Meeting**

18 Chair Condon opened the meeting by asking Assistant to Land Use Boards to read the Public
19 Notice. The assistant confirmed that the hearing was posted and advertised in the newspaper,
20 and that the abutters were notified.

21 Chair Condon then reads a Staff Report from Antrim's Consultant Planner, Carol Ogilvie
22 [*attached as Addendum 1*].

23 Chair Condon only goes through Minor Site Plan Review checklist items that were waived or not
24 applicable to the specific application.

25 **Motion:** Vice Chair Cahoon moved to accept the application as complete based on the met
26 checklist requirements and to subsequently open the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. McEwen.

27 **Discussion:** Mr. Holmes had a question about why the lighting specifications were waived on the
28 checklist. Chair Condon confirmed there were no lighting concerns addressed on the application.

29 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

30 **Public Hearing**

31 Chair Condon opened the Public Hearing by giving the floor to the applicants. The representative
32 that gives the official proposal of the application is Mr. Timothy Goldthwaite of Meridian Land
33 Services.

34 Mr. Goldthwaite worked his way through the detailed plans that were displayed for the Board and
35 the public. The first sheet of plans showed the proposed lot line adjustment. Mr. Goldthwaite
36 explained that the lots will be adjusted to provide more land for the Stone Church's parking lot, as
37 well as better delineate the property of the Church and the Rymes' separate property. The main
38 property in question (Map 228, Lot 28) currently sits at 2/3 of an acre, and with this adjustment it
39 will be slightly more than an acre. Mr. Goldthwaite also mentioned that there has also been an
40 application in process for an expedited wetlands permit, which the Town's Conservation
41 Commission was asked to review and then will be going to the State. The need for this permit is
42 based on the fact that the expanded parking area would enter into a wetland buffer. Moving to the
43 second sheet of plans, Mr. Goldthwaite explained that the existing driveway entrance will remain
44 the same, with the addition of a paved apron at the entrance. The rest of the parking lot will be
45 gravel. A retention wall will be added to the parking area, which runs 6 to 8 feet [in height] at the
46 maximum, and tapers off at the edges. A proposed stone-filled trench will be used to collect water

47 run-off and will move it to a proposed additional catch basin located on the southeastern side of
48 the parking area. There will also be the addition of a stone-filled riprap apron. The parking lot will
49 have a slight pitch, at most being eight percent, in order to help water flow towards the catch
50 basin. Mr. Goldthwaite explained that this pitch percentage was chosen as a balance between it
51 being able to allow flowage without becoming too steep to safely park cars on the lot. The
52 impacted area equates to 22 square feet. To the north of the parking area, the plans create a
53 shallow grassland swale to redirect some water run-off away from the parking area.

54 In regards to the Town's parking standards, the Church has 140 seats, and it is required that the
55 plans provide one parking space for every three seats. Therefore, a minimum of 47 parking
56 spaces were required. The proposed plans provide fifty parking spaces with a pressure - treated
57 posting rail for safety reasons.

58 There were concerns from the public about the flowage of the water. The plans outline that there
59 will be some regrading done to the hillside on the Church property. Scott Burnside, owner of
60 Landsite Corporation, stepped in to explain that the current flow on this lot now discharges into
61 the same area where the State's culvert discharges, at the bottom of the hill along the
62 southernmost property line of Map 228, Lot 28. The proposed regrading of the hill will not be
63 changing the location of where the water ends up flowing, which is into an easterly wetlands area.

64 Mr. Goldthwaite drew attention back to the proposed plans. He pointed out the planned profile of
65 the retaining wall. There are also plans for two pipe penetrations: one for the catch basin and the
66 other for the existing stone water pipe, which will be extended to an added riprap apron as a way
67 to mitigate erosion issues. He showed where on the plans one can find details of the paved
68 apron, the materials used for the gravel parking lot, and the shallow stone line swale.

69 Chair Condon explained the process of a Public Hearing and proceeded to open up for questions
70 from the Board.

71 Mr. Holmes said if he was reading the map correctly, everything would be draining to the west
72 side of the parking lot, since that is the lowest point in elevation. He and Mr. Goldthwaite
73 discussed the elevations of different sections of the parking lot. Mr. Goldthwaite noted that the
74 grading of the parking had to be done a certain way so cars could safely turn from what starts as
75 a three percent grade to an eight percent grade. Mr. Holmes also asked if the intercepting swale
76 is not currently part of what the new section of land in Map 228, Lot 28 will be after the lot line
77 adjustment. Mr. Goldthwaite confirmed.

78 Ms. McEwen wanted to clarify if all the water that is being discharged is essentially going to the
79 spot where all of the water was being discharged previously, in the land's former state without the
80 proposed regrading of the hill, and if the only difference would be that the parking lot, even
81 though it is gravel, will still be less permeable after reconstruction. Mr. Goldthwaite confirmed that
82 there will be an increase, although minor, in runoff after reconstruction. This is due to an increase
83 in the area that will become gravel. Mr. Goldthwaite said he did not think there would be a
84 significant increase in volume. Scott Burnside interjected that the infiltrator trench with stones will
85 reduce some of the runoff volume. The water in that area, with help from added sand, will leach
86 into the ground.

87 Ms. McEwen asked the applicants to delineate where wetlands are, and to describe what they are
88 asking the State to waive on their Wetlands Permit application. Mr. Goldthwaite showed where on
89 the map it delineates the boundaries of the wetlands. The wetland impact equates to about 2,200
90 square feet, which qualifies for the State's minimum impact requirements [which is anything less
91 than 3,000 square feet]. The plans show that the parking lot will fall within the wetland itself.
92 Impact-wise, the plan hasn't made it to the State yet to officially review. The application was first
93 given to the Conservation Commission. If the Chair of the Commission signs this application, it
94 will be under expedited review from the State. If it is not signed, it will fall under the guidelines of
95 a standard review process. There was concern from the Commission's Chair that the applicants
96 did not apply for a Special Use Permit. However, this permit was only required in the major site
97 plan review process, not the minor site plan review application, which is what they qualified to be
98 able to fill it out.

99 Mr. MacDonald asked that if he understood what was going on, if the intent in design is to
100 interrupt the drainage as little as possible, so it flows similarly to how it has to flow naturally, then
101 what does the permit have to do with any of this? Mr. Burnside explained that the wetland permit
102 is necessary because the land acquired through the lot line adjustment is part of what is called a
103 forested wetland, which is typically considered a low impact or low value wetland.

104 Ex-officio Robertson commented that the Stone Church been part of his family for over one
105 hundred years, and that he thought it was fantastic that it was being used again.

106 Chair Condon opened up the hearing to the abutters of the Stone Church property.

107 The Assistant to Land Use Boards used this time to represent an abutter who could not be
108 present for the Public Hearing. The abutter, Mr. Kurzon, lives downhill and across the street from
109 the Stone Church property. He wished to express his concerns about the possible drainage
110 impacts to the road, as he already receives a lot of run-off onto his property. He was worried that
111 the proposed retaining wall will only protect the Church's property from higher amounts of runoff.
112 He was also concerned that what appears to be more of a commercial use for a property will be
113 allowed in the Rural District, and this may have an adverse effect to traffic and may change the
114 character of that section of Antrim. Per clarification by Ms. McEwen, it was confirmed that the
115 proposed plans would have no impact on the runoff that would go down the State road and
116 across the street.

117 Suzanne Houghton, an abutter, was opposed. The water drainage is already a problem for her
118 property, as she lives directly downhill. She doesn't think that there can be proper drainage on
119 this site that could be installed in a way that wouldn't impact the amount of water that flows onto
120 her property. She was also concerned that her septic system may be affected. Mr. Goldthwaite
121 noted that he walked the Stone Church property in the late Fall of 2018, and it was certainly wet,
122 but he was not sinking into the ground.

123 Shane Demers, an abutter, noted the spring that lies on the other side of the septic system. He
124 agreed that the parking area behind the Church will change how the water will flow. But, as a
125 whole, the parking lot will be a large, flat surface that will differ in permeability from the natural
126 landscape. People who don't live in this area need to understand that the water flow on the hill,
127 starting at Meetinghouse Road and down, is quite excessive. He also said that he was more
128 concerned about aesthetics than he was about the drainage, and asked about the setback
129 requirements for the Rural District. Ms. McEwen brought out the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning
130 Board was not sure if a parking lot can go directly up to property line.

131 Ms. McEwen asked if the main issue for the water that currently exists is the flow of the water
132 from the State's catch basin. Mr. Burnside confirms that this is the case, but the New Hampshire
133 Department of Transportation wanted the applicants to extend the culvert of their catch basin, and
134 to pave an apron on the entrance to the parking lot.

135 Mr. Demers said that if the abutters extended the culvert of the existing catch basin, it would
136 extend right into the LaBree/Houghton property that is south of the Stone Church property. Mr.
137 Burnside noted that it would still discharge into the same seasonal streambed.

138 Vice Chair Cahoon asked if planting vegetation would help the water issue. Mr. Goldthwaite said
139 that the fill slope may be a place where they can put more vegetation. Mr. Burnside outlined the
140 path of current water flow. Vice Chair Cahoon asked if more shrubbery could soak up the water
141 that is heading through that area.

142 Mrs. Rosansky, representing herself as a property abutter and not a Board member, asked what
143 the applicants are doing to the drainage. Mr. Burnside explained the intent of establishing gradual
144 trench drains. Mrs. Rosansky explained that this would be a problem because the culvert in the
145 area of the gradual trench drains doesn't work, and the run-off flows onto her property. Mr.
146 Burnside noted that Jim Rymes has called multiple times to take care of drainage issues that she
147 had addressed. Mrs. Rosansky went on to say that it would then appear to be that the lack of a
148 functioning culvert in that area is a big reason behind why all of the abutting properties receive
149 such a high amount of run-off. She asked whether planned drainage be sufficient if there was

150 double the current volume of water. Mr. Burnside said that it will match the existent swale. The
151 bigger problem lies within the fact that the catch basin in question is owned by the State.

152 Mr. Burnside said that the unfortunate thing is there is not enough parking for Church. Attendees
153 used to park on the State road, but can't do that anymore. They could put the lot in the field
154 above the Church, but nobody wants to see that. There are limited options. It's the Foundation's
155 right to put in parking for the Church. The swale and the new catch basin will help mitigate
156 concerns of runoff, but they cannot do anything about existing, natural drainage shed. It is the
157 applicant's intent to keep it as close to what is already there.

158 Mr. MacDonald asked to what degree can it be done where, after the fact, if the water does not
159 behave as expected, can the property owners retroactively fix where the water goes? Can
160 intervention happen later in the process?

161 Mr. Burnside confirmed that future intervention is possible, but how do you prove that something
162 that is already this wet was caused by the Church's redesign of the drainage? How will you know
163 they aren't just blaming any water increase on this initial project? He added that they could design
164 a leach basin which will precipitate more into the groundwater than the currently proposed catch
165 basin. There are no other structures proposed to collect water. The underlying soil is glacial till,
166 which is claylike, and not very permeable to begin with, so there are only so many things to try.

167 Mr. Rosansky, an abutter, asked of the ramifications of someone building a structure in the future.
168 Mrs. Rosansky added that there may be issues if Jim Rymes tries to ever sell the lot north of
169 Church building. Mr. Burnside notes that the Rymes' gave access to their abutting property as
170 well for surveying purposes.

171 Ms. Houghton asked why the parking lot can't be on the northern side of the Church. Mr.
172 Burnside noted that the lot line adjustment makes the northern side part of the Rymes' other lot
173 (Tax Map 28, 27), and that a parking lot in this location would affect aesthetics.

174 Mr. Demers asked if there was a way to reduce parking lot minimums and noted his concern
175 about increased light pollution. Mrs. Anne Truslow, an abutter, asked why they need to max out
176 the capacity of the Church to 120 seats. Chair Condon stated it is not for the Planning Board to
177 tell the Church that they cannot calculate parking spaces based on their maximum capacity. Ms.
178 McEwen noted that historically, the Church was used for weddings, and other large events. It isn't
179 fair to say they have to have less than what the current Town zoning permits/requires.

180 Mrs. Rosansky spoke in favor of the application. Overall, she doesn't have a problem with a
181 parking lot and thinks it is good that the Church property is being used for its intended purpose.

182 Ms. Truslow inquired about the level of excavation that will be happening in order to regrade the
183 hill to the west of the Church. Mr. Burnside noted the use of an eight percent slope. They are just
184 excavating top soil and organics. An eight percent grade is steep for a parking lot, but there is not
185 much they can do with this site to improve the current situation.

186 Ms. Truslow asked for more details on the retaining wall and the gradient of the back parking lot.
187 Mr. Burnside said they wanted to get something a little flatter so people don't get stuck.

188 Ms. Truslow stated Clinton Road is completely eroded. She worries that more water is going to go
189 into the drainage, and because that system is already in place, it may be overwhelmed with any
190 more development. She asked if the flow could be monitored, as it could create more streams
191 going down the side.

192 Mr. Demers expressed concern on the removal of a few large trees on the development, that
193 needed to be removed for a better line of vision for cars entering and exiting the parking lot. The
194 removal of those trees also gives his property a direct view of the mountains, and he is worried if
195 this will play a role in increased taxation for "view tax."

196 Ms. Truslow noted that the Church has been in use for quite some time now, and the process on
197 notifying property abutters of increased activity could have been better. To her, it does feel like a
198 commercial use is right next door. The lighting that has been installed is extraordinarily bright.
199 The little bit of woods she has between properties is now an important wildlife corridor. She likes

200 that the building is in use, but there is an impact. It very much feels like there is a commercial use
201 in a rural neighborhood. Chair Condon noted that the Planning Board does have a lighting
202 ordinance, which can be a matter that gets looked into separately from the application in
203 question.

204 Rick Davis, who was representing the Stone Church, mentioned more about the activity of the
205 Church. There are bible studies held on Monday and Wednesday nights, and youth group on
206 Friday's. Nighttime activities run between 6-8 PM, and usually host 12 to 15 people. The lighting
207 issue is one that can be addressed.

208 Ms. McEwen asked about which areas of the proposed lot would be better areas to park for
209 nighttime use and if the back parking lot be better as opposed to side parking. Mr. Demers
210 responded that the difference would just mean light will be shining in other abutters' property
211 instead of his.

212 Richard Guillemette asked if there will be more water than there is now and will it affect the
213 LaBree/Houghton and Truslow property. Mr. Goldthwaite responded that it would not affect them
214 adversely.

215 Ms. Houghton asked for clarification on a suggestion made that she should give some land to the
216 Church for the parking lot. Mr. Burnside clarified that her land was too low, and they wouldn't be
217 able to do anything with it. It is too far into the wetlands, and he doesn't think the State would ever
218 approve it. It was just a thought.

219 Mr. Demers stated that he thinks what Rick has done with the Church is a wonderful thing,
220 especially for the aesthetics to the Town he calls home. It's just a change. As long as the lines of
221 communication are open, we can make this a great thing. The brook flow is pretty persistent. All
222 that runoff is going to flow into the brook, which is what it does today.

223 Ms. Liz Robertson, a neighbor, stated that if there is any way to make the drainage flow more
224 easterly, it should be done.

225 Mr. Burnside closed with a statement outlining that the watershed stays the same, and the
226 volume of water stays the same. The velocity will just change throughout the property. The
227 addition of a stone line flair will reduce that velocity significantly.

228 At 8:26 PM, Chair Condon closed the Hearing for public input.

229 **Deliberation**

230 Ms. McEwen stated that one of the main issues of concern was increased water flow onto the
231 Houghton/LaBree property. She wanted possible solutions to this, along the lines of a leach
232 basin, or vegetation to where the water settles. She offered that the vegetation could be in the
233 form of a blueberry bush. She said that the applicants can't be expected to remedy a condition
234 that already exists. In regards to the impact on neighbors, she inquired about how much of a
235 vegetation barrier the applicants were planning on retaining. Mr. Burnside said that the State is
236 having them shave back vegetation for visibility purposes, but there should be 15 feet of mature
237 trees on the southern property line that is shared with the Houghton/Labree's.

238 Ms. McEwen wanted to know if reducing parking spaces was plausible on the top section to
239 accommodate for exposure concerns.

240 Mr. MacDonald added that he was at the Candidate's night last night at the Grange. There was
241 no parking. At some point, there will be plans to try to redo that building as well. There needs to
242 be a condition to the application that shows that they have a plan in place for future development
243 in the area that may affect future drainage issue that they haven't currently planned for. There
244 needs to be outlined plans in place that will help mitigate future issues if things don't go
245 accordingly. Mr. Burnside interjected that the only problem is that you need to have a baseline.
246 He doesn't know how one would establish that line in this situation.

247 Vice Chair Cahoon asked if a continuous maintenance improvement plan was to be filed. Mr.
248 Burnside that would not be an issue. Mr. MacDonald said that a maintenance plan meets the
249 intent of his concern.

250 Mr. Holmes said he doesn't feel comfortable that a drainage plan would be done on the other
251 property (Tax Map 228, Lot 27). What if Mr. Rymes sells his property? Mr. Burnside said he will
252 ask for a drainage easement/permit.

253 Ms. McEwen mentioned that the application is still subject to State approval of the Wetlands
254 Permit. The lighting issue will be an issue separate from this application.

255 Chair Condon asked for motions for the conditions that must be met in order to accept
256 application.

257 **Motion:** Holmes moved to require a leaching basin/Macdonald seconded.

258 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

259 **Motion:** Vice Chair Cahoon made a motion concerning the addition of vegetation, such as wild
260 blueberry bushes, etc. meeting the needs of a "wetlands seed mix" for the wetlands areas and
261 areas along the retaining wall of the property in question to improve quality of drainage. This
262 vegetation must be made up of native plants only. Ex-officio Johnson seconded.

263 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

264 **Motion:** Ms. McEwen moved to have the NHDES Wetlands permit's acceptance be a condition of
265 this application. MacDonald seconded.

266 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

267 **Motion:** Mr. MacDonald moved to require a maintenance plan, including an outline of swales,
268 catch basins, the stone line, and interceptor drain. An update will be provided as needed. Vice
269 Chair Cahoon seconded.

270 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

271 **Motion:** Holmes moved to require a drainage easement on the abutting property, defined as Tax
272 Map 228, Lot 27. Cahoon seconded.

273 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

274 **Discussion:** Ms. McEwen thought the initial motion that outlines the wetlands requirements
275 needs more clarification so it can also specify a 10-foot setback for a vegetation buffer, which is
276 currently required in the Rural District's regulations. Chair Condon was willing to accept a new
277 motion in hopes to clarify this condition.

278 **Motion:** McEwen moved to ensure that there is a ten foot setback from the parking lot on the
279 boundary line that is shared with 217 Clinton Rd (Tax Map 228, Lot 25). In that setback there has
280 to be a vegetation buffer created or existing. Vice Chair Cahoon seconded.

281 **Discussion:** Mr. Burnside noted that if that condition needs to be met, one parking space will be
282 lost. Chair Condon responds by adding that this condition will actually put them within the
283 requirements of the existing Zoning Ordinance, so that would need to be followed or else the
284 plans would be in violation by a different statute.

285 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all agreed.

286 **Discussion:** Mr. MacDonald stated that everybody needs to work together here. There is
287 intention on both sides. This puts a lot of pressure on the Board in order to balance the needs of
288 all parties involved.

289 **Motion:** MacDonald made a motion to approve the application as written with amendments.
290 Cahoon seconded.

291 **Roll call vote:** John Robertson - "Aye." Bob Holmes – "Aye." Jeanne Cahoon –"Aye." Janet
292 McEwen – "Aye." Steve MacDonald – "Aye." Chris Condon – "Aye."

293 The application for a Minor Site Plan Review of the Stone Church property (Tax Map 228, Lot 28)
294 and a subsequent lot line adjustment between the aforementioned property with the easterly
295 abutting property line of Tax Map 228, Lot 27 was approved by the Antrim Planning Board, given
296 that all of the conditions specified in the aforementioned motions are met.

297

298 **Business Meeting**

299 Chair Condon begins the business meeting portion of the evening at 8:57 PM. Mrs. Rosansky
300 joins the Planning Board as a member for this portion of the meeting.

301 **I. Minutes:**

302 **Motion:** Mr. Holmes moved to read the minutes from March 15th, 2018 for approval, seconded by
303 Ms. McEwen.

304 **Discussion:** Ms. McEwen clarified wording on lines 58-60. She was addressing the location of
305 the septic, but nobody was actually submitting a septic plan.

306 Mr. MacDonald will offer services as alternate. Victor may be able to be an alternate.

307 **Motion:** Mr. Macdonald moved to accept minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Holmes.

308 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all Board members agreed.

309 **II. Survey**

310 Planning Board accepts the survey for distribution through mail, e-mail, and website posting. Ms.
311 McEwen volunteered to hand out the surveys at Town Meeting.

312 **Motion:** Ms. McEwen moved to make the survey available at Town elections and Town Meeting
313 for people to fill out. Someone should ask the moderator, Arthur Merrill, if it is acceptable for PB to
314 be present to hand out surveys at the exit route. Vice Chair Cahoon seconds the motion.

315 **Vote:** All Board members voted "aye," except Mr. Holmes. He said that the Board is mailing it out
316 anyways, it is not necessary.

317 **III. Additional Business:**

318 The website calendar needs to be updated so it no longer shows that there will be another March
319 meeting. The Planning Board will not meet again until April 5th, 2018. The next meeting will be the
320 first with newly elected Board members, so materials need to be prepared for them.

321

322 **Adjournment:**

323 **Motion:** Vice Chair Cahoon made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Robertson.

324 There was no discussion.

325 **Vote:** By a voice vote, all Board members agreed.

326

327 Meeting adjourned: 9:14 PM

328

329 Respectfully Submitted,

330 Kristin Bixby

331 *Assistant to Land Use Boards*

Addendum I:**STAFF
REPORT**

TO: Antrim Planning Board
DATE: February 12, 2018
RE: Stone Church Application

This application proposes to adjust a boundary line between two lots, and at the same time present a Minor Site Plan Review. The proposal deals with the Stone Church on Clinton Road, which has recently begun to be used for religious services again. The purpose of the lot line adjustment is to provide additional area that is necessary to create parking for the use. The existing lot on which the church sits does not have the area needed for parking.

The property is located in the Rural District, where churches are a permitted use. The lot does not meet the minimum lot size required for the district, but it is a pre-existing legal lot of record; the lot line adjustment will, however, make this lot larger.

I have reviewed the checklist submitted by the applicant, and found all of the submission items required for a lot line adjustment to be met. In addition, all of the submission requirements for a Minor Site Plan Review have been met as well, with the exception of #'s 6, 7, 8, 11 and 13, which the applicant indicates are not relevant, and I agree with that assessment. This proposal did receive a preliminary conceptual consultation with the Board and a site visit in July. The Board concluded at that time that, while the proposal did not rise to the level of a Major Site Plan Review, there was other information that would be necessary to address specific concerns, such as erosion control for the new parking area. Those data have been provided on the submitted plans and include the parking layout, snow storage, erosion control measures, and construction details. There is a proposed @2,000 square-foot disturbance to the wetlands, for which the applicant is applying for an expedited minimum impact permit. That issue should be ready to be discussed at the public hearing.

In my opinion, this application meets the submission requirements necessary for the Board to vote to accept the application as complete and then move into public hearing on the merits of the proposal.

If you have any questions or comments about this review, please do not hesitate to contact me.