

**MINUTES
CHARLESTOWN PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 1, 2011**

Members Present: Robert Frizzell (Chair); Sharon Francis (Vice-Chair); Steve Neill (Ex-Officio); Andy Jellie, Eric Lutz, Pat Royce

Alternates Present: None

Staff Present: David Edkins – Planning & Zoning Administrator
Regina Borden – Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER & SEATING OF ALTERNATES: Mr. Frizzell called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He noted the absence of regular member Roger Thibodeau and alternate members Herb Greenwood and Jim Jenkins; there were no alternate members present to seat on the board.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 18, 2011:

This was passed over and will be an Agenda item for the next meeting due to the fact that a quorum of members who attended that meeting were not present at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 2011:

Mrs. Francis moved to approve the Minutes of the February 15, 2011, meeting as printed. Mrs. Royce seconded the motion. With five members in favor, the Minutes were approved.

VICKI FISK – Preliminary Consultation on a Potential Two Lot Subdivision – 37 No. Hemlock Road – Map 228, Lot 1 – Zone E (Mixed Use): Mr. Edkins advised that Hal Wilkins, who was to make this preliminary consultation, phoned in to say he was out of town and would not be able to make it back in time for this meeting.

ERIC F. FLAIG; CONNECTICUT VALLEY AUTO, LLC; DANIEL & CAROL McSHANE – Preliminary Consultation on a Potential Boundary Adjustment Among Three Existing Lots – Calavant Hill Road – Map 205, Lots 32, 33, & 34 – Zone E (Mixed Use): Tom Dombroski, surveyor, presented a revised plan that he feels will be a solution to this boundary adjustment situation. Mr. Edkins distributed copies of the February 2009 plan that was approved at that time for boundary adjustments to four different lots. The plans were signed and recorded but the Deeds were not passed. The 50-foot strip used to go through the Eric Flaig house so when they did the boundary adjustment they moved that strip over but when they did that it left Daniel and Carol McShane without enough frontage to subdivide so they could have a back lot; therefore they never passed Deeds to make that happen. Now Mr. Dombroski is proposing to start that 50-foot strip back to where it was but he is jogging it over so that McShane gets their full 250-feet of frontage back. Mr. Frizzell requested that something be written so that if

the Town needed ownership of that strip of land for a road in the future they could have frontage back there. Mr. Dombroski felt that could be a stipulation. It could be addressed with the McShane subdivision.

Mr. Dombroski noted that after this boundary adjustment was made he would be bringing in a plan for a subdivision for a back lot for Daniel and Carol McShane using the frontage on the north side of the lot. He presented this plan. Mr. Edkins noted that if the PB were to allow this to happen now it could be with the understanding that the little triangle would become a part of the right-of-way in the future. Mr. Dombroski felt the stipulation would be only if it became a Town road and that would give McShane frontage on the Town road. This property does not have municipal water or sewer. This would require two separate applications but they could both be on the agenda for the same meeting. There was a consensus that this appears to work.

PLANNING & POLICY ISSUES:

Subdivision Regulations: Mr. Frizzell advised that two weeks ago the PB agreed to work on item Nos. 1, 3 and 4 in Larry Crocker's e-mail to them.

Mrs. Francis referenced the Subdivision Regulations, No. 4.5.2, which has the various things that the plot shall show. No. 18 is the topo map. They could add a No. 19 (4.5.2.19) "A Natural Resources map of the site based on the Charlestown Natural Resources Inventory and the NH Shoreland Protection Act that depicts wetlands, vernal pools, riparian areas, wildlife and rare plant habitat, rock outcrops, historic features and that indicates where natural resources will be preserved on the site as part of the proposed subdivision." The applicant would have to do the map and show the PB what they propose to do. They would have to identify the natural resources and indicate what they think should be preserved; the applicant and PB could then negotiate. Mr. Edkins felt it needs to be tightened up if it is going to be a regulatory kind of structure. His question is when they talk about wildlife habitat just about every place in NH has wildlife. There are various maps in the Conservation Commission (CC) Inventory that single out deer yards and high value habitat. They would need a better map as all the high value habitat and roads are marked in red. The map does not indicate wildlife corridors; if they are going to regulate them they have to know where they are. The sightings and crossings are anecdotal. Are we saying that the PB is going to regulate everything that is in color on this map which is substantial or are they going to say it is the high value habitat. They would have to be pretty precise on what they will regulate. Mr. McClammer felt they have to identify the high value habitat as some wildlife is everywhere. Mrs. Francis said that Mr. Crocker's suggestion to involve the CC by having them review all major subdivisions would be time consuming but the PB could send them a copy of applications and seek their advice as they are probably familiar with the areas. Mr. Crocker noted that it is his intent that this is a part of the review process. It needs to be a part of the thought process. Mr. Edkins noted that the shoreline limitations map indicates the Little Sugar River, Connecticut River, Clay Brook and Jade Meadow Brook. They could ask the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Region Planning Commission to print another map to take off some lines and areas so they could see the high value habitat more clearly.

Mr. Edkins pointed out that 4.5.2 includes all the information that is required in an application; 4.5.3 spells out additional information that can be required but it is not a part of the initial application. Maybe major subdivision applications just need to be looked at a little more thoroughly. Mr. Crocker is asking that there be a review process in place to bring it to the PB attention. Mr. Edkins is wondering what it would take to make it easier for the applicant to provide them with this information, maybe with overlays on the tax maps, but how do they put that in writing.

Mr. Edkins noted that Mr. Neill has expressed concern for quite some time now about Site Plans, Subdivisions and Building Permits not getting enough review by the various departments before coming before the PB. He tries to run applications that come in by some of them so they can get their comments in but the process needs to be formalized more. Mr. Neill feels everybody should know what is going on. There needs to be some general input. Maybe have a “technical committee”. Mr. Edkins said information needs to be received in a timely manner. He needs to work out the mechanics.

Mr. Edkins noted that they did not work on Mr. Crocker’s recommendation for Riparian Buffers to be increased at stream crossings. This would need to be put into the regulations. He will work on this and report back at the next meeting.

Mr. Edkins mentioned that the Zoning Ordinance has a provision under 8.4.8 for buffers that requires a 25-foot for residential uses and 50-foot for business/industrial uses. He read this section including the exemptions. Mr. Crocker feels that the area approaching a bridge needs to be wider. Mrs. Royce suggested looking at the subdivisions over the past 2-or-3 years to see what impact that would have if there was a 300-foot buffer. Mrs. Francis would prefer not having a fixed “one size fits all” because each site has characteristics depending on soils, slopes and wildlife corridors. Mr. Edkins will work on the language that Mrs. Francis introduced except for riparian buffers.

ADMINISTRATION and CORRESPONDENCE:

Ralph’s Supermarket LLC, Gary Stoddard, Mbr, DBA Emma’s Market and Deli: Mr. Edkins distributed copies of the letter received from the NH Liquor Commission notifying the Town that Gary Stoddard has made an application to them for a Combination bev/wine/tobacco liquor license. This establishment is located at 741 Old Claremont Road.

Department of Transportation: Mr. Edkins attended a Local Government Center meeting a week ago and they had a presentation from George Campbell, Commissioner of the DOT. NH residents have been paying a \$30.00 surcharge on their vehicle registrations but it is scheduled to “sunset” on June 30th. The Commissioner distributed a list of the Ten Year Plan projects that would be dropped if this surcharge expires. This includes the Route 12 project from South Charlestown to North Walpole. We need to protect this project. If the State’s matching funds are not there they will lose the Federal dollars. Mrs. Francis suggested that a meeting be scheduled to develop a strategy. Mr. McClammer feels they need to make sure that they stress how important this is. Mr. Edkins will discuss this with the Selectboard tomorrow night. .

Charlestown Planning Board Meeting – March 1, 2011 – Page 4

Expired Term: Mr. Edkins reported that this is Eric Lutz's last meeting. Hopefully, he will consider being appointed as an Alternate Member.

Next Meeting: There are no new applications for the next meeting on Tuesday, March 15th, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no other business, Mr. Neill moved for adjournment. Mr. Lutz seconded the motion, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 8:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Regina Borden, Recording Secretary

Minutes Filed: 3-4-11

(Note: These are unapproved minutes. Correction, if necessary, will be found in the minutes of the March 15, 2011, Planning Board meeting.)