

**MINUTES  
CHARLESTOWN PLANNING BOARD  
JULY 5, 2016**

Members Present: Robert Frizzell (Chair); Sharon Francis (Vice-Chair); John Bruno, Thomas Cobb (ex-officio); Richard Lincourt, Douglas Neill, Rose Smith-Hull

Alternates Present: James Jenkins, Duane Wetherby

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 advised that meetings are recorded and asked that anyone wishing to speak identify themselves for the record. Mr. Frizzell advised that the full Board is present therefore there is no need to call upon alternate members.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2016:**

**Mrs. Smith-Hull moved to approve the Minutes of the June 21, 2016, Planning Board meeting, as presented. Mr. Lincourt seconded the motion with the following change: Page 1, under “Fisher”, sixth line, change “abutters” to “abutter’s” well. With all in favor, the Minutes and change were approved.**

**JAYSON DUNBAR, cont’d – Four (4) Unit Multi-Family Dwelling – SE Corner of Main Street & Paris Avenue –Map 119, Lot 26– Zone A (Town Center Residential/Professional):** Mr. Edkins had included in their packets a copy of an email he received from Michael J. Petrovick, AIA, Architect, advising that Mr. Dunbar has been away. Once he has made a decision either Mr. Dunbar or Mr. Petrovick will contact Mr. Edkins to schedule a meeting with the PB. Mr. Edkins suggested that if they do not have something definitive at the next meeting he will let them know that the PB might reject this application as incomplete and they will have to start over.

**Mr. Bruno moved to postpone the Jayson Dunbar application until the next meeting on July 19, 2016. Seconded by Mr. Lincourt. With seven members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**ARTHUR & ADA LUFKIN – Voluntary Merger of Existing Parcels – 63 Bridge Street – Map 117, Lot 17 (Parcels 2 & 3) – Zone E (Mixed Use):** Mr. Edkins advised that Arthur & Ada Lufkin own the property on the corner of Bridge Street and Northwest Street. In their Deed it is described as three separate parcels. A copy of their Deed was enclosed in the packets. There is a Statute, RSA 674:39-aa that says “if adjacent parcels of land are merged by the town without the consent or knowledge of the current owners or the former owners they have the right to petition the Selectboard to unmerge those lots.” Mr. and Mrs. Lufkin did petition the Selectboard to unmerge the lots and the Selectboard did agree to unmerge those three lots. They

are now three separate lots of record. There is no record of them voluntarily being merged. Now that the three lots have been unmerged Mr. and Mrs. Lufkin would like to merge lots 2 & 3 back together again so they have one building lot. Statute RSA 674:39-aa became effective in 2005; it actually expires at the end of this year and will no longer exist unless the legislature votes to continue it. The governing body has the right to unmerge lots. The Statute requires the town to post notice of its existence; it is included on page 9 of the Town Report and posted on the Town bulletin boards. Their Deed description is relatively easy to follow.

**Mr. Cobb moved to accept this Voluntary Merger of Existing Parcels for Arthur and Ada Lufkin, as presented. Seconded by Mrs. Smith-Hull. With seven members in favor, the motion was approved.**

**RICK & ROBIE'S PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC – Add 36' x 40' Garage with Apartment Above to Existing 6 Unit Apartment Building – 806 Old Claremont Road – Map 106, Lot 8 – Zone E (Mixed Use):** Mr. Edkins reported that Mr. Fortier first came to the Town Building Inspector for a Building Permit for a garage with an apartment over it. The Town's regulations do not allow for separate dwellings on the same lot therefore he asked Mr. Fortier to come in for a Site Plan Review. If the garage is to have an apartment over head (second floor) it needs to be physically connected to the house/main building. If it was just for a garage the Building Permit would have issued. Mr. Fortier pointed out that the two structures will be connected into the existing Town water and sewer lines on this lot. Mrs. Smith-Hull pointed out that there are no abutters' names on the plan. Mr. Edkins noted that historically they have not required names of abutters on the plans but they could be added. All adjacent parcels are on the plan. Replying to a question from Mr. Frizzell about the number of abutters who were notified, Mr. Edkins said four abutters were notified by certified mail; two parcels are owned by the same person. Responding to a question, Mr. Fortier said the breezeway will be covered.

Mrs. Francis asked if the Town has other breezeways connecting two dwellings and, if so, where. Mr. Edkins said one is on the Old Claremont Road (connecting two mobile homes) and there is one on South Main Street. Mr. Frizzell mentioned one by Putnam Farms. Mr. Edkins pointed out that this is before the PB because it is a 6 unit apartment building. They might not see this if it was a two unit dwelling because two-family dwellings are permitted by right. Mrs. Francis asked where the parking is for the six-unit building and the proposed apartment above the garage. Mr. Fortier responded that all the tenants have parking spaces; there is parking on both sides of the dwelling. Mrs. Francis asked if the breezeway connects to doors on both ends. Mr. Fortier explained that it is just attached to the buildings. Mr. Cobb said the regulations say it has to be attached; it does not say how it has to be attached. Mr. Edkins noted that some of these questions are for Building Permits and not the Planning Board. There was discussion relative to two mobile homes being connected by a breezeway but they were both single family dwellings. Mrs. Francis said this is a good sized lot so there is room for two lots. Mr. Edkins talked about this with Mr. Fortier. He has 150-feet of frontage; he could have a back lot with adequate frontage; that is a possibility. Mr. Cobb noted that Mr. Fortier is meeting the regulations for two dwelling structures provided they are connected.

Mr. Edkins explained that they used to allow two separate dwellings on the same lot but it got to be a problem because it was intended for a family member to live in the second unit however if

the family member no longer lived there then people wanted to start renting them. In about 2003 when the Board revised the subdivision regulations they removed those provisions. Properties had to be subdividable. There is a new State statute that states the towns have to allow accessory buildings. It does not affect Charlestown because they allow two-family dwellings but there are many towns in New Hampshire where this would have an impact. Charlestown only allows single dwellings in the Water Shed area so it might affect that zone.

Mr. Bruno mentioned there is another driveway and another structure on the site. Will it meet the set-backs? Mr. Edkins said there is a side set-back requirement of 10-feet. Mr. Bruno feels the site plan needs to show more; the roads are not identified, where is there parking for the tenants, the second driveway should be shown. Therefore he feels it is not a complete site plan. Mr. Frizzell mentioned that this looks like it is a separate business so it should be on a separate lot; the breezeway goes nowhere. Following a discussion, Mr. Edkins pointed out that they might not find the rule in the regulations with reference to connections. Mr. Bruno feels the rules do not define what a connection is; he does not feel utilities are a connection. Mr. Fortier said he could build a four-foot walkway with a roof over it. The garage is for him to put his property management equipment in; it is what he needs for this property. It is not for his business. He also has two trucks and two cars. *Ms. Chaffee, alternate member, came into the meeting.* Mrs. Francis feels this is separate from the six-unit apartment building. There is enough room to subdivide this into two lots. Mr. Cobb would not be happy if someone told him he would have to spend a considerable amount of money to do a subdivision. Mr. Frizzell pointed out that no abutters were present at this meeting. Mr. Edkins did not have any abutters contact him in the office. Because there was discussion about indicating the abutters' names on the plan, Mr. Edkins asked if the PB members would like him to include the list the applicants submit in their packets. There was a general consensus that this was not necessary.

**Mr. Bruno moved that in order to deem this Site Plan application as complete there should be more detail on the Site Plan to show all existing driveways, set-backs, other structures on the property, parking areas, road names, address of the lot on the plan so it can be located. Seconded by Mrs. Smith-Hull. With seven members in favor, the motion was approved.**

Mrs. Francis asked Mr. Edkins to start making a list of regulatory items that they should consider for clarification for next year.

**PLANNING & POLICY ISSUES:** Mr. Edkins had no new Planning and/or Policy issues.

**ADMINISTRATION & CORRESPONDENCE:** Mr. Edkins had no Administration or Correspondence to come before the PB at this meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**There being no other business, Mrs. Smith-Hull moved to adjourn this meeting. Seconded by Mrs. Francis. With seven members in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:56 PM.**

**Charlestown Planning Board Minutes – July 5, 2016 – Page 4**

Respectfully submitted,  
Regina Borden, Recording Secretary

Filed: 7-12-16

**(Note:** These are unapproved Minutes. Any corrections will be found in the Minutes of the July 19, 2016, Planning Board meeting.)