

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

1 A meeting of the Planning Board was held on Tuesday, January 3, 2017 at the
2 Hampstead Town Hall, 11 Main Street, Hampstead, NH.
3 The meeting was broadcast live over HCTV 17.
4

5 **PRESENT:** Paul Carideo, Chairman, Ben Schmitz, Vice Chairman, Neil Emerson,
6 Dean Howard, Robert Waldron, Glen Emerson, Chad Bennett (Ex-Officio) and Scott
7 Bourcier (Dubois and King)
8

9 **Old Business**

10 *Continued Public Hearings (from 12.05.16)*

11 **1. 02-037 John Thompson Subdivision (366 Main Street)**

12 R. Waldron stepped down from the discussion due to a conflict with the project.
13 Jim Lavelle of James M. Lavelle Surveyors, LLC presented a new plan set along with
14 the soil calculations. The new plan shows a 2-lot subdivision along Main Street
15 with the 1st lot being 1.42 acres with 186.76 feet of frontage. The second parcel
16 will have 75 feet of frontage (variance granted) and be 1.08 acres (47,111 sq. ft.)
17 He noted that there is also a variance to the soil zoning which restricts the new
18 home to 3 bedrooms. The revised plan shows the property line to the edge of
19 Old Derry Road/Fire Lane 1. He noted that they have the State DOT driveway
20 permit and subdivision approval. Chairman Carideo asked if the numbers on the
21 soil calculations match the plan. J. Lavelle responded that they did. He broke out
22 the soil calculations to show how much is there without the use of the old road
23 (Old Derry Road/Fire Lane 1) and with the use of the old road (Old Derry Road/Fire
24 Lane 1). The line shows the property boundaries to the stonewall. There was a
25 request from Town Council to remove note #10 on the plan that states an
26 easement will be given to the Town of Hampstead. J. Lavelle stated that he
27 would delete the note. J. Lavelle asked if the Planning Board would consider
28 granting their approval based on Note 10 being deleted, the marking of the
29 monuments, and the Engineering review of the soil calculations. There was
30 discussion about adding a new note 10 to the plan regarding the preservation of
31 the stonewall along the old road (Old Derry Road/Fire Lane 1). The wall is on the
32 North side of the property and should not be removed. J. Lavelle will add the
33 reference to the Stonewall ordinance from 2014 as note #10.
34

35 **MOTION: D. Howard motioned to grant conditional approval for Map 02-037,**
36 **John Thompson Subdivision with the following conditions:**

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

1. Remove Note #10 regarding easement to Town

2. Set Required monuments

3. Town Engineer review of soil calculations by lot size

4. New Note 10 is to state that the stonewall on the north side of the property will be preserved and any changes to the wall must comply with the Stonewall Ordinance.

The conditional approval is for 90 days (4/3/17).

SECOND by B. Schmitz

VOTE ON MOTION: 6-0

R. Waldron stepped back to the board.

2. 06-019- DHT Sports Trust Site Plan (142 Route 111)

A request had been submitted to the Planning Board asking to continue the public hearing by DHT Sports Realty Trust to the March 2017 meeting. In the letter, it was stated that they have hired a new consultants to handle their proposal and are applying for the state permits. There was discussion amongst the members as to how many times they should allow a continuance. It was noted that there was some concern that with a new consultant, there could be a new plan, and that the new consultant would need to be notified as per RSA if his stamp is on a revised plan. It was agreed the best option was to deny the continuance and to reject the application as incomplete. The plan brought in was a basic plan with no stamps on the plan such as an Engineer's stamp. They discussed whether they should review it with Town Counsel but ultimately agreed to deny the request for continuation and to reject the application as incomplete.

MOTION: R. Waldron- Motion to deny the request for a continuance by DHT Sports Realty Trust, Map 06-019, 142 Route 111

SECOND by D. Howard

VOTE ON MOTION: 6-1

MOTION: N. Emerson-Motion to deny the application of DHT Sports Realty Trust, Map 06-019, 142 Route 111, as being incomplete as submitted.

SECOND by D. Howard

VOTE ON MOTION 6-1

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

72 3. 09-060- Hastings Drive Subdivision, Maison Belle, LLC (Hastings Dr. /Kent Farm Rd)

73 Chairman Carideo stepped down from this hearing due to a work conflict and
74 Vice Chairman, Ben Schmitz stepped in as Chair.

75 Dave Jordan of MHF Design represented the owner of Maison Belle, LLC. He went
76 over the plan and stated that it was the same plan that was presented, and
77 discussed at the meeting in November. There were a couple of revisions at that
78 time based on comments from the department head review. Mr. Jordan stated
79 that they would give a conveyance to the Hartungs to allow them access to reach
80 their driveway over the dirt road. The remainder of the dirt road will not be in
81 the conveyance. Mr. Jordan mentioned that there had been a site walk taken by
82 some of the committee members. He stated that they looked into more detail
83 on the extension of the water line by Hampstead Area Water Company (HAWC)
84 down Hastings to each lot. Mr. Jordan also stated that there were concerns from
85 the abutters about what the duplex homes would look like so he presented
86 pictures from a few of the current duplex homes built by Maison Belle, LLC, the
87 developer. He explained that they will be about 2300 square feet with 3
88 bedrooms on each side. A lot of the final information on the duplex will be
89 based on when the approval happens and the market conditions.
90 He noted that they have filed for a dredge and fill permit and are working with
91 the State of NH Department of Environmental Services (DES), and are expecting
92 their permit within the next 30 days.

93
94 Mr. Jordan had been sent a copy the engineering review done by Scott Bourcier
95 of Dubois & King. There was a note on the review letter regarding the request
96 for a waiver on the site distance for lots 4/5 and 6/7. In the request for waiver,
97 there was a reference to American Association of State Highway and
98 Transportation Officials (AASHTO) to support a shorter distance length. Mr.
99 Bourcier disagreed with the reference to the AASHTO case "B" intersection.
100 N. Emerson asked what the sight distance was on the lots. D. Howard responded
101 that it varied 200 feet to 400 feet. Mr. Jordan stated that on lot 1 it is 400 feet
102 with 280 feet to Kent Farm Road; lots 2/3 it is 400 feet to Kent Farm Road and 320
103 feet down; lots 4/5 it is 340 feet and 288 feet to Kent Farm Road; lots 6/7 it is 200
104 feet in both directions. Mr. Jordan also noted that the homes on the other side
105 of Hastings have only one lot meeting the sight distance requirements. N.

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

106 Emerson asked what the speed limit was on Hastings Drive. It was noted in
107 response that unless posted otherwise, the speed limit is 30 M.P.H.

108
109 B. Schmitz stated that the lots are getting close to 400 feet except for lot 6.
110 R. Waldron asked whether they would be looking at duplexes actually being
111 condex. He noted his concern that if they were built as duplex units and then
112 later became condex they would need to come back to the Planning Board. He
113 suggested that if they are declared at the start to be condo's and the condo
114 documents are submitted it would be easier and make them associations of 2 (for
115 two unit owners) Mr. Jordan stated that they could do that.

116
117 B. Schmitz noted that there was a request for a waiver regarding Section II-2:9 of
118 the Hampstead Zoning Ordinance. B. Schmitz read the 4 conditions under
119 Conditional Uses. Mr. Jordan read the letter of waiver requests dated 12/2/2016 as
120 submitted to the Planning Board. B. Schmitz stated that he had a concern with
121 four crossings over the wetland and was looking more at the crossings over lots
122 4/5 and 6/7. He asked Mr. Jordan if the driveway over lots 4/5 could be extended
123 as an access point for lots 6/7 and eliminate one crossing. Mr. Jordan responded
124 that he didn't have an issue as long as the Fire Department had no issues, which
125 he didn't anticipate as an issue. He stated that they would explore this as an
126 option if the Board gave them that direction.

127
128 Mr. Kuhl of 5 Hastings Drive said that he shared some of the confusion regarding
129 the duplexes. He has seen that 2 Hastings Drive is being marketed as a single
130 family home for \$579K and is not sure what is coming in on the property. He
131 noted that given the area around this proposal, the duplex would be out of
132 character.

133
134 Tim Lovell, Chairman of the Conservation Commission spoke to the project and
135 concerns of the Conservation Commission. He stated that he did go for the site
136 walk with the Planning Board members and stated that he felt the wetlands were
137 larger than what was marked. The Conservation Commission has requested that
138 the Planning Board hire a Wetland Engineer to review the site. He stated that the
139 four crossings are detrimental to Wash Pond. He pointed out that this site is the
140 last area before the water flows in to Wash Pond, which is a recreational area and

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

home to many creatures. He announced that Wash Pond is one of five areas left in the State of NH that is home to the Eastern Pond Mussel. The tributaries to Wash Pond are watched closely. He has been in touch with DES and there is an inspector coming from Fish and Game to check the area for impact and see if the number of crossings should be reduced. T. Lovell also stated that DES has stated that they believe this proposal isn't the least impacting and suggested two crossings with a single roadway to access all lots. T. Lovell stated that they would like to see a wetland assessment done by an independent Wetland Engineer. He called the DES to see when the assessment could be done. He went on to state that the tributaries and how they are filtered out with the impact of the roads and crossings and the potential impact on the mussels will be looked at. He said that it is not in the best interest if the property to have four crossings but two would be better. R. Waldron noted that the Planning Board had a copy of a letter from Ebner Lewis of DES. T. Lovell said that is the letter he is referring to and it states that DES would like to see 1 crossing over the 1st lot and then a road between lots 2 and 3 and then go across to the other lots. R. Waldron asked who would be responsible for the cost of hiring a Wetland Engineer. Both N. Emerson and B. Schmitz noted that it would be the applicant. N. Emerson asked Mr. Jordan if a certified Soil Scientist surveyed the site and marked the wetlands. Mr. Jordan stated that an Engineer designed the crossings and the seals are on the plans submitted. N. Emerson questioned Mr. Jordan about the comment from T. Lovell about feeling there was more wetlands than what was marked on during the site walk. Mr. Jordan stated that he stands by the plan as stamped. T. Lovell noted that this was one of the driest years but Mr. Jordan responded that the vegetation, whether wet or dry, and the soil takes decades to change. There are two or three criteria on how wet or dry the area is.

N. Emerson suggested that the hearing be continued until the report from the State of NH Fish and Game or DES is received.

C. Bennett asked the size of the culverts. He was told that lot 1 is 30 inches and the rest are at 36 inches. D. Howard asked if they moved the buildings and septic systems back on lots 6/7 to further on the back lot similar to lots 4/5, if there would be enough room. D. Jordan responded that they were not constrained on the back lots and there is more room there. N. Emerson stated that there would

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

176 be more hot top if a road was placed in to access the lots to eliminate a crossing.
177 He also noted that it would need to be built to town specifications such as 24-
178 foot pavement. There would need to be a turnaround at the end and would be
179 more of an impact to the wetlands that they are trying to protect.

180
181 B. Schmitz noted that there are three items to consider:

- 182 1. The State is looking at the wetland
- 183 2. Question on minimizing the crossings
- 184 3. Site Distance on the driveways.

185
186 **MOTION: N. Emerson moved to continue the public hearing on Map 09-Lot**
187 **060, Hastings Drive Subdivision, to the February 6, 2017 meeting.**

188 **SECOND: G. Emerson**

189 **VOTE on motion: 6-0**

190 P. Carideo came back to the Board at 8:15 pm

191 **New Business**

192 **1. 10-004, Blue Sky Towers LLC - 1st Public Hearing for a cell tower to be located at**
194 **transfer station, 311 Kent Farm Road Map 10, lot 004**

195 C. Bennett stepped down from the discussion due to the fact as a Selectmen, he
196 signed the lease agreement.

197 E. Duval, Attorney for Duval & Plasnick was representing the applicant, Blue Sky
198 Towers, LLC. He noted that the Town of Hampstead and T-Mobile are listed as co-
199 applicants per the conditions of the lease agreement between Blue Sky
200 Technologies and the Town of Hampstead.

201 He introduced Tom Johnson, the Project Engineer from Terra Design Group. He
202 began his presentation with how the process has gotten to this point. He stated
203 that there was an informal presentation given to the Planning Board a few
204 meetings ago. At that meeting, he explained how the process was determined to
205 choose the Kent Farm transfer station as the location for a proposed cell tower.
206 He stated that they look at raw land sites that have the topography, issues with
207 wetlands, visual aspects, proximity to historical properties etc. They then look at
208 the zoning and permit requirements that are needed for approval. There was a
209 site acquisition consultant that worked with the Town of Hampstead from Blue
210 Sky Towers, LLC. He approached the Town after determining a need for

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

coverage. Through the process of working with the town it was determined that zoning did not permit cell towers on town property so there was a warrant article drawn up and presented to the public for voting. There was also a warrant article presented to the voters authorizing the Selectmen to enter into a multi- year lease agreement. The Selectmen then sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) and Blue Sky Towers, LLC was awarded the proposal and they entered into a lease agreement with the Town of Hampstead. The lease is a five-year lease and is renewable in 5-year increments. The Town of Hampstead would get ground rent and revenue sharing for the second and any subsequent carriers on the pole. The Town of Hampstead is to receive a lump sum payment to be used to purchase a generator for the Fire Department communication equipment. The agreement also states that the fire department equipment will be moved from the current location on the water tower to the new cell tower. They will also be given a space (cabinet) in the storage area. That was the background history that led up to this point. They now have a carrier that is interested in placing their equipment on the cell tower and they are now asking for approval to move forward and put the tower up.

Mr. Duval explained that they are looking at an 80' x 80' area on the 45-acre lot. There will be a 70' by 70' fenced in area. The area will be fenced in using chain link fencing with three strands of barbed wire around it to deter climbers. Inside the 70' by 70' area, the 180-foot Monopole style tower will be located. T-Mobile has requested to co-locate their equipment at the center line at about 176 feet with 9 panel antennas, 9 radio heads and one additional antennae with the cabling from the antennae down the pole out the bottom to the cable bridge and then to their cabinet. The fire department will be locating their antennae at the top of the pole, which gives them the best coverage. T-Mobile will have a 7.5 KW propane back-up generator with 120- gallon propane tank (located on a 3' by 3' concrete pad). The fire department will have an 8' by 8' concrete pad to house their cabinet and a 10 KW propane back-up generator with fuel coming from two 100-gallon propone tanks. The access to the site will be through a 330-foot gravel driveway off the pavement. There will be a 12' by 25' area for parking and a turnaround. Electric will run from the existing pole overhead to a box and then underground to the facility. The generators will be the emergency back-up. The DC generator will kick in when the power goes out and it estimated to last as long

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

as there is fuel in the tank up to as long as 48 hours. There will be an alarm that will be sent to the third party vendor in a power outage. The generator will cycle through at least once a month and will be monitored remotely. Mr. Duval noted that the Planning Board can determine the period that the generator test should run. He also noted that the site will not be staffed, but that there will be routine maintenance possibly on a monthly basis and when a repair might be needed. There is an alarm if there is an attempt to tamper with the site that goes to the operation center.

Mr. Duval went through the application and the different exhibits attached to it and recapped them.

Exhibit 1. Site Plan

Exhibit 2. Lease Agreement, redacted

Exhibit 3. T- Mobile Antenna Specifications

Exhibit 4. T-Mobile Generator Specifications

Exhibit 5. Town Antenna Specifications

Exhibit 6. Town Generator Specifications

Exhibit 7. Photo Simulations

Exhibit 8. FAA Determination

Exhibit 9. Radio Frequency (RF) Emissions Report

Exhibit 10. T-Mobile Existing and Proposed Radio Frequency Coverage Maps

Exhibit 11. T-Mobile Radio Frequency Statement

Exhibit 12. T-Mobile FCC Licenses

Exhibit 13. Town Existing and Proposed Radio Frequency Coverage Maps

Mr. Duval explained that a balloon test had been performed back in November by Caron Associates. There were 14 sites observed for the visibility of the red balloon. In the pictures submitted it shows where the balloon is or should be and what the tower would look like at the spot.

He noted that there are no issues with the tower and the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA). The tower is not in the flight path or at a height to be an issue.

Regarding Exhibit 9 and the Radio Frequency (RF) Emissions report, he stated that they were well under the allowed amount even if the tower was full, as set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Mr. Duval mentioned under Exhibit 12 that each carrier is responsible to maintain their license and to show that they are providing coverage. The last exhibit

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

shows the Fire Department coverage as it stands now and what it is expected to be with the addition of their equipment onto the cell tower. Mr. Duval ended his presentation noting that he was waiting to receive comments from the Town Engineer and that they listed out the waivers that they are requesting in the opening statement of application.

Planning Board members:

N. Emerson asked if the communication equipment is coming off the water tower because it is not high enough and at what height does T-Mobile need to be at to provide coverage. There was a question as to whether or not a different site had been looked at that might be higher. He also asked if other carriers looking to come on would want to be at a higher height. Mr. Duval stated that they based the site on the height and topography and this one will be sufficient. If a carrier wanted to be at a higher height, they would need to substantiate the need for more height. B. Schmitz asked if the access to the site was through the existing road and how would a third party person access the site. P. Carideo stated that would be a co-ordination between the town and the carriers. Mr. Duval noted that this has already been worked out.

P. Carideo asked if there was any thought to the size of trucks and the packers working at the transfer station and the location of the current electric pole. He suggested that it might be a good idea to consider going from the existing pole to the proposed pole by going underground. He noted that when reviewing subdivisions they like to see the utilities go underground. Mr. Johnson reported that he met with Steve Harms on the site and went over the options and stated that they were okay with going underground if required. He noted that they did discuss the trucks that come in and out of the area. P. Carideo stated that as long as the people who operate the facility are okay.

Public Portion:

P. Stoltz 255 Kent Farm Road- She stated that she was new to town and wanted to know what was prompting the cell tower. P. Carideo responded that the Selectmen put out an RFP (Request of Proposal). P. Stoltz asked if the reason for the RFP was for the revenue that would be generated. She went on to state that there were concerns with the property values in the area and that they would be going down along with concerns with the health of the residents. There is a

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

316 concern within the 1,000 feet of a tower and the Radio Frequency (RF) it gives
317 out. This will be 750 feet from her backyard. She also noted that there is
318 already a lease agreement in place without the concerns of the abutters. She
319 went on to state that the balloon test was done without anyone being notified.
320 She also went on to state that the website is atrocious and has no information on
321 it. P. Stoltz also asked what the period of this whole thing. P. Carideo stated that
322 this was the first public hearing and once the review is completed and any
323 questions are answered, the Planning Board will vote to approve or disapprove
324 the project based on whether or not it meets the site plan regulations and
325 zoning. They cannot base their decision on potential health concerns but based
326 on whether or not zoning requirements are met. The FCC regulations are not
327 within the scope of the Planning Board to discuss, he stated. It was stated that
328 town meeting approved cell towers on town property and the discussion has
329 always been the locations of the transfer station and Little's Lane. At the same
330 time, that town meeting voted to allow cell towers on town property, they
331 voted to allow the Selectmen to enter into a lease agreement with a cell tower
332 company.

333 Mr. Duval commented that a carrier must demonstrate that the RF Emissions are
334 in the allowable levels in order to maintain their licenses. In the RF Emissions
335 report, they submitted in the application, they submitted for all the co locators
336 including the town's equipment to be on the tower at maximum capacity and
337 the RF Emissions are well below the allowable amount. Mr. Duval also pointed out
338 that the Planning Board is unable to deny the application based on health. He
339 noted that there are two reports, SHIPO and NEPO that are required and have
340 been filed for. They are expecting no issues with them. The FAA and FCC
341 approvals are required are in the process. Mr. Duval stated that all documents
342 have been filed. P. Stoltz stated that it should not be profit before the people
343 and the science used is at least 20 years old. P. Carideo told the public that if they
344 had questions they could submit them to the office and they will be given to Mr.
345 Duval for a response.

346
347 *Shawn Raposa- 199 Wheelwright Road.* S. Raposa stated that he voted against the
348 cell tower on town property when it was on the ballot. His house is the closest to
349 the tower and every time he would wake, up and look out his window that will
350 be all he will see. He said that there should be more social media notice of

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

information getting out in town and that people are not informed. He stated that the town needs to provide more information digitally for its residents. He then asked if he has any grounds to get this project stopped. P. Carideo responded that everyone has the right to protect their own interest and that there is a process to follow. He noted that cell towers are allowed in the Town of Hampstead and it was voted in by the residents. There are certain criteria that an applicant must meet. If the applicant meets the criteria then this board will need to approve the project. S. Raposa pointed out that this is the same town that approved an active shooting range and now a cell tower. The property values will decrease and they have nothing to prove that. P. Carideo noted that he can see the tower from his home on Wheelwright but he pointed out that he has a cell phone and wants to be able to use it.

Kellie True, 244 Kent Farm Road- K. True asked that when they did a site assessment, was the residents of Granite Village and their proximity to the site considered? She also asked if Granite Village was notified as one parcel or were all the residents their notified. The response was that all the abutters were notified per the RSA requirements. K. True stated that with the RF emissions reaching out 1,000 feet, everyone in that vicinity should have been notified. M. Duval responded that the 180 foot tower will give off less RF Emissions than a cell phone. One of the residents pointed out that they have cell coverage with their carrier and see no need for a cell tower to increase coverage. Mr. Duval reported that the RF emissions consider all carriers at peak capacity including all their equipment. Coverage is not an issue for the Planning Board to decide, or the public. He stated that this is found in case law. He also pointed out that if T-Mobile did not need the coverage, then they would not be here to go through this process. He also noted that lack of coverage could be 50 feet from the road depending on the traffic.

Scott True, 144 Kent Farm Road- S. True stated that the balloon test does not show impact or what it will look like. There are no provisions on how it fits into the community and the impact it will have. He stated that the public should be educated as well on the liability on the access to the site. He also asked why the site at the Fire Station was not used whereas it makes more sense there. P. Carideo responded that the Kent Farm site was looked at as a spot where it can

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

cover the area of lost communication. He also noted that the town has two other cell towers, one at Gigante Drive and one over by East Coast Lumber. K. True stated that they were not abutting residents. S. Raposa said that he installs small cell towers and they provide coverage with no impact and no large cell towers. They go in small towers such as steeples. P. Carideo reiterated that they were looking at the plan that was before them at this time.

Cheryl Hess, 263 Kent Farm Road, C. Hess noted that she is an abutter and when she was notified she began doing research. She pointed out that the Planning Board states that they cannot deal with health and safety of the residents, yet tonight there was a project put on hold until the health and safety of wildlife could be addressed. N. Emerson pointed out that was the Conservation Commission, which is responsible for Natural Resources. That is one of the functions of the Conservation Commission to look at the Natural Resources as part of how the ordinances are written. C. Hess asked who is responsible for the health and safety of the residents and is looking out for their best interests. P. Carideo responded that we all are and pointed out that the zoning and ordinance are written by residents and approved by residents. He went on to state that the Planning Board members are not professionals and they do the best they can. C. Hess stated that she knows this has been in the works for 2 years, but the abutters have just heard about it and now they find out that there is a lease agreement already in place so where do they go to voice their concerns about the health impacts and safety. P. Carideo told her that they should start with the Board of Selectmen. S. True asked if the Planning Board could deny the application based on aesthetics. P. Carideo responded that there are reasons for a denial, but not just on aesthetics. P. Stoltz stated that they all need to be better educated and asked if they had enough signatures, could this project be stopped.

MOTION: N. Emerson made the motion to accept the application of Blue SkyTowers, LLC (10-004) as complete.

SECOND: G. Emerson

VOTE on Motion: 7-0

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

MOTION: N. Emerson made the motion to continue the Public Hearing for Blue Sky Towers, LLC (10-004) to the February 6, 2017 meeting.

SECOND: R. Waldron

Vote on Motion: 7-0

2. Petition Zoning Article regarding amending Article IV-5:4 and delete Article IV-5:5. The effect is to allow seasonal conversion without the requirement of BOA action.

N. Emerson informed the others that this petition article is from the Board of Adjustment. Due to a communication error, it didn't come forward directly to the Planning Board to discuss and bring forward. The purpose of the change in the article is to stop residents from having to go the ZBA for a special exception to update a seasonal property and then go back to the ZBA to convert the property from seasonal to year round. If they meet all the requirements in updating the property, the Chief Building Official can sign off and it will become year round. D. Howard asked why the ZBA doesn't grant the permission when the resident is before them at first. N. Emerson responded that they need to see that the work has been completed and updated. R. Waldron asked if there was any ideas as to how many seasonal properties there still are in town. The answer is roughly estimated at about 60. B. Schmitz said the first step is for a special exception to build/remodel the property and is that typically a rubber stamp. N. Emerson responded that it depended on the property and that some could take months some pass that night. N. Emerson was asked if the ZBA knew the intend down the road to convert the property to year round. He responded that they do sometimes know. It was also noted that it is more difficult to get a loan to build or rebuild a seasonal property. R. Waldron stated that he was in favor to of the change. He noted that he has a seasonal property in Moultonborough and they have no seasonal rules. He stated that Hampstead makes it difficult and that every 4-6 years there are changes in the mechanism to get conversions done. It was noted that the petition article amends IV-4 and deletes Section IV-5 but does not address IV-6. At this time it was agreed it was too late to change the article by deleting IV-6 and hold another public hearing so it will need some housecleaning in 2018.

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

MOTION: N. Emerson motioned to recommend the petition article as submitted.

SECOND: R. Waldron

Vote on Motion: 7-0

OTHER PUBLIC MATTERS

Conditional approvals that expire 1.03.17

1. 02-052- Labrador Lane Subdivision (447 Main St)

All of the information has been submitted by the developer. The only issue is directions as shown on the plan and the deed. Mr. Bourcier needs to do a final review of the Mylar to see if it agrees with the changes he requested.

MOTION: D. Howard motioned to extend the conditional approval to 2/6/17.

SECOND: R. Waldron

VOTE on Motion: 6 -0-1- C. Bennett abstained.

2. 06-018- Sweet Management Site Plan (184 Route 111)

Mrs. Harrington was directed at the last meeting to send a certified letter to the owners stating that they needed to either submit the final paperwork, or come to the Planning Board to explain the delay. Mrs. Harrington stated that she did not send the letter. She explained that in talking with J. Lavelle, he stated that they submitted everything in September and were waiting to hear that everything was all set before submitting the Mylar. Chairman Carideo stated that submitting the Mylar is part of the final conditions and they were therefore not in compliance and to send them a letter stating that they need to meet their conditions prior to the next meeting (2/9/17) or risk having their approval rescinded. Mrs. Harrington stated that she would send that out.

MOTION: R. Waldron motioned to grant a continuance of the conditional approval to the 2/6/17 meeting and if the conditions are not met, they need to come back to the Planning Board to explain why.

SECOND by: N. Emerson

VOTE on Motion: 7-0

HAMPSTEAD PLANNING BOARD

11 Main Street, Hampstead, New Hampshire 03841-2033

Minutes of January 3, 2017

Planning Board Matters

Correspondence:

1. Letter received from NH Division of Historical Resources regarding 10-004, Cell Tower Proposal. They stated that there were no concerns.
2. Request from Al Davis to be appointed to the Rockingham Planning Commission. It was noted that officially, there is no vacancy and asked that Mr. Davis come and meet the Planning Board members and if he is still interested, there should be an opening in March 2017. They also noted that he may be interested in helping out on the local level instead of the county level. Mrs. Harrington will request that he come to the next meeting.
3. Rockingham Planning Commission Long Range Transportation Report was sent to the area towns outlining the long-term projects and asking for input on any additional projects that may need to go on.
4. Fremont NH Planning Board- Cell Tower Notice for a 145 Foot Monopole style to be located at Map 1 lot 12 on Chester Road in Fremont NH
5. State of NH DES Approval CA2003053288A for Construction of an individual sewage disposal system located at Map 09-024- Granite Village, Phase V

Review of Minutes: (12/5/16)

C. Bennett asked to have lines 49-50 to state that it has woken his family up three times

R. Waldron asked to have line 140 correct to state is loud at 6 am

MOTION: N. Emerson moved to approve the minutes of December 5, 2016 as amended.

SECOND by: G. Emerson

VOTE on Motion: 6-0-1 (BS abstained)

MOTION: N. Emerson motioned to adjourn at 10:19 pm

SECOND by: C. Bennett

VOTE on Motion: 7-0

Minutes by: Tina Harrington, Planning Board Secretary

Approved: Planning Board

Date: February 6, 2017