

Moultonborough Planning Board
P.O. Box 139
Moultonborough, NH 03254

Regular Meeting

July 14, 2010

Minutes

Present: Members: Joanne Coppinger, Judy Ryerson, Jane Fairchild, Chris Maroun, Peter Jensen, Ed Charest (Selectmen's Representative); Town Planner: Dan Merhalski
Alternate: Keith Nelson – arrived at 7:06
Excused: Member: Natt King
Audience: Fire Chief: Dave Bengtson, Road Agent: Scott Kinmond, ZBA: Russ Nolin

Mrs. Coppinger called the regular meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion: Mr. Charest moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of June 23, 2010, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously with Ms. Fairchild and Mrs. Coppinger abstaining.

Ms. Ryerson commented the board had had a discussion regarding roads, noting they had discussed having separate standards for different types of roads and the discussion was not captured in the minutes. She requested the following sentence "The Board has agreed there should be lower standards for smaller subdivisions that cannot be expanded" be inserted into the first paragraph on page 2. Ms. Fairchild noted a reference on page 3 to the Boards lack of authority to require specific size, color or material of signs, commenting that the Board does have the authority to require specific size and requested to strike the word size. Mrs. Coppinger commented the reference in the minutes to Section 6.2, E, should be 6.2 D.

Motion: Mr. Jensen moved to approve the Planning Board Work Session Minutes of June 30, 2010 as amended, seconded by Ms. Ryerson, carried unanimously with Mrs. Coppinger abstaining.

Mrs. Coppinger appointed Keith Nelson to sit on the board with full voting privileges in place of Natt King.

III. New Submissions

IV. Boundary Line Adjustments

V. Hearings

VI. Informal Discussions

VII. Unfinished Business

a. Discussion of Revision of Subdivision Regulations

Mrs. Coppinger noted the Fire Chief and Road Agent were in attendance this evening and suggested the board discuss first any proposed changes pertaining to their areas of expertise.

The Board first reviewed Section 6.2. Easements For Utilities, Access, and Public Service, Section B. Mr. Merhalski noted as a result of the discussion at the work session he had added "or sprinkler systems in individual homes". Dave suggested the addition of the word cistern to be included as another method of fire protection, giving developers a wide range of options. Mr. Merhalski questioned if there were regulations regarding what type of cisterns, size etc. Dave stated yes, and he includes that in his comments to the board.

The Board then reviewed Section 7.2 Road Design and Construction, Section D, 2, Minimum Width of the Roadway. There currently are two widths, one for a collector road and one for a local road. The Board had suggested a definition to determine which a road would be. Through past experience Mr. Merhalski had arbitrarily proposed 20 or more newly created lots as a collector road and under 20 newly created lots a local road. The number of lots suggested was for discussion and may be adjusted up or down by board. Dave stated ideally he would like a 12' travel lane width or a 24' road width. Dave explained his reasoning for the 12' being the ability to pass equipment by on roads with compartment doors open, on roads with snow banks. The extra 2' makes a difference between a road becoming blocked, impassable for two-way traffic and making it safe for traffic and trucks to pass by each other. Trucks can get in and out of a scene to deliver water or other necessary equipment. Mrs. Coppinger commented the regulations now require a minimum width of 22' of paved surface with 4' shoulders. Dave stated he would like the minimum cleared width (plowed) of 24'. This would allow two vehicles to pass by. Scott commented he feels that all roads should be at least 22' in width, and not anything less for a smaller size subdivision. The concern is not with the paved surface, but with the clearance once a road is plowed. If there is not a sufficient shoulder then there is no place to push the snow back and that is when it becomes an issue. Both Dave and Scott advocated for all roads to be a minimum of 22' noting they deal with the same issues, fire protection and snow removal, on all roads. The clear zone (obstruction free) should be a minimum of 5' from the edge of pavement. Moultonboro Neck Road was given as an example, with Scott stating it the average lane width is 12 -14', or about a 24 - 26' wide paved surface with the added shoulders.

Board members weighed in on this, with some stating their objections to a traveled path 24' in width and 4' shoulders creating a 30' +/- clearing, stating aesthetics were a major concern. Many felt aesthetics were more important than having wide roads. Preserving the rural character of the Town has been noted time and time again. Dave and Scott both commented their major concerns are always related to safety and being able to provide services to property owners and that they were asked for their input and these areas. The board discussed the number of lots determining if it would be a collector road or a local road requiring either a minimum width of 22' or 18' with 4' shoulders. Dave and Scott both felt the number of lots should not determine the width of the roadway as they still need to provide the same services.

It was noted that the applicant may request a waiver for any of the requirements and if the board finds that there is reason and cause that it would be an undue hardship to have a minimum width of 22' then they could waive the requirement and reduce the width.

This issue was discussed at length with a unanimous consensus of the board to eliminate the two standards for a collector road and local road and have one standard requiring a minimum width of 22' with 4' shoulders.

Dave and Scott both recommended the board include the option of a hammer-head to the standards. The board discussed cul-de-sacs and hammer-heads, minimum space requirements, radii and curves. Scott stated it was more time consuming and difficult to plow a cul-de-sac than a hammer-head turnaround. After discussing this with the Road Agent, it was noted that a cul-de-sac with an island in the center was easier to maintain, could provide open green space and a suitable location for a cistern if required in the approval for a subdivision.

It was the decision of the board to add the option of a hammer-head to the standards and to require a center island in the design of a cul-de-sac. Scott will provide the minimum dimensional standards for both of these to the board.

In both the discussion of minimum road width and cul-de-sac's the issue of frontage was raised. At this time our standards do not make reference to a minimum required footage for frontage.

Other recommended changes included increasing the required 3' minimum base of 1 ½' crushed bank run gravel to a required 6' minimum base of 1 ½' crushed bank run gravel. Scott commented that there is no reference or requirements to compaction and believes that the board should address this in the regulations. A compaction test should be required. Another item to be addressed were provisions for an inspection process, including who would do them and who would pay for it. It was stated this should be done by an engineer and that the engineer should work for the Town. Dan noted proposed language was added to Section 4.13 Security, C noting that a Clerk of the Works may be appointed and explaining the process. There still needs to be a standard for compaction, Scott will provide the board with a table for this.

Scott noted the regulations require the roadways to be paved and commented that he is not opposed to a gravel roadway so long as they are built correctly in the beginning. Drainage is important in the construction of the roadway and he agreed with the addition of the language requiring adequate drainage to handle a 24-hour 50 year storm event. Mrs. Coppinger referred to number 12 of the standards for roads and asked if there should be minimum standards for a ditch. This section will be amended to include language relating to the 24-hour 50 year storm event as noted above.

Scott noted there are new Federal Highway Administrative street sign standards that should be included or referred to in the regulations. These refer to the size of the sign, type of post, size of lettering and material. Scott will provide this information to be included.

Mr. Merhalski asked for input from Scott regarding grades (number 4), Maximum grade of 12%. Scott noted that is a steep slope and suggested it be less. This is a maintenance issue in the winter time. The steeper the grade, the more treatment the roadway needs. The board discussed this and was in agreement to amend the maximum grade to 10%.

Scott noted there were no minimum standards for driveways. He has reviewed standards for other communities that range from a few pages to 11 or 12 pages. He has taken excerpts from those and would like to work with Dan on drafting driveway standards, which should include installation and maintenance of culverts and ditches. The standards could be added to the regulations or language added stating that all driveways must meet the standards of driveway regulations per the Road Agents policy.

The last issue the board discussed was frontage, noting again that there is no minimum frontage requirement in our regulations. Proposed language has been added to Section 7.1 Lots, E. All lots shall have frontage on a street. Mr. Nelson asked what the definition was for a street. Mr. Merhalski stated he had looked in the RSA's and case law and they do define a street. It is cross referenced with 229:1 and 674:41, I (a, b, c, d & e) and III. The statutes are grey, as to what constitutes a street, but does state for

purposes of the article, to be able to build on a lot, a lot has to have frontage on the street. The board discussed many different scenarios and configurations of back lots and what constitutes frontage and what the minimum required footage would be. After a lengthy discussion the board acknowledged that a lot must have frontage on a street. This will require further discussion to determine what they would may require for a minimum amount, with suggestions ranging from 50' to 150'.

Due to the amount of time spent reviewing the items above it was the decision of the board to wrap up the discussion at this point this evening and to continue them again as time allows at their next regular meeting on July 28th.

b. Discussion of Revision of Site Plan Regulations

VIII. Other Business/Correspondence

1. Mr. Merhalski noted the Board had conditionally approved a Site Plan for Maine PCS, located on Moultonboro Neck Road, TM 203, Lot 7. The condition was the receipt for verification of the structural integrity of the structure and for the weight additions the proposed changes may have on the tower. The owner SBA submitted a Structural Analysis for the tower. Mr. Merhalski provided each member with a copy of the Engineering Report, asking that they review it and they will discuss it their next meeting on the 28th and make a decision.

2. Mr. Merhalski stated the Lakes Region Planning Commission is trying to put back together a Scenic Byways Committee and are asking for volunteers from area boards. There will be a meeting on August 4, 2010 at 9 AM for anyone interested in attending as a representative of the Town. Ms. Fairchild expressed her interest in this program.

3. Zoning Board of Adjustment Draft Minutes of July 7, 2010 were noted.

4. Selectmen's Draft Minutes of July 1, 2010 were noted.

IX. Committee Reports

X. Adjournment: Mrs. Coppinger made the motion to adjourn at 9:35 PM, seconded by Mr. Charest, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bonnie L. Whitney
Administrative Assistant