

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

Work Session Minutes

August 31, 2011

Minutes

Present: Members: Joanne Coppinger, Chris Maroun, Jane Fairchild, Tom Howard, Judy Ryerson
Ed Charest (Selectmen's Representative), Natt King – arrived at 7:08;
Alternates: Peter Jensen, Keith Nelson; Dave Holden – Interim Planner

Joanne opened the meeting at 7:00, noting that this was a regularly scheduled work session, and appointed Keith Nelson to sit on the board with full voting privileges in place of Natt King. (Keith stepped down when Natt arrived at 7:08)

I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Joanne questioned the order in which the Board wanted to discuss the three items on the agenda. It was their decision to go out of order and address them in order of 1, 3 and then 2.

Discussion relating to Site Plan Regulations – Driveway Permits

Board members referred to Section 10.D.2, of the Site Plan Review Regulations, which requires an applicant to provide with their application for site plan review, an “Approved Driveway Permit from NHDOT or the Town of Moultonborough.” This is the language that Interim Planner, Dave Holden, had suggested to be amended in a way that would allow the Planning Board the opportunity to review driveway permits, in conjunction with site plan review, prior to approval by NHDOT or the Town of Moultonborough. The Board discussed possible language which could be inserted in an effort to direct an applicant to provide the Board with a copy of the driveway permit application for review in conjunction with the site plan and allow the Board the opportunity to make comment prior to the issuance of an approved permit. After a short discussion the following motion was made.

Motion: Joanne moved to amend Section 10.D.2 of the Site Plan Review Regulations to read “NHDOT or Town of Moultonborough Driveway Permit Application prior to submission to the appropriate governmental entity” and for Dave to confer with the State of NHDOT for their comment. Seconded by Natt, carried unanimously.

Discussion relating to Road Standards

Peter provided the board with a handout for discussion purposes to get started on the idea of what to do with an existing road. The idea was that “When an existing road is scheduled for reconstruction, the design should maintain the character of the neighborhood on either side of the road by rebuilding within the existing roadway footprint” Exceptions to rebuilding within the existing footprint would be: Where the road is tangible probability of significant future development along the road, or its feeder roads, and there is tangible probability that expanding the existing footprint would be needed to support added traffic, or, Where portions of the roadway to be rebuilt have encountered unusually high safety events that would have been mitigated by a road footprint that is different from the current footprint, or, When expanding the footprint to the current specifications for a new road in a subdivision is either requested by a majority of abutting residents impacted or the expansion would not adversely impact abutting residents or businesses.

Jane stated that her recollection was that initially there were some questions about the Board's jurisdiction in this area. Joanne commented what the Board was discussing was revising their own road standards in their subdivision regulations, as the Road Agent would like something to rely upon, or a guidance. Jane commented that our Subdivision Regulations dealt with new roads. Joanne stated there were situations in which our current standards didn't seem to make sense, given the context. These are the types of situations that need discussion, when things appear to be out of sync with the surrounding area. Jane commented philosophically she agreed, but questioned where this would fall under the current subdivision regulations. Peter's proposed language was to deal with existing roads, and there must be a distinction between new roads and existing roads.

Peter commented that it was his understanding that the Board could amend our regulations to include language that dealt with existing roads. Dave stated, more appropriately, the Board could show standards that they want to have applied, then the town could decide whether or not they were going to meet those standards, but there would be some guidelines. Dave went onto say that normally standards were set by AASHO and are generally based on what there is for traffic on the road. The State of NH requires a minimum right-of-way (ROW) of 50'. It is not the ROW that concerns the Board, it is how the "street" part is developed. This is generally based on how many vehicles pass a day/traffic volume. There are several components to take into consideration, such as travel lane, shoulder, bikes or pedestrians, utilities etc. Dave stated there might be standards for several types of roads, industrial road, commercial business road and a residential road. The reason for the standards is not so much for the existing impact, but what you perceive as the future impact. The standards would be advisory, if you have a new subdivision, they should get the 50' ROW and then pick the pavement width that would be appropriate for the situation.

Jane questioned where in our regulations that Dave would suggest that these standards are included. He stated where our existing standards are now. You would add additional standards to that, along with an explanation as to when you would apply that standard.

In response to a question raised earlier by Jane as to the authority of the Board regarding this matter, Judy referred to RSA 674:1, Duties of the Planning Board, II.

The Board discussed this at length with members noting their concerns in preserving historic and scenic values of roads and that there should be a context sensitive solution.

Joanne suggested that the Board may look at what other town's may have in their regulations.

Cristina provided the Board with a handout of "Road Standards" titled iTRaC, which is the Nashua Regional Planning Commission's new approach to community planning that focuses on integrating transportation, land use and environmental planning. She then suggested perhaps that a group or committee be formed look at this issue closer and then present something to the Board. She noted that the problem appears to be that there is not a standalone document for road standards, only the current regulations which apply to new subdivision roads.

Board members were in agreement with the suggestion to form a sub-committee that would report back to the Planning Board. Joanne asked for volunteers for the sub-committee.

Dave noted that the key is the preservation of the ROW and how you may later develop on/in that ROW in the future.

Motion: Ed moved to form a sub-committee for the purpose of discussing road standards. Seconded by Natt, carried unanimously.

Ed, Natt, Chris, Peter, Judy and Cristina all expressed interest in serving on the sub-committee. Cristina stated that Norman Larson and Richard Brown had expressed interest also. It was noted that the Board would like the input from the Fire Chief and the Road Agent as well.

It was noted that the meetings of the sub-committee would be open to the public, and that they must be noticed 24 hours in advance. The members present who volunteered to serve on the committee scheduled a meeting for Tuesday, September 6, 2011 at 5 pm to be held at the Moultonborough Town Hall. A notice will be posted in the Town Hall and Bonnie will contact the Fire Chief and Road Agent and extend the Board's invitation to serve on the committee, or to schedule time to attend a meeting to give input to the committee regarding this issue.

Discussion relating to the Revision of the Sign Ordinance

Board members were provided again with copies of the material prepared by Dave. The first was his memo dated July 20, 2011 which included our existing Article V Sign ordinance, which was revamped into the new format. The only changes being made was changing Roman numeral V to an Arabic 5, and correcting the reference on page 3, item 7, to reflect the correct section.

The second was Dave's memo of July 26, 2011 which included the attachment in which he incorporated some of our existing Article V, along with New Section Headings and text suggestions.

The question was raised as to what the Board should focus on. Tom stated that the section relating to real estate signs is what led to this issue with the signs to begin with. The question raised was if there was a difference between lease and rent. Dave noted that he had provided a definition for a real estate sign in his draft, but it did not distinguish between the two.

There was a lengthy discussion amongst the Board as to what the difference was in the two, and what was a temporary real estate sign? Another issue was the length of time a "temporary" sign would be allowed to stay up, as short term rental signs never seem to come down. Other questions were if there was a difference between a realtor sign versus a private individual's sign. The key points the Board would like to focus on at a future meeting are: Term, uses versus zones, Residential/Commercial, and the size. Dave will amend the table in his draft to include real estate signs.

Tom requested 5 minutes to bring the board up to speed regarding the redevelopment of the soccer field on Playground Drive. He stated at the Public Hearing, the BoS decided by consensus the Town has moved on from the Lion's Club property. In the process of working on Playground Drive, the costs have increased significantly, and it has been determined that 1/4 of the field is in wetlands. He encouraged board members to attend the next public hearing on September 15th to speak to any issues or statements which may arise. He noted the Planning Board had invested a great deal of time in regards to the Public Hearing regarding the Lion's Club property.

There was a lengthy conversation regarding the Board as a whole, attending the Public Hearing and addressing any concerns that may arise. Many members stated that they were not comfortable with that at this time, and when they spoke to the Lion's Club property, they were acting on an application that had been submitted by the town. Tom again encouraged the Board to attend the meeting on the 15th.

III. Adjournment Mr. King made the motion to adjourn at 9:22 PM, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bonnie L. Whitney
Administrative Assistant