

 *Your complimentary use period has ended. Thank you for using PDF Complete.*

[Click Here to upgrade to Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)



Meeting Minutes Work Session

**North Hampton Planning Board
Tuesday, June 17, 2014 at 6:30pm
Town Hall, 231 Atlantic Avenue**

7

8

9

10 These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a
11 transcription.

12

13 **Members present:** Shep Kroner, Chair; Tim Harned, Vice Chair; Dan Derby.

14

15 **Members absent:** Joseph Arena, Barry Donohoe, Mike Hornsby, Jim Maggiore, Select Board
16 Representative.

17

18 **Alternates present:** Nancy Monaghan

19

20 **Others present:** Jennifer Rowden, RPC Circuit Rider, and Wendy Chase, Recording Secretary

21

22 Mr. Harned convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. and noted for the record there was a quorum.

23

24 Mr. Harned seated Ms. Monaghan for Dr. Arena.

25

26 **I. Old Business**

27

1. None

28

29 **II. New Business**

30

31 **1. Committee Updates**

32

33 a. Long Range Planning (LRP) – There was no report. The LRP Committee has not met since the
34 last Work Session. There was a question as to who was the Chair of the Committee and they
35 determined that they have not met to organize the committee yet.

36

37 b. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) – Ms. Monaghan said that the Committee is meeting regularly
38 throughout the summer; they started meeting earlier in the year to make sure the capital items
39 are done in time for the budget process.

40

41 c. Rules and Regulations/Procedures – schedule meeting to:

42

43 **(i) Discuss a requirement to submit digitized copies of subdivision and/or site plans with**
44 **applications.** Ms. Rowden said that she found a couple of examples from other towns but
45 nothing she really liked for North Hampton. She suggested adding to the Board's Rules of

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

zed copies of final plans. The Board discussed different

47 reasons why they would require digitized copies of subdivision and site plan. Mr. Kroner said
48 that because a recent applicant brought up the issue regarding the number of copies of plans
49 the Board requires it was decided to start discussions on how to minimize the volume of plans.
50 Ms. Rowden suggested digitizing major subdivision and site plans that have multiple copies.
51 Mr. Harned said he is fine with receiving an 11"x17" size plan to review and make notes on, as
52 well as, receive a digitized copy. A large plan would be submitted for the permanent record and
53 the public to review. Ms. Monaghan suggested deciding on a case by case basis on whether or
54 not the Board would require a digitized copy of the plans; the average person may find it
55 difficult to produce a digitized copy. Mr. Kroner suggested the Board elicit feedback from the
56 business community and engineering firms to get their take on digitized copies. Ms. Rowden
57 said that most engineering firms are used to doing digital submissions. Mr. Derby said he is fine
58 with the smaller plans. Mr. Kroner said that small plans wouldn't be feasible when the proposal
59 is a large subdivision or major site plan change.
60

61 Glenn Martin, 196 Atlantic Avenue – said that digitized plans are the way of the future and
62 engineering firms prefer it. He said he has several parcels in town that may be impacted with
63 some of the changes the Board is considering.
64

65 Mr. Harned suggested Ms. Rowden come back to the Board with a list of ideas for the next Work
66 Session. She said that she would.
67

68 **(ii) Review the "Blasting" Regulation** – formulate a Blasting Application and appoint a Blasting
69 Administrator. Ms. Chase confirmed that this is being taken care of. She said that the
70 appointment of Fire Chief Cote as the Blasting Administrator is on the next Select Board Agenda.
71

72 **(iii) develop regulations/standards for shared driveways** – Mr. Kroner said that he has received
73 negative feedback from the Fire Chief regarding shared driveways and long driveways in regards
74 to accessibility for emergency vehicles; some driveways are longer than some roads in Town but
75 are not built up to road standards. Ms. Rowden reminded the Board that any changes to the
76 Ordinance would only affect new driveways; it would not affect driveways already in place. It
77 was decided that the Board would like to meet with Chief Cote to discuss this issue with him.
78 Ms. Chase will invite Chief Cote to a Work Session.
79

80 d. Application Review Committee (ARC) – The ARC has not met; there have been no applications
81 for the Committee to review.
82

83 e. Economic Development Committee – Ms. Rowden distributed copies of the final Economic
84 Development Analysis to the members, and had the maps with her if anyone wanted to review
85 them. There are five recommendations for both the Economic Development Committee and
86 Planning Board to consider. The recommendations are:

- 87 1. Align zoning districts with parcel boundaries – The EDC asked RPC to explore more
88 deeply this recommendation. They wanted to see what the I-B/R District would look like
89 if the zoning line was changed so that all the I-B/R lots that are also partially in the
90 Residential Zone would be entirely in the I-B/R Zone.
- 91 2. Any proposed zoning changes to parcels on the western area of Exeter Road should be
92 limited to the following parcels: Lots 10-3, 10-4, 10-5 and 10-6.

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

ges within the I-B/R Zone or adjacent parcels, or Exeter Road

94 take potential increases in traffic and future transportation infrastructure changes into
95 consideration. Ms. Rowden said that recommendations #2 and #3 are no longer on the
96 table; they are no longer being considered. She said that there is very limited
97 development that could go in there; the impact on the tax base is minimal.

98 4. Continue evaluating impacts of building sewer infrastructure along Lafayette Road.

99 Ms. Rowden said that the recommendation will remain on the table, but they will not be
100 doing anything about it at this time.

101 5. Evaluate the impacts changing zoning to have minimum lot size be based on soil type.

102 Ms. Rowden said that changing zoning to have lot size be soil-based may increase the
103 ability for lots to be subdivided and developed for residential, commercial and industrial
104 purposes.

105

106 Ms. Rowden said that any proposed changes to the zoning would require recommendations to the
107 Planning Board and then it would have to be voted on by the Legislative Body.

108

109 f. Select Board Representative – Jim Maggiore – employee recognition program – Mr. Maggoire
110 was not in attendance.

111

112 2. Zoning Ordinance Review

113

114 a. Article IV, Section 406.4.1 – Duplex Requirements: The Board discussed the popularity of
115 duplex construction in North Hampton. There have been at least ten (10) duplexes built within
116 the last two years. The current duplex regulations require a lot to have .29 more acreage than
117 the single family home of 2 acres; there is no additional frontage required, or wider setback
118 requirements. The two single family dwellings units are separated by a common party wall. Mr.
119 Kroner opined that what drives the current interest in duplexes is the potential return on
120 investment for the builder and the availability of land in town. The Board may want to increase
121 the setback and frontage requirements and consider only allowing duplexes in the high density
122 zoning district. Mr. Kroner referred to neighborhoods that only have duplexes, and it is nice
123 grouping like things together; duplexes do change the characteristics of a neighborhood. He
124 wondered if the Town were headed in the direction that single family homes will be torn down
125 to build duplexes.

126

127 Mr. Kroner said that he would start compiling information for the Board to review. He said he
128 has never seen duplexes erupt in a manner they have recently, and it is up to the Board to look
129 at it and see why.

130

131 Mr. Derby said that if he can get a list of the neighborhoods with duplexes and he will go out
132 and photograph them.

133

134 Ms. Rowden said that some towns have architectural design requirements for duplexes to give
135 less of a visual impact on neighborhoods, which wouldn't require dimensional changes.

136

137 b. Develop a Wetland Delineation Ordinance – The Board was in receipt of a Wetlands
138 Designation Ordinance from the Town of Hampton Falls. The Applicant has to post placard
139 markers along the wetland buffer setback and at the points and corners. The Board discussed

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

141 they approved that has two small building envelopes and a lot
142 of wetlands. The Board approved the subdivision based on the information and plans
143 submitted. Each lot allowed for a single family home. The purchaser of one of the lots had the
144 wetlands flagged by another Wetlands Scientist who came up with enough contiguous upland
145 (60,000 square feet) to allow a duplex to be built on it. Board members voiced concern over
146 the confidence they have in Wetlands Scientists.

147 Ms. Rowden said that wetland delineation is an art, and sometimes things in the ground are
148 different.

149 Mr. Harned asked if the Board could add a condition on an approval that the wetland
150 delineation can't be changed without Planning Board review. Ms. Rowden said it could be
151 done on site plan applications but probably not on subdivision applications.
152

153 Mr. Harned said that there needs to be a mechanism in place so it doesn't go to the more
154 favorable result for the Developer. The Board may want to add to its regulations that a
155 wetland setback line cannot be moved without coming back to the Board for review and
156 approval.
157

158 Mr. Kroner said that he went to a seminar, put on by the RPC, a few years ago that was very
159 informative. He said it is more beneficial to have a 20-foot vegetated buffer between the edge
160 of the lawn and the wetlands than to impose a 100-foot wetlands buffer setback.
161

162 Mr. Derby thought that the Planning Board should be working in conjunction with the
163 Conservation Commission on this topic. Mr. Kroner said that they can write a letter to the
164 Commission to get their feedback on the "marker" idea.
165

166 The Board decided that they would like an expert on wetlands to come to a Planning Board
167 Work Session and have a thoughtful conversation on the best practices.
168

169 Ms. Rowden said that she could give an overview of the best practices and that the
170 Cooperative Extension at UNH is another good resource.
171

172 c. Develop a Solar Array Ordinance – Ms. Rowden forwarded a copy from Cornwell University
173 of a Solar Array Ordinance. Ms. Rowden said she will make an effort to clean it up and forward
174 it to the Board prior to the next work session.
175

176 Mr. Kroner said the ordinance is basically protection when there is a clash between an abutter
177 and a landowner that wants to install a solar array.
178

179 Mr. Harned said that they are supportive of the concept, but it came to their attention that
180 fundamentally it could be a commercial enterprise in a residential area, and could potentially
181 be very large. They need to balance it so to make sure it fits in a residential area.
182

183 Ms. Rowden said that no other towns have a solar array ordinance; North Hampton will be a
184 good example.
185

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

187 **III. Other Business**

188

189 **1. ¹ Items laid on the table**

190

191 a. Master Plan update – Natural Resource Chapter, and Future Land Use Chapter consideration
192 of adoption of the Chapters as part of the Master Plan. Ms. Rowden had no updates at this
193 time.

194

195 **2. Minutes**

196 a. May 20, 2014 Work Session Minutes

197 b. June 3, 2014 Minutes

198

199 There was not a quorum of the Board to approve the May 20, 2014 and June 3, 2014 meeting minutes
200 so they were tabled for approval at the July 15, 2014 Work Session.

201

202 The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m. without objection.

203

204 Respectfully submitted,

205

206 Wendy V. Chase

207 Recording Secretary

208

209 Approved July 15, 2014