1	2 <b>April 11, 2012</b>		
2			
3	PUBLIC SESSION		
4		Approved & Amended	
5			
6			
7	<b>Type of Meeting:</b>	regularly scheduled meeting	
8	Method of Notification	n: Posted at the Nottingham Municipal Building & Nottingham	
9		Post Office	
10	<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Nottingham Municipal Building	
11	PB Members Present:	Arthur Stockus, Chair, Troy Osgood, Vice Chair, Susan Mooney,	
12		Secretary, John Morin, Dirk Grotenhuis, Robert "Buzz" Davies,	
13		Alt. Member, Hal Rafter, Selectmen's Rep, Cheryl Smith, Alt.	
14	DD 16 1 41 4	Member	
15		Rick Bacon, Traci Chauvey, Alt. Member.	
16	Others Present:	Lisa Sears, Land Use Clerk, Paul Colby, Building Inspector/Code	
17		Administrator, Charles Brown; Town Administrator, Christian	
18		Smith, Beals Associates, Faith Levesque, Peter & Thelma	
19 20		Thompson, Sarah Carson, Peter Landry, Kenneth Cardillo, Betsy Saunders, Lincoln Lavoie, Kristen Dubee	
21		Saunders, Lincoln Lavoie, Kristen Dubee	
22	Chair Stockus called th	e meeting to order at 7:02 pm. Introductions were made. Mr. Davies	
23		on. Ms. Smith was participating but not voting. The approval of the	
24	minutes was moved to the end of the agenda. Chair Stockus called the case.		
25	minutes was moved to	ne ond of the agenda. Chan blockus canca the case.	
26	Case #P12-03-S	SUB-An application from Doucet Survey, Inc. for a 4-lot subdivision	
27	(acceptance, compliance review, and final approval). The property in question is		
28	located on Old Turnpike Road (Rte 4) and identified as Tax Map 4 Lot 5. Owner(s)		
29		es S. Fernald Revocable Trust; James S. Fernald Trustee, Linda R.	
30	Fernald Revocable Trust; Linda R. Fernald Trustee, Frederick S. Fernald 1992		
31	Trust; Frederici	k S. Fernald Trustee	
32			
33	It was noted that the Bo	pard had received all the missing Notices of Authorization from all	
34	of the Owners that allow	w Beals Associates to represent them here tonight. Chair Stockus	
35	asked Mr. Colby to revi	iew his memo on Completeness and Compliance. Mr. Colby first	
36	addressed Completeness. He noted that under the Subdivision Regulations (page 6) the		
37	applicant is required to have a letter from the Conservation Commission (CC) in order to be		
38	complete. He noted that there is no letter yet but traditionally the CC is notified during the		
39	process and asked to comment then not as a condition of completing the application. He		
40	suggested doing so again; if the Board agrees then the application is complete. Ms. Mooney		
41	asked if it could be mad	le a condition of being complete. Chair Stockus agreed.	
42			
43		oney to accept this application as complete contingent upon review	
44	•	ne Conservation Commission.	
45	SECOND by Mr. Osg		
46	VUIL /-Aye. U- Uppo	sed 0- Abstained MOTION PASSED	

47
48 Mr. Smith, Beals Associates, reviewed the 4 lot subdivision proposal with the Board. He
49 noted that waiver requests; one for slope profiles and the other for road sediment control
50 plan. He noted that one of the lots is a large lot for future development.
51

Mr. Colby continued to review his memo. He addressed that the impact statement needs to address the traffic needs to address all the lots not just one. Mr. Smith agreed.

Mr. Colby noted that the Board needs the Fire Chief's input. Mrs. Sears noted that request to the Chief was just made the night before. Mr. Colby noted that the Board can no longer (by law) require sprinklers. Mr. Smith noted it will likely be a cistern if the Chief requires them to do so.

Mr. Colby explained that the large future development of this lot needs to be shown and that there can be a note put on the plan acknowledging that the undeveloped lot cannot be developed for 4 years from date of approval per Town regulations.

Mr. Smith showed potential development plans (14 lots in each of the 2 concepts) but added that the applicant doesn't own the lot needed for access (off Merry Hill Lane) to this lot.

Mr. Colby briefly discussed the access to the State Highway and shared driveways. He also noted that he would be meeting with the Dept of Transportation (DOT) on these driveway accesses on Thursday. It was noted that the Chief of Police sent an email to the Board expressing his safety concerns on these proposed driveways as well. Mr. Colby gave the Board a brief review of his site walk with applicant and the DOT. He recommended the Board have a site walk; either as a Board or each member going individually.

Mr. Colby reviewed the rest of his recommendations in the memo. Mr. Smith agreed to comply with Mr. Colby's recommendations. Mr. Smith said he believed that the driveways would be approved by DOT as designed. He added that they meet all standards but did acknowledge that it may take some time to get out of these driveways especially taking a left hand turn. Chair Stockus read an email from the Police Chief expressing safety concerns for these driveway accesses. Board members asked various questions on the driveway accesses.

Chair Stockus opened the public hearing for this case. He called for abutters in favor or against the project. There were none. He called for abutters with questions or comments. Ms. Saunders asked about phasing of the plan. Mr. Colby again confirmed that the large parcel would not allow for development for four years per the Town's Zoning Ordinances. It was noted when that does come before the Board all the abutters would be notified. Mr. Smith added that they would probably be required to also provide a traffic study, drainage plan, Alteration of Terrain permit from the State, etc. She added that it is very difficult to take a left onto Route 4, perhaps that they should not use Route 4 as the access. Mr. Smith again noted that the applicant doesn't currently own any other access to the property.

93 Mr. Smith took additional questions about the proposed plan from various abutters. It was 94 noted that the lot with future development was only provided as background info that the 95 whole Planning Board Subdivision process (and all its requirements) would have to be 96 done on this large lot and there are no guarantees that it would be what is being presented 97 tonight. Chair Stockus closed the public hearing. 98 99 The Board discussed the need for a site walk. The Board decided due to scheduling issues 100 that each member would review the site before the next meeting. They did not schedule an 101 official site walk that would be a public meeting. At this time the public was not invited to 102 participate in the site walk. Mr. Smith added that he did not have authority to authorize

103 that. 104

Mr. Colby noted that the only outstanding issue is the driveway permitting process. Ms.

Mooney noted that the May 14<sup>th</sup> is the next Conservation Commission meeting.

MOTION by Ms. Mooney to continue this case #P12-03-sub on May 23, 2012 at 7pm. SECOND by Mr. Osgood

110 VOTE 7-Aye. 0- Opposed 0- Abstained MOTION PASSED

111 112

## Winter Street Matter- Charles Brown, Town Administrator

113

- Mr. Brown had submitted and reviewed a letter on behalf of the Board of Selectmen (BOS)
- on the issue of Winter Street being a Class VI and getting one building permit for TM 12
- Lot 17. Mr. Colby added that the local governing body (BOS) can allow this and the owner
- would have to sign a waiver of liability. Chair Stockus read a sample waiver.

118

119 It was noted that before a building permit could be issued the final waiver would need to be signed.

121

Point of Order: there were many side discussions going on at the same time while questioning this issue.

124

Mr. Brown noted that the Town will need to take an inventory of similar roads that need to be discontinued but for one reason or another never was.

127

Mr. Davies noted that if a building permit is granted for Lot 17 then there is potential for others. Mr. Brown agreed. It was noted that there was a lot of about 1500 acres on this road. Discussion continued on the owners of the road and land/lots around it.

131

Ms. Smith asked about a legal opinion. Mr. Brown read from his notes on what the Town's attorney had said in regards to this issue. Mr. Brown noted that the issue of prescription came up. Ms. Mooney asked about the class of the road and its length.

135

- Mr. Landry briefly reviewed his research on this road adding that private rights are always
- there. The owner explained that his son would like to move into his existing home (Lot 18)
- and he and his wife would build a house on this lot for themselves (Lot 17). Discussion

139 moved to the proper addressing and numbering for 911. It was noted that it would be 140 handled later on in the process. They also reviewed briefly the RSA that applies requiring 141 comments from the PB. 142 143 Ms. Mooney suggested a subcommittee to review roads in Town that may need to be 144 discontinued. Mr. Brown agreed. 145 146 Ms. Smith noted that she would have liked a written, more formal response from the 147 Town's Attorney. Mr. Brown agreed. 148 149 Mr. Grotenhuis added that the concerns were future development, lot(s) being sold off, 150 what is going to happen for a common driveway and the waiver issue, can or should the 151 Town going to maintain it or not. Ms. Smith added she would like legal input. Mr. Rafter 152 noted that he didn't hear any opposition or doubt in these comments tonight. Chair Stockus 153 noted there seemed to be the most concern for setting a precedent. Ms. Smith agreed. 154 155 Mr. Davies asked if the land owner could discontinue the road. Mr. Brown noted only the 156 Town could do that. Mr. Davies stated that he didn't think it was a good idea to issue a 157 building permit on a Class VI road because it would open too many other options along 158 that same road. Mr. Osgood agreed, noting the road should be discontinued before issuing 159 the permit. 160 161 Mr. Landry stated that the RSA covers issues of liability for the Town, and gave his 162 opinion on the law in this area. Mr. Rafter noted that if the BOS had approved the permit and sent them to the ZBA they probably would get approval. He also added that, based on 163 164 history they probably wouldn't challenge it. 165 166 Mr. Rafter also noted that the BOS will put a warrant article for this road and maybe other 167 roads like it to be officially discontinued at next year's Town Meeting. 168 169 Mr. Brown thanked the Board. 170 171 **Old Business** 172 173 The Board reviewed the conditions for Rocky Hill Subdivision. Mrs. Sears noted that the 174 Town has not received the bonds for the maintenance and construction of the road. Mr. 175 Smith reviewed Mr. Gerry of Rockingham County Conservation District (RCCD) memo 176 confirming that they will comply with their requests. He also added that they met with the 177 Conservation Commission and RCCD will hold the conservation easement. 178 179 The Board agreed to sign, individually, the mylar once the Bonds are set. Mr. Smith 180 thanked the Board. 181 182 **Review of the Minutes** 183 184 March 28, 2012

185	Line 32 change <i>Damn</i> to <i>dam</i>
186	Line 40 change bond to the
187	Line 44 change <i>Granite</i> to <i>GRANIT</i>
188	Line 49 insert a after at
189	Line 65 add s to Fernald
190	Line 66 change this to third party assignment
191	
192	MOTION by Ms. Mooney to approve the amended minutes of March 28, 2012
193	SECOND by Mr. Davies
194	VOTE 5-Aye. 0- Opposed 2- Abstained MOTION PASSED
195	
196	Master Plan Chapter(s) Review
197	
198	After discussing the case load and scheduling, the Board decided to postpone this review
199	until April 25 <sup>th</sup> meeting. Chair Stockus asked the Board members to read them all ahead of
200	time.
201	
202	MOTION by Mrs. Mooney to adjourn.
203	SECOND by Mr. Morin
204	VOTE 7-Aye. 0- Opposed 0- Abstained MOTION PASSED
205	
206	Respectfully Submitted,
207	
208	
209	
210	Lisa L. Sears, Land Use Clerk
211	
212 213	These minutes are subject to approval at a regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting at which time the above minutes are corrected or accepted.