

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

**Sandown Planning Board
Minutes
October 21, 2014**

Date: October 21, 2014

Place: Sandown Town Hall

Members Present: Ernie Brown - Chairman, Matt Russell -Vice Chairman, Ed Mencis – Secretary, Doug Martin, Cynthia Bucu – Ex Officio

Also Present: Town Engineer - Steve Keach, Recording Secretary - Andrea Cairns

Absent: Steven Meisner, Mark Traeger, Lisa Butler – Alternate

Opening: Mr. Brown opened the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

Review of the 10/7/14 Minutes

L227 change “30” to “5”

MOTION: Mr. Russell made a motion to approve the 10/7/14 minutes as amended. Mr. Mencis seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

James George, Infill Development Partners, Inc.

Mr. George noted Infill Development works on behalf of Blue Sky Towers. They build cell towers in secondary markets. He has a proposal with the Selectmen to do one on a town-owned piece of property but he was there to propose one on Mr. Mencis’ property at 56 North Road. He noted Sandown has communications problems with areas that don’t have good cell service.

They are working with Plaistow, Atkinson, Windham, Danville, Seabrook, Salisbury and Hampstead to put similar towers in those towns.

Mr. George noted there is only one tower that propagates one to two miles around town located at the Bassett’s property. Angle Pond has an issue and the North Road area towards the school also has an issue. There is some coverage from Fremont and Chester but it is a large residential area and a highly traveled road. He was there for an informal discussion to determine what he needed to do in terms of getting approval from the town to construct the tower.

Mr. George indicated where the tower would be located on Mr. Mencis’ property. He noted it would be past the football field in a back corner. They would use the existing access road to gain access to the tower. They would need to update electric lines and would run them underground beside the existing roadway. They would be putting a 100’x100’ facility and would meet all property setbacks and the 125’ fall zone.

Mr. George explained the tower would be 180’ tall in the center of the 100’x100’ fenced in area. The height and type of fence used would be based on the conditions of the board. He would prefer to have an 8’ fence. Within that 100’x100’ area would be the tower and

46 all equipment required for each carrier—battery back-ups and generators. Each carrier
47 has their own equipment. The tower would be a monopole structure, similar to what is at
48 East Coast Lumber. The FAA requires any tower over 200' be lit with a blinking light, so
49 they wouldn't go that high. He feels the height is appropriate given the wooden nature of
50 the parcel and the few abutters. He noted they would do a balloon test, where they fly a
51 red balloon at the height of the proposed tower and drive around to locate where you can
52 see the balloon. That will help abutters determine if they will see the tower or not. They
53 do feasibility studies on soil to see if there are any artifacts. They also do testing on the
54 soil to make sure it's not contaminated.

55

56 Mr. George noted that a 180' tower gives him the potential for four carriers. They need
57 10' of space between each carrier and given the tree cover, he would likely not go below
58 140'. They could also put secondary tenants lower down such as the state police.

59

60 Mr. George noted in terms of zoning, it is a residential zone and the residential zone does
61 not allow cell towers. After looking through the regulations, he felt he would need to get
62 a variance, conditional use permit and site plan approval. He noted he would have an
63 anchor tenant before he comes in with a formal application and that tenant would be a co-
64 applicant.

65

66 Mr. Russell questioned what wind speed the tower could withstand. Mr. George noted
67 they are rated for 120mph.

68

69 Mr. Russell questioned if the facility would be lit. Mr. George noted it would not be. Mr.
70 Russell questioned if they would use diesel engines for the back-up generator. Mr.
71 George noted they generally prefer diesel, but could go with propane if necessary. Mr.
72 Russell wanted to make sure they would meet NFPA storage guidelines since that area is
73 next to the Exeter River. Mr. George noted that they would and all of that would be
74 shown on the plans. He noted the carriers test the generators once a month and also do
75 what they can for sound dampening.

76

77 Mr. Martin questioned how much power the tower would draw. Mr. George noted it was
78 200 amps per piece and they would be upgrading the property to handle that increased
79 capacity. Each carrier would have their own meter and pay their own electric bill. There
80 is no cost to the town or property owner for that.

81

82 Mr. George noted they would also have an annual removal bond in place. Mr. Martin
83 clarified that was for restoring the area if the tower was to be removed. He questioned
84 how long it will have to be out of use for the bond to be called. Mr. Keach noted the
85 ordinance states one year.

86

87 Mr. Martin questioned, with changes in technology, would the tower be outdated 10-15
88 years down the road. Mr. George noted that he feels they will always need the elevated
89 infrastructure, but the antennae will likely change (E.g., 3G vs. 4G).

90

91 Mr. Brown questioned what happened if the bond wasn't renewed. Mr. Keach noted it
92 will be a self-calling bond so if the successor bond isn't in place by the date of expiration,
93 the bond is called automatically.

94

95 Mr. Keach noted that Mr. George would be seeking a variance from Article 9, Section
96 4C; he didn't need a conditional use permit; and would need to submit a site plan
97 application.

98

99 Mr. Keach noted that state statute RSA 674:53 mandated that they notify the Town of
100 Chester because the property is situated in both towns. He noted they will need to go to
101 the Chester Planning Board and get their signature.

102

103 Mr. Martin questioned if they had elevation requirements for choosing a site and
104 questioned if FAA height requirements were based on sea level or ground level. Mr.
105 Keach noted that it is height above ground. Mr. George noted that when they chose a
106 location, it has to do with a carrier trying to build their network. They have search range
107 maps that indicate areas where there is poor service, so they look to find positions within
108 the center of these areas that have good range. Elevation is important, but it isn't
109 everything.

110

111 Mr. Martin questioned if Mr. George would be able to reveal his tenants when he comes
112 in with an application, to show that he has credit worthy tenants committed to the tower
113 and asked if his leases were subject to the town's review as landlords. Mr. George noted
114 he would be more willing to do that with the town's tower, but for Mr. Mencis' tower,
115 that information would only be shared with Mr. Mencis. He will talk about the dynamic
116 of the lease in a public forum when he is ready and has the lease determined.

117

118 Mr. George noted that companies merge all the time, so there is risk of going from four
119 companies down to two companies simply because those companies merged together.
120 (E.g., Sprint and Nextel). He noted there were other opportunities for rentals.

121

122 **Review of Subdivision Regulations for Fire**

123 Mr. Keach reviewed his suggestions based on the questions that the board raised during
124 the 10/7/14 meeting.

125

126 *vii – Cistern structures shall be rated for H-20 highway loading*

127

128 *Mr. Keach's emailed response: While "H-20 highway loading" is a standard structural*
129 *load implying a structure is capable of being driven over by a vehicle, in the present*
130 *instance that does not mean we anticipate cisterns will be situated beneath roadway*
131 *surfaces or be driven over ... in fact with cistern equipment poking out of the ground*
132 *surface it will be impossible to drive over one. Rather, the intent of the H-20 loading*
133 *requirement is simply one of cistern strength and durability. As a practical matter, most*
134 *if not all commercially available precast concrete cistern or polyethylene/fiberglass tank*
135 *products of a size capable of holding 30,000 gallons will likely be rated for H-20 loads or*
136 *better anyway. By having this requirement in the Code all we are really doing is*

137 *providing a “yardstick” to easily measure structural requirements for any product or*
138 *material used in cistern construction or installation. I presume this is why Bill’s initial*
139 *draft of the Code included this reference. Probably a good idea to keep it as written.*
140

141 Mr. Keach added that it is standard loading and while they aren’t intended to be driven
142 over, the reality is any structure will have to be rated H20 loading so it could be picked
143 up and moved. He sees it as surety to make sure they are receiving a structurally sound
144 structure.

145
146 ***xv - Complete cistern installations shall be guaranteed, via maintenance bond, for one***
147 ***year from the date of public acceptance by the Town of Sandown. In instances where***
148 ***cisterns are located in subdivisions having public streets, the date of public acceptance***
149 ***shall be the date of public roadway by the Board of Selectmen pursuant to RSA 674:40-***
150 ***a. This maintenance guarantee shall cover water tightness of the cistern as well as all***
151 ***appurtenances associated with cistern operation. Completed cistern installations shall***
152 ***be inspected for compliance by the Fire Chief or his/her designee prior to the release of***
153 ***the maintenance bond, and a report to that effect will be submitted to the Board of***
154 ***Selectmen.***
155

156 ***Mr. Keach’s emailed response: “Acceptance” and “availability” are two separate***
157 ***things. While I am confident Chief Tapley will want to require a cistern be in place prior***
158 ***to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy (Pelham requires it prior to issuance of***
159 ***the first building permit based on the notion that buildings under construction catch fire***
160 ***just as easily as those that are occupied), I don’t believe the Town should “accept” (i.e.***
161 ***take formal ownership) any cistern until such time as it accepts the streets and any other***
162 ***public improvements. This is our way of making sure everything is complete and correct***
163 ***before ownership of anything is assumed by the Town.***
164

165 Mr. Keach added that the town doesn’t want to accept “pieces” of infrastructure. The
166 bond will be for the entire project, so acceptance in terms of public ownership should
167 happen all at the same time.

168
169 Mr. Russell noted his concern is that if Phase B doesn’t happen for a long time, that
170 portion of the road may not be complete and totally accessible. Mr. Keach noted that
171 Chief Tapley likely wouldn’t want to wait for the cistern until Phase 2 is complete, so it
172 likely would be part of Phase 1.

173
174 The Board agreed to add the word “acceptance” before “by the Board of Selectmen.”
175

176 9.6.3.1 – Mr. Russell asked if they should add the word “accessible” to read “operable
177 and accessible.”
178

179 Mr. Keach felt “operable” indicated “accessible” since they couldn’t operate it if they
180 weren’t able to access it.

181
182

183 **Site Plan Regulations**

184 **Mr. Keach's emailed response:** *As far as the Site Plan Regulations are concerned, I*
185 *would suggest Chief Tapley provide some language for the Board to*
186 *consider. Remember, site plans by their very nature most often relate to non-residential*
187 *or multi-family construction which are the subject to different NFPA Code*
188 *requirements. One "easy way" to handle this would be to add language to the site plan*
189 *regulations requiring applicants to meet with the Fire Chief, as Authority Having*
190 *Jurisdiction to review NFPA Code requirements specific to the planned use, occupancy*
191 *and configuration of any non-residential or multi-family site.*

192

193 Mr. Keach noted every non-residential or multi-family application review has the
194 potential for different code requirements. It would make more sense for them to meet
195 with the Fire Chief and get a letter of satisfaction from him after his review.

196

197 Mr. Keach noted what invokes the new regulations is a new application. If there is a
198 subdivision, even if unbuilt, as long as it maintains its vesting, it cannot be retroactive.
199 This is for subdivisions moving forward and is only for major subdivisions.

200

201 xvi – Mr. Keach agrees with the “or to manufacturers specifications” change.

202

203 xxiii – Mr. Keach explained it is vertical feet, not horizontal feet and noted it needs to go
204 back to the original dimensions. He recommended 16 feet.

205

206 xvii - Mr. Keach explained what that meant and noted it didn't impact how close the
207 chief could get his truck to the pipe.

208

209 9.6.3.1 – keep with changes

210 vii – keep as is

211 xv – keep all language and add the word acceptance

212 xvi – keep Board's changes

213 xxiii –put back to 16 and let the chief weigh in on that.

214

215 Mr. Keach questioned - iii – and asked if they should add concrete. He preferred
216 polyethylene or fiberglass, but suggested they add “pre-cast concrete” as an option. The
217 Board wanted to run it by Chief Tapley.

218

219 Ms. Cairns will also talk to Chief Tapley about how they wanted to handle the site plan
220 regulations. They will do the site plan and subdivision regulation public hearing at the

221

222 **Correspondence**

223 Request from Mr. Villella to have his bond released for Phillips Pond Estates fire
224 protection. E. Brown went over to talk to Mr. Holmes to make sure he was ok with it, but
225 he wasn't home. Mr. Keach didn't need to review it. Chief Tapley needed to send a letter
226 of approval.

227

228 The Board received a Summary of services provided by RPC. Mr. Russell asked Mr.
229 Keach if he felt the dues they pay is money well spent. Mr. Keach thought RPC's work is
230 very valuable. They have a lot of grant money available only to members. They offer
231 services that if you have to hire a professional to do you would pay three times as much.
232

233 **Other Business**

234 Mr. E. Brown noted he got a call from the building inspector; the store is going to put a
235 walk-in freezer and wanted to know if he needed to file an application for that change.
236

237 Mr. Keach noted there is a site plan approved for that facility already, they could use
238 those plans and draw the addition on and come in for an amended site plan hearing.
239

240 **Doug Martin – Community Rail Extension Study Public Hearing**

241 He was able to attend the meeting. They have done environmental, impact and feasibility
242 studies. They are also doing ridership studies. They have narrowed down to three sites in
243 the town of Plaistow. There will be a layover area where the trains are stored at night and
244 a station. Mr. Martin explained the various sites. He noted a rep from the town of
245 Plaistow offered to come and give a presentation to the town if needed. Mr. Martin is
246 going to present the same information to the Selectmen.
247

248 Mr. Martin added as a region, the closer you are to public transportation, the more value
249 there is to property values.
250

251 **Engineer's Report**

252 Mr. Keach noted that St. Matthews wants to have 90% of the site work, including the
253 pavement, done by the time it snows.
254

255 The Wells Village Road culvert should be done by next Friday.
256

257 He handed out changes in legislature and went through the two that were relevant to the
258 town.
259

260 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Martin seconded the motion. All
261 members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed. MEETING ADJOURNED at
262 9:27 p.m.
263

264 Respectfully Submitted,

265 

266 Andrea Cairns