

Sandown Planning Board
Minutes
April 5, 2016

Date: April 5, 2016

Place: Sandown Town Hall

Members Present: Doug Martin – *Vice Chairman*, Ed Mencis - *Secretary*, Steven Meisner,
John White, Terry Treanor - *Ex Officio*, Erik Dykeman – *Alternate*

Members Absent: Ernie Brown – *Chairman*, Mark Traeger, Lisa Butler – *Alternate*

Also Present: Andrea Cairns – *Administrative Assistant*, Steve Keach – *Town Engineer*

Mr. Martin opened the meeting at approximately 7:04 p.m.

Erik Dykeman was appointed as a voting member in place of Mr. Traeger.

Review of the 3/15/16 Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the 3/15/16 minutes as written.

Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

Correspondence

- Letter from RPC with the dues for this year. The dues are \$6,016 for the year at a per capita rate of \$0.97.

MOTION: Mr. Mencis made a motion to approve payment of the \$6,016.00 for dues for Rockingham Planning Commission. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

7:15 p.m. - Public Hearing for review of a Lot Line Adjustment application submitted by Ronald and Sharon Frick. The properties are located at 6 & 10 Steele Drive and identified on Tax Map 25 as lots 66 & 67.

Mr. Ronald Frick presented the application. He noted the two properties have been in the family for decades. There is a septic easement on Lot 66 for the septic system on Lot 67. The lot line change would encompass that easement.

Mr. Meisner asked if the applicant was going to the Zoning Board and made him aware that he is Chairman of the Zoning Board and would not be able to hear both cases. The applicant confirmed he would be going to the Zoning Board so Mr. Meisner recused himself from the hearing.

Mr. Frick reviewed the plans and noted Lot 67 was going from .13Ac to .48Ac giving them 21,000 sq. ft. Lot 66 was going from 1.46 Ac to 1.11 Ac resulting in 48,336 sq. ft.

Mr. Keach reviewed his review letter dated 4/4/16. He noted that Mr. Zilch from SEC Associates addressed most of the changes and comments. He suggested three conditions when granting approval. He feels the application is a positive thing.

Mr. Martin opened the meeting to the public.

48 *Janice Joslin, M25 L69*

49 Ms. Joslin had concerns about where the property line was noting that the Frick's stairs to the
50 pond were actually on her property. She questioned if the lot lines were indicated in the
51 wrong place. She had concerns that they may have issues down the line if they ever go to sell
52 the property. The board agreed that it wasn't something they would be involved in since it
53 didn't affect the application they were reviewing. Mr. Frick offered to have an easement
54 drawn up. Ms. Joslin agreed that would be acceptable.

55

56 Mr. Keach noted that he saw that when he reviewed the application. He pulled the 1997
57 subdivision plans that were recorded at the registry of deeds. Those plans indicate the lot line
58 is the same on both plans, so the steps were built on her property.

59

60 Mr. Keach questioned if the intent was to eventually convert from a seasonal to year-round
61 property. Mr. Frick confirmed that was his plan in addition to cleaning up the septic
62 easement. Mr. Keach noted it set up the property well so it was eligible for conversion.

63

64 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the application for jurisdiction submitted by
65 Ronald and Sharon Frick for the properties located at 6 & 10 Steele Drive and identified on
66 Tax Map 25 as lots 66 & 67. Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.
67 The motion passed.

68

69 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to approve the application submitted by Ronald and
70 Sharon Frick for the properties located at 6 & 10 Steele Drive and identified on Tax Map 25
71 as lots 66 & 67. The following conditions apply:

72

- 73 • Receipt of certification from licensed land surveyor that all required boundary
74 monuments have been installed.
- 75 • Receipt of correspondence from town engineer acknowledging comments
76 and recommendations offered in his letter report of 4/4/16 have been
77 satisfactorily resolved
- 78 • Maintain positive PREA account

79

Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

80

81 Mr. Meisner stepped back in.

82

83 **7:45 p.m. - Public hearing for a design review for an application submitted by Kasher**
84 **Corporation to create a 50 unit open space development for multi-family dwellings. The**
85 **property is located on Wells Village Road and identified on Map 13 as Lot 1.**

86

87 Jim Lavelle presented the application and gave a history of the project. They are now
88 proposing to put in 50 condo-style rental units, 2-3 bedrooms. Half would likely be 3-
89 bedroom and half 2-bedroom. Mr. McCarthy noted he hasn't decided what the breakdown
90 will be, but it will likely depend on the market.

91

92 Mr. Keach reviewed his letter dated 4/5/16. He noted it was not intended to be an exhaustive
93 review.

94

- 95 • They are utilizing the infrastructure created for the conditionally approved application
- They demonstrated there were 25 attainable single family homes with a yield plan

- 96 • The Open Space Development ordinance enables non-age restricted multi-family
97 housing, but not more than 50% of the units can have more than three bedrooms
98 • They have received the proper state permits. Mr. McCarthy noted they needed to
99 apply for a revised permit for the community water system, but that has been done.
100 • Once they have an application to submit, they need to abandon their previous
101 approval so they don't have approval for two different subdivisions.
102 • They used the provisions of the zoning ordinance with no changes needed
103 • They should submit homeowner's association documents so the board can get town
104 council approval.
105 • This proposal will not be exempt from the impact fees because it is not age restricted.
106 The impact fee will be \$2,940 per dwelling unit.
107 • When they construct the road, he would like them to grant a highway easement on the
108 Chester side as well so they can widen Wells Village Road.
109 • They also need to prove there is adequate site distance on Wells Village Road
110 • The recreation proposal will stand
111 • Mr. Keach added that the ordinance was originally created to meet the workforce
112 housing statute.
113

114 Mr. Lavelle noted they were there to take additional input from the board, but feel they are
115 prepared to close out the design review phase and submit a formal application.
116

117 Mr. Lavelle noted they met with the fire chief and he does not want to change the secondary
118 access and is satisfied that the buildings will have sprinklers.
119

120 Mr. Russell questioned if the agreement with the Bishops still stood given that the application
121 has changed and is now apartments with no age restriction. The development will have a
122 higher impact on the town in terms of the demographics and impact to Wells Village Road.
123

124 Mr. McCarthy noted that the impact and square footage of the buildings is actually reduced
125 from the 55+ proposal. They reduced the area of roof runoff and drainage. It is a much
126 smaller development with buildings that have smaller footprints than what they previously
127 planned for. He added that he owns other rentals and the demographics are not as different as
128 you think. The turnover is quite small and there is a very small percentage of school aged
129 children.
130

131 Mr. Martin noted the demographics are very different and there will be a lot more car traffic
132 on Wells Village Road.
133

134 Mr. McCarthy noted that there are similar units over at Cornerstone Estates. All tenants go
135 through a strict screening process. They have a management company that takes care of the
136 rentals. They have a 24 hr. maintenance person on-site.
137

138 Mr. Russell noted that he may run his properties well, but someone else could purchase it and
139 not take care of it as well.
140

141 Mr. McCarthy noted that apartments have a bad stigma, but they are needed in the state and
142 the town. He is trying to find a project that he can build-out and the economics of 25 single
143 family homes can't work.

144

145 Mr. Treanor questioned what the rent would be. Mr. McCarthy said likely between \$1,200-
146 1,500/unit.

147

148 Mr. Meisner questioned if there should be some kind of on-site recreation—a small playing
149 field or playground creating an open space for residents to use. He feels that would serve the
150 town and those residents better than the original proposal. Mr. Mencis agreed something
151 similar to what is at Waterford Village Estates would be great. Mr. McCarthy would talk to
152 his insurance company and see what they would allow.

153

154 Mr. and Mrs. Bishop questioned why they would be rentals and not condos. Mr. McCarthy
155 noted it was income for the future. He added there is a need for rentals, his other units are
156 always full. He doesn't feel they will be low-income residents.

157

158 **MOTION:** Mr. Martin made a motion to accept for jurisdiction the application for design
159 review submitted by Kasher Corporation to create a 50 unit open space development for
160 multi-family dwellings. The property is located on Wells Village Road and identified on Map
161 13 as Lot 1. Mr. Mencis seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion
162 passed.

163

164 Mr. Lavelle noted they would continue with state and NHDES approvals and will work
165 towards a complete application.

166

167 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to close design review for the application submitted
168 by Kasher Corporation to create a 50 unit open space development for multi-family
169 dwellings. The property is located on Wells Village Road and identified on Map 13 as Lot 1.
170 Mr. Meisner seconded the motion. Mr. Mencis, Mr. Dykeman and Mr. Meisner voted in
171 favor. Mr. Martin and Mr. Treanor opposed. Mr. White abstained. The motion passed.

172

173 **MOTION:** Mr. Treanor made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Mencis seconded the motion. All
174 members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed. MEETING ADJOURNED at 8:50
175 p.m.

176

177 Respectfully Submitted,

178



179

Andrea Cairns