

1 Sandown Planning Board
2 Minutes
3 November 15, 2016
4

5 **Date:** November 15, 2016

6 **Place:** Sandown Town Hall

7 **Members Present:** Ernie Brown – *Chairman*, Doug Martin – *Vice Chairman*, Ed Mencis
8 - *Secretary*, John White, Lisa Butler – *Alternate*, Matthew Russell – *Alternate*

9 **Members Absent:** Steven Meisner, Mark Traeger, Terry Treanor - *Ex Officio*

10 **Also Present:** Andrea Cairns – Recording Secretary

11
12 **Opening:** Mr. Brown opened the meeting at 7:06 p.m.
13

14 Mr. Brown appointed Ms. Butler for Mr. Meisner and Mr. Russell for Mr. Traeger
15

16 **Approval of the 10/18/16 Minutes**

17 **MOTION:** Mr. Martin made a motion to accept the 10/18/16 minutes as amended. Ms.
18 Butler seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Russell and Mr. Mencis
19 abstained. The motion passed.
20

21 **Correspondence**

- 22 • Inspection reports from Keach Nordstrom regarding Wells Village Estates
- 23 • Letter from the U.S. Department of Transportation regarding the potential Exit 4A
24 off Route 93. Mr. Martin volunteered to represent the board at the workshops.
- 25 • Cleanwater energy audit project proposals
- 26 • RPC Legislative Forum
27

28 **7:15 – Gary Barnes, Discussion regarding Vantage Point**

29 Mr. Lavelle noted that Vantage Point is an approved 140 unit elderly housing
30 development. Mr. Barnes is going in a different direction with the project and wanted the
31 board’s input before they went too far. They provided plans that showed a conventional
32 subdivision layout with approximately 50 house lots. They are proposing to do an open
33 space development, which would yield 42 house lots.
34

35 They are proposing to do it in two phases. There would be two points of access into the
36 subdivision: Wells Village Road and Lantern Drive. There is a large wetland in the
37 middle where they would propose to install a dry hydrant. The upper section has too
38 much elevation to install a dry hydrant and they would likely utilize the existing wells for
39 the hydrants.
40

41 They presented road profiles. They are hoping to keep the grade under 6%. The lower
42 road is approximately 1,300’ to the cul-de-sac and the upper road is approximately 2,800’
43 to the cul-de-sac. They are unlikely to connect the two phases, but they are proposing a
44 fire lane access.
45

46 Mr. Keach has been given the plans but has not provided input yet. Mr. Brown noted they
47 would need to show the plans to the fire chief as well and get his input.
48

49 Mr. Brown noted he has some concern about the road lengths, but wasn't entirely sure
50 what the regulations were.

51
52 Mr. Lavelle noted that they are proposing common wells, which are in place from 10
53 years ago. Mr. Mencis noted NHDES would require they get retested. Mr. Lavelle noted
54 each lot would have it's own septic.

55
56 Mr. Russell questioned if the wetland delineation was current. Mr. Lavelle noted that Mr.
57 Fewerda has been onsite and the plans look good, but they will be recertified.

58
59 Mr. Mencis questioned if Chester would be notified. Mr. Lavelle noted they are not
60 abutters, but they would be notified.

61
62 Ms. Butler noted that the plans state Tammy Lane, but that road is actually Ammy Lane.

63
64 Mr. Martin questioned if he had any intention of making them into apartments. Mr.
65 Barnes noted he had no intention to doing that.

66
67 Mr. Lavelle noted the proposed configuration is far less impact on the land since there
68 will be less blasting and less filling of wetlands.

69
70 Mr. Barnes noted the two phases would be different types of homes. The upper portion
71 may be more marketable to the elderly, but won't be age restricted. The bottom will be
72 single-family homes similar to Waterford Village Estates.

73
74 Mr. Lavelle questioned if the board would be open to the two-phased approach. The
75 board was open to it and felt the project made most sense to do it that way.

76
77 Mr. Barnes questioned what recreation requirements there would be. He noted that doing
78 something similar to Waterford Village with sidewalks and playgrounds did not seem
79 practical. It doesn't get used the way it should. He would prefer to make a donation per
80 lot so the recreation department could do something with it for the town. Mr. Russell
81 noted the only problem with doing it that way is that he cannot direct how the money is
82 spent.

83
84 Mr. Lavelle noted they would likely bring the design review application before the board
85 in December.

86 87 **Non-Confirming Lots Zoning Amendment**

88 Ms. Cairns presented a draft of the amendment based on the samples from Bedford and
89 Hooksett that Mr. Keach provided the board. The board felt at this point it would make
90 most sense to have the town attorney review it and offer feedback.

91 92 **Other Business**

93 Mr. Russell raised concern over the special meeting to be held on November 22, 2016.
94 He noted it was not protocol for the board to hold special meetings for applicants and had
95 concerns about setting precedence. He did not feel the board should have a special
96 hearing since they've had problems with doing that in the past. Since the hearing was
97 already noticed, the board agreed to still hold it. Mr. Brown noted that he would have

98 preferred Mr. Russell raise his concerns while the planning of the meeting was
99 happening.

100

101 **MOTION:** Mr. Martin made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Mencis seconded the motion. All
102 members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed. MEETING ADJOURNED at
103 8:50 p.m.

104

105 Respectfully Submitted,



106

107 Andrea Cairns