1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Stratham Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting Minutes April 24, 2012 Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room 10 Bunker Hill Avenue Time: 7:00 PM
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Members Present:	Dave Short, Vice Chairman Jeffrey Karam, Secretary Bruce Barker, Full Time Member Kirk Scamman, Full Time Member Chris Brett, Alternate
19 1 20	Members Absent:	Arol Charbonneau, Chairman Mike Smith, Alternate
21 22 23 24	Staff Present:	Paul Deschaine, Town Administrator
25	continuation from professional invo Beals and Assoc Mr. McNeill the	oll Call: han, Mr. Dave Short, took roll call and explained that tonight's hearing is a m the April 10, 2012 meeting. Mr. Short explained that he has had lowement with some of the people present in the room: Christian Smith from iates, Mr. Scott Gove, realtor in a real estate investment in Portsmouth and applicant's attorney provided some advice to Mr. Gove during that process. ody present had an issue with that, nobody present did.
	2. Approval of Min April 10, 2012	utes:
38 39	The Board did no	ot review the minutes from April 10, 2012.
	3. Public Hearing:	
42 43	Mr. Short reopen	ed the public hearing and read the case for those present.
44 45 46	Special Exce	Jason White, 39-41 Union Road, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 10 Lot 78. A pption has been requested, pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, Sections d, 20.4.1, and 17.8.2, to allow the construction of a new residence and

appurtenant septic system. A Special Exception is required because the test pits used for the septic system do not meet the requirements of Stratham Zoning Ordinance, Sections 20.1.5.a. and d. specifying a minimum of two feet of natural permeable soil above the seasonal high water table beneath the sewage disposal area and sewage reserve area.

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

Mr. McNeill, the Applicant's attorney introduced his client Jason White as well as Christian Beal, Project Engineer and June Lobe, Environmental Consultant. Mr. McNeill explained the exhibits he had provided along with the application. He began by sharing the site plan showing the proposed septic design area. Other exhibits included a copy of the lot of record and a letter dated March 08, 2012 from the Rockingham Country Conservation District relating to their inspection of the property and their comments about exceeding minimum design requirements. Mr. McNeill stressed that this is a very a narrow Special Exception request, requesting relief due to the fact that the test pits relied upon for the septic system do not meet the requirement of 2 feet of natural permeable soil above seasonal high water. The 2 pits the applicant is relying on are 21" above the high water table so a difference of 3". Mr. McNeill explained that the proposed house will be set back significantly from the roadway. There will be wetland impacts to the driveway and there is also a conditional use permit pending before the Planning Board. Other permits required will be a New Hampshire Wetlands permit and a local driveway permit, but that doesn't relate to the 3" high water issue. Mr. McNeill continued that the driveway is designed to miss wetlands to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. McNeill asked Mr. Smith to explain the project layout to specifically address the septic system and special measures used for it. Mr. Smith referred to 4 wetland crossings on the plan explaining that they tried to locate in accordance with Jim Gove. Three of them don't have flow but the second one does have propensity for a decent flow of water. There are two 18" culverts underneath which should provide more than an adequate capacity to handle the potential flow of larger storms coming in.

Mr. Smith then talked about the septic design. He said he had spoken with Mike Cuomo 31 from the Rockingham County Conservation District and they had looked at different 32 33 options to facilitate more settlement before the affluence actually left for the leach field 34 itself. The septic system proposed, meets State requirements easily and has an extra 35 overflow tank too. He added that they also have more enviro-septic field that is required. In addition, Mr. Smith said that even though the test pits show 3" less natural soil, they 36 still maintain Stratham's minimum 3' from the seasonal high table to the bed bottom. 37 38 Mr. Smith explained why he chose the 21" test pits. Mr. Smith also confirmed that the 39 test pits meet State standards. 40

41 Mr. Short commented that if the test pits met the regular requirements would the system 42 being built be at least equivalent or better than that system would be. Mr. Smith replied 43 that essentially the tank where all the solids are settled, are bad in general for leach fields 44 but the system being built has 500 gallons of additional storage to deal with that. There 45 is also extra bed area which better disperses the flow. Mr. Short said that once that tank 46 is full the flow rate won't be impacted by size. Mr. Smith responded that it is a double walled tank which also facilitates a longer residence time. Had the test pits met the extra 3 inches required, then the tank and field that would have been built would have been smaller.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

34

Mr. Scamman asked what the State requirements were. Mr. Smith said that the Town of Stratham alone requires an extra 6" of depth more above the water table than the State. Different septic systems were then discussed.

Mr. Short referred to a letter from Mike Cuomo stating that although Mr. Cuomo refers to mitigation measures being taken, he senses that is not enough in its own right to grant a special exception. Mr. McNeill commented that there was an earlier letter from Mr. Cuomo stating the previous plan was unacceptable. Mr. Smith felt that the wording, "The applicant has exceeded other applicable minimum design requirements in an effort to mitigate impacts resulting from the limitations of the site" and the fact that Mr. Cuomo cites what those measures are, are key.

Mr. Gove spoke next saying that he did the delineation of the wetland area and was also the soil scientist with Mike Cuomo. He showed some pictures and an aerial photo to the Board and explained the location of the road. Mr. Gove also visited the site today after 3" of rain had fallen as he had previously seen it during winter only. He followed the area where the driveway will be located and showed the spot where the septic system will be located which is away from the marsh system and the stream area as well as being the best location for the best soils.

24 Mr. Short asked Mr. Scamman if he knew the last time the land was farmed at 39-41 25 Union Road. Mr. Scamman said it had been farmed pretty regularly. Mr. McNeill asked Mr. Gove what difference 3" would make from a soil scientist's perspective. Mr. Gove 26 27 said it wouldn't make much difference, but from the standpoint of the ability of the soil to treat affluent, it is virtually the same for 21" as it is for 27". The soil is fine sand which is 28 29 fine for a septic system. Below that is some silt clay loam which is slower, but the 30 treatment portion is above that loam. From the point of natural treatment allowing for the extra material being put in by Mr. Smith, there is no difference between 21" or 24" in 31 Mr. Short asked if the house grade and therefore the 32 terms of treating the affluent. 33 septic system grade were being raised a proportional amount. Mr. Smith said it was.

Mr. McNeill asked if he could run through the criteria. Mr. Short said he would like to ask the public if they had any input first. Mr. McNeill suggested he run through the criteria first so the public have a better idea of the application. Mr. Short allowed him to do so.

40 Mr. McNeill ran through the criteria pertaining to the high water seasonable table in 41 Section 20.1.5.a and d, 20.4.1 and explained how his client met them. Mr. McNeill 42 added that the applicant will need to get a state permit, and Stratham's own inspector has 43 visited the property with Mr. Gove and issued an initial letter addressing issues that 44 needed to be corrected and has then written a letter which has specifically addressed the 45 criteria just addressed by Mr. McNeill as the inspector knows it's essential to allow the 46 applicant to have this pass. Mr. McNeill stressed that he believes the applicant meets the criteria of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance about exceeding the standards. Mr. McNeill then ran through the general criteria that need to be met for a special exception explaining why his client met them too.

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

38

Mr. Short asked if anybody in the audience would like to speak for or against this application. Ms. Elwell from the Stratham Conservation Commission said she found it interesting that the term the applicant keeps using is, "the best spot" for the house. She commented that just because it is the best spot for the house, doesn't mean it is necessarily a good spot for the house or septic design along with the wetland crossings. Ms. Elwell said they were basically adding four wetland crossings to a sub standard lot. Her understanding is that there is a lot of beaver activity behind that lot and they have raised the water table on this site so she doesn't feel comfortable that the septic design is going to be acceptable. Her other concern is that the current seasonable high water table may not be the same in the future. 850' of roadway is going to be added that will be an impervious surface as well as a house and garage. All of those will add to the run off that is going off into the wetland area. From Ms. Elwell's perspective, this will be an over use of this lot even with just one house being built there. Ms. Elwell commented that her understanding of the comment from Mr. Cuomo "exceeded other applicable minimum design requirements in an effort to mitigate impacts resulting from the limitations of the site" refers more to the efforts that have been made and not the septic system design.

Mr. McNeill said he appreciated Ms. Elwell's comments and asked that she consider the qualitative evidence that has been submitted. He referred to the fact that the Town of Stratham requires a special exception and not a variance for this particular issue and he respectfully disagreed with Ms. Elwell's comments.

27 Mr. Paul Deschaine, Town Administrator made everybody aware that members of the 28 Stratham Building department visited the site yesterday during the rain storm and took 29 pictures not knowing that Mr. Gove was going to go out today. The Chairman has copies 30 of those pictures and Mr. Deschaine suggested sharing them with the Applicant. The pictures show very clear ponding and flooding of the area. Mr. Deschaine said that his 31 concern is that areas of this site, including possibly the house site, is subject to flooding. 32 33 If this site is repeatedly subject to this kind of flooding and adding in the problem that the 34 Town has had with beavers and the culvert that crosses Union Road, Mr. Deschaine feels 35 this could be a problem going forward. Mr. McNeill looked at the photos and then observed that the photos that are before the Board are nothing to do with why the 36 Applicant is before them. 37

39 Mr. Barker asked what Mr. Smith estimated the elevation of the house site was going to 40 be in relation to the road. Mr. Smith emphasized that the bottom of the leach bed will be 15" above existing grade at its highest point. Mr. Barker said he was trying to get a 41 handle on how high the bed and the tank is above what he would consider the release 42 43 point, which would be the road. Mr. Smith said the slab itself is proposed to be about 6 44 feet high. The bottom of the bed will be about 9 feet higher than the release point at the road. Mr. Smith wanted the Board to know that with regard to the separation from the 45 bed bottom to the seasonal high water table, would be the same regardless of the number 46

of inches of native soil above that seasonal high water table. He continued that they are not requesting a reduction of 3 inches of the bed to the seasonal high.

1

2

3

5

7

20

29

4 Mr. Gove added he would like to speak specifically to the soils aspect of this case and relate that to the pictures. He said it is sometimes difficult looking at photos and 6 overviews to actually grasp what is geographically placed at the site. He explained there is a lot of clay and water flows into it slowly, sometimes it is more likely that the water 8 will flow over it and down slope. On this site in the upland parts, there is a sandy cap 9 over the top so from the road to the septic location, there are areas that are clay, that have a cap of sandy loam and sand on top of that, clay, sandy loam, clay, sandy loam and clay. 10 During a rain storm there is plenty of infiltration and then run off. The reason Mr. Gove 11 12 went out to the site after the rain storm was to see how much water actually infiltrated 13 into the soil. Mr. Gove showed where it had completely infiltrated and one small area 14 near a crossing had 6 inches of water, but it was still working its way into the soil. Mr. Gove said this is why a double culvert is being put into that area. This is all fairly typical 15 16 after a rain storm. Mr. Gove then talked about the beavers and said they come and go and that this water table is long term one because beavers have been backing up the water for 17 a very long time in that area. Mr. Gove said there is no evidence of water inundation 18 19 even in the short term.

- 21 Ms. Elwell asked Mr. Gove to talk about the impact of the impervious surfaces. Mr. 22 Gove said that she was talking about an area that has 6 acres of land and a driveway that 23 is about 12' wide and 850'long. Mr. Smith said that equated to about four tenths of a 24 percent of the site. Ms. Elwell asked about the house. Mr. Smith said that calculation 25 included the house. Mr. Barker asked if the culverts were meant to redirect any flow or just to maintain flow. Mr. Smith said they were for maintenance. Mr. Short asked who 26 27 would be responsible for maintaining those culverts from the beavers. Mr. Smith said it 28 would be the homeowner's responsibility.
- 30 Ms. Cindy Stoddard, current owner of the property commented that she had maintained the lot. She further stated that the Town had managed to discourage the beavers, but then 31 it started to encroach on her hay field so she took care of the beaver and swales. Ms. 32 33 Stoddard emphasized that as long as the field is maintained, drainage will not be a 34 problem. She added that the culverts are in a place where she knows there is drainage 35 that flows into the current stream that goes under the road. Ms. Stoddard also commented that the location for the house is definitely the highest spot on the property 36 but maintenance is essential to prevent the beaver from affecting the drainage. If it isn't 37 38 maintained, it will start to affect the homes surrounding it. 39
- 40 Mr. Short checked there were no further comments from the public and closed the public session. Mr. Short said his concerns were more about the site itself, but that is a Planning 41 42 Board issue not a zoning one. Mr. Scamman stressed that they were here to discuss the 3 43 inches which meet the State requirements, but not Stratham's. Mr. Karam said that he 44 would like to discuss Mr. Cuomo's letter as he felt it was neither for nor against the proposal. Mr. Karam feels that Mr. Cuomo is leaving the decision up to the Board and 45 that the applicant fulfilled certain criteria from his point of view. Mr. Short and Mr. 46

1 2 3 4 5 6		Scamman agreed. Mr. Brett asked if there was a reason why Stratham had a more stringent ruling than the State. Mr. Deschaine responded that the belief is that the State minimum in part is set up for all the soils in the State and so it is generic. Mr. Deschaine continued that it is believed that here on the seacoast that an added treatment layer was advisable but it varies from town to town.
7		The Board then went through the criteria relevant to the application from Section 20.1.5.a
8		and d, and 20.4.1. The Applicant satisfied the criteria. The Board then went through the
9		criteria of Section 17.8.2 of the Ordinance for Special Exceptions. The Board agreed the
10		Applicant met all of the criteria.
11		
12		Mr. Scamman made a motion to approve Case # 571 for Jason White at 39-41 Union
13		Road, Stratham, Tax Map # 10, Lot # 78 to allow the Special Exception as requested.
14 15		The motion was seconded by Mr. Barker and the motion was passed unanimously.
13 16		Mr. Short reminded everybody that there is a 30 day appeal period.
10 17		with short reminded everybody that there is a 50 day appear period.
17		
10	4.	Miscellaneous
20		
21		There was nothing to report.
22		
23	5.	Adjournment
24		U Contraction of the second seco
25		Upon a motion by Mr. Karam and seconded by Bruce Barker, the meeting was adjourned
26		at 8.38pm. All in favor.
27		
28		