

**TOWN OF NEW HAMPTON
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
NEW HAMPTON TOWN OFFICE
NEW HAMPTON, NH 03256**

March 15, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Regular members Mr. Kettenring, Mrs. Hiltz, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Mertz, and alternate members Mr. Joseph and Mr. Hays were present.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Permitting Assistant Mr. Pollock

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Kettenring called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Kettenring appointed Mr. Hays and Mr. Joseph to vote in place of the Mr. Conkling and the vacant regular member positions.

MINUTES

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Hiltz to accept the meeting minutes of 1/4/16 as written. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hays to table the minutes of 12/15/15, 1/19/16, and 2/16/16. Vote was unanimous.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Copy of letter to NHS Jill Duncan from NH DES for approval of an Alteration of Terrain Permit for the work related to the ice arena and parking area.

**(Cont) PUBLIC
HEARING/ABUTTERS
HEARING**

Michael Sharp; NH Route 104 & Riverwood Drive; Tax Map U-17, Lot 55 – Site Plan Review for health focus facility.

Mrs. Lucas advised that the driveway permit application with engineer Kent Brown's plan was submitted to NHDOT.

Mrs. Lucas said the applicant is asking for a continuance while he obtains feedback from NHDOT.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, to continue this item to 4/19/16 at 7:00 pm. Vote was unanimous.

**(Cont) PRELIMINARY
HEARING/ SUBMISSION OF
APPLICATION:**

Ty Shute, Straits Road, Tax Map R-6, Lot 2; 93.96 acres, 4-lot subdivision.

Advanced Land Surveying Carl Johnson was present.

Mr. Kettenring read a letter into record from Fire Chief Drake. He expressed concern with the rear lot and its future development as the property is very steep which could make it difficult for emergency vehicles to access and turnaround. He said he had no issues with the other 3 lots.

Mr. Johnson advised he received a copy of Chief Drake's letter and sent an email response that he is proposing a note on the plan which states a Certificate of Occupancy would not be issued for any dwelling in the subdivision until the driveway has been approved by the Fire Chief. Sufficient area at terminus of each driveway will be provided for emergency access. Note was added to the plan.

The review that was done January 18, 2016, the driveways were approved by the Public Works Department of New Hampton. The setbacks were then

(Planning Board, March 15, 2016, cont.)

added to the plan. There is an access and septic easement at the top of Lot 3 to benefit Lot 1. Randall Shoey of Shoey Environmental put a Wetland Stamp of approval onto the plan as the soils are adequate to support a septic for a future home site.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there were any questions, Mr. Joseph asked if they were planning on making it a stone road way? Mr. Johnson answered that no road ways were purposed only driveways.

Mr. MacDonald asked if this plan was only for Lots 4, 3, and 2. It was answered by Mr. Johnson that it was for all lots.

Mr. MacDonald asked about doing a terminus. It was answered by Mr. Johnson that the terminus normally goes in when the driveway is put in.

The terminus will be applied to all four lots.

Mr. Kettenring asked for any more questions. There were none.

It was accepted and approved.

Mr. Mertz made a motion that they will accept the plans as complete. It was seconded by Mr. MacDonald. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there were any other motions.

Mr. Mertz asked Mr. Johnson if he had a Mylar. Mr. Johnson said that he did not, but that he had spoken to Mrs. Lucas about it, and that there would be some minor plan changes that could be done. He would provide copies of what the Mylar would be. He said that that would be done on March 16, 2016 and request that the board sign it outside a regularly scheduled meeting.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Mertz made a motion to approve it as it was presented.

It was seconded by Mr. Joseph.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. and Mrs. Bascom came for advice and ideas on whether it would be a good idea to subdivide the lots because half to three quarters of the each property are zoned for commercial use. Mrs. Bascom believes that if the property is available, then it will be desired by a potential developer. She had three ideas about the subdivision.

1. 19-B (Mr. and Mrs. Bascom's Lot) would be subdivided.
2. 19-A and B (19-A is her brother's lot) would be combined, and then subdivided as there would be more acreage, and therefore be more desirable. It would then only need one easement.
3. All three lots (Lot 19 is Mrs. Bascom's sister-in-law) would combine and then be subdivided.

Mr. Kettenring asked what the access would be. Mrs. Bascom answered with

Other Business

*Beth Blood Bascom/Rodney Bascom
204 Pinnacle Hill Road
Lots 19, 19-A, & 19-B
Subdivision*

(Planning Board, March 15, 2016, cont.)

if all three lots were combined, then the access would be along the line between 19 and 19-A. Which would give the lots as much frontage as possible, if it were developed to be sold as a house lot.

If Lots 19 and 19-A did not wish to be a part of the subdivision, or if it was only lots A and B participating, then the easement would be on the left hand side along the line between 19-A and 19-B.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the lot that was to the right of 19-B was the lot that was previously discussed. Mrs. Bascom said it was owned by KGI. Mr. Kettenring asked if it would be better to wait until KGI was developed and work out an easement with them and/or sell them the lot. Mrs. Bascom said that an acre was with the house already, but that the rest of the land was in current use. She liked the idea and would consider to go ahead and subdivide Lot 19-B with only the amount of land that could be sold with the house. She would also put in a partial easement. She would also leave the rest of the lot alone until a developer came along.

Mr. Mertz asked whether it was one, two, or three subdivisions and then a merger that it would be bank of land that would fall into the mixed-use zone. He asked if what she wanted to do was to create access, so that it was a legitimate lot. Mrs. Bascom said yes it was. He said that they could create a right-of-way that could be used for whatever property that was created.

Mr. Kettenring pointed out that the Bascoms are in a mixed-use zone, so when they went to sell it would not need to be specified for either commercial or residential use.

Mr. Kettenring clarified that what the Bascoms were proposing is that if the lots were combined and cut in half into a separate lot with an easement to Pinnacle Hill Road that the easement could be potentially used for commercial use. He pointed out they could sell it either way.

Mr. MacDonald asked about what the topography was like on the lot in question. He remembered walking KGI's property, and it was a bit steep. He remembered that the edge of the property had a stream. Mr. Bascom answered that there were some flat areas and that some others were steep. The steepest part being near Pinnacle Hill Road. But there are changes in the elevation on the proposed property.

Mr. Kettenring had said if they were to get a surveyor that the surveyor would suggest a possible place for a driveway that would be suitable for the topography. It might require some adjustments to the line to make the easement work.

Mr. Bascom had said if they were to combine the three lots and put the easement closer to lot 19 than 19-A. That lot was very flat, and would not cause much difficulty.

Mr. Bascom asked if an easement was put it, would it be permanent/

Mr. Kettenring said you could make it part of the deed when it was sold. The surveyor could help with that process. Mrs. Lucas suggested it be part of the plan as well as the deed.

Mr. MacDonald asked what the impact would be if 19-B was to come out of current use. Mrs. Bascom assured them it would be within the specifications. The Bascoms said it would not be an issue if all the lots merged and were then subdivided. The three lots combined are over 10 acres. Even with a boundary adjustment, it would not affect the current land use. It would not need to come out of current use until it was developed.

Mrs. Lucas reminded them that the ownership has to remain the same as the front lot or it would disqualify it.

Mr. Kettenring asked if 19-B was the only lot with a house. Mrs. Bascom answered yes, and that they had 11 acres. 10 acres in current use and 1 acre with the house. Mr. Kettenring clarified that the three lots combined were 16 acres. Lots 19 and 19-A would be fine to leave in current use, but as 19-B has a house, there are questions that would be answered by a surveyor.

Mr. Bascom asked about the change of ownership and its effect on current use. Mr. Kettenring answered if the lots were merged and the ownership had changed it could still stay in current use as it is land only. 19-B might come out of current use depending on how the deed was worded.

Mr. Joseph asked where the lot was located on 104. The Bascoms answered that it was behind the nursery on NH Route 104. The lot is only accessible from Sinclair Hill Road or Pinnacle Hill Road. There is a possibility it could be accessible from KGI.

Mr. Kettenring asked if Mr. and Mrs. Bascom had any more questions from the Planning Board. They said that they did not. The Bascoms thanked them for their time and the input regarding the subdivision.

Mr. MacDonald asked that if the subdivision access was on the Pinnacle Hill Road side could it still be used as a commercial lot. Mr. Kettenring answered that it could because it was in the mixed use district. Even if it is in a residential zone it could still be used for commercial access. Mrs. Lucas said that it could be worded in the deed that it could be only used for residential or multi-family use and not commercial.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the Bascoms or the Planning Board had any questions. There were not any.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Kettenring talked about the Agricultural Tourism that was tabled last meeting. One approach to the Agricultural Tourism is that it will be permitted by special exemption. He proposed that they think about it more and make an ordinance that would be talked about at next month meeting. He thinks that the special exemptions could be permitted in the agricultural and rural areas, but not in the mixed use, and village district. It could also be permitted in the commercial districts.

Mr. Mertz suggested that they do what Mr. Kettenring proposed.

Mr. MacDonald suggested making the special exemption rules and definitions that would apply to each district.

(Planning Board, March 15, 2016, cont.)

Mr. Kettenring suggested that the Planning Board review each case.

Mr. Kettenring also suggested that they prepare to have this be able to be in place for November, so that it will be on the ballot in March.

Mrs. Lucas suggested it be talked about at every meeting from now until November to be ahead to the game. Each meeting they will bring in news articles that pertain to this issue as to learn from them.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any other business.

Mrs. Lucas asked if Mr. Mertz wanted to brief the Board of the meeting the previous evening.

Mr. Mertz talked about Eversource's presentation to SEC. Any questions for Eversource had to be submitted in writing. They also had public comment on which you submitted your name. Most people were opposed to what Eversource said, but that people for it argued that it should look at New Hampshire companies first to the job.

Northern Pass will take 2 years to complete. Interstate 93 is not a viable route. Other people believe that the proposed route is not viable either.

Senator Forrester stood up in opposition and reminded them that in the study from 2014, Interstate 93 was a viable option.

If Northern Pass was to go underground the entire way, Eversource said it would be an extra billion dollars.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Kettenring. It was seconded by Mr. MacDonald at 8:12.

Respectfully submitted,
Pamela Vose and Regina Adams