

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

April 19, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Regular members Mr. Kettenring, Mr. Mertz, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Broadhurst, 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.

MINUTES

There were not any minutes.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Notice for the 22nd annual Spring Planning and Zoning Conference on June 4, 2016

**(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.*

Mr. Kettenring said that NHDOT received the permit application, but that they have not acted on it yet. Mr. Kettenring said that when NHDOT does act on the application that the people should be notified again as this item has been in continuation for about a year. Mr. Mertz agreed.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, to continue this item to 5/17/16 at 7:00 pm. Vote was unanimous.

**PRELIMINARY HEARING/
SUBMISSION OF
APPLICATION**

*Advanced Land Surveying
Consultants Carl Johnson, Jr.;
property belonging to Jennifer
Ferland 343 Winona Road, Tax
Map R-7, Lot 6, 18.64 acres --Two-
lot Subdivision.*

Advanced Land Surveying, Carl Johnson was present.

Mr. Johnson described the property belonging to Ms. Ferland. He said that Ms. Ferland is interested in subdividing the lot into 2 different properties. One lot would be eight acres, and the other would be 10.64 acres. Mr. Shuey of Shuey Environmental did the test pits on the eight acre lot. Advanced Land Surveying also did sufficient topography to demonstrate that the land would be suitable for at least one septic, one well, and have access from Waukewan Road.

Waukewan Road being a State highway required a state permit which was pending.

The lot would have a single driveway that would meet the footage requirement as it has 400 feet of site distance going east and west. The state requires a small 12 inch culvert, due to drainage, and a simple driveway with a possible apron coming off the road.

Mr. Johnson said they do not have any interest to further develop the 10.64 acre lot due to the business being there. The eight acre lot could have a possibility of having two houses because of the lot size, pending a revision of the state driveway permit to change it from a single to a double driveway permit.

Mr. Johnson said that the lots to be subdivided more than exceed meeting the planning and zoning requirements.

Mr. Johnson said he would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Mertz was concerned about the wetlands that were marked on the lot. He asked what amount of land would be disallowed due to the wetlands. Mr. Johnson marked a sufficient amount of upland parts of the lots to make his determination and said that if you have enough for the minimal amount of upland, then the amount of wetland would be irrelevant.

Mr. Mertz asked for the upland amount. Mr. Johnson believes that there was about 100,000 square feet was upland marked on the map. He said he could have an exact number for next meeting. Mr. Johnson said that about two and a half acres was what they did topography on.

Mr. MacDonald asked where the two and a half acres were located on the map.

Mr. Johnson said he only demonstrated enough acreage to qualify for one lot. There is an existing road that could be used that would not impact the wetlands and that there would be an adequate amount of room by the westwardly edge of the lot, but they did not do any test pits there.

Mr. Kettenring asked if all the wetlands were marked on the map. Mr. Johnson said that they were not.

Mr. Kettenring asked Mr. Pollock if he had anything to ask. Mr. Pollock said that Mr. Johnson had answered his question relative to the driveway impact on the wetlands. Mr. Johnson said there is an existing culvert that helps with drainage.

Mr. Kettenring asked if any abutters were present that would like to ask a question. The abutters did not have any questions.

Abutters present were: Mr. Tharin and Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the board was ready to accept the application.

Mr. Mertz said he would like to see the lot size calculations. And if they needed Mr. Johnson's signature.

Mr. Johnson was waiting for the state issued driveway permit number to put in the final plan along with his signature.

Mr. Johnson said that the lot was large enough that it did not need a state approval for subdivision and all it needed was local approval.

Mr. Mertz made a motion to accept the application. Mr. MacDonald seconded the motion. Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any discussion. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Kettenring said that the application was accepted. Mr. Johnson is hoping to bring the driveway permit and the additional information that was requested by the board. He would also submit a new set of plans and was in hope to get a set date of continuance as to not have to notify the abutters again.

Mr. Mertz motioned to move this to May 17, 2016 at 7 p.m. It was seconded by Mr. Hays. Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any discussion. Vote was unanimous.

INFORMATIONAL/
CONCEPTUAL

Beth Blood Bascom/Rodney Bascom
204 Pinnacle Hill Road Map R-4
Lots 19-A and 19-B
Subdivision

Mrs. Bascom introduced her surveyor Mr. Bryan Bailey. Mr. Bailey presented a conceptual map which was based off of the tax map and the last survey from 1979.

Mr. Bailey stated that what is proposed is two lots on the north side of Pinnacle Hill Road that is around 20 acres. They wish to re-subdivide the two lots, so that it will be three lots.

The existing house lot would become 5.1 acres. The next lot, which includes some of 19-A and 19-B would be 5 acres. The final lot or back lot would be around 4 acres. This is due to the zoning line which is 1800 feet south of NH Route 104.

The Bascom's (Lot 19-B) wish to sell their home. Mr. Blood (Lot 19-A) wishes to keep his lot with the hope that he would build a residential house one day. The other lot would hopefully be sold to the commercial properties surrounding the lot.

Mr. Bailey stated that they meet all the requirements excluding the NH Route 104 frontage.

Mr. Bailey asked about requiring a test pit.

Mr. Kettenring said they did not require a test pit over 5 acres until time of construction.

Mr. Kettenring had the concern about the back lot and approving access from Pinnacle Hill. The Bascom's intend to sell it as a commercial lot, but it could also be sold as residential lot. Mr. Kettenring also would like to see if there are wetlands or steep slopes in the proposed driveway area as it could be problematic.

Mr. Bailey said his daughter was a Wetlands scientist and could do an evaluation of the wetlands and slopes of the property.

Mr. MacDonald asked what road frontage each lot had.

Mr. Bailey answered that the first one is 210 feet, and the second is 168 feet.

Mr. Kettenring asked where the proposed septic and well system of 19-A would be located, so they could see if the new lot line was too close.

Mr. Bailey said he would look into it.

Mr. MacDonald asked if 19-B would be buildable with its slopes and size.

Mr. Kettenring said it was over 5 acres, so most likely. He said that the lot would need a lot calculation to see if at least one acre was buildable.

Mr. Bailey said that according to the survey, they were C- slopes, which are 8 to 15 percent. He believes that these slope types should not be difficult to build upon.

Mr. Kettenring said that they had a formula in the rules that said what a buildable acre was according to soils and slopes.

Mr. Hays asked if there was already a driveway access to 19-A.

Mr. Bailey said there was not.

Mrs. Bascom said there was an old logging landing, which is not on that lot.

Mr. MacDonald asked if it was a commercial lot, how it would impact Pinnacle Hill Road. Is it an issue to worry about now or later down the road?

Mr. Kettenring said they would worry about it later because he doubts that any commercial enterprise with heavy traffic would want this property.

Mr. Kettenring reminded Mr. Bailey that both the lots would need driveway permits.

Mrs. Lucas reminded everyone that at the last meeting, they had talked about putting notations into the deed of what kind of access this back lot (19-C) could have.

Mr. Bailey said that he would hesitate to put any restrictions onto the property beyond the zoning restrictions that already exist. They do not know what will happen. He feels that it would discourage builders.

Mr. Kettenring said it could be a commercial lot that has only one or two customers a week.

Mr. Mertz said it could become a commercial entity that has no customer base like a warehouse for employees only.

Mr. Mertz also asked if down the road 19-C was sold to an adjacent lot that had access to NH Route 104, could it become another residential piece on Pinnacle Hill Road? Would it have the dimensions to become its own lot?

Mr. Bailey believes it could based on the topography of the left side of the property and it would have around 150 feet of road frontage.

Mr. Kettenring reminded everyone that this is an informational/conceptual plan meeting. He asked if the board had any concerns for Mr. Bailey before he made his final plan.

Mr. MacDonald asked when a lot is in two different districts, what rules apply to the lots?

Mr. Kettenring answered it depends what part of the lot you are in. You can put a house on any part of the lot, but the business can only go in the mixed-use part of the lot. A house and a business cannot go on one lot.

Mrs. Bascom said that she and her brother have a plan that one of them will own 19-C. It would then be adjacent to either 19-A or 19-B. She said it would most likely be him, so that the lot could stay in current use.

Mr. MacDonald pointed out that part of 19-C belonged to Mrs. Bascom.

Mrs. Lucas said that the board would look into the penalties of the current use issue for the lots.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there were any further questions.

Mrs. Bascom asked how long the process took.

Mrs. Lucas said she had to come at least 2 more times (preliminary hearing and abutters hearing).

The Bascom's thanked the board for their time.

OTHER BUSINESS

*Mr. and Mrs. Guyer
Off of Campground Road at
5 Cottage Lane
Sunroom addition*

Mr. Kettenring called upon Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Guyer said he owns a cottage at the Twin Tamarack Condo Association. He expanded on three sides and put it on a full foundation. The company who put the foundation in said that the current deck could be used again, but as the foundation went in, the deck did not survive.

He put a deck back on without a permit, and extended out a few more feet. He added the feet for when the snow came off as they are away for part of the winter.

Mr. Guyer came for a building permit for a sunroom, but was told he was farther out in footage by two feet than he was supposed to be. He believes he was less due to the fact that a deck used to be there.

He said he was told he needed a building permit, and because he failed to get a permit for the new deck, he had to pay additional fees. He also needed permission from the condo association. He did get permission from the condo association. He still had not expanded on the one side, so he will take the two feet that went over on the deck side, and reduce the unexpanded side by two feet.

Mr. Guyer is interested in finding out information about what steps to take about getting a sunroom.

Mr. Hays asked if he had information about shore land when he had the excavating done.

Mr. Guyer said he did not need to do one. He said that he is far enough away from the water. He said that he is 56 feet away from shore. He was only required to do a short form when he put his foundation in because he was not moving his house.

Mrs. Lucas asked if he had a footprint drawing that he could pass around.

Mrs. Guyer is requesting to move a 2x16 foot piece to the undeveloped side, so that the footage would not change.

Mr. Broadhurst asked if the Guyer's had a copy of what the condo association requirements were.

Mr. Guyer provided them with a letter.

Mr. Guyer explained to Mr. MacDonald about the difference between the pictures that were passed around.

Mr. Kettenring told Mr. Guyer that he needed a survey done to show the change that was done, so that the board can file it with the Registry of Deeds to show that it was amendment to the original.

Mr. Guyer said that he had a declaration done by an attorney.

Mr. Kettenring said that the survey only needs to be for the Guyer's limited common area with enough tie into the original to show the amendment.

Mr. Pollock asked if they were adjusting the limited common area so that one side is 6 feet and the other is 10 feet. He said that the survey would consist of the building and the new limited common area.

Mr. MacDonald said if the surveyor had any questions to come see the board.

Mr. Kettenring said that the survey needed to show what the building look like as it currently is.

Mr. Mertz pulled up an image on google map to help show what the Guyer's were talking about.

Mr. Mertz said that they had some issues with prior cottage expansion into common area that took away from emergency ways. He wants to know how close the Guyer's cottage is to the other cottage.

The Guyer's said it was close, but a regular vehicle could fit through. A fire truck cannot fit through.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the board would require the distance between the houses.

Mr. Mertz would like to see in the survey what the distance between the cottages are. So that if in the future someone extends their cottage without a

(Planning Board, April 19, 2016, cont.)

permit, they will know exactly what the footage is now.

Mr. Guyer asked if he needed a site plan.

Mrs. Lucas said he would need to fill out a subdivision application not a site plan. He would need to state that it was an amendment to the subdivision.

The Guyers thanked the board for their time.

Mr. Kettenring asked if there was any other business.

Mr. MacDonald is going to the conference, and asked if anyone else was going. Mr. Broadhurst was going. Mr. Mertz is also going.

Mr. MacDonald said he would not be at the June meeting.

Mrs. Lucas introduced Mr. Pollock, and told the board about what his job entitles.

Mr. Kettenring asked if the board should talk about the Agri-Tourism next meeting to start addressing the different zones and start an outline of requirements that the town will have.

Mr. MacDonald said he would check into the legal status on where the statute stood.

Mrs. Lucas reminded them that the May meeting was the board's election of officers which will take place after correspondence on the agenda. She also reminded the board that the liquor store opens this week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kettenring asked for a motion to end the meeting. It was motioned by Mr. Hays to adjourn. It was seconded by Mr. Mertz at 8:11.

Respectfully submitted,

Regina Adams