

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

February 19, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Kettenring, Mr. Irvine, Mr. Luciano, Mr. Conkling, Mr. Mertz, Mr. Joseph, Mr. Lacey and Mr. Randlett were present.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Vose, Secretary was present.

CALL TO ORDER:

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

Mr. Irvine appointed Mr. Joseph to vote in place of Ms. Gregg and Mr. Lacey to vote in place of Mr. Love.

MINUTES:

1/15/13

Mr. Joseph made a motion, seconded by Mr. Irvine, to accept the minutes with the following change:

1. Page 2, last paragraph under signing of plans: "*clarification of the hydrant on the map in the area L2*" should be changed to "*the map designated L2.*"

The motion passed.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Copy of a letter from the Selectmen to LRPC advising that Robert Barry be appointed to the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee.
2. Copy of a State driveway permit approval for NHS's new entrance for the O'Connor House dorm.
3. Copy of a Notice of Decision from the ZBA for approval of 2 variances for applicant Northstar Contractors LLC, property owner Sean Sweeney, Tax Map U10-6.
4. Standard Wetland Permit submittal from Brown Engineering for the culvert replacement on Sky Pond Road.
5. Wetland Permit Application submitted by Holden Engineering for applicant Bruce Vaal, property owner G10 (Elaine Dolbec).

MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Irvine advised the members have received a 2 page draft narrative of the survey results and asked the Planning Board to review it for any comments or edits, asking them to email those to Mrs. Lucas, who would forward them to him.

Mr. Lacey asked if there were any conclusions coming from the survey. Mr. Irvine advised that attitudes are fairly consistent with the previous survey in 1998, valuing the character of the town while allowing growth. Mr. Luciano

asked if the survey represented the population of the town and Mr. Irvine said that according to census information it did seem to mirror the age group of the residents, and the response rate was roughly 18%.

Mr. Lacey asked if there were any means to solicit certain types of businesses and Mr. Kettenring said the Planning Board could ensure those types of businesses are allowed in the ordinance. Mr. Irvine pointed out that the town doesn't have the authority to seek out businesses. Mr. Dougherty, property owner and representative of KGI Properties said that New Hampton's Planning Board is one of the better communities to work with, as the town has good ordinances, while encouraging businesses. Ms. Leadbeater, BCEDC, advised that the council can assist the town with making businesses aware of the possibilities of situating in New Hampton.

**PRELIMINARY
HEARING/SUBMISSION OF
APPLICATION – Expedited Site
Plan Review**

LRGHealthcare, applicant, New Hampton Route 104 LLC, property owner; Tax Map R-4, Lot 90K - to renovate 2350 sq. ft. in the Exit 23 Plaza to locate a medical office.

Mr. Mertz advised that Fire Chief Drake submitted a letter with his comments on this site plan.

Mr. Kettenring read the letter from Chief Drake stating he has reviewed the plans and has the following comments and questions for the record:

1. All renovations and construction must meet current NFPA code requirements for this type facility.
2. The 2nd rear egress required overhead protection and defined egress path.
3. Plans submitted do not show any fire alarm system but does refer to “sprinklers”; more clarification is required on this issue.
4. No indication of Smoke Detectors or Carbon Monoxide Detection.
5. Heating system needs to be inspected and approved.
6. Further review of interior separation construction from other occupancies.
7. Access keys to be provided and stored in a secure Know Box outside front entrance.
8. Final walk-thru inspection prior to occupancy.
9. Review of the electrical system needs to be completed.
10. No reference on the plan for fire extinguishers and locations.
11. No reference on the plan for exit signs or emergency lighting.

John Dunleavy (Director of Facility Services at LRGHealthcare), Larry Connor (contractor with Lacewood Group), and Frank Dougherty (property owner), were present.

Mr. Dunleavy said they had a provider previously located on the NHS campus and are looking for a new location in New Hampton. This Exit 23 Plaza location will accommodate the

provider, with possibly an additional provider or a locating specialist if needed. There will be an area for routine lab work.

Mr. Mertz thanked Mr. Dunleavy and advised that the residents will appreciate the provider's relocation into New Hampton.

Mr. Mertz asked if there was anything in the Fire Chief's comments that concerned them. Mr. Connor said relative to the reference to sprinklers, he did not think the building was set up to handle a sprinkler system, which Mr. Dougherty confirmed. Mr. Irvine pointed out that a note under A10 on the plans, under #1 - "work by others", it is noted "adjustments to the fire sprinkler system shall be part of this contract". Mr. Dunleavy said he doesn't see any other issues with the requirements as the state will be inspecting their facility. Mr. Connor has not spoken with the Fire Chief yet relative to his comments. Mr. Kettenring advised he remembered concern with egress out the back so a pedestrian won't walk directly into the travel way. As rear parking is now permitted for employees, Mr. Irvine recommended that striping be done along the entire rear of the building, as the drive through has been removed. Mr. Kettenring advised that bollards could be used instead.

Mr. Luciano asked how the medical waste and radiation protection will be handled and Mr. Dunleavy advised that medical waste will be handled by a contractor who will pick it up. The space for x-rays will be in place, but will not be installed at this time as the electrical service currently can't handle it.

Mr. Mertz asked for the hours of operation. Mr. Dunleavy said the plan was 8am-8pm, Mon-Sat. Mr. Mertz asked if there was adequate lighting and Mr. Dunleavy said there will a light added over the door, which should be sufficient.

Mr. Irvine asked if there would be any controlled substances that would require extra security. Mr. Dunleavy advised there would not be, but a security system will be in place.

Mr. Lacey asked when the anticipated opening date would be and Mr. Dunleavy said it would take several months.

The board reviewed the list of items to qualify a site plan for an expedited review. The board agreed it met the criteria.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Joseph, to accept the application. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Kettenring advised that the Police Chief has not reviewed the application.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Joseph, to approve the site plan with the condition that any comments/concerns of the Police Chief are addressed and that the items noted by the Fire Chief are addressed. Vote was unanimous.

**PRELIMINARY HEARING/
SUBMISSION OF
APPLICATION**

Jeffrey Huckins, applicant, Martha Huckins Revocable Trust et al, property owner; Tax Map R-10, Lots 10, 10A & 10B – boundary line adjustment

Jeffrey Huckins and surveyor Colin Brown were present.

Mr. Brown advised that the properties are located along Dana Hill Road and Magoon Road. He showed a drawing which reflected how the lots are currently, then the addition of 48.77 acres going to Jeffrey and Jennifer Huckins' lot, and an additional 32.53 acres going to George and Sheila Huckins' lot. The remaining lot will be reduced by 81.3 acres.

Mr. Kettenring asked for any abutter's comments. There were none.

Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Luciano, to accept the application as complete. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Irvine, to approve the boundary line adjustment. Vote was unanimous.

**INFORMATIONAL/CONCEPTUAL
MEETING:**

Colin Brown, property belonging to William Cannon II, Sawicki Family 2012 Trust, and Christopher Sanborn, 29, 33 & 47 Old Bristol Road, Tax Map U1, Lot 11

Surveyor Colin Brown presented a copy of a portion of tax map U1, with an area highlighted. He explained that Mr. Cannon owns about 5.45 acres which wraps around 2 other house lots. Mr. Cannon would like to subdivide, creating a 2nd lot, and perform a lot line adjustment to add acreage to the 2 abutting lots, as those property owners are interested in purchasing additional rear acreage. Mr. Brown had drawn in a right-of-way near the SW corner of Mr. Sanborn's lot. He explained that as the proposed new lot is very steep along the road, they would like to provide access using a ROW off of Mr. Sanborn's driveway.

Mr. Mertz confirmed with Mr. Brown that it is the intention of Mr. Cannon to sell additional acreage to the abutters. Mr. Brown advised that the existing lots have precinct water and sewer, but the new lot being created does not and Mr. Cannon did not think it was feasible, though he has not contacted the Precinct. Mr. Brown advised that without town water and sewer, there isn't sufficient road frontage. Mr. Kettenring said that without town water and sewer an appeal to the ZBA will be required prior to submitting an application to the Planning Board. Mr. Kettenring pointed out that the 4:1 ratio on parcel A should be looked at but did not see any additional issues with the conception as presented.

**INFORMATIONAL/CONCEPTUAL
MEETING:**

"Reno" Rossi, Paul Rossi, and surveyor Anthony Randall were present. Mr. Randall submitted a sketch showing the existing

Rossi's Restaurant – Onorio & Filomena Rossi, 322 NH Route 104, Tax Map R11, Lot 10, used vehicle sales

restaurant property. Two areas were highlighted to show the area Paul Rossi would like to use for the purpose of selling vehicles. The existing garage (672 sq. ft.) would be used for detailing the vehicles. A portion (660 sq. ft.) of the existing restaurant structure would be used for office space for a new sales office. Mr. Randall pointed out the restriction that no more than 10% of the primary structure can be used for outside display/storage. Mr. Randall advised that on the sketch he's noted where Mr. Rossi would like to display vehicles, which calculates to roughly 6,000 sq. ft. Mr. Randall said he was unsure whether or not the garage used for detailing can be used in the calculation. He said the plan would allow for flow through of traffic around the building. He advised there were no plans for additional lighting and that Mr. Rossi would like to relocate the existing sign on the eastern end, to the western side of the property.

Mr. Randall asked for any further concerns relative to the proposal, other than the need for a variance on the display percentage.

Mr. Joseph expressed concern with the amount of parking available during the restaurant's busy times. Paul Rossi advised that there has been sufficient parking even during their busiest times in the 30 years they've been in business.

Mr. Irvine asked where prospective customers would park to access the vehicle sales. Mr. Rossi said it would be on all sides of the restaurant except the western side. Mr. Irvine advised the parking would need to be looked at relative to the ordinance requirements. Mr. Rossi said he would operate the vehicle sales during the day and as the restaurant doesn't open until 4:30 pm he would be working at one business then going to the other. Mr. Kettingring said that parking and traffic flow needs to be shown and consideration needs to be given to emergency access. Mr. Rossi pointed out that Dunkin Donuts was situated in the building before, with much more traffic than this business will have. Mr. Irvine asked if there would be any maintenance or service in the garage and Mr. Rossi said there wouldn't be. Mr. Irvine asked if the state had been contacted relative to any approvals they may require for selling vehicles. Mr. Rossi said he hadn't and Mr. Randall said they wanted to find out if the plan could be approved before looking at those requirements. Mr. Irvine expressed concern with having 2 in & out entrances on this lot, and suggested one entrance in, one out.

OTHER BUSINESS:

*Shoreline Condos
NH Route 104, Cabin Drive*

Ken & Candice Dionne and Attorney Tom Quinn were present. Atty. Quinn advised that Mr. and Mrs. Dionne own a cottage at

Shoreline Condominiums off NH Route 104. They would like to tear down and rebuild their cottage. Atty. Quinn showed the location on a tax map and on the previously approved condominium plan. He said this cottage is under 400 sq. ft. is a single story, and has condition issues so there is a need for repair. He explained that each cottage has a limited common area. They would like to demolish and rebuild the cottage roughly 1+ foot wider and longer. Mr. Kettenring advised them to speak with Shoreland Protection. Mr. Dionne said he had and was told that if the cottage is less than 1500 sq. ft. it is exempt.

Under the cluster development section in the subdivision regulations, Mr. Irvine pointed out the requirement of 30 feet between buildings, He advised a variance would be required as the cottage is 28 feet on one side and 32 feet on the other side – from the nearby cottage, so with an addition it would encroach further. Mr. Irvine asked if the deck shown on the plan is going to be put back on. Mr. Dionne said he wasn't going to demolish that and Mr. Irvine advised him to show it on the plan. Atty. Quinn said they would be revising the condominium documents.

Mr. Mertz asked how many bedrooms there are currently and what they are proposing. Mr. Dionne said it is one bedroom and will remain one. The cottage will have a loft area to be used for storage. Mr. Mertz asked what would prevent the 2nd floor area from becoming a 2nd bedroom and Mr. Dionne advised it would be accessed by ladder only, no stairway. Mr. Irvine asked if there was anything in the condo documents limiting the cottages to 1 bedroom. Mr. Quinn said the documents are very limiting in what can be done to any of the cottages.

There was discussion on making changes to the addition to keep it within the 30 setback to another structure and to get approval of the other association owners prior to making application to either board.

***New Hampton School
Parking Requirements***

Kirk Beswick, Director of Facilities at NHS, was present. During development of their parking plans, Mr. Beswick advised that they are looking at current and future structures relative to parking requirements in the ordinance. They are trying to create spreadsheets to calculate parking requirements but need some guidance.

Relative to the ordinance, residential parking is clear relative to # of bedrooms, but educational occupancies aren't as simple to calculate. Mr. Beswick pointed out the requirement of 1 space per 3 seats in the largest assembly room (dining hall) – or – 1

space per staff member, whichever is greater and asked how they calculate # of staff (ie. for building; for all staff in general; or staff present at one given time; faculty & staff; faculty only; what about staff that works nights; rotating schedules). Mr. Kettenring advised 1 space for every employee, staff, etc. but make adjustments for those that work nights, live on campus and walk to work, etc. Mr. Mertz said if you discount parking spaces, the number will be lower than the numbers required by the school's largest assembly area, so the assembly area should be the control. Mr. Irvine pointed out that looking at the campus as a whole, is a better way to calculate parking. He said it's best to look at what the maximum impact to parking is, at any given time, and that during those times the school still has to have parking for residents. Mr. Beswick said they could count all the residents, count the educational occupation and its min-max count versus seats in the largest assembly, then discount those that live and park on campus. Mr. Beswick said there is nothing in the ordinance relative to parking for special events. He asked what if they do all these calculations and it comes out that this is more parking than what the ordinance requires. Mr. Kettenring pointed out that during some of the events the Police Department has had problems with parking. He said that this portion of the ordinance was not written by this board, and was done many years ago. He sees the issues will be with residency, education, and events, with the educational staff having a lesser impact than the events. Mr. Kettenring advised he doesn't want the events to create parking to be taken up on Main Street and causing problems there. Mr. Irvine pointed out a requirement that parking for a place of assembly without seats is calculated by using the floor space of the area accessible to the public. He suggested this could be used to provide appropriate event parking. Mr. Beswick said that relative to basketball tournaments they would look at the sq. footage around the courts. Mr. Irvine advised there were bleachers to be counted and Mr. Beswick said he didn't think bleachers were seats. Mr. Beswick said that for the tournament the school paid for a police detail, had 4 parking attendants, and provided the town a parking plan for the campus. He said the school feels it is unreasonable to expect that there be parking spaces to accommodate the few large events the school has each year. The school is working to meet the intent of the ordinance and wanted to know what mandates the parking for the few special events. Mr. Kettenring advised the board can't require what isn't mandated but does not want to see issues created for the town. Mr. Conkling suggested considering overflow parking. Mr. Beswick advised that the inner campus is getting very crowded with an increase in student count by roughly 60 over the past several years, so there isn't a lot of space to create parking. The school is looking at using peripheral properties. Mr. Beswick asked if the board was agreeable to a parking plan

using other properties during events, such as the church and grange parking lots. Mr. Kettenring said that could be considered and suggested very large events could possibly use KGI property and shuttles. Mr. Irvine said the town should remain flexible with the parking requirements as the school is a unique property.

Mr. Mertz advised that as an abutter, graduation is a parking issue but doesn't want to see parking areas created in green space for a 1-time event, but to handle large events with overflow parking. Mr. Conkling mentioned the use of the Blood property and property behind the cemetery. Mr. Kettenring suggested a flexible and common sense approach relative to parking.

Seminar by Randall Arendt

Mr. Irvine that land-use planner Randall Arendt held a seminar attended by a few members of the board and Conservation Commission member Pat Schlesinger, who purchased his book "Envisioning Better Communities" for the town. He strongly suggested the members read it.

Exit 23 Plaza Renovations -3rd party review of plans

Relative to the Exit 23 Plaza renovations, Mr. Beswick asked if 3rd party review has been required for that project. Mr. Kettenring advised that the changes are being reviewed by the Fire Chief. Mr. Irvine pointed out that the school's plans are getting 3rd party review because of the occupancy being where students are boarded. He said if the plans are complex enough the Planning Board will require that review.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Mertz, seconded by Mr. Lacey. Vote was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Vose