

TOWN OF THORNTON
PLANNING BOARD

Approved on: 8/15/13
PB Initials: TBP
Rec'd by Town Clerk on: 21 AUG 13
Town Clerk Initials: ZC

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
August 8, 2013
Site Visit / Workshop

CALL TO ORDER:

Board members met at Waterville Estates Realty Office, 548 Winterbrook Road Campton at 6:00pm.

ROLL CALL:

The following members/alternates were present:

T. Phillips, Chairman S. Macintosh, Member C. Piantedosi, Member F. Gunter, Alternate

Staff members J. Fleury and N. Decoteau were also present.

T. Avallone presented a brief overview and history of the Waterville Birches site plan development and provided a detailed plan for continuation with Phase II of an existing project by constructing 21 detached single units in condominium organization.

T. Avallone and those present drove to the site and viewed the last duplex units recently completed in Phase 1 and proceeded to walk the site of the proposed continuation of development with the beginning of Phase 2.

The Board returned to the Town Office at 7:30pm and summarized the issues discussed during the site visit as follows:

- Letter of Credit: Details of the current Letter of Credit and current correspondence from the bank regarding the status.
- NH Alteration of Terrain Permit: Review to see if there is a need to amend the current AoT permit to meet the recharge requirements.
- Driveways: Profiles showing flattened out landings at junction with road. Intersections of driveways with road need to address site distances especially where the driveway meets the road on a curve.
- Setbacks and distances between the structures: If not in compliance with Zoning a variance will need to be obtained.
- Drainage Pond: Needs to be shown on the plan.
- Phasing of development: Perhaps a schedule of the development could be established and noted as a condition of approval to address the concern that at no point during the project will the Letter of Credit be for less than what would be necessary for the development of the remaining area.

During the discussion another issue was noted and the Board requested that N. Decoteau provide T. Avallone with a draft copy of the minutes so that he will be aware of all the Board's concerns.

- Setback distances from drainage ditches to septic leech fields: It was noted during the site visit that test pits and septic design were done prior to the last adjustments to the road and site

plan lay out. The Board voiced concern that a dry drainage ditch needs to be 35 ft. from any leech field and wet drainage ditches have a requirement of 50-75 ft. The Board wanted to be sure that the latest changes in the plan address meeting these requirements.

The Board reviewed the draft Agenda for August 15, 2013.

N. Decoteau indicated that she will not be present for the meeting but that J. Fleury will be present at the meeting and is up to date on all of the agenda items.

The Board reviewed the *1st Draft 08 07 13 Table of Contents* submitted by G. Coogan and made the following comments to be submitted back to G. Coogan for his review:

1. Page 1, Article 1, line 5: The effective date will need to be for 2014 instead of 2013.
2. Page 1, Article 1, G: The word "and" should be removed and added to the end of H.
3. Page 1, Article 2, Abutter line 6: should read "include any person" instead of "include an person".
4. Page 2, Accessory Apartment: Use 750 SF as the max floor area. Make a note to consider adding a section specific to Accessory Apartments to consider criteria such as septic, number of bedrooms, detached garages with apartments, etc.
5. Page 2, Cluster Development: The definition is good. But a question came up as to whether or not the acreage used in the calculation/fulfillment of the density requirement can or cannot be in Current Use and should this be included in the definition – or like Accessory Apartment have a section specific to Cluster Developments with the detailed criteria.
6. Page 2, Dwelling: remove the word "or".
7. Page 2, Dwelling, Single-Family: "means" not mean
8. Page 2, Home Occupation: Again – a separate section listing the specific criteria so that items 1 through 6 can be removed from the definition and addressed in the section on Home Occupations. Other issues relative to Home Occupations that need to be considered are the procedure (application form, submission items, is a Notice of Decision issued?-because currently there is no procedure in place) and are they permitted on private roads.
9. Page 2, Selectmen: There was a grammar discussion regarding whether or not the "plural" word selectmen uses "mean" or "means" after it. We did not come to a decision on that.
10. Page 2, Variance: The board considered adding the following sentence to your definition; "The Board of Adjustment, upon appeal in specific uses, is empowered to authorize a relaxation of the terms of this ordinance, pursuant to the terms of this ordinance and RSA 674:33." The Board took it from our old definition and wanted to add that to yours. They want to know what your thoughts are on that.
11. Page 2, Qualifying Acreage: A lengthy discussion regarding this definition resulted in the following suggestions/comments:
 - a. Change the definition to what land can/cannot be used to meet requirements. A suggested start is "Qualifying Acreage is that portion of land use in calculation to meet density requirements but shall not include wetlands, floodplains and slopes over 35%."
 - b. Take the concept of your definition and add it to the separate section on Cluster Development. One of the specific issues to address with Cluster Development is that all the acreage used in meeting the density requirements must be contiguous but that each lot in the development need not abut the qualifying acreage.
 - c. A third point to make a note of is how "qualifying acreage" comes into play in the development of a parcel with an access inhibitor. Say for example a 20 acre parcel has a

stream going thru the lot separating 5 acres on the road frontage from 15 acres of backland. The question is should there be a provision/incentive/procedure for allowing 20 units on the front 5 acres to give credit per say to the developer for not crossing the stream? The Board welcomes your comments and any experience you have had on this issue.

12. Page 3, Structure: The Board agrees with the idea that some items such as those you listed may not fit our existing definition. The Board would like you research and present an alternative definition for structure. A note was also made that we need to keep in mind to watch the use of the words "Structure" and "Building" when we review Article 6 of the current Zoning Ordinance.

At 9:35 the following motion was made:

MOTION: "To adjourn."

Motion: C. Piantedosi

Seconded: F. Gunter

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 4– Yes, 0 – No

Respectfully submitted by:

Nancy Decoteau, Planning Board Assistant

Approved on: 8-15-2013