

**TOWN OF HOLDERNESS
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday,
April 16, 2019 6:30PM**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: R. Snelling called the meeting to order at 6:30.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Members Present: Robert Snelling, Chairman; Carl Lehner, Vice Chairman, Donna Bunnell, Secretary; Angi Francesco, Member; Ronald Huntoon, Member; Louis Pare (not present for minutes approval or 1st case), Member; Peter Francesco, Ex-Officio

Staff Present: Linda Levy, Land Use Board Assistant

Others Present: Frank Yerkes, Rebecca Hanson, Larry Kill, John March, Tony LeMenager, Peter Webster, Will Davis, Ken Chadderton, Susan Chadderton, Rob Haskell, Gail Castonguay

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The draft of the minutes of the March 19, 2019 were reviewed with suggested edits.

Motion: "To accept the minutes as amended."

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 0-absention 1-absent

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Case 19-3-6: Property owners Kenneth and Susan Chadderton of 127 Perch Pond Rd, tax maps 229-005-000 and 229-008-000, request a lot merger so that lot 229-008-000 (.432 acres) merges with lot 229-005-000 (5.12 acres) to create one lot equally 5.552 acres.

- R. Snelling opened Case 19-3-6 at 6:31 asking the Chadderton's to present their proposal.
- S. Chadderton: We have two pieces of property that we would like to combine into one piece of property.
- R. Snelling: Do you plan to develop it in any way?
- S. Chadderton: No, at some point we will move and sell the property as one piece.

Motion: "To accept the application."

Motion: R. Snelling

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 0-absention 1-absent

- R. Snelling asked if the board or the audience had any questions or concerns on the merger. None were raised.

Motion: “To approve the merger of the two lots.”

Motion: C. Lehner

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 0-absention 1-absent

- R. Snelling closed the case at 6:35 and opened Case 19-3-7 at 6:37.

Case 19-3-7: Application submitted by John March as Agent for Curry Place Cottages LLC, located at 850 US Route 3, identified as tax map 102-004-000. Request a Site Plan review of property to renovate a commercial space into two residential units, located in the Commercial District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Site Plan Regulations.

- P. Francesco recused himself from the case citing his conflict of interest as an abutter. He asked if there were any objections to him remaining at the table during the discussion given that he is on crutches. No objections were raised.
- R. Haskell: I am the owner of Curry Place Cottages. The current proposal is for Phase III of the project, a duplex of residential rentals. I hope to have one of the units completed by the summer and finish the other unit after the summer.
- R. Snelling: Can the septic can handle the additional load?
- J. March: We believe that it can. We are in the final stages of finishing the septic plan, it should be done in the next week or so. He handed out diagrams of the septic plan and the septic loading.
- R. Snelling: Where is this field going or is it the existing field?
- J. March: Existing
- R. Snelling: In the middle of the open area?
- J. March: Yes
- R. Snelling: What is the capacity of that system?
- J. March: Over 5000 gpd
- R. Snelling: The future – is that Stage IV?
- J. March: That’s these 2 units (pointing to the site plan).
- D. Bunnell: So, tonight we’re doing Stage III?
- J. March: Yes. Future construction will be Phase IV.
- R. Snelling: Do you have a blessing from the State?
- J. March: It needs to be reviewed by the State, we should have that next week.
- R. Snelling: That would be a reasonable condition then. Where is the parking for Phase III located?
- J. March: I added many spots (explained by showing the parking on the drawing).
- D. Bunnell: You can park on the septic?
- J. March: Yes
- R. Haskell: They are concrete chambers.
- R. Snelling: Any questions on the application?

Motion: “To accept the application.”

Motion: R. Snelling

Second: A. Francesco

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 1-absention 0-absent

- R. Snelling: Are there any questions on the proposal?
- C. Lehner: What exactly is Phase III?
- R. Haskell: It is a duplex structure where the Peabody-Smith Building is now. They will move into the new construction that we’re doing this summer. We will build summer rentals and the rest in the winter during the off-season.
- C. Lehner: Which building am I looking at?
- R. Haskell: The barn
- D. Bunnell: There is no expansion of the building?
- R. Haskell: The backside of the building is a shed area. We’re going to go straight up to create more space using the same footprint.
- R. Huntoon: Are you going to mark out the parking spaces so people will know how to utilize them?
- R. Haskell: Yes, we have to. The tenants are asking for dedicated spaces. The spaces will be on the sides of the building. The lines will be drawn for head-in parking.
- A. Francesco: Do you have pictures of the elevations?
- R. Haskell: Yes, it is part of the proposal.
- R. Snelling: What is the height of the building?
- R. Haskell: 24’
- R. Snelling: Have you talked with the Fire Marshall for sprinklers?
- R. Haskell: Yes
- C. Lehner: What does the projected shoreline mean here?
- J. March: That is the State setback, the first 50’ is the waterfront buffer, the second is the woodland buffer.
- R. Snelling: Any other questions from the board? From the audience?
- R. Hanson: I couldn’t hear the answer about the shoreline setback.
- R. Haskell explained the setback to her.
- R. Snelling: Any other questions from the audience?

Motion: “To approve the proposal upon septic approval.”

Motion: C. Lehner

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 6-yes 0-no 1-absention 0-absent

- The hearing was closed at 6:50 and Case 19-3-8 was opened.

Case 19-3-8: Application submitted by Will Davis as Agent for the Holderness School located on Chapel Lane, identified as tax map 225-003-000. Request for Site Plan Review for property located on 29 Mt. Prospect Rd., located in the General Residential District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Site Plan Regulations.

- T. LeMenager: This project is to take a faculty house connected to a dorm by a breezeway, demolish the breezeway and dorm, add a new dorm with a new breezeway with more beds and a living area. We got an Alteration of Terrain from the State today.
- W. Davis walked the board through the site plan, including sewer connections, water service (the building will be sprinkled) and asked if there were any questions.
- R. Snelling: Everything that is shaded on that picture is being taken out and replaced?
- W. Davis: Yes

Motion: "To accept the application."

Motion: C. Lehner

Second: P. Francesco

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absent 0-absent

- G. Castonguay: I am an abutter and have a few questions? Is this city water or does it come from a well?
- T. LeMenager: City water is from Plymouth. There will be no well, no leach fields.
- G. Castonguay: Are you increasing the number of students?
- T. LeMenager: There will be no increase in students. We need to be able to redistribute students around. We like the number of students that we have.
- R. Snelling: Will the number of rooms be doubled?
- R. LeMenager: The intent is not to increase students; the intent is to be able to offer single rooms. We want to have flexibility.
- G. Castonguay: There is always the concern about the foot traffic. What are you doing to accommodate foot traffic across Mt. Prospect?
- T. LeMenager: It is being addressed through policy. The process is for the students to not be crossing anywhere except at the crosswalks. There are 2 crosswalks. They are supposed to stay on their side of Mt. Prospect until they get to the crosswalk. There is no intention to put in another sidewalk.
- G. Castonguay: What is your plan for lighting?
- T. LeMenager: The plan is to install more substantial light to make it look like the rest of the lighting on campus. We'll also plant trees.
- G. Castonguay: Will there be any new technology to anyone on the street?
- T. LeMenager: No, we have a private network through an underground network from the Library.
- R. Hanson: What are your long-range plans, the next dorm up the street?
- T. LeMenager: That is likely, but not certain. We want to see how successful this project is. The next house up the street (41 Mt. Prospect) lends itself to a similar project, if this is successful. We want to maintain the small feel, going from 4 to 8, or 4 to 6 bedrooms. All water mains are being sized to accommodate 41 Mt. Prospect.
- G. Castonguay: What about the other house on the other side of the maintenance building?
- R. LeMenager: We are not planning on renovating that building. It is a less desirable location.
- R. Snelling: Where will the parking be for this building?
- T. LeMenager: It will be in the same area, the gravel area.
- R. Snelling: Did you say that you have State approval for the septic?
- T. LeMenager: We are waiting for approval from the Plymouth Village Water District.
- R. Snelling: So that would be a condition of approval.

- C. Lehner: Can you explain what District “How” Water is?
- T. LeMenager: All buildings are connected to existing lines.
- C. Lehner: The legend labels h-o-w water.
- W. Davis: It should be h-o-t water.
- R. Snelling: What will be the height of this building?
- T. LeMenager: The house will remain single story, the dorm will be 2 stories. No taller than it is now.
- C. Lehner: On page 2 of the application, you haven’t identified who is the responsible person.
- R. LeMenager: The Holderness School is the applicant/responsible person.
- P. Francesco: Do you hire a professional Clerk of the Works?
- T. LeMenager: It depends on the scope of the project. There is no Clerk for this project. We have a Chief Operating Officer who oversees the project.
- R. Snelling: What percentage of students are day students?
- T. LeMenager: ~25 of the 280 total are day students

Motion: “To approve the proposal upon water and septic approval, and recognition that they need to comply with our lighting standards.”

Motion: P. Francesco

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

- R. Snelling closed the hearing at 7:26 and opened Case 19-3-9 at 7:27.

Case 19-3-9: Application submitted by Frank Yerkes as Agent for Katherine Grealish and Andrew Webster, for site plan review for a boundary line adjustment to add 1.93 acres from tax map 232-003-000 (45 Paugus Rd) to tax map 231-012-000 (Mooney Point Rd), located in the General Residential District, in accordance with the Town of Holderness Site Plan Regulations.

- F. Yerkes: We are proposing a boundary line adjustment between two existing lots (showing the boundary line change on the site plan). The existing house will be on 5 acres, the existing lot will be 14.85 acres. We are not proposing any construction or anything different.
- C. Lehner: What is the reason for this boundary line adjustment?
- P. Webster: The kids want the barn on their lot. The property is in their name.
- R. Snelling: Any other questions from the board?

Motion: “To accept the application.”

Motion: R. Huntoon

Second: R. Snelling

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

- R. Snelling: Any questions on the proposal?
- A. Francesco: Is the shed 35’ from the boundary line?
- F. Yerkes: Yes

Motion: “To approve the boundary line adjustment.”

Motion: R. Snelling

Second: P. Francesco

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

- R. Snelling closed the hearing at 7:31.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS: None

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Road Policy

- R. Snelling: Asked the board to approve a set of road standards that will go to the Select Board. The only road standards that we have now apply to subdivisions. We don't have a set of standards for the rest of the roads. Kevin presented a proposal to adopt, as a model, the Gilford set of standards. He suggested a couple of modifications; the line of site for a driveway (reduce from 300') and the 10% allowable grade on a road (change to 12%). He asked the board if they had reviewed the standards and if they feel comfortable making a recommendation. He thought having a town road standard was a good idea rather than having a standard that applies to just subdivisions, saying that as the town grows, the town might have to take over private roads that are part of a subdivision. The Gilford standards follow the State standards, with some slight modifications. He passed out the last page of the Gilford proposal that has a summary of the geometric design standards listing the Holderness subdivision standards, which align with the 0-200 automobile daily traffic (ADT). The Holderness standards align with the ADT so it would not be a major change from what we are currently using for subdivision regulations.
- P. Francesco: Shared that he had never heard of this and wanted to know why the Planning Board is going to the Select Board with the proposal.
- R. Snelling: We were asked to make a recommendation.
- P. Francesco: By whom?
- L. Levy: Kevin
- R. Huntoon: He came to us to see about adopting the policy so that the town would have standards.
- R. Snelling: The State says that the Select Boards approve roads, not Planning Boards.
- P. Francesco: Yes, if you have a subdivision. The response is that the town will take it over conditionally (make required changes). I am not opposed to having a set of standards. The Select Board does that the authority, but I have never seen it approved without it going to the Town for a vote at the March meeting. I am not ready to approve this without understanding the effect of the standards.
- R. Snelling: That's why we need to look to Kevin (or civil engineer) to make recommendations. I don't think this board has the knowledge to make appropriate comment on the specifics of the standards. There is more in the standards than geometric design standards, the board needs to read it to understand the responsibilities for oversight of construction and requirements for storm water studies, etc. Do you want to table it?

- A. Francesco: I still have a whole lot of issues with the whole way that it is written. It is cumbersome and not clear who is responsible for certain things. There are things in the policy that I don't think need to apply to Holderness.
- R. Snelling: We have those kinds of standards in the subdivision.
- A. Francesco: Yes, we do have them in the subdivision so there is the expectation that they are going to build the roads up to a certain standard. I'm not comfortable saying this is what we want. There needs to be a bigger discussion of who bears the burden and who pays taxes so that there is a clear path to follow.
- R. Snelling: That wouldn't change. The developer pays the taxes.
- A. Francesco: That's not clear. There are a bunch of engineering studies that are requested in here.
- R. Snelling: If we take Lane Rd. for example, and the town was asked to take over that road. Is that a subdivision or is the town taking over a road that leads to a subdivision? What standards should we apply to that?
- A. Francesco: I agree that there should be a standard, I just don't think that superimposing Guilford's standards over ours with just a couple of changes is the answer.
- R. Snelling: Kevin did his homework looking at a number of models and looked at the State standards.
- C. Lehner: Who here has an understanding of what a 10% grade actually looks like?
- P. Francesco: Shephard Hill Rd. exceeds 10%.
- R. Huntoon: Kevin wasn't trying to get us to write something up. I think he was trying to say that if we build roads, we need an idea of what they should be like so that the Select Board has a set of standards to know what can and cannot be done; people would know the pros and cons of what you do.
- R. Snelling: My feeling is that it is not this board's job to decide whether we should have 10% or 12% grades. The question is the concept of having a set of town standards that apply to all roads, not just subdivision roads. Kevin is proposing that the town adopt standards that would be referenced in our zoning ordinances.
- A. Francesco: Why not add a line that says to bring the roads to the State standards?
- R. Snelling: We could. Kevin was asked if the town were to adopt a road standard, could you come with a standard? He looked at a number of towns and the State, and asked us to take a look at what he came up with. What we've been asked to do is make a recommendation to the Select Board.
- P. Francesco: I will not vote. I will have to look at the standards later.
- R. Snelling: We don't have to vote tonight. I was going to propose that we dedicate the May meeting to these 4 issues on the agenda. It will be on the agenda and the Board needs to get up to speed on it. You might want to have a discussion with the Board of Selectmen. Maybe have Kevin brief the Select Board as well.
- R. Huntoon: Why are the numbers in the standards optimal?
- R. Snelling: It all goes back to the standards in the industry over time. I will put it on the May agenda. The vote will be to approve the concept, not the Guilford road standards, but something analogous to the Guilford standards.

2. Conservation Commission Master Plan sub-committee

- R. Snelling: Angi, where are you on the master plan?

- A. Francesco: I have to turn it into a pdf.
- R. Snelling: Please keep it moving and plan to bring it to the May meeting.

3. Flood Plain zoning ordinances

- At the last meeting we proposed to change the definition of the Holderness Flood Zone to be the same as the FEMA Flood Zone. Right now, they are different in the area defined by those flood zones. The question arose, why do we have 2 different flood zones? The initial recommendation from the sub-committee was to make them the same. The impact of that is minimal. The only area that is affected is the Holderness School's lower practice fields. I've met with the Holderness School and they have absolutely no plans to do anything with that property. If they put in a shed or anything like that, they'd have to meet FEMA standards. The fundamental change is do we want to change our definition for all lands between west of I-93 and the Pemigewasset River, to all those lands that are defined by FEMA's 1 in a 100-year flood?
- A. Francesco: My opinion is, no, we don't need to change it. It is just Holderness School. It is just the way it is right now. The fact that it has a minimal impact to one property owner who has been very clear that they are going to keep the lower fields. I think we should leave it as it is.
- R. Snelling: Lou, I think you had some concerns as well.
- L. Pare: I don't any more.
- P. Francesco: We have 2 standards (Holderness and FEMA), and whichever is the more stringent has to be adhered to?
- R. Snelling: When we have overlapping jurisdictions, the more restrictive would apply. FEMA Flood District doesn't preclude development, it is a building standard. So, if you are going to build, you have to raise the building up so it doesn't flood. You can build there. It is an insurance requirement. In the Holderness Flood Zone, you cannot build, we don't allow it. If we made our flood zone the same as FEMA, we would be more restrictive than FEMA.
- P. Francesco: What is the 500' foot restriction? Can you build in the 500' area?
- R. Snelling: It is primarily a setback. I forget the exact numbers. I think it is 150' to the river to build a home. There is a steep slope requirement and a woodland requirement. It is more restrictive. It is stronger than the shoreline protection act. The setback is related to environmental concerns, not flooding.

Motion: "To not change the Holderness flood zone definition from the area between west of I-93 and the Pemigewasset River."

Motion: A. Francesco

Second: R. Huntoon

Discussion: D. Bunnell: Just clarifying to make sure I understand. Holderness is stricter, yes?

R. Snelling: Yes, you cannot build, you cannot have a dwelling.

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

- R. Snelling: You were given the proposed changes to the 300/400 zoning ordinance changes. We will make the flood zone changes and bring them back. We'll discuss them and hold a public hearing in June or July.
- C. Lehner: I have a request that we add a bar scale to the checklist on the site plan application for boundary line adjustments. The small copy of the site plan is not accurate without a bar scale.
- L. Levy agreed to make that change on the application.

4. Next Meeting - Tuesday, May 21, 2019 at 6:30PM

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: At 8:15 the following motion was made.

Motion: "To adjourn."

Motion: A. Francesco

Second: D. Bunnell

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-yes 0-no 0-absention 0-absent

Respectfully submitted,

Linda S. Levy
Land Use Boards Assistant