

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Call to Order

Members Present: Eduard Viel, Chairman; Ian MacKinnon, Vice Chair; Teresa Bascom, Member; Charlene Andersen, SRPC Representative; Robert “Buzz” Davies, Alternate.

Members Absent: Susan Mooney, Secretary; John Morin, Select Board Ex-Officio Representative; Sherry Sandler, Member; Sandra Jones, Alternate.

Alternate Seated and Voting: Mr. Davies was seated and voting for Ms. Sandler.

Others Present: Blair Haney, SRPC; Alana Kenney, Land Use Clerk; Christopher Berry, Berry Surveying & Engineering; Dawn Fernald, Applicant; Joseph Fernald, Applicant; Lon Weston, Abutter.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00PM.

Public Hearings

Case # 23-004 SUB Residences At Fort Hill - Smoke St & Fort Hill Rd (Continued): Application from Berry Surveying & Engineering, on behalf of Owl Ridge Builders, requesting a twenty-five (25) lot open space subdivision. The property is located at Smoke Street and Fort Hill Road in Nottingham, NH and is identified as Tax Map #23, Lot #11. Two conditional use permits have been applied for. Article III, Section B, Item #6 permits a request to allow disturbance within 25 feet of a wetland. Article IV, Section S, 8.2 permits a request for lots that have a larger than maximum area, allow frontages less than prescribed, and allow a reduction to the landscape buffer.

Christopher Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering came and sat before the Board.

Mr. Viel reminded the Board as well as members of the audience that the application for this project was accepted as complete at the April 24, 2023 meeting. At that time, there was a motion that this project is not one of developmental impact. A site walk was done on the evening of May 17, 2023.

Mr. Viel invited Mr. Haney to provide his revised comments, now that additional information has been received from the applicants.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

38

39 Mr. Haney requested confirmation regarding which exact sections of the *Zoning Ordinance*
40 *Regulations* the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is for in the open-space development section
41 versus the wetland conservation section. He asked for explanation regarding a document,
42 *Existing Watershed/Proposed Watershed*. He also asked for clarification regarding the proposed
43 roadways and how they coincide with the Aquifer Protection District standards. He noted that
44 any blasting in the Aquifer Protection District would require a CUP. He noted that the yield plan
45 showed road right-of-ways that appear to be closer than fifty (50) feet from adjacent property
46 lines and asked for confirmation that those standards have been met.

47

48 Mr. Berry gave an update as to where they are at this time. He advised that they have received
49 the comments provided by Mr. Viel and Mr. MacKinnon. They have not yet gotten comments
50 from CMA Engineers. Ideally, he would like to go through all of those comments at one time, so
51 he has not written a response letter to the already-received comments. He stated that Mr.
52 MacKinnon had brought up a good point at the last meeting regarding the yield plan and
53 ensuring that that is sound and agreed upon so that the project can move forward. He has
54 resubmitted the yield plan; nothing has changed, he just intended to make the plan more legible
55 and easier to interpret. Since the last Board meeting, they have met with the Nottingham
56 Conservation Commission (NCC) to discuss their CUP and are hoping to be able to further
57 discuss it with the Board tonight. He reported that the NCC had a favorable response to the
58 project. The NCC did have a couple of small conditions that were noted in their letter to the
59 Board. Mr. Berry stated that they are happy to implement these conditions. He noted that a site
60 walk had been completed. One item that resulted during the site visit was a culvert that is
61 blocked by an existing trail. He advised that his team would work with the applicant and the New
62 Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) to do a restoration of that area or,
63 potentially, remove the culvert altogether, as it appears no longer necessary. A second item noted
64 during the site visit was the potential to move the Fort Hill driveway a little further from the
65 abutting boundary line to provide more distance.

66

67 Mr. Berry reported that he is happy to discuss the waiver request and/or the three (3) CUPs if the
68 Board desires.

69

70 Mr. Viel summarized the following points of a letter from the NCC to the Board dated May 23,
71 2023:

- 72 • They met with the applicant on May 8, 2023.
- 73 • Discussion of downspouts and drip edges to direct flow of water off roofs to dry wells
- 74 and to redirect the rainwater into the ground system

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

- 75 • The wetland impact for disturbance within twenty-five (25) feet of a wetland was studied;
76 it was determined that the open space development design and the resulting proximity to
77 the wetland was a fair tradeoff in that the disturbance would be minimal.
- 78 • The potential archaeological significance of the glacial deposit hill located in the central
79 portion was of concern. A study was conducted by Monadnock Archaeological Services
80 at the applicant's expense. There was no evidence discovered of indigenous peoples'
81 activity at the site.
- 82 • There was some discussion about the large area of disturbance.
- 83 • Other concerns put forward by the Commissioners were as follows:
 - 84 ○ Limit the use of road salt in aquifer areas
 - 85 ○ That four to six (4-6) inches of loam be replaced on the entire lot site to encourage
86 re-vegetation
 - 87 ○ Timber cutting be suspended from April 1st to October 1st with respect to wildlife
88 breeding, raising of young, and subsequent migration
 - 89 ○ Signage be erected to identify the open space area and to identify the wetlands
90 and the wetland twenty-five (25) foot no-disturb buffers
 - 91 ○ The percentage of uplands versus wetlands will be determined and added to the
92 site plans. The portion should conform to Nottingham *Zoning Ordinance*
93 *Regulations*
- 94 • All of these points were acceptable to Mr. Berry. He will post signage along these noted
95 areas.
- 96 • In summary, the Commission approves the application for a CUP to allow disturbance
97 within twenty-five (25) feet of a wetland per Article III Section B(6)

98
99 Mr. Viel invited discussion from the Board.

100
101 Ms. Andersen inquired as to whether or not downspouts/drip edges would be noted on the plan
102 set. Mr. Berry reported that it is noted on the recording sheet. Ms. Andersen asked if the Board
103 would be getting a copy of the Monadnock Archaeological Services study. Mr. Berry reported
104 that the Board would be getting copy of the report now that it has been approved.

105
106 Mr. MacKinnon noted that, in his comments submitted to the Board, the Public Works Director
107 inquired about the added runoff water that will impact the pond next to Fort Hill Road. He asked
108 if the hydraulic study picked that up and also noted the culvert that crosses Fort Hill Road from
109 that pond. Mr. MacKinnon indicated that there is not a culvert that crosses Fort Hill Road, and
110 stated that the Director was likely referring to flow from the backside of Frederick Lane. Mr.
111 Berry reported that the project would not be increasing rate offsite in any particular direction that
112 would change the hydrology anywhere offsite.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

113

114 Mr. Viel reviewed a couple of his own comments following the site walk:

- 115 • Two (2) test pits per 4k area are required; only one is shown at this time for some of the
- 116 proposed lots
- 117 • Proposed extending the Fort Hill Road pavement to include the shared driveway
- 118 • Try to save large and healthy trees, if possible
- 119 • Drainage easements should be kept with the Homeowners Association (HOA). Town
- 120 Counsel will need to review the documentation.
- 121 • There were a few areas of standing water that were not marked as wetlands or as test pits.

122

123 Mr. Berry reported that they have already begun the process of developing the HOA with their
124 project attorney.

125

126 Mr. Berry advised that John Hayes prepared both the wetlands poorly drained boundary and the
127 very poorly drained boundary as well as prepared the soils map and conducted all the test pits
128 on-site.

129

130 Mr. Viel expressed concern regarding the amount of cutting and alteration proposed in the
131 Peekaboo Drive area and how that might affect erosion. Mr. Berry replied that his team has
132 sediment erosion control plans specific to the removal of material to assist in stabilizing the area
133 prior to construction.

134

135 Mr. Viel inquired about an unclear area on the yield plan. Mr. Berry advised that the color
136 differential is due to poor drafting.

137

138 In regards to the yield plan, Mr. MacKinnon noted that one particular lot appears to just barely
139 meet the steep slopes and side setback. Mr. Berry advised that this particular lot is the tightest lot
140 in the yield plan but that it does meet the requirements.

141

142 Mr. Viel noted that, during the design review portion of the process, the number of lots was
143 slightly higher than what is currently being proposed. Mr. Berry confirmed this.

144

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Mr. MacKinnon expressed concern regarding the ten (10) percent limit of the Aquifer Protection Zone. Mr. Berry responded that none of the proposed lots in the Open Space Development are in the Aquifer Protection Zone and the project has been specifically designed for this.

Ms. Andersen inquired as to the dimensions of some aspects of the plan set. Mr. Berry walked her through the scale. Ms. Andersen asked if the proposed roadway is allowable. Mr. Viel advised that the Board would need to ask Town Counsel some questions about yield plans.

Mrs. Bascom asked about the requirements for an open space subdivision versus a “normal” house development. Mr. Berry advised that the yield plan goes around the base of the large hill in question, even if the development doesn’t. He further advised that Nottingham does not have a steep slopes ordinance where the applicant is prohibited from touching and developing steep slopes. The current steep slopes ordinance only addresses if the applicant can place a building on them.

Mrs. Bascom asked for clarification that the yield plan shows twenty-five (25) large lots of at least two (2) acres each and that the open space subdivision would be less than one (1) acre each. Mr. Berry confirmed and advised that that is one of the reasons why they are seeking a CUP, to allow them larger lots than one (1) acre.

Mrs. Bascom asked if there were layouts for the twenty-five (25) proposed homes. Mr. Berry replied that there are layouts for reasonably-sized homes; the Fort Hill Road and Frederick Drive lots will have larger homes, while the Peekaboo Drive lots have specific layouts in accordance with their footprints.

Mr. Viel opened the public hearing at 7:35PM.

Mr. Viel read the following letter from Mary Crockett, a resident of Tremblay Drive, dated May 23, 2023:

“I am saddened to see another subdivision will be allowed in Nottingham. Variances are set aside with little consideration. Why do we have them if they are set aside when requested? What is the impact on the wetlands that will be removed, replaced, and supposedly better, so they say, then what has been there for many, many years? Amount removed to make way for houses and change the landscape forever; what will that do for the surrounding area in the next

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

180 hundred-year flood? The impact on Smoke Street from additional traffic, which is in dire need of
181 repair, and also on our Police and Fire Departments and our school. I guess we have totally sold
182 out to progress in our town while failing to provide safe, functional structures to support our
183 rural community. How sad to not limit development.”

184
185 Mr. Viel clarified that, as children of the State, Nottingham has to operate within the bounds and
186 laws of the State of New Hampshire. Nottingham is permitted to have *Zoning Ordinance*
187 *Regulations* and *Subdivision Ordinance Regulations* but still has to conform to State law. Within
188 the law is landowner rights, which development is a part of. The Town has a *Master Plan*,
189 *Subdivision Ordinance Regulations*, *Site Plan Review Regulations*, and *Zoning Ordinance*
190 *Regulations* to govern what the Town wants to see as far as development and how it’s developed.
191 All of these items are voted upon by the public. Mr. Viel noted that there are not any direct
192 wetland impacts being proposed by this plan. There are buffers that may be impacted, but this is
193 when the CUPs come into play and help to address these issues. Anything beyond that goes to
194 the Zoning Board for a variance, which is not the purview of this Board. As for infrastructure,
195 some of these things are addressed through impact fees.

196
197 Mr. MacKinnon commented that the Board does not have the authority to place limits on
198 landowner development if it is within the law. Mrs. Bascom noted that, per the RSA, the Board
199 does have the ability to put a hold on a development if it is deemed that there is a stress on the
200 community and it’s resources. The Board would need to specify why and it would only be for a
201 period of time. Ms. Andersen stated that a study would need to be done, which would then go to
202 the voters. The moratorium would usually only last one (1) year. She noted that the towns that
203 have recently done this have been contested.

204
205 Lon Weston came forward and introduced himself as a resident of 20 Fort Hill Road. He
206 expressed concern regarding the proposed driveway along Fort Hill Road. He asked that the
207 driveway be moved slightly so that his property could retain privacy.

208
209 Mr. Viel closed the public hearing at 7:43PM.

210
211 Mr. Berry returned to his place at the table before the Board. He responded to the concern raised
212 by Mr. Weston and reported that they could move the lot line over in that area and the driveway
213 could be moved over. This, however, would eliminate the even split that Mr. Berry had created.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

215 *Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the yield plan component of Case # 23-004 SUB*
216 *as submitted to the Board at twenty-five (25) lots. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies.*

217

218 Ms. Andersen expressed concern regarding the yield plan showing a road off of Fort Hill Road
219 because of the size of the entrance as well as where it is located on that particular corner in
220 relation to the width of Fort Hill Road. She suggested that two (2) house lots, the first two off of
221 Fort Hill Road, should be removed from the yield plan. Lot 11-10 would remain but lots 11-11
222 and 11-12 would be removed.

223

224 *The motion failed by a vote of 2-3-0.*

225

226 Mr. Viel expressed that, if the applicant comes forward with a plan for a conventional
227 subdivision and having scrapped the plan for an *Open Space Development* (OSD) subdivision,
228 the Board would address features such as setbacks and variances that may be needed. He noted
229 that the proposed lots are so oversized that there is still room to potentially change the geometry
230 of the road.

231

232 Mr. Davies commented that changing the geometry of the road would not change how it
233 intersects with the existing road.

234

235 Mr. Viel noted that, at that point, the Board would have the option to do offsite exactions for
236 road improvements. It is ultimately the purview of the Board to reduce lot space on each plan
237 and the conditions set to it, but the Board would have to have reasons to do so.

238

239 Mr. Berry pointed out that Fort Hill Road is currently a dead-end road. The access in and out of
240 there, at the proposed length, would provide an additional level of safety along Fort Hill Road to
241 allow for a second means of access in and out. He reported that, whether or not they provide that
242 access in this yield plan, the question remains whether or not a twenty-five (25) lot yield is
243 reasonable for this 102 acres. If the Board continues to find that the yield plan, with that
244 connection, is not acceptable, then he would need to revise it. The “dead answer” is not whether
245 or not they lose one (1) or two (2) units, but how to make the subdivision work if they can do so
246 reasonably with twenty-five units.

247

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Mr. Viel used the example of the proposed cul-de-sac. Mr. MacKinnon advised that the applicant could similarly add a cul-de-sac rather than a connection to Fort Hill Road. Mr. Berry advised that the connection to Fort Hill Road was made because the Town's rules speak to connectivity.

Mr. MacKinnon noted that there is a no-disturb buffer of twenty-five (25) feet of a new right-of-way. The proposed yield plan would accommodate this.

Ms. Andersen stated that she would be comfortable with twenty-five (25) lots if the aforementioned lots were either a cul-de-sac or a shared driveway.

Mr. MacKinnon noted that a cul-de-sac would meet zoning requirements. A connection makes more sense from a safety standpoint.

Mrs. Bascom raised a concern regarding the dimensions of a potential cul-de-sac and the ability for emergency vehicles and passenger vehicles to get through it. Mr. MacKinnon noted that, dimensionally, cul-de-sacs do meet the road standard.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the twenty-five (25) lot yield plan of Case # 23-004 SUB as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

Mr. Viel advised that the Board would now focus their attention on the *Open Space Development (OSD)* subdivision plans.

Mr. MacKinnon noted that the Board has not yet made a motion to accept the CUPs as submitted. He asked Mr. Berry to provide an overview of the CUPs they are seeking.

Mr. Berry advised that they are asking for CUPs for the following:

- To impact within twenty-five (25) feet of a wetland (which the Board and Town has defined as a buffer). This impact is approximately five thousand (5,000) square feet in size and is due to the installation of a storm water treatment swale and grading swales to ensure that the storm water treatment from the impervious surface of the roadway is handled appropriately. Mr. Berry has reviewed the Conditional Use criteria found in the

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Zoning document concerning the twenty-five (25) foot buffer and has keyed out all of the functions and values that his team saw in that area and how they are addressing them. This area is less than 1% of the project site and is less than a fraction of a percent in terms of overall buffer that remains on this site and surrounding sites. He stated that this project, as designed, has very little environmental impact. All of the best-management practices that they are proposing are eco-friendly.

- Two buffers are proposed to be less than one hundred (100) feet in width in the OSD for the two frontage lots on Fort Hill Road, to include a small area around Frederick Drive where landscaping is proposed, and another small area where a rain garden is proposed within one hundred (100) feet of a perimeter buffer. Landscaping that area will shield it from abutting landowners.
- They are planning for lots that have less than one hundred (100) feet of frontage on Fort Hill Road. Three (3) proposed lots in the subdivision would be larger than the maximum allowed within an *OSD*/conservation subdivision. The most notable are the two (2) along Fort Hill Road. They have tried to make these standard-sized lots so that they fit the context of the neighborhood. In this area, much of the land is not buildable but is good for access. It is also within the Aquifer Protection Zone. The other two lots are on Frederick Drive. The building area has been strategically placed off the proposed roadway. To gain access to those, they have had to adjust lot sizes.

Mr. MacKinnon noted that the applicant is asking for four (4) total CUPs.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to accept the Conditional Use Permits, submitted under Case # 23-004 SUB, as complete. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

Mr. Viel invited discussion from the Board regarding the first CUP pertaining to the wetland buffer.

Mr. MacKinnon asked for clarification that this CUP would be for work on the entrance to Peekaboo Drive. Mr. Berry confirmed this and advised that the nearest lots would be 11-1 and 11-17.

Mr. Viel stated that, per the *Zoning Ordinance Regulations*, CUPs are allowed for a vegetative buffer as long as it is not around a vernal pool. This particular area is not.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Mrs. Bascom asked Mr. Berry to confirm that there is no alternate route for an entrance to Peekaboo Drive. Mr. Berry did confirm this.

Mr. MacKinnon recommended that the Board review the seven (7) criteria for a CUP:

- a. The proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land not within a Wetland Conservation Area and the upland area considered for development is not smaller (acreage) than the wetland area (acreage) being considered;
- b. Designs, construction, and maintenance methods will be such as to minimize detrimental impact upon the wetland and will include restoration of the site as nearly as possible to its original grade and conditions;
- c. The Nottingham Conservation Commission has provided comments relative to the value of the wetland under construction and design of the proposed project as it relates to the wetland;
- d. Economic advantage alone is not a reason for the proposed construction;
- e. Prior to the granting of the Conditional Use Permit under this Section, the applicant shall agree to submit a performance security to ensure all construction is carried out in accordance with an approved design. The security shall be submitted in a form and amount, and surety and conditions satisfactory to 1) the Planning Board for site plan and subdivision application and 2) the Board of Selectmen in all other cases. The security shall be submitted and approved prior to issuance of any permit authorizing construction.
 - a. Proper surety in the form of cash bonds must be submitted to the Town to ensure the completion of work. No work shall start on the property until proper surety is in place. The surety amount shall be 115% of the current estimated cost.
 - b. An itemized cost estimate shall be submitted for approval to the Planning Board, and Town Counsel prior to the surety being accepted. The cost estimate shall include the costs of inspection and testing. Surety may be drawn down no more frequently than monthly. In no case shall the surety be drawn below ten percent until the completed road has successfully stood for two (2) years.
 - c. The surety may be used by the Town to repair work that has failed or was not performed in accordance with the plans and specifications, to restore the site should the project default, to cover the cost of testing and inspections and to cover legal or other fees the Town may incur during the collection process.
- f. The Planning Board may require the applicant to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment when necessary to evaluate an application made under this Section. The cost of this assessment shall be borne by the applicant. The Planning Board may also assess the applicant reasonable fees to cover the costs of other special investigative studies and for the review of documents required by particular applications.

Mr. MacKinnon stated that this CUP meets all criteria, with the expectation that (e) would be added as part of the bonding process for the proposed road.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Case # 23-004 SUB relative to Article III Section B.3(b): Disturbance within the twenty-five (25) foot wetland buffer that is not a vernal pool. The motion was seconded by Ms. Andersen. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

Mr. Viel noted that the CUP application for this section did meet the criteria as outlined within the Town's *Zoning Ordinance Regulations* of Conditional Uses (a) through (f) with the condition that (e) would be met if final approval is granted.

Discussion moved to the next CUPs relating to lots larger than the maximum, lot frontage is less than prescribed, and allow reduction to the landscape buffer.

Mr. MacKinnon stated that he would prefer to see two (2) homes with access rather than a potential roadway connection. He further suggested that the Board request that the lot line be shifted to reduce the frontage of Lot #18.

Mrs. Bascom asked what the frontage is for these lots if not one hundred (100) feet. Mr. Berry responded that each lot has 37.51 feet of frontage. Mr. MacKinnon noted that this would be along the idea of a back lot subdivision, in a way. It was noted that a back lot subdivision has a lot frontage of twenty (20) feet.

Both Mr. MacKinnon and Ms. Andersen expressed support of a shared driveway rather than a new access road.

Discussion followed regarding whether the Board should approve, deny, or request Town Counsel's input regarding this particular CUP.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to accept Town Counsel opinion relative to Article IV Section 7 to confirm applicability of what a Conditional Use Permit can be requested from. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Mr. Viel asked the Board if they would like to take action on the next two (2) items pertaining to this case or to table it to another meeting for further discussion. Mr. Davies advised that it may depend on what Town Counsel has to say.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to continue the Conditional Use Permits relative to Article IV Section S: Open Space Ordinance to June 28, 2023 at 7:00PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

There was a discussion regarding waivers. Mr. Berry reported that, even if the Board does not take action on them, he would still like to hear comments about waivers.

The first waiver request pertains to Road Design Standards; the applicant is seeking to waive the requirement to widen the road width by two (2) feet with the installation of curbing. Per Mr. Berry, Peekaboo Drive proposes sloped granite curbing adjacent to the gravel wetland and below to direct flow to a proposed treatment swale. This is only proposed on one side and is for a small section. The road design is not widened in this area as stated in the regulations.

Mr. MacKinnon suggested that the Board jump forward to discuss and potentially to take action on Waiver Request #4 regarding Road Side Drainage—to permit Peekaboo Drive to be built with swale lines that exceed ten percent (10%) and that exceed two hundred fifty (250) feet in length.

Explaining this, Mr. Berry reported that the applicant is proposing a roadway that has a consistent profile slope of ten percent (10%) for more than two hundred fifty (250) feet and therefore the swales are the same slope for a similar distance.

Mr. Viel recommended that the Board continue to read through the waiver requests but not take action on any of them until the third-party engineering firm has had an opportunity to review the project and provide comments.

Waiver Request #2 pertains to Road and Driveway Design and Construction Standards Table 1. The applicant is seeking to permit Peekaboo Drive to be built with a reverse curve containing a tangent less than one hundred (100) feet. In one instance near the entrance of Peekaboo Drive, there is a tangent between two reverse curves that is less than one hundred (100) feet. It is proposed to be 54.81 feet.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Waiver Request #3 pertains to Road and Driveway Design and Construction Standards Table 1. The applicant is seeking to permit the vertical curve entering the cul-de-sac to be less than eighty (80) feet in length. Seventy-five (75) feet is proposed for Peekaboo Drive. The applicant is proposing to enter the cul-de-sac with a vertical curve that is seventy-five (75) feet where eighty (80) feet is required.

Waiver Request #5 pertains to Road Side Drainage #6. The applicant is seeking a permit for building flared end sections instead of head walls. The applicant would use flared end sections on the ends of culverts instead of the required headwalls.

Waiver Request #6 pertains to Well Radius Placement. The applicant requests a permit well radii to be off the lot for which they serve. Well radii are typically shown on the lot during the subdivision process and then constructed so that they are off lot. A radius release is then required from the land owner so as not to inadvertently encumber the neighboring lot. The proposed Open Space Subdivision allows for lots that are not as wide as standard lots and therefore the radii will extend onto abutting lots. NHDES permits the applicant to provide radius easements for the purposes of subdivision.

Mr. MacKinnon made the motion to continue Case # 23-004 SUB to June 28, 2023 meeting at 7:00PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davies. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5-0-0.

Other

The Select Board took action on appointing a representative and an alternate to SRPC at their last meeting. Mr. Viel noted that Cheryl Smith is now the representative to SRPC and Mrs. Bascom is the alternate.

Mr. Viel drafted a letter to the New Hampshire Parks Department providing comment on behalf of the Board pertaining to the proposed expansion of Pawtuckaway State Park.

Public Comment

None.

Approval of Minutes

It was decided that approving minutes would be tabled until the next meeting so that Ms. Mooney could have an opportunity to review outstanding minutes.

Nottingham Planning Board Meeting

DATE: May 24, 2023

Official Minutes

Select Board and Staff / Board Member Updates

Mr. Davies had no comment.

Mrs. Bascom had no comment.

Mr. MacKinnon reported that Town Administrator Ellen White recently send out an email regarding the Hazard Mitigation Plan update that is due. SRPC will assist with this and Mr. Haney reported that he would be putting out the report. Ms. White was looking for people who would be willing to be a part of a committee working on this.

Mr. Viel reported that he has reached out to Mark Fougere of Fougere Planning to discuss reviewing the Town's impact fees.

Ms. Andersen asked the Board to consider drafting an ordinance for wireless exposure. She advised that she recently attended a presentation that discussed the impact of 5G wireless towers on residents.

Mr. Haney reported that his goal is to provide staff reviews for new applications by the Friday prior to a Board meeting and review new information by the Monday prior to a Board meeting.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Russell Leed, Transcriber