



**Town of Plaistow, NH  
Office of the Planning Board  
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH 03865**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
May 3, 2017**

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM

**ROLL CALL:** Tim Moore  
Gennifer Silva  
Laurie Milette  
Lisa Lambert  
Steve Ranlett, *Selectman Ex-Officio*  
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate*

Also present: Greg Jones, *Town Planner* and P. Michael Dorman, *Chief Building Official*

**Agenda Item 2: Minutes of April 05, 2017 Meeting**

**★G. Silva moved, second by L. Milette to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2017. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 2-0-3 (Moore, Silva and Ranlett abstaining).**

**Agenda Item 3: Town of Plaistow Water Summit - Resilience Planning – Plaistow Water Resources Master Plan Chapter Presentation**

Steve Whitman, Resilience Planning, was present for the presentation.

It was noted that the draft copy of the chapter is available online.

S. Whitman explained the process that was used to develop the draft of the Water Resources Chapter. He noted that they gathered all the information from previous work and synthesized it into a single document. He noted that they developed the implementation section with concise and actionable items. Mr. Whitman added that the new format considered that most would use the document digitally, which is the preferred format for grant applications.

S. Whitman gave a PowerPoint presentation on the draft Water Resources Master Plan Chapter, explaining each map, timeline, graph and section. He discussed aquifers, groundwater, stormwater management, public water supplies, wetlands education and potential threats and contamination. Mr. Whitman noted the implementation section and that target date, priority and responsible parties still needed to be discussed and assigned.

There was discussion regarding whether or not to combine the listed items or to break them out in bullet fashion.

Harry Stewart, Normandeau Associates, suggested consolidating the items related to whether or not to develop a municipal water supply consolidation would be based on the supplier. It was noted that possibilities have been discussed about obtaining municipal water through lines running from Manchester through Derry, Salem and Hampstead with Hampstead Area Water Company (HAWC) or from Nashua (Pennichuck Water Works)

There was discussion about funding currently available through the Groundwater Trust Fund, which Exxon had to pay into to resolve MBTE issues throughout the state.

T. Moore asked if anyone from the public had any questions or comments about the Water Resources Master Plan Chapter.

David Averill, 179 Main St

- Has the Town decided to proceed with a municipal water supply
- If so, what area of town would be serviced
- Are the wells that have been affected by the recent drought dug or drilled wells and if a Municipal water system a disproportionately expensive remedy for those situations
- Would the municipal water be used for commercial or residential development

T. Moore responded that whether or not to pursue a municipal water supply was the \$64,000 questions with a lot of variables. Would the water be used to assist residents and businesses with contamination issues or would it be used to attract different types of businesses to Plaistow and where would the Town get the most “bang for the buck” are all part of the discussions. Availability, suppliers, costs and politics all come into the discussion as well.

M. Dorman noted that the failed wells were primarily dug wells.

There was discussion about the GREE funds that the Town was hoping would be made available in order to study possibilities like whether or not the existing fire suppression line would be usable for potable water and whether or not it would be cost prohibitive.

John McArdle, Plaistow Fire Chief/Water Superintendent noted what areas are currently serviced by the fire suppression line.

S. Ranlett noted that if the fire suppression line were found to be viable for potable water then anyone along the line would have the opportunity to tap in.

D. Averill questioned what the need for the water was.

S. Ranlett noted there was a need for the community as a whole for the Town to develop alternate water supplies, which became particularly clear during the recent drought. He offered if the opportunity was there to have a reliable municipal system why would the Town not take advantage of that.

D. Averill asked if an evaluation of the real needs and whether it would be a benefit to enough of the population based on the costs involved. He questioned whether or not it would be more cost effective for the Town to just buy the contaminated sites.

S. Ranlett offered that he didn't know why the Town would want to purchase contaminated sites.

D. Averill, estimating the number of contaminated sites around ten (10) and reiterated that it may be more cost effective to just purchase the properties than fund a municipal water system.

There was a discussion of the number of areas that are considered contamination risks. It was noted that while the funds were currently available to do the studies, they may not be in the future and the costs would be borne by the Town. All the elements involved in a study were discussed: planning, drafting, source levels, and infrastructure. It was also noted that the City of Haverhill was once considered as a potential source for water, but there were complications with procuring water from across the state line, the biggest of which is the lack of cost controls.

The role of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) was discussed. It was also noted that the build-out analysis still needed to be updated.

D. Averill reiterated his concerns over the costs, both start up and maintenance and whether or not there was an actual need for a municipal water system.

H. Stewart offered that the key to any viable municipal water system was that it had to be affordable to the user, if it's not then the system falls apart. He added that there were still a lot of questions to be answered, quantity, coverage areas, arsenic levels in existing wells, all drivers in the decision.

D. Averill added that he didn't want to see the Town proceed down the path to a municipal water system without a full understanding of the costs and the need. He suggested that conservation efforts should be enough to preserve the current groundwater for the long term.

G. Jones noted that there is no way to predict when the next drought will be.

D. Averill responded that the cost of a new drilled well to replace a dug well was far less than the cost of a municipal water system. He added that limiting development would also help preserve resources, adding that if there were a municipal water system then there was the potential for greater development.

G. Jones noted that the last build-out analysis was done in 2007 and needed to be updated. He added that there wasn't much land left to be developed.

D. Averill questioned if that would change with a water supply.

G. Adams offered that it would depend on where the water line ran and the supply. He added that it could result in more multi-unit buildings.

S. Ranlett noted that there couldn't be greater development unless there was a significant change to the Zoning, noting the multi-unit development currently requires a minimum of ten (10) acres. He also noted that there aren't many ten (10) plus acre parcels in town. He added that the real concern was for drought conditions. S. Ranlett offered that water bans don't work well as they become an enforcement issue. He noted that the Town would not be running the water system, but that would be sub-contracted to a qualified agency. He reminded that there wasn't a plan to obtain water yet, just a study to determine if the fire suppression line could carry potable water.

G. Adams added that potable water could allow for a different type of development, such as an office building, that would be more beneficial to the town.

S. Ranlett reiterated that was not why the study was being done, he added it had zero to do with commercial development and zero to do with better types of business, and it has everything to do with not having contaminated water. He noted that was at least the position of the Board of Selectmen.

Brian Stack, 20 Partridge Lane noted that his property is part of the Sweet Hill Estates Homeowner's Association (HOA) and that he would like to offer another perspective on the water supply. The HOA has thirty (30) single-family homes serviced by a community well that is managed by Pennichuck. He explained that they have seventy (70) acres of common land and still are not able to drill wells that produce more than a 15gpm supply. Mr. Stack added that they have spent significant money over the last twenty (20) years to try and resolve the water issues, but have been unsuccessful. He added that no amount of conservation efforts will relieve their supply issues.

S. Whitman offered that the timing of this chapter update for the Master Plan was fortunate, because of the funding that is currently available to study the problem. He added that Normandeau's input was helpful in developing this chapter.

G. Jones reminded that it was a living document and can be amended as needed.

Barbara Kiszka, 1 May Ray Ave asked who the point person would be regarding water questions.

G. Jones offered that he could be the initial point of contact but the Board of Selectmen is the decision makers.

J. McArdle noted that he would get together with G. Jones about some formatting questions. He added that the Kingston Water Authority does not exist.

S. Whitman responded that according to RPC (Rockingham Planning Commission) it does.

There was discussion regarding the existence of the Kingston Water Authority. According to the Kingston Fire Chief it does not. It was questioned whether or not there was an existing position in Kingston that is just not filled at this time.

J. McArdle reiterated that according to the Kingston Fire Chief, it does not exist. He asked if the Town would be the leader in the "Green Snow" program by reducing the amount of salt used to treat winter roads.

There was discussion about the difference between the GREE funding and the (Exxon) settlement fund. It was noted that if there ever was a waterline in Plaistow property owners would not be mandated to connect to it. It was also noted that it is commonly cheaper to connect at the time the line is being constructed than after the fact, but it would be by property owner choice. It was noted that the Town of Salem charged residents an "improvement fee" whether or not they connected to the expansion of their water line.

There was additional discussion regarding connecting to the Haverhill water system. It was reiterated that the greatest concern with that possibility is the lack of control to set rates. It was noted that even if a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) were reached it would not be legally binding on the City of Haverhill.

H. Stewart noted that even if settlement funds are used, the State of New Hampshire is going to expect that Plaistow will have a financial investment in the project. He added that the focus on where funds are dispersed will be on the affordability and long-term stability of any project.

There was additional discussion about the study for the viability of the fire suppression system to be used for potable water. It was noted that despite the existence of some asbestos piping the system, studies have proven that it still may be useable for potable water.

T. Moore thanked all for participating in the information session. He noted that there was additional work to be done before the final chapter would be adopted.

There was a break from 7:37 PM to 7:42 PM

**Agenda Item 4: PB17-04: A Public Hearing for an application submitted by the owner of record, Blinn's Family Reality, LLC., to seek approval for a site plan amendment which proposes to add 2,226 square feet of building space to the existing auto body repair shop. This 1.42 acre site is located at 38 Westville Road (Map 27, Lot 49), Plaistow NH, 03865, within the CI Zoning District.**

Charlie Zilch, SEC Associates was present for the application. He noted that following for the Board:

- The parcel is located at 38 Westville Rd, Tax Map 27, Lot 49, 1.42 acres with 430' frontage in the Commercial 1 (C1) District
- The property is located in the Aquifer Protection District, but not in the Shoreland Protection District and not in a flood plain
- The property is serviced by on site well, septic and existing parking
- Drainage is existing catch basin, detention basin, and sheet flow design
- The property is currently being used as an auto body shop (3300 sq ft) with related offices (1700 sq ft) and the use will continue to be the same

He noted the existing conditions sheet of the site plan. He explained the proposed change to Board:

- The plan is to expand the work area with an additional building
- The building would be constructed on existing pavement so there will be no significant changes to the drainage calculations
- There will be no increase in the number of employees
- There is some relocation of parking to accommodate the new building and continue to meet the requirements
- There will be a slight increase on lot coverage from 46% to 47%, but it is still well below the maximum lot coverage of 75%
- No additional State permits are required
- All the original notes from the Planning Board approve plan are applicable to the amended plan

There was discussion regarding the setback and a variance that was granted as part of the initial plan. There was discussion as to whether or not they would need to get another special exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a greater expansion of a non-conforming lot. It was noted that there wasn't a specific size expansion noted in the ZBA decision, but they did see the proposed site plan. It was consensus of the majority (4-1-0, Moore dissenting) of the Board that the application would not need additional relief from the ZBA. It was noted that the applicant is still subject to all the restrictions of the original special exception.

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to accept the amended site plan for 38 Westville Rd as complete. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

#### **Waivers**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the waiver request for Article I, §230-14.1.HH (separate landscaping plan) based on the landscaping already being established and the improvements will not change anything. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the waiver request for Article I, §230-14.1.II (separate lighting plan) based on the lighting already being established and the improvements will not change anything except to add additional lighting to the new building. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the waiver request for Article I, §230-14.1.CC (onsite and abutting wells and septic) as there will be no additional sewage loading and there is no impact to abutting wells and septic. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the waiver request for Article I, §230-14.1.F (establishment of an escrow account) as there is no change to the drainage being proposed and therefore no engineering review or inspection will be needed. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A**

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the waiver request for Article I, §230-12.H.1 (24' wide maneuvering aisle) as this is the same request that was granted for parking on the original site plan. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A**

There was discussion about the existing security fence and whether or not more would be added for the new building. C. Zilch offered to put a note on the plan that any additional security fencing would be installed at the same level at the new addition.

M. Dorman expressed concern that the top coat of pavement was never completed under the original site plan. He noted that he will not issue a Certificate of Occupancy for the new building unless and until all the site work, including the top coat of pavement and striping per the approve site plan are complete.

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva to approve the amended site plan for 38 Westville Rd as complete with the following condition:**

- **A note regarding security fencing be added to the plan**

**There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

## **Other Business and Updates**

### **Hoyt/Seracusa Subdivision**

Charlie Zilch, SEC Associates was present for the discussion.

C. Zilch explained that they had completed and sent the bond estimate worksheet to CLD for the Forrest Street subdivision. He added that his client would like to post a 10% bond that would cover restoration of the site in case of default and just build the road.

There was discussion about the dollar value of the site work. It was noted that there was no issue with building the road instead of bonding it.

**★S. Ranlett moved, second by G. Silva set the bond amount for the Forrest Street subdivision at \$24,300, pending CLD feedback. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

M. Dorman gave the following updates:

- Letter to 118 Main Street regarding moving forward with their site plan application before any building permits will be issued for commercial renovations.

It was noted that they had begun commercial renovations of the property prior to the issuance of a building permit for Planning Board site plan approval and the letter was sent to stop them.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dee Voss  
Recording Secretary