



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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 4, 2018

Call to Order: 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Tim Moore, *Chair*
Lisa Lambert, *Vice Chair*
Laurie Milette
James Peck
Steve Ranlett, *Selectman Ex-Officio*
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate*

Also present was Dee Voss, *Planning Coordinator*.

D. Voss noted receipt of a letter of resignation from Chantal Boudreau. The Board wished Chantal well with her future endeavors.

Agenda Item 2: Review/Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 21, 2018 deferred to next meeting.

Agenda Item 3: CIP Committee Assignment

T. Moore explained that there were two (2) member and one (1) alternate member assignments to the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) Committee. He added that the chair of the Planning Board is automatically the chair for the CIP Committee.

S. Ranlett moved, second by L. Lambert, to appoint G. Adams as the second member to the CIP Committee. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.

L. Lambert volunteered to be the alternate member to the CIP Committee from the Planning Board.

Agenda Item 4: Site Plan/Subdivision Regulation Amendment Review:

The Board reviewed a list of proposed Site Plan and Subdivision Regulation changes. The list is ideas for changes that have come up in discussion since the last time the regulations were changed. Proposed additions are noted in ***bold italics***, deletions are noted in ***bold-italie strikethrough***

SITE PLAN REGULATION CHANGES

§230-14.1. AA (AKA “the checklist”)

Page 12:

Planning Board Minutes
April 4, 2018

AA. Existing and proposed grades, drainage systems, *siltation/erosion controls*, structures and/or features.

Page 14:

||. Wetlands boundaries/buffers.

Change "~~II~~." to AAA to continue the numbering system

Add to checklist:

BBB. Hours of Operation (See Plaistow Zoning Ordinance §220-11.1)

CCC. Note stating: "Construction hours shall be in accordance with Plaistow Zoning Ordinance 220-11"

DDD. Previous Plan Reference by Rockingham County Registry of Deeds Recording Number (Amended Site Plans Only)

Discussion:

There was a brief discussion by the Board regarding hours of operation. It was noted that the Zoning Ordinances require that hours of operation be noted on any site plan, but it has never been added to the checklist. There was a discussion between regarding the difference between construction hours and business hours of operation. It was noted that should the Board wish to consider a change in construction hours, which is a zoning ordinance, that change would have to be discussed in the fall when such changes are considered.

SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

§235-8 – Rights of way: reserve strips.

Page 8: Add a new section...

§235-8A – Shared Driveways

- A. Each existing lot, or new lot(s) created by a subdivision, for single-family dwelling unit must have a separate driveway that connects to a Class V or better road.**
- B. Each duplex dwelling unit may have two separate driveways or may share one driveway for some or all of the driveway length, provided that each dwelling unit of the duplex dwelling unit has its street address clearly displayed. Each driveway (shared or unique) must connect to a Class V or better road.**
- C. Multi-family dwellings may share driveways provided dwelling unit numbers or other address identifiers are clearly displayed at the driveway entrance(s).**

Discussion:

It was noted that the Fire Chief is not a fan of shared driveways as it makes it more difficult to locate a particular address. It was noted that the proposed language was to prevent situations where there is a 300-foot-long "driveway" with five (5) houses on it because the developer didn't want to build a road; but, would still allow for shared driveways in situations where they made sense like the recently approved 18B Danville Road.

§235-9 – Adequacy of land

Page 8: **Modify §235-9** – Adequacy of Land, Paragraph B. (2) Land use limitations as follows:

Currently reads:

- (a) Wetland areas in which soils are classified as very poorly drained, freshwater marsh, or alluvial soils shall not be utilized to fulfill any portion of the minimum lot size requirements. (See also Chapter 220, Zoning, Article IV, § 220-25.)

Proposed Amendment:

- (a) Wetland areas as defined in Chapter 220, Zoning, Article IV, § 220-20 in ~~which soils are classified as very poorly drained, freshwater marsh, or alluvial~~ **soils** shall not be utilized to fulfill any portion of the minimum lot size requirements. ~~(See also.)~~

§235-12 – Board's Procedures on Plats

Page 14:

§235-12. B.(2)(b) – *Note: This amendment is to comply with NHRSA 676:4-b)*

(b) Once the application has been submitted the Planning Staff shall review all submitted materials as to their compliance with the Regulations and report all comments to the Board. In addition, the Planning Staff shall refer, as appropriate, all submitted materials to the Planning Board's Review Engineer for review and comment. ***Options for the selection of the Review Engineer are as follows:***

- 1) The applicant may elect to use the Planning Board's designated Primary Review Engineer.***
- 2) The applicant may select a Planning Board Review Engineer from a list pre-approved by the Planning Board.***
- 3) The applicant may submit their own request for a Planning Board Review Engineer, subject to Planning Board approval.***
- 4) In all instances the Review Engineer will be retained to review plans on behalf of the Plaistow Planning Board. All communication and invoicing with the Planning Board Review Engineer will be conducted through Planning Staff.***

Page 15:

§235-12 – Board's procedures on plats

ADD letter [c] to B.2.(e)[3] Escrow Amount

- [3] Escrow amount.
 - [a] The initial escrow amount is listed in the Plaistow Fee Schedule. [Amended 12-3-2008]
 - [b] The determination of the required escrow fee shall be based on an estimated number of reviews and/or inspections required for the submitted plan.
 - [c] ***If the Staff determines that no engineering reviews, legal reviews, or additional studies are required, then an escrow account does not need to be established.***

Page 20: §235-12.B.

(10) Construction bonds (amended 4-1-15)

(a) **For Site Plans:** Construction bonding of sites includes on-site roads, drainage systems and individual public parking areas, erosion control systems, landscaping (or plantings) in buffer areas, loam and seed for the entire project area, fencing, construction survey, preparation of record drawings and other site improvements.

The security for site plans shall be the ***greater amount between of 10% of the total site improvement cost estimate, or \$5,000.***

(b) **For Subdivisions:** Construction bonding for streets and roadways shall cover all work to be performed within the proposed right(s)-of-way and all work associated with the storm drain system(s). It shall also cover any required off-site improvements.

The security for subdivision plans shall cover a minimum of 50% of the total site improvement cost estimate.

Page 21:

Current Language:

(13) Performance bonds

(a) Upon completion of improvements and approval by the Town, surety (performance bond) covering maintenance of roads and improvements for a period of two years from completion shall be required in an amount based on the cost of such improvements, as approved by the governing body. The amount of the performance bond shall be 10% of the construction bond. (Amended 4-1-15)

(b) The amount of the performance bond shall reflect 10% of construction costs and winter maintenance of streets, public improvements, drainage structures, other utilities. This amount shall not be released from the construction bond until the performance bond has been received by the Board of Selectmen. (Amended 4-

1-15)

Proposed Change:

Make switch paragraphs (b) and (a) – letter (a) is more of a definition and should come first

Amend the last sentence of letter (a) to be 10% of the construction costs as defined in paragraph (a) of this section. As is “performance bond shall be 10% of the construction **bond**” to read “construction **costs of the new road.**” If the current language stands then the calculations are taking 10% of the 10% or 50% that was set as the construction bond, not 10% of the construction costs, which is what is intended to be bonded.

The revised section would read:

(13) Performance bonds

(a) The amount of the performance bond shall reflect 10% of construction costs and winter maintenance of streets, public improvements, drainage structures, other utilities. This amount shall not be released from the construction bond until the performance bond has been received by the Board of Selectmen. (Amended 4-1-15)

(b) Upon completion of improvements and approval by the Town, surety (performance bond) covering maintenance of roads and improvements for a period of two years from completion shall be required in an amount based on the cost of such improvements, as approved by the governing body. The amount of the performance bond shall be 10% of the construction **costs of the new road.** (Amended 4-1-15)

Starts on Page 33

Add a new paragraph K. Street Lighting to § 235-32. Construction of roads.

K. Street Lighting

(1). The location of all streetlights shall be shown on all new subdivision roads and on connecting roads where they intersect new subdivision roads. Streetlights shall properly illuminate all street intersections. Streetlights should be placed approximately every ~~150~~ 300 feet and on sharp curves or other potentially dangerous areas along the street that should be lit at night. The Highway Safety Committee should also review and provide comments on streetlight locations.

(2). Street names of all streets in the proposed subdivision as well as all connecting and/or intersecting street names.

(3). Street sign location(s) shall be shown on the subdivision plan. The street sign must not block site distance and must be a location that is lit by a streetlight. Street names should be reviewed by the Highway Safety Committee ~~and approved by the Fire Chief~~ and approved by the Board of Selectmen.

(4) Streetlights should be on the side of the road where provisions, if any, for

pedestrian or bicycle paths that are made and that are part of the road profile.

Discussion:

The Board discussed street lighting and the history of placing the lights. It was noted that placing lights every 150 feet, especially if they are LED fixtures, more than is necessary for safety and security and is only increasing the Town's street lighting costs. It was suggested that street lights be placed every 300 feet instead.

There was discussion about if Unitil would replace an LED light fixture with another LED light fixture if there was a need. The concern is that Unitil might replace an LED fixture that is damaged with a mercury vapor fixtures currently in use.

There was a discussion on the naming of streets. Naming of streets is under the jurisdiction of the BOS (Board of Selectmen), who frequently consult with the Fire Chief to ensure that there are no conflicts that would affect 9-1-1 responses.

There was additional discussion that once all the Subdivision and Site Plan Regulation changes are approved that the checklist given to engineers and developers would be updated accordingly. It was noted that there will be specific checklists that will relate to the type of project being proposed. For example, a residential condominium conversion would not have the same checklist as a subdivision or commercial site plan application would.

There was discussion regarding combining Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations into a single chapter with common checklist items and then application-specific items.

Other Business

The Board cancelled the meeting for April 18, 2018 and discussed future meeting dates. Next meeting is May 2, 2018.

T. Moore discussed with the Board reviewing the updated methodology from Bruce Mayberry for Recreational Impact Fees. It was noted that in March the voters approved the changes to the Impact Fee Ordinance and now the Planning Board needed to hold a public hearing to officially adopt the new Recreation Fee Methodology. That public hearing will be scheduled for May 16, 2018. Hopefully the revisions to the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations can be adopted at the same public hearing.

D. Voss noted that there will be a public hearing on May 2, 2018 for a lot line adjustment between the Public Safety Complex property and the Plaistow Cemetery property, both of which are town-owned.

There was discussion about how the inspection process for new site plans. It was noted that not only is the site monitored by the Code Enforcement Officer, but also by the Planning Board's Review Engineer. It was also noted that once all conditions are met and a Plan is approved and recorded it becomes the jurisdiction of the Code Enforcement Office.

There was discussion regarding tree cutting at the +/-45AC parcel on North Avenue. A letter from NHDES (New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services) was discussed. The letter noted that they had applied for the permit stating that they were doing the cutting for forestry management purposes only and not for current or future development. Since the property owner had brought in a conceptual plan to the last Planning Board meeting it was known that they were obviously cutting to develop the parcel.

It was noted that Mike Dorman was in contact with NHDES and the New Hampshire Forestry Department to get answers as to why the permit was issued; whether or not it meant that they could not develop that site; or if they had to wait a specific amount of time before developing the site.

There was discussion as to how the Planning Department/Board informs the public about what is coming before the Board. It was explained that the Planning Department complies 100% with the NHRSA's (New Hampshire Revised Standards Annotated) with reference to a better notification and posting of the meeting agendas. Notices are posted to the public board in the Town Hall vestibule as well as on the Town's website. It was noted that there is an option on the website for people to be automatically notified when something is posted to the website.

D. Voss offered that she was open to whatever suggestions the Board may have for notification.

There was additional discussion about how votes are recorded on proposed Zoning Amendment Warrant Articles when they appear on the ballot. It was noted that the vote of the Planning on each Article was not recorded on the recent ballot, but that there was no prohibition against doing so. The only language that is prescribed by RSA is that it must read "as proposed by the Planning Board" must appear on each article. Concern was expressed that voters may not be understand the language in the Warrant Articles as they are presented on the ballot.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joyce C. Ingerson
Recording Secretary