

**TOWN OF NEW HAMPTON  
PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
NEW HAMPTON TOWN OFFICE  
NEW HAMPTON, NH 03256**

October 21, 2014

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Kettenring, Mr. Mertz, Mr. Luciano, Mr. Irvine, Mrs. Hiltz, Ms. Gregg (7:03 pm), and Mr. Conkling (7:05 pm) were present.

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Town Administrator Mrs. Lucas

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Kettenring called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Kettenring appointed Mrs. Hiltz to vote in place of Mr. Love.

**MINUTES:**

9/16/14

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Luciano, to accept the minutes as written. Vote was unanimous.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Kettenring advised that the board has a request to take an item out of order. He explained there was someone had traveled from MA for an Informational/Conceptual discussion relative to the cell tower on Main Street belonging to New Hampton Realty. Mr. Kettenring advised that the Selectmen had asked Mr. Wallace to meet with the Planning Board to determine whether site plan review was necessary.

Industrial Communications Steve Wallace was present. He said they are proposing to add four antennas and radio equipment on a post mounted rack, for a new carrier. Mr. Wallace advised the ground equipment was approximately 5'X5', would be inside the fenced area, and would not change the tower height. The board reviewed the regulations relative to criteria in determining whether site plan review was required.

Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Hiltz that site plan review would not be necessary based on the criteria in the regulations.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

1. Copy of a letters from Selectmen to KGI Properties and Wolak Realty relative to some signage and pennant flags that are in violation of the zoning ordinance, and must be removed to avoid enforcement action.
2. ZBA Notice of Decisions approving a variance for William Cannon II that includes a recommendation to the Planning Board that when they review a potential subdivision application from Mr. Cannon, they consider not allowing any further curb cuts along Old Bristol Road.
3. ZBA Notice of Decisions denying an appeal from an administrative decision, but approving a variance for Paul Yager.
4. NH DES Wetlands application to reconstruct an existing retaining wall on Lake Winona for Edward Dipple.

**MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

Mr. Mertz advised he has nothing to report at this time.

**(Cont) PUBLIC**

**HEARING/ABUTTERS HEARING**

*Michael Sharp; NH Route 104 & Riverwood Drive; Tax Map U-17, Lot 55 – Site Plan Review for health focus facility*

**HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

*Driveway standards, major subdivisions, and fire safety codes*

**PRELIMINARY HEARING/  
SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION**

*Kevin Lacasse and Louis & Karen Porrazzo; 80 Lake View Drive; Tax Map R-8, Lot 1A20 & Straits Road; Tax Map R-7, Lot 1 – Boundary Line Adjustment and Subdivision*

Mr. Kettenring advised that the board has a request to continue this item to the November meeting.

Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mertz, to grant a continuance to 11/18/14 at 7:00 pm. Vote passed.

Deputy Fire Chief Kevin Lang was present but advised he had no information for them at this time. Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Luciano, to continue this item to the November meeting. Vote was unanimous.

Several abutters were present but no applicants were present. Mr. Irvine made a motion, seconded by Mr. Luciano, to table this discussion until the applicants arrive. Mr. Kettenring explained to the abutters that if no applicants arrive, this discussion will be continued to the next Planning Board meeting on 11/18/14.

Mr. Lacasse arrived at 7:16 pm so the vote on tabling the discussion was withdrawn.

Mr. Lacasse showed where he currently lives on Lake View Drive and that one acre would come from the Porrazzo's lot and be added to his lot. He advised that 10 acres would then be subdivided off of the same Porrazzo lot. He said his initial intention was to access this new 10 acre lot from Straits Road, but upon advice from the Planning Board at an earlier Informational/Conceptual meeting he added a ROW from Lake View Drive. Mr. Lacasse stated that the Porrazzos will also be merging two of their lots together (R7, lots 1D & 1C) if this application is approved. For clarification purposes, Mrs. Lucas advised that the original subdivision for the Corrigan/Porrazzo properties created an access to lot 1 and 1D from a ROW. She pointed out that as the regulations allow for access to no more than two lots from a ROW, lots 1D & 1C will be merged. She stated that lot 1C already has the required frontage on Straits Road. She said this proposed plan will provide a 50' ROW to lot 1 and the new 10 acre lot being created. Mr. Lacasse said the purpose for creating this ROW to this 10 acre lot would be for logging purposes.

Abutter Helen Dinsmore expressed concern with creation of another road in their neighborhood and the effect it could have. Mr. Lacasse advised he was not looking to add more homes to the 10 acre lot. Mr. Kettenring explained that Mr. Lacasse had initially wanted the access to the 10 acres to be from Straits Road only, but the regulations would not allow for that as it would have meant 3 lots being served from one ROW. For this reason he is proposing access from Lake View Drive, through his existing property.

Abutter Paul Lanni asked if these two new ROW's would create another access point into Winona Heights. Mr. Lacasse advised that was not his intention. He said he needs more space on his property to put vehicles and store his personal equipment. He intends to keep the 10 acre parcel in current use, and allow his children to ride their ATV's on the property.

Resident Al Firmin asked why the plans reflect a possible building envelope, well radius, and septic area for the 10 acre lot if Mr. Lacasse does not intend to construct something on this lot. Mr. Lacasse advised that these items were included as required per the subdivision regulations. Mr. Mertz confirmed that part of reviewing a subdivision is to ensure it can be a buildable lot. Mr. Firmin expressed concern with the purpose for owning the 10 acre lot separately if there is no desire to develop it. Resident Jerry Heckman expressed the same concern. Mr. Lacasse said the Porrazzos will hold the mortgage on 10 acre lot.

Mr. Kettenring asked why there was a need for the ROW off of Lake View Drive if there was one from Straits Road and Mr. Lacasse said he would prefer not to have the ROW off of Lake View. Mrs. Lucas reminded the board that during the conceptual meeting they had concerns that this ROW from Straits Road is in excess of 2200' in length. Asking for Deputy Lang's input on a driveway of this length, he said emergency access would be much less difficult if it was constructed to town specs, which would not be a requirement in this situation. Mr. Lacasse pointed out that there were many lots in town that if developed, would have very long driveways and Mr. Kettenring pointed out that those do not reflect recent approved subdivisions, but rather grandfathered lots. Mr. Irvine pointed out that as Mr. Lacasse was not looking to develop this 10 acre lot, only wanting to access it, it made sense to have a ROW across his existing lot to access his larger lot. Mr. Irvine advised that this also solved the issue with accessing 3 lots from one ROW, as that was the case prior to the merging of lots 1C & 1D.

Mr. Lanni?? said the resident's concern is in future development of the 10 acre lot and its affect on the privacy they currently have. Mrs. Lucas pointed out that the subdivision regulations state that a dead-end road cannot be any longer than 1,500'.

Abutter Marylee Matthewman asked for clarification on the ROW that currently exists from Straits Road. Mr. Kettenring advised the current 50' ROW from Straits Road was for the purpose of providing access to the two rear lots - R7, lot 1 and lot 1D as they did not have frontage on Straits Road. Mr. Irvine pointed out that this proposed ROW to the 10 acre lot would extend the length of the current ROW. Abutter Roger Matthewman expressed concern with this ROW to the 10 acre lot creating a run-off issue that would affect his property. The board noted that a single family driveway would not require engineering work as there are no town standards for driveways. Mr. Kettenring advised that even an access road for logging could cause run-off issues for the Matthewman property. Mr. Irvine suggested a condition of approval could be that this 10 acre lot not be further subdivided and that any protections be in place during the approval process as opposed to if and when the lot is developed. There was discussion that this ROW extension could be further west of the property line that abuts the Matthewmans. Mr. Matthewman advised that if the ROW stays along the property line trees would likely be removed which would take away some of the buffer of vegetation currently in place. Mr. Lacasse said he would have to speak with the Porrazzo about this re-location.

Mr. Irvine asked Mr. Lacasse if he was agreeable to a condition that the 10 acre lot could not be further subdivided and Mr. Lacasse said he was.

Mr. Mertz asked Mr. Lacasse to see if the Porrazzos would be agreeable to relocating the ROW away from the property line and suggested a site visit to the board. Mr. Lacasse confirmed with the board that it was their desire to have the ROW moved further away from the property; once it reaches the end of lot 1D, but pointed out that he is proposing it in the most level spot.

Mr. Mainville advised he did not have a problem with the plan as he now understands there will not be a new access to Lake View Drive but wondered how all the water that ends up in the cul-de-sac in front of Mr. Lacasse's house would be handled with a ROW in place. Mr. Lacasse advised he would address that situation if he developed the site.

Mr. Kettenring reviewed the primary concerns brought up at this meeting to review at the site visit was relative to the location of the ROW and how it would affect stormwater runoff.

The residents and abutters were in agreement that they would like to see a condition on the plan that no further subdivision will be allowed, to maintain the private neighborhood.

Mr. Mertz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Irvine, to perform a site visit to the property on 11/1/14, 8:00 am, at the end of Lake View Drive. Vote was unanimous. Mr. Kettenring advised that no final decision would be made at that time and this was still a preliminary application.

**PRELIMINARY HEARING/  
SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION**

*Theodore Rand Trust; 187 Old Bristol Road; Tax Map R-12, Lot 10 and Hemlock Trust; 101 Old Bristol Road; Tax Map R-12, Lot 4 – Boundary Line Adjustment*

Paul & Amy MacDonald and surveyor Colin Brown were present to represent the application.

Mr. Brown advised that the boundary line adjustment between the Rand and Hemlock Trusts takes .45 acres, "Parcel A", from lot 10 and adds it to lot 4 to give that lot additional access. Mr. MacDonald stated that the purpose for obtaining this access is that the portion of the property that this Parcel A will access cannot be reached from the other part of the lot 4, due to a brook. He advised that there is an old cabin on this portion of the lot, which had been part of the boy's camp. He said though there are no plans to develop this portion of the lot, someone may want to do that in the future. He said there were some locations where a structure could be placed while maintaining the required distance from the Pemigewasset River.

Bristol abutter Max & Helga Stamp were present. Mr. Stamp asked what the intended use was of the property and Mrs. MacDonald said it was not their intention to reopen the camp.

Mr. Kettenring asked Mr. Brown to speak to the difference on R12, Lot 10 as being listed as 2.3 acres on the survey instead of the 2.53 acres that is currently on the town tax map. Mr. Brown advised the lot is smaller than the size on the tax map. Mr. Kettenring asked where the Pemigewasset Overlay (PO) District fell in relation to these properties

and Mr. Brown showed it on the plan. It was noted that portions of the properties were in this district. It was noted that there was a 2 acre minimum lot size in the PO District and the plan shows lot 10 becoming a 1.86 acre lot which may require a variance to create. There was discussion on how to apply this 2 acre minimum to a lot where only a portion of it lies in the PO District. Mrs. Lucas advised that if there is a question on where the district line falls, the ZBA could make that determination. There was discussion on reducing the amount of road frontage for Parcel A, to give lot 10 the additional .14 acres to make it a two acre lot. Mr. Brown advised that more road frontage was provided due to the terrain. The board suggested that Mr. MacDonald determine where he would like the access to be and design the ROW to be as narrow as possible to create the additional .14 acres. Mr. MacDonald advised that they do not want to encumber lot 10 with a ROW. It was determined that Mr. Brown would need to determine exactly where the PO District lies on the survey.

Mr. Kettenring made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mertz, to continue the meeting until 11/18/14 at 7:00 pm. Vote was unanimous.

**INFORMATIONAL/CONCEPTUAL**  
*New Hampton School, Tax Map R-3,  
Lot 12, Dr. Childs Road, new Skating  
Rink*

NHS Facilities Director Kirk Beswick was present.

Mr. Mertz advised he was recusing himself from this portion of the meeting as he was an abutter.

Mr. Beswick showed conceptual drawings of the site for a new hockey rink. He said he had met with the Selectmen recently and wanted to discuss the project and its affect on Dr. Childs Road, which is a town road. He said the school plans to tear down the existing rink, constructing a larger one. He showed a concept of the building placement, where parking would be, and a detention pond for stormwater treatment. He said it would be parallel to the Field House but further west. The plan would be to remove 4-6' off the hill where the current rink is so the rink sits at the same elevation as the Field House. Mr. Beswick advised that the existing ROW for Dr. Childs Road shows the road is longer and wider than originally thought. The Field House has been determined to have been constructed at the very edge of the ROW and the retaining wall and part of the stair structure are in the ROW. He said the proposed placement of the new building would be within the 35' setback of the Village District. He advised that moving the building away from the setback would put it up into the hill and would cause the loss of parking spaces. He pointed out that with the change in the orientation of the rink at 90°, the roof will now shed snow off towards Dr. Childs Road, into a calculated 20' zone.

Mr. Beswick explained the options they are considering:

1. Appeal for a special exception for a change in a non-conforming use.
2. Ask the town to consider abandoning a portion of Dr. Childs Road. The advantage to this is the setback issue goes away, and they can maintain the roadway, which they do already.
3. Ask the town to abandon the entire roadway, but that there are two abutters who have access rights to Dr. Childs Road. As they want to begin construction in June 2015 getting these abutters to agree to

a legal access agreement by that time, may be difficult.

He said option 2 is likely the best, with the end of the town ROW being just past the Gnerre property, and creating a hammerhead turnaround for the public.

Mr. Kettenring asked why the town road couldn't come to a dead end and then the school can allow the traveling public to turnaround in their parking lot. Mrs. Lucas pointed out that this issue is relative to the general public and the school may not want the public to enter onto their property. Mr. Beswick advised that they will seek an abandonment of a portion of the road and move the building as far from the ROW as possible given the hill and parking, and simultaneously seek a variance on the setback issue. Asked if the school would want to ask to have the entire roadway abandoned in the future, Mr. Beswick said they may, but further discussion would need to take place first.

Mr. Beswick said that they will be showing the 20' zone for snow coming off the roof as needing to meet the setback from the ROW and said that is why they will try to move the building away from the ROW as much as possible. The board advised Mr. Beswick that they would not want the location to change to the degree that it creates a large retaining wall in the back that creates a potential hazard.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn was made by Mrs. Hiltz, seconded by Mr. Conkling. Vote was unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Vose