

**PLANNING BOARD  
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire**

**DRAFT Minutes of June 13, 2011**

**Members Present:** Chairman Leandra MacDonald, Bill Groff, Tom Weeks, Michael Henry, Ivy Vann, and Rick Monahan.

**Also Present:** Carol Ogilvie, Director Office of Community Development, Laura Norton, OCD Administrative Assistant.

The Peterborough Planning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on June 13, 2011 in the Selectmen's Meeting Room of the Town House. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Chair MacDonald introduced the members and staff and appointed Alternate member Groff to sit. She noted the only item on the agenda was an application for a Conditional Use Permit to cross the Wetlands Protection Overlay Zone on Parcel No. U034-001-005 on Hunter Farm Road in the Family and Rural Districts.

Heather Peterson introduced herself as the representative for applicant, Lloyd Reynolds. She took a moment to review the staff report and other data associated with the application. She reviewed a map of the parcel and noted "this application is to renew the ZBA approval to allow access to the lot." She noted that originally the application was to the ZBA "we were going to apply in March but we were told to wait for the vote (town vote on the proposed wetland ordinance amendment) in May. That was approved but then we had to wait for the regulations to be approved." She added "we have an approval from the state for a wetland crossing that is current."

Ms. Peterson gave a brief history of the property located on Hunter Farm Road. She noted "some of you might remember Mr. Reynolds tried to subdivide the 39.5 acre lot into three lots in 2004 but that was not approved so it is still one lot." She presented a map that showed the entire width of a private road with a portion marked off. "We are only taking 12 feet of it" she said, and pointing to the map noted, "the squiggle is the area that counts."

Ms. Peterson noted "we have a DES permit for dredge and fill of 2,885 square feet of forested wetland for the driveway" adding "that permit was approved in 2006 with the work and calculations done by Meridian Land Services." She also noted the permit expires in December of this year. The members briefly reviewed the map showing the wetland crossings. Ms. Peterson also presented portions of the original application, a letter of authorization to present and a map that showed the building site on the property including the location of the well and septic system. Ms. Vann asked about the topography lines with Mr. Monahan interjecting "it is a steep site." Ms. Peterson replied "actually it is a nice meadow." She presented the parcel as seen from aerial photography. She reviewed the increase in the contour lines as going from 860 to 880. She also pointed out a seasonal stream running to the pond. Chair MacDonald noted "the building site is fairly restrained" with Ms. Peterson replying "yes, it is." The members briefly reviewed the actual wetland crossing areas (a primary and secondary one) and discussed the driveway.

Mr. Monahon noted the width to be 18 feet total (12 feet for the driveway and 3 feet on each side for shoulder). Mr. Weeks asked “what about erosion control measures coming down the hill?” adding “what are they going to put in and where is the runoff going to go?” Ms. Vann asked about ditching noting “there is no curbing, so where does the water go now – I guess is my question.” Mr. Monahon replied “it runs down into the wetlands.” A brief discussion about erosion, runoff and sheet drains followed. Ms. Ogilvie pointed out that the process of obtaining a Driveway Permit would address the Board’s concerns. Ms. Peterson also pointed out that a portion of the crossing “is a road already, it is a woods road that would break into the clearing.”

Referring to the Conditional Use Permit process Mr. Monahon noted “I think I understand the proposal pretty well” adding “the question is how we work this, this it is our first application.” Chair MacDonald asked about the conditions of the ZBA approval for a Special Exception in 2006. The members reviewed the decision in that case.

Ms. Vann stated “this is pretty straight forward” adding I make a motion that we issue a Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a driveway with the impact not to exceed the footage of the approved plan.” Mr. Weeks asked about waivers. Ms. Peterson noted the submission requirements and a letter requesting the pertinent waivers. Ms. Ogilvie reviewed the progress the application had made through its presentation (soil and vegetation types, surface drain patterns and location of building envelope). Mr. Weeks asked about a report from a soil scientist with Ms. Peterson noting she would add this concern to the waiver list.

A brief discussion about the uniqueness of this application followed. The Board was concerned about applicants in the future “because this is *not* a typical application” said one member, adding “this has already been through the process.” The group discussed the fact that the application was not new, that it was back under certain circumstances. Mr. Weeks noted “this is our first one (application for Conditional Use Permit) but it has already been vetted, they just got caught up in the mud because of a change in the process.” He also noted the field work that had been done noting “but for the future we want to make sure we dot our I’s and cross our T’s.” Ms. Vann suggested they add a note stating the application was expedited because it had already been approved. “The work was done and it is unreasonable to be done again” she said. “Anyone flipping through the file would know.”

The members decided to use the state map, and reference the subdivision plan which shows the delineation of the wetlands and is stamped by a soil scientist. Mr. Weeks noted “I think we should stay within the limits approved by the state but our wetland boundaries go beyond the state’s jurisdiction; the ConCom may want those areas marked.” He noted the impacted areas were shown for both the larger and smaller crossings and noted “we will just have to see how the erosion control will be handled.” Another member noted that could be determined and approved by the Public Works Director. Chair MacDonald interjected “we need to work on a list of information we want to have in the file.”

When the Chairman asked if there were any other questions Ms. Peterson asked if she needed to obtain a Conditional Use Permit prior to obtaining a Driveway Permit. A brief discussion about planning, permit processes and order followed.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:35 p.m.

With the Public Hearing closed Chair MacDonald asked if there were any other questions or concerns. With none she noted she would entertain a motion. Ms. Vann stated she would like to make a motion to approve the request for a Condition Use Permit with a list of necessary documents and conditions. That list will include the limits of disturbance and defining the name of the actual plan being approved. Ms. Ogilvie suggested they reference the Subdivision Plan of Land prepared for Mr. Reynolds in 2003 “that is where the information is coming from” she said. That plan was dated 12-23-03 from Meridian Land Services. The members also agreed to reference NH DES Minimum Impact Expedited Application (Dredge and Fill Permit) dated 12-22-06 to show disturbance allowed by the State of New Hampshire. The members also reviewed a request for waivers. The members agreed the waivers were reasonable “due to the fact that the application is a re-application where the process has changed.” The waivers included a report on the soil and vegetation from a soil scientist and a submission of proof that the applicant is or will be compliant with Performance Standards. One member noted “it is unreasonable to take an application back and redo work that has already been done.” Mr. Weeks asked about monumentation and a brief discussion about the practicality of monumenting a wetland crossing followed, with the Board agreeing that monumentation was not practical in this case.

**A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Henry) to approve the application for a Conditional Use Permit with all in favor.**

Chair MacDonald asked about the draft work program for 2011. Ms. Vann spoke briefly about a conference she attended with Randall Arendt. She reviewed the importance of taking a potential application to the Board “before the engineering has been done.” Mr. Monahan noted the Board encourages and does that very same thing. Ms. Vann replied “we do but we do not reward it.” She went on to give an example of Arendt’s model ordinance and told the members she would follow up with a copy of it. She noted the essence of the ordinance would combine the appropriate Boards (Planning Board, Zoning Board, Conservation Commission, etc.) and begin by walking the site. The hearing would be posted and at the hearing they would lay out the maps and decide where things could go. She noted “it is very agreeable to our goals as a Planning Board and to the goals of the applicant.” Chair MacDonald asked if the hearing would be noticed with Ms. Vann replying “yes.” Chair MacDonald noted “so it is like a conceptual site visit” to which Ms. Vann replied “that is *exactly* what it is” adding “I will get the model ordinance, I vote we talk about that.”

Mr. Groff noted he thought that was a very good idea. “Looking at the flat plans versus going out and walking the land makes a big difference” he said.

Chair MacDonald noted she was still interested in getting together with the GIS Specialist and/or Rodney (Bartlett, DPW Director) “to look at topographical maps of areas where public water and sewer could be extended in the town.”

Ms. Vann also suggested a revisit of the Traditional Neighborhood Design Overlay. “It is ever popular in my heart” she said. A brief discussion about the community standards of a

neighborhood followed. Ms. Vann also noted a discussion about encouraging increases in density and what a new neighborhood should look like would be helpful.

Mr. Monahon mentioned the Heading for Home Conference he had recently attended and how Ms. Ogilvie had presented a plan for mixed use at Evan Flats in Peterborough. He noted “this is town-owned land; it shows perfectly how a town may become the stimulator of a work force housing model.” The members briefly discussed housing above retail and retail fronting a parking facility. They also discussed incentive zoning and the problems that can result from it.

In closing Chair MacDonald reported she had attended the Spring OEP Conference over the weekend and noted an interesting tutorial she attended about data collection from the Census Bureau. “There is better, comparative data coming” she said.

**Minutes:**

A motion was made/seconded (Monahon/Groff) to approve the Minutes of May 9, 2011, May 16, 2011 and June 2, 2011 as written with all in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton,  
Administrative Assistant