

ATKINSON PLANNING BOARD
Atkinson, New Hampshire
Workshop Meeting
Wednesday November 7, 2012

Present: Sue Killam, Chairman; Vice Chairman: Paul DiMaggio, Regular Members: Ted Stewart, Tim Dziechowski, Alternates: Scott Simons, Todd Barbera, Ex-Officio,

Ms. Killam called the meeting to order at: 7:40 p.m.

Minutes

Minutes of October 17, 2012

Paul made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Scott seconded the motion and the members voted in favor to accept the minutes as written

Correspondence

Incoming - 2 applications for a lot adjustment for Public hearing at November 21st Planning Board meeting
- Haverhill meeting November 14th- Waterfront overlay
- RPC - Notice - legislative Annual meeting - 11/14 6-9pm

Outgoing Sue sent a memo to the Building Inspector re:
Communication Towers on the Busby site to exchange old antennas for new ones. AT&T wants to add 3 more antennas. Sue wanted to know if it was an amendment to the site plan or if a building application is needed, both of which would start the "shot clock. "

Discussion

Sue informed the Board that the DES had an emergency culvert permit for work the Road Agent did last summer. The discussion went into DES and the Osbornes, who applied for a permit for a new dock. DES had written them up because they had no erosion control, so they need to dredge the sand and silt. Discussion ensued on whether it would affect the Osborne's certificate of occupancy.

Scott handed out results from the survey that he and Julie had discussed. They broke it down into 4 categories. They did this to see what stood out for numbers. Were there any trends and how to use the information that was received as a result of the survey. Scott stated that on page 3 the question on preserving open spaces stood out as it had 72% in favor. Scott wanted to see if and what stood out and then how to dissect it. How best to send the information on to other departments to help them with relevant topics that the public wants and doesn't want. Scott found some information contradictory, such as under Conservation and the ADA Accessibility and making the trails accessible by root removal and that it wasn't as high a priority as treating the roads in the winter. The discussion went into that what is used on the roads is from the Budweiser company. It is the sediment that consists of brown molasses and it is non-corrosive to the roads. The discussion went on to how much salt or road treatment cost and what is most economical for the town.

The discussion went on to the question on the survey to "new" Cluster Development, open spaces and incentive zoning and what properties were left and what incentives could be given to preserve open spaces left in the town.

This brought the Board into turning the questions into recommendations. Tim would like new zoning incentives (question 4B) Preserving Habitat and prime wetlands. Julie, Tim and Paul to work on the wording for zoning. Sue reminded everyone on the time frame for publishing a public notice. Also, Sue reminded the Board that if it is a site plan change there is not legislative process but a zoning plan change there needs to be a legislative process done.

Scott stated that he broke the survey down and made the Land Use Zoning tabs to help the Board easily find information on the spreadsheet. There were 54% in favor of wetland setbacks and 69% for screening buffers along streams. Discussion went into 50 foot buffers of undisturbed buffers or natural buffers. Scott stated that there was

only a 17% response rate of the surveys which was a small representation group and how does the Board get more information, how to reach more people.

The Board discussed the different age brackets that participated in the survey. The Board wanted to get the younger population to participate. It was brought up about civic events and preparing for future events. Scott stated that there was only 1 survey from the age bracket of 18-25 and that there were 277 in that age range. This person was preserving conservation as a high priority. Discussion was on the August 31st cut-off date. Scott stated that he did look into the IP addresses to see if there was improprieties. Only one IP address was used more than once but the surveys were filled out for different age brackets leading Scott to believe that a family had filled out the surveys. The Board then discussed about IP addresses and if there would be an alert if to having more than one person manipulating the numbers. That was not observed in the survey. There was a concern brought up by Scott that the age bracket of 26-40 was not well represented. The Board discussed different reasons why and how to get them to respond, Whether sending surveys home with school children, sports events, scouts, etc.

The Board discussed questions #8 & #9, which were open responses on what you like most about living in Atkinson (#8) and what you like least about living in Atkinson (#9). Sue stated that maybe an addendum be added to the back of the book with the responses.

Paul would like the incentive zoning for every mile or 1/2 mile of trails the developer would get one unit. This had the Board discuss what parcels of lands were left and what may be coming in the future and how the Board needs to approach open spaces and trails for conservation.

Sue mentioned that there would be 2 new applications at the next Board meeting. She also noted that it was the night before Thanksgiving and she wanted to make sure that would be a quorum for that meeting. The members stated that they would be available for the meeting.

Tim brought up illegal in-law apartments or also know as extended family living units and how it is impossible to enforce if they are being used properly. Discussion on adopting a method into the Master Plan. He brought up a court order of Atkinson vs. Sansberg. Also was discussed went into the need for emergency calls to 911 and if the fire department would have to check both addresses. The Board discussed the requirements of the extended family living units could not be more than 750sqft. The need for special exceptions. The property is required to have better septic systems. Under the current requirements, if there is a change in the circumstance the property owner is to inform the Town. This is where the problem is that there is no way to monitor it. So the Board wanted to see if there should be a change in the zoning.

Tim made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Todd seconded the motion and the Board voted in favor to adjourn.

The Planning Board meeting was adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Patty Power