

**ATKINSON PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2016**

Members Present:

Sue Killam, Chair
Mike Turell, Vice Chair
Tim Dziechowski
Barbara Brown, Alternate
Ted Stewart
Paul DiMaggio

Other's Present:

Michael Garrepy, Brown Engineering
Scot Frankowitz, Brown Engineering
Steve Keach, Keach Nordstrom

Call to order: 7:30 PM

Chair Killam called the meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board to order on Wednesday, March 2, 2016 at 8:00 pm.

Minutes: February 17, 2016

February 17, 2016:

Vice Chair Mike Turell made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2016 meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board as written Member Paul DiMaggio seconded the motion. All regular members of the Atkinson Planning Board present voted in favor. Vote: 5/0/0.

Correspondence: not reviewed

Workshop: Mike Garrepy for Tuck Realty: discussion regarding Brown parcel, density, soils, design concept

Mr. Garrepy appeared before the Board to discuss the Brown parcel and passed out revised plans. Mr. Garrepy explained that the big grid lines were open space and the small ones showed the septic areas. Water will be provided by Hampstead Water. Chair Killam informed Mr. Garrepy that there were some codicils to water from Hampstead including that the applicant must drill a well to augment Hampstead Water supply. Drilling a well on the property will take a year and a half. The well must also provide enough water to cover the additional capacity. Mr. Garrepy showed the Board some possible locations for a well on the property.

Mr. Garrepy showed the Board the new location for the road on the plans. It has been moved to the left side of Princess Pasture, hugging the woods and the wetland. The road will connect to Knightland. Mr. Garrepy has met with Chief Murphy and Chief would like the project to be connected to Knightland Road and be a two way road. Member Dziechowski would like a Conservation parking lot by Knightland Road.

The soil map has been completed. The soil can accommodate 50 bedrooms. The applicant informed the Board that they will work with the Conservation Commission on open space, possibly an easement, deed to the Conservation Commission or some trails. The applicant feels that a three bedroom model will better accommodate the water supply.

The Board looked at possible trails.

The applicant explained that he would like the Board to be aware of what the soil based density map would allow for development. There is enough room for 52 four bedroom units 67 three bedroom units or 92 two bedroom units.

The applicant would like the Board to approve a scenic vista density development. Chair Killam asked about a Conservation subdivision. She explained that the applicant has discussed public access. Member Dziechowski explained the requirements for a Conservation subdivision are 50% open space and public access, which the developer has already provided.

The Board discussed the differences between the two types of subdivisions and which would be the better alternative. The Board is concerned about the vista. The applicant proposed moving some of the stone wall on the property to the southern part of the property. A stone wall would hide the road. Also, there is a tree line that runs down to the location of the well. If some trees were removed, then it would open up more of the area as pasture. Chair Killam pointed out that the pump house would have to be hidden. Mr. Keach mentioned that a developer in Pelham is building the pump house to look like a sugar house.

The Board returned to a discussion of a Conservation subdivision. If the Town buys the back part of the development, then it will impact the density. The Board also discussed the cost of adding three hundred feet of road to accommodate a scenic vista.

The Board discussed unit size, two, three or four bedrooms. The developer would prefer three bedroom units.

Chair Killam explained that whoever builds the houses must be aware that the development must be eligible for review as a rural cluster.

Member Dziechowski informed the applicant that if they did not need all the back land for density, then the Conservation Commission would be willing to buy part of it.

The Board discussed the best location for the well. One alternative would be in the front on the first house lot. The only problem would be the location of the pump house.

Member DiMaggio asked each Board member to state their opinion about a Conservation subdivision. Chair Killam stated that in her opinion, she would prefer a conservation subdivision cluster rather than a scenic vista. Under the cluster ordinance, the first two hundred feet needs to be left open. Member Brown stated that she thinks of the field and Princess Pasture as scenic vista, not the part that is overgrown. She likes the idea of the road skirting the edge of the wetlands. Member Dziechowski remarked that the only objection to the scenic vista is the location of the pump house. Member Stewart stated that he is not sure how the developer can make it work. The driveways will be too steep. Mr. Keach stated that Mr. Stewart has a valid point; the site is very uneven and will be a challenge to build on. Member Stewart also remarked that the driveway issue could affect saleability. Chair Killam agreed. Mr. Garrepy stated shared driveways could be a solution. Mr. Keach asked if the driveways would be to NFPA standards. All the units would be sprinkled.

Chair Killam asked if the units would meet the specifications of 600:8.

The Board discussed the 100 foot wetlands set back. Mr. Keach informed the applicant that the odd lot will probably be needed for storm water management. The well house could also be placed there.

Mr. Keach mentioned that another issue would be the vertical alignment of the roadway. The Board discussed a turnaround. Member Stewart would prefer a cul de sac rather than a hammerhead. The Board discussed whether any of the road requirements could be waived.

Chair Killam asked the applicant if he would go forward as a Conservation subdivision. Mr. Garrepy stated he would like to look at the language but he would be agreeable. Mr. DiMaggio stated that the consensus of the Board is that the development is not well suited as a scenic vista. The applicant

informed the Board that if the site is developed as a conservation subdivision, then more units may be placed in the front.

The Board returned to a discussion of the lots. The applicant agreed to drawing grading plans for some of the lots.

New/Old Business: none

Other: Member Dziechowski mentioned that the Board should ask the Town lawyer about regulations because of issues with other subdivisions. There are issues with the Little River development.

Chair Killam requested a motion to adjourn.

Member Paul DiMaggio made a motion to adjourn the March 2, 2016 meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board. Vice Chair Turell seconded the motion. All regular members of the Atkinson Planning Board present voted in favor. Vote: 5/0/0.

Chair Killam adjourned the March 2, 2016 meeting of the Atkinson Planning Board at 9:00 pm.

The next Planning Board meeting is a public hearing on Wednesday, March 16, 2016.