

1 **Amherst Planning Board**
2 **Wednesday May 6, 2015**

3
4 Attendees: A. Rosenblatt-Chairman, J. D'Angelo-Selectman, G. Leedy, R. Hart-Conservation Commission,
5 M. Peterman, A. Merriman, C. Harris, S. Wilkins and C. Mailloux- Community Development Director
6

7 A. Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

8 **Case #: PZ6019-040615–Peterborough Building Consulting, LLC, Town Farm Road, PIN #: 001-018-000**
9 **& 001-018-001 –Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for work within the Wetland and**
10 **Watershed Conservation District and Aquifer & Wellhead Protection District associated with**
11 **improvements within the Right of Way of a Class VI road in order to provide access to two existing lots**
12 **of record.**

13 A. Rosenblatt confirmed with C. Mailloux that there is also a request for a waiver from stormwater
14 requirements. The engineer provided additional information today in response to the staff report- an
15 amended plan with a gravel driveway instead of a paved one. M. Peterman asked if the changes made
16 by the applicant change the staff recommendation. C. Mailloux stated she is more comfortable with the
17 information that was provided today regarding the rationale with stormwater.
18

19 C. Guida of Fieldstone Land Consultants presented for the applicant.

20 He is a wetlands and soil scientist and is representing the owner of the two lots; 1-18 and 1-18-1 located
21 on Town Farm Rd- a class VI road.

22 The proposal is to allow access to those existing lots. No subdivision is proposed. The existing Town
23 Farm Rd is about 800 feet, is paved with existing homes, then it turns into gravel. In the first part there is
24 no proposed disturbance to the wetlands. Further down there is a small wetland area to the north and a
25 small amount of flow comes across the road. Yesterday it was about 2" deep and a foot wide and this is
26 spring- the highest time of year.

27 The first proposal is to let the flow continue by installing an 18" culvert in that area. That is oversized for
28 the amount of flow there. The water shed to that is about four acres. There is no major watershed that
29 feeds that. The other crossing is an intermittent stream. There is an existing 15" culvert there. It appears
30 to be undersized and backs up in the wetlands there. It handles 90% of the events that come through
31 there. Mr. Guida handed updated photos to the board. Occasionally it flows over the road and there is
32 some minor erosion. He looked at the culverts at Golden Ln. Those are 30" culverts that handle 150
33 acres. The stream at Town Farm is about 80 acres of water shed, so they are oversizing the proposed
34 culvert.

35 You have to cross the stream again to get to the lot because of the way the lots are configured. They are
36 trying to minimize the impact and are crossing at the narrowest point in an area that has been disturbed
37 in the past by logging activities.

38 The proposed road will be raised a foot or two then gravel suitable for emergency vehicles will be
39 added.

40 There won't be any shedding off of the road besides what's already there because the ground is higher
41 on either side of the road for most of the road.
42

43 R. Hart asked if the plan is to build houses on those lots. Yes eventually. What percent of the lots are
44 wetland and high ground? Both lots are about 10 acres each. One lot is about half wet and the other is
45 about ¾ wet with the dry area on the far side. They looked at coming into the lots from the Milford side,
46 but it's extremely steep and the right of way is much narrower. It's also very wet and the dry portion is

47 closer to the Amherst side. In order to minimize cost and environmental impact, the Amherst side is
48 more level with a wider right of way so it seems a more suitable entrance.
49 A. Merriman stated it looks like it's planned well to minimize impact.
50 G. Leedy clarified that the plan is to not pave the road. Correct. The intent is to have a vegetative swale
51 in the ditch. It's very gentle. Keep it as natural as possible. Maintain rural character. G. Leedy asked if
52 they need BOS authority to use this road for access. Yes. C. Mailloux stated the BOS is aware of the
53 project. They need various BOS approvals for permits and waiver of municipal liability. The fire chief has
54 stated he wants a 12' wide roadway that is suitably maintained and plowed.
55 G. Leedy asked if they need to pull utilities. Yes. They will be underground as part of the waiver.
56 Yes, they will be filing with DES. The impact is 4500 sq. ft. so it's a little beyond the minimum. There's no
57 other way to access the lot.
58 G. Leedy confirmed they will use a 36" culvert and fill the bottom 6" with natural fill. Yes. Given the
59 gentle slopes and minimal water shed, and no steep slopes or substantial flow, it will support the 80
60 acres. G. Leedy wants someone do a calculation and certify that it's sized to accommodate the
61 minimum.
62 Once they file for the wetlands permit, they will run the numbers, but they are comfortable that they
63 are overestimating with the 36" culvert.
64
65 M. Peterman asked C. Mailloux if the staff recommendation has changed based on the follow up letter.
66 C. Mailloux is more comfortable. The big change is going from paved to gravel. They've done some
67 calculations. If storm water is waived, she recommends there be a condition of approval that the
68 calculation of the culvert size be provided.
69
70 S. Wilkins was also going to suggest that they waive the management plan but request the drainage
71 calculations. If they have Steve look at the drainage calculation, that is sufficient. She asked if
72 Pennichuck was notified as an abutter. C. Mailloux confirmed they were and she clarified there are no
73 improvements in the aquifer protection district.
74
75 M. Dell Orfano asked how long Town Farm Rd. is. There is currently 800ft of paved road. They will add
76 1400 ft. of gravel. It will be 2200 ft. He asked what the plan is for public safety and fire vehicle access.
77 There will be 12' of road with 2' shoulders on either side.
78 C. Mailloux clarified that the culverts are a part of the road and will need to be maintained by the
79 property owner.
80
81 Public comment:
82 J. Tranquilli 6 Town Farm Rd
83 He is the second lot on the road. The first couple of hundred feet of this proposal will go along the side
84 of his property. The right of way is part of his property. He has three issues to mention.
85 1. Town ordinance 4.11h.2 construction or improvement to roadways in wetlands: "such construction
86 may be permitted when there is no viable alternative."
87 On the Milford side, there is less than 300 feet of road that would need to happen and it doesn't cross
88 any wetlands. It is steeper than the long approach down Town Farm rd.
89 Mr. Guida stated the grade is close to 30%. M. Dell Orfano clarified for the abutter that 8% is the
90 maximum allowed.
91 2. The width of the road is proposed as 12' road with 2' on each side. Currently there is 9' of road and
92 massive boulders and trees on either side that would need to be cleared the whole length of the road.
93 What is the plan for that? Also, there are rock walls. It seems to need a massive amount of clearing and
94 a lot of disturbances to the wetlands there. Per 4.11.I.B, No significant impact to the abutting properties.

95 The clearing of all of those trees in the right of way along his property will have an impact on his
96 property.
97 3. Per 4.11.I.G, did the conservation commission review this? Yes. C. Mailloux listed their notes.
98
99 Mr. Florence 1 Town Farm Rd.
100 His concern is snow removal. It is a very narrow rd. He is in the first house. Currently, they snow blow
101 the road. At the bottom there are stone walls on each side so there's nowhere for the snow to go. When
102 it's plowed, the snow packs in and creates a narrower road.
103
104 S. Wilkins asked how wide the current paved portion is. It's 12' wide to the first house, then 10' wide.
105
106 R. Hart asked how many houses are expected to be built. Mr. Guida replied one house per lot. (2) The
107 lots are not conducive to a subdivision with the wetlands and topographical issues. They did a lot of
108 surveying in the right of way to determine the width and work needed. There will have to be some tree
109 cutting to meet the width for the town requirements. The clearing will all be in the right of way.
110 C. Harris asked about the stone walls on each side. They are boundaries and won't be touched. The
111 southerly wall is almost nonexistent. The wall on the northern side is intact and will remain undisturbed.
112 Discussion ensued and it was clarified that the current pavement is 12' wide and there are currently
113 shoulders in addition to the paved roadway. Photos were shown and road width described.
114 The first 500' of the road is 12' wide and the next 400' of road is 10' wide plus shoulders.
115 M. Peterman asked if the town would reconsider its condition for 12' of road width and allow them to
116 maintain a 10' road with 2' shoulders for the additional 1400 ft.
117 C. Mailloux stated she could ask the fire chief if that's acceptable to him. 12' seems to be the minimum
118 requirement especially because of the distance they are adding to the road.
119 A. Merriman asked who maintains the road now. It is privately maintained.
120 How many houses are on Town Farm Rd? Currently two houses on that road.
121
122 **S. Wilkins moved to approve the waiver with the condition that the drainage calculations be**
123 **submitted.**
124
125 R. Hart wondered what the total storm water impact is going to be once the houses and driveways are
126 in. G. Leedy said if you look at the watershed for these culverts, whatever is going to be disturbed by a
127 single house on each of those ten acre lots is going to be insignificant.
128 C. Mailloux pointed out that normally a single family house on a residential lot would not fall under this
129 board. When they choose their house site, if they are in the wetland buffer when they build the house,
130 they would come back to the board.
131
132 **G. Leedy seconded the motion.**
133 M. Dell Orfano asked if the board should limit salt use on the road due to the wetlands. The motion was
134 not altered. The board voted on the motion. **The motion carried.**
135
136 G. Leedy asked what the plan is to address the 300 feet of road in the middle that isn't sufficient in
137 width. The applicant hasn't had any discussion with the fire chief about it. C. Mailloux said in this case,
138 since this application is for conditional use permit for work in the wetland area, we can highlight that
139 issue for the fire chief to consider.
140 S. Wilkins stated the applicant has made the impact as small as possible. Some of the trees look like they
141 will remain. Mr. Guida stated that is true, there's a large section that won't need cutting.
142

143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189

G. Leedy moved to accept the plan as complete. M. Dell Orfano seconded. The motion carried.

G. Leedy moved to approve the conditional use permit with the following conditions:

- Drainage calculations be submitted demonstrating that there shall be no increase in stormwater discharge on abutting properties, or else drainage easements shall be obtained from property owners abutting the proposed improvements.
- The turf grass mix be changed to native field grasses and instead of 10-10-10 fertilizer, only fertilizer without phosphorus be used.
- Approval numbers and expiration dates for all applicable state permits shall be added to the plan.
- The waiver of municipal liability shall be amended to include reference to maintenance of the culverts.
- Submit 3 full size, one PDF and one 11"x17" plan set to the Community Development Office for final approval signature by the Planning Board Chair.
- Prior to construction, approval must be obtained from the BOS for building permits on Lots 1-18 and 1-18-1, the waiver of municipal liability must be approved and recorded, and the Director of Public Works shall approve the commencement of work within the ROW.
- Clearing within the right of way will be minimal, but the cleared area will be completely clear – no stumps etc.

C. Harris seconded. The motion carried.

S. Wilkins pointed out that lot 1-17 is vacant. There is no provision for that lot to be included in the road maintenance. If developed, they should be included in the maintenance.

Case #: PZ5935-030215 –Camp Young Judaea, 9 Camp Road, PIN #: 008-059-000 –Request for approval of a Non-Residential Site Plan (NRSP) for reconfiguration of the girls’ cabin area and construction of tennis courts.

Case #: PZ5936-030215–Camp Young Judaea, 9 Camp Road, PIN #: 008-059-000 –Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for impacts within the Wetland and Watershed Conservation District associated with the NRSP Application Case #PZ5935-030215

C. Mailloux stated the applicant would like to table the cases to June 3rd.

S. Wilkins moved to table the cases to the June 3rd meeting. C. Harris seconded. The motion carried.

Regional Impact

C. Mailloux stated there is no regional impact cases scheduled for next month.

190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230

Sign Ordinance Amendments

C. Mailloux asked the board if they want to review the sign ordinance. This topic was mentioned at the last meeting. The board discussed the topic.

The businesses have sign issues. Should we have people come in and find out what their concerns are? This was reviewed about five years ago.

A. Rosenblatt asked two questions of each board member: do you want to consider reviewing the sign ordinance and will you serve on a subcommittee for it.

R. Hart yes, no

A. Merriman yes, and possibly willing

G. Leedy yes

J. D'Angelo yes, no

A. Rosenblatt no, no. We did it relatively recently and there are competing concerns

M. Peterman no, no

S. Wilkins yes, no

M. Dell Orfano yes, no

C. Harris yes, no

G. Leedy asked C. Mailloux what, if anything, do you think is going to come out of the strategic plan for the village? There's discussion of a business overlay district in the village. It would be highly controversial. There might not be anything major that comes out of it at this point.

G. Leedy stated there's talk of hiring a consultant for design guidelines for businesses and what if signage was part of that. He is not a big fan of our sign ordinance. There have been technological advances in signage- some of which are good and some of which are bad. We don't really address any of that in our ordinance.

What is the timeline for the village? Public sessions are in two weeks and the presentation to the board of selectman is in June.

A. Rosenblatt feels that when someone thinks a cause is really important, they volunteer to work on it. He gave examples. He suggested deferring discussion on this for several months and seeing where we are.

Approval of Minutes: April 1, 2015

S. Wilkins moved to approve the minutes of April 1, 2015 as submitted. G. Leedy seconded. The motion passed with M. Dell Orfano and M. Peterman abstaining.

C. Harris moved to adjourn at 8:39pm. S. Wilkins seconded. The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Marchant