

1 **AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**

2 **Wednesday June 7, 2017**

3
4 In attendance: A. Rosenblatt- Chair, S. Wilkins, M. Dell Orfano, M. Peterman, P. Lyon- Selectman Ex-
5 Officio, E. Hahn and Community Development Director G. Leedy

6
7 A. Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:32pm and noted that E. Hahn will vote for C. Harris
8 tonight.

9 E. Hahn stepped away from the board and presented the first topic with DPW Director B. Berry.

10
11 **NEW BUSINESS**

12 **1. Scenic Road Public Hearing – Town of Amherst, Department of Public Works – Scenic Road Public**
13 **Hearing for the removal of trees on the following scenic roads: Ponemah Hill Road, Old Milford Road,**
14 **7 Colonel Wilkins Road, 3 Lyndeborough Road & Green Road in accordance with NH RSA 231:158.**

15
16 **S. Wilkins moved to open the public hearing. M. Peterman seconded. All in favor**

17
18 Bruce Berry and E. Hahn made their presentation.

19 Bruce described the first five trees on Ponemah Hill Rd being requested to be removed and why they are
20 on the list. Each one is marked with a green dot on it and orange paint in the roadway. The remaining
21 trees on Ponemah Hill Rd on the list are too close to the roadway. There are 22 trees total on Ponemah
22 Hill Rd in the request.

23
24 There are also 10 trees on Old Milford Rd that need to come down. Seven are dead and the remaining
25 three are close to the road. These trees are also marked with a green dot on them and orange paint in
26 the roadway.

27
28 These last three requests are requests from the homeowners, but they are town trees.

29
30 At 7 Colonel Wilkins Rd, there are two trees that need to come out so he can do some drainage work.

31
32 At 3 Lyndeborough Rd there are two trees that need to come out due to sight lines.

33
34 On Green Rd, there are two trees that need to come out due to sight lines.

35
36 Public Comment:

37 24 Ponemah Hill Rd

38 He wanted to confirm there will be no damage to the stone wall on Ponemah Hill Rd. The stone wall is
39 unstable- please be careful working around it. The road is 18' at the top, is there any plan to widen it?
40 Bruce replied there is not.

41 He requested they be careful with the two small maples next to the dead maple. Please leave them as
42 they prevent people from accidentally going over that hill. He requested the DPW leave the two trees
43 that are on his property after they take them down so he can use the wood.

44 Bruce said they will work with the homeowners on those requests.

49 Ted Drotleff- 10 Ponemah Hill Rd
 50 He is across from Farmington. There is an ash tree on his property that he requested be put on the list to
 51 come down. It is 75% dead, leans over the road and the branches fall off. It is on the town side of the
 52 wall.
 53 He also asked where the catch basins will go.
 54 Bruce said he will host a public meeting specifically to discuss Ponemah Hill Rd questions, but he
 55 believes there will be one just up from the owner's house.
 56
 57 Bill Emerson-3 Lyndeborough Rd
 58 There are two trees on his lot that are falling down, cause line of sight issues and have branches in the
 59 power lines. He requested the DPW remove those trees while they are doing the rest.
 60
 61 Susan Hargreaves-29 Green Rd
 62 She just wanted the board to know she was the owner who requested the trees come down on Green
 63 Rd that Bruce mentioned.
 64
 65 **S. Wilkins moved to close the public hearing. M. Peterman seconded. All in favor**
 66 **M. Peterman moved to approve the requests of the DPW Director for tree removal with the potential**
 67 **additions that were mentioned during public comment.**
 68
 69 E. Hahn rejoined the planning board at this time.
 70
 71 **2. CASE #: PZ8499-040317- LaBelle Winery, LLC (Applicant & Owner) & Friends of Young Judaea**
 72 **(Owner) – 345 RTE 101, PIN #s: 008-057-000 & 008-058-000 – Discussion on a conceptual plan for a**
 73 **potential new building, parking area & infrastructure. Zoned Residential/ Rural.**
 74
 75 This case was withdrawn prior to the meeting.
 76
 77 **3. CASE #: PZ8625-051017 – Stickney Family Rev. Trust (Owner) – 137 Hollis Road, PIN #: 001-012-000**
 78 **– Discussion seeking clarification on how IIHO incentives are applied. Zoned Residential/Rural.**
 79 Ken Clinton of Meridian Land Services was present to have this discussion with the board.
 80 His clients are looking at putting in a PRD and are considering bonuses/ incentives. He is here to make
 81 sure they interpret those correctly.
 82
 83 A. Rosenblatt stated this conversation is not binding- it's just a discussion. This is the first time the board
 84 is hearing of this potential project. When a plan comes forward in the future, individuals will have their
 85 own interpretations on the project as presented.
 86
 87 Ken quickly ran through the list of incentives and how bonuses might be applied: skipping over some,
 88 listing or asking brief rhetorical questions about others and discussing some in more detail as follows:
 89
 90 1.Attached housing yields a 10% addition to the baseline: they discussed how the bonuses for the
 91 number of attached units is applied. Would all 10 base units need to be attached to yield the 1 bonus
 92 unit? What happens if you have 6 attached and 4 singles?
 93 S. Wilkins said you would gain a bonus of .6 - it's prorated. At the end, you add up all the partial bonuses
 94 to arrive at the total.
 95 2.Single floor unit: is it the same here? If you have 8 of 10 units as single floor living you get .8 bonus
 96 rather than 1 bonus for having single floor units? That is S. Wilkins' interpretation.

97 If at the end, there are 10 base units and 10 bonus units given, do the bonuses have to be attached or
 98 single floor living?
 99 S. Wilkins believes the bonus units can be different. M. Dell Orfano agreed. M. Peterman stated the
 100 board has not yet had this discussion.
 101
 102 Ken pointed out that if 10 bonus units conform to the same restrictions as the 10 base units, you lose
 103 your diversity of housing. You end up with homogeneous housing which probably wasn't the board's
 104 intent.
 105 He further commented that this project as well as others are stalled out waiting to see how these rules
 106 will be applied before they move forward.
 107
 108 A. Rosenblatt pointed out that what Ken is hearing is not a consensus of the board, but differing
 109 thoughts on each of these items: prorating, uncertainty about having the same type of housing or not
 110 and possible bonuses on bonuses
 111
 112 3. handicapped accessible:
 113 4. Bedroom size: they discussed the percentage of 0, 1 or 2 bedrooms.
 114 5. walkability- how is a footpath defined? The material/ length/ width? Pavement/ a trail/ ADA
 115 accessible? S. Wilkins said it should be appropriate to the site and usable and the board will review the
 116 plan and decide if it's worth a bonus.
 117 He described the risk level for the owners when they put money up for these projects, yet they don't
 118 know going in how many units they will be allowed to put in.
 119 S. Wilkins said the board is cognizant of that and tries to balance all the scales.
 120
 121 6. community space for residents: is that a picnic area/ community room?
 122 7. open space is a given since it's required
 123 8. rental: is that in perpetuity? Yes, deed restricted.
 124 9. redevelopment of existing structure: If 400%, do all four units have to be inside that existing
 125 structure? He discussed an existing structure that won't fit four units. They might look to put two in the
 126 house and two in the garage/barn if that is acceptable.
 127 10. public betterment: how many other people need to benefit from it to receive the bonus? If water
 128 mains are added, but only one other property benefits from it, would that yield the bonus? The reaction
 129 was probably not.
 130
 131 M. Peterman said the goal of this was to bring diversity in housing in both type and cost from what
 132 Amherst has now.
 133
 134 G. Leedy clarified that the owner can assume the project starts with fractional units. You can start with
 135 12.5 and each fraction will count. But at the end, if you have 16.9, you will be allowed to build 16 units-
 136 not 17. Therefore, those last few bonuses you try to get won't matter because if you don't get them and
 137 you're at 16.8 rather than 16.9, it still gets you only 16 units.
 138
 139 E. Hahn stated utility betterments can include separate bonuses for separate utilities.
 140
 141 Ken asked how soon in the process of formal application do the bonuses get established? On a certain
 142 night/ or do they continue adding up all the way through the process?
 143 G. Leedy said they need a conditional use permit as one of the requirements. There should be a
 144 preliminary conversation prior to that which will include showing available plans. That gives you an idea

on the bonuses. Then you'd come back for a conditional use permit and that can be granted for a certain number of units.

Ken will volunteer to come in for work session discussions that are not specific to a project- just to have the other perspective in the room.

He asked, for CUP, does he need to come in with a conceptual plan or does it have to be an engineering plan?

G. Leedy said they will need to be able to talk about what the project will include in order to determine the bonuses.

The board discussed whether it's a good or bad idea to have outsiders aid in the work session conversations.

4. CASE #: PZ8594-050117- David & Donna Goldstein (Owners) – 13 Nichols Road, PIN #: 003-032-002 & 003-032-003 – Request for a Lot Line Adjustment and subdivision of lots 003-032-002 & 003-032-003. Zoned Residential/Rural.

Tom Carr from Meridian presented the case.

The applicant is before the board for a lot line adjustment and subdivision. Currently, there are two lots, 3-32-2 and 3-32-3 comprising 28.5 acres and 27 acres respectively. The applicant is requesting to adjust the lot line between the two lots, and subdivide 3-32-3 to yield three lots: 3-32-2 with 49.2 acres, 3-32-3 with 3.301 acres and 3-32-3-1 with 2.836 acres. The resulting lots include most of the buildable area of the overall property. Most of the resulting 3-32-2 is in the 100-year floodplain making further subdivision unlikely.

Bruce Berry looked at driveway/ easement plans and approved the site lines.

There is onsite septic and wells. They received state approvals today.

S. Wilkins asked if lot 3-32-2 is intended to be a single- family home with backland. Tom clarified that lot is already developed. The owners would like to eventually put in an outdoor riding rink.

Public comment

Stacy Garnick- 16 Nichols Rd

She asked what the timing of the project would be. Tom was not sure. The owners have several properties and may want to do the building themselves.

Tom addressed the waivers:

The waivers requested are as follows:

Fiscal Impact, Environmental Impact, Storm Water Drainage Calculations and Report, Hydro-Geologic Impact, Water Supply Impact and Statement of phasing.

This is a minor lot line adjustment and subdivision between two large tracts of land. The end result of the proposal will be one new lot on Nichols Rd. The applicant doesn't think it's worth the expense to do all of the required studies.

M. Peterman moved to approve the waivers. S. Wilkins seconded. All in favor

S. Wilkins moved to approve the plan for review.

193 S. Wilkins wants the wetland placards to be added to the property. The ACC has the placards.
194 **S. Wilkins moved to approve the plan as presented with the additional condition of the placement of**
195 **the ACC placards as well as the regular Planning Board requirements. M. Peterman seconded.**
196 **All in favor**
197
198 OTHER BUSINESS
199 Minutes: May 3, 2017
200 **M. Peterman moved to approve the minutes of May 3rd as submitted. M. Dell Orfano seconded.**
201 **All in favor**
202
203 G. Leedy said they will discuss subdivision regulations at the next work session.
204 He also informed the board there will be a signage initiative upcoming as well as a bike/ pedestrian
205 masterplan. He asked if anyone on the Planning Board will join a committee to work on this masterplan
206 in advance of the spring grant season. After some discussion, possibly Arnie and/or Cliff will be
207 interested.
208
209 **M. Peterman moved to adjourn at 9:12pm. A. Rosenblatt seconded. All in favor**
210
211 Respectfully submitted,
212 Jessica Marchant