

**APPROVED**  
**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
**PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES**  
**September 17, 2018**

Vice Chairman Roger Montbleau called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

Secretary Paul Dadak called the roll:

**PRESENT:** Roger Montbleau, Paul Dadak, Tim Doherty, Jim Bergeron, Blake Clark, Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde, Alternate Paddy Culbert, Alternate Bruce Bilapka, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

**ABSENT:** Peter McNamara, Alternate Derek Steele, Alternate Richard Olsen, Alternate Samuel Thomas

Mr. Culbert was appointed to vote in Mr. McNamara's absence.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**September 6, 2018**

**MOTION:** (Lynde/Bergeron) To approve the September 6, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**PB Case#PL2018-00011**

**Map 6 Lot 4-137-28**

**DREME BUILDERS – 30 Longview Circle – Proposed 2 Lot Subdivision. (Note: Applicant has requested to WITHDRAW w/o prejudice)**

Mr. Montbleau announced that the applicant had withdrawn their application without prejudice.

**PB Case #PL2018-00028 Map 15 Lot 8-216**

**James Petersen Built Homes, LLC – Windham Road - Site Plan Review for Proposed 42 Unit Elderly Housing Community Development and a Special Permit for Wetland & WCD Crossing for Access to Residential Units.**

The applicant Mr. James Petersen came forward with his engineering representative Mr. Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates. Mr. Gendron stated the proposal was for a 42-unit elderly housing project on a 36.5 acre parcel. There are over twenty acres of usable, exclusive of wetland, area with 92,403SF of open space (43.5% of the parcel). Water will be supplied to the project from two wells via a community water system. He stated they were working with Bruce Lewis to create a design; although the two wells have been drilled and tested. Since the last meeting with the Board, they've submitted plans to Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) and in return received a lengthy review.

Mr. Gendron told the Board they would like to discuss a couple of the 'sticking points' from the last meeting. The first being the access off Claudine Drive. He said they had no issue with making the Claudine Drive access an emergency only access. The Board was provided with an email (dated September 17, 2018 – 4:04pm) from Fire Chief James Midgley who indicated he did not have a problem with the use of a gate on the Claudine Dr.

entrance/exit as long as it is maintained at all times of the year. Failure to do so will result in the gate being secured open or removed on his authority under NFPA 1 Section 18.2.3.3. Mr. Montbleau read the email aloud.

Mr. Gendron stated there were three wetland impact areas relating to the roadway. The permits for the impacts are going to be handled by Gove Environmental. He wanted to hold off on pressing those issues given Mr. Keach had some issues listed in his review letter pertaining to road alignment that may cause the impacts to change. He spoke about one area located at Windham Road and the proposed access road; there were two reverse curves that would be altered to become more streamlined/straight. There is another issue by the intersection with Claudine Drive that will become a fire access. Currently that access is 22ft. wide and typically an emergency access is narrowed to 14ft-15ft., therefore the curves in the road will be able to be straightened out. Mr. Gendron noted there were also some radiuses within the subdivision (at the intersections) that needed to be made broader. He wanted to answer the Board's questions and receive public input so they could get some of the work done and come back in approximately 45 days.

Mr. Montbleau invited Mr. Keach to speak. Mr. Keach came forward and spoke to his letter report dated September 12, 2018. He spoke to, and summarized what he considered the 'high' points of his letter.

Mr. Doherty spoke to the comment to the applicant's waiver request regarding the 30ft. flare radii and asked if it should be reduced to 26ft. Mr. Keach replied the requirement is 30ft. and felt with 22ft. of pavement the 30ft. became more necessary to allow for plenty of turn-around room for trucks. Mr. Doherty asked if the recommendation was for the four intersections (associated with the development). Mr. Keach said it would be for Windham Road, the two interior cul-de-sacs and it remains to be seen regarding the emergency access.

Mr. Montbleau questioned if the State approved the water supply. Mr. Gendron answered no. Mr. Montbleau inquired if the pump down test had occurred. Mr. Petersen replied they hadn't done the 72hr test, but they had done their own test that showed they had more than enough sufficient water.

Mr. Lynde asked if the proposed roads would be Town roads. Mr. Petersen answered no. Mr. Lynde confirmed the Town would have no requirement to plow snow or maintain the roads. Mr. Petersen answered no.

Mr. Bergeron questioned if the project had ever planned to connect with Pennichuck. Mr. Gendron answered no; as he didn't believe Pennichuck was in that area. Mr. Bergeron understood that the system would fall under the State's Regulations and held to high standards. He said the Fire Chief had spoken about keeping the emergency access available and asked if it could be reflected in the homeowner's documents. Mr. Gendron expected Town Counsel to require that type of language. Mr. Bergeron understood that Mr. Keach had a problem with the reverse curve radii. Mr. Keach replied his concern was with the total geometry (flares, length of tangent, curve and pavement width). He would like the 'throat' of the intersection be a normal (26ft) width. Mr. Bergeron noted he had taken several rides to the property and became highly aware of the lack of sight distance from Claudine to Simpson. He supported the Fire Chief's opinion and said anything that would make the Windham Road access safe would be good because Simpson Road was dangerous. He then spoke about sidewalks and noted the Zoning wasn't specific as to how much, it just indicates there shall be sidewalks. He believed if they were overdone they could create issues with drainage and wetland sensitivity Mr. Keach agreed. He said he would look at something similar to the development near the Windham line; the final plan had sidewalks on the interior loops and truncated at the first intersection and didn't extend to Mammoth Road. In the proposed plan he envisioned the sidewalks possibly extending to Claudine, but not out to Route 111A. Mr. Bergeron questioned Mr. Keach if he would consider changes in pavement width for purposes of providing mobility and decreasing pavement width where the sidewalks commence. Mr. Keach thought that was a good idea.

Mr. Lynde wanted to know why the applicant needed the waivers. Mr. Gendron replied they needed dimensional waivers because of the way the road was set up. He said elderly housing didn't create the same type of traffic that forty-two single units would create, they would have a lower intense use. He believed the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') had already supported the roadway width and 50ft. cul-de-sacs. He noted they received

Mr. Keach's report in the middle of last week and had started to work on the plan, but hadn't had a lot of time to fine tune the suggestions outlined in the report. He said he didn't have an issue with them, he just didn't have time to address them prior to the meeting. Mr. Lynde believed the applicant could conceivably meet all the requirements. Mr. Gendron didn't know what benefit there would be to doing so. Mr. Bergeron pointed out that the roads would be owned and maintained by a private entity and believed that was the reason for the waivers. Mr. Lynde felt there were reasons why the Town had the regulations and standards and believed they should be upheld. Mr. Petersen told the Board that every single 55+ and 62+ development in Town and in the area have 22ft. wide pavement because they were considered more like a driveway than a road. He pointed out that there would not be a cut-through to another development. Mr. Keach anticipated half of the waiver requests going away with Mr. Gendron working on the road geometry. He wanted the design team to understand that he would be hard pressed to recommend approval of waivers at that location.

Mr. Doherty recalled the Board requesting traffic calming measures within developments and noticed with the present plan they were asking the applicant to straighten out the roads. He asked Mr. Keach to make sure the applicant didn't go overboard and create 'runways'. Mr. Keach agreed, and said there were techniques that could be used if the need is determined. Mr. Clarke questioned if speed limits were specified in elderly housing developments. Mr. Gowan responded by saying the Town couldn't go under 30mph without a detailed traffic analysis. He believed the only time the speed might be lower is in a private project. He couldn't recall the HSC ever recommending under 30mph. Mr. Keach believed with the road being private, the applicant could suggest a speed less than 30mph. Mr. Lynde questioned if the Town had any role on setting speed limits on private property; he didn't see that they should. Mr. Gowan replied the HSC would recommend the width and didn't see why the speed limit would be any different. He felt it would be a good idea for the applicant to propose a slower speed. Mr. Petersen referenced his development (done a few years ago) called Paradise Estates that posted three 20mph signs.

Mr. Bergeron confirmed that the plan had been accepted for consideration. Mr. Gowan stated the Board had done so at their last hearing. Mr. Bergeron commented on the well system and asked if there was any limitation for the effluent disposal areas. Mr. Keach replied they could not be situated within the well radii, but could go right up to the edge. Mr. Bergeron questioned if there was any need to apply more sensitivity to those areas and wanted to know if septic systems would be commonly shared units. Mr. Gendron stated that the well systems were for the whole project. Each septic system would be associated with a few units. Mr. Bergeron believed the proposed was a minimal impact type project because it would have a negative tax impact; the likelihood of school-age children was nearly zero. Mr. Keach commented that he worked as the town engineer/planner for Sandown and their school district did a census of the 55+ developments town-wide; with just over 200 units there were two school aged children.

Mr. Gowan questioned the road names and origins. Mr. Petersen commented that the road names came from golf courses. Mr. Gowan asked that a list of proposed names be forwarded for the HSC review. He then spoke about snow removal/storage in the area of the Claudine Drive emergency access and wanted the HSC to be involved in discussing such. Mr. Petersen noted that the Town would be plowing on the Claudine Drive portion and a private contractor plowing within the development. Mr. Gowan saw that the project included bio-retention ponds, which in his experience didn't look like detention ponds when completed. He suggested describing their function to the Board.

Mr. Bergeron understood there were no architectural renderings. Mr. Petersen replied the units would be the same as the other developments he had done in Town. The area shown on the plan were building 'boxes', the units will be smaller than the area shown on the plan; most will be 39ft.x48ft. with porches and single level, although a couple will have an upstairs bedroom and bathroom. Mr. Bergeron asked if anyone had discussed the amount that would be added to the tax base. Mr. Petersen answered no.

Mr. Gowan wanted it clear that nothing could be constructed in between the units because of emergency access requiring a 20ft. separation. Mr. Petersen replied they would only have air conditioning units. Mr. Gowan

recommended having a pad in the rear of the units for generators etc. Mr. Petersen wasn't thinking of having any generators and felt it would be better for an owner to make that decision. He said he could draw it on the plan, but cautioned there would be gas, electric, septic and drainage lines that would make it very difficult to have an exact location. He thought it would be better to have the Fire Inspector come to the site and inspect the location prior to installation. Mr. Gowan believed installing a pad after-the-fact creates problems. Mr. Doherty didn't feel the Board should get involved with picking specific locations for generator pads. Mr. Dadak suggested including general guidance for generator location in the homeowner documents.

## PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Nick Spanos, 9 Claudine Drive told the Board he had spoken to his neighbors and they were happy about 'no travel' on Claudine Drive. He wanted to know if the neighbors could receive something in writing to guarantee nothing would happen to their wells or water quantity. With regard to the Claudine Drive access, he didn't think the neighbors would mind if the gate was opened before storms so the plow could travel through. He asked that there be no travelling allowed through Claudine during construction. Mr. Gendron replied the main entrance to the project would come from Windham Road. He noted they would sit with the Fire Chief to finalize the drive; currently there was a 22ft road shown on the plan that would probably be narrowed down. He said after their discussions they would show the gate and snow storage areas on the plan.

With regard to the question about water, Mr. Gendron stated there was no long-term guarantee for water. He said they would monitor neighboring wells when conducting the draw-down test for State permitting. Mr. Spanos didn't know if he had a lot of faith in the test based on residents in the Sherburne Road area losing water after the testing. Mr. Montbleau believed the neighbors were short on water in the Sherburne Road area before any testing occurred. He explained that water pump-down testing is done under strict guidelines by the State. He said during that process monitors would be set up on area wells. Mr. Petersen spoke about the Claudine access and explained initially, until the new road was installed they would need to utilize Claudine. However, once trees were cleared and they had another access into the property they would stay off Claudine. Mr. Spanos pointed out there were only six residents on Claudine, but only three were sent notices. He felt the other people in the area should be notified. Mr. Montbleau suggested they form a neighborhood group to speak to each other. He also suggested creating a rapport with the developer for open discussions.

Mr. Bergeron discussed the parameters the Board had regarding water concerns. Mr. Gowan spoke about the information that would be obtained through the well driller's reports.

Mr. Dave Goodridge, 7 & 11 Simpson Road spoke about losing water and finding contaminants during the time that the Claudine Drive development was constructed that had significant cost to him. He was concerned about the road not withstanding construction trucks and wanted to know who would take care of any damage. Mr. Gowan replied the Highway Road Agent would be interested in what happens to the roads. He stated damages occurring during development would have to be repaired by the developer. He noted there would be expertise applied to the review process and road status. Mr. Goodridge spoke about an existing problem with a speeding truck traveling on Simpson Road. Mr. Gowan suggested he contact the Police Department regarding the situation.

Mr. Montbleau asked if the Board members had any final questions. He understood that there were a lot of items that would be reviewed by the applicant and Mr. Keach.

Mr. Lynde asked if the abutters could have their wells monitored. Mr. Gowan replied well monitoring was part of the sustained yield test process. Mr. Dadak described the process of monitoring prior to and at the end of testing. Mr. Petersen clarified that a letter would be sent (by the water engineering/testing company) to everyone within 1,000ft. asking if they want their well monitored. The information is sent to the State, and it's the State who determines which one will be monitored.

Mr. Gendron said if the Board was amenable to conducting a site walk, they would like to do so before returning to the Board in 45 days. He noted that road alignment wouldn't affect the site walk. Mr. Bergeron felt the applicant understood this was the first project of this scale that the Board had seen since the major Zoning changes had occurred. He referenced the 100ft. setback and questioned what impacts that would occur in that area. Mr. Keach explained that the bio-retention areas emulated wetlands and discussed the biological activities of such. Mr. Bergeron believed a site walk would help him understand how the areas would be cleared and what visual impacts there would be. He asked if it was necessary for the retention of storm water. Mr. Keach replied there was more than one way to get to the outcome of the regulations relative to volume and quality of storm water mitigation and Department of Environmental Services ('DES') requirements. He said in the proposal the engineer was treating the storm water locally instead of piping it to other locations within the property. He believed the proposal would work well and be most effective in the project phasing. He noted that the property was not pristine and work had been done in previous years.

Mr. Doherty referenced plan sheet 5 of 21 that showed the bio-retention #2 area as having an excavated area of 75ft.x125ft. It left a 25ft. buffer between the house and retention area; there was nothing left between the retention area and property line. He asked if the area could be made narrower/wider. He also wanted a description of how the project would be phased. Mr. Gendron replied they could present phasing ideas at the next meeting. He believed they would have 90% of Mr. Keach's comments addressed by that time as well.

The Board discussed conducting a site walk; applicant requested date specification of 45 days. A site walk was scheduled for October 20, 2018 beginning at 9am. Abutters are welcome to attend given site walks were public meetings. Mr. Gowan will inform and invite the Conservation Commission. The applicant was asked to flag the center line of road, retention ponds and any other important areas. It was noted that the plan would be date specified to November 5, 2018.

Mr. Gendron wanted the Board's opinion about site walks. Mr. Petersen stated he had reviewed (approximately 18) 55+/62+ developments in Pelham, Hudson and Windham and found none had sidewalks. He cautioned if sidewalks were required it would create a 'rollercoaster' effect throughout the project. He commented that in the developments he had done people usually knew each other and walked together in the middle of the roadways. He said people won't use the sidewalks and they wouldn't be maintained in the winter. He felt they would be overdone in the proposed situation and urged the Board to review other developments. Mr. Lynde questioned why the sidewalks had to be raised since they are a walking pathway. Mr. Bergeron added they could be a delineated white line on a flat road since Zoning didn't specify sidewalk types. He felt a curbed sidewalk in the proposed development would be ridiculous. Mr. Montbleau agreed he asked that the Board make it a priority to inform the developer exactly what they wanted during the next meeting.

Mr. Gowan reiterated that the plan was date specified to November 5, 2018 and the Board would conduct a site walk October 20, 2018 beginning at 9am.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **PB Case #PL2018-00029**

#### **Map 14 Lot 3-88**

#### **Philip Currier Revocable Trust, Philip Currier, Trustee -Mammoth Road, Nashua Road & Hancock Lane – Proposed 2 Lot Subdivision.**

Mr. Dadak read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Representing the applicant was Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates. He described the request and stated the parcel contained approximately 2.7 acres and was located in the Residential Zone with frontage on Nashua Road, Mammoth Road and Hancock Lane. The proposal was to set up two single-family lots; both with frontage on

Nashua Road. The lots are set up to meet all Zoning requirements. The wetland on lot 3-88-27 has been flagged by Gove Environmental and a 50ft. Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') has been shown around it. Pennichuck Water runs along the road therefore they aren't proposing any wells for the project. He noted test pits had been done and they've received State Subdivision approval.

Mr. Lynde wanted to know the sight distance of the corner lot and the frontage. Mr. Gendron replied sight distance was 100ft. (time stamp 2:06:56) and the frontage on Nashua Road was approximately 204ft. Mr. Lynde asked if they could use frontage on Mammoth Road. Mr. Gendron replied they didn't have enough frontage on Mammoth Road. Mr. Lynde was familiar with the area and felt the proposed driveway (on Nashua Road) would be dangerous and asked if the driveway could be moved (away from the intersection). Mr. Gendron agreed to move it as far as possible to increase sight distance. Mr. Bergeron asked for the Nashua Road frontage on the lot closest to Mammoth Road. Mr. Gendron replied the frontage is 201ft, calculated to the tangent of the curve. Mr. Bergeron suggested the Board consider how they will accept the calculation; either linear, or right angle dimension.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the 'dog leg' portion of the lot was included for the area calculation. Mr. Gendron explained the 'jog in the lot' was an existing condition of the lot and they configured the lot to avoid requesting waivers. Mr. Clark commented that the dimensions of the 'jog' were 40ft.x40ft. and believed it would require a waiver based on requirements of the Subdivision Regulations Section 11.04-Lot Shape for a minimum allowed width of 50ft. There was a brief discussion about the lot lines and if they would be able to be adjusted to create different lot shapes. Mr. Gowan noted the applicant would need a waiver to either the lot shape or the building envelope (if the lot lines were moved).

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Dadak) To accept the plan for consideration.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Clark stated he would rather that the applicant seek a waiver for the 15KSF box and straighten the lot line from the 'jog' straight to the street. There was further discussion regarding the shape of the lots. Mr. Gowan said it was rare that this type of situation comes up. He said the Board could consider waivers for either irregular shape or building area.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Mike Bourk, 14 Hancock Lane came forward. Prior to the meeting he sent an email (dated September 15, 2018) to the Mr. Gowan describing his concerns, which was then forwarded to the Board for review in the event he was unable to attend the meeting. The email included a photo showing where standing water previously came onto his property fourteen years ago and where it had currently receded to. Also attached was a copy of the parcel map highlighting a proposed buffer area. Mr. Bourk told the Board that he currently had an easement on his property from Pennichuck Water that allowed water to be brought in from Mammoth Road to three houses. Mr. Gendron was unaware of a water line that ran through the applicant's property. He said they had water running along the frontage at Nashua Road. Dig Safe had come out when test pits were done and didn't recall a water line being flagged in that location. Mr. Bourk noted Brian Soucy had built the Hancock development and may have plans that show the water line. Mr. Gowan stated that there would be plan of record at the Registry for the engineer to review. He said it would have to be sorted out before the land subdivision occurred. Mr. Gendron referenced page three of the plan set that showed the water main shut-off valves. He believed the water main may run along the side of Nashua Road. Mr. Gowan suggested he speak to Pennichuck Water regarding easements they may have and note such on the plan.

Mr. Bergeron understood Mr. Bourk was serviced by Pennichuck Water and asked if the lots across the street from him were also service by Pennichuck. Mr. Bourk replied all eight lots were. He noted the line that serviced the three lots along Mammoth Road were serviced through a line that went through his property. There was

further discussion and questions regarding where the Pennichuck Water lines entered the neighborhood. Mr. Gendron will research and clarify. Mr. Bergeron noted that any tie-in to Pennichuck Water would come from Nashua Road and not through Mr. Bourk's property.

Mr. Bourk then spoke about the location where the standing water line was on his property 14 years ago when he purchased his home. He used the photograph he submitted to show where the previous water line had been and where the water line currently was on his property. He stated the reason the water line had moved was because of the vegetation growth that had occurred. He showed the Board a (topographic) plan/map of the area with a colored/highlighted buffer. Mr. Montbleau questioned how he determined the proposed buffer location and dimensions. Mr. Bourk showed there was already a 19ft. no-cut zone on the property with frontage on Hancock Lane/Nashua Road. Based on the photograph depicting the vegetation and growth, having an additional no-cut area may help alleviate water runoff coming across his property (from the applicant's lot) that traveled across Hancock Lane.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Bourk if he had a no-cut zone on his property, or if it was completely cut. Mr. Bourk showed the property marker; some of the grown area was already in his property. He said he wouldn't cut it. He didn't have a no-cut area on his property. Mr. Culbert asked if he cleared his property himself. Mr. Bourk answered no.

Based on the topographic lines, Mr. Doherty wanted to know if Mr. Bourk's property drained toward the applicant's lot. Mr. Gendron stated that Mr. Bourk's property was higher than the applicants. He noted the applicant's property drained toward Hancock Lane. He was agreeable to discussing a no-cut zone and felt it would make sense to have it more defined; possibly square it with the WCD and have it follow the lot line for a nominal distance. Mr. Bourk informed that the water didn't all drain from the lots; it actually came from the Jeremy Hill area. He said the trees and shrubs helped to soak up excess water. He didn't object to having a no-cut zone also on his own property. He would work with the engineer. Mr. Bergeron wanted to see the existing grades of the lots. Mr. Gendron referenced page 4 of the plan set and summarized the topographical information.

Mr. Bourk spoke about traffic and informed there was a substantial amount that was northbound on Route 128 (Mammoth Road) and was concerned about vehicles turning right onto Nashua Road. He said there was a lot of activity, such as vehicle traffic and foot traffic because of the park. He said the corner was currently difficult to negotiate and additional driveways would make the corner worse. He asked if a traffic analysis could be done to determine how much of a danger it would be. Mr. Gowan spoke about the geometry of the Mammoth Road/Nashua Road intersection. He understood Mr. Bourk suggested the driveway for the corner lot be out to Mammoth Road. On the plan, Mr. Doherty saw two existing driveways and two proposed. He saw the proposed driveways as an improvement. Mr. Gendron said that was correct. In reference to a traffic analysis; he didn't know how they would do one for two single-family homes because there wouldn't be a quantifiable number. There was a brief discussion regarding the intersection geometry of the Mammoth Road intersection and speed at which the vehicles traveled when turning onto Nashua Road. Mr. Bergeron didn't believe the State would allow the driveway access for the corner lot to be on Mammoth Road because it would be too close and too dangerous to the Nashua Road intersection.

Mr. Bourk discussed the history of the lots and recalled the lots being wet in the past. Mr. Gendron told the Board that they had done test pits with the Town's Health Inspector in the area where the proposed house and 4K areas are shown. They found seasonal highs between 4.0ft-4.7ft. which he said was an excellent test pit for Pelham. Mr. Bourk thanked the Board for their time.

Ms. Diane Chubb, 20 Hancock Lane told the Board she isn't a direct abutter, but resides within 1,000ft. She's spoken to Mr. Gendron about some of her concerns and was happy to work with him. The neighbors are very concerned about the water flow and how much vegetation would be lost after construction. She displayed photographs of the water flowing at the end of her driveway that had eroded the area. She said there was a drain, but it was located in the wrong place; water floods onto the neighboring properties, the street and forms a 'lake'.

She displayed additional photographs of her children ankle deep in water and the erosion conditions. Ms. Chubb stated they were happy to work with Mr. Gendron about securing as much 'green' area as possible. She spoke about her concerns with the WCD on the applicant's property and noted there was another WCD across the street. She wanted to make sure that the WCD was preserved for drainage and posted 'no-cut' for privacy reasons. She understood that Mr. Gendron would work with the neighbors and would like the Board to come to the site and review the proposed driveway locations, amount of vegetation and topography so they could preserve the area. Ms. Chubb discussed her concerns about the driveways on Nashua Road because of the way vehicles stack at the intersection. When she asked the Police how many accidents occurred at the intersection, they told her they were surprised there weren't more. She spoke about the vehicles pulling off the road and parking to make cell calls because it was the last place to receive cell service; further north is a dead cell service area.

Mr. Gendron explained that there was no curbing on Hancock Lane; it was sheet drainage. Based on the topographic lines, he believed there was a high point on Ms. Chubb's lot. He told the Board that he wouldn't be able to correct the situation in Ms. Chubb's driveway, because she needed a ditch line and it didn't appear to be maintained. He had no objection to adding a 'no-cut' buffer for a nominal distance on the rear lot lines. Ms. Chubb commented that her photographs were a few years old; as vegetation grew the flooding issues had diminished.

Mr. Doherty questioned if vehicles were currently parking at the intersection. Ms. Chubb answered yes and described the trucks and cars that stop at that intersection (on Nashua Road before Mammoth Road) to use their cell phones prior to entering the 'dead zone'. It was noted there was a well-defined parking spot for vehicles. Mr. Bergeron felt the Board needed to see the road profile of Hancock Lane and where the elevations change; also have Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) review. Mr. Gendron had no objection to submitting a road profile to the Board and pointed out that they weren't proposing anything on Hancock Lane. He also had no objection to including a buffer. He pointed out that the request was for a two-lot subdivision that came close to meeting all the Regulations (with the exception of a waiver). He didn't believe he had any responsibility to Hancock Lane. Ms. Chubb replied she wasn't requesting the applicant to fix her driveway.

Mr. Montbleau confirmed the neighbors would meet with Mr. Gendron to discuss a buffer. He asked the Board if they needed an opinion from Keach Nordstrom. Mr. Bergeron understood the road (Hancock Lane) had a culvert and the applicant's lot would affect it. He felt they should do what ever possible to shed water where it should go. Mr. Gendron suggested they address the house itself with possibly a drip edge, or something of that nature. He reiterated he wasn't working on Hancock Lane.

Mr. Lynde stated they were dealing with multiple issues, some relating to the subdivision, some were not related. He said the issue with the water was the flow coming off Jeremy Hill Road crossing Mammoth Road (through culverts). He understood the applicant's property (and vegetation) had helped mitigate some of the effects. He said the other issue was water going down Hancock Lane, which probably had nothing to do with the proposed lot, should be reviewed by the Town. Ms. Chubb understood that the Board only dealt with the plan in front of them and stated Mr. Gendron had been very gracious and offered to work with them. She wasn't asking him to fix her driveway, she was just showing the Board what happened when excess water occurred.

Mr. Gowan suggested that the applicant work with the neighbors to create a buffer zone and come back in front of the Board. Separately from the case the as-built for Hancock Lane could be reviewed and possibly get Keach Nordstrom involved. Personally, he wanted to see if there was a defined ditch line that had disappeared. The Highway Safety Committee may want to review the Mammoth Road/Nashua Road intersection and possibly post 'No Parking' signs along Nashua Road.

Mr. Gendron asked the Board if they preferred a waiver for lot dimensions or the 15K area. The Board considered the question and preferred to leave the plan as presented and submit a waiver for the lot dimension (being less than 50ft).



Mr. Dadak spoke about the WCD being marked with signage. Mr. Gowan replied the applicant was aware that the WCD signs would be required every 50ft. prior to a building permit being issued.

The case was date specified to October 1, 2018. Mr. Montbleau asked that the abutters meet with Mr. Gendron on the 'no-cut' issues prior to the next meeting.

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION (If requested in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 )**

Not requested.

**SITE WALK – October 20, 2018 beginning at 9am**

PB Case#PL2018-00011 - Map 6 Lot 4-137-28 - DREME BUILDERS – 30 Longview Circle

**DATE SPECIFIED PLAN –**

**October 1, 2018**

PB Case #PL2018-00029 - Map 14 Lot 3-88 - Philip Currier Revocable Trust, Philip Currier, Trustee -Mammoth Road, Nashua Road & Hancock Lane

**November 5, 2018**

PB Case#PL2018-00011 - Map 6 Lot 4-137-28 - DREME BUILDERS – 30 Longview Circle

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:27pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary