



50 Doherty questioned if the work done by the highway effected the fracture. Mr. Head said he doubted it. He  
51 said the slide was an example of individual bedrock fractures.

52  
53 Slide #10 – Showed imaginary wells extending down from houses intercepting water bearing fractures. Mr.  
54 Head said typically when development is relatively sparse it would be unusual for one well to effect another  
55 well. As development increases with wells tapping into the same fractures there could be impacts; however it  
56 was not common.

57  
58 Slide #11 – Outlined bedrock well yield.

59  
60 Slide #12 & 13– Outlined a case study similar to the residential development occurring within the Southwest  
61 portion of Pelham. Diagram showing the cross-section of a well for how water cycles from the ground water  
62 level.

63  
64 Slide #14 – Residential water well (in bedrock) trace during pumping. To get the reading they put a pressure  
65 transducer in the well to read the water level every minute all day long and all week long continuously. This  
66 allowed them to understand what was going on with the water when the well was pumping. The trace showed  
67 the water level going up and dropping down over the course of approximately two weeks. Superimposed  
68 below was the trace from a well in the same neighborhood (shown in Slide #14) at a lower elevation who used  
69 an irrigation system. Mr. Head noted the pumping from the two individual wells had no impact on each other.  
70 The bottom of the slide superimposed a line showing a monitoring spot within the neighborhood; the  
71 groundwater level remained unperturbed even with 46 homes pumping all day and all evening long. Mr. Head  
72 told the Board the trace was typical for what they saw for residential zoning of one-two acres. He stated it was  
73 very unusual to see impact from one well to another. He said it tended not to happen; not to say it couldn't  
74 happen, but it would be highly improbable.

75  
76 Slide #15- Conclusion from trace information: *It is highly improbable and very atypical that pumping from*  
77 *residential bedrock wells in a development with acre-type zoning would materially impact other nearby wells.*  
78 *The chances of impact increase some with larger-scale groundwater withdrawals and high-density*  
79 *development; but there is no easy and inexpensive way to determine this.*

80  
81 Slide #16 – Large-Scale Groundwater Withdrawals. Defined by the State as 40 gallons per minute (57,600  
82 gallons per day).

83 Slide #17 – List of common requirements by the State for large scale withdrawals. (Could cost upward of  
84 \$100,000)

85 Slide #18 – Large-Scale Groundwater Withdrawal Permit Process.

86  
87 Mr. Gowan questioned if the \$100,000 cost was true for a twenty acre parcel or more of a case of a several  
88 square mile radius in a particular area of Town. Mr. Head said the cost wasn't dependent of the size of the  
89 area, but rather the pump rate of the well. The larger the ground withdrawal, the more complicated the process  
90 would become. He said Hopkinton pumped +80,000 gallons per day with the area of impact not extending  
91 past several hundred yards. He said the impact area was dependent on the hydrogeology.

92  
93 Mr. McNamara wanted to know if there were any types of testing or methodologies that could ascertain with  
94 any kind of certainty whether or not new wells coming into an already developed area would negatively  
95 impact existing wells. Mr. Head replied it was possible; however, it would require the same analysis of  
96 installing pressure transducers, understand the hydrogeology of the area, log the well bore using geophysics to  
97 understand what was going on. He said there were different thing that would need to be sorted out such as the  
98 other wells in the area, precipitation etc. which would require a qualified professional to undertake the task and  
99 interpret the information. Mr. McNamara questioned what degree of certainty they would have at the  
100 conclusion. Mr. Head stated they wouldn't have a high degree of certainty. He said they might have an  
101 understanding about the potential for impact, but they wouldn't have a high degree of certainty whether the  
102 impact would be significant over the long haul because they would be testing it over a short amount of time.

103 He stated the degree of certainty would be generally low. Mr. McNamara questioned the expense for the  
104 testing. Mr. Head noted he had never had a call to do so, but estimated the cost to be less than \$20,000 to  
105 compare one residential well against another. Hypothetically, Mr. McNamara asked if the analysis would  
106 change for a twenty-five lot development. Mr. Head said that would perhaps get into a larger ground water  
107 withdrawal that could cost upward of \$100,000.

108  
109 Mr. Montbleau inquired if Mr. Head knew of any municipalities or townships that require any type of testing  
110 as part of their regulations when homes are being built. Mr. Head replied the only ones he was aware of relied  
111 on the State requirements for testing; he wasn't familiar with any towns having specific regulations. Mr.  
112 Montbleau asked if Mr. Head agreed that the financial burden to ascertain groundwater would be so  
113 astronomical as to prohibit that type of testing. Mr. Head responded that the financial burden to a typical  
114 developer for a typical residential development would be very high. He noted that the size and scale of the  
115 development would drive the answer to the question, but felt it would be very burdensome on a private  
116 developer who was developing small scale (20 unit) subdivisions. Mr. Montbleau confirmed that testing might  
117 not be conclusive even after spending a significant amount of money. Mr. Head stated that was correct. He  
118 said if someone undertook the type of study he spoke about at the end of the presentation they would have a  
119 pretty good idea versus the smaller scale testing that Mr. McNamara mentioned. Mr. Montbleau said he was  
120 referring to the type of conclusiveness that would substantiate a legal platform for a homeowner or a builder to  
121 establish reasoning of burden for there being no water. Mr. Head believed if a person was willing to undertake  
122 the testing required by the State for a large ground water withdrawal they could obtain the data to enable them  
123 to make a very robust argument as to the potential for impact.

124  
125 Mr. Gowan said the Town's conventional subdivisions are one-acre zoning; however Pelham has a lot of  
126 conservation subdivisions in which a yield plan is established for a developer to achieve a density offset. He  
127 said conservation subdivisions had the same impact to land, but wanted to know with development being  
128 closer together if there would be more of an impact than if development was spread apart. Mr. Head said wells  
129 closer together tended to act like a single well and would also tend to exacerbate the impact. Comparing  
130 individual wells to a small community water system (1-2 wells drawing water for all the homes) Mr. Gowan  
131 wanted to know if either scenario was more likely to have a bigger impact than the other. Mr. Head said it was  
132 difficult to find a water supply in bedrock that would typically yield enough water for a community. In general  
133 he said the closer in density for water use/withdrawal, the greater the impact would be to the area.

134  
135 Mr. Doherty spoke about conservation subdivisions that usually had one to two 5,000-10,000 gallon tanks  
136 (with pump houses) that draw water at night and are drawn down during the day. He wanted to know if that  
137 was a better system than trying to put in a well that would provide water as needed. Mr. Head said use and  
138 storage was a common thing. He said in New Hampshire the yield of drawing from bedrock wasn't great. If  
139 the demand during peak usage was 60 gallons per minute and the yield was 40 gallons per minute there  
140 wouldn't be a way to support the usage; however that scenario could be mitigated with storage by pumping  
141 more continuously into storage and drawing it down during peak demands. Mr. Head said it was a common  
142 situation. He was aware of homeowners that put storage tanks in their basement because the yield from their  
143 well was inadequate. The pump is continuously filling the storage and the homeowner draws from the storage.  
144 By having wells close together Mr. Doherty said he experienced chlorine in his water when his neighbor  
145 chlorinated their well. Mr. Head jokingly said it was a great way to trace fractures.

146  
147 Mr. McDevitt spoke about the Board hearing abutter concerns about development impacting their wells. He  
148 believed Mr. Head indicated that would be unlikely and couldn't be proven. Mr. Head stated it was unlikely,  
149 but not impossible and at the same time very difficult to prove. He said they could try to find ways to trace  
150 fractures but it was so site specific and individual to the location and the fractures that there was no way to  
151 generalize that kind of conclusion. He stated in general it would be atypical for a small 5-6 unit subdivision  
152 with acre lots for the wells to materially impact wells that were already existing. He said it wasn't impossible,  
153 but it was very difficult to prove. He noted that the drought this summer had a substantial effect on water  
154 levels. Mr. McDevitt noted there were some dug wells in Town that were probably dependent on rainfall by  
155 and large and wanted to know if there was some connection with someone who has a fractured well. Mr. Head

156 said it was similar because rain recharged both the soil for dug wells as well as the bedrock fractures.  
157 Typically the dug well would have a more immediate response and with the bedrock fractures, water can take  
158 a long time to seep in. The effects of drought or rainfall are mitigated in bedrock whereas a dug well tends to  
159 be much more reactive to climatic conditions. Mr. McDevitt recalled hearing something about the age of some  
160 water in bedrock and questioned how old the water could be. Mr. Head spoke about working on a water  
161 supply job in Pinkham Notch, NH where the issue was the quality of water. They conducted tritium dating of  
162 the water which tested before the atomic bomb tests (pre 1940's). He said water at depth in bedrock could be  
163 there for hundreds of years or longer.

164  
165 Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Head to speak to blasting of ledge to put utilities and foundations in a subdivision and  
166 what it could potentially do to abutter's wells whether it could increase/decrease water supply, make it  
167 dirty/cleaner etc. Mr. Head replied one way people try to increase their yield in bedrock is to hydrofrack,  
168 which puts the well under pressure by fracturing the rock or further opening the existing fractures in the rock.  
169 He noted blasting could have the same effect as hydrofracking and in some cases increase the fracture density  
170 in rock; however, it's not as controlled. In terms of water quality, Mr. Head had seen cases where there was  
171 impact from blasting through contamination of ammonium nitrate (blasting agent) which has a transient effect  
172 (short-lived). They nitrates start to spike in the well and decay and in other cases they see evidence of blasting  
173 packaging materials. He said the times he's seen that the effects were transient and didn't tend to last more  
174 than a few weeks to a few months. Mr. Doherty wanted to know if the distance to a development was relevant,  
175 meaning hundreds or thousands of feet. Mr. Head replied the shorter the distance the greater potential for  
176 impact. He had no rule of thumb for what distance would become safe. He stated he'd monitored wells for  
177 blasting hundreds of feet, maybe up to 1,000 feet. from a blasting site. Most of the time they don't see impacts  
178 and they don't see impacts at greater distance from the blasting site. Mr. Montbleau questioned what he  
179 meant by '*greater distance from the blasting site*'. Mr. Head replied he didn't have a rule of thumb; he used  
180 1,000 feet as a possible distance. He explained when they'd seen impacts from blasting and the most notable  
181 were within hundreds of feet, not 1,000 (plus) feet. Mr. Montbleau said that brought into mind a problem the  
182 Board had a few years ago. He explained they required a builder not to blast (for roads and foundations)  
183 closer than 1,000 feet to area homes who were highly sensitized to well issues, and who were becoming certain  
184 in their own minds that blasting was causing problems in their wells. He understood Mr. Head indicating it  
185 was hard to establish those facts. He confirmed that 1,000 feet was so far removed that it was unlikely to  
186 occur. Mr. Head went back through his memory of projects requiring blasting. He stated when they get to  
187 distances near 1,000 feet it became unlikely. He said it's possible, but not likely. Mr. Montbleau replied that's  
188 what the Board heard from sources investigating the situation, but they weren't sources asked to come in front  
189 of the Board. He noted Mr. Head's discussion was a corroboration of what the Board previously heard.

190  
191 Mr. McNamara opened the discussion to public input and questions.

192  
193 Mr. Chris Nietubyc, 55 Sherburne Road told the Board he was present with his wife Betty and his neighbor  
194 Kristy Milock. He found the presentation to be very interesting. He understood the quotes were  
195 approximately fifteen years old and asked if there had been any advances in characterizing bedrock aquifers.  
196 Mr. Head replied there had been no material advances made. He noted there was better geophysics to review,  
197 but materially they weren't any further along in understanding the occurrence of bedrock, fractures or ground  
198 water than they were fifteen years ago or even thirty years ago. Mr. Nietubyc asked for an explanation of  
199 metamorphic versus igneous rocks. Mr. Head explained metamorphic rocks tended to be older. They were  
200 formed directly from magma, molten bodies of rock that had changed under pressure. Granite is an igneous  
201 rock. Once granite has been exposed to ground surface and weathered, there is erosion over time which carries  
202 additional sediment and buries it more deeply under the earth's crust. Mr. Nietubyc spoke to the slide that  
203 compared a property with irrigation and one that didn't. He believed there was an offset and questioned if it  
204 could be explained by the irrigation being on cycles. Mr. Head said the issue was whether one well was  
205 impacting the other. He said if that was the case they would have seen an almost instantaneous response  
206 between the two wells. He noted there wouldn't be a lag in the response. When they conduct pump tests they  
207 see almost immediate responses although over long distances there could be a time lag, but in general for  
208 homes within 150 feet of each other if there was a response it would be relatively immediate. Mr. Nietubyc

209 wanted to know when looking at the impact of a community if the static water level could be measured over  
210 time. He inquired how an impact could be quantified. Mr. Head explained they measure ground water using  
211 monitoring wells (wells with no pumps) that can be used to determine what's happening to the static water  
212 level of an area over time. He noted that the State had been using monitoring wells to look at the effects of the  
213 current drought. Mr. Nietubyc stated in terms of the testing it seemed to come down to cost and who would  
214 pay that cost (either a developer, a series of developers or homeowners) and how to get quantitative data to  
215 make a determination of whether or not there was an impact. He recalled a comment during a past meeting  
216 about some of the properties along Sherburne Road having well problems. He thanked Mr. Head for his  
217 presentation.

218  
219 Mr. Montbleau noted one key point made by Mr. Head was when an issue occurred there would be an  
220 immediate response from the same location area; if wells were next to each other they would react at the same  
221 time. He said if that didn't occur it would be a more difficult situation. Mr. Head said someone could put  
222 pressure transducers in everyone's wells and map how they behaved over time. If there was a larger  
223 community supply well nearby and they were able to have access to put a transducer in their well to see when  
224 it was pumping, Mr. Head said they could start to see if there were effects and begin to understand if there  
225 were regional impacts. He noted however there was cost and a lot of labor to install the transducers.  
226

227 Mr. Passamonte asked for clarification about the trace overlay of the two wells. He understood that one well  
228 didn't effect another well. Mr. Head replied that was correct. Mr. Passamonte asked if that remained true with  
229 irrigation. Mr. Head replied that was also correct. He said it was a case used to demonstrate that over the  
230 course of his 30 year career, it was the typical rather the opposite, when there are residential wells nearby to  
231 each other (within 150ft) that the behavior of the wells don't have an impact on each other, even in the case of  
232 irrigation. He noted irrigation and swimming pools require a lot of water; more than a typical home requires  
233 for just residential use. Mr. Passamonte confirmed a neighboring well wouldn't be changed with a nearby  
234 irrigation system. Mr. Head answered no.  
235

236 Mr. Culbert asked for an explanation of using a divining stick and if it was an accurate science. In Mr. Head's  
237 opinion, divining was a lot of fun, but didn't see the science behind it. His firm didn't get involved with  
238 divining. He thought it was great if people had good luck with it, but they didn't see it as having any relevance  
239 to the work they did. Mr. Culbert noted there was a resident with a dry well who was able to move over 35ft  
240 and obtain 35 gallons per minute. Mr. Head understood there were people with similar stories. He said they  
241 did an experiment with diviners years ago in a university setting. They invited diviners to show them what  
242 they did and when the session was done, no one could prove that divining had any validity. Mr. Culbert told  
243 Mr. Head it was known that Pelham sat on one of the largest aquifers in the State. Mr. Head replied Pelham  
244 had a very potentially prolific overburden aquifer.  
245

246 Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Montbleau to share information from a previous meeting regarding a large boulder  
247 located off Sherburne Road. Mr. Montbleau stated there was a development behind where he lived. He said  
248 years ago tests were done on the soil levels to bedrock, most of which was sparse. He explained that the hill  
249 was a huge glacier boulder, and the original developer (prior to purchasing the property) sought after and hired  
250 hydrogeologist to find water. After a few months, the hydrogeologist brought the developer to the site and  
251 showed him a piece of string woven through the trees and up the hill and told him that's where the water is.  
252 The hydrogeologist told the developer he needed more money to continue the study, and although the number  
253 was big, the developer agreed to it. Mr. Montbleau stated they picked out five locations on the hill that were  
254 prime water sources; two of which were on the developer's property. They chose the number two spot (at the  
255 top of the hill) and set the drilling rig; after going down approximately 200ft the static pressure pushed the drill  
256 bit back out of the ground. They did the necessary pump testing and determined it was enough to supply 65  
257 homes with water. Mr. Head agreed that type of scenario could happen. He said when they look for water  
258 they conduct a fracture trace analysis and look for the surface expression of the fractures. Bigger ones are  
259 affiliated with old fault zones and can be seen through aerial photographs and topographical maps. Mr.  
260 Montbleau recalled they did a magnetic resonance and located the fissure in the rock. Mr. Head replied  
261 geophysics could be used. The best way to find a high yield bedrock water supply is to use the fracture trace

262 analysis. He noted on smaller parcels of land where there may not be a fracture running through the property  
263 and a person would have to use what they had. He said large scale fracture can be a great target for water and  
264 be able to achieve 40-60 gallons per minute. Mr. Montbleau stated that was exactly what occurred, noting just  
265 south of the site (possibly 500 yards) there was very little water. Mr. Head agreed that's what happens. He  
266 said those types of fractures tend to dip at angles greater than 45 degrees from tectonic stresses. Therefore the  
267 target tends to steeply dip and moving 500ft over it could be missed. He noted that the picture of the  
268 horizontal fractures was less common, but happens.

269  
270 The Board thanked Mr. Head for meeting with them and giving the presentation, everyone found it very  
271 informative. Mr. McNamara thanked the Board of Selectmen for allowing the meeting to occur. Mr. Gowan  
272 stated he would provide the Board with a copy of the slides shown in the presentation.  
273

274 **PB Case# PL2016-00018**

275 **Map 39 Lots 1-54-2, 154-3, 1-54-4, 1-54-5 & 1-55**

276 **RJ McCarthy Development LLC – Sherburne Road – Special Permit Application to approve the Yield**  
277 **Plan for a proposed Conservation Subdivision of the above referenced lots. Full Application for**  
278 **Conservation Subdivision will follow once Special Permit and density is established**  
279

280 Mr. Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the request for  
281 special permit. He explained they were looking to do a 21-lot conservation subdivision. From the discussion  
282 and comments provided during the last meeting Mr. Gendron revised the proposed yield plan. He summarized  
283 the revisions for the Board, such as updating preexisting lots of record 1-54-2 & 1-54-3 to add a proposed  
284 house, driveway, 4K and 15K areas and submitting written waiver requests (11.04,C.1-building envelopes &  
285 11.11,B,2-well radiuses to be within 15ft setback). He provided the Board with a traffic impact study that was  
286 prepared by Mr. Pernaw. Mr. Gendron spoke about the open space, which contained two existing wells. The  
287 owner was looking to have individual wells and not use the existing wells to service the project. He explained  
288 that the front end cost to do a community water system didn't make sense given the size of the project. The  
289 owner is willing to deed that parcel (known as Lot 1-55 containing 17 acres and the two wells) to the Town.  
290 He will keep lot 1-55-1 (near the pond) and include it with the homeowner's association. Mr. Gendron  
291 addressed Chapter 15, Sections 15.04 and 15.05 of the Subdivision Regulations and Section 307-105 from the  
292 Zoning Ordinance which mirror each other with regard to bonus density for yield subdivisions. He provided  
293 the Board with a list of seven things they were providing that they believed helped them qualify for a bonus  
294 density.  
295

296 Mr. Steven Pernaw of Pernaw & Company came forward to discuss the traffic study. He told the Board he  
297 came in front of them months ago when a 10-lot subdivision was proposed. The plan was to take the build  
298 traffic volumes from that previous study and use it as no-build traffic volumes for this study. He learned that  
299 the Board asked for additional data collection. He stated the difference in the report was they collected traffic  
300 counts in September on a Thursday, Friday and Monday and compared them with the data collected in  
301 December. Mr. Pernaw stated the Department of Transportation ('DOT') had an updated traffic volume for  
302 Mammoth Road (Rt. 128) that was included in the new report. He called attention to the graph showing  
303 counts for the morning and afternoon peak hours; of the three days, Monday had the highest volumes and was  
304 used for future projections to the year 2026. He noted that the data collected in December included a high  
305 seasonal adjustment factor. The recent data from September was higher than December but the adjustment  
306 factor to get to a peak month condition was lower. Mr. Pernaw stated the in total, the data was indicating the  
307 same thing when the seasonal adjustments are made. He reviewed the trip generation information for the  
308 proposed development and discussed the projections through 2026. He showed various diagrams for projected  
309 traffic and spoke about the intersection capacity and level of service, both current and project. Mr. Pernaw felt  
310 their findings should be shared with the DOT. He stated that the intersection had enough traffic, delay and  
311 enough queuing that it should be operated under traffic signal control. He said the only concern would be if  
312 signals were added in the intersection's current configuration. He believed it would need to be reconfigured to  
313 include exclusive turn lanes and possibly a through lane in each direction. Mr. Pernaw addressed sight  
314 distance at the proposed road and said it checked out fine. In conclusion, they recommend stop sign control at

315 the subdivision road approach to Sherburne Road with optional pavement markings separating inbound and  
316 outbound vehicles and 18in. white stop line.

317  
318 Mr. Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) came forward. He received the  
319 traffic report the previous week and had an opportunity to review. He believed the findings and conclusions to  
320 be very predictable. He reviewed the data and didn't see that the proposal would make the existing traffic any  
321 better and wouldn't make it measurably worse in the progression of time between now and buildout in 2026.  
322 Given the data used, Mr. Keach was comfortable with what the Board was presented. In regard to the updated  
323 plans, Mr. Keach updated his September 16, 2016 memorandum and submitted a new version dated September  
324 27, 2013. He reviewed his comments and told the Board he felt the applicant had proven their case with  
325 regard to the yield plan.

326  
327 Mr. Doherty spoke of his personal experience off Webster Avenue, which during peak hours had vehicles  
328 parked along the side with parents waiting for the school buses. He saw that there might be a similar situation  
329 with the proposed development with vehicles parking along the open space area to wait for the school bus. He  
330 questioned if that scenario would impact the traffic analysis. Mr. Keach replied for the purposes of the  
331 proposed subdivision, he felt the effect would be negligible for the operations of the Sherburne  
332 Road/Mammoth Road intersection. Mr. McNamara said he took the study for what it was; however, he  
333 experienced an extremely long line of traffic at 5:45pm and had a 15 minute delay coming down Sherburne  
334 Road toward the Mammoth Road intersection.

335  
336 Mr. McDevitt believed the development would contribute virtually no traffic to Sherburne Road. He said  
337 traffic studies addressed the number of vehicles a development would generate. He was concerned with the  
338 safety of vehicles leaving the development and entering the traffic queue. He noted that the Town had been in  
339 contact with the DOT for at least five years voicing concerns about the Sherburne/Mammoth intersection. He  
340 noted preliminary studies had been done; however the DOT didn't have funding. The intersection wasn't  
341 listed on the State's 10-year plan. Mr. McDevitt felt vehicles existing the development would have difficulty  
342 turning left during peak hours due to the traffic queue and the vehicles traveling at high speeds toward  
343 Hudson. He stated that a patrol officer helps manage traffic at the intersection; however they leave if they are  
344 called to an emergency. The Police budget for next year proposed an officer to be at the intersection more  
345 frequently. Mr. McDevitt questioned why the safety concerns of exiting the development aren't being  
346 addressed. Mr. Pernaw replied they reviewed the traffic in December, 2015 and September, 2016 they were  
347 aware that the intersection had an 'F' for the level of service. He agreed there was a safety concern and said  
348 the reason for the 'F' was the fact that there wasn't enough hourly capacity to make the maneuver. He said  
349 unfortunately, vehicle wait so long in line that they start taking gaps that aren't safe. By researching crash  
350 data, Mr. Pernaw learned there was an average of five crashes per year at the intersection, which was to be  
351 expected given all the data and statistics known about the area. Mr. McDevitt understood the issues at the  
352 Sherburne and Mammoth intersection. His question pertained to the subdivision road and how safe it was to  
353 exit onto Sherburne Road, specifically turning left. Mr. Pernaw didn't expect there to be a safety concern. He  
354 said there was good sight distance and only one exit lane was needed. Based on data, there would be two  
355 vehicles taking a left in both the A.M. and P.M. period in an hour. Most vehicles would be turning right out of  
356 the subdivision road. Mr. McDevitt questioned how a vehicle's turning movement was determined for a  
357 subdivision that didn't exist. Mr. Pernaw replied their calculations came up with 80/20.

358  
359 Mr. Keach noted the road reviewed by the Board a few months ago was located approximately 560ft-600ft  
360 west of the Sherburne/Mammoth intersection (on the north side of the road) and the proposed road was located  
361 approximately 2400ft. He said based on the Board's concern they had the applicant modify the design to  
362 position the proposed intersection as far west on the parcel as geometry would permit. Mr. Keach commented  
363 there had been a lot of conversation about the Town accelerating an improvement at the intersection and the  
364 response had been to collect dollars for that effort. He presumed Mr. Gowan would make a similar  
365 recommendation for the proposed development so as time goes on the sum could grow to the point that  
366 something could be done. He felt the seed money being collected might help accelerate the intersection being  
367 on the State's plan. Given that the land extends to Mammoth Road, Mr. Keach suggested reviewing the

368 possibility for acquiring right-of-way easements for the future that could reduce construction costs if/when an  
369 intersection project is done.

370  
371 Mr. Doherty questioned if the intersection queue during a.m. peak would back up to the access of the proposed  
372 development. Mr. Keach felt it was unlikely.

373  
374 Mr. Keach referred back to his memorandum dated September 27<sup>th</sup>. He was satisfied that the yield plan  
375 showing 18 lots was a valid yield plan, provided that the Board grants the dispensation of the two waivers,  
376 specifically the lot shape for the yield plan lots 1, 4, 12 & 14. He spoke to the well radii of lots 12 & 13 that  
377 encroached upon the 15-foot side setback. He said those were considerations the Board saw frequently didn't  
378 feel the Board needed him or Mr. Gowan to add much discussion. He noted there were comments regarding  
379 traffic because at the time of the letter he hadn't received the traffic study. Mr. Keach stated the yield plan  
380 showed 18 lots and under the Subdivision and Zoning provisions the Board has the authority to grant  
381 dispensation for density offset up to 20% of the baseline; in this case the applicant has requested three lots. He  
382 suggested deferring action on the request until the applicant gave a presentation of why they believed they  
383 earned that dispensation. He understood Mr. Gendron provided the Board with a letter outlining their request  
384 and reasons for such.

385  
386 Mr. McNamara read aloud Mr. Gendron's letter dated October 3, 2016 in reference to the bonus density (of  
387 three additional lots) sought by the applicant. Mr. Keach commented that eliminating four potential curb cuts  
388 onto Sherburne Road shouldn't be overlooked by the Board. Mr. Gowan wanted the opportunity to have the  
389 Highway Safety Committee review the proposed easement into Pelham Veteran's Memorial Park to determine  
390 the location so it would come out at the most appropriate place. Mr. Keach went back to his suggestion of  
391 considering a right-of-way (along the front of the property), which he felt went with the 'spirit' of how an  
392 applicant could earn consideration of supplemental density. Mr. Gendron replied anything they put in their  
393 letter could be further discussed. He said anything they put into the letter was expandable; they would be fine  
394 having a wider easement and were happy to work with the Town and its staff. He would like to come back in  
395 front of the Board with an application within thirty days.

396  
397 Mr. McNamara opened discussion to public input. No one came forward.

398  
399 Mr. Doherty said he mentioned at the last meeting if the Town were to end up with the well fields the he  
400 would like to see a future water pipe laid under the road and 'stubbed' into the open space. Along with that he  
401 suggested having a junction box for the electric in the event the water was ever needed. Mr. Gendron replied  
402 they didn't mention any water piping in their proposal. They were more than happy to work with the Town  
403 regarding an easement. He noted running water pipes through the development would be a costly endeavor for  
404 them. He said the Town would need to discuss the type of capacity they'd seek and felt at this point it was  
405 premature for them to make promises. Mr. Gendron stated the wells were good producing wells and the owner  
406 was willing to grant them to the Town. He said if the Town had a reasonable plan they would work together.  
407 Mr. Gowan asked Mr. Doherty if he was referring to the project road or Sherburne Road. Mr. Doherty replied  
408 he was referring to the project road. He recalled there was a water main near the Spaulding Hill development  
409 that had a standard size. He commented the pipe he suggested wouldn't have to be pitched since if it was used  
410 it would probably be pressurized. He didn't see a way for the Town to get water out of the area any other way.  
411 Mr. McDevitt thought it would be a good idea, although the Town didn't have a specific plan. He felt the  
412 Town could request appropriate easements. Mr. Keach told the Board he would discuss the suggestion with  
413 Mr. Gowan. He was concerned with having a dry line underground for an unknown amount of time. If it was  
414 more immediate he would advocate for a water main to go under the street.

415  
**MOTION:** (Culbert/Montbleau) To accept for consideration the waiver to Section 11.04,C,1  
– to allow yield lots 1,4, 12 & 14 to have building envelopes not have the required  
100ftx150ft dimension.

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

416 -----

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Montbleau) To accept for consideration the waiver to Section 11.11,B,2  
 – to allow the well radius on lots 12 & 13 to be within the 15ft side setback.

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

417 -----

418 **MOTION:** (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the waiver requests to Section 11.04,C,1 and  
 Section 11.11,B,2.

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

419 -----

420 **MOTION:** (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the yield plan of 18 lots.

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

421  
 422 Mr. Gowan noted if the Board was going to move forward with a Special Permit, he recommended to  
 423 proceeding with a conservation subdivision of 21 lots, with three of which being offsets in response to the  
 424 proposal made during the meeting.

425  
 426 Mr. McNamara explained if the Board approves the Special Permit, the applicant will come back with an  
 427 engineered plan. Mr. McDevitt replied the information was just provided to the Board and wanted the  
 428 opportunity to give the request due consideration. He wanted time to review the proposal. Mr. Doherty  
 429 agreed that some of the points needed additional consideration. The Board preferred to defer action at present.  
 430 Mr. Gendron felt the applicant was giving substantial points of consideration, such as deeding 17 acres of open  
 431 space and two wells that produce a lot of water. He had no problem working with Town staff to discuss an  
 432 easement. Mr. McNamara said typically the Board needs ten days to two weeks to review and absorb the  
 433 information. He said they could schedule the case for the next meeting. He told the Board if they had any  
 434 specific concerns to send them directly to Mr. Gowan who would in turn provide them to Mr. Gendron.

435  
 436 Mr. Doherty asked that the easement and trail system be shown on the plan when it came back to the Board.  
 437 Mr. Gowan noted he would get comment from the Highway Safety Committee.

438  
 439 The case was date specified to the October 17, 2016 meeting.

440  
 441 **ADMINISTRATIVE**

442  
 443 **Zoning Subcommittee Volunteer Interviews**

444  
 445 No one was present.

446  
 447 **DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S) – October 17, 2016**  
 448 PB Case# PL2016-00018 - Map 39 Lots 1-54-2, 154-3, 1-54-4, 1-54-5 & 1-55 - RJ McCarthy Development  
 449 LLC – Sherburne Road

450  
 451 **MINUTES REVIEW**

452  
 453 **September 8, 2016**  
**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Olsen) To approve the September 8, 2016 meeting minutes as  
 written.

**VOTE:** (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. McDevitt abstained.

454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459

**September 19, 2016** – deferred.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Olsen) To adjourn the meeting.

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

460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary