

**TOWN OF BARTLETT PLANNING BOARD
WORK SESSION**

May 21, 2013

Members Present: Chairman David Publicover; David Patch; David Shedd; Doug Garland; Lydia Lansing; Margaret Lavender; Julia King. **Members Absent:** None

Chairman Publicover opened the meeting at 7:05 pm.

1. Continuation of Discussion with Joe Berry and Mark Lucy regarding Blocks F & G at Stillings

Grant: The Chairman noted we were waiting for further information from the applicant, which the board had requested. The applicant had indicated they would be at this meeting so were put on the agenda, but nobody was present.

2. Continuation: Red River Properties Development Corp., Highland Road. File: 2013-1184.

Application for amendment to subdivision plan to reduce a previously-approved 8-unit subdivision to 4 units. Tax Map 6SACOR, Lot 037HRO.

The Chairman noted the applicant was not present, but a review letter had been received from Fire Chief Pat Roberts which needed discussion. Chief Roberts had been asked to review the plan to ensure that fire equipment could negotiate the two driveways. Roberts' letter stated the 1"=80' scale of the map was too small to accurately determine the location of the two driveways and he could not perform his review. The regulations call for a scale of 1"=40' and Mr. Dryjas will be asked to provide plans to that scale. After reviewing Chief Roberts' letter, the planning board requested the following revisions to the plan: the location of the building envelopes, along with their drives; the turnouts; the turnarounds; the width of the travel surface; and that lines on the plan be shown in more-distinguishable colors to differentiate between them. Mr. Dryjas will be advised of these requests.

Doug Garland asked what had transpired at the last meeting, which he was not present at, regarding this application. The Chairman advised the meeting had been publically noticed, a public hearing had been held, the application was accepted, and the board had voted unanimously to grant two driveway waivers conditional on the fire chief's approval. The granting of the waivers elicited a long discussion as to whether the general public was well-enough informed about applications before the board to offer input at a public hearing, and what could be done to improve the process. The Chairman said the public hearing for this application had met all the posting requirements set forth in the state RSA. However, it was felt the public could be better informed of the planning board process.

Mr. Garland expressed concern at the board for having voted to approve the waivers, particularly on the same night the application was accepted. He also didn't agree that a waiver should be granted contingent on the fire chief's review, but that he should have been consulted first. He further said the location of the house and driveway on the second lot, and whether it complied with our ordinance, including ridgeline ordinance, should have been established before a waiver was even considered. The Chairman advised the only thing the waiver did was to give permission for the second lot to be accessed off the lower driveway when the lot was developed. It was not part of this four-unit subdivision and he said he had no problem with the board's decision to grant the waiver. Mr. Garland polled the board and asked if anybody else had a problem with it. David Patch said he had no problem since the ridgeline ordinance had specific requirements which applicants had to comply with, regardless. David Shedd added he had no problem and wasn't sure what a driveway had to do with the ridgeline ordinance. He said he had voted to grant the waiver so that a third driveway wouldn't have to be cut, which would destroy further vegetation. Margaret Lavender agreed. The Chairman noted this was an established lot which did not need to come before the planning board. Before

any development can take place, the applicant will need to obtain a building permit and will have to show compliance with the requirements of that. Lydia Lansing agreed.

Referring to the waivers again, Mr. Garland said this was a well planned-out subdivision that we'd been to court over, and razing it to two haphazard driveways is a real bad decision. He asked to be put on record for his comment. Mr. Garland also had issues with the number of informal discussions or preliminary reviews that the board has previously afforded this and other applicants. He felt those discussions should have been part of the acceptance process. Several board members agreed, and there was discussion of limiting the number of informal discussions allowed in the future to one, unless more are requested by the board.

Lydia Lansing asked how many turnarounds would be required on the driveways, particularly the one that will serve the second lot. David Patch noted the regulations only require a turnaround at the end of each driveway, so if the driveway was initially built to just the second residence, then a turnaround would be required there. If it was extended to a third residence on the second lot, another one would be required at that location. Ms. Lansing said she would feel more comfortable requiring the applicant to build two turnarounds, one at each location. It was agreed it should be made clear on the plans where turnarounds will be required in order to assist the selectmen when issuing building permits. Julia King said she advised Chief Roberts to determine the largest-size fire fighting equipment allowed under the town's agreement and that he require the driveways be constructed to accommodate that. Doug Garland agreed, saying that it should include Conway's equipment as well, as they sometimes respond to fires in Bartlett and he didn't want them getting stuck. After further discussion, a motion was made by Lydia Lansing; seconded by David Patch, that the application be continued until such time as we receive revised plans showing the changes requested by the fire chief. Vote: All in favor.

3. *LA Drew gravel pit expansion:* The Chairman advised a letter had been sent Josh McAllister of HEB Engineers advising of Atty. Mansfield's response to the expansion of LA Drew's existing grandfathered gravel pit onto the adjacent lot. The letter neglected to ask the status of the reclamation plan previously requested by the board, and this will be address in another letter to Mr. McAllister.

4. *Review and Approve Minutes:*

The minutes of the April 16, 2013 meeting were reviewed. Motion to accept the minutes as written was made by Julia King; seconded by David Shedd. Vote: All in favor. A motion was made by David Shedd; seconded by Julia King to defer voting on the May 6 minutes until the next meeting to allow time for further review. Vote: All in favor.

5. *Mail and Other Business:*

Items noted on the agenda were reviewed.

During review of these applications, the board spent a great deal of time discussing planning board procedural rules and how they could be improved. Discussed was whether to limit the number of informal reviews to one, unless more are requested by the planning board, and whether to impose a cut-off date for applicants who wanted to come to the work session seeking advice. These restriction would probably need to be formally adopted. David Patch advised he had guidelines that were adopted when the planning board was established which he will bring to the next meeting. Though not an official requirement, the work session agendas will be posted at post offices on the Friday before the meeting as a courtesy to the public. Agendas for all meetings will be emailed to board members ahead of time and agendas and minutes will be added to the town's website.

With no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Julia King; seconded by David Shedd. Vote: All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Bush, Recording Secretary