**NEWMARKET PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2018**

**MINUTES**

Present: Janice Rosa, Bill Doucet (Alternate), Val Shelton (Vice Chairman), Diane Hardy (Town Planner), Jamie Bruton, Sarah Finch, Daniel Lewis (Alternate), Michal Zahorik (Alternate),

Absent: Jane Ford, Eric Botterman (Chairman), Dale Pike (Town Council ex officio Alternate), Gretchen Kast (Town Council ex officio) all excused

**Agenda Item #1 - Pledge of Allegiance**

**Agenda Item #2 - Public Comments**

None.

**Agenda Item #3 - Review & Approval of Minutes: 08/14/18**

Val Shelton appointed Bill Doucet to fill in for Jane Ford. Michal Zahorik was appointed to fill in for Eric Botterman.

**Action**

**Motion: Sarah Finch made a motion to approve the minutes of 08/14/18**

**Second: Jamie Bruton**

**Vote: Bill Doucet and Janice Rosa abstained due to absence**

**All others in favor**

**Agenda Item #4 - Regular Business**

***SCG Management – Request for extension of conditions of approval for 2 Bennett Way, Tax Map U4, Lot 4-11, B1 Zone.***

This request was rescheduled for the October 9, 2018 Planning Board meeting.

***Hersey Lane LLC – Preliminary Conceptual Consultation for plans for an approximately 12.8 acre parcel located at 77 Hersey Lane off of the Class VI road.***

Bill Doucet recused himself.

Val Shelton explained what a Preliminary Conceptual Consultation was. There is no abutter notification required. This is just an opportunity for an applicant to come before the Board to solicit input on an idea. It is all done in general terms and is a review of basic concepts of a proposal. This assists in solving problems in meeting various requirements there may be questions about. The discussion needs to be kept in very general terms. None of this is legally binding on either party.

Alexx Monastiero represented the applicant. She apologized, as she had included a yield plan in the application. She now understood that would not be allowed to be presented. Diane Hardy stated she had pulled it from the file. Ms. Monastiero stated one of the reasons they are here tonight is because of some of the unique characteristics of the parcel. It is off of a Class VI road off Hersey Lane. She indicated the area on a general plan of the area. She showed the surrounding open space land and multi-family development. This parcel is zoned for single-family dwellings on half acre lots under the R-2 Zoning District. In coming up with a design for this lot, they thought a lot about what would be the best use of the parcel. They have a yield plan showing they could produce thirteen conventional subdivision lots of one half acre in size. It would preserve no open space and would create about 1,000 feet of Town road to maintain. They like the idea of doing a conservation subdivision, which would allow them to condense the development. That fits in with the goals of the Master Plan, and it would be a good plan for this parcel. It ties some of the large open space corridors together. There is conservation land around the parcel and a working farm. They are wondering what the Board thinks would be better. The next step would be to go to the Town Council about the Class VI road.

Val Shelton asked if the design concept was for single-family. Ms. Monastiero stated they have designed for all different scenarios. They can do a conventional subdivision or a conservation subdivision creating single-family lots. They have come up with many conceptual duplex and fourplex designs. She had talked with Diane Hardy about going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to do four-plexes or multi-family housing, since they are surrounded by multi-family housing. If the Board thought they would like to see four-plexes condensed to leave more open space, they can get 75% open space on this parcel. It is a 12.8 acre parcel. 5% of that is about 9½ acres; however that would require a variance.

Ms. Monastiero stated their next step would be to apply for Design Review. They get thirteen lots in a conventional subdivision. Under a conservation subdivision there is some allowance for bonuses, so they could get a maximum of fifteen lots. In all of their plans, the maximum number of units is fifteen.

Val Shelton stated, regarding the Master Plan, a conservation subdivision would be preferable. She stated she felt every subdivision should be a conservation subdivision. Sarah Finch stated it would tie the conservation land together. Ms. Monastiero stated it connects the small pieces into much bigger pieces. This would allow the open space land to be preserved in perpetuity, which is good for the wildlife and natural resources.

Janice Rosa asked how many bedrooms would be in the units. Val Shelton stated they could not show building plans under this application. There is nothing limiting the number of bedrooms under a conservation subdivision. Ms. Monastiero stated the number of bedrooms would be the same for whatever they built. The Town water and sewer is adjacent to this parcel. Diane Hardy stated the road would be upgraded to a Class V roadway. Any road would have to be built to Town standards. Ms. Monastiero stated they are planning on small, two bedroom homes, with an office, with a floor area of 1,500 sq. ft. maximum, whether it is a conventional subdivision or a conservation subdivision.

Diane Hardy stated she wholeheartedly agreed with Val Shelton and Sarah Finch that she too would, ideally, like to see conservation subdivisions. There are some great examples in Newmarket that have worked very, very well. They know that concept works to preserve natural features of the land and to create development that fits in with the harmony of the community and the natural heritage of the town. She did speak with the applicant about options and she would strenuously oppose any townhouses or attached dwelling units in that location. The R-2 zoning talks about the purpose of the zone, which is to provide a transition between high density development and the R1 Zone, which is a rural zoning type. She had done some research in the Master Plan going back to 1991. All of the Master Plans including that one and since then that talks about the imbalance in residential single-family and multi-family housing in Newmarket. Over 50% of the housing stock is multi-family and over 50% rental housing. They have time and again stated in the record in the Master Plan that it is the goal of the Town to seek a more balanced approach and to encourage the establishment of single-family houses to balance that. They are not saying to exclude multi-family housing, but there was a conscious effort of the Town when they changed the zoning of areas in 1996 to R2 that the Planning Board and the Town made it clear there was enough multi-family housing and they wanted to preserve the rural qualities of the town. There is the track record to show it is working. She stated she would not be an advocate for a zoning change or for a variance for multi-family housing.

Val Shelton asked if they were thinking about apartments or rentals. Ms. Monastiero stated they would be one story, duplexes would be ideal. R2 is a transition zone, they are surrounded by four-plexes. The outskirts of the four-plexes are single-family homes. This is like a donut hole surrounded by multi-family and not being near any other single-family dwellings. Duplexes would be the perfect answer. There is a duplex development being built in town now that is wonderful and beautiful in the general vicinity. They have three of those under contract, referring to the Hersey Green. If they went to the maximum and did four-plexes, they still want to do single level living. They would not be the double level townhouse style you see in town now. The reason duplexes and four-plexes appeal to people is because people who are older and aging like living next door to someone. It gives them some comfort and cuts down on costs. Also, people newly married and have a family, for example, and can’t afford a $700,000 detached dwelling in Newmarket could maybe afford a half of a duplex. It gives you an immediate neighbor and maybe a friend. Duplex development is a win-win and a good compromise and may be perfect for this location. Val Shelton asked, if they did the units in a duplex design concept, what would be the differential between the open space that would be preserved vs. a conventional open space development. Ms. Monastiero stated they are equal. They could conserve about 8+ acres. Val Shelton asked if they would have the same pervious coverage. Ms. Monastiero stated it would be similar. She does not have exact calculations at this point. The road length would be the same. There would be 280’ of road. The duplexes would require 110’ of additional road and the conservation subdivision would require about 380’ more.

Sarah Finch stated she would prefer to see single-family dwellings.

Daniel Lewis asked if the units would be on quarter acre lots. Ms. Monastiero stated it would depend on slopes, wetlands, hydrology etc., and a variance. Duplexes would be on half acre lots. The R-2 zoning calls for half acre lots. She spoke with Diane Hardy about getting a variance from the Zoning Board, as the R-2 zoning does not allow duplexes. Diane Hardy stated the development on Washington Street started out as duplexes and it turned out to be problematic with the lot sizes and setbacks and they ended up doing single-family dwellings. Ms. Monastiero stated they are proposing a smaller footprint of 1,500 sq. ft. They would fit them in and still have good development. They are doing the smallest number of lots possible to conserve the largest amount of open space.

Daniel Lewis stated he is in favor of the duplexes, as long as there is conservation land. There was discussion of Hersey Green. It was noted that those are multi-story, three bedroom duplexes. They are large, with two car garages.

Ms. Monastiero stated road costs often drive the cost of the units. When they can build a minimum amount of road and infrastructure, it keeps the cost of the units down. They are not looking for higher density. They are looking for fifteen (15) units. If these are duplexes, there would be seven duplexes and then a single-family home. It would be under one association. There is a unique ability for the over 55 group and the millennial group to co-mingle. Those groups work well together and it could be a pretty spectacular community. Diane Hardy stated the most recent Master Plan talks about co-generational housing and it advocates that as a housing option for people to age in place.

Val Shelton stated she thinks the Board would support a variance and this is a different concept than what Diane Hardy was referring to about multi-family. Diane Hardy stated she was not referring to duplexes in her comments, but to attached multi-family units with three units or greater. Val Shelton stated there is consensus that the duplexes would be a good thing.

Ms. Monastiero thanked the Board for their time.

***Eric Dewitt – Continuation of a public hearing for an application for site plan review, at 81 Exeter Road, Tax Map U3, Lot 137, B1 Zone. The proposal is to remove the existing buildings and driveways and build a 2,920 sq. ft., two-story, mixed use building, with associated parking, lighting, and drainage.***

**Action**

**Motion: Janice Rosa made a motion to continue the application to the October 9, 2018 meeting**

**Second: Sarah Finch**

**Vote: All in favor**

***Public hearing for an application for Boundary Line Adjustment, requested by Marker 44 Holdings LLC, 3, 12, 14, 16, 26 Eagle Drive, Tax Map R2, Lots 36-9-1, 36-10—9, 36-10-8, 36-10-7, 36-10-2; Wayne & Kimberley Banks, 5 Eagle Drive, 36-9-2; John & Kimby Parrett, 7 Eagle Drive, 36-9-3; Jacques & Marie Navarre, 9 Eagle Drive, 36-9-4; Richard & Jeanne Ormrod Rev. Tr, 10 Eagle Drive, 36-10-10; Adam & Rosamie Moore, 11 Eagle Drive 36-10-11; William & Cheryl Bunting, 13 Eagle Drive, 36-10-12; Dennis & Ruth Viola, 15 Eagle Drive, 36-10-13; Andrea Thorn, 17 Eagle Drive, 36-10-14; Virginia Kraus, 18 Eagle Drive, 36-10-6; Geoffrey McIntosh & Carridy Blair, 19 Eagle Drive, 36-10-15; Andrew Coulter Jr & Mary Flanagan, 20 Eagle Drive, 36-10-5; Julie Kath Rev. Tr., 21 Eagle Drive, 36-10-16; Jeffery & Susanne Parks, 22 Eagle Drive, 36-10-4; Drew & Darby Remignanti, 24 Eagle Drive, 36-10-3; Wilfried & Freia Backes, 28 Eagle Drive, 36-10-1, Moody Point Community Association, 36-9-5; all in the R1 Zone. The adjustment is necessary, because the as-built plan for Eagle Drive, does not match the deed description for the metes and bounds on the original recorded subdivision plan. This adjustment will correct the deeds. Also, a small section of land used for community mailboxes owned by The Hill HOA to The Moody Point Community Association, Inc., will be conveyed.***

Val Shelton recused herself. Janice Rosa took over as acting Chairman.

Kim Parrett, 7 Eagle Drive, President of The Hill at Moody Point HOA, presented the application. These lot line adjustments are required to complete their 11/2017 subdivision approval. After the Planning Board approval, they went to Doucet Survey and once they did the survey it was determined that Eagle Drive, a private road, as laid out on the as-built did not conform to what the developer had originally set up on the plan, so the current deed does not reflect the existing road right-of-way. They would like to modify the plan based on what was approved by the Planning Board last fall. This plan was put together to correct the deficiencies. The plan is very busy, because the “as-built” is different from the original subdivision plan that was approved.

Val Shelton, representing the applicant, stated the plan D-21471 has a metes and bounds survey of Eagle Drive. On an enclosed plan in the Board’s packet, is a plan showing a dotted line indicating where the road should have gone, but the black line shows where the road really is. She indicated these details on the plan. They need to clear this up in order to start deeding land back to the homeowners from the approval last fall. The Association is responsible for the repair and maintenance of the road.

Kim Parrett stated there is land where their mailboxes are located. There are also mailboxes there for other homeowners in other Associations. They would like to quit claim that land to the Moody Point Community Association, which would be much cleaner. Otherwise, it would be on one homeowner’s property and they would assume liability.

**Action**

**Motion: Sarah Finch made a motion to accept the plan for review**

**Second: Daniel Lewis**

**Vote: All in favor**

**Action**

**Motion: Sarah Finch made a motion to approve the application, with the following condition:**

**The Mylar be stamped, certified, and dated by the Licensed Land Surveyor prior to recording at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. The Mylar and three plan sets to be signed by the Planning Board Chairman prior to recording.**

**Second: Michal Zahorik**

**Vote: All in favor**

***Janice Rosa opened the public hearing at this point, intending to ask the Board to take another vote, if necessary. There were no comments and the public hearing was closed. The vote was retaken.***

**Action**

**Motion: Sarah Finch made a motion to approve the application, with the following condition:**

**The Mylar be stamped, certified, and dated by the Licensed Land Surveyor prior to recording at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. The Mylar and three plan sets to be signed by the Planning Board Chairman prior to recording.**

**Second: Michal Zahorik**

**Vote: All in favor**

**Agenda Item #5 - New/Old Business**

***Chairman's Report***

Val Shelton stated she sat in for Eric Botterman at a meeting with Diane Hardy, Steve Fournier, Town Administrator, and Dale Pike, Town Council Chair and developed an agenda for the joint meeting to be held on 09/19/18.

Regarding the agenda, Diane Hardy stated the Town Council has set some priority goals for the year and one of them is to look at the three gateways to town, with an eye to redevelopment. The Town Council is considering hiring a part-time economic development consultant to provide direction. There also needs to be some discussion about moving forward with recommendations of the Economic Development Committee. There is a need to update the Master Plan. The last item concerns the Town’s participation in the MS4 Program.

Val Shelton asked the Board members to review the Master Plan and think about which chapters may no longer be needed and what should be the focus of the next update. There are some that are required to be included according to the RSA’s. Diane Hardy will send out a table with this information for discussion at a future meeting.

The joint meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m.

***Planner's Report***

Diane Hardy stated they needed to appoint someone to the Environmental Energy Committee. A Planning Board liaison is needed. There were no volunteers.

A CIP Alternate is needed for Jane Ford’s position. Jamie Bruton volunteered.

Board members are needed on the Stormwater Committee. Gretchen Kast had stated she would like to continue on the committee. Daniel Lewis and Bill Doucet volunteered and Val Shelton stated she would be an alternate.

**Agenda Item #6 - Adjourn**

**Action**

**Motion: Janice Rosa made a motion to adjourn at 7:53 pm.**

**Second: Bill Doucet**

**Vote: All in favor**