



PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF EAST KINGSTON
New Hampshire

2014-2015
Joe Cacciatore, *Chairman*
Dr. Robert Marston, *Vice Chairman*

MINUTES
Regular Meeting 19 March 2015
7:00 pm

AGENDA:

- ◆ **Call to Order**
- ◆ **Update** on Cole House Project.
- ◆ **Review** of Subdivision Regulation updates and changes
- ◆ **Board Business**

CALL TO ORDER: This meeting of the East Kingston Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:, Vice Chairman Dr. R. Marston, Mr. J. Bath, Mr. B. Caswell, and Ex-Officio Mr. R. Morales. Chairman Mr. J. Cacciatore and Mr. C. Delling were excused.

Advisors present: Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC) Senior Planner Ms. J. LaBranche; East Kingston Building Inspector John Moreau; East Kingston Assistant Building Inspector Tom Welch, Dennis Quintal - Civil Construction.

Also Present: East Kingston resident Gary Hinz.

Minutes

Dr. Marston asked for a motion to approve the January and February minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Bath **MOVED** to approve the January and February minutes as presented. Mr. Morales seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Board Business

Update on the Cole House

Mrs. White reported receiving communication from Principal Jim Eaves of the East Kingston Elementary School on the progress of the Cole House project.

As the program overseeing the project is unable to begin construction until September, they will wait until Spring to have the footing excavated and there will be a structural engineer inspection of the foundation as requested by the Building Inspector. Mr. Eaves will send updated plans and inspection results to the Planning Board once the inspection is complete.

Subdivision Regulations Update Review

Ms. LaBranche had been temporarily taken away from this project and also has not had a chance to review with the Fire Chief or Mr. Quintal. She will have updates to review for the April meeting.

Mr. Quintal offered as they were reviewing the subdivision regulations, the Board might want to consider adding some stipulations for driveways and placement of mailboxes in new subdivisions. This year there had been many complaints regarding damage to mailboxes, mostly because were installed too close to the edge of the road and consequently there was no way to avoid damage from the snow being plowed.

Mr. Quintal was presently working on a project for two other towns who have regulations for driveways and mailbox locations which would a 10' long apron from the edge of the road at the right-hand side of the driveway, either paved or graveled. Mr. Quintal opined East Kingston might want to consider incorporating this into their subdivision regulations and handed out two examples of configurations.

The mailbox would be set back a minimum of 5' from the edge of pavement and would protect the mailbox from damage from snowplows and allow adequate room for the postal service to deliver the mail. As this area would need to be cleared, it will permit better sight distance for the resident to emerge from their driveway. Ms LaBranche opined the area should not be required to be paved, but be up to the homeowner to decide to pave or gravel.

Mr. Quintal thought it could be placed on the checklist for the Building Inspector for the Occupancy Permit to make sure the mailbox is placed away from the edge of the pavement. Mr. Moreau thought instead of being on the occupancy permit, it should be checked at the time the road is adopted by the town, as mostly he would be giving occupancy permits to the developer and not the homeowner. Mr. Bath wondered if subdivisions should have one central location to pick up mail. Consensus was that most people preferred their mail to be directly in front of their house.

Ms. LaBranche asked if Board members could give it some thought and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss whether or not they wanted to include this item in the subdivision regulations and/or if they had any additional changes. She also thought some of the figures on the typical roadway section also might need to be updated (page 29 of the subdivision regulations) and will look at that section.

Handouts to the Board

Mrs. White distributed the yearly Planning Board calendar and reminded everyone Chairman and Vice Chairman elections would be held next month.

The OEP Conference will be held in Concord on Saturday, May 2. Registration fees will be paid by the Planning Board, and Mrs. White corroborated that mileage will also be reimbursed. Please return your Registration Information to either Mrs. White or Cheryl at the Selectmen's Office by April 6.

Woldridge Lane

Mrs. LaBranche reported Mr. Moreau had contacted her regarding receipt for approval of a septic plan for Lot 03-02-03 on Woldridge Lane from the present owner and wanted to make sure it was a buildable lot before approving it. This is the same property that had made an application for extending the road beyond the approved town length to build 4 then 3 houses last year.

Ms. LaBranche and Mr. Moreau reviewed the original plan. There was an access easement across the Woldridge Lane subdivision property to the back lot from the early 1920's to lot 2-3. When the subdivision was approved, it was recommended by the Town Attorney that the Planning Board grant an access easement to the back lot from the Woldridge lane cul-de-sac.

Ms. LaBranche had contacted the Town Attorney who ascertained from RSA 674:41 that it was not a buildable lot. Mr. Moreau had requested a written opinion from the Town Attorney, which he provided.

Board consensus was this was not a Selectmen Issue, but an issue for the Building Inspector. Mr. Moreau and Ms. LaBranche will draft a letter to the applicant. Mr. Morales commended Mr. Moreau for recognizing it might not be a buildable lot. The Board received a copy of that letter.

Finch/Davis Monumentation

Mr. Moreau reported that he had not been contacted to walk the bounds for the Finch/Davis Lot Line Adjustment/Conservation Easement to date. He will update the Board on the progress of this. Mrs. White will contact the conservation entity in regard to this and see if she can find out additional information.

Extending Commercial Zone

Ms. LaBranche asked, given the discussion at the public hearing regarding the citizen's petition to rezone, and the Board wanting to revisit exploring extending the business and commercial uses on the Town highways, did they wish to work on that before jumping into the Master Plan?

An analysis could be prepared of the character of the properties to see how many properties could meet the criteria, etc. to get a feel for what the potential is for mixed use. Guidelines could be established to protect existing properties; for example mandating a 200 ft of screened buffer from the side yard between residential and commercial. With this mandate, not every piece of property would be able to support a commercial use. And the types of uses that would be allowed would need to be decided. You could also limit building footprint size

Ms. LaBranche asked if the Board was interested in pursuing this before starting on the Master Plan. Mr. Morales opined he would like to work on that project. Mr. Bath noted he was concerned the Board was yet again putting off reviewing the Master Plan to work on another project, reminding them it was a mandate of the Board to review the Master Plan. Mr. Morales suggested waiting until there was a full Board present to take a vote on this subject.

Mr. Bath inquired if they could work on both; Ms. LaBranche noted that was only a certain amount of hours per month she was allotted to work on projects within the scope contract so there would not be enough time to do both at the same time.

She suggested a calendar to work on the individual projects:

- April and May to complete the subdivision regulations;
- For the Master Plan - June through August for the Vision section;
- September and October for the Land Use section;
- November through January to work on the Town Center/Commercial zoning analysis.

Mr. Morales referred to the Visioning Sessions they had conducted with the residents of the Town several years ago and that there had been an overwhelming desire for the Town to be kept as a residential/agricultural community and to encourage farming. He did not think that had really changed.

Ms. LaBranche suggested they do a community survey and perhaps a couple of meetings as part of the vision chapter of the master plan. Mr. Morales agreed it was very important to get the input from the residents.

Citizens Petition

Mr. Bath noted if the citizen's petition had not come before the Board, if you read the wording you would not understand what you were actually voting for. Mr. Morales noted that if a person comes to the Board for some direction, they could suggest understandable wording, but other than that it would stand as they presented it.

Mr. Hinz remarked it appeared as if the process for the most recent citizen's petition had not been followed. Ms. LaBranche answered there had been a procedural error in the process which negated the ability of the Planning Board to include a comment. Going forward, a set of procedures is being established.

She reviewed that the normal process would have been to have a public hearing on it in January, and the Planning Board would have had an opportunity to place a statement on the ballot with an explanation and an opinion.

Light Industrial Park

Mrs. White reported that a person in the light industrial park had contacted her about how to go about getting a license to sell used trucks. Since she did not recognize the name of the company as one who was approved in the industrial park, she will contact Mr. Masone and ask for an updated list.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Dr. Marston **MOVED** the Planning Board adjourn; Mr. Morales seconded. The motion was unanimous.

The meeting was closed at 8:05 pm. The next Planning Board meeting will be April 19.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara White

Barbara A. White
Planning Board Secretary
Mr. Cacciatore, Chairman

Minutes approved April 19, 2015