

**Pittsfield Planning Board
Town Hall, 85 Main Street
Pittsfield, NH 03263
Minutes of Public Meeting**

DATE: Thursday, May 3, 2018

AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to order

Chair Clayton Wood called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Roll call

Planning board members present:

Clayton Wood (chair),

Daren Nielsen (vice-chair),

Jim Pritchard (secretary),

Paul Nickerson,

Carl Anderson (selectmen's ex officio member),

Adam Gauthier (alternate),

James Hetu (alternate), and

Jim Adams (alternate for the selectmen's ex officio member)

Planning board members absent: None.

Pittsfield town officials appearing before the planning board: None.

Members of the public appearing before the planning board: Robert Elliott; Jeff Lewis, engineer for Pittsfield Self Storage; Mike McDonough, owner of Pittsfield Self Storage; and Ralph Odell, chair of the master plan committee.

“Members of the public appearing before the planning board” includes only members of the public who spoke to the board. It does not include members of the public who were present but who did not speak to the board.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Public input

No public input.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Pittsfield Self Storage’s application to approve a site plan for a self-storage facility on High Street, tax map R-15, lot 30, in the Light Industrial/Commercial zoning district

- a. Determination of potential regional impact
- b. Completeness review if the board determines that the application has no potential regional impact
- c. Merits review with a public hearing if the board determines that the application is complete

Carl Anderson said that he would recuse himself from the Pittsfield Self Storage case because he had a monetary interest in the project via a property that he owned at 124 Barnstead Road (NH Route 107), tax map R-15, lot 28-1, downstream from the wetlands on tax map R-15, lot 30. (Comment of recording secretary Jim Pritchard: Tax map R-15, lot 28-1, does not abut tax map R-15, lot 30.)

Jim Adams sat in place of Carl Anderson.

Determination of potential regional impact:

Jim Pritchard moved the board to find that the Pittsfield Self Storage project has no potential regional impact.

Clayton Wood seconded the motion.

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote that the Pittsfield Self Storage project has no potential regional impact: carried 5 - 0 - 0. Voting “yes”: Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, Paul Nickerson, and Jim Adams. Voting “no”: none. Abstaining: none.

Completeness review if the board determines that the application has no potential regional impact:

Jeff Lewis, engineer for Pittsfield Self Storage, and Mike McDonough, owner of Pittsfield Self Storage, explained the proposal. Jeff Lewis distributed to the board an aerial photograph of Pittsfield Self Storage’s existing self-storage facility on tax map R-15, lot 30-1. The proposed self-

storage facility is proposed to be on the adjacent lot, tax map R-15, lot 30, on High Street. Jeff Lewis said that tax map R-15, lot 30, had been created in 2007. Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage had tried to sell tax map R-15, lot 30, but had not been able to sell it, and thus had recently decided to expand the existing self-storage facility because demand for storage space in self-storage facilities is strong and because the existing facility had been successful.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage had applied to the zoning board of adjustment for a special exception for the proposed self-storage facility and that the zoning board of adjustment had continued the hearing until after the planning board's meeting tonight.

Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility was planned to be very similar to the existing self-storage facility except that the proposed self-storage facility would be a little smaller than the existing self-storage facility. Jeff Lewis said that a detention basin between the two lots would prevent connecting the two self-storage facilities across the shared interior lot line and consequently that the proposed self-storage facility would have its own driveway on High Street. Jeff Lewis said that the driveway for the proposed self-storage facility would be gated. Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility would not have its own office but would instead use the office at the existing self-storage facility and would have only the four storage-locker buildings. Jeff Lewis said that the second driveway on High Street should present no problem because traffic on High Street is currently light and because the traffic that the proposed self-storage facility will generate will be light.

Jeff Lewis said that tax map R-15, lot 30, where the proposed self-storage facility is proposed to be, has a large wetlands on the northern half, facing NH Route 28, and that consequently the proposed self-storage facility is proposed on the southern half, facing High Street.

Jeff Lewis said that the three storage-locker buildings nearest to High Street would have the typical arrangement of storage lockers accessible from the outdoors, with each building having two rows of storage lockers on opposite sides of the building, and with each storage locker having an entrance directly from outside the building. Jeff Lewis said that the fourth storage-locker building, the storage-locker building farthest from High Street, would

house climate-controlled storage lockers that would be accessible from inside the building.

Jeff Lewis said that he had designed the parking-and-travel ways between the proposed storage-locker buildings to be consistent with what the board had approved for the existing self-storage facility. Jeff Lewis said that the parking-and-travel ways between the storage-locker buildings were 25 feet wide. Jeff Lewis said that the travel way around all four buildings was 30 feet wide.

Jeff Lewis said that he had designed the lighting plan and the landscape plan for the proposed self-storage facility to be consistent with what the board had approved for the existing self-storage facility. Jeff Lewis said that the lights would be mounted on the buildings, would face down, and would be dark-sky compliant. Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility would have “a little bit of landscaping up along High Street.”

Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility would have an on-lot storm-water management basin that would collect and treat all of the runoff from the entire impervious area on site. Jeff Lewis said that the storm-water management basin was a surface sand filter basin, which would need a site-specific alteration of terrain permit from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage had applied for the site-specific alteration of terrain permit.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage had an erosion control plan for the proposed construction, and he briefly explained the plan.

Jeff Lewis referred to Matt Monahan’s third-party review, from Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission. Jeff Lewis said that the deficiencies that Matt Monahan had identified should not bar the board from finding the application complete even though Matt Monahan had said that the application could be considered complete only after the applicant had corrected the deficiencies. Matt Monahan’s brief statement of the deficiencies was “The application could be considered substantially complete once the following issues have been addressed: 1) abutter conflicts between the cover sheet and plan set; 2) a copy of a Town of Pittsfield Driveway Permit Application is submitted; 3) ZBA acts upon Special Exception Application; 3) Existing traffic count data is added to the memo; 4) notes regarding how solid waste will be addressed; 5) delineation of

parking spaces in front of units; and, 6) if sewer, water, and utilities will be needed.” Jeff Lewis acknowledged what he called “typos” in the abutter addresses, but Jeff Lewis said that the abutter list was correct so that abutters had been properly notified.

Jim Pritchard said that the abutter list had errors, and Jim Pritchard cited the Town of Pittsfield, owner of tax map U-4, lot 34, Floral Park Cemetery, as being erroneously listed as having its address at 30 Barnstead Road, Pittsfield, NH, when the correct address is 85 Main Street, Pittsfield, NH. Jim Pritchard said that he had caught this error in time to avoid a notice error. (Comment of recording secretary Jim Pritchard: The abutter list also erroneously states Matthew and Vickie St. George as having their address at 29 High Street, Pittsfield, NH, when their correct address is 101 True Road, Pittsfield, NH. Jim Pritchard also caught this error in time to avoid a notice error, but not before he had already sent a certified letter to 29 High Street, so Jim Pritchard had to send another certified letter, to 101 True Road.) Jim Pritchard said that the information available on the Internet from the town’s contract assessor, Avitar, was confusing.

Jeff Lewis said that he would correct the errors in abutter addresses.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage had expected to apply for a driveway permit after Pittsfield Self Storage had received site plan approval, but, Jeff Lewis said, he would be happy to submit an application for a driveway permit for the board to consider at its next meeting.

Jeff Lewis said that the zoning board of adjustment had begun considering Pittsfield Self Storage’s application for a special exception (on April 26, 2018) and that the zoning board of adjustment had continued consideration of the application (to May 10, 2018) to give board members time to study Matt Monahan’s report. Jeff Lewis said that he hoped that the zoning board of adjustment would approve the special exception when the zoning board of adjustment resumed consideration of the application.

Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility would have no on-site provision for tenants to dispose of their trash. Jeff Lewis said that tenants would have to remove their own trash. Jeff Lewis said that he would put a note on the plan explaining that the self-storage facility would have no on-site provision for tenants to dispose of their trash and that tenants would have to remove their own trash.

Jeff Lewis said that the zoning ordinance, article 16, section 3, (e), Table of Parking Requirements, indicated that the proposed self-storage facility should have 11 parking spaces because the self-storage facility would have 32,300 square feet of storage space and because the table specifies one parking space per every 3000 square feet of storage space. Jeff Lewis said that tenants would park in front of their storage lockers and that the proposed self-storage facility would not need striped parking spaces for an office because the facility would not have an office. Jeff Lewis said that the proposed self-storage facility would have ample space for parking and that he did not want to stripe parking spaces.

Jim Pritchard said that he thought that Matt Monahan was not suggesting to stripe parking spaces but rather that Matt Monahan was suggesting that the plan should show how cars would park so that the board could see how cars would park in front of the lockers.

Jim Pritchard said that a condition of the special exception, zoning ordinance article 6, section 2, (c):

“The use, its parking needs, and its access ways shall be no nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. Parking needs shall be deemed a nuisance if parking needs force vehicles to park on a STREET or on a nearby property.”

superseded article 16, section 3, (e), Table of Parking Requirements. (Shell Oil Co. v. Manchester, 101 N.H. 76, 133 A.2d 501 (1957); also see Pittsfield Zoning Ordinance, article 6, section 1, (b).)

Daren Nielsen asked whether there would be enough room for a car to fit between two cars parked in front of two storage lockers directly facing each other.

Jeff Lewis said that there would probably not be enough room for a car to fit between two cars parked in front of two storage lockers directly facing each other, but that the third car could avoid the two parked cars by using another aisle.

Paul Nickerson said that the proposed self-storage facility should ensure proper access for the fire department.

Jim Pritchard said that the board had received only two reports from department heads. Jim Pritchard said that the waste water treatment department had said that there was no town sewerage on High Street, and that the police department had said nothing in its report.

Jeff Lewis said that he had taken traffic data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook. See Pittsfield Self Storage application for site plan review, traffic analysis letter, referencing the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 9th Edition, from which Pittsfield Self Storage predicted

“an average of 82 trips ends (total number of vehicles in and out) on a weekday, with an average of 10 trip ends during the AM peak hour and an average of 10 trips ends during the PM peak hour.”

and

“an average total number of trip ends of 76 (38 vehicles in and out) for Saturday and 58 (29 vehicles in and out) for the average Sunday. Average peak hourly traffic flows for Saturday are predicted as 0.4/ksf or 13 vehicle trip ends and 0.3/ksf, or 10 vehicle trip ends on Sunday.”

Jeff Lewis said that self-storage facilities generate very low traffic and that he wanted to speak to Matt Monahan about the requirement for a traffic count. Jeff Lewis said that he could do traffic counts but that traffic counts seemed to him to be unnecessary.

Daren Nielsen said that High Street was a popular place for people to walk and that the traffic that the proposed self-storage facility would generate would probably affect the pedestrian traffic more than it would affect the vehicular traffic.

Jeff Lewis said that the existing self-storage facility, on tax map R-15, lot 30-1, has a septic system because the existing self-storage facility has an office but that the proposed self-storage facility would not have an office and thus would not need a septic system. Jeff Lewis said that he would add a note to the plan saying that the proposed self-storage facility would have no water and no sewerage.

Paul Nickerson said that the highest traffic volume on High Street would happen when a funeral would happen, which would likely happen on a weekend and draw 30 or 40 cars.

Jeff Lewis said that he would want the board's notice of decision to be recorded at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds (if the board were to approve the site plan).

Jeff Lewis referred to Matt Monahan's statement in his report citing Pittsfield Site Plan Review Regulations, section V.C, and saying, "Such a fence [for screening or security] is required per this section of the Regulations and it should be shown on the plan as a condition of approval." Jeff Lewis said that he disagreed with Matt Monahan's statement that the site plan review regulations required screening for storage. Jeff Lewis said that "storage" in section V.C meant outside storage.

Daren Nielsen said that he was very concerned about landscaping because the townspeople had spent much private money on an attractive fence around the cemetery. Daren Nielsen asked Jeff Lewis to discuss the landscaping.

Jeff Lewis said that he would have to consult the landscape architect for details of the landscaping. Jeff Lewis said that landscaping between lots was not necessary because the proposed self-storage facility would have self-storage facilities on either side of it.

Paul Nickerson said that he too was concerned about the visual effect on the cemetery, and Paul Nickerson also cited the new fence as evidence of the townspeople's concern for the cemetery.

Clayton Wood said that his understanding of the zoning ordinance was that the zoning ordinance did not permit outdoor storage in a self-storage facility.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage was not asking for outdoor storage as part of its application for a special exception for the self-storage facility.

Clayton Wood asked whether the existing self-storage facility had outdoor storage.

Mike McDonough said that the existing self-storage facility had eight or nine parking spaces for cars to be stored on the north side facing NH Route 28.

Jim Pritchard read the zoning ordinance definition of “self-storage facility”:

“SELF-STORAGE FACILITY” means a facility that has as a PRINCIPAL USE one or more containers, such as lockers, that are for individual storage use at the facility, that give users direct access, and that are available for rent, lease, or sale.

Jim Pritchard said that this definition excludes outdoor storage because containers contain things. Jim Pritchard said that he agreed with Matt Monahan’s suggestion for a plan note saying that the proposed self-storage facility would have no outdoor storage, because Jim Pritchard had been familiar with several other self-storage facilities and because he had often seen outdoor storage at these other self-storage facilities.

Jim Pritchard said that he shared Daren Nielsen’s concern about appropriately landscaping the proposed self-storage facility to screen the facility from the cemetery, and that he, Jim Pritchard, agreed with Matt Monahan’s interpretation that the site plan review regulations, section V.C, require screening of any storage, not just of outside storage, because the regulations use the word “storage” and do not use the term “outside storage”.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage might request a waiver of the screening requirement if the rest of the board agreed that the site plan review regulations do require screening at self-storage facilities. Jeff Lewis said that the justification for the waiver would be that the self-storage facilities next door have no screening.

Clayton Wood said that he was concerned about no sewerage on the lot where the new self-storage facility was proposed. Clayton Wood said that the proposed self-storage facility appeared to be an accessory to the existing self-storage facility. Clayton Wood said that this accessory status of the proposed self-storage facility concerned him because the lot could be sold away from the existing self-storage facility. Clayton Wood said that all four buildings of the proposed self-storage facility depended on the existing self-storage facility.

Mike McDonough said that there would never be a reason to sell the proposed self-storage facility apart from the existing self-storage facility.

Clayton Wood suggested that Pittsfield Self Storage merge the two lots.

Mike McDonough said that he would merge the two lots if necessary. Mike McDonough said that the proposed self-storage facility was really an expansion of the existing self-storage facility.

Jeff Lewis said that selling the proposed self-storage facility apart from the existing self-storage facility would be difficult.

Clayton Wood said that the merger would solve the problem of four principal buildings on the lot, which, Clayton Wood said, the zoning ordinance prohibits. (Zoning ordinance, article 3, (c).)

Jim Pritchard said that each of the four buildings was clearly a principal building because none of them was accessory to another.

Jeff Lewis said that the principal use on both lots was self-storage.

Jim Pritchard said that the prohibition was on principal buildings, not on the principal activity. Jim Pritchard said that the office at the existing self-storage facility was the principal building there because the office was where the business was conducted. Jim Pritchard said that the proposed self-storage facility would have no office. Jim Pritchard said that every building of the proposed self-storage facility is subordinate to the office in the existing self-storage facility.

Daren Nielsen said that the board would have a conundrum if the board permitted the proposed self-storage facility and if the proposed self-storage facility were later sold. Daren Nielsen said that the lot merger would avoid this problem.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage could sell the proposed self-storage facility and that someone else could administer it from off the lot.

Jim Pritchard said that whether Pittsfield Self Storage administered the proposed self-storage facility from off the lot or whether someone else administered the self-storage facility from off the lot made no difference

under the zoning ordinance. Jim Pritchard said that putting an office at the proposed self-storage facility would solve the zoning problem.

Clayton Wood said that the lot with the existing self-storage facility stands on its own and that the lot where a self-storage facility is proposed will not stand on its own. Clayton Wood said that he saw no reason not to merge the two lots and that merging the two lots would be easy.

Jeff Lewis said that merging the two lots could be a condition of site plan approval.

Clayton Wood said that the application appeared to be incomplete. Clayton Wood suggested that the driveway permit might be made a condition of approval.

Jim Pritchard said that the driveway permit might be made a condition of approval, but, Jim Pritchard said, making the driveway permit a requirement of completeness would be make more sense because then the board would know whether the proposed self-storage facility would have access. Jim Pritchard said that the board could not withhold a finding of completeness because state permits were lacking (RSA 676:4, I, (b)), but, Jim Pritchard said, the statute has no such limitation for local permits.

Clayton Wood agreed with Jim Pritchard.

Jeff Lewis said that he would apply for a driveway permit.

Jim Pritchard referred to the questions of screening and traffic counts. Jim Pritchard said that he hoped that Pittsfield Self Storage would landscape the front of the proposed self-storage facility to make the facility a tasteful view from the cemetery. Jim Pritchard said that the townspeople are proud of the cemetery. Jim Pritchard said that he had had decades of familiarity with many self-storage facilities and that he knew that self-storage facilities are quiet places, but, Jim Pritchard said, he did not know what the traffic volume was despite his long familiarity with self-storage facilities. Jim Pritchard said that a traffic count might help show that that the proposed self-storage facility would not adversely affect the cemetery.

Jeff Lewis said that he would propose appropriate landscaping on High Street. Jeff Lewis said that he did not want to fence the whole proposed self-storage facility.

Jim Pritchard said that he was concerned with only the High Street front.

Jeff Lewis said that he wanted to talk to Matt Monahan about the reason for traffic counts.

Jim Pritchard agreed that talking to Matt Monahan would be a good idea.

Jeff Lewis explained that he would propose to count traffic by having a person count cars on a given day.

Daren Nielsen asked whether Pittsfield Self Storage knew the traffic volume on its own driveway.

Jeff Lewis said that Pittsfield Self Storage did not know the traffic volume on its own driveway but that Pittsfield Self Storage could measure it.

Daren Nielsen said that the traffic volume on Pittsfield Self Storage's own driveway would be the most useful information.

Clayton Wood suggested continuing the consideration of the application's completeness to the board's meeting on June 7, 2018.

Daren Nielsen emphasized that he was most concerned about landscaping on the High Street front.

Paul Nickerson asked whether Pittsfield Self Storage would merge its two lots.

Clayton Wood said that Pittsfield Self Storage would consider this option.

Jim Pritchard and Clayton Wood discussed that granting continuances to dates when the applicant is not very confident of being ready makes much extra work for the administrative secretary and is unfair to people who come to the meeting and expect an opportunity to testify.

Mike McDonough said that he could make the necessary changes in a week's time.

Jeff Lewis said that the changes were just notes on the plan.

Jim Pritchard reminded the board that RSA 676:4, II, (c), prohibits the board from doing what the board is doing tonight, because the statute says, "Preliminary review shall be separate and apart from formal consideration" and because turning a plan with problems into a work in progress is preliminary review.

Clayton Wood asked board members whether to continue consideration of the Pittsfield Self Storage application to May 17 or to June 7.

Jim Pritchard, Paul Nickerson, and Daren Nielsen each said that he preferred to continue consideration of the Pittsfield Self Storage application to June 7.

Clayton Wood moved to continue consideration of the Pittsfield Self Storage application for site plan approval to June 7, 2018.

Jim Pritchard seconded the motion.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote to continue consideration of the Pittsfield Self Storage application for site plan approval to June 7, 2018: carried 4 - 1 - 0. Voting "yes": Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, and Paul Nickerson. Voting "no": Jim Adams. Abstaining: none.

Clayton Wood invited informal public input.

Carl Anderson asked the board to have the board's own engineer review the storm-water management plan independently to ensure the plan's adequacy. Carl Anderson said that he owned property downstream from the Upper City watershed and that he had had flood problems in the past. Carl Anderson said that an adequate storm-water management plan was critical because Pittsfield Self Storage was proposing to make much impervious surface on tax map R-15, lot 30.

Jim Pritchard said that he agreed with Carl Anderson and that highway agent George Bachelder had stated similar concerns in other situations. Jim Pritchard asked Carl Anderson whether Carl Anderson were asking for third-party engineering review in addition to the review that the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services would do in its review of Pittsfield Self Storage's application for a site-specific alteration of terrain permit.

Carl Anderson said that he was asking for the board to have its own third-party engineering review. Carl Anderson said that he did not want to cause anyone unnecessary expense but that the load on the existing drainage means was already heavy, that Pittsfield Self Storage was proposing to make much impervious surface on the lot, and that exceeding the capacity of the existing drainage means would damage his property.

Matt St. George asked why the zoning ordinance requirement for a special exception for a self-storage facility did not nullify the requirement for fencing just as, according to Matt St. George, the zoning requirement for a special exception for a self-storage facility nullified the requirement for parking.

Jim Pritchard explained that the zoning ordinance has two requirements for parking. Jim Pritchard said that the first requirement is article 16, section 3, (e), Table of Parking Requirements, and that the second is article 6, second 2, (c):

“The use, its parking needs, and its access ways shall be no nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic. Parking needs shall be deemed a nuisance if parking needs force vehicles to park on a STREET or on a nearby property.”

Jim Pritchard said that article 6, second 2, (c), applies to self-storage facilities as special exceptions because this condition is the one that the zoning ordinance says applies to special exceptions.

Jim Pritchard explained that the screening is not an explicit requirement of the zoning ordinance but is an explicit requirement of the site plan review regulations.

Matt St. George said that he thought that Pittsfield Self Storage should not have to screen its proposed self-storage facility.

Clayton Wood closed informal public input.

Jeff Lewis said that the board could comment to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services on Pittsfield Self Storage's application for a site-specific alteration of terrain permit. Jeff Lewis asked at what point in the review process would the board decide whether to have its own third-party engineering review of the drainage plan.

Daren Nielsen asked whether the drainage plan had enough information for independent third-party engineering review.

Jeff Lewis said, "If you are inclined to send it out, I would prefer to send it out now."

Jim Pritchard said that the board would decide during the merits review whether to get third-party engineering review of the drainage plan.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Conceptual consultation with Robert Elliott for review of the conditions of approval of his subdivision of tax map R-22, lot 1C, at 111 Winant Road in 2004, creating current tax map R-22, lots 1-39 and 1-40, in the Suburban zoning district

Carl Anderson replaced Jim Adams on the board.

Robert Elliott said that, in 2004, he had agreed to the following condition of subdivision approval of tax map R-22, lot 1C:

"For any future development the road must be brought up the Class 5 standards"

(Merrimack County Registry of Deeds plan 17206, approval condition B; and letter of Robert Elliott to the Pittsfield Planning Board dated June 28, 2004.) (Comment of recording secretary Jim Pritchard: "the road" means Winant Road Extension, and "any future development" means any future development of tax map R-14, lot 62, because tax map R-14, lot 62, is the first lot that Winant Road Extension reaches after passing through tax map R-22, lots 1-39 and 1-40, and because tax map R-14, lot 62, is the lot that Robert Elliott specified in his letter of June 28, 2004, to the planning board: "I will also agree that in the event I develop my land in back (tax map R14,

lot 062), I will upgrade the section of private road along with any new sections as required by the town at that time.” Robert Elliott’s letter of June 28, 2004, and the planning board’s notice of decision approving the Elliott subdivision on July 15, 2004, are attached at the end of this minutes document.) Robert Elliott said that he had thought that “development” meant subdivision when he had proposed this condition in 2004.

Robert Elliott said that, in 2004, he had expected to subdivide tax map R-14, lot 62, but that since 2004, he had decided that he would prefer to sell the lot for only one house. Robert Elliott said that selling the lot for only one house would make the road-improvement condition a problem because selling the lot for only one house would not recover the costs of road improvements. Robert Elliott said that he wanted the board to amend the board’s approval of his 2004 subdivision and to replace approval condition B with a condition that would allow tax map R-14, lot 62, to be developed with one house but not be subdivided, and that would not require the road, Winant Road Extension, to be improved. Robert Elliott said that he wanted to sell tax map R-14, lot 62, for only one house, that he had a buyer for the lot as a lot for only one house, and that the buyer would agree to the prohibition on future subdivision, but that he, Robert Elliott, would have to develop the lot to its full density potential if the board insisted that Winant Road Extension would have to be improved to class V standards for any development whatsoever.

Clayton Wood asked why the board had imposed condition B.

Jim Pritchard said that he wanted to answer this question because he had attended the planning board meeting on July 15, 2004, when the board had approved the Elliott subdivision. Jim Pritchard said that the board had been sharply divided on whether to enforce the road construction standards for the two-lot subdivision and that Robert Elliott had proposed the condition as a compromise that the board would accept.

Clayton Wood asked how the board could change the condition of subdivision approval.

Jim Pritchard said that the board could amend the subdivision approval. (Subdivision regulations, article 6, section 4, (d), Major changes.) Jim Pritchard said that Robert Elliott’s request would require a hearing.

Jim Pritchard distributed tax maps R-14 and R-22 to show how tax map R-14, lot 62, is a buffer between Winsunvale Shores and Wildwood Drive and how tax map R-14, lot 62, fronts on Whites Pond. All five board members said that they favored amending the subdivision approval as Robert Elliott said that he would ask. Jim Pritchard said that Robert Elliott could use cluster development to get full potential density by improving little more than Winant Road Extension as it passes through tax map R-22, lots 1-39 and 1-40. Alternate board member Adam Gauthier, who abuts tax map R-14, lot 62, at tax map R-22, lot 6, and who spoke from the audience, said that he favored amending the 2004 subdivision approval as Robert Elliott had said that he would ask. Carl Anderson said that developing tax map R-14, lot 62, to its full potential density would adversely affect the town's tax rate.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Meeting with Ralph Odell, chair of the master plan committee, to set a date for a public hearing on seven chapters of the master plan

Ralph Odell said that he had seven chapters of the master plan ready for adoption and that he could be ready to present them at a public hearing on May 17, 2018. (Comment of recording secretary Jim Pritchard: The seven chapters are Introduction, Demographics, Transportation, Housing, Municipal Operation, Recreation, and Education. After the meeting, Clayton Wood realized that the board would not be able to give the 11 days newspaper notice that RSA 676:7, I, requires if the board were to use the Suncook Valley Sun. Consequently, Clayton Wood rescheduled the public hearing to June 21, 2018.)

AGENDA ITEM 7: Approval of the minutes of the April 5, 2018, and April 13, 2018, meetings

Clayton Wood moved to approve the minutes of April 5, 2018, as written in draft.

Daren Nielsen seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Jim Pritchard asked for the following changes:

Agenda item 4, page 9: At the very end of the agenda item, add “The board’s notice of Adam Gauthier’s appointment as an alternate member of the planning board is attached at the end of this minutes document.”

End of the minutes document: Number Ted Mitchell’s traffic-counts proposal as the second attachment, and state the first attachment as “Notice of Adam Gauthier’s appointment as an alternate member of the planning board.”

Vote to approve the minutes of April 5, 2018, with the changes that Jim Pritchard requested: carried 4 - 0 - 1. Voting “yes”: Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, and Paul Nickerson. Voting “no”: none. Abstaining: Carl Anderson.

Clayton Wood moved to approve the minutes of April 13, 2018, as written in draft.

Paul Nickerson seconded the motion.

Discussion:

No board member stated any problems in the draft minutes.

Vote to approve the minutes of April 13, 2018, as written in draft: carried 4 - 0 - 1. Voting “yes”: Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, and Paul Nickerson. Voting “no”: none. Abstaining: Carl Anderson.

After the meeting, Clayton Wood and Jim Pritchard realized that a notice of decision vacating the approvals of the Carson three-lot subdivision at 121 Barnstead Road would clarify the historical record of the Carson case. Consequently, Jim Pritchard made the following changes to the minutes of April 13, 2018:

Agenda item 3, page 7: After the statement of the board’s vote to vacate the Carson subdivision, add “The board’s notice of decision vacating the board’s final approval of March 15, 2018, the conditional approval of January 18, 2018, and the finding of completeness of December 21, 2017, of the Carson three-lot subdivision at 121 Barnstead Road (NH Route 107), tax map R-15, lot 6, is attached at the end of this minutes document.”

End of the minutes document: Number Brandon Giuda's objections as the first attachment, and state the second attachment as "Notice of decision vacating the board's final approval of March 15, 2018, the conditional approval of January 18, 2018, and the finding of completeness of December 21, 2017, of the Carson three-lot subdivision at 121 Barnstead Road (NH Route 107), tax map R-15, lot 6."

AGENDA ITEM 8: Vote on Clayton Wood's nomination as one of Pittsfield's two representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission

At the board's meeting on April 5, 2018, Daren Nielsen moved to nominate Clayton Wood as one of the town's two representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission, and Jim Pritchard seconded the motion, but the board did not vote on the motion.

Vote to nominate Clayton Wood as one of the town's two representatives to the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission: carried 5 - 0 - 0. Voting "yes": Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, Paul Nickerson, and Carl Anderson. Voting "no": none. Abstaining: none.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Potential regional impact to Pittsfield of a telecommunications tower in Goffstown

The board considered the potential regional impact to Pittsfield of a telecommunications tower in Goffstown. The applicant in Goffstown is VWI Towers LLC doing business as Varsity Wireless. The owner is Raymond G. Blondeau. The location is 91 Church Street, Goffstown, tax map 37, lots 6 and 5. The proposal is to erect a new tower with a height of 110 feet for a new telecommunication facility.

Clayton Wood moved the board to find that the Goffstown telecommunications tower will have no regional impact to Pittsfield.

Jim Pritchard seconded the motion.

Vote that the Goffstown telecommunications tower will have no regional impact to Pittsfield: carried 5 - 0 - 0. Voting "yes": Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, Paul Nickerson, and Carl Anderson. Voting "no": none. Abstaining: none.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Selectman's report

Carl Anderson had nothing to report.

AGENDA ITEM 11: Members' concerns

No board member stated any concern.

AGENDA ITEM 12: Public input

Adam Gauthier offered to be an alternate for Clayton Wood on the housing standards board.

AGENDA ITEM 13: Adjournment

Jim Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting.

Clayton Wood seconded the motion.

Vote to adjourn the planning board meeting of May 3, 2018: carried 5 - 0 - 0. Voting "yes": Jim Pritchard, Daren Nielsen, Clayton Wood, Paul Nickerson, and Carl Anderson. Voting "no": none. Abstaining: none. The planning board meeting of May 3, 2018, is adjourned at 8:55 P.M.

Minutes approved: June 7, 2018

Clayton Wood, chairman

Date

I transcribed these minutes (not verbatim) on May 5, 2018, from the digital audio recording that Chairman Clayton Wood made during the meeting on May 3, 2018, and uploaded to the Internet.

Jim Pritchard, planning board recorder and secretary

Attachments:

1. Letter of Robert Elliott to the Pittsfield Planning Board dated June 28, 2004.
2. The planning board's notice of decision approving the Elliott subdivision on July 15, 2004.

Robert J. Elliott
111 Winant Road
Pittsfield, NH 03263

June 28, 2004

Pittsfield Planning Board
Box 98
Pittsfield, NH 03263

RE: Application for Subdivision at 111 Winant Road

After doing some research on my minor subdivision, it appears that private road frontage counts for frontage in a subdivision. Further it appears the Planning Board has the authority to waive the road requirements on a private road. Consequently, I am requesting that the Planning Board reconsider my application for a minor subdivision at 111 Winant Road. I am also requesting that the Board waive the road requirement for this application.

Further, I will agree that the lots fronting on the section of private road will maintain the road and will be responsible for any liability. I will consult with the police chief, the highway department supervisor, and the fire chief or one of his lieutenants to do whatever is necessary to provide a safe access to any house built on the new lot. Thus, the town of Pittsfield will not have to maintain or be liable for that section of the road just as is the case for other private roads in town.

I will also agree that in the event I develop my land in back (tax map R14, lot 062), I will upgrade the section of private road along with any new sections as required by the town at that time.

Respectfully,

Robert J. Elliott



Town of Pittsfield Planning Board Notice of Decision

A Minor Subdivision application filed by Robert Elliott of Pittsfield NH for a parcel of property located at 111 Winant Road (Tax Map R-22 Lot 1C) Pittsfield, NH 03263.

You are hereby notified that a duly convened meeting of the Pittsfield Planning Board was held on Thursday, July 15, 2004 at 7:00PM, by request of Robert Elliot for a Minor Subdivision to create two (2) Single Family Residential Lots on Tax Map R22 – Lot 1C, on Winant Road. The request was **GRANTED**.

RESOLVED:

The request to allow a two (2) lot Subdivision on said property in a Suburban Zone is **GRANTED**. The Planning Board voted four in favor to one opposed with one abstention, to grant application approval on the conditions that the Applicant brings the private road up to Class V standards for any future development, follow the town sewer ordinances in connecting the new residential lot to the Town wastewater system, and have water and sewer connections in a right-of-way to the Town.

Lawrence Konopka, Chair
Pittsfield Planning Board

July 21, 2004

Note: Application for rehearing on any question of the above determination may be taken within thirty (30) days of said determination by any part of the action or person affected thereby according to New Hampshire Revised Statutes Annotated, Chapter 677:2.