

DEERFIELD PLANNING BOARD  
DEERFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
NOVEMBER 4, 2015

MINUTES OF MEETING

PRESENT: Board members Fred McGarry, Peter Schibbelhute, Richard Pitman. Alternate member David Doran and Secretary Jane Boucher.

Chair Fred McGarry called the meeting to order at 7PM and appointed David Doran to sit as a voting member.

APPROVAL OF MANIFEST

Peter Schibbelhute moved and David Doran seconded to approve the manifest in the amount of \$313.99( File purchased by Fred McGarry from Engineer Supply).

Voted in favor with Fred McGarry abstaining.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The following corrections were made to the minutes of October 14, 2015:

Page 1: Paragraph 3: Correct to read "..that were more than the wetlands area on the ...."

Page 1: Add to last paragraph:"The area is recognized as the largest remaining unfragmented tract in the region."

Page 2 Paragraph 5: Correct to read "...and she questioned if a cistern on the property is necessary and thinks eight lots are to much for the land."

Page 2 Paragraph 6; Correct to read...cut down the number of lots..."

Page 2 Paragraph 9: Correct to read".The Board and Mr. Pelletier mutually agreed..."

Page 3 Paragraph 1: Correct to read"...whether of not..."

Page 5 Paragraph 3: Correct to read "(No further subdivision added to plan)

. Construction of revisions to driveway before plans are signed."

Page 5 Last Paragraph Correct to read "...for stockpiling of processed soil and rock..."

Page 6 Paragraph 4 Correct to read "..would cause more dust and noise."

Page6 Paragraph 5 Correct to read "..paving shown on plan would..."

Page 6 Paragraph 6 Add to last sentence"...hours of operation."

Page 6 Paragraph 12 Correct to read "..house and garage..."

No vote was taken as there was not a quorum present.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of October 28, 2015

Page 1 Add to Paragraph 1: David Doran was appointed a voting

member"

Page 1 Paragraph 3: correct to read "...to correct runoff issues on Gulf Road

Page 1 Correct name to Ann Scholz

Page 2 Paragraph 3 Correct to read "...she approve to omit..."

Page 2 Paragraph 3 Correct to read "...role for the Deerfield Village District..."

Page 2 Paragraph 6 Correct to read "...an opinion from..."

Page 3 Last Paragraph "Correct to read"...would propose zoning regulations and propose limits of the district."

No vote was taken as there was not a quorum present.

#### PROPOSED ZONING/DEERFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Chair McGarry read a letter to be mailed to residents of the proposed district asking for their input. A copy of the letter is attached to these minutes.

#### SPM CONTINUATION; APPLICATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING; SITE PLAN REVIEW; STEVE ROLLINS; PARADE ROAD

Steve Rollins and Eric Sandford were present along with abutters Mark and Deborah Todd and Cheryl Brosnahan.

Board member Richard Pitman excused himself as his Company , Center Hill Barns, had provided the drawings for Mr. Rollins.

Mr. Sandford provided revised plans for the Board's review. He reviewed the recommendations outlined in Steve Keach's letter of October 13, 2015 . A copy of Mr. Keach's letter is attached to these minutes. In his review Mr. Sandford showed that notes on the submitted plans complied with Mr. Keach's recommendations.

Chair McGarry asked Mr. Rollins what will exterior siding be. Steve Rollins replied that had decided to go with metal all the way around.

Mr. Sandford said that also added several trees to the plan.

Chair McGarry referred to the proposed green area and asked if detail showed what it would be consisting of. Mr. Sandford replied loam, seed and mulch. Mr. McGarry said that should be added to the plan. Mr. Sandford said a detailed sheet showing that was shown on the previous plan.

Chair McGarry referred to the stated Hours of Operation: ie Monday through Saturday 7-5.

Fred McGarry said that this is the first application for operation for Deerfield Sand and Gravel. Steve Rollins said that the W. Rollins Excavation business is on Raymond Road and

it is a separate business. He added that the only location that Deerfield Sand and Gravel has operated is on Parade Road.

David Doran questioned the hours of operation and noted that he thought that Saturdays was not included. Steve Rollins explained that he wanted to open a few hours to Saturday to accommodate local residents.

Chair McGarry questioned screening on the existing parking area. He added that more detail should be shown on the drawings.

Chair McGarry advised that the Board will need a letter from Nellie Rollins saying that Steve Rollins is acting on her behalf. Steve Rollins advised that his mother had put a letter in the mail noting that issue.

Mr. McGarry asked abutter present if they would like to comment.

Deborah Todd commented that they have concerns and think that their concerns will get worse. She noted that on Saturday, October 31, 2015, at 7:45AM a loud noise came from the pit and lasted about 40 minutes. Ms. Todd taped the noise and played it for the Board.

Cheryl Brosnahan also said that there was significant noise coming from the site for several hours.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Todd and Ms. Brosnahan expressed the fact that they thought there would be no Saturday hours.

Steve Rollins said that they were drilling a well line to the house.

The abutters present expressed concern regarding the proposed expansion.

Chair McGarry questioned the hours of operation of the pit, stating that the hours of operation should be Monday thru Friday only. He added that the Board will be looking at the renewal of the permit for the pit in 2016. He added that, at that time, the Board will be looking at the issues of dust, noise, and hours of operation. Mr. McGarry said that he felt those issues need to be revisited.

Steve Rollins agreed to remove the Saturday hours indicated on the plan.

Mark and Deborah Todd and Cheryl Brosnahan voiced concern regarding noise coming from the proposed garage.

Steve Rollins felt that the garage will be insulated and will buffer any noise being created.

Chair McGarry noted that he thought the Deerfield Sand and Gravel Operation was headquartered at 30 Raymond Road and said that if that were the case, he would not be subject to a Commercial aspect of Impact Fee. He added that Commercial Operations were subject to the Highway portion of the Impact Fee.

Mr. McGarry said that if the operation is not part of existing operation on Raymond Road, it is subject to the Commercial aspect of the Impact Fee as well as the Impact Fee assessed for a mobile home. He added that if Nellie Rollins was willing to give up the rights for a commercial business on Raymond Road, Steve Rollins would not be subject to the commercial fee.

Mr. Sandford will work on estimating the impact fee for Deerfield Sand and Gravel and Mr. Rollins will speak with Nellie Rollins and then determine if he will pay the assessment.

Peter Schibbelhute suggested that Steve Rollins work with the abutters prior to meeting with the Planning Board in 2016 to outline what he intends to do on the site and address concerns of abutters. Both abutters and Steve Rollins agreed that they will sit down and try to address each others concerns.

Fred McGarry said that he is not happy with what is shown for screening, he would like them to come back with a planting plan to adequately screen the parking area. Mr. Sandford did not feel that parking of the trucks had anything to do with this application.

Steve Rollins said, rather than additional screening, he will move the trucks back into the pit. Mr. Rollins asked if he speaks with his mother regarding the commercial operation and either pays the impact fee or she agrees to close the W. Rollins Excavation site and moves the trucks can he have his permit to build a garage.

Peter Schibbelhte moved and David Doran moved to grant conditional approval to Steve Rollins, Deerfield Sand and Gravel, which includes pavement and building a garage with the folling conditions:

1. Eliminate the Saturday hours shown on the plan. Hours of operation to be shown Monday Thru Friday 7AM-5PM.
2. Include note detailing loaming and seeding in green area on plan.
3. Trucks not to be parked on area located on Rte.43 and will

- be moved to location on site. Remove parking area on plan
4. Letter from Nellie Rollins authorizing Steve Rollins to act on her behalf
  5. Signed letter of Agreement dated June, 2015
  6. Payment of invoices for review from Town Counsel

Mr. Sandford will determine what the commercial assessment will be and Steve Rollins will pay the fee or, if Nellie Rollins agrees , the operation located at 30 Raymond Road will cease.

Conditional approval to lapse in 120 days. (March 4, 2016)

Chair McGarry called for a vote on the motion. Voted in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 10PM.

Recorded and transcribed by Jane Boucher  
Pending Approval by the Planning Board

During a meeting in June? between the Planning Board and residents from the proposed Village District, the residents expressed interest in keeping the historic appearance of the center of Town, including those buildings on North Road and Church Street. However, they generally objected to most features of the proposed Village District including reduced lot sizes and permitted business uses beyond conventional Home Businesses. They expressed some interest in applying design standards proposed for the Village District to new construction within the Deerfield Center to make sure the structures were in keeping with the existing historic buildings. The residents asked the Board if it could investigate alternatives that would retain the historic features but not the other features of the Village District.

The Board investigated the alternatives and found that establishment of a historic district commission would most closely match the residents' desires. For those interested, the historic district commission is covered in RSA 673:4. Procedurally, the Planning Board would propose the establishment of an historic district commission at the 2016 Town Meeting. If the voters approve the warrant article, the Board of Selectmen would appoint "not less than 3 and no more than 7 members . . ." The members could be residents of what was proposed as the Village District. The commission, once established, would propose the limits of the historic district and the historic district ordinance. These would then be submitted to the voters at the next town meeting in the same manner as zoning changes. If the voters approve the proposals, any new construction within the historic district would need to be in accordance with the historic district ordinance and the historic district commission would review and approve the plans for the building before a building permit could be issued.

The Board would appreciate your input regarding whether or not a historic district commission should be established. Please check off your view either in favor or opposed to a historic district commission, provide your name and address if you would be interested in serving as a commission member and return the card to the Board in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Should you have any questions regarding the historic district commission please feel free to contact any member of the Planning Board listed below.

October 13, 2015

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.; Chairman  
Deerfield Planning Board  
Post Office Box 159  
Deerfield, New Hampshire 03037

**Subject: Site Plan Review Application – Land of Nellie A. Rollins  
35 Parade Road (Map 209 – Lot 35); Deerfield, New Hampshire  
KNA Project No. 07-0125-1**

Dear Mr. McGarry:

At the request of the Town Planner we have completed a technical review of project plans and supporting information submitted to your Board by or on behalf of the applicant in the subject matter. Specifically, we acknowledge receipt of the following information, which was the subject of our review: (a) a copy of a site plan (3 drawings, dated September 22, 2015); and (b) A copy of supplementary drainage calculations dated September 25, 2015. Based on our careful consideration and review of application materials received through this date we offer the following comments and recommendations at this time:

**General Comments**

1. 2015 Note No. 1 provided on Sheet 2 of the current site plan indicates “this plan is an addendum to the 5 sheet set of plans for a gravel excavation operation approved and on file at the Town of Deerfield Planning Board.” While this note may be correct from a drawing context it must be recognized that the current application involves a site plan for proposed buildings and related improvements, which happen to be situated on a portion of the same tract that remains an active excavation site previously permitted by your Board in accordance with applicable provisions of Section 321 of the Deerfield Zoning Ordinance and Excavation Regulations under the authority of RSA 155-E. The current application for site plan approval, which will affect an estimated 42,000 square feet of the subject 153.95 acre tract, will be considered and reviewed by your Board in accordance with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review Regulations under the authority of RSA 674:43. We remind the applicant that your Board’s purview under the current application varies from its function as “Regulator” under RSA 155-E. On that basis, in the event the planning, design or implementation of work contemplated under the current site plan ultimately necessitates amendment of the previously approved Excavation Permit, it may be necessary for the applicant to advance a separate application for such amendment(s) under applicable provisions of the Deerfield Excavation Regulations and RSA 155-E.

2. We understand the applicant has received NHDES Construction Approval for a planned on-site subsurface sewage disposal system intended to serve the proposed building(s). It appears the only other State project permit required under this application is amendment of the previously issued NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit for facilitation of the currently planned building and site improvements.

### **Zoning Matters**

1. The subject parcel is situated in the Agricultural-Residential District in its entirety. Under the current application the owner seeks site plan approval for a garage, which we understand will be used to facilitate on-going excavation operations including the storage and maintenance of equipment, as well as a "night watchman's quarters", which we understand will essentially function as a single-family dwelling. Construction of this dwelling is permitted by right in the Agricultural-Residential District pursuant to Section 204 of the Zoning Ordinance. The planned non-residential use of the proposed garage will invoke need for the applicant to satisfy applicable terms and conditions of the Commercial/Industrial Flexible Overlay District Ordinance (see Section 212). We understand the Town Planner will review and comment on this application accordingly.

### **Planning/Design Matters**

1. As acknowledged above, under this application the owner/applicant seeks approval to construct both a residential dwelling unit and a non-residential garage on a portion of a site having benefit of a previously issued Excavation Permit. Being somewhat familiar with the subject property, this writer recognizes the planned construction is intended to occupy a portion of the Phase 1A excavation area identified on the previously approved excavation plan over which previously approved excavation activities are now substantially complete. Given the need for both the applicant and your Board to consider work planned under the current site plan application separately from administration of on-going excavation activities, we recommend the current site plan "box out" a limit of work area around the currently planned improvements for the purposes of conveniently identifying and delineating "what is site plan from what is remaining excavation site".
2. We recommend the list of reference plans provided on the current site plan be expanded to cite the previously approved excavation plan.
3. Given the need to treat the current site plan application separately and distinctly from the previous approved excavation plan we recommend the applicant's consultant revisit the text of several of those "General Notes (2007)" provided on Sheet 2 of the current site plan and remove any of the same which pertain to the previously approved excavation plan rather than the current site plan.
4. In order to satisfy applicable requirements of Section III-3.E.3 (a) of the Site Plan Review Regulations we recommend the current site plan be expanded or revised as follows:

- To include the standard notation required under Section III-3.E.3 (a) (3);

*Civil Engineering*

*Land Surveying*

*Landscape Architecture*

Mr. Frederick McGarry, P.E.  
October 13, 2015

- To specify the height of each proposed building;
  - To identify the locations of each planned building entrance;
  - To indicate typical dimensions of proposed parking spaces including accommodations for compliance with applicable requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA);
  - To provide detailed parking calculations sufficient to demonstrate compliance with Section IV-II.B.4 of the Site Plan Review Regulations;
  - To identify the manner in which solid waste generated on site is to be stored prior to off-site disposal;
  - To specify planned exterior lighting accommodations, if any;
  - To specify suitable accommodations for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period;
  - To provide construction details for applicable elements of site work (pavement, drainage, etc.);
  - To provide a detailed grading plan; and
  - To provide architectural elevation drawings of proposed building construction.
5. We recommend the site plan be expanded to address applicable requirements of Section IV-3 of the Site Plan Review Regulations pertaining to landscape and visual buffering, especially at the site entrance and along Parade Road.
  6. Site Note No. 5 provided on Sheet 3 of the site plan reads: "For every 1,000 square feet of impervious area (pavement/roofs) must be matched by 75 square feet of loam and seeded area (for this plan 30,000 square feet of roofs and paving is to be offset by 22,500 square feet of reclaimed green area." We recommend the final site plan indicate the limits of planned site restoration/reclamation.
  7. We recommend the applicant identify intended non-residential uses beyond those currently permitted at the site so as to enable the Planning Board to make a determination if mitigation of impacts resulting from the same are warranted pursuant to the provisions of Section IV-6.F of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
  8. Does the applicant intend to install floor drains within the proposed garage? If so, we recommend the site plan be expanded to address applicable requirements of Part Env-Wq 402.35 of the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules governing the same.

We trust the foregoing comments and recommendations will prove useful to your Board in your consideration of the subject application. In the event you should have specific questions or further instructions related to this matter, please contact the writer at your convenience.

Sincerely:

Steven B. Keach, P.E.; President  
Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.

*Civil Engineering*

*Land Surveying*

*Landscape Architecture*

10 Commerce Park North, Suite 3B

Bedford, NH 03110

Phone (603) 627-2881

Fax (603) 627-2915