

DEERFIELD PLANNING BOARD
DEERFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE
JANUARY 13, 2016

MINUTES OF MEETING

PRESENT: Board members Fred McGarry, Kate Hartnett, William Perron, Peter Schibbelhute, Planning Consultant Gerald Coogan, Alternate David Doran and secretary Jane Boucher.

7PM Chair Fred McGarry called the meeting to order.

PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS FOR 2016

Chair McGarry read the Notice of Public Hearing which proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance will be presented:

Article II Section 212 :Deerfield Business Overlay District:
Delete Existing Section 212 and substitute with New Section 212
Article II Section 210.3 Wetlands Conservation District;
District Boundaries A.

Article III : Section 325.1: Open Space Development D & F
Article VI: Section 602: Definitions.

Article II Section 212 Deerfield Business Overlay District:
Board members reviewed The Final Draft of Section 212 Dated
12/21/15

Gerald Coogan noted that the Board voted to recommend the revision of Section 212. At that time David Doran said he would provided information on "Noise" levels.

At this time it was noticed that the Final Draft did not include the section on Noise. Chair McGarry stated that the copies of the draft left at the Town Clerk's Office did not include the information. Another public hearing will be necessary in order to include the section.

Board members discussed the proposed section on "Noise" and David Doran noted that it was very subjective.

Fred McGarry said they before they adopt it the should look at it it is continuous or intermittent.

Kate Hartnett noted that every site will be different.

David Doran said the issue is complicated, every site is affected by topography.

Chair McGarry said that on Page 2: b,III; It should read Topography: Site Design should incorporate existing stone walls and woods roads whenever possible.

Mr. McGarry also noted that, he felt, that Traffic should be

included in Section 212. He referred to the existing Section 212 "If the project is likely to generate more than 25 vehicle trips per business per acre both to and from the premises, will the project site be directly served by an arterial or collector street?"

After discussion, it was decided to address traffic in the proposed Section 212 noting that 25 vehicle visits or 50 trips per day be included under c d Access. "A proposed development that is likely to generate more than 25 visits or 50 trips per business day per acre both to and from the site, shall be directly served by an arterial or collector street. A proposed development that is likely to generate more than 25 visits or 50 vehicle trips per day both to and from the site in the busiest hour of the operating day (annual average) shall be served by an arterial street."

Add e "Repair and servcie facilities: All repair and service activity , including storage, shall occur within a building."

Kate Hartnett suggested that the following be added to b,ix, Noise." Consideration will be given to whether the noise is intermittent or continuous."

Kate Hartnett referred to b,iii, Topography , suggesting that it read "Site design shall incorporate existing vegetative features as much as possible and shall incorporate stone walls and wood roads whenever possible."

A public hearing to consider replacing Section 212 with a new Section 212 will be held on January 20, 2016 at 7PM.

AMEND SECTION 210.3 SUBSECTION A TO READ AS FOLLOWS

"The Deerfield Wetlands Conservation District is defined as those areas of Town that contain wetlands as defined in 210.2 including, but not limited to, marshes, ponds, bogs, vernal pools, lakes, streams..."

Peter Schibbelhute questioned the necessity of adding vernal pools to this section. He referred to property owned by John DiFranzo, and because he was trying to accommodate the road, he lost usage of land.

Kate Hartnett suggested adding the definition of vernal pools to article II Section 210.5 C "Vernal Pools :No filling of or mitigation of vernal pools. Vernal pools are small scattered temporary ponds fed by snow melt and spring rains.

This proposed amendment will be discussed at the public hearing on January 20, 2016.

OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT

Amend Section 325.1, Purpose and Objectives, by inserting the following subsection D:

D "Open Space Plan " Subdivisions proposed under the Open Space Development ordinance shall incorporate the objectives of the Town of Deerfield Open Space Plan, dated August, 2010 or later, in the overall design of the proposed Open Space Development."

William Perron moved and Kate Hartnett seconded to include amendment to Section 325.1 on the ballot. Voted in favor.

Amend Section 325.4 Subsection F, Minimum Open Space Area to read, in part as follows: "Not more than fifty percent of the Minimum Open Space Area may consist of lands within the Wetlands Conservation District or having slopes in excess of twenty percent. The area within the front, side and rear setbacks shall be included in and be a part of the Open Space."

William Perron moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to include the amendment to Section 325.4 on the ballot. Voted in favor.

Board members reviewed the proposed ballot and agreed that "explanations" be included.

APPROVAL OF MANIFEST

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to approve the manifest in the amount of \$132.00. (SNHPC \$132.00 - time sheets for Jane Boucher). Voted in favor.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

A letter was received from Cathleen Perron requesting an extension to January 26, 2017 for Phase III of the McCarron Subdivision.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and Kate Hartnett seconded to grant an extension for conditional approval to Cathleen M. Perron to January 26, 2017. The Board agreed to further review any requests and that Ms. Perron meet with the Board if further requests are necessary. Voted in favor with William Perron abstaining.

DEERFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Chair McGarry reported that 35 letters had been mailed to residents of the Village District with 9 responses. 5 would support; 2 would not support and 2 replied that they do not know enough to support or not support.

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE (SEC) NORTHERN PASS

An e-mail was received from Erick Berglund asking the Planning Board to intervene in the NH Site Evaluation Committee process.

Chair McGarry said that under SEC Regulations, Northern Pass is exempt from the Site Plan Review Process and agreed the Planning Board should intervene.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and Kate Hartnett seconded to send a letter to the SEC asking that the Deerfield Planning Board intervene in the process. Voted in favor. Erick Berglund will contact Gerald Coogan to respond.

OTHER BUSINESS

Kate Hartnett expressed concern regarding recent invoices being billed to applicants from Keach Nordstrom.

Fred McGarry moved and Peter Schibbelhute seconded to grant permission to Kate Hartnett to speak with Steve Keach regarding invoices billed to Shelly Tetreault. Voted in favor.

CONTRACT PROPOSAL; GERALD COOGAN

Peter Schibbelhute moved and William Perron seconded to approve a six month contract for Gerald Coogan , with a payment of \$1250.00 per month. voted in favor.

A performance review will be held on February 24, 2016.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Peter Schibbelhute moved and Kate Hartnett seconded to approve the minutes of November 18, 2015.

The following corrections were made to the minutes:

Page 2 Paragraph 4; Correct to read "...if conservation land had been specifically set aside in the previous subdivision."

Page 2 Paragraph 7: Correct to read "...not 7 acres as proposed."

Page 2 Paragraph 8: Correct to read "...referred to the Town's Open Space Plan in this development location showing green infrastructure). She stressed the importance of minimizing fragmentation further."

Page 3 Paragraph 6: Correct to read "...of the existing gravel.. Mr. Chadwick replied it was in good condition on the existing access road."

Chair McGarry called for a vote on the motion. Motion carries.

Peter Schibbelhute moved and Kate Hartnett seconded to approve the minutes of December 9, 2015. The following corrections were made to the minutes;

Page 2 Last Paragraph: Correct to read "...on the subdivision road."

Page 3; Paragraph 5: Correct to read "...with an estimated number of three poles located on the subdivision road."

Page 3 Paragraph 5: "...Strike utility trench sheet but show

detail sharing underground power going to homes.

..."...from corner of proposed project to Thurston Pond Road."

Page 4 Paragraph 3 Correct to read "...by 18 inches wide with carvings marked above."

Page 4 Paragraph 6 Correct to read "...elevation of 600 feet and drops down to 560 feet."

Page 4 Paragraph 8 Correct to read "...full perimeter survey."

Page 5 Paragraph 4 Correct to read "...in this well drained...."

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