

PLANNING BOARD

Monday, October 17, 2005
Belmont Corner Meeting House
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Chairman P. Harris; J. Pike, G. Flack (6:50), W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden and R. Caldwell.
Alternates Present: C. Shibles.
Alternates Absent: C. Gilbert.
Staff: C. Daigle, R. Ball and E. Murphy.

The chairman opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP):

P. Harris explained that the CIP has been approved by the CIP committee and forwarded to the Planning Board for their approval and then to be forwarded to the Budget Committee and Board of Selectmen. The CIP committee and the town departments have been working hard and have made changes and updated the CIP.

J. Marden stated that he is concerned that the \$25,000 the Conservation Commission is requesting to preserve open space is not enough. He stated that they may be looking at some prime conservation land and that may not be enough money to purchase the land. He is not sure if the land could be subdivided for acquisition and used for a police and town facility. He is not sure if combining the Police Department which employs about 17 people and the Town Hall which has about 15 employees is the best scenario. Other towns that have joint facilities are trying to get out of that situation because of added space needed because of growth. The Town Hall may want to consider a joint facility with the school because room is only needed for staff unlike the police department which needs room for cruisers, holding area etc. J. Marden said he would prefer to see the Conservation Commission drop the \$25,000 request and go for a one or two million bond to purchase property and have the town build a facility on that site. C. Daigle explained that the Conservation Commission has not brought that proposal forth. J. Marden stated that at the Commission level there has been a lot of discussion. If the land is valuable then the town should look at it for the building possibility. P. Harris explained that the CIP Committee puts the figures in the schedule and puts a value on. It is not the job of CIP Committee to put figures in without backing and a study. The Conservation Commission has to make that determination. J. Marden stated that the facility design is in the CIP and it is his opinion that with the town growing the joint building with the Police Department and Town Hall might not be the right way to go because the Police Department keeps growing. Talking to the school about a joint facility between them and Town Hall is a good idea. C. Daigle stated that they have talked to school during the previous study and they were not interested at that time. Mr. Brian Watterson, Board of Selectmen, stated that there will be a joint meeting with the School Board in

November and they will discuss it with them at that time. J. Marden stated that the Conservation Commission's request for \$25,000 is not unreasonable but he would like to see it higher. J. Pike wanted to know if J. Marden was suggesting that a bond be turned over to the Conservation Commission without having any criteria. J. Marden stated that there have been studies done on the value of preserving land. J. Pike stated that they have to come forward with a certain tract and a recommendation to preserve it. J. Marden stated that the Conservation Commission has gone into non-public session with land owners to purchase properties. J. Pike stated then they have to come forth with a certain tract of land to purchase because you cannot sell the unknown. C. Daigle explained that some towns have put money aside in case a piece of property becomes available. The other way is to come in when they identify a certain tract of land they want to purchase. J. Marden stated that to save substantial land they will need substantial money. The money in the Conservation fund may not be enough. J. Pike stated that the voters need to see a specific piece of land that needs to be preserved before they will approve the funds. J. Marden stated that they should bring it forward and let the voters decide.

G. Flack entered the meeting at 6:50 PM.

The Planning Board discussed who prioritizes the CIP and C. Daigle explained that the voters are the ones who ultimately prioritize it but the CIP committee does prioritize by scheduling over 6 years. It is the Planning Board's duty to hold the Public Hearing and take input from the public. P. Harris stated that there are no more comments from the public. He wanted to know if the budget has to be available to prioritize the CIP. C. Daigle explained that the Budget Committee will look at the individual requests and how they affect them this year. CIP is a planning tool. The CIP is developed then sent to the Board of Selectmen then it goes to the Budget committee and finally to the voters.

MOTION: J. Marden moved to amend the Conservation Commission's preservation fund to \$2,000,000.

There was no second.

W. Peterson moved to approve the CIP as written.

The motion was seconded by C. Patten and carried (5-1) J. Marden opposed.

TRAFFIC STUDY:

Mr. Stephen Pernaw presented a traffic study to the Board for the BBE Realty, Amily, Johngis, Terra Firma/Carousel Homes and Realty Resources. The study area includes Rte 106/Brown Hill Road, Rte 106/Farrarville Road, Rte 107/Brown Hill Road and Rte 107/proposed Upper Parish Settlement Drive extension. BBE Realty subdivision consists of 34 single family homes, Terra Firma/ Carousel is for 44 single family homes, Amily subdivision is for 24 single family homes and Johngis is a 47 unit single family subdivision. Realty Resources is for a 32 unit multi family apartment complex.

Mr. Pernaw explained that the study area is Brown Hill Road and its intersections. The traffic study will be with and without the through connection created by Terra Firma/Carousel. He stated that Brown Hill Road is a two lane town maintained collector roadway that extends between Rte 106 on the west and Rte 107 on the east. The

pavement width ranges from 20' to 28' and the unpaved shoulders vary in width and run on both sides of the road. The road has no pavement markings and has a posted speed limit of 30 MPH. Combined Brown Hill Road and Farrarville Road has three access/egress points. There are approximately 227 dwellings in the area that rely on these access points. The proposed extension of Upper Parish Settlement Drive to Rte 107 will create a fourth access point.

Rte 106 is a two lane highway that extends in a north/south direction on the west side of the study area. The pavement in the vicinity of the study area is 36'-38' wide with a 4" double yellow line and 4' single white lines. The speed limit is 50 MPH. In the vicinity of the Farrarville Road intersection the road width is approximately 59' with a left turn lane for southbound traffic turning onto Farrarville Road and a northbound left turn lane onto Lamprey Road. The shoulders in that area are between 10' & 11'.

Rte 107 is a two lane highway that extends in a north/south direction to the east of the study area. The pavement width in the vicinity of Brown Hill Road is approximately 30' and is delineated with a 4" double yellow line and 4" single white edge lines. Paved 3'-5' shoulders are along both sides of the road. The posted speed limit is 40 MPH.

The intersection of Rte 106 & Brown Hill Road has a stop sign on Brown Hill Road. The travel lane configuration is one shared through/ right lane northbound, one shared through/left lane southbound and one shared left-right lane westbound.

The intersection of Rte 106 & Farrarville Road & Lamprey Road has stop signs at the two minor approaches. The travel lane configuration is one exclusive left-turn lane, one shared through right lane northbound. One exclusive left-turn lane, one shared through right lane southbound. One shared left-through-right lane eastbound. One shared left-through-right lane westbound.

Mr. Pernaw explained that there are State traffic counters on Brown Hill Road over the Tioga River and Rte 106 north of Brown Hill Road. The average daily traffic volume on Rte 106 is 12,429 vehicles with peak levels during the AM and PM commuter hours. Mr. Pernaw installed two additional traffic counters on Brown Hill Road, one over the Tioga River and the other west of Rte 107. The average daily traffic count was 1,304 vehicles over the Tioga River and 498 west of Rte 107. The peak morning traffic on Brown Hill Road ranged from 86 trips at the west end near Rte 106 and 30 trips on Brown Hill Road at the east end near Rte 107. At the west end of Brown Hill Road the predominant traffic flow was in the westbound direction towards Rte 106 and the east end of Brown Hill Road, the directional traffic flows were balanced. Rte 106 carried 1,050 vehicles (north of Farrarville Road) and 1,029 vehicles (south of Brown Hill Road) during peak AM hours. Rte 107 carried 237 vehicles (north of Brown Hill Road). The peak afternoon hours had traffic flow on Brown Hill Road ranging from 107 trips at the west end by Rte 106 to 45 trips at the east end by Rte 107. At the west end of Brown Hill Road the predominant traffic flows was 67% in the eastbound direction away from Rte 106. At the east end of Brown Hill Road, the directional traffic flows were slightly higher in the westbound direction away from Rte107. Rte 106 has 1,416 vehicles (north of Farrarville Road) and 1,411 vehicles (south of Brown Hill Road) during PM peak hour and Rte 107 carried 2999 vehicles (north of Brown Hill Road).

The traffic turning patterns at Rte 106 and Brown Hill Road are to/from points south on Rte 106. The left-turn

departures and right-turn arrivals are the major traffic movements. At the Farrarville Road and Rte 106 intersection the predominant patterns are to/from points north on Rte 106. Rte 107 and Brown Hill Road intersection turns are primarily to/from points north.

Mr. Pernaw explained that the posted speed is 30 MPH but the mean speed is 42 MPH. There have been 33 crashes in the study area between 2002 to July 2005. Most were single car accidents. The highest frequency of accidents occurred between Farrarville Road and Wild Acres Road and those involved sliding off the road during snow/ice covered roads. The accidents at the intersection of Rte 106 and Brown Hill Road revealed that three vehicles drove off the road, two because of snow/ice conditions. One involved a vehicle colliding with a bicycle. Three crashes involved two vehicles and one rear-end crash.

Mr. Pernaw estimated the number of trips generated by the new developments would be as follows: BBE 28 trips during AM peak hours and 37 trips during PM peaks hours. Terra Firma 33 trips during AM peak and 44 during the PM peak hours. Amily would be 19 trips during the AM peak hours and 24 during PM peak hours. Johngis would be 35 trips during AM peak hours and 47 trips PM peak hours. Realty Resources would have 16 trips during AM peak hours and 20 trips during PM peak hours. If the extension of Upper Parish Settlement Drive is completed it will alter the travel patterns of existing trips in the residential area that lies between Rte 106 & Rte 107. With the buildout the overall utilization of Rte 106 & Brown Hill Road intersection will increase by approximately 104 vehicles-trips during the PM peak hour. The net impacts at the Rte 106 & Farrarville Road intersection and at the Rte 107 and Brown Hill Road intersections are minimal in terms of overall intersection utilization. The impact summary shows that during PM peak hours for 2006 there would be 112 vehicles with the no- build volume and 222 with the buildout volume east of Rte 106. At the Tioga River the no build volume would be 132 vehicles and build volume would be 248. West of Rte 107 no build volume would be 47 vehicles and build out volume would be 60 vehicles.

An analysis of the long- rang traffic projections for 2016 indicates that adding an additional lane on the Brown Hill Road approach to Rte 106 for right-turn departures is recommended, however in this case it will not improve intersection operations significantly because the right-turn volume is expected to remain low.

The results of the analysis for Rte 106/Farrarville/Lamprey Road show that currently the departure movements are well below capacity and by 2016 vehicles departing from Farrarville Road will operate at poor levels of Service during AM peak hours and PM peak hours. The analysis also confirms that single approach lanes on each leg of each intersection are sufficient from a traffic capacity standpoint.

The results of the analysis for the Rte 107 and Brown Hill Road intersection demonstrate that there is ample capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes. It also confirms that single approach lanes on each leg of each intersection are sufficient.

Rte 107 at Upper Parish Settlement Drive Extension demonstrates that there is ample capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes through 2016 and beyond.

The analysis of Rte 106 & Brown Hill Road intersection indicates that no special treatment is currently warranted to accommodate left-turn from Rte 106. However, with the additional vehicles from the

developments the analysis shows that a bypass lane should be provided at this intersection. An analysis of the Rte 106 and Brown Hill Road intersection confirms that the exiting shared through-left lane is sufficient for the anticipated traffic volumes.

The analysis of the study area intersections revealed that an exclusive right-turn lane is warranted on Rte 106 at the Brown Hill Road intersection,. The other study area intersections do not require special treatment to accommodate right-turns from the major street at these intersections. At the proposed intersection of Rte 107 with the extension of Upper Parish Settlement Drive, a shared through-right lane is sufficient.

Mr. Pernaw stated that the analysis indicates that the eight-hour traffic signal warrants will not be satisfied based on extra population of the four- hour data. Post-development traffic volumes should be monitored to determine if the resultant traffic volumes meet the four-hour or eight-hour criteria for signalization.

Mr. Pernaw stated that he evaluated the sight distance at the intersections on Brown Hill Road. The intersection of Sargent Lake Road and Brown Hill Road are adequate. Brown Hill Road and Upper Parish Settlement Drive to the left could be improved by trimming and maintaining the roadside vegetation that exists within the roadway right of way. The view from the proposed subdivision road intersection and Rte 107 can be improved by trimming the roadside vegetation along the east side of the highway. The intersections of Brown Hill Road and Grimstone Drive has excellent sight distance. At Brown Hill Road and Wild Acres Road the roadside vegetation should be trimmed to maximize the available sight distance.

He explained that the current road width is a 22' traveled way and based on traffic volumes it would be desirable to have a road width of 24' with an 8' graded shoulders on each side of the road.

J. Marden wanted to know if there is any traffic count information for Rte 107. Mr. Pernaw stated that there were no traffic recorders on Rte 107 but there are about 300 cars at peak hours and about 3000 cars a day. J. Marden wanted to know if the proposed through road from Upper Parish Settlement to Rte 107 would need an auxiliary turn lane. Mr. Pernaw stated that it would not need a turn lane. J. Pike wanted to know if NH DOT gets involved at the State's intersections. Mr. Pernaw stated that they do and the Board of Selectmen would have to be the applicant as part of the upgrade to Brown Hill Road and Farrarville Road intersections with Rte 106. J. Marden wanted to know if the curves are taken into consideration when determining the speed of Brown Hill Road. Mr. Pernaw said they do not but he noted that there are no pavement markings and they could put in a double yellow line and narrow 10' fog lines which act as calming factors. P. Harris stated that the width of Brown Hill Road runs from 20'-28' and the new pavement is 22'. W. Peterson wanted to know if Mr. Pernaw recommends widening the heavy traffic area. Mr. Pernaw stated that it would be a logical place to begin.

Mr. Dennis Prescott, Amily Development, wanted to know how long the right turn lane would be. Mr. Pernaw stated it would be 200'. Mr. Roger Roy wanted to know if there is a warning sign for steep grades. Mr. Pernaw stated there is no sign but residents know the road. They could put in a reverse curve sign where the "S" turn towards Rte 107 is.

Mr. Jim Bolduc stated that with the connector road from Upper Parish Settlement Road the 48 MPH is recorded for today's volume and with the five developments there could be a significant reduction in speed because of the

increase in volume. He stated the reality is that not all of the five subdivisions could reach full build out. The need to look at triggers for improvements when certain criteria are met without waiting for full build out. Mr. Pernaw agreed that with an increase in volume speeds may be reduced. He stated that not all subdivisions will reach build out but he would like to think that by 2016 they would be. The bypass lane is close to being needed now, the right turn lane trigger has already been met and the traffic signal will be needed but it is not imminent.

The Board thanked Mr. Pernaw for his informative presentation.

IMPACT OF PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS IN BELMONT:

Mr. Russ Thibeault, Applied Economic Research, explained that he has done an economic development analysis on BBE Realty, Amily Development, Johngis and Sun Lake. He thanked C. Daigle for providing him with a lot of data needed. He explained that he looked at growth and taxes in Belmont, the housing needs and impact of proposed residential development. He also stated that Mr. Bruce Mayberry is doing an impact study. He has studied the four proposed developments and what their impact will be on the community. He has studied the perspectives on growth, the Town's municipal financial trends, school enrollment and the impact of the current proposals.

Mr. Thibeault explained that Belmont's population has tripled since 1970 while the State's doubled. Belmont is growing faster than the State and the county. Belmont adds 50 units per year but that pace has increased. They are receiving about 10% of the permits for county. Belmont has added 352 units since 2000. The NH Office of Energy and Planning anticipates that it will continue to grow at a fast pace.

The second factor he looked at was the Town's municipal finance trends. Since 1994 the town expenditures including the schools funding has doubled. Both the town and school spending has increased sharply which coincides with growth. With rising population people expect more services. Spending per capita has doubled. Spending on the school and the town level is increasing rapidly because they are providing more services. Growth plus the quality of services and inflation are factors in the rising expenditures. He used the introduction of kindergarten as an example of increase in services. Also the number of staff required now to handle the daily functions of the town as opposed to those needed ten years ago. There are major capital expenditures that lie ahead and are outlined in the CIP. These are things that are needed. Belmont is at the point that things need to be expanded and has a number of capacity issues. Revenue requirements are projected to nearly double by 2010, this is reasonable and in part will be reflected in a 37% rise in the tax rate. Belmont is financially stressed by growth and the need for more services.

The other factor Mr. Thibeault looked at is school enrollment. School enrollment has been essentially stable since 1993. School age population is less than a half of a child per housing unit. School enrollment from 1991 to 2000 increased. Between 2000 and 2005 school enrollment has declined. In 1997 first grade enrollment began to decline. There were fewer school kids generated in 2005. The schools' capacity is an issue as an additional 18 students would put the schools over capacity.

Mr. Thibeault stated that it is his conclusion that Belmont is expected to continue to sustain significant growth. Cumulative impacts of growth and resident expectations have stressed the capacity of the town to provide

adequate services. Many public services are at capacity and if growth continues, will probably need expansion. He explained that the study is not a precise science and he has reviewed the municipal services that are provided to the community as a whole and the cost per unit is vague because you cannot determine the cost of providing fire protection to one more housing unit. Municipal service capacity increases are large and expensive. The results are influenced by the analyst's assumptions and methodology. You have to use your best interpretation to determine if a development generates a significant surplus? Deficit? Or about breaks even? He used the tax impact model to estimate the market value and town revenues, municipal cost impacts, school enrollment, local school cost impacts. Also to identify capacity issues, develop estimates of capacity costs for proposed development and to estimate annual revenues, expenses.

Mr. Thibeault explained that all the developments have land in current use except Sun Lake Development. He explained that the estimated impact cost for Amily's Development would be \$10,044, for BBE Realty \$17,317, for Johngis \$19,095 and the estimated impact cost for Sun Lake would generate an average of \$26,881.

P. Harris stated that building \$275,000 homes in a \$100,000 neighborhood is like a two edge sword because the equity in the homes increases but so does the taxes.

Mr. Phil Brouillard stated that the prices used in the analysis for his homes should be doubled, the selling price is more like \$750,000. The development also has a private road so is less costly to the town. The only town services the development would require would be Police and Fire, therefore it would be a bigger benefit to the town.

Mr. Steve Nix wanted to know if the current use penalty is taken into consideration when determining the cost to the town. That needs to be looked at. Mr. Thibeault stated that he didn't want to commit to the current use figures as they could change. He can talk to the assessor about the current use figures on the individual lots. Mr. Nix stated that there has been talk about regional police and fire departments and he thinks this is a good idea. Mr. Thibeault stated that regionalization is more efficient.

Mr. Thibeault addressed Mr. Brouillard's concerns about private roads and stated that it would not make too much of an impact because the residents will still use the public roads throughout the town. He will change the cost of the houses for that development and run the new figures.

J. Marden stated that the lots from these developments may have fire suppression systems on them. Does this factor into the cost? Mr. Thibeault stated that it is a good idea to have a fire suppression system but it is a small financial item and doesn't factor in.

PUBLIC HEARING – BBE REALTY, LLC: Continuation of a request for open space Subdivision approval to subdivide one lot into 38 lots. Property is located off Sargent Lake Road, Tax Lot 238-004 in the "R & RS" Zones. PB # 0705

BOARD'S ACTION – BBE REALTY, LLC:

MOTION: W. Peterson moved to Table the application to October 24, 2005.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (7-0)

PUBLIC HEARING – SUN LAKE VILLAGE: Request for Subdivision approval to create a 24 lot cluster subdivision. Property is located at 631 State Route 3, Tax Lot 101-001 in the “C” Zone. PB # 1405

BOARD'S ACTION – SUN LAKE VILLAGE:

MOTION: W. Peterson moved to Table the application to October 24, 2005.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (7-0)

PUBLIC HEARING - AMILY MANAGEMENT LLC: Request for Subdivision approval to create a 23 lot cluster subdivision. Property is located on Grimstone Drive and Wild Acres Road, Tax Lot 229-024 in the “R” Zone. PB # 2605

BOARD'S ACTION –AMILY MANAGEMENT LLC:

MOTION: W. Peterson moved to Table the application to October 24, 2005.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (7-0)

BOARD'S ACTION-MINUTES:

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by J. Marden, it was voted to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2005, meeting as submitted. (7-0)

STAFF REPORT:

A. JOINT MEETING:

C. Daigle reminded the Planning Board of the joint meeting with the School Board on November 10th.

B. ANDREW P. SANBORN FARM LLC/ DURRELL MOUNTAIN ROAD LLC TAX LOT 214-009:

C. Daigle informed the Planning Board that Andrew P. Sanborn Farm LLC has filed an appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment on the Planning Board’s interpretation of the definition of frontage/access.

C. FEE SCHEDULE:

The Planning Board signed the certification form for the fee schedule adopted September 26, 2005.

D. PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING TAX LOT 122-138:

C. Daigle explained that the Board of Selectmen is proposing to demolish the old Public Works Building on Sargent Street. They are planning on replacing it with a modular office. This is a government building and is not required to meet local zoning or Site Plan Regulations.

E. PROTECTIVE WELL RADIUS:

C. Daigle explained that the Conservation Commission will meet with the Tilton/Northfield Conservation Commission to learn more about the process for extending the protective well Radius. They will then inform the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen on what additional well radius protection will involve on the part of the Town of Belmont.

F. NONPUBLIC SESSION 91 A:3II (A):

The Board went into nonpublic session at 8:55 PM. Roll call was taken. P. Harris, J. Pike, G. Flack ,W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden, R. Caldwell and C. Shibles were present.

The Board discussed employee compensation.

MOTION: J. Pike moved to come out of nonpublic session at 9:05 PM. The motion was seconded by J. Marden. (7-0).

Roll call was taken. P. Harris, J. Pike, G. Flack ,W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden, R. Caldwell and C. Shibles. No action was taken during nonpublic session.

G. IMPACT FEES:

J. Marden wanted to know if the methodology for impact fees is being worked on. C. Daigle explained that they are waiting on Bruce Mayberry’s recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by R. Caldwell, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 9:12p.m. (7-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine M Murphy
Administrative Assistant