

## PLANNING BOARD

Monday, November 13, 2006  
Belmont Corner Meeting House  
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Chairman P. Harris; J. Pike, G. Flack (7:06), W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden and R. Caldwell.  
Alternates Present: C. Long.  
Alternates Absent: C. Shibles.  
Staff: C. Daigle, R. Ball and E. Murphy.

The chairman opened the meeting at 7 p.m. and appointed C. Long as a voting member for tonight's meeting.

### **BOARD'S ACTION-MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by R. Caldwell, it was voted to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2006, meeting as submitted. (7-0)

### **STAFF REPORT:**

#### **SUNSET ROCK TAX LOT 235-038 & 235-039:**

The chairman signed the Sunset Rock merger plan.

G. Flack entered the meeting and C. Long stepped down as a voting member.

### **LAND USE INFORMATION:**

J. Marden wanted to know if land use staff could generate a list of people who come to the office inquiring about possible future development. The Board discussed the possible ramifications of listing all land use inquiries. If someone is just coming in to inquire about possibly buying property and wanting to know what they can do with it having that put on a list could affect the purchase price. R. Caldwell stated that he is against the list because it could provide the Board with information prior to an application coming before the Board and it may be construed that they are prejudging the application. J. Marden explained that he just wants to be aware of possible future development and doesn't need to know the name of the applicants. Mr. George Condodemetraky stated that it is public knowledge and he sees no problem with the Board knowing about inquiries. P. Harris stated that when people are ready to go public and want the Board's input they come to the Board for an informal discussion or design review. That process works well. J. Marden reiterated that he just wanted a list of what people are



lots.

He discussed proposed Article 6. B.5 giving a density bonus allowing up to 20% more building lots for providing exceptional public benefits. C. Daigle stated it came as a recommendation from the Conservation Commission. J Marden wanted to know the difference between the proposed Article 6 Table 3 and the current regulations concerning the percentage of total lot required to permanently remain open to qualify for the density bonus. C. Daigle stated that in the residential multifamily zone currently it is 25% proposed 50%, residential single family zone is 25% proposed is 50%, rural zone is 50% proposed is 60% and the village zone is 25% proposed 40%. J. Marden wanted to know how many lots in the overlay district are in each district. R. Ball stated that he hasn't done the figures but most are in the rural zone. A significant portion is on Bean Hill and Brown Hill Roads which are in the rural zone. C. Daigle stated the overlay zone is where you would have to do an open space subdivision in lots over 20 acres. A lot of the developers are already doing open space developments to preserve land. Most of the buildable area is built out to the maximum and the remaining is significantly undevelopable due to the land lay out. P. Harris stated that they should be sticking to numbers that are substantiated. We should be in line with what is happening around us. R. Ball stated the figures came from other ordinances that work well. He stated that since he has worked in Belmont most large lots have gone with open space developments.

C. Daigle stated they are also recommending some standard amendments defining who owns open space and who manages it. J. Marden stated they should have developers do a study for co-occurrence. C. Daigle stated the Board has the authority to do it and they have been doing some independent studies. W. Peterson stated that the Conservation Commission also has been doing that study. R Ball stated that it is based on only a few particular sites and wildlife. C. Daigle wanted to know if Fish & Game can locate wildlife. W. Peterson stated that they locate wildlife not their habitats.

J. Pike stated that he would like to strike "20% more" building lots from the density bonus. He doesn't want to get caught up in the numbers but wants the ability to look at each individual proposal. C. Daigle stated the public could have concerns that without a certain percentage it would give the Planning Board too much control. J. Pike stated the density bonus would depend on what exceptional public benefit the developer wants to give the town. He doesn't want to be locked into a maximum number. Without a given percentage the Board would be able to look on each application on a case by case basis. J. Marden stated it may be just as easy to eliminate the density bonus and leave it in the table. C. Daigle stated that requiring open space subdivision without compensation isn't going to work. The Planning Board would have to negotiate with developers to protect the community.

J. Marden discussed having just a residential overlay. R. Ball stated that there may be areas in other zones that may have significant value. J. Marden suggested revising the existing standards for permanently protected open spaces. W. Peterson stated that conserving land along the Tioga River corridor is important. C. Daigle stated the density bonus encourages developers to do open space developments. R. Ball stated that if the Planning Board has the authority to negotiate on the density bonus then it should be throughout the town not only in the overlay zone. C. Daigle suggested keeping the density bonus throughout the town for projects that provide exceptional public benefit. J. Marden stated that forest land would be a significant benefit. W. Peterson stated that it is a definite benefit for







Respectfully submitted,

---

Elaine M Murphy  
Administrative Assistant