

PLANNING BOARD

Monday, July 11, 2005
Belmont Corner Meeting House
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Chairman P. Harris; J. Pike, C. Patten and J. Marden.
Members Absent: G. Flack and W. Peterson.
Alternates Absent: C. Shibles and C. Gilbert.
Staff: C. Daigle, R. Ball and E. Murphy.
Board of Selectmen: B. Watterson, R. Caldwell (also PB ex officio member) and R. Cormier.
Staff: Town Administrator D. McLelland and Administrative Assessor J. Beaudin.

The Planning Board chairman opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Public Meeting Concord Street Sidewalk

P. Harris welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that this is the first visual meeting for the proposed Concord Street sidewalk. This meeting is to give the public a chance to voice their concerns and opinions. He explained that this is a joint meeting of the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen and the Board of Selectmen are in charge of project.

Mr. Bill Stack stated that he works for Steve Smith Associates who are in charge of designing the project. He outlined the project stating that the current sidewalk design will run on the westerly side of Concord Street from the middle school, Memorial Drive, almost out to Rte 106. The sidewalk is proposed for the westerly side of Concord Street because of the steep slopes at the beginning of the project adjacent to the new housing project. The drainage problems along Concord Street were also taken into consideration when deciding which side of the road the sidewalk would be on. He explained that at the beginning of the sidewalk, heading toward Rte 106, the first 700' would have granite curbing then from that point on there would be a grass panel to the end. Toward the end of the sidewalk where the guardrails are located the sidewalk will run in front of the guardrails. The road would be relocated slightly to the east. Catch basins will be installed to improve the drainage. He explained that they are still in the designing phase of the project. He continued outlining the project using the pictures R. Ball supplied showing Concord Street, the houses and proposed changes.

P. Harris stated that the Planning Board is aware of the flooding and drainage problems on Concord Street within the sidewalk area and those will be corrected as part of this project. Mr. George Condodemetraky stated the drainage problem is not from Concord Street but from Rte 106. He has written letters to the town and state about this situation. There is a culvert on Rte 106 and just south of it there is a catch basin. He suggested that they plug the culvert making the water run to the catch basin to eliminate the problems.

Mr. Tom Roy explained that he owns property on the corner of Main Street and Concord Street and

every time there are heavy rains he has water in his cellar. He has a drain in the middle of his driveway. He keeps that drain clean as well as the three drains across the street. The drains fill up with sand and clog. When the drains clog the water goes over the swale and over the top and floods his yard. His garage doors have braces to prevent them from caving in. Selectman Brian Watterson wanted to know if the drainage is inadequate or is it lack of proper maintenance. Mr. Roy stated that maintenance will improve the situation but will not solve the drainage problems. Mr. Condodemetraky stated the drains are below the surface and the catch basins need to be raised up and paved.

Mr. Earl Sweeney stated that he is opposed to the sidewalk as proposed because of the negative impact it will have on the older houses. Those houses were built 100 years ago and are close to the road. The road was designed for horse and carriages. His lot is 50' x 100' and he can't put a legal driveway in to the rear because it would encroach on abutters. In the spring of 2004 he looked into having his front yard paved when he noticed a surveyor had put stakes in his front yard. He applied for and received a driveway permit. The town also continued with the sidewalk project. He is concerned that the sidewalk would have little use since the people continue to walk in the street even where there are sidewalks. The sidewalk would also have to be maintained and plowed. The existing sidewalk is on the easterly side of Concord Street and they would have to cross the street to get to the westerly side of the road. There are utilities poles on the westerly side that would have to be removed and relocated. He suggested that the road be straighten out allowing ample room for the sidewalk. He is concerned about the sharp corner near Rte 106 and people skidding on ice and going over the sidewalk. Having the sidewalk on the westerly side of the road reduces his front yard and he would have no place to shovel the snow. He would not be allowed to park his cars in front of his house because they would overhang the sidewalk.

Mr. Sweeney submitted photos showing where he parks his cars and the snow stacked up in front of his house. He stated that because of the curvature of the road there would be more room for the sidewalk on the easterly side of the road once the embankments are removed. He reiterated the fact that utility poles would have to be removed, and the fact that the curve of the road creates a hazardous situation because of possible skidding across the sidewalk due to the ice in the winter. He also stated that because of his lot size it is impossible for him to have a legal driveway because of the proximity to the Parent Brother's property line.

Mr. Tom Carroll stated that he owns property at 38 Concord Street and if they put the sidewalk on the westerly side of Concord Street he will lose his front yard putting his house directly on the sidewalk. He stated that there is plenty of room on the other side of the street. He owns property on the east side of Concord street and wouldn't mind having the sidewalk on that side.

P. Harris stated that the town's concern is for the safety of those who walk on Concord Street. The 1992 Master Plan states that when the Post Office was relocated they would put in a sidewalk.

Mr. Carroll wanted to know why they want to put the sidewalk on the westerly side of road when they already have one on the other side by Memorial Street. P. Harris explained that because of the steep slopes and granite. Also Belmont Garage showed a hardship because there would be no place to park his vehicles. Mr. Carroll stated that he also would have a hardship because he would have no front yard and that is a safety issue because his grandchild lives in that house. Mr. Sweeney stated that Belmont Garage has more room than the rest of them have. He also stated that while they are talking about safety he would like to address the fact that

the street lights along Concord Street have been shut off. If the Boards are concerned about safety they should do something about the lights.

Mr. Condodemetraky stated that he agreed with Mr. Sweeney that the curve near Rte 106 is dangerous in the winter. The side that the sidewalk should go on depends on how many people would have a hardship. The houses on the westerly side of the road are closer to road. He owns property on the east side and said it would be fine on that side.

B. Watterson wanted to know how they decided to propose the westerly sidewalk. Mr. Stack stated the one of the reasons was because of the speed vehicles come off Rte 106 when entering Concord Street. R. Caldwell wanted to know why they can't put a crosswalk in rather than take the front yards of the houses on the westerly side of the street. The sidewalk beyond Memorial Drive is on the easterly side. R. Ball explained that they have been looking at the other side of the street as an option. B. Watterson wanted to know if Mr. Carroll has property on both sides of Concord Street. Mr. Carroll stated that he does and would rather lose some of his front yard on the easterly side of Concord Street than on the westerly side. Mr. Stack stated that the sidewalk would be totally in the town's ROW. J. Marden suggested that they go past the steep slopes to where the drainage issue is and then put the crosswalk in. J. Pike stated that the sight distance on the easterly side is better and the sidewalk would have less of an impact. C. Patten wanted to know where they are proposing to relocate the utility poles. Mr. Stack stated that only one pole had to be relocated and they would be behind the panel of the sidewalk. Mr. Condodemetraky wanted to know how they would plow the sidewalks if they are too narrow or the poles are too close. Mr. Bob Bennett stated that there was room to plow.

J. Marden wanted to know if there is a significant cost difference to have the sidewalk on the easterly side. Mr. Stack stated that there wouldn't be a significant difference. B. Watterson stated that the town has received a petition from Mr. Sweeney that they would like to bring forward tonight. He stated that he would like Mr. Stack to do some more work on designing the sidewalk to reflect what the residents of Concord Street want. He wanted to know if they would need easements if the sidewalk was on the easterly side. Mr. Stack stated that easements would be needed for either side of the road but they may need less slope easements for the easterly side.

Town Administrator, Don McLelland, wanted to know why the committee directed Mr. Stack to design the sidewalk on the west side of Concord Street. R. Ball explained that the main reason was to keep people from Sandy Ledge Development from crossing the road near the Rte 106 intersection because of the speed vehicles travel at in that area. Mr. Stack also stated that the sidewalks would have to be wider over the culvert crossings. They also considered the drainage problems on Concord Street and they could be addressed with this design. J. Marden noted it was also the recommendation of the Traffic Consultant.

It was the consensus of the Board of Selectmen to have Planning staff work with Mr. Stack to design a sidewalk on the easterly side of Concord Street. Another public meeting will be scheduled with the new proposal.

Mr. Roy wanted to know if there is any money from other sources so they could incorporate the drainage issues on Main Street and Concord Street as part of the project. B. Watterson stated they would look into Mr. Roy's concerns. J. Pike wanted to know who would contact the State about blocking the drain on Rte

106. The Board of Selectmen instructed R. Ball to contact the State about the drainage issue.

Mr. Condodemetraky wanted to know the cost of the project. C. Daigle stated that it is estimated at \$100,000, \$38,500 of the cost is being paid by Sandy Ledge Development and money has been put in the Capital Reserve Account for the project. They have to use the money by 2009 or it is returned to the developer. J. Marden wanted to know if the money could be used for street lights. B. Watterson stated that he would look into it.

P. Harris thanked the public for their input tonight and stated that there will be a meeting in the future to discuss the new proposal.

B. Watterson stated that early this year the Board of Selectmen and the Planning Board agreed to do a joint housing study. The Board of Selectmen has received a contract from Applied Economic Research to do the study and they are comfortable with the contract with the minor change to include the Board of Selectmen in briefings

MOTION: R. Caldwell made the motion to accept the contract between Board of Selectmen and Applied Economic Research with the amendment to include briefing the BOS as each session is completed. The cost of the study is \$32,500. He further authorized the chairman B. Watterson to sign the contract.

The motion was seconded by R. Cormier and carried (3-0)

The Board of Selectmen adjourned at 7:51.P.M. R. Caldwell joined the Planning Board as the Board of Selectmen's representative.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- A. **Design review plan discussion – Winnisquam Marine:** Discussion for a site plan for outdoor boat trailer parking. Property is located on Paquette Drive, Tax Lot 104-008 in the "C" Zone. PB # 1805.
- B. **Design review plan discussion – Winnisquam Marine:** Discussion for a site plan for a boat storage building. Property is located on Paquette Drive, Tax Lot 104-008 in the "C" Zone. PB # 1905.

Atty. Stephan Nix and Mr. Ed Crawford presented the design review plan and combined both plans.

Atty. Nix stated that the property is 1.5 acres located at the end of Paquette Drive. Currently it is a field with a shed on it. The road has been paved to just before the last two houses on the road. The first phase of the project is to utilize the field for parking boat trailers. No boats will be stored on the property. The use is a very low impact use. The second phase is to construct a building. The lot is in the aquifer and had very sandy soils and drainage is not a problem. During the first phase, the storage of trailers, no earth work will be done. When the building is constructed there will be drainage issues that will need to be addressed. The aquifer is not a big issue with the trailer parking but they want to know how to handle

the aquifer for Phase 2. P Harris wanted to know what type of trailers would be stored in the field. Mr. Crawford stated that they would be new or used boat trailers or yard trailers. There will be no boats. P. Harris wanted to know if that is where customers would park their trailers. Mr. Crawford stated that they would not. J. Marden wanted to know if the town plows the road. Mr. Roger Fortin stated that they do.

J. Pike stated that if they are already using the field for parking what do they want from the Board. C. Daigle stated that they are already using the field but are in violation and have been cited for it. Atty. Nix stated that the approval process is long and that is why they are doing it in two phases. Mr. Crawford stated that he bought the property and never thought it would take so long for approval. He has done site plans before and the process wasn't this long. C. Daigle stated that the Regulations haven't changed recently and applications don't take any longer than previous approvals if all the required information is submitted to the Board.

Atty. Nix used a power point presentation to show the magnitude of the project and how the natural buffer has remained. Mr. Crawford stated that he has walked the property and there is no erosion on the property.

Ms. Donna Fletcher wanted to know if there would be any gates or fences around the property. She owns the old Sharp farm and allows neighbors to cross the field and would like that to continue. Mr. Crawford stated that they would still be allowed to cross the property as they currently do now

The building plan will be a 50' x 139' three sided four story building. The floor will be concrete. R. Caldwell wanted to know if the concrete will be going up the side of the walls. Mr. Crawford stated that there would be the usual frost wall about 1' creating a sump. The concrete will be on three sides with the front open. The Board discussed the concrete floor and protecting the aquifer. It was suggested that they grade the front to protect the aquifer from leaks and drainage. Mr. Crawford stated that it is not hard to design a 6" lip similar to a speed bump. There would be 4 bays with 16 storage area in each bay. J. Pike suggested that an oil and water separator be put in to protect the aquifer. Mr. Crawford stated that boats have sophisticated fuel systems to prevent leaks. J. Marden stated that it is a four story building and there is a 45' high restriction. Mr. Crawford stated the building is 32' high.

R Ball wanted to know if this is valet parking of boats. Mr. Crawford stated that they never did valet parking, this will be for long term storage only. P. Harris was concerned about the winter storage. C. Daigle stated that the area will have to be maintained for emergency access. Atty. Nix stated that they would have to plow around the building and have a hammer head for town trucks to turn around. He stated that the plan shows a second entrance but from an engineering stand point it won't work so they will only have one access from Paquette Drive. C. Daigle wanted to know the status of Paquette Drive as it is similar to Dupont Road. How will the maintenance be done? Will they meet the terms of the 1955 petition to accept the road as long as it is a 2 rod road?

C. ALTERNATE MEMBER INTERVIEW.

Mr. James Dwyer stated that he is interested in helping out the Planning Board. He has a Masters

Degree and has worked with the Attorney General in Massachusetts. He has worked for the government as Director of Contracts. He also has a certificate in family mediation and also does divorce mediation as well. He was a financial analyst. J. Marden wanted to know his definition of rural character. Mr. Dwyer stated that he is not sure how to describe it. C. Patten wanted to know if Mr. Dwyer was interested in being an alternate member. He stated he is interested. C. Patten wanted to know if he would run to become a full Board member. Mr. Dwyer stated that he would. He submitted a copy of his resume. P. Harris stated that the Board will review his resume and thanked him for his interest in the Planning Board.

D. BOARD'S ACTION-MINUTES:

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by J. Pike, it was voted to approve the minutes of the June 27, 2005, meeting with the following changes:

On page 10 paragraph three should read "J. Marden stated that they will have to get permits to cross the wetlands and a State highway permit for a curb cut."

The motion passed (4-0-1). R. Caldwell abstained.

STAFF REPORT:

A. HANDOUTS:

The Board received the DOT letter concerning the upgrade meeting to Winnisquam Bridge. They also received copies of *Spotlight on Belmont*.

B. TRAILS:

J. Pike stated there is a logging trail on his property from Swallow Road to Province Road and he is willing to give an easement to use it in order for the trail system to continue. This is a good trail system and goes directly across from Ambrose pits. C. Daigle stated that she will contact the clubs to see if they are interest in it. J. Marden stated that the Boggie Busters and the ATV club may be interested as it would allow them to connect to Edwards Road. He stated that usually the pit owners don't mind then using pits as long as they don't use the pit roads.

C. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP):

C. Daigle explained that letter have been sent to Department heads and letters will be sent to members who worked on the CIP last year inviting them to work on the CIP again this year.

D. FIRE PROTECTION:

C. Daigle explained that she has talked to the Fire Chief and would like to invite him to the August worksession to discuss the different types of fire protection. He will explain why certain systems work better than others in different situations. The Board agreed that this would be a good opportunity for them to understand what the fire department requires and what the different types of fire protection are.

E. PLANNING PROJECTS:

C. Daigle explained that the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen agreed to have a housing study done and the cost would be \$32,500. She has talked to the Town Administrator about the funding of this project. There is some money available in the Master Plan budget and she wanted to know if the Board would be willing to take the money out of that account. Money for the traffic study would be withheld and community survey could be appropriated in the upcoming budget. J. Marden wanted to know if the housing study included any methodology for impact fees. C. Daigle explained that it does not but the data he collects can be used towards that project.

It was the consensus of the Board to use the extra Master Plan money to pay for the housing study as that project is on the Planning Boards list to do and can be used to complete the Master Plan Housing Chapter.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by J. Pike, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 9:21p.m.
(5-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine M Murphy
Administrative Assistant