

**Pembroke Planning Board  
(Draft)  
Tuesday, May 13, 2008**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Robert Bourque, Chairman; Alan Topliff, Vice Chairman; Kevin Krebs; Kathy Cruson; Todd Terrien; Cindy Lewis, Selectmen's Representative

**EXCUSED:** Mark Zydel, Brian Seaworth, Alternate Member

**STAFF PRESENT:** Geoff Ruggles, Town Administrator as Acting Interim Planner and Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

Chairman Bourque opened the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

**Guests**

**1. CTAP Buildout Analysis – Craig Tufts, Central NH Regional Planning Commission**

Sharon Wason, Director and Craig Tuft, GIS Analyst for the Central NH Regional Planning Commission (CRPC) introduced themselves and presented 4 maps of Pembroke: (1) Base Buildout; (2) Standard Alternative Buildout; (3) 2005 Land Use Pembroke Buildout; and (4) Existing Conditions – Pembroke Buildout. Ms. Wason explained that CRPC prepared a buildout analysis of 26 communities.

Mr. Tuft explained that in order to construct the buildout analysis for Pembroke, he took the zoning and site plan regulations, input them into a computer, and created the land use data, which then analyzed what the town will look like when all developable land is developed.

Two buildout analyses were done: A base buildout analysis which represents everything presently in the zoning codes (excluding the wetlands, floodplains, and existing conservation land). The computer placed a house on all developable land, based on the size of the zoning requirements, and created the map.

Mr. Tuft said that he created a generic buildout known as the Standard Alternative Buildout which each town received. He said that they increased the density around the center of town by a specific formula and assumed that all the NSN area could not be developed.

Ms. Wason explained that Natural Services Network (NSN) is a GIS composite layer that consists of lands which provides critical environmental services to help people live. It includes flat lands that percolate water and recharge the water supply, floodplains that provide flood storage, agricultural land for pollination, and other features that support human life. It also consists of wildlife action plan layers which preserve habitat for endangered animals and hunting animals, forested blocks of over 500 acres, and used existing conservation land that had very high values for wildlife. In total, the NSN is primarily floodplains, wetlands, wildlife action plans, prime agricultural soils, and the protective radiuses of public wells. The NSN was developed by the NH Audubon and the Jordan Institute in consultation with a number of state agencies.

The Standard Alternative Buildout omits the NSN land. The pink area is along the rivers (Merrimack & Suncook). There are 7,200 houses in both the Standard Alternative Buildout and the Base Buildout (houses), although they are arranged differently.

Ms. Wasson said that CRPC is willing to create a buildout scenario for Pembroke based on their specific guidelines. She suggested that the Board may want to examine the results of (1) maintaining the development limitations on the range roads, (2) allowing multi-family houses in place of single family houses in certain parts of Town, (3) considering cluster developments on every 50 acres of land, or (4) creating more density in certain zones if land in other areas were being saved. The possible criteria for creating the buildout analysis is broad and completely up to the Board.

Mr. Tuft said that they used the 2005 assessing data from Vision Appraisal (online) when creating the Land Use map. Multi-family dwellings were three or more units. He said that duplexes may not have been counted and were possibly treated as single family dwellings. They can make changes to the map based on the Board's criteria.

Vice Chairman Topliff noted, and Ms. Wasson agreed, that part of the process envisions helping the community understand changes in zoning that might be appropriate to manage the town.

Ms. Wasson stated that CRPC and NH Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) developed a guide book of innovative land use techniques regarding transfer development rights in NH which will be published at Christmas time.

Mr. Tuft said that he would be willing to run 2 scenarios, although he typically only runs one for each town.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said her concern was the easements on open space and the fear of how easily the extinguishing of an easement can occur. Ms. Wasson said that she has created "no development zones" similar to a conservation zone. It then would require a two-thirds vote at town meeting plus extinguishing the easement. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis is also concerned of the land being used as recreational areas. Ms. Wasson noted that usually when a town meeting votes to authorize the Planning Board to create open space, it envisions that they are saving habitats, bird sanctuaries, and farmland and not giving people more recreational areas.

Ms. Wasson said that conservation easements can be in favor of a conservation organization. A homeowners' association may retain it but the interest to ensure that it remains conservation can be given to a land trust that advocates for keeping it open.

Mr. Tufts said that the buildout maps are created as PDF files.

Chairman Bourque thanked Mr. Tufts and Ms. Wasson for their presentation and said that once the Board has discussed the topic more thoroughly, Mr. Ruggles will contact Mr. Tufts.

Chairman Bourque suggested that the Board discuss the topic with the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Ruggles pointed out that the buildout maps can be an important tool if the Board is looking for something specific.

Vice Chairman Topliff said that it does not appear that the buildout took into consideration the placement of the roads.

Ms. Cruson said that it was her recollection that at the past charette, there was a recommendation for 5-acre zoning on range roads. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that the Master Plan suggested increasing the zoning of the areas that are undeveloped and are at the center of town to 10-acres. The problem is that it decreases the value of the land when zoning is changed from 2-acres to 10-acres.

Member Topliff suggested looking at the buildout result if zoning was changed to 5-acre parcels from land northeast of Fourth Range Road (beginning at approximately Townsend's Training Farm) and zoning be unchanged from Fourth Range Road to the river.

Member Cruson wondered if the Town would be creating an area where only the wealthy can afford to live because the lots will be 5-acres.

Vice Chairman Topliff suggested work force housing areas by creating a category where developers would be allowed a credit such as a reduced lot size for building lower priced homes. He said that he thought that open space subdivision development would lend itself better to workforce housing because of the lower development costs. This would be an attempt to balance the affect of the larger parceled areas.

Mr. Ruggles noted that Pembroke has a larger-than-average number of middle-income housing (a/k/a workforce housing) compared to other surrounding towns.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis suggested asking Mr. Tufts to keep the existing line and show what a 3-acre or 5-acre buildout would look like.

Vice Chairman Topliff suggested the possibility of maintaining the 200' frontage but requiring a deeper lot? Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that the town presently has that "bowling alley" affect on Cross Country Road and it would be very difficult to re-subdivide the lots should the need arise in 20 years.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis suggested that Mr. Ruggles ask Mr. Tufts to compare the calculation at the present density level above Third Range Road to the calculations if the zoning was changed to 3 acres or 5 acres. Member Cruson suggested to also run the calculations based on 300' of frontage. The Board agreed that if Mr. Tufts can come up with figures, then the Board can decide which map they want.

## Discussion

### **2. PB Residential Driveway Standards**

- **Are there any conflicts with other Town standards?**
- **What changes should be made or additional standards should be added?**

Jim Boisvert, Public Works Director, said that the driveway standards presently in effect are working well. The only issue has been that the temporary driveway permits require that a driveway be completed within 6 months. He said that there is a \$15 fee to extend the permit for another 6-months if necessary. Mr. Boisvert said that the Town's present building inspector is doing a great job at keeping track of the driveway permits.

Chairman Bourque suggested the following changes to Chapter 198, Driveways: (1) "Road Agent" should be changed to the "Public Works Director" or the "Highway Department"; and (2) Page 4, N: replace the word "written" with the word "notarized".

Mr. Boisvert said that there is a temporary driveway permit for one resident that has been extended every 6 months for the last 3 years. Chairman Bourque said that there should be a limit to the number of extensions granted for a temporary driveway permit.

Mr. Boisvert said that many residents have a permanent driveway and a temporary driveway. The temporary driveway is usually created during construction with the intention of being discontinued once construction has been completed. Temporary driveways are usually unpaved and do not have a paved apron.

Chairman Bourque suggested that the temporary driveway permit regulation be changed to allow only one extension.

Mr. Boisvert said that the requirement for slope, drainage, and culverts for a temporary driveway are the same as a permanent driveway.

Member Krebs said that a permanent driveway must be paved and a temporary driveway does not.

There was a brief discussion about driveway runoff and the purpose of dips along the side of the road to direct water.

**The Board concluded that §198-11. Driveways, H should read as follows: “Any permanent driveway shall be paved from the edge of the pavement for a maximum width of 20’ and a minimum length of 25’ from the edge of the road before the Certificate of Occupancy is given.”**

Vice Chairman Topliff suggested the following language regarding temporary driveways: (1) that temporary driveways shall be constructed to the same standards as permanent driveways except that paving an apron not be required; (2) temporary driveway permits shall be issued for a period of 6 months and can be extended for one additional 6-month period. If the applicant wishes to continue using the temporary driveway beyond the 12-month period, it shall apply for a permanent driveway permit.

Mr. Boisvert suggested requiring a 5’ paved apron on temporary driveways in order to protect the road from edge-breakup. Selectmen’s Rep. Lewis suggested allowing Mr. Boisvert to use his discretion to allow either an extension of a temporary permit or require a 5’ paved apron on temporary driveways.

Chairman Bourque agreed that there should be language which allows the Public Works Director the authority, if it is in the best interest of the Town, to necessitate paving an apron and extending a temporary driveway permit for more than 1 yr.

**It was concluded that §198-12, C will read: “Temporary driveway permits are valid for a period of six (6) months. The Public Works Director may extend the permit for six (6) month periods and require a 5’ paved apron to protect the roadway.”**

With regard to driveway construction standards, Vice Chairman Topliff suggested there be a middle ground between driveway construction standards and construction road standards when dealing with long driveways or driveways that service more than one home.

Chairman Bourque suggested that the Public Works Director have the authority to require driveways to meet certain standards based on its length and use.

Mr. Boisvert suggested making it a requirement that he contact Fire and Police Departments as part of the requirement for sign off of the permit.

Member Cruson said that with regard to the Heiser subdivision, the Town should not allow residential driveway construction standards to be used on a driveway that is used by three houses. She said that the odds are that vehicles could be forced to pass each other and it would be difficult for more than one vehicle to get in and out of a standard width driveway. The driveway should be wider.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that a regular driveway is not wide enough for two cars to pass. Mr. Boisvert agreed, especially when a driveway is not well plowed.

**It was agreed that §198-11, C should read: Driveway construction shall be approved by the Public Works Director and have sign-off by the Fire and Police Departments.**

Mr. Ruggles said that with regard to Grace Capital Church's driveway, they needed an easement for plan approval but received no direction as to what size the driveway should be.

The Board recessed at 9:10 p.m. Chairman Bourque called the meeting to order at 9:17 p.m. Member Cruson was excused.

The Board unanimously agreed to address the traffic study by CRPC tonight and review Article X, Open Space Subdivision Provisions at the Board's next work session.

### **CRPC Traffic County Program – 2008**

The Board agreed to request a traffic count study at the following locations:

- (1) North Pembroke Road, East of Borough Road
- (2) North Pembroke Road at 106.
- (3) US Rt. 3 (NB), South of NH 106
- (4) US Rt. 3 (SB), South of NH 106
- (5) Front Street, West of Main Street
- (6) Buck Street, East of US 3
- (7) Borough Road, (both sides of North Pembroke Road)
- (8) Donna Drive, West of US 3

### **Minutes**

#### **3. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes of April 22, 2008**

**MOTION:** Chairman Bourque moved to accept the April 22, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. Seconded by Vice Chairman Topliff.

**VOTE:**            Robert B. – Y            Alan T. – Y            Todd T. – Y  
                         Kevin K. – Y            Kathy C. – Y            Cindy L. – Y

**MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APRIL 22, 2008 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED PASSED ON A 6-0 VOTE.**

### **Miscellaneous**

#### **4. Correspondence**

Mr. Ruggles included a list of correspondence in the Member packet and noted that there are three things of interest: (1) the notice of a cell tower in Goffstown; (2) tomorrow night's CRPC workshop on Coordinated Transit & Human Services Transportation Plan, and (3) HB 1260 Local which was passed by the House and will be going before the Senate.

Mr. Ruggles said that he received a fax from Pembroke 600 which indicated that they received the deeds from DOT for access to the Route 3/106 intersection. He also said that Stephanie called Grace Capital Church and CAP to remind them that they would need the plans in the Planning Department by today in order to be on this month's agenda. Grace Capital Church submitted them in time but CAP requested a 3-day extension to meet the May 27, 2008 deadline. Mr. Ruggles said that Mike McNally said he would have enough time to review them. Mr. Ruggles said Pembroke 600 will not have anything for the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting and asked if the Board would like to offer an extension to Pembroke 600?

Mr. Ruggles said that Pembroke 600's problem is that their sewer extension expires before the Planning Board extension. If they don't make the May meeting, they cannot start the work to satisfy the sewer commission. The Board could also give them the option of coming to the June work session but that would only give them 10 days to remove the pipe from the ROW.

It was decided that the Board would offer Pembroke 600 a 3-day extension which may enable them to come to the May 27<sup>th</sup> or June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. If they could not make either meeting, Pembroke 600 would have to speak with the Sewer Commission about an extension beyond the June 20<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis noted that the HB 1260 says that if a town has established a Capital Improvement Committee, the Growth Management Plan would be established by that committee and not the Planning Board.

**5. Committee Reports** – Nothing reported.

## **6. Other Business**

Mr. Ruggles said that if the committee has suggestions regarding the spreadsheet of Board Approvals and Expirations prepared by Stephanie Alexander, please notify her.

## **Adjournment**

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Topliff moved to adjourn. Seconded by Member Terrien.

The vote was unanimous in favor of the Motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jocelyn D. Carlucci  
Recording Secretary