

**Pembroke Planning Board  
Minutes of Meeting  
(Adopted)  
Tuesday, August 11, 2009**

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

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Brian Seaworth; Larry Young, Sr., Jeff White

**EXCUSED:** Kathy Cruson; Mark Zydel, Todd Terrien

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

Chairman Bourque called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He noted that Stephanie Alexander, Interim Planner is on vacation and Mr. Jodoin is absent. He appointed Alternate Member Seaworth to vote in place of Member Terrien, Alternate Member Young to vote in place of Member Zydel, and Alternate Member White to vote in place of Member Cruson.

**Discussion**

**1. Site Plan Fees, Subdivision Fees, Special Use Permit Fees, Design Review Fees, and Conceptual Consultation Fees for Open Space Development.**

The Board recalled that Ms. Alexander's recommended fee schedule changes were based on the amount of time that she spends on different portions of the planning process. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that the proposed fee changes were not a directive from the Board of Selectmen. There has been no discussion among the Selectmen on Planning Department fees. She did point out that the change in Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission's fees has sparked discussions among the Selectmen regarding the hiring of a full-time Planner. She suggested that the Planning Board share their thoughts on the subject with the Board of Selectmen.

Alternate Member Young said that a simple lot line adjustment between neighbors should not be expensive. The proposed \$400 fee is too high.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that the escrow fees are the most difficult to estimate.

Vice Chairman Topliff said that he was surprised with the \$800 new wireless tower fee. His experience was that wireless tower technology was very specialized and, in the past, the Planner did not play a significant role in the process. Engineering documentation was provided, but the Planner was not able to review them because of the technicalities.

The following were suggested:

- That Reuse of Existing Commercial/Business/Industrial fee be a flat fee. Any additional building changes be applied to the "New Commercial/Business/Industrial fee.
- Reuse of Existing Developed Area (No Buildings) be a flat fee.
- New Wireless Tower fee be \$500.

Vice Chairman Topliff suggested that the Board have additional discussions regarding change of use vs. reuse.

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Topliff moved to table further discussion of fees to the next work session. Seconded by Selectmen's Rep. Lewis.

**VOTE:**            Robert B. – Y            Alan T. – Y            Larry Y. – Y  
                         Cindy L. – Y            Kevin K. – Y            Brian S. – Y  
                         Jeff W. – Y

**MOTION TO TABLE FURTHER DISCUSSION OF FEES TO THE NEXT WORK SESSION PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.**

## **2. Site Plan Review, Subdivision, Special Use Permit, and Other Application and Checklist Revisions**

### Special Use Permit

Vice Chairman Topliff said that the consensus of the Board at the last work session was that the Board should establish criteria for special use permits. This would help create a fair way to guide the Board's decision process.

Because it is difficult to keep track of all the special use permits that one applicant may need and the application, Chairman Bourque suggested that all the special use permits and the application be heard at one public hearing. It was agreed that there should also be discussion with Ms. Alexander about clarifying the significant points to an application such as (1) why an application is before the Board, and (2) the reason for the special use permits.

The consensus of the Board was to table the discussion until the next work session at which time Ms. Alexander could comment on the following questions:

- Is it necessary to have a public hearing for each special use permit?
- Can all the special use permits be listed on the Agenda in the initial application paragraph rather than as a separate item?
- Is a separate Notice of Decision required for each Special Use Permit?
- Is there a way to reduce the amount of paperwork in each Member Packet such as a one-page synopsis of each department's comments rather than providing a copy of each department's response.

### Major Subdivision Review Checklist

Paragraph I – The Board discussed whether 15% slopes should be shown on the plan and at what intervals. The consensus of the Board was not to identify the 15% slopes.

The consensus of the Board was to accept the proposed changes until the public hearing.

#### Minor Subdivision Review Checklist Includes Lot Line Adjustments

The Board agreed to:

- Keep the requirement for contours and allow the Board to accept a waiver.
- Remove Paragraphs P and T
- Review the submission process for a conceptual review at the next work session.

#### Major Site Plan Review Checklist

The consensus of the Board was not to show the 15% slope on the plan and to approve all other proposed changes until the public hearing.

#### Minor Site Plan Review Checklist

The Board agreed:

- To change Paragraph K by removing the word “Town Planner” and inserting the words “Planning Board.”
- That Note 2 should be changed to state that only the Planning Board has the authority to decide if an application is complete.

#### Special Use Permit Application

The Board agreed to place the Special Use Permit Application on the next work session agenda.

#### Design Review Application

Vice Chairman Topliff clarified that at the conceptual review, the Board can request a design review application which would still be advisory in nature.

A technical review is similar to a full application which would require public notification.

The Board agreed that the cost of a Design Review should be minimal for the applicant. The Board agreed to table this discussion until the next work session in order to gain Ms. Alexander’s opinion on the subject.

### **3. Buildable vs. Non-Buildable Area Definitions**

Member Krebs explained that paragraph 1A is a revision of Paragraph 1 “Calculated Buildable Area”; Paragraph 2A is a revision of Paragraph 2 “Contiguous Buildable Area”, and Paragraph 3A is a revision of Paragraph 3 “Non-Buildable Area.

Member Krebs also explained that the term “calculated buildable area” provided a way to calculate how much area there could potentially be to build on -- not necessarily that the entire area would be allowed to be built upon. Calculated Buildable Area is a starting point of determining the maximum amount of units that can be built on a piece of land.

- 1A. The Board agreed with the revised language.
- 2A. The Board agreed with the revised language.
- 3A. The Board asked that the paragraph be changed as follows:

That area of a lot including all soils . . . rights of way.  
\*Wetland buffers and setbacks may be included in calculated buildable area. However, no construction is allowed in the wetland buffers or setbacks.

**4. Zoning Ordinance Public Hearing Schedule – No action needed**

**5. Business Location Change of Use/Expansion of Use Form (for staff use only)**

The consensus of the Board was that the Business Location Change of Use/Expansion of Use form should be reviewed by the Code Enforcement Officer in order to determine if the applicant needed a minor site plan. The Board had no changes to the Form.

**Minutes**

**6. Review and Approve Minutes of July 28, 2009**

**MOTION:** Alternate Member Young moved to approve the meeting minutes of July 28, 2009 as amended. Seconded by Alternate Member Seaworth.

**VOTE:**            Robert B. – Y            Alan T. – Y            Larry Y. – Y  
                      Cindy L. – Y            Kevin K. – Y            Brian S. – Y  
                      Jeff W. – Abstained

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 28, 2009 AS AMENDED PASSED ON A 6-0 VOTE WITH ONE ABSTENTION.**

**Miscellaneous**

**7. Correspondence – None**

**8. Committee Reports**

**Roads Committee:** Alternate Member Seaworth said that Tim Bernier of T.F. Bernier, Inc. representing Silver Hill Development did not attend the last Roads Committee meeting with regard to the easement language. The committee wanted assurance that there was no long-term obligation by the Town to maintain the easement. The Public Works Director will follow up with Mr. Bernier.

The Roads Committee has the information pertaining to the Transportation Enhancement Grant Application.

**CIP Committee:** Alternate Member Seaworth said that the CIP Committee has met with the Police and Fire Departments and will meet with the Roads Committee and the Public Works Department on August 12, 2009.

**Conservation Commission:** Alternate Member White said that:

- The Conservation Commission are looking for volunteers for an Open Space Committee. The NH Department of Transportation and Central NH Regional Planning is preparing to create a map listing the best green spaces and open spaces in Pembroke along with suggestions on how to acquire those lands within a certain period of time.
- The Conservation Commission will have an informational booth at Old Home Day. They are also looking into a computer system to keep more efficient notes and records.
- The Police Department has indicated that activity at White Sands has improved tremendously since the gate was installed.
- The Conservation Commission received a conditional approval from the Board of Selectmen regarding the Hillman property on Buck Street. The State has agreed to match funds up to \$300,000.

Vice Chairman Topliff agreed to fill out the application pertaining to the Central NH Regional Planning Commission's Regional Environmental Planning Program that will assist 10 chosen Towns, at no cost, to implement innovative land use controls. Vice Chairman Topliff will apply for the "Energy Efficient Development" Program.

**MOTION:** Chairman Bourque moved to adjourn. Seconded by Alternate Member White.

The vote was unanimous in favor of the Motion.

The meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jocelyn D. Carlucci, Recording Secretary