

**TOWN OF CHESTERFIELD, NH
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES**

Monday, April 2, 2012

Present: Brad Chesley, Chair, Jon McKeon, Selectmen's representative (7:19), James Corliss, John Koopmann, Bob Del Sesto and Rolland Vollbehr (Alternate)

Call to Order

Chesley called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM
Chesley seated Vollbehr for Willich

Review of the Minutes

March 19, 2012

*Koopman motioned to accept the March 19, 2012 minutes as amended. Corliss seconded the motion which passed, Del Sesto abstained.
(With only a minor change, the minutes were signed at the meeting)*

Koopman motioned to accept the site note minutes from March 19, 2012 as amended. Corliss seconded the motion which passed, Del Sesto abstained.

Elections

Del Sesto nominated Brad Chesley for Chairman of the board. Koopmann seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Del Sesto nominated James Corliss for Vice-Chairman of the board. Koopmann seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chesley nominated John Koopmann for secretary of the board. Corliss seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Appointments

- **Timothy Hanson/ Gerhard Isleib/ Eleanor Fink** – This is a continuation of an application for a Subdivision of the property located on Farr Road (Map 13, Lot A-6) consisting of approximately 26.87 acres in the Residential zone. It may be followed by a review to grant or deny approval of the application.

Tim Hanson were present for the applicant. Abutters to the proposed subdivision were also present. Jim Griswold from Envirostrategies was present to answer questions on their report.

Corliss noted that the abutters main concern has to do with the availability of water from wells in the area. Corliss also noted that the board is also concerned with continued instability of the northwest slope and the lack of plan and understanding.

Jim Griswold had a projector presentation and noted that the old ferry road is experiencing what is called soil creep. He noted that this is a very long process and they have no real concern of the subdivision adding to the existing problem. Griswold noted that the NW ravine could pose some issues. He noted that the solid waste found on site is likely adding to the instability. Griswold noted that the proposed catch basin location is an issue. He noted that the current location will create more weight and may cause a slip face – causing the whole hillside to collapse. He recommends moving the catch basin to the other side of the proposed development and stabilization of the slope.

Chesley noted that Griswold had noted the position of the catch basin is an issue, and since that time, the applicant has provided a new plan, with the catch basin 75 feet further from the ravine. Chesley asked if this was sufficient. Griswold noted that this is not his area of expertise. An answer would need to come from a Geotechnical Engineer. Griswold noted that more is needed than what he was provided. He stated that there is a better than average chance of slope failure with the catch basin close to the ravine.

Hanson asked how far back the basin needed to be moved. Griswold explained again that is not his area of expertise, however the further the better.

Annie Disilva (Abutter) asked if moving the catch basin would just shift the erosion to another location. For example toward her house. Griswold noted that the ravine is going to keep moving, and if it is stabilized, it would actually help to keep it away from her home. Griswold stated that this is a slow process and could take a couple hundred years. Disilva noted that there used to be a path 22 years ago where the ravine currently sits. She noted that they used to walk that area and could jump over the ravine, and that was only 22 years ago.

Koopmann asked Griswold if he agreed with the consensus that the debris is contributing to the weight. Griswold agreed that the debris needs to be removed.

Del Sesto asked if the bank is going to erode anyway, is it the function of the planning board to look that far forward and not allow houses to be built that in a few hundred years will be in danger of being swept down the slope. Chesley would like to halt discussion on this particular issue and pick it back up after the public hearing has been closed.

Griswold noted that all wells in the area are bedrock wells. According to the data, wells in the area range from ½ to 30 gallons per minute. He explained that this is typical of a bedrock aquifer. The bedrock aquifer conveys water through cracks, but does not usually contain much storage space. He noted they evaluated where the sponge is for this area and found two. The Connecticut river is the first one and the other is an underground aquifer, part of which is under the proposed development land. Griswold stated that with the information gathered, he cannot say that the development will negatively affect the supply of water in the area. Disilva noted that when her neighbor added an addition to their house, she lost her water and was forced to dig another well. While re-digging her well, a neighbor two houses down lost their water. She asked how he can say more wells will not

affect the current wells, when clearly the existing wells affect each other. Griswold noted that with all the evidence he has seen this far he cannot say it will affect. Dilsilva asked if he could say for sure. Griswold said that he believes the addition of the development is unlikely to affect the current water situation. She stated that without a yes or no, his answer is not valid. Griswold noted that a 2,000 gallon water storage tank could be used to solve the issues with the gallons per minute. Jeff Scott asked the board what kind of recourse was available to the abutters if the development is approved and they do lose their water. He wanted to know if something could be put into the approval. McKeon noted that the Planning Board makes its decisions based upon all of the information, and not on fear. Koopmann noted that although the verbal testimony at the hearings is helpful, written information for the board to consider after the closing of the public hearing would be helpful. Chesley noted that the board has suggested this many times to the abutters and has yet to receive anything in writing from any abutters.

Hanson provided the board with a plan (C-1) for stabilization for removal of debris. He provided the board with an adjusted site construction cost estimate which now includes figures relative to the ravine stabilization. He also provided the board with a declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions. Hanson noted that Rob met with a specialist and it was recommended that they move the catch basin back 75 feet and stabilize the bank. He showed the board the material that they are planning on using to assist in the stabilizing of the bank. Hanson stated that they will remove all asphalt, painted wood, plywood – all building materials. The brush, stumps and concrete will stay and get pushed down to assist in the stabilization. Hanson noted that the stabilization could be part of a bond, the material is guaranteed for 24 months, so the bond could be for 36 months. Hanson will forward email from Wayne Wheeler (NHDES) to Lachenal who will provide it to the board.

Del Sesto noted that the stabilization plans are not adequate. He would like cross sections and more details. Hanson noted that he has done what the board asked and now he has to do more? Corliss noted that the board is here to review his plans, he has not seen evidence of good understanding of this area. McKeon noted that the board requested an erosion control plan, and the one provided only has one cut which is not enough for the board to see what is going on and what will be done. Del Sesto noted that an inspector needs to be able to look at the plan and know what the board has approved and go to the site and make sure that is what is going on. Chesley noted that another walk through may be necessary once the new plans are received.

The board asked Hanson if he could get the plans to us on or before April 13, 2012 so that we can look them over and have a site visit during the work session on April 16, 2012. Hanson believes he can have the plans. He will get in touch with Rob Hitchcock to make sure. Site visit will be tentatively scheduled for April 16, 2012 at 6PM on Farr road.

Corliss motioned to continue the public hearing to May 7, 2012 at 7:30, Koopmann seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

- **Charles A Donahue, Trustee of the Charles A. Donahue Revocable Trust of 1988** – Continuation of an application for a Major Subdivision, and an application for Major Site Development of property located on Rote 63 (Map 12A, Lot A-2) consisting of approximately 75.66 acres in the Residential zone. It may be followed by a review to grant or deny approval of the applications.

Dave Bergeron was present for the applicant. He provided the board with a stewardship plan which goes along with the covenants and restrictions provided at the last meeting. Bergeron noted that after the site visit, he looked over the buffer to see if anything could be moved. He noted that he did not have any luck finding areas that could be adjusted. Koopmann asked if the applicant has considered fencing or natural screening. Bergeron told the board that hedges have been discussed. It was noted that there will only be one light, and that will be at the entrance. Del Sesto asked if the intent was still to have work-force housing. Bergeron noted that by state definition, no. They have decided to gear the development toward older people; however there will not be an age requirement. He noted that the homes will mostly be one level with easy access.

Bergeron noted that they have not applied for an AOT permit and understands that would be a condition of approval.

Bergeron indicated the applicants desire to do 4 phases to the project. Del Sesto would like to see all the phases planned out. There will need to be a bond for the construction of the road. Del Sesto noted that the Planning Board has the responsibility on the final approval of the bond. Bergeron explained that there would be hammer head turn-a-rounds until the road was complete. He will bring in information on the phasing at the next meeting. Bergeron provided the board with a request for a continuance, which the board granted.

Corliss motioned to continue the public hearing to May 7, 2012 at 7:30 PM. Vollebhr seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Items for Discussion

- Monroe Muffler/ Tire Warehouse – The board reviewed the new plans provided. It was noted that there was an erosion plan added, and the dimensions were now correct. The board noted that they have met the conditions of the conditional approval.

*Corliss motioned for final approval of the **Monroe Muffler Brake Inc** Application for a Major Site Plan review for property located on 3 Mr. Arthur Drive (Map 14C Lot 11) consisting of approximately 2 acres in the Commercial/ Industrial zone Koopman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

The board noted that there was a certification signature missing on the plans. The plans will not be signed until that signature has been attained. Lachenal will contact the applicant.

Cersosimo Industries – The board was provided notes from Lawson-Kelleher. McKeon will review notes and get back to board. Lachenal will type notes for McKeon and email them to him.

Items for Information

Items for Signature

Adjournment

Koopmann motioned to adjourn at 10:00 PM, Corliss seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Patricia Lachenal
Planning Board Secretary

Approved by:

Brad Chesley, Chairman

Date