ZONING BOARD OF ADUSTMENT

Meeting Minutes Recorded by Janice Pack January 24, 2018

4 5 6

7

1

2

3

Members Attending: John Gryval, Gil Morris, Jarvis Adams, George Rainier, Craig Pettigrew

8 9 10

Public Present: Michael Borden, Code Enforcement Officer; Colleen O'Connell, Paul Renaud, Dave and Tammy Blanchette, Chad Branon, Carol Irwin

11 12 13

14

Meeting opened at 8:00 PM

- JGryval called the meeting to order. Five members were present. JGryval will be voting tonight. JGryval advised
- the Applicants that we need 3 affirmative votes to pass. The Recording Clerk confirmed that the certified
- mailing had been sent to all of the abutters, and that the hearing had been properly noticed and posted. The
- 17 Recording Clerk received their initial check #4863 in the amount of \$100, and requested the balance due of
- 18 \$132.50, which was later received. JGryval introduced the Paul Renaud, Planning Board Chair; Carol Irwin, the
- 19 ConComm Re; and Michael Borden, the Code Enforcement Officer who were present tonight.
- 20 A Public Hearing, ZBA Case 2018-02, for the property located at 295 Sawmill Road (Map 1, Lot 29) for a
- Variance to permit a reduced setback as specified in the Zoning Ordinance, Section III, Article F, Paragraph 3
- and a Special Exception in the Wetland Conservation District from Section III, Article J(2)(d) to permit
- 23 upgrading an existing driveway culvert which crosses a wetland area on behalf of Dave Blanchette began at
- 24 **8:00 PM.**
- 25 CBranon from Fieldstone gave an overview of the project. The subject property is 3.60 acres of land which has
- 26 809 feet of frontage. Existing conditions show the site is vacant, with no structures currently on it. There is an
- 27 existing tree line, an old pit where sand and gravel has been excavated, and a couple of wells that serviced the
- former dwelling. There is a gravel road that bisects the property and leads to a secondary access for the DOT to
- 29 their lot. He pointed out the existing culvert and talked about the jurisdictional wetland. The site is forested
- with mature hardwoods. The property is zoned General Residence and is also in the Industrial Overlay District.
- 31 He shared an aerial photo showing the land currently, and a drawing showing the proposed 3 storage unit
- 32 buildings totaling 18000 square feet in size; all 30' wide, and one each 175' long, 190' long, and 235' long. The
- 33 layout provides a break in the buildings to adjust for the topography. This includes balancing the narrow width
- of the property and provides reasonable setbacks and respect for the wetlands. They propose a 12' by 12'
- 35 maintenance and utility shed to house electrical components separately from the storage buildings. They
- provide 2 visitor parking spaces at that location. The area will be gated, with another emergency access gate at
- 37 the south end of the property. They plan to maintain the access to the DOT lot. The storm water management
- the seath end of the property. They plan to maintain the decess to the Box lost market management
- of the project includes catch basins connected by a 12" perforated pipe which will be imbedded in the soil. This
- 39 will infiltrate all run off. They propose to upgrade the existing culvert. Total wetland impact is 2976 square feet.
- 40 The project will require a DES wetland permit and a DOT permit as they are changing the use of the property.
- 41 They are before the ZBA tonight to request the 2 variances and the special exception. In summary, they believe
- 42 that this project has been designed to provide a quality self-storage facility, and provide reasonable
- 43 accommodations for a severely restricted lot. They feel it is a very good location from a transitional standpoint.
- 44 JGryval stated that while the Town doesn't really have an Industrial District, 2J:B (page 12 of the Zoning
- 45 Ordinance) talks about the Sawmill Road area being part of the industrial zone, and identifies the lots, including
- 46 lot 29 (this lot).

- 47 George asked if PRenaud had any input. PRenaud mentioned that sometimes the Planning Board is required to
- 48 submit a comment on a case the ZBA is hearing, but because this case is going before the Planning Board, he
- 49 does not feel he can comment at this time. The Preliminary Conceptual Consultation took place about four
- months ago, and the Planning Board will hear this case on Monday, January 29th, at 7:15 PM. 50
- 51 MBorden said he met with Mr. Blanchette early on, and directed him to speak to the Planning Board on a
- 52 consultation basis. He feels this would be a great use for that property, no septic issued or any impact of that
- 53 nature. The only utility that comes on to that property is electric. It was a residential property at one time, and
- is on the edge of residential. Personally, he feels this is a needed use. 54
- 55 JAdams asked to return to the drawing showing setbacks and clarified that a variance would be needed no
- matter what if *anything* was to be done on this property because of its shape. 56
- 57 CIrwin stated on behalf of the ConComm that she has a lot of questions, but hasn't had a chance to study this
- 58 yet. She wondered if it would require excavation or the bringing in of fill, and to what extent the terrain would
- 59 be changed. CBranon said as engineers they are charged with the best possible way to change terrain; they
- propose that one section of the site would get filled (about 4' in one corner) and another section would have a 60
- 61 cut on the west side and a fill on the east side to create a level area. He said that they don't anticipate any
- 62 material going in to the site, but perhaps a surplus because of the foundations. He did state that 18,000 square
- 63 feet of available storage area was the minimum necessary for a viable project. CIrwin asked how much
- vegetation would be removed from the site; CBranon said "a good portion would be removed". He said they 64
- had designed the storm water management to mitigate the storm water run-off. CPettigrew directed her to 65
- page 5 of the drawings which showed that. 66
- 67 CPettigrew asked CBranon about the retaining wall in the back; and CBranon described it as a 2' to 10' wall. He
- does plan to talk to DOT about cutting that back a bit so it can be better landscaped. CPettigrew said that 68
- 69 Building C is the one that encroaches the setback the most but without that building, he understood that the
- 70 plan would not be profitable. He asked if there were any proposed commercial rentals; CBranon said "no".
- 71 CPettigrew asked DBlanchette if there were any electrical units inside the units; DBlanchette answered "typically
- 72 not". JGryval said the conversation of how the units would be used would be under the Planning Board purview.
- 73 Cirwin asked how the water flows on the property; the answer was that it started in the left-hand corner and
- 74 swirled around to the right and back. She asked if anyone knew what had happened to that site during the
- 75 floods of 2007. JAdams said he didn't recall any damage there during that point. They discussed the culvert,
- 76 which will be a 30" high-density polyethylene pipe. The current one is also 30", they will be making the new one
- 77 a little bit longer. JGryval asked if the area around the units will be gravel or tarred; DBlanchette said it will be
- 78 gravel but all of the aprons will be paved. CBranon stated that the project really has no negative impact on the
- 79
- wetland because of the infiltration system proposed. GRainier asked where the brook drained to. CBranon said 80 he thought it went to Otter Lake. CPettigrew said it came from Sunset Lake, and went to Otter Lake. GRainier
- 81 asked how much water the trees on that lot would suck up during growing season. CBranon said he wasn't an
- 82 arborist and couldn't speak to that. Clrwin asked what trees were there now; CBranon said mostly pine with
- 83 some hardwood. GRainier asked if we could do a site visit. CIrwin asked if there were restrictions against
- 84 storing hazardous materials in the units, and how that was policed. CBranon said the standard contract
- 85 addressed that, and unfortunately, if someone wanted to break the rules, it could be done. From an ownership
- 86 standpoint it was obviously something they wanted to enforce. CIrwin asked if the units were large enough to
- 87 store a car, and the answer was "Yes". JGryval said if this neared an approval, she could suggest a condition that
- 88 would address this. PRenaud said that the Planning Board also has the option of imposing certain conditions.
- 89 CPettigrew asked if on page 3 of the plans, the dark green area was actual encroachment on the wetlands, not
- 90 buffers; CBranon said that was correct. The largest storage unit would be 10' by 20' and the smallest would be
- 91 5' by 10'. GRainier asked if the buildings would be mounted on a concrete slab. CBranon said they recommend

| 92 93 | a 6" slab. Clrwin asked if they had considered a different design that would lessen the encroachment. CBranon said this design has the least amount of impact. Clrwin said that she would appreciate a site walk. |
|---|---|
| 94 95 96 | JGryval asked CBranon to speak to the letter received from the NH Natural Heritage Bureau. CBranon said that in order to get approval from the State, they need to address this. The letter of 12/27/18 states that they had a "negative result" which means they did not find any rare or endangered species in that area. |
| 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 | JGryval asked him to speak to the setbacks, and CBranon said a 100' setback is required. There is only 53' in the front at the most encroaching point where 100' is required, and 35' to the rear where 50' is required. The side setbacks are within the requirements. JAdams stated again that anyone looking to build on that property would need to come before the Board. The entire Building A is the one that encroaches it the most. Building C is 100% in the front setback. DBlanchette said there is essentially only 17' of usable land on that lot. JGryval asked if they had an idea how many visitors would be at the self-storage site at one time. CBranon said traffic data analysis would show that an 18,000 square foot facility would show 2.7 vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour which equates to one vehicle every 22 minutes, and 1 vehicle every 13 minutes during the p.m. peak hour. |
| 105 106 107 | Karen Day asked about non-point source pollution, in view of the parking all around the buildings, and what provision had been made to address that. CBranon said the design of the facility makes it completely self-contained, and explained the infiltration system to her as she had joined the meeting after that initial discussion. |
| 108 109 110 111 | MBorden asked what would be the average height of the buildings; Mr. Blanchette said 10'. MBorden asked what the width of the access way would be. Through the center, it will be 24'. Around the east and west sides, the access ways would be 20' and there is a 2' shoulder. MBorden said he thought it was a pretty well thought out plan. |
| 112 113 | The Board discussed if a site walk was necessary. Clrwin said that as an advisory board, they could not give a recommendation, but could advise; however, she does not have enough information to do that at this point. |
| 114 115 116 | The Board decided to hold a site walk mostly for the benefit of the ConComm. It was decided to meet at the site at 9:00 AM on Saturday, January 27, 2018. We will reconvene here next Wednesday, January 31, 2018 at 8:00 PM. |
| 117 | GRainier motion to continue the Public Hearing for Case 2018-02; CPettigrew seconded. All were in favor. |
| 118 | Other Business: |
| 119 120 | An invoice was received in the amount of \$80 for 8 2017/2018 Planning & Land Use Manuals. This was approved. |
| 121 122 | GMorris motioned to adjourn, and CPettigrew seconded. All were in favor, and the meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM. |
| 123 | |
| 124 | |
| 125 | |
| 126 | |
| 127 | |