

**TOWN OF SUTTON**  
**Planning Board**  
Pillsbury Memorial Hall  
Meeting Minutes  
July 22, 2014

**Present: Planning Board Members: Carrie Thomas, Chairperson; Carole O'Connell, Julie McCarthy, Roger Wells, and members; (Bob DeFelice and Peter Blakeman, member, was absent); Dan Sundquist, Ex-Officio; and Laurie Hayward, Land Use Coordinator (LUC) and Bob Stewart, applicant, and John Mears, applicant, and Laura Hallahan, interested member of the public was present for the first hearing only.**

**The meeting was called to order** at 7:00 PM, by Carrie Thomas, Chairperson.

**Administrative:**

**Minutes of previous meetings:** Meeting minutes of July 8 were tabled.

**Hearing:** The Chair opened the meeting for explaining that it is **Case PB 2014-04, John Mears, applicant, as agent for Carl & Gail B. Olson Revocable Trust of 1999 and Robert O'Neil Revocable Trust, to annex 3.33 acres of the 76.4 acre O'Neil property to add it to the 7.52 acres of the Olson property. 02-508,408 & 02-467,400.** The Chair stated that this is a simple hearing and not a Public Hearing; therefore there is no public input. The Planning board will discuss the application with the applicant and /or the owners. If there is an approval, then the usual notices to abutters and public notice in the InterTown Record and on town bulletin boards will advertise the approval and state that there is a 30 day appeals period during which time anyone can request a Public Hearing at which time the Planning Board will obtain public input.

John Mears stepped forward. The Chair asked what the purpose of the annexation is. Mears explained that he lives across the street and just down the road. He found the 7.52 acre property and wanted to keep it open and place it in current use. To do this he needed the 3.33 acres to bring the total to more than 10 acres as required. Mears gave a bit of the history. The Chair called for questions and there were none.

**Wells moved the application be approved as submitted McCarthy seconded and it was voted unanimously to approve.**

**This ended the first hearing, Case PB 2014-04.**

**Public Hearing:** The Chair opened the second hearing which is a public hearing. The Notice was read: **"You are hereby notified of a Public Hearing, Case 2014-03, to be held on July 22, 2014 at or around 7:00 p.m. at the Pillsbury Memorial Town Hall, 93 Main Street, Sutton Mills, NH, concerning a request by Robert Stewart, acting as agent for T&G Land Holdings LLC, for a minor three lot subdivision, at Eaton Grange Road & Stevens Brook Road, in a Rural-agricultural district, Tax Map # 01-141,370. Plans are available for your review at the Town Office"**

Wells recused himself. The Chair asked the applicant, Robert Stewart to step forward. Stewart explained that his company RPS Designs represents T&G Land Holdings, the owner of the property. Stewart stated that he understanding this would be a hearing to determine if the application is complete and there would be a later hearing. Sundquist moved that the application be accepted as complete, it was seconded and approved. Sundquist asked if the application is complete. The LUC explained that she had noticed this as though it is a public hearing and she did that because she felt the application was complete. She also explained that Peter Blakeman, a member who was not

*Approved 9/11/2014*

present, reviewed the application and had not notified her of any concerns regarding completeness. **Sundquist made a motion that they accept the application as substantially complete and move into Public Hearing; O'Connell seconded and it was voted unanimously.**

The applicant explained that the property in question borders on Eaton Grange Road and Stevens Brook Road. He explained that lots reflect setbacks in accordance with town zoning requirements. Stewart spoke regarding the method of surveying. He explained that with the survey and the topographic survey as well shows the wetlands on three quarters of the property (by the USGS 5 foot maps). He told the Board that both the USGS and the percolate maps matched very well, confirming the survey. He went on to address the test pits and the soils which he stated matched well with the SCS survey [a soils survey] and supported development of the lots.

Stewart went on to explain the proposal is for a three lot subdivision; with 12.6 acres on lot #1, 7.1 acres on lot #2, and 14.2 acres on lot #3. Stewart explained that he hopes to place the entire subdivision in current use. A buyer or buyers would need to decide regarding continuing to keep in lots current use after purchase. He also noted that the application contained a copy of a letter to the Select Board regarding the proposed subdivision and placing all three in current use. The LUC explained that she had done some research, at the request of the Planning Board, including speaking with the Town Administrator and discovered that an approved subdivision may remain in current use as long as the sum of the contiguous lots exceeds the required 10 acres. As each lot is sold, only the adjoining, that is contiguous lots, with a sum greater than 10 acres can remain in current use.

O'Connell asked if there was any correspondence from abutters. The LUC replied that there was no correspondence regarding this application; except that the Road Agent had expressed a concern regarding the proposed driveway site distance on one of the lots. Stewart explained that he had completed the application including the checklist and submitted all that was required on that and on a newer version as well and that he additionally submitted driveway permits to the Road Agent. The LUC explained that she had spoken to the Road Agent and he was leaving the decision up to the Planning Board and had forwarded the permits to her. The LUC mentioned possible shared driveways. Stewart corrected that, explaining that each lot has a separate driveway and there will be no shared driveways. Regarding the issue of site distances, Stewart agreed that he had noted concerns with a site distance that is not adequate on one lot. There is a large pine tree in the way. Stewart said that he does understand that the pine tree is in the way on Lot #3 and the owner is willing to remove it. Stewart showed Board members the plans and where the proposed driveways would be located. Stewart stated that he believes that the grading and everything else planned for the three driveways are fine and that the removal of the tree could be a condition of approval.

There were very brief discussions about the historical significance of the area. There was a question whether Stevens Brook Road is a scenic road. It was agreed that it is not a scenic road. There was a question about the surveyors' stamps on the plan. It was noted that the stamp clearly shows on the larger versions of the plat which clearly have both Cliff Richer's stamp and signature and Stewart's stamp and signature. Stewart says there is one adjustment made since the original submission in connection with Lot # 3. The new plan reflects his determination that the entire wetland is actually greater than 10,000 square feet and so the original 50 foot setback has been changed to 75 feet. He explained that they tried to keep the plan simple, in compliance with DES as well as Sutton Regulations and disturb as little vegetation as possible and, especially on Lot #3; they limited the test pit to one area. They wanted to and did propose a subdivision that leaves a large field intact.

The Chair called for additional questions. **Sundquist moved that they leave the public hearing, O'Connell seconded and it was voted unanimously.**

*Approved 9/11/2014*

**The Board took up deliberations.** The Chair called for any discussion on the proposed subdivision. O'Connell noted that the Condition that the pine tree be removed seems to be something on which there is agreement. There was a discussion about the best wording of the Condition. **Sundquist moved that the subdivision as presented be approved with the condition that all three driveways as located be acceptable to the Road Agent in terms of adequate working site lines and drainage. And with the Condition that the large pine in the way and preventing adequate sight line distance on one lot be removed. There was no additional discussion. McCarthy seconded and it was voted unanimously to approve with Conditions.**

Sundquist instructed the applicant that the applicant would have to get the Mylar to the LUC and she will get the necessary signatures from the Board Members and then get the signed Mylar to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. Stewart agreed that he would get the Mylar showing the changed 75 foot wetlands setback to the LUC. Regarding the driveway permits, the LUC stated that she did have them and would get signed copies to the applicant. She told the applicant that she thinks the resolution with the removal of the tree would resolve the Road Agent's concerns.

**This ended the second hearing, Public Hearing Case PB 2014-03.**

**Master Plan:** The Chair opened with questions that Bill Thomas, her tester, had when taking the survey. She explained that he wanted more definitions. There was some expanded information agreed to for instructions before various questions.

There was extensive discussion about paring down the demographic information at the start of the survey and it was simplified. It was further agreed that they did not need to stick to the same language as was used in earlier Master Plan Surveys.

The Board members went through the draft language asking, what do we want to know and will the answer provide useful information? In the case of the earlier draft explanation about "At Home" services, it was agreed that be removed entirely.

The LUC asked Members about Wells questions that included why there were still places for "comments". The LUC explained that she took out all of the "other" answers; but did not take out all of the places that allowed for comments. After brief discussion members agreed that there should only be one "comments" section and that the last question and that question kept very general.

O'Connell asked that the survey be compressed by reducing the space between lines. Board members agreed that there should not be any reduction in spacing in order to make it easier to read.

The Chair asked about definitions and whether a "glossary page" would be useful. In the end that option was not taken; instead the definitions in advance of questions were reworded to be more informative. Instead, Wells suggested that the format on a few questions be changed so that the question asks for check marks on all that apply. Wells also recommended changes to questions that included items that were not pertinent to Sutton and/or did not make sense for a population the size of Sutton. Sundquist noted that there are some things that have been put before Sutton voters and have never come close to finding favor amongst voters- so why include them?

During the course of the discussion, the LUC made the changes to the document as members agreed and directed so that at the end of the session, the document was revised.

The Chair noted that her tester suggested that there should be a question about whether respondents actually use town facilities. Members agreed that there should be a question about what facilities respondents currently use.

O'Connell asked if the Board could put anything in the Survey about shooting ranges. Members agreed this is not the forum for that. The LUC did explain that Chief Korbet has offered language on a possible Noise Ordinance and

*Approved 9/11/2014*

the Zoning Board of Adjustment is looking at possible language to suggest to the Planning Board.

Wells asked why there is a question that asks about whether there should be more or less money spent. After some discussion, it was agreed that there should be a question about “where the town should change its efforts”; but, not a question about money. It was agreed that the question about effort might point to money or it might not.

Members then discussed where to direct people who wish to complete paper versions of the survey. It was agreed that they should be directed to Town Hall and, because it has somewhat different hours, to the Library. It was agreed that they should not be directed elsewhere.

The Board then took up the postcard to notify people that the survey is available. Wells and O’Connell had each edited the draft of front and back of a postcard. The LUC agreed to incorporate their recommendations in order to simplify the language on the card. O’Connell pointed out that there should be a deadline for submission. There was agreement that the deadline should be September 1, 2014.

Wells asked about writing a letter to the editor and whether members had any concerns about that. There was agreement that is fine. The LUC also pointed out that she is working with Kristen at the InterTown to get small articles into the paper about the Master Plan.

**Next regular meeting is scheduled to include Public Hearing and will be** on August 12, 2014 at 7:00 PM.

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned** at 8:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Hayward  
Land Use Coordinator