

- 1 **Present:** Marge Badois, Chair; G Harrington, Vice Chair; Deb Lievens, member; Bob Maxwell, member;
- 2 David Heafey, member; Mike Byerly, member; and Susan Malouin, member; and Mike Speltz, alternate 3 member
- 4
- 5 Absent: None
- 6
- Also present: Amy Kizak, GIS Manager/Comprehensive Planner; and Beth Morrison, Recording
 Secretary.
- 9

10 Marge Badois called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

11 DRC – 86 High Range Rd Subdivision – Map 6, Lot 106: Doug MacGuire, P.E. from The Dubay Group, 12 136 Harvey Road, Bldg B101, Londonderry, NH, addressed the Board. D MacGuire explained that this is a 13 two-lot subdivision, with an existing lot on High Range Road that has a single-family home, where they 14 are subdividing off the existing lot, and the remainder of the land is going to the second lot. He 15 mentioned that there are wetlands on the site in the back of the property, but no wetlands are in the 16 vicinity of the development area of the second lot. M Speltz asked why the new lot line coming off High 17 Range is curved, as he thought the requirement was for it to be perpendicular to the road. D MacGuire 18 replied that there is a little bit of master planning going on because there are adjacent parcels of land to 19 the south, and if there was going to be further subdivision there are requirements to have radii flares. M 20 Speltz asked if there could be a back-lot development. D MacGuire replied that there would not be a lot 21 of opportunity on the lot as it stands today, but if there was negotiation with property to the south, 22 then that would make sense. He commented that this would allow for a new roadway coming off High 23 Range Road. D Lievens mentioned that she has never heard of radii flares and asked if other 24 neighborhoods have them. D MacGuire responded that this is part of the roadway requirements. M 25 Badois interjected that she has never heard of them either. D MacGuire remarked that any new road 26 that is to be constructed has radii flares at the entrance. D Lievens asked if this was for a road or 27 driveway. D MacGuire replied that this is for a road. He reviewed the plan with the Commission noting 28 other subdivision requirements that they have tried to master plan for future development. G 29 Harrington asked if they plan on placing the conservation buffer signs, even though it is in the very back 30 of the lot. D MacGuire replied that if the Commission would like them to be there, they will put them up. 31 M Speltz asked if the signs needed to be on the east side only. G Harrington commented that he is not 32 sure of how the ordinance is written. D MacGuire pointed out that there would not be any development 33 to the eastern side of the wetland, as this would result in a landlocked parcel. G Harrington countered 34 that it would not be landlocked as there is a right-of-way shown on the plan. D MacGuire replied that he 35 was right and reiterated that they are not proposing any development in the area, but would place the



- 36 signs if the Commission would like them. The Commissioners commented that the conservation buffer
- 37 signs should be placed along the wetland buffer on both sides.

38 DRC – Wolters LLA – Map 3, Lots 45-61 & 165-1 – 7 Chartwell Ct & 11 Greeley Rd: Mark Sargent, LLS, 39 from Richard D. Bartlett Assoc., LLC, 214 North State Street, Concord, NH, addressed the Commission. M 40 Sargent reviewed the two parcels with the Commission noting the first parcel is 7 Chartwell Court, which 41 has an existing single-family home with 3.06 acres and 150-feet of frontage on Chartwell Court. He went 42 on stating that the second parcel is 11 Greeley Road with an existing single-family home with 9.48 acres 43 with 55-feet of frontage on Greeley Road. He pointed out that there are wetlands on the property 44 associated with the pond and another one towards Greeley Road. He explained that they are proposing 45 a lot line adjustment to annex 2.27 acres from 11 Greeley Road to 7 Chartwell Court. He mentioned that 46 there is no change to the frontage nor are any improvements planned at this time. M Speltz asked what 47 this accomplishes if both properties are owned by the same person. M Sargent replied that owner of 48 both would like to sell 11 Greeley Road, and as you can see from the plans her driveway on 7 Chartwell 49 Court crosses the existing property line, so the new lot line would make her lot bigger and give her a 50 buffer around the house. D Lievens asked if she lives on 7 Chartwell Court. M Sargent replied that is 51 correct. D Lievens asked what is happening on 11 Greeley Road. M Sargent replied that she would like to 52 sell 11 Greeley Road. G Harrington asked if conservation buffer signs are being proposed. M Sargent 53 replied that he did not know this was a requirement, but would certainly do this. D Lievens asked how 54 big the pond is. M Sargent responded that is about 20,000 SF. He reviewed the outline of the pond, 55 noting that the wetland itself exceeds beyond that, so it will most likely be more than half an acre. M 56 Speltz stated that the buffer signs should be placed. G Harrington asked if there would need to be any 57 alteration to the wetland to improve the existing driveway. M Sargent replied that the driveway has 58 been in use for many years. M Badois asked if it changes because it is a subdivision. M Sargent replied 59 that it is just a lot line adjustment and not a subdivision because they are not creating any new lots or 60 making any improvements. The Commissioners commented that the conservation buffer signs and the 61 wetland buffer should be noted on the plan.

62 DRC – 3 Akira Way Site Plan – Map 28, Lot 31-1: Brian Pratt, P.E, from Fuss & O'Neill, 50 Commercial 63 Street, Manchester, NH, addressed the Commission. B Pratt told the Commission that he is here to 64 present a minor site plan amendment to a previously approved plan. He explained that in 2004 there 65 was an industrial site plan approved for a two-level facility with access off Technology Drive for the 66 upper level and access off Akira Way for the lower level. He explained that the developer never 67 developed the site as it was not cost effective, so in 2014 they did a site plan amendment for a 9,600 SF 68 multi-tenant industrial building for plumbers, electricians, etc. He said that there is a sidewalk and doors 69 to each unit and the back has garage doors. He mentioned it was recently purchased by Ranger 70 Development Corp and they are proposing to reduce the building to 7,200 SF and connect the driveway 71 all around the building. He stated that they are proposing to reduce the impervious area by 2,300 SF. He 72 added that nothing else changes and there are no wetlands on the site or anywhere within 75-feet of

the property. D Lievens mentioned that recently the Commission has been letting applicants know that



74 the Calary Pear is not a good choice for their landscape plan, as they do not live long, break and the 75 flowers do not smell good. B Pratt asked if there was a replacement the Commission would recommend. 76 D Lievens answered that they do not have a specific replacement, but suggested a crab apple tree if they 77 are looking for a blooming spring flower. B Pratt remarked that he would pass this along, noting that 78 they have not updated the landscaping plan yet, as the original landscape architect that designed the 79 plan works for another company. M Speltz suggested red oak or red maple as safe choices, and they are 80 native. B Pratt commented that he would pass this along to the landscape architect. M Speltz asked if 81 they are asking for a waiver for two internal trees. B Pratt replied that is correct, as this is an industrial 82 plaza and not a retail plaza, they are requesting to push the trees to the outer perimeter for ease of 83 maintenance, as the internal islands are difficult to plow around. He added that they do have one 84 internal island in the front that they added back with this revision. M Speltz asked if the original 85 approved plan included the internal island. B Pratt replied that the original approved plan received 86 waivers. G Harrington noted that the landscape plan has a note that reads as follows: "The building has 87 shrunk, no changes proposed to the landscaping" but now the traffic flow goes around the whole 88 building and the landscape plans shows it with two dead ends. B Pratt asked if he had reviewed the 89 redline overlay plan sheet. G Harrington replied that he understood the red outline was the new 90 building, but stated that they are placing pavement on the new plan where the landscaping used to be. 91 B Pratt responded that was not correct and reviewed the redline overlay plan with the Commission. He 92 commented that since the landscape architect no longer works for Knowles Design, it is complicated to 93 try and get a new landscape plan. M Speltz suggested that the Commission recommend the landscape 94 plan be updated. B Pratt remarked that he would try, but stated that the landscaping is not changing, 95 they are just reducing the building footprint. He said that it seems silly to spend \$5,000 for a new 96 landscape plan on paper, when the old one is perfectly capable of being constructed. He went on stating 97 that the applicant thought he could just pull a building permit for a slightly smaller building, and not 98 through the whole site plan process. He said that the applicant thought this could be handled 99 administratively, but when they submitted the proposed plan, they were told it could not. M Speltz 100 asked if the traffic flow goes both directions around the building. B Pratt replied that it is designed for 101 two-way circulation. The Commissioners commented that they recommend avoiding Calary Pear trees 102 and updating the landscaping plan.

103 Unfinished Business

Plummer monitoring: M Badois told the Commission that both herself and Officer Aprile will be walking
 this with someone from LCIP on June 9, 2022.

106 **Musquash Bridges:** M Badois informed the Commission that the mountain bike club will provide them 107 with a diagram of what they are proposing to build and where they are going to build before they start 108 any work. M Byerly asked what places they have proposed in the Musquash. M Badois replied that there 109 are a couple places and mentioned the Landing Trail. M Byerly mentioned that this could be used on the



- 110 Heron Trail. M Speltz suggested a log bridge as it is fairly deep. B Maxwell noted that if they are willing
- to do this, Whadaya Think Trail has some planks that have been misplaced.
- 112 Ingersoll: D Lievens reiterated to M Byerly that they have a new contact person, Matt Scaccia. She
- noted that there is woolly adelgid there, but she does not know how bad this is. She asked if M Byerly would reach out to him. M Byerly replied that he would.
- Woolly adelgid: M Speltz informed the Commission that there is a hemlock on the corner of Gilcreast and Cortland, about 100-feet west of the intersection. He commented that he is not sure what the protocol is for a tree affected with wolly adelgid on private property. D Lievens said that she would take a look and investigate. M Badois asked if the state would get involved. G Harrington replied that this is up to the property owner before it dies and falls. M Speltz wondered what the transmission factor might be the longer it stays.
- 121 Kendall Pond: M Byerly told the Commission that he walked Kendall Pond and did some simple trail 122 work. M Badois asked if they need to do any work with the kiosk. M Byerly replied that he thought it 123 looked good, but the posts the boy scout did have some stickers missing and graffiti. He said that the 124 Commission might want to revisit the posts. M Speltz suggested what they did on the Rail Trail with the 125 QR codes and asked if M Byerly could talk to Trailways about this. M Byerly replied that he would do 126 this. B Maxwell pointed out that this area is subject to the most vandalism. M Speltz asked if is it mostly 127 on the platform. B Maxwell replied that it is mostly on the platform, but noted a post and a bench had 128 been tagged with graffiti. M Badois asked about the picnic tables. B Maxwell replied that they are still 129 there, stating one was tagged with graffiti last year. He pointed out that all the graffiti has been 130 removed.

131 New Business

- Scobie Pond paddle event: M Badois asked if the Commission wanted to do such an event this year. M Byerly asked how well attended this event was the last time it was held. M Badois pointed out that the last time they held this event was pre-COVID. M Speltz replied that they are not well attended, but the people that do come enjoy it. M Badois pointed out that in the past, they have done this when the blueberries are good for picking, like the end of July or beginning of August. M Badois suggested August 6, 2022, for a date. M Speltz asked if 10 a.m. would be a good time. M Badois replied that would be great and suggested the event go from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.
- **Treasurer report:** D Lievens commented that she did the report and thought that the Rockingham County Conservation District (RCCD) invoice should have been paid out of the Open Space Fund, but it was from the Line Item Budget. She noted that they still have money in case they need it as they have spent approximately \$2,600, which leaves roughly \$500. She added that there is no land use change tax
- this year.



- 144 **NHFG:** M Badois told the Commission that the contact at the New Hampshire Department of Fish &
- Game (NHFG) that was trying to help Kyle Chrestensen at Mack's with the deer problem did not call him
- back. She said that she hoped Kyle was able to watch the meeting or read the minutes about this.
- 147 Updates: M Speltz informed the Commission that he submitted the pre-proposal paperwork to the
- Aquatic Resource Mitigation (ARM) Fund on the conservation project they are working on today. He
- 149 mentioned that the executed purchase and sale agreement is in the hands of the Town Manager, but he
- is on vacation this week, so it has not been signed. M Badois asked if the seller signed it. M Speltz
- replied that the seller has signed it. He will be working on the grant next. M Badois asked who has been
- 152 out there. M Speltz replied that the wetland scientist has been out there and discovered an osprey nest.
- 153 He said that the Forest Society's Vice President of Conservation visited the property and will take this to
- their board for approval for them to hold the conservation easement. M Badois asked if the appraisal
- 155 was done yet. M Speltz responded that the appraisal is due at the end of July. M Badois clarified she was
- asking about the appraisal on another property. M Speltz replied that it has not, but there have been
- some recent developments that he is not fully informed on at this time.

158 Other Business

- 159 **Minutes:** The Commissioners went over the public minutes of May 10, 2022. D Lievens made a motion
- 160 to approve the minutes as amended. G Harrington seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0-2,
- 161 with S Malouin and M Byerly abstaining.
- 162 The Commissioners went over the non-public minutes of May 10, 2022. B Maxwell made a motion to
- approve the minutes as presented. D Lievens seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5-0-2, with S
- 164 Malouin and M Byerly abstaining.

165 Non-Public Session

- Adjournment: M Byerly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:21 p.m. B Maxwell seconded themotion. The motion passed, 7-0-0.
- 168 Respectfully Submitted,
- 169 Beth Morrison
- 170 Recording Secretary