

**DUNBARTON PLANNING BOARD  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2012  
TOWN OFFICES – 7:00 P.M.**

The regular monthly meeting of the Dunbarton Planning Board was held at the above time, date and place with Chairman Ken Swayze presiding. The following members were present:

**Kenneth Swayze, Chairman  
George Holt, Co-Chairman  
Alison Vallieres, Secretary  
Michael Guiney  
Travis James, Alternate  
Charles Frost, Alternate  
Les Hammond, Selectman**

**Matt Monahan, Central NH Regional Planning Commission**

**Members of the Public:**

None

The Chairman verified with the Secretary that the Meeting had been posted in accordance with the RSA in two public places and published on the Dunbarton Web Page.

**7:00 P.M. – GENERAL SESSION:**

**A. General Board Discussion**

1. Approval of previous meeting minutes: Wednesday, September 19, 2012

**MOTION:**

Les Hammond made a motion that the minutes from the previous meeting of September 19, 2012 be approved as written. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Selectmen's Report:

Les Hammond stated he had nothing to report from the Selectmen's Office.

3. Meeting Schedule for November 2012:

Ken Swayze, Chairman, stated that the third Wednesday of the month for November would be the night before Thanksgiving. Due to travel plans, etc., some of the members might not be able to attend. Due to the fact that we will have business to conduct (possibility of four applications), the Planning Board should consider rescheduling the meeting to the following week.

Both Les Hammond and Travis James will be unable to attend if the Planning Board Meeting is rescheduled to Wednesday, November 28, 2012 due to a scheduled Town Hall Restoration Meeting on that date.

**The final decision was to reschedule the November Planning Board Meeting to Tuesday, November 27, 2012.**

**CONTINUED WORK ON THE OPEN SPACE PROPOSED ORDINANCE:**

Matt Monahan, Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission, gave the Board members a spread sheet showing other towns and how they addressed Open Space Cluster Ordinances. (attached) In addition, he presented a "Cluster Review Summary" for the Board to review. (attached)

Matt stated he would like the Planning Board to address the following items this evening and have the Planning Board make decisions on each item before proceeding.

1. Should this only be Single Family Residences
2. Individual Lot Size Minimum
3. Lot Size Minimum for Parent Tract
4. Buffers around the Parent Tract
5. % of Parent Tract allocated for Open Space

The Planning Board went over the above items and made decisions as follows:

1. Should this only be Single Family Residences

**The Planning Board reached a consensus that this Ordinance would only be for Single Family Residences.**

The Board noted they already had sufficient Ordinances relating to Multi-Family i.e. Workforce Housing, a Multi-family district along Route 13 and 77, and a recent ordinance change relating to in-law apartments.

2. Individual Lot Size Minimum

Alison Vallieres stated she felt that two acres would be an acceptable minimum size lot. She noted that we presently have smaller lots than two acres and there are always issues.

Ken Swayze stated he tended to agree with the two acre minimum.

George Holt stated he felt it should be smaller than two acres. If you can put a well, septic system and house on the lot, it should be allowed to be smaller than two acres.

Les Hammond stated that how can we allow very small lots and still defend our five acre minimum? How can we maintain the Rural Character of Dunbarton, etc. if we allow these very small lots within this Open Space Ordinance?

Travis James stated he felt that the lots could be smaller than two acres.

The Board noted that the formula for computing how many lots would be allowed within the tract would be determined by the Minimum Lot Size in the particular District the Parent tract was located. (Either 5 acres for Low Density District or 3 acres for Medium Density District.) It was noted that the Village District is two acres minimum and the Board was undecided as to whether this Ordinance would apply to the Village District also.

Setback for Septic Systems were discussed. It was noted that the State allows a ten foot setback whereby the Town of Dunbarton mandates a 50 foot setback. (It was noted that with regard to non-conforming lots, there is a lesser setback allowed with stipulations, etc. )

It was noted that it would be difficult to apply the 50 foot setback for lots 1.5 acres. Should consider changing the setback for lots within the Open Space Ordinance.

**The Planning Board reached a consensus that the Minimum Lot Size to be allowed would be 1.5 acres.**

**3. Lot Size Minimum for Parent Tract**

**After discussion, the Planning Board reached a consensus that the minimum size Parent Tract should be no smaller than 20 acres.**

**4. Buffers around the Parent Tract**

**The Planning Board discussed various buffers and reached a consensus that the Buffer around the entire Parent Tract should be 100 feet. This would mean no structures, cutting of trees, etc. within 100 feet of the perimeter boundary. This will provide screening for the development.**

**5. % of Parent Tract allocated for Open Space**

The Planning Board discussed this issue in detail. It was noted that the amount set aside for Open Space was self-limiting and determined by the size and number of lots proposed.

There was also discussion about what the Open Space would be used for and who would own it. Would it be deeded to the Town? Would it be owned by an Association of the development? Would it be part of Conservation Land?

Alison Vallieres stated she did not feel the Conservation Commission wanted many small parcels scattered throughout the Town. They are interested in connecting land to their existing holdings at this point. This becomes a monitoring issue for the Town and/or the Conservation Commission.

Ken Swayze noted that the Town should not want the developer to be given a credit for all wetlands (i.e. excessive wetlands on a very wet tract) as "required" open space. We should make a determination that only 30% or so of the wetlands could be used as part of a credit for reducing lot size or increasing number of lots.

**6. Density Incentive**

The Board discussion the Density Incentive of giving a developer one or two extra lots if he chose the Open Space Development.

Ken Swayze, Chairman, stated he felt this would encourage developers to chose this way of developing, etc.

Les Hammond stated he felt the developer was already getting an incentive by developing the property with less infrastructure such as less roads, smaller lots, etc. This is enough of an incentive.

Alison Vallieres stated she felt that they are already getting an incentive and would not allow for extra lots, etc.

**The Board reached a consensus that there would be no density incentives for Open Space Development.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alison R. Vallieres, Secretary

