

**Town of Milton**  
424 White Mtn Highway  
Milton NH, 03851



**Planning Board**  
PO Box 310  
(p)603-652-4501 (f)603-652-4120

---

**Meeting Minutes**  
**March 6, 2018**  
**6:30 PM**

Members in Attendance: Joseph Michaud, Peter Hayward, Brain Boyers, Bob Bourdeau, Ryan Thibeault Ex. Officio, Larry Brown

Public Attendance: Nick Marique, Dennis Woods, Lynette McDougall, Tom McDougall, Alexx Monastiero

Chairman Boyers called the meeting to order at 6:30pm

Public Comment: No public comment.

**Public Hearing:** to receive public input on the approved language for the proposed amendment to the Driveway Regulations:

Chairman Boyers opened to the public: No public comment. Closed public comment and public hearing. L. Brown moves to approve the updated language of the Driveway Regulations. P. Hayward seconds the motion. Discussion: L. Brown noted he still thinks the driveways are too wide and too much impermeable surface on the properties. Vote: All in favor (5-0) Driveway regulations update approved.

Alexx Monastiero re: Preliminary Conceptual Consultation, to review a yield plan for a future Open Space Subdivision, property located on Northeast Pond Rd, Tax Map 23 Lot 44, owner Three Ponds Investment LLC: Alexx Monastiero of Three Ponds Investments LLC, was in attendance, presented to the board a sketch yield plan designed by Norway Plains depicting 17 lots by regular subdivision and zoning standards lots. The goal for the property is to do an open space subdivision, this would allow them to conserve 50% of the lot, and approximately 25 acres as designated open space, the remainder of the lot would become buildable lots. On the presented yield plan there is one lot line that is incorrect, all the lots meet the dimensional requirements, all being 2 acres, 200 feet of frontage and contain the right amount of wetlands but lot 13 or the yield plan by error cannot have a house on it because of the side and wetland setbacks, error in the drafting, have a sketch plan of how that could be corrected and allow for 17 lots. Another part of her attendance is the hopes to receive some initial feedback form the board as they move forward with the open space development.

B. Bourdeau asked for the explanation of how the lots can be adjusted to allow lot 13 to be a buildable lot. A. Monastiero explained. L. Brown questioned the conceptual drawing and how the lot design would benefit a homeowner. A. Monastiero explained this would not be the actual design of the lot with the open space development.

B. Woodruff explained to the board that the end game here is for the board to review the conceptual plan that shows how a conventional subdivision can be laid out and meet all dimensional requirements and aspects of zoning, so that the board can approve a yield plan number, so the developer can then go back using the open space subdivision zoning regulations prepare an open space subdivision plan that shows smaller lots that are clustered in one or two areas that would be better for the land and abutters, 50% will be open space and will not all be developed like a conventional subdivision, but a number must be decided on so the developer can base their calculations on that. Board needs to determine if the concept plan before them passes the straight face test in regards to zoning and then make a motion to that number they decide.

A. Monastiero noted that regardless of the max number decided tonight, they will still be limited by the characteristics of the land, it is possible that even if the board approves for 17 lots they could come back with 15, it provides a good starting point for them.

B. Bourdeau questioned if what is decided tonight being preliminary has to be the final decision.

B. Woodruff replied not if they are following the open space subdivision rules, there is step in the open space subdivision regulations that says the developer will come before the board with a yield plan. B. Bourdeau takes issue with receiving a copy of the plans the night of the meeting and expected to make a decision. L. Brown questioned if he heard clearly that they have made no assessments of the character of the land and roadway, for the "17 lots" or for the open space, are they satisfied that the roadway being shown is practical and the access is practical. A.

Monastiero replied the conversation has taken place with the engineer, this lot has come before the Planning Board with a previous subdivision under different ownership, this proposed road was designed as part of those plans, the engineers both think it is plausible that the road could possibly be built, addressed the state of Bolan Rd where it is a very narrow right of way, understands the boundary line survey is being re-done and the wetlands delineation is being re-done, that would all be included on a future plan, saying 17, 10 or 5 lots gives them a starting point, they would still come back with a plan that meets the regulations.

B. Woodruff pointed the board to number 7 page 22 of the Open Space Developments that speaks to the yield plan and total number of density, cautioned the board to remember the plan before them is not what the same plan that will be submitted for full review, board needs to make a determination if the lots shown before them meet zoning and subdivision regulations and if the road can be put in to meet frontage.

Board discussed the wetlands of the parcel and DES permits, the steep slopes depicted on each page of the presented plan.

B. Bourdeau questioned who is saying the lots meet the requirements. A. Monastiero replied two engineers are Norway Plains have worked on the plans. B. Bourdeau asked if there is anything from them stating that. A. Monastiero replied that it was the intent of the notes on the plan that gives specifications. L. Brown questioned in terms in having a contiguous lot of land that reps open space, uncomfortable (was here in 2005) looking at something that does not show both sides of the menu, does not know how much of the road they might keep, A. Monastiero have not engineered any open space development plans, explained where they would like to preferably put the open space development spots, ideal plan is the put the development on one half of the lot and then the other half be the open space.

B. Bourdeau would be comfortable with 16 lots, and if they really want the 17 would have to prove it more. P. Hayward when looking at it, there is ways to reconfigure the lots to make sure they all meet requirements.

**P. Hayward motions to allow and accept 16 lots as the yield plan for Map 23 Lot 44. L.**

Brown seconds the motion. Discussion: R. Thibeault thinks that is reasonable with the large wetlands on lot 13, J. Michaud if they did the re-write and still cannot get the 17<sup>th</sup> right now 16 is more reasonable, P. Hayward noted that with the lands constraints it may only drive the number down it will not go up, L. Brown commented on cul-de-sac sizes to lot sizes. **Vote: 6-0 in favor, motion carried.**

A. Monastiero explained it will be a few months before they come before the board, surveys should be done in April, intend to meet with Town Planner and then come for Design Review.

Site Plan Review Regulation Analysis & Revision: B. Woodruff explained to the board he has begun to revise the Site Plan Regulations, there are several requirements that are not up to date, wanted to discuss with the board how many days the board wants plans to be submitted prior to the meeting currently says 17, the regulations have changed to 21 days but Towns can set a longer time frame. Brought up to the board agribusiness/agricultural business to be added to the site plan. B. Woodruff asked the board if wanted to amend and update the current site plan regulations or start with a new document that is based off the template ordinance made Milton centric from the State recommendations.

Chairman Boyers feels they should start over, P. Hayward commented that after the work they did with Master Plan piece meal fixing it seems it would be a better idea to start with a fresh document for the Site Plan. L. Brown Chairman Boyers pointed out that even going with a new document the board still must review it and hold public hearings.

Board was in consensus to do a new document.

Discussion on how many days would be best to receive plans, asked the Land Use Clerk what would be best for that department. She replied that 30 days would allow for ample time to make sure everyone has a full chance to review everything submitted without rushing.

Town Planner Comments: No further comments.

Approval of Minutes: February 20, 2018 meeting minutes- R. Thibeault motions to approve the minutes, P. Hayward seconds the motion. All in favor (J. Michaud and B. Bourdeau abstained)

Other Business: D. Crossley reported to the board that they received a letter from the Department of Environmental Services Request for more information, no action required by the board.

B. Bourdeau motions to adjourn, L. Brown seconds the motion and thanks B. Bourdeau for his years of service. All in favor, meeting adjourned at 7:24pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Crossley  
Land Use Clerk