

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

Chairman Fowler calls the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Matt Fowler, Alternate Brenda DiMatteo, Tim Jandebaur, Ruth Vultaggio, Babette Morrill, Alternate Justin Miller and Pam Sanderson.

TOWN STAFF PRESENT:

Board Administrator Linda Smith, Land Use Secretary Susan Austin, and Attorney Amy Manzelli, Counsel for the Zoning Board.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Matt Fowler, Tim Jandebaur, Ruth Vultaggio, Babette Morrill and Pam Sanderson.

MINUTES

Ms. Sanderson made a motion to accept the minutes of October 23, 2017. Ms. Morrill seconded. Motion carried 5/0

REHEARING

Case 17-11R: Suzanne Steed and Grace Burr, 32 Shore Drive, Map 122/39. Consideration of Motion for Rehearing, decision of August 28, 2017.

Ms. Sanderson made a motion to grant the rehearing, to be held on December 18, Mr. Jandebaur seconded.

Ms. Sanderson stated that in making the motion to grant the rehearing, she stated that she would like to open up the opportunity for new evidence to be brought forth, with the contingency that any new evidence be received no later than two weeks before the hearing date. Mr. Fowler stated that since the rehearing date is December 18th, any new information they would like to include would be due on December 4th.

Motion carried 5/0.

Case 17-18R: John Kane, 32 Shore Drive, Map 122, Lots 45,46,77. Consideration of Motion for rehearing, decision of September 25, 2017.

Ms. Sanderson made a motion to rehear the decision of case 17-18 of September 25, to be reheard on January 22, 2018, contingent upon new information being supplied to the board no later than January 8, 2018. Mr. Jandebaur seconded.

Ms. Sanderson stated that this was a *du novo* review, so they would be looking at this case, and all the information from fresh. They will review the case of RSA 674:41 from scratch. They will look at all the material again and make a decision based on that. Ms. Manzelli stated that the decision that they are making tonight to have a rehearing or to not have a rehearing typically is not a public hearing. Tonight the board would be making this decision publicly, and people can view it, but there is no participation of the public. When they have the rehearing, it would be a full public hearing. The applicant or any member of the public may attend

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

Motion carried 5/0.

Continued Cases:

CASE 17-14: Dan Moore for Steve Kutftnec, 9 Pleasant View Ave, Map 109 Lot 35. Applicant seeks to build a new two-bedroom single family home and is requesting the following variances:

- A variance to Article IV. B(6)(d)(8) for type of road frontage (private road)
- A variance to Article IV. B(2)(b) for lot size that does not meet the zoning ordinance, lot has .19 acre, where two acres are required. **Approved 10/23**
- A variance to Article IV. B(1)(c)(1) Length of frontage, lot has 120 feet where 150 feet is required. **Approved 9/25**
- A variance to Article IV.A Table IV-1 Minimum setback for the septic field does not meet 20 feet. **Approved with conditions 8/28**
- A variance to Article IV.A Table IV-1: setback for house is 8.37 feet where 20 feet is required. **Approved 10/23**

Chair Fowler stated that the applicant has requested to continue their case until the December 18 meeting.

Chair Fowler made a motion to continue Case 17-14 until December 18. Ms. Sanderson seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

CASE 17-17: Granite Street Properties, LLC Map 108 Lot 102. 1520 First NH Turnpike. Applicant proposes to construct a roadway and is requesting the following:

- Applicant proposes to construct a roadway which will impact 5,420 square feet of slopes between 20-25% and is requesting a special exception as specified in the zoning ordinance Article VI Section E (2.)
- Applicant is proposing to construct a roadway which will impact 6,065 square feet of wetlands and is requesting a special exception as specified in the zoning ordinance Article VI Section A (4).

Ms. Sanderson recused herself because she is an abutter.

Ms. Morrill recused herself due to conflict of interest.

Chair Fowler recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Voting Designation:

Brenda DiMatteo, Tim Jandebour, Ruth Vultaggio, and Justin Miller.

Mr. Jandebour was Chair Pro Tem for Case 17-17

Mr. Jandebour, Chair Pro Tem, called the applicants to the table.

Mark Sargent from Richard Bartlett and Associates, and Cindy Balcius, a certified wetland scientist from Stoney Ridge Environmental, were present for the applicant.

Mr. Sargent stated that the applicant plans to construct a subdivision out of 43.82

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

acres. In order to complete that, they need to get two special exceptions from the ZBA to construct the proposed roadway. It is a 16-lot subdivision. 14 of the lots would be accessed from the new road; two lots would be accessed from Old Turnpike Road. These are proposed for single family residential use. They are requesting two special exceptions: Article VI Section E (2.) Steep slope district, the proposed roadway will impact 5,420 square feet of 20% to 25% slopes and those are the areas shaded in blue on the plans. The other special exception is Article VI Section A (4), the wetlands overlay district. There are two wetlands crossings that total 6,065 square feet. There is an existing culvert at one of the crossings, and they are proposing to expand that culvert. Also, there is a wetland located right at the intersection of where the loop starts, and they would be proposing to impact the entire wetland. They did have a meeting in August with the Northwood Conservation Commission to review as part of their requirements for the wetland overlay district. They sent a memo to the board to let them know their comments.

Mr. Jandebeur read the memo from the Conservation Commission.

9-18-2017

From the Office of the Conservation Commission, Town of Northwood, NH.

To the Zoning Board of Adjustment

Re: application for special exceptions, 168 Granite Street Properties.

The Northwood Conservation Commission acknowledges that they did a cursory review of the proposed project at the September 5, 2017 meeting and have no obvious objections. The Commission does plan to do a site walk in the future, possibly with the Planning Board as part of their review of the subdivision.

Three criteria for the Special Exception for construction in areas with slopes of 20% or greater but less than 25% may be granted if the following criteria are met:

1. The impact of the clearing and development shall be the minimum necessary to accommodate the development.

Mr. Sargent: As we testified earlier, they put a lot of thought into this particular development to have the least amount of impact on slopes and wetlands. As you can see from our plan, there is an existing woods road that impacts those slopes right now, especially at the culvert crossing. We planned it to be the minimum impact possible to access the upper portion of the property, while steering clear of impacting the wetlands or the Flat Meadow Brook area that is near Old Turnpike Road.

2. A suitable erosion control plan shall be implemented during construction.

Mr. Sargent: We have hired Novis Engineering out of Concord to provide the engineering plans on this. As part of this application we will be into site specific permitting which requires the erosion control plan. The grading plan associated

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

with the site itself is part of the application for both the state and the Planning Board they will be providing additional plans that will show the erosion control that will be provided.

3. A suitable drainage plan shall be implemented for post development conditions.

Mr. Sargent: Again, we have hired Novis Engineering to do an engineered drawing on this. There is a series of swales and detention basins that will be associated with the drainage from the roadway for this project.

Ms. Smith stated that Mr. Sargent had said drainage plan post development is completed? Mr. Sargent stated that it is not completed. The engineering firm has been put on hold until they have the special exception in place. They would be open to it being a condition of approval. The whole idea behind the drainage is that the pre-development doesn't exceed the post development. Ms. Smith stated that it would be up to the board. Either they can make it conditional which would be making a special exception conditional, which basically requires that all three must be met to grant approval. They could ask for that information to be provided so they can review it. She states to the board that is one of the criteria that you have the right to ask for and see. Ms. Vultaggio asked if it also applied to the erosion control plan as well. Ms. Smith stated that she understood that it was available for the board to review. Mr. Sargent stated that they could provide those plans if that would like to see them. Mr. Jandebuer stated that they would like to see them.

Mr. Jandebuer opened up the public comment.

Pam Sanderson spoke as an abutter. She stated that she lives on 132 Old Turnpike Road. She stated that she has lived there since 1984. She stated that she was presenting long term evidence of flooding, erosion and damage. She presented the board with photographs documenting damage from storms going back to the late 1980's until 2017. Ms. Sanderson stated that by increasing the amount of runoff or any slope changes, that has to be seriously addressed. Formally, it used to be within the jurisdiction of the Planning Board to request that a peer review be conducted by the town engineer. This has now been extended to the zoning board. The zoning board can request that this plan be reviewed by the town engineer, and the expense is to be provided by the property owner. Ms. Sanderson adds that they have a long history with this property, her husband was caretaker for it. She's walked it and snowshoed it. She was very good friends with the former owner. She doesn't wish the property owners any ill will; she thinks it would be a beautiful place to have homes. She is objecting to 16 lots, she feels it is an overuse of the property. She also looked at the idea of 43 acres, that the property owner is a steward of the property, they have the power and ability to stay within the Town Ordinances without a special variation. She stated that she learned a long time ago, that if the land is available, you "move the shed". Essentially what she is proposing is that there are other alternatives to the site development that will not impact slopes and will not impact wetlands. She referenced the 2013 minutes of the planning board. It was not a proposal at that time; it was a site design review with abutters present. Mr. Jandebuer was present at that meeting.

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

She stated that the ZBA should review the minutes from that meeting to see what the input was from that meeting as well. She distributed a copy of the referenced minutes.

Jeff Tenley was present as an abutter. Mr. Tenley stated that he lives at 176 Old Turnpike Road. He stated that he is a Civil Engineer for the Natural Resource Conservation Service. He stated that he doesn't begrudge the land owners. They have invested in the property, and he understands wanting to develop it. He stated that he has a few concerns. He stated that on October 25th, Northwood had two and a half inches of rainfall: on the 26th, 1.1 inches; on the 27th an inch. Almost four inches of rainfall fell in a three-day period. Then on October 30th the big storm came in with a 3.3-inch rain fall. A 3.3-inch rainfall is about a ten-year storm event. T, Based on the saturated conditions prior to the one-day event the road below where the marsh is was flooded although there were two days in between those 4 inches of rain. The road was covered. It was still passable, but there was about a half a foot to ten inches of water covering that road. You may be familiar with some of our programs in our agency; we have a program called EFH 2 which is a hydrology program to run calculations on runoff. We also have TR 55 which is another program which is used in the industry to determine runoff in an area. He stated that he delineated the watershed to the best he could today, and he figured where he lives there would be two homes proposed across the street. The area where the development that runs towards Old Turnpike Road is about 7.2 acres of watershed. The soils there are Canton soils, which is a moderately drained soil, or hydrological group B. He states that he ran a few hydrology runs just to see what the increase would be, compared to what is existing there now, compared to what would happen with the 7.2 acres of watershed that drains toward Old Turnpike Road and Flat Meadow Brook. Existing conditions consist of a wooded area in fairly good condition, so when you are looking for a curve number, which is an empirical number that deals with the direct runoff from the site, the curved number with the woods there is about a 63. The curve number with a development based on two acre lots, within the 7.2 acres of watershed, with one acre of impervious (due to roofs of the homes and the road) jumps to 70. Currently with a 25-year storm, we are getting about 9 CFS, cubic feet per second of runoff from that area. After the development based on two acres residential lots and taking into account the impervious surface, the runoff for a 25-year storm would be 13 CFS, a 31% increase. If we go up to a 100-year storm, we are looking at a 26% increase of runoff from the 7.2 acres. He stated that he also ran it with TR 55. He adds that EFH 2 is used for a lot of our hydrology work, but when more than 10% of the acreage is urban, we use the TR55, which is an industry standard that most engineers will be using. The TR 55 came up with approximately the same results: between a 25%-30% increase in runoff. He adds if this is allowed to go forward there will be an increase in runoff when they remove the trees and the leaf litter, there will be more runoff. What is the town going to do about it and who's going to take care of the road if it's flooding on a three-inch rain storm? There will be a 30% increase and it will flood more often. It's pretty much a no outlet road. The town does have a right of way, but the problem is that it becomes very mucky. The town has a chain across it when the road gets flooded, which has happened three times in the 21 years that he has lived there. In order to get through there, the town would have to come in and do something to upgrade the other exit in some manner. Ms. Smith stated this is not town right of way; it is a private road. Mr. Tenley stated he did not know that. He stated that the other comment he had was that

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

he understood that there is 6,000 square feet of wetland impact and the gentleman mentioned that there were two crossings. It seems for a culvert crossing it is much less than 6,000 square feet. What is the other crossing for?

Mr. Sargent stated that the other crossing did not need a culvert. It is a forested wet area that sits at the top of the hill. Ms. Balcius stated that it was an isolated pocketed forested wetland. They are proposing about 5,000 square feet of impact to that area.

Ms. DiMatteo asked if perhaps they could create less lots, instead of 16 maybe a smaller number of lots. Mr. Sargent stated that he didn't believe that fewer lots would have any impact on slopes. The road is the road. You can see where the steep slope section is, they would still have some kind of road coming in. He stated that they met with the planning board in 2013 for a design review. There was considerable discussion about Old Turnpike Road and the flooding, and that sort of steered the direction of this development and why they avoided having any impact or heading the road toward Old Turnpike Road.

Mr. Jandebaur stated that one of the things that has been brought up is that they have the option to have the town engineer take a look at the plans. He stated that it might become more of an option when they start looking at the wetlands. Ms. Smith stated that one of the things the board may want to see is any detailed plans including profiles including what the grade of the road is predevelopment and post development. There are details the board may want to see, such as what is the culvert crossing going to look like? Or, how is it going to be built? What is the size of it? Now it's just marks indicated on a road map. Mr. Jandebaur asked Mr. Sargent if he had any of that information. He stated that he did, but he didn't have it with him this evening, but he could certainly provide that information to them. He stated that he didn't think they would need that information this evening. Mr. Jandebaur stated that they had a couple of issues as far as more information and they also need to consider if they would like the town engineer to look at the slopes. They can move to the next issue so they can decide if there are more issues that they need to look at as well.

Ms. DiMatteo made a motion to have the applicant provide more information including details of engineering of the steep slopes with profiles so they can review them and decide if they are going to send them out for peer review. Mr. Jandebaur seconded. Motion carried 4/0.

Mr. Jandebaur made a motion to continue the special exception for steep slopes until January 22nd. Ms. Vultaggio seconded. Motion carried 4/0.

Mr. Jandebaur stated that they would move on to the second special exception. He stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a roadway which will impact 6,065 square feet of wetlands and is requesting a special exception as specified in the zoning ordinance Article VI Section A (4).

1. After the applicant meets with the Conservation Commission, findings by the Northwood Conservation Commission regarding the proposal submitted with

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

the special exception application, are reviewed by the ZBA, and are made a part of the record of case.

Mr. Sargent stated that they did meet with the Conservation Commission in September.

2. Dredging, filling or other alteration shall be designed to minimize adverse impact on the wetland and its setbacks, even if this requires adjustments in design outside of this overlay district.

Mr. Sargent stated that they believe that this is the minimum impact to allow this project to move forward. There is an existing woods road and an existing culvert that they are replacing and expanding, and the wetland that they are proposing to impact at the top of the hill is a low functioning isolated pocket wetland.

3. There shall be provisions made to restore the site as nearly as possible to its original grade and condition

Mr. Sargent stated that they are proposing to impact the wetlands and construct a road on top of it, so he isn't sure how to answer that. Ms. Balcius stated it would be final stabilized when they were finished.

4. A state wetlands permit shall be obtained when required.

Mr. Sargent stated that they will require one, and they will be submitting an application if they are granted a special exception.

5. A Special Exception is not required when the use meets the criteria for a permit by notification as defined by the NH Wetlands Bureau Code of Administrative Rules.

Ms. Balcius stated that it does not meet the requirements.

Pam Sanderson, 132 Old Turnpike Road, stated that her primary question was on the site plan Map 108 Lot 3, which is the small lot down below.

The owners name isn't on it, so she was wondering if that was available, and if it was still part of the ownership right by Eames Realty. She stated that she had the 2008 NLWA report which is water quality program showing for Northwood Lake. There are a lot of people monitoring Northwood Lake and watching what's happening there. Phosphorous sources within the lake's watershed include septic system failure, animal waste, lawn fertilizer, etc. Several sampling sites produce persistently high phosphorus counts including the inlet on Route 4, the Narrows Brook, and Flat

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

Meadow Brook. There are some things coming down through to Northwood Lake through a brook that passes through this property and also from the front. From the Suncook Valley Sun, (2008) "Noting the high E. coli and phosphorus levels within Northwood Lake. Phosphorus sources within the lakes watershed included system failure." "Flat Meadow Brook is high E. coli (2010) and phosphorus." She stated that she would like to point out that this property is very much within the Northwood Lake watershed. She presented some documents from the volunteer assessment program from the Department of Environmental Services. It shows the delineation of the Northwood Lake Watershed, which has this property within it. It also shows the current situation. Once again identifying E. coli, total phosphorus turbidity, and Flat Meadow Brook once again flagged as one of the problems for Northwood Lake. She stated that she also has a geological map in color showing the full radius of Northwood Lake with Flat Meadow Brook coming down through the heightened elevation of this property. She also presented a prime wetland in Northwood from the DES. Flat Meadow Brook before it crosses onto this property is designated as Prime Wetlands. From DES, a list of threatened or impaired waters, Flat Meadow Brook is classified as 5P which is severe. She adds that her contention here is that the wetlands that exist on the property are key and relevant to maintaining the environmental flow of water down through the Northwood Watershed into the Northwood Lake, via the front side and the back side. These wetlands, and every key component that is up there on the high ground, have a purpose. They are not negligible; they are not a percentage to be ignored. She asks about the additional houses that will be built up here; how many of those homes would require a special exception if they wish to put a garage or structure into a wetland. She stated that she had a lot of questions pertaining to the wetlands and the protections up in that area. There is a lot of it is potential for pollution into Northwood Lake which we have to protect at all costs. E. Coli is a human health hazard. Human health, the public health, outweighs all considerations, so she asks once again that the town engineer oversee this application for the board. Also, obtaining additional information from this project is wonderful too. This project can go ahead, but it has to come forth with the public interest. She adds that for Northwood Lake, Flat Meadow brook, the abutters, and all of us that could be affected, there needs to be some good environmental consideration.

Jeff Tenley, 176 Old Turnpike Road, stated that he wanted to make one other point. As the gentleman stated, yes, I used two acres for residential. If there is an increase in residential area, that's actually going to increase your curve number, that will increase your runoff, so the more residential area that you have, the higher that your curve number is going to be if you are taking it out of a forced type system. The seven acres that he delineated, he stated that he didn't have a copy of the map and it would be great if it was made available to the public at some point. He stated that he did the best he could with the delineation, even so, there is some acreage that is running off towards Old Turnpike Road and with residents coming in, there will be an increase in runoff. He stated that he just wanted to reiterate, they just had a 3-inch rainfall, which is not quite a ten year storm with some saturated conditions and the road was

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

flooded. So any additional water coming in will cause a problem down there at the marsh.

Pam Sanderson spoke again. She stated that she wanted to point out that she did a lot of backup research on this and she referenced a lot of RSAs. She lists the RSAs that she referenced: RSA 482 A-1, RSA 483:4, RSA 483:9, RSA 483:9, RSA 483-A, RSA 485 A-17, and RSA 487:15 which include the wetlands fluvial geomorphology, the rural river protection, the lakes management and protection, the terrain alteration and also the clean lake program through the DES.

Ms. Smith stated that all of the material that has been circulated to the board for review has to stay with the board if it's going to be evidence. Ms. Manzelli stated that typically when the matter is concluded finally, a decision has been made and no appeal has been filed and the appeal period has been expired, or if an appeal has been filed and that appellate process has reached an end point, typically the records will be returned. Ms. Smith stated for Robert Young that the map is available and it is public information and available at the town hall during business hours.

Jeff Tenley clarified that they would be asking for the applicant's engineer to supply the board with a design? And the town engineer will be looking at that? Mr. Jandebuer stated yes. Mr. Tenley stated that again, the biggest concern for the people living on the street, the neighbors that he's talked to, even the ones that aren't abutters have stated that their main concern is being able to get out of the main area when it floods, especially for emergency vehicles.

Babette Morrill, 9 Esther Lane, stated that she lives at the end of Flat Meadow Brook where it empties into Northwood Lake. She stated that all the turbidity and E. coli is right where she lives. In the nine years she's lived there, she's seen it go from pretty good to really bad. It feeds in all that erosion and containments in the soil, and it always ends up in the lake. She stated that she can't imagine what it will be like when there are more houses up there. As far as the flooding, it will flood under Route 4; there are two big huge culverts that go under Lake Shore Drive and it's like rapids through there that actually fill up the culverts and these culverts are huge. When it gets really flooded it floods her dock out. The flooding is real. Diversion of the water and erosion causes problems; eventually where she lives those culverts will have to be dredged, there is so much sand and silt now. It's also eroded the culvert. She stated that she just wanted to reiterate the realness of the flooding.

Jeff Tenley spoke again. He stated that he's been working with his agency as a civil engineer for 30 years. When they look at a project, and they are putting a development or a new structure they have to look down gradient or downstream from what they are doing, to see what kind of effect that has. Is that a requirement for this type of project going in? There are 46 acres of development going in which will change the watershed and there are culverts down below. Are those culverts being looked at or being analyzed by the applicant's engineers to see what kind of impact this additional runoff will have? For example, a town road could have a culvert that's undersized for the additional runoff that's coming in. Where does that responsibility lie? It that with the

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

town or the applicant in those situations? Mr. Jandebaur stated that if it's not on the applicant's land he would think no. All he can tell him is that when they are out and fixing things they are oversizing culverts on purpose.

Ms. Smith stated that it is the responsibility of the applicant to show that the post development off site doesn't change from pre-development by increasing runoff.

Mr. Jandebaur closed public comment.

Mr. Jandebaur stated that in his opinion they are in the same place that they were with the steep slopes, they would like more information from the applicant, and they would like that information to go to the engineer so they could take a good hard look at it.

Mr. Sargent stated that he'd like to respond to the abutters concerns. He stated that there were some valid concerns that were brought up. He stated that most of the issues are planning board issues, and they would deal with them there, rather than the zoning board. Tonight, seeking a special exception to allow some minor impacts to slopes and wetlands crossing. Most of the issues that were brought forth concerning erosion or septic design or development of the actual parcels themselves will be dealt with at the planning board. They are more than happy to provide the board with any additional information concerning the construction of the roadway and the grading of the roadway, the erosion control that will be put in place as part of construction of the roadway, and how they are going to be dealing with the runoff from the roadway itself. As it pertains to runoff into Flat Meadow Brook, , they have looked very hard at this particular piece of property. They knew it was a concern with flooding on Old Turnpike Road. They knew it was a sensitive area down by Flat Meadow Brook, and they avoided heading in that direction. He stated that he heard a comment made about a 43 acre development. This isn't a 43 acre development. This is a 43-acre parcel of property with a smattering of proposed single-family homes on it. Those single-family homes may only occupy an acre or less of that. Those are things that they aren't looking at this evening. Ms. Balcius referenced the site map while she was speaking to the board. She stated that she wanted to talk about the wetlands on site, what they found, what they flagged, how they arrived at the decisions of where the entry road is, the impacts that they propose on the project as well as what they have to address as far as RSA 42 A which is the wetlands statute. She stated that the entrance road comes in off of Route 4. One of the reasons why that design was chosen was to avoid Flat Meadow Brook. As a wetlands scientist, we pointed out that it is Prime Wetlands on the other side of the road, so they wanted to put most of the impact on the other side. Mark is correct in saying that the watershed is broken out. Right at the top of the proposed wetland impact to the forested pocketed wetland, it is located at the very top of the watershed. It splits out. Based on that, most of the road design came in on this portion of the watershed. As far as the wetlands go, they were careful to reuse and keep the impacts to an existing forested road that is there. That road has a current culvert crossing which is 18 inches. The road itself, (she submitted a photo) as part of the wetland application, they have to minimize impact. They tried to use what is

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

currently on site, and that existing culverted road would reduce the impact by running the road right through it. All they are doing is upgrading that culvert. The wetland they are crossing is called a forested wetland drainage. It's not a stream (she submitted two pictures of the wetland). You will; notice that there are some pushed leaves, it's more ephemeral in nature, like a swale. From the Wetlands Bureau perspective, they have minimized impact at that location for access to the uplands on the property. She further explains the design by pointing to areas of the map. The engineer does the design, and we handle all the drainage calculations based on the amount of impervious surface that the subdivision has. Everything that Jeff brought up is addressed in the engineer design for the plan. As they go through the wetlands application and continue through what they call the chapter 300, they have to be able to address that their impacts are not going to affect abutters. It's something that is considered by the Wetlands Bureau from the wetland impacts they are doing on this site. In addition, they look at the functions and values of the wetland that they are impacting, in this case it is a forested wetland drainage with a pre-existing crossing. They are really upsizing that crossing. They are impacting a low functioning isolated pocketed wetland that is not a vernal pool, it's a very shallow pocket, and the reason why it's pocketing here is that there is actually a pan. Canton is a well-drained soil, stony and gravelly, and it actually has good infiltration. As you get to the side with the slopes, there is a pan. As far as the recent rain events, she adds that she is involved in the Epsom project on the Suncook River, and they have held back water so that the project can be completed. She's not saying that's the reason for the flooding because it obviously does flood, but that's certainly added 3 inches in an hours' time which is more than a ten-year storm. As far as the amount of wetland impact, it's a little over 6,000 square feet. That's considered a minor impact and they don't need any mitigation for that, it's a relatively low number for an impact for a project.

Mr. Miller asked if the wetland at the intersection had standing water in it. Ms. Balcius stated that there was in the spring and after rain events. Mr. Miller asked what would happen after they build the road there. Ms. Balcius stated that the engineers will accommodate that the volume will be displaced.

Mr. Jandebaur stated that the board would like the engineer to look at the impacts of the wetlands on this property, as well as more information including; planning profiles, drainage calculations, erosion control plan, any information that will assist them in determining the criteria, particularly on criteria number 2 and 3 of the special exception. They will need some detailed engineer plans of the wetland crossing and impact so that they can see the profiles and see where the 6,000 square feet actually is. Any information that will allow them to determine that this design is designed to minimize the adverse effect of the wetland and its setback.

Mr. Miller made a motion to request that the applicant provide more information as discussed. Ms. Vultaggio seconded. Motion carried 4/0.

Mr. Jandebaur made a motion to continue case 17-17 until January 22, 2018.

Mr. Jandebaur states that all information for special exceptions is to be received

**Town of Northwood
Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting
November 13, 2017**

**2 weeks prior to the meeting, no later than Jan. 8. Ms. DiMatteo seconded.
Motion carried 4/0.**

Chair Fowler, Pam Sanderson, and Babette Morill returned to the table.

Mr. Jandebaur handed the meeting back to Chair Fowler.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Matt Fowler, Tim Jandebaur, Ruth Vultaggio, Babette Morrill and Pam Sanderson.

Internal business

Ms. Smith stated that they had discussed the possibility of changing the procedures relative to alternates. There are two different ways that they can do it. They can either not allow an alternate to have any discussion whatsoever as part of the application on a case, they can change it back so they can be involved in discussion, but cannot vote. Ms. Manzelli stated that one of the biggest advantages to letting non-voting members be a part of the discussion, is that a particular alternate might have more institutional knowledge because they have been on the board longer, or just a flat out better memory than other people that might elicit helpful information that without that member's participation would have been unknown. That's one of the major benefits. She stated that she's been told it's more gratifying and satisfying for alternates when you are able to participate. Having engaged members generally lends to the vitality of the board. One of the disadvantages is that it can get a little confusing to administer because they need to keep track of where they are in the meeting. She stated that there is not a general rule how boards handle alternates and this issue. Mr. Fowler stated that the benefits outweigh the ability to keep track of who can speak when. Ms. Smith stated that she will revise the procedures to include that and they will be available to be reviewed for the next meeting. Their procedures require they have to read it twice at subsequent meetings before they can adopt it.

**Ms. Sanderson made a motion to adjourn at 8:12 PM. Ms. Vultaggio seconded.
Motion carried 5/0**

Respectfully submitted

Susan Austin, Land Use Secretary