

# TOWN OF WEBSTER

## PLANNING BOARD

### MEETING MINUTES THURSDAY MAY 18, 2023

The Planning Board held a meeting on Thursday, May 18, 2023. The meeting was held at the Town Hall in the Grange Hall; 945 Battle Street, Webster, NH 03303.

**Planning Board Members present:** Craig Fournier, Paul King, Marlo Herrick, Susan Youngs, Adam Mock, and Theresa Finnemore.

**Also, present:** Land Use Coordinator Russell Tatro, Dan Higginson, Tim Austin, Samantha LaMontagne, Jerry Buckley, Nancy Rosborough.

Chairperson Fournier opened the meeting at 6:30pm by taking attendance and all members were present. He then moved the first item on the agenda, Subdivision Case 23-02 for the Robert H. Austin Trust. Land Use Coordinator Tatro informed the Board that the surveyor for the Austin Trust was not currently at the meeting. Tim Austin then informed the Board that Mr. Higginson was running late.

Chairperson Fournier moved to the next item on the agenda, the review the draft minutes. He informed the Board that prior to the meeting he had asked Coordinator Tatro to make the minutes more detailed because he felt they did not accurately reflect everything the board had discussed at the previous meeting. Coordinator Tatro said that he had created a second set of draft minutes with the amendments marked in red. The Board then reviewed the minutes and the changes in the amended draft. Member King also pointed out that there was a typo that needed to be fixed.

**MOTION:** Member Youngs

*To approve the meeting minutes from 4/20/23 as amended*

**SECOND:** Member Herrick

**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

**MARLO HERRICK – YES**

**PAUL KING – YES**

**ADAM MOCK – YES**

**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

**The motion passed 5 to 0**

Chairperson Fournier then moved to the next item on the agenda, the review of the annual Planning & Zoning Conference. He then went over Planning Board basics such as the duty to assist, providing good feedback, conflicts of interest, and other functions of the Planning Board.

During the review Danial Higginson, the surveyor for the Robert H. Austin Trust arrived and Chairperson Fournier moved back to Public Hearing Case 23-02. Chairperson Fournier began the hearing by going over the procedures and rules for the hearing and then asked Mr. Higginson to explain the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Higginson explained that this subdivision was straightforward. The Austin Trust proposed to subdivide a 5-acre parcel of an 80-acre parcel on Pond Hill Road. The plan didn't show a septic box because there was plenty of space to place a septic on the proposed parcel. He was also aware the Austin's had applied for a driveway permit previously and there had been discussions on how best to avoid impacting the wetland. To do this, they had to move the driveway further up the road to avoid the wet area. Chairperson Fournier asked if Mr. Higginson had read the driveway regulations. Mr. Higginson responded that he had, and they were currently looking for a new spot for the driveway. However, this would all be contingent on where the Austin's decided to build. Chairperson Fournier asked what the time

1 schedule to build would be to build. Mr. Higginson responded that he hoped to get the approval tonight  
2 and the building schedule would be up to Austin's.

3  
4 Member King asked if NHDES didn't like the location of the driveway that had been proposed  
5 previously. Mr. Higginson responded that NHDES had never reviewed, and he felt the location was too  
6 wet. He had suggested the driveway be moved further up to avoid any wetland impact. Member King  
7 asked if the proposed location had been flagged. Mr. Higginson responded that it had not been marked but  
8 the location would be above the original blue marker past the telephone pole. Mr. Austin added that they  
9 had put a stake down with a pink marker for the new location. Member King then asked if the driveway  
10 was expected to be longer than 200ft. Mr. Higginson responded that it would be, and they planned to have  
11 a turnaround. Chairperson Fournier pointed out that the Austin's would need to file a new driveway  
12 permit application and the Road Agent would be able to help them with sighting the best location.

13  
14 Chairperson Fournier asked if Mr. Higginson planned to use granite bounds. Mr. Higginson responded  
15 that they couldn't because of the rock wall at the front of the property and he would be using a capped  
16 iron pipe. Chairperson Fournier responded that would be acceptable.

17  
18 Member King asked if the wetland scientist Mr. Higginson had hired approved of the location of the new  
19 driveway. Mr. Higginson responded that he had not reviewed the location and that the new location was  
20 outside of the wetland area that had been flagged by the scientist.

21  
22 Chairperson Fournier asked if there were any further questions from the Board, hearing none he opened  
23 the meeting to public comment. Jerry Buckley of 266 Pond Hill Road stated that the proposed subdivision  
24 was to the left of his property. He informed the Board that the Austin's had owned the property for many  
25 years, and he felt they always took good care of maintaining the land. He knew this was not a quick  
26 decision on their part and looked forward to having new neighbors.

27  
28 Chairperson Fournier, hearing no further comment, closed the public hearing and the Board began their  
29 deliberation. He asked the Board if anyone wanted to make a motion to approve the subdivision.

30  
31 **MOTION:** Member Youngs

32 *To approve Subdivision Case 23-02 submitted by the Robert H. Austin Revocable Trust with the*  
33 *following conditions:*

- 34 1. setting of all boundary markers per Subdivision Regulations of the Town of Webster, NH,  
35 as Amended September 15, 2022-section 8.6 Boundary Marking;
- 36 2. submission of three (3) updated paper plats;
- 37 3. submission of two (2) final Mylars;
- 38 4. each boundary marker shall be flagged for easy identification with surveyor's tape above grade  
39 level;
- 40 5. walking of the bounds by designated Planning Board members;

41 **SECOND:** Member Herrick

42 **CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

43 **MARLO HERRICK – YES**

44 **PAUL KING – YES**

45 **ADAM MOCK – YES**

46 **SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

47 **The motion passed 5 to 0**

48  
49 Chairperson Fournier then moved back to the review of the information from the annual Planning and  
50 Zoning Conference. The Board continued its review of Planning Board's process and duties. Some of the

1 topics the Board reviewed were the acceptance of applications, period to act on applications, streets as  
2 part of subdivisions, and other related topics.

3  
4 Chairperson Fournier then moved to the next item on the agenda, future zoning.

5  
6 Chairperson Fournier began the discussion by stating he wanted the Board to think about how they saw  
7 the future of Webster and what type of development they wanted to see in Town. He wanted the Board to  
8 think about this in preparation for a discussion he wanted to have in either July or August. Member  
9 Youngs commented that you couldn't currently find land for sale anywhere in Webster. Member Mock  
10 commented that he thought they should discuss reducing the 5-acre zoning requirements. Member Herrick  
11 wanted to review the Driveway Regulations. Coordinator Tatro suggested splitting the suggested topics  
12 up and discussing one per meeting. The Board agreed that idea made sense.

13  
14 Coordinator Tatro asked if the Board also wanted to review the impact fee ordinance. Member Mock  
15 asked if they could reduce it. Coordinator Tatro said that it was a possibility and then the Board briefly  
16 discussed the purpose of the impact fee. Nancy Rosborough commented that she had come to the meeting  
17 today to see how the Planning Board intended to address the language in the impact fee ordinance in  
18 relation to how impact fees are assessed in the event of a fire. She had also asked Coordinator Tatro to  
19 investigate several other cases in the past regarding fires to see if impact fees had been assessed.  
20 Coordinator Tatro stated that he had investigated other Town's ordinances and it appeared that other  
21 towns use the same language as Webster. Member Finnermore asked if the Board was considering a three-  
22 year window of time. Member Youngs responded that was what the Board discussed the last time the  
23 topic had come up.

24  
25 Ms. Rosborough asked if the other two properties that she had mentioned had to pay an impact fee.  
26 Member Youngs asked when the fires had happened. Ms. Rosborough responded that both happened in  
27 2014. Member Youngs stated that her house had burned in 2016 and she had not needed to pay an impact  
28 fee. Member Herrick asked how long it took Member Youngs to rebuild. Member Youngs responded that  
29 she had rebuilt within a year. Ms. Rosborough then asked about the cellar hole any requirements to build  
30 on the same footprint of the previous home. The Board then briefly discussed what changes would trigger  
31 an impact fee assessment. Coordinator Tatro also let the Board know that there was an appointment next  
32 month regarding a question on whether impact fee would be assessed.

33  
34 **MOTION:** Chairperson Fournier  
35 ***To adjourn the meeting 7:44pm***

36 **SECOND:** Member King

37 **CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

38 **MARLO HERRICK – YES**

39 **PAUL KING – YES**

40 **ADAM MOCK – YES**

41 **SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

42 **The motion passed 5 to 0**

43  
44 Respectfully,

45  
46  
47 \_\_\_\_\_  
48 *Minutes taken by Russell Tatro*  
49