

**TOWN OF WEBSTER**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES THURSDAY OCTOBER 21, 2021**

The Planning Board held a meeting on Thursday, October 21, 2021. The meeting was held at the Town Hall in the Grange Hall; 945 Battle Street, Webster, NH 03303.

**Planning Board Members present:** Chairperson Craig Fournier, Paul King, Adam Mock, Susan Youngs.

**Also, present:** Russell Tatro (Land Use Coordinator), please see attached sign in sheet for the public in attendance.

Chairperson Fournier opened the October 21, 2021 meeting at 6:29pm and took attendance. Alternate Members Kathy Bacon, and Ex-Officio Member Marlo Herrick were not in attendance.

Chairperson Fournier moved to the first item on the agenda, the Steeles's driveway.

Daniel Higgins, the Steeles's surveyor, presented the updated driveway plans that were made based on a previous Planning Board site visit. Member King expressed concern that there were only two bump outs on the 1800-foot driveway. Mr. Higgins stated that this wasn't discussed at the previous meeting but there were three places on the driveway that could be used to park. Member Mock asked if the Steele's were still considering perusing the waiver. Ms. Steele responded that they were hoping not to need the waiver. Mr. King asked what the grade of the driveway would be. Mr. Higgins responded that it was about 11% the whole way. Member King continued to express his concerns regarding the lack of bump outs. Mr. Higgins responded that he did not think it would be possible to park on the location he was mentioning because of the steepness of the grade. The Board discussed the driveway plan and agreed that they would approve it on the condition that Road Agent/Fire Chief Bean approved the plan.

**MOTION:** Susan Youngs

*Motion to approve the driveway permit contingent on the approval of the plans by Road Agent/Fire Chief Emmett Bean.*

**SECOND:** Adam Mock

**PAUL KING – YES**

**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

**ADAM MOCK – YES**

**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

**The motion passed 4 to 0**

Chairperson Fournier moved onto the next item on the agenda, the Collins driveway.

John Collins came before the Board to discuss his driveway application off Clothespin Bridge Road. He provided the board with copies of the application and pictures of where he was proposing the driveway. Chairperson Fournier stated that his understanding was that there were already two houses on lot 11-3 and 11-4. Member King stated that he had visited the site but some of the area was posted, and he had not gone into the driveway. From what he had been able to see, it appeared to be two separate driveways. Mr. Collins confirmed that Member King was correct. Member King felt that the Board was looking at the possibility of a shared driveway.

Chairperson Fournier asked if the road was a private road. Member King stated that he didn't even think it was a road and was just a couple shared driveways. Coordinator Tatro gave some history on the road. This was a road that had been part of a subdivision plan approved in the late 60's called the Blackwater Development. He had reviewed the other roads in the subdivision and he was still unsure what this right

1 of way was. He thought it was a paper road that never got constructed but had two driveways built across  
2 the right of way prior to zoning.

3  
4 Chairperson Fournier asked if the abutter was ok with there being a shared driveway. Mr. Collins  
5 responded that his daughter was the abutter, and she would be in favor of a shared driveway. Chairperson  
6 Fournier stated that the Board had to consider future property owners when granting approvals for shared  
7 driveways. Mr. Collins stated that his daughter did not own the land that the driveway went across and to  
8 his knowledge no one owned it. Chairperson Fournier commented that if this was a private road no  
9 driveway permit would be needed. Member Mock commented that it was his understanding that Mr.  
10 Collins would need a driveway permit to build. The Board discussed the current condition of the right of  
11 way. Member King commented that it was likely created prior to driveway regulations. Chairperson  
12 Fournier added that nobody knew who owned the right of way. The Board agreed that it made sense to  
13 have to Town's Attorney look into the matter. Member Mock suggested approving the driveway  
14 contingent on the Town Attorney's findings regarding the road's designation.

15  
16 **MOTION:** Adam Mock

17 *Motion to conditionally approve the driveway application for Mr. Collins contingent on the findings of*  
18 *the Town Attorney regarding the road's designation.*

19 **SECOND:** Susan Youngs

20 **PAUL KING – YES**

21 **CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

22 **ADAM MOCK – YES**

23 **SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

24 **The motion passed 4 to 0**

25  
26 Chairperson Fournier moved onto the next item on the agenda, the second hearing for the proposed  
27 Wetlands and Watershed Ordinance.

28  
29 Chairperson Fournier opened the public hearing at 6:59pm. He gave a brief overview of the previous  
30 public hearing. He pointed out that many of the concerns brought up at the previous hearing would be  
31 grandfathered uses. The Board had added language to the ordinance to clarify this. The Board also  
32 reduced the buffer size to 50ft from the edge of the wetlands for lots two acres or less. The Board had left  
33 the petroleum storage language the same and added language to clarify that the storage of petroleum  
34 products was still allowed outside the buffer. The Board had removed the conditional use permit  
35 requirement for replacement of pre-existing septic systems that were in the buffer and the replacement as  
36 a permitted use. New docks would also be permitted providing that they had NHDES approval. The  
37 Board had also removed the restriction on vertical expansion of pre-existing structures within the buffer.

38  
39 Chairperson Fournier asked if any Board members wished to make any comments. Member King stated  
40 that he was still concerned over the storage of petroleum products. He felt that existing storage of  
41 petroleum products in the district should be able to continue provided it was in an approved storage  
42 container. Member Mock asked if there are State Laws regarding the storage of petroleum products in the  
43 wetlands. Chairperson Fournier responded that there were laws regarding oil storage containers, but they  
44 did not mention wetlands. Wetlands Ordinance Sub-Committee Member Isabel Brintnall clarified that any  
45 current legal storage of petroleum products in structures within the proposed district would be  
46 "grandfathered" and this ordinance would only effect new uses or structures. Select Board Chair  
47 Hemenway asked where the list of State approved containers could be found. Chairperson Fournier stated  
48 he was not sure if there even was a list of State approved containers.

1 James Clarke-Dawe commented that if this ordinance were to pass, he would make sure a can of gas was  
2 in his shed to “grandfather” the use. He also pointed out that the Town could not regulate what was on the  
3 docks or in boats.  
4

5 Mike Jette thanked the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission for all the work they had put  
6 into the ordinance. He thought the ordinance was a bit confusing because one section stated current uses  
7 would be “grandfathered” and in another separate section the same use was listed as prohibited. He felt it  
8 was important that the language in the ordinance be easy to understand for future generations. The Board  
9 agreed with Mr. Jette. Mr. Jette also wanted to make sure his current legal use of fertilizer and pesticides  
10 could continue. Conservation Commission Chair Christine Schadler stated that the goal of the  
11 Conservation Commission is to protect the buffers because the buffers would keep the Town’s wetlands  
12 healthy. Mr. Jette pointed out that difference between the buffer and the district was also confusing.  
13

14 Mr. Clarke-Dawe asked if a property owner currently using State prohibited fertilizer on their property  
15 would be “grandfathered”. Coordinator Tatro pointed out that the use he was mentioning was an illegal  
16 use and would not be grandfathered. Member Mock asked why the State’s Laws were not referenced in  
17 the ordinance. The Board agreed that referencing the State laws in the ordinance would be a good idea.  
18

19 Mr. Clarke-Dawe commented that the language regarding the grandfathering of repairs of structures was  
20 not included in the ordinance. Member Youngs commented it was and read off the section of the  
21 ordinance that covered the restoration, replacement and reconstructing of pre-existing structures. Mr. Jette  
22 asked if fence really should need a permit from the Planning Board. Mr. Clarke-Dawe also wanted the  
23 language regarding the removal of hazardous vegetation clarified.  
24

25 Chairperson Fournier felt the Board would likely have to rewrite some of the ordinance. The Board  
26 agreed that they needed to work on the ordinance further. The Board scheduled a work session on  
27 Tuesday, November 9, 2021, to further discuss the ordinance. Chairperson Fournier stated that anyone  
28 who wished to submit comments should send them to Coordinator Tatro. He then closed the hearing at  
29 7:40pm.  
30

31 Chairperson Fournier moved onto the next item on the agenda, the Planning Boards recommendation  
32 regarding the sale of Town owned property.  
33

34 Coordinator Tatro explained that the Select Board was requesting input from the Planning Board  
35 regarding selling lots 10-5-148 & 10-6-64. The Board reviewed each lot and agreed they could be sold.  
36

37 **MOTION:** Adam Mock

38 ***Motion to recommend to the Select Board that lots 10-5-148 & 10-6-64 could be sold***

39 **SECOND:** Susan Youngs

40 **PAUL KING – YES**

41 **CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**

42 **ADAM MOCK – YES**

43 **SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**

44 **The motion passed 4 to 0**  
45

46 Chairperson Fournier moved to the next item on the agenda, the Master Plan recommendations follow up.  
47

48 Coordinator Tatro had compiled a list of all the recommendations in the Master Plan. The Board looked  
49 over the list and decided to send letters to each of the Boards asking what had been accomplished so far.  
50

51 Chairperson Fournier then moved onto the approval of draft minutes.

**MOTION:** Susan Youngs  
*Motion to approve the minutes from 8/24/21 as written*  
**SECOND:** Craig Fournier  
**PAUL KING – YES**  
**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**  
**ADAM MOCK – YES**  
**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**  
**The motion passed 4 to 0**

**MOTION:** Craig Fournier  
*Motion to approve the minutes from 9/16/21 as written*  
**SECOND:** Adam Mock  
**PAUL KING – YES**  
**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**  
**ADAM MOCK – YES**  
**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**  
**The motion passed 4 to 0**

**MOTION:** Paul King  
*Motion to approve the minutes from 9/29/21 as written*  
**SECOND:** Adam Mock  
**PAUL KING – YES**  
**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**  
**ADAM MOCK – YES**  
**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**  
**The motion passed 4 to 0**

**MOTION:** Susan Youngs  
*Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:04pm.*  
**SECOND:** Craig Fournier  
**PAUL KING – YES**  
**CRAIG FOURNIER – YES**  
**ADAM MOCK – YES**  
**SUSAN YOUNGS – YES**  
**The motion passed 4 to 0**

Respectfully,

---

*Minutes taken by Russell Tatro*