

**ALSTEAD PLANNING BOARD &
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JOINT MEETING
POB 60, Alstead, New Hampshire 03602
Phone/Fax 603-835-2986**

**MEETING MINUTES
September 10, 2018**

Note: These minutes are furnished for public inspection in accordance with RSA 91-A:2 and are unapproved until offered for disposition by the Board at a regular meeting. **Accepted as corrected ZBA 10/1/18. Accepted as corrected by the PB 11/12/18. The ZBA concurred with the PB changes on 12/3/18.**

PB Members present: Peter Rhoades/Chairman, David Konesko, Gordon Kemp, Matt Saxton, Chris Rietmann, Joyce Curll and Tim Noonan. Joe Levesque, Alternate Member was also present. ZBA Members present: Dennis Molesky, Kevin Clark and Sam Sutcliffe.

P. Rhoades/Chairman opened the Joint Meeting at 7:45PM to discuss proposed zoning amendments.

Article VI F 2 was discussed as it pertained to the parameters of new encroachments (based on a situation the ZBA encountered – see 3/5/18, 4/2/18, 6/4/18, 8/6/18 & 7/2/18 ZBA Minutes). Sutcliffe suggested the encroachment should not invade a 10-foot setback; Rhoades pointed out it was the same setback as required with a driveway – 'no new encroachment of any part of the building may come closer to a sideline than 10-feet (this includes drip lines).

The next issue discussed was from the 12/11/17, 1/8/18 & 2/12/18 PB Meeting Minutes regarding waiving permit fees for structures under 120 square feet. Some PB Members felt in favor of increasing the allowed structure size to be 1000 square feet, up from 120 square feet. It was noted that the 120 square foot dimension came from the SouthWest Regional Planning Commission model Zoning Ordinance when Alstead was working on creating their own ordinance. Discussion that Building Permits were required to make people follow the setback requirements; as well as prompting the tax assessors. The Building Permit is also designed to protect landowners – as it brings them in contact with the Zoning Ordinance and Regulations, which in turn help them avoid infractions. It was noted that there is no longer a taxable property inventory sent out yearly, and there is a 5-year rolling basis that the assessors use to catch everyone up with their taxable property. *Marsden to start to track all Building Permits for structures under 200-square feet in order to tally occurrence rate.

The Sign Ordinance was discussed at the 8/7/17 PB Meeting, where it was determined that the Sign Ordinance last amended date of 3/12/13 needs to be added into Article IV G, which covers that there can be no discrimination on content of signs. Sutcliffe wanted to make sure that aesthetics were discussed in the Town's Master Plan – the Boards looked, and determined it was in the Vision Statement.

It was noted that at the 4/13/15 meeting the Planning Board wanted the information regarding a required pre-paid postage mailing tube to be added to the Application; Planning Board approval only is required for this action.

Also at the 4/13/15 Planning Board meeting, minimum driveway width requirements were discussed. Sutcliffe inquired if the discussion included common/shared driveways. Noonan stated he felt a grade profile was more of a concern than the width of a driveway.

Konesko brought back up the concern he had when an Applicant, who was not the landowner, but who was putting a second dwelling on an existing lot with another dwelling – as the lot was deemed to be sub dividable – was allowed to submit a Driveway Permit without the landowners signature. He wanted to discuss formal procedure, pointing out that the Driveway Permit goes with the land. Rhoades agreed that the actual landowner should be part of the process. Noonan stated that a Driveway Permit is a simple permission to access land in a specific place – that when the permit is given – it is only on the

location, not the design or the right to build it. Konesko re-iterated that if the second dwelling went away, there would still be a second driveway access. All agreed that the landowner needed to be tied to the Driveway Permit somehow.

Sutcliffe brought up the Right-of-Way and the required setbacks from it – pointing out that it is the requirement of/burden of the Town to establish the Right-of-Way – not the property owner. Suggestions were made to make it from the center of the traveled way; or if the edge of the Right-of-Way is not clearly defined then the setback is 75-feet from the center line of the traveled way – it was suggested to amend the Zoning Article III 3 a) to 75-feet & b) to 50 – feet.

The Joint Meeting ended at 8:10PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melanie Marsden/Administrative Assistant