

**TOWN OF LYNDEBOROUGH  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
March 17, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Tom Chrisenton, Vice Chair Bret Mader, Bob Rogers, Mike Decubellis, Larry Larouche and Alternates Bill Ball and Julie Zebuhr

T. Chrisenton began the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Public Service of New Hampshire; pursuant to RSA 231: 158, a request to correct improper clearances of electrical wires crossing over Old Temple Road (a scenic road) and Beasom Road as well as any necessary tree removal and/or tree trimming required to complete the work.**

Present: Jeffrey Enman

Jeffrey Enman stated that during a recent safety check it was noted that there was low service to one of the farmhouses because of the improper height clearance for telephone wires crossing over the Old Temple and Beasom Roads. Because PSNH owns pole (26/6), it is their responsibility to correct this code violation; therefore a new 40 ft. pole will be installed to replace the existing 35' pole. A second 40 ft. pole will also be installed between poles 26/8 and 26/8-1 to meet height clearances at the junction of Beasom Road and Old Temple Road.

B. Rogers asked if there were plans to cut down any major trees. Mr. Enman answered that there were a few trees tagged (not necessarily major); some were on private property and the others were on town property. M. Decubellis asked if there was notification given to the landowners. Mr. Enman replied that the property owners were notified and permission was granted.

T. Chrisenton told Mr. Enman that he was familiar with the area and that PSNH could take down any trees that were necessary on his Beasom Road property. B. Rogers asked if a visit to the site was needed. B. Ball did not think a visit as necessary since T. Chrisenton was aware of the situation.

B. Ball made a **motion to allow PSNH to proceed with the work that is necessary to correct the code violation.** B. Rogers seconded the motion. No further discussion; therefore the vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Pauline Ball; 110 Crooked S. Road; Map 215 Lot 12; update**

B. Ball asked to discuss two items regarding his conditionally approved subdivision. T. Chrisenton cautioned that the Board could not make any changes unless another hearing was called and the abutters were notified. B. Ball replied that he understood and just wanted to clarify a misstatement and ask some general questions. T. Chrisenton agreed to listen.

First, B. Ball submitted the driveway permit that was issued by Road Agent Kent Perry after he examined the location of the proposed driveway and did not see any problems with its placement. This was one of the conditions of approval for the two lot subdivision recently approved at the February 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Taking up the second item, B. Ball asked the Board to look at the site plan again and listen to his concerns. At the last hearing there was a conversation directed toward the northern boundary drill holes indicated on the site plan. The site plan showed the drill hole (prp) at each location and everyone assumed that “prp” meant “proposed.” In fact, after review and according to the surveyors at Meredian Land Services, “prp” means “per reference point.” These measurements and pin locations referred to the original lot map which indicated that the drill holes were (set.) B. Ball agreed that the location of the drill hole in the northeast corner of the property is still unknown because that drill hole has not been found. Meredian will determine its location when the snow has disappeared.

He then raised a general question as to why the location of that boundary had anything to do with subdividing the southern portion of the property when the all the drill holes indicating the boundary for the new lot are set. B. Rogers thought that during the subdivision process, it is a time to clean up some irregularities on the entire parcel. B. Ball replied although that may true, it really did not affect the portion of land that is actually to be subdivided. M. Decubellis questioned whether or not there is a subdivision requirement which states that all outside boundary must be located. T. Chrisenton said that a landowner has a responsibility to identify the corners of his property.

In order to clear up some of the confusion and ending the discussion, T. Chrisenton recommended that a note be place on the site plan which explains the meaning of “prp” and have the surveyor or landowner contact the abutter with an explanation of the abbreviation and that it would be referenced on the site plan. Because the location of that corner drill hole has not yet been identified it is important for the Board to know that there is a drill hole in the location as stated on the site plan.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**(1) Southwest Regional Planning Commission (SRPC); discussion**

M. Decubellis told the Board that he finally made contact with the executive director of the Southwest Regional Planning Commission and they discussed issues regarding Lyndeborough's similarities to the southwest region such as demographics, growth concerns, etc. As far as membership, he was told that they do not make the decision to allow a town to join their commission. A town, such as Lyndeborough, makes the decision and if the Office of Environmental Planning is in agreement, it is accepted by a regional commission.

Because the funding for membership in a regional commission comes from the Planning Board budget, M. Decubellis thought that the Board would make the final decision. He also agreed that the Board of Selectmen should be included in the discussion.

The Board came up with several questions and comments which included:

- whether it was necessary to belong to any regional commission
- what were the benefits of membership
- difference in the cost of a membership (NRPC vs. SRPC)
- why the town of Mason changed over to NRPC; talk to Mason Planning Board
- how change will affect "fair share" status
- how would it affect work force housing criteria
- gather data from the WebPages of both commission to see how they function

The Board agreed to continue this discussion at the April meeting so that M. Decubellis could gather more information.

**(2) Zoning review to improve the tax base of the town**

T. Chrisenton presented the following list of items to consider in helping to improve the tax base of the town:

- The town's wealth is in land and buildings. (*No industry in town*)
- Agricultural building regulation was passed to encourage ag building development and resultant increased tax generation. (*Unaware of anyone taking advantage of this regulation, as yet*)
- Every lot of land in town can be developed according to the zoning ordinance.
- Agriculture and forestry are allowed throughout the town.
- Town's natural beauty and rural character are assets.

T. Chrisenton stated that the current home business regulations could be improved upon:

- Home businesses should be encouraged to move away from the house and expand into a dedicated building. (*would increase the tax value to the town*)
- Expand hi speed internet throughout the town. (*no cable service in town*)
- Zoning should specifically allow internet businesses.

Referring to the Home Businesses regulation 1200.00(d.) under Zoning Ordinances,

T. Chrisenton read the following:

**Home businesses shall be carried on by the resident owner, resident members of the owner's family, a resident tenant, or resident members of the tenant's family within the residence.** T. Chrisenton explained that a person outside the residence could not be hired without moving the business to a dedicated building. His reasoning for this additional language is because a home business cannot occupy any more than 1/3 of the floor area in the residence and keeping check on the expansion of the business would be difficult.

B. Rogers suggested making the following change to 1200.00 (b) of the Home Business regulation:

**The home business shall be operated in the residence or in an accessory structure built for that purpose.** He also suggested that the language specify that the building could be converted back to residential uses; therefore the building should resemble a barn or a residential accessory; rather than commercial in appearance.

L. Larouche, referring to 1200.00 (e), did not think any change was needed.....it was only fair for two non-resident employees to be permitted on the premises at one time when someone was starting a home business and unable to construct an accessory building.

- Home businesses should allow up to \_\_\_employees with a special exemption and no more than\_\_\_with a special exception.

B. Ball thought that septic system concerns would affect the number of employees working in a home business environment.

M. Decubellis stated two issues; (1) regulations for home businesses are for overseeing someone working out of their house, to prevent growing too big for the residence or for doing anything improper; (2) regulations for the commercial district that are more highly regulated. Now there is a new issue; regulations needed for someone who wants to do things on their own land, other than commercial or retail.

At this time, the discussion turned to the expansion of the commercial district. B. Ball cautioned that to generate any serious tax revenue from an expansion of this district would require the installation of water and sewer.

J. Zebuhr suggested looking at the recreational aspect of Lyndeborough and permit camping. B. Ball added that there are recreational parks where modulars are housed and owners are allowed to stay from April to November of each year. Regulations could be adopted to restrict any permanent residency.

Another suggestion was to encourage the building of a conference center, such as the Harris Center which could operate on a well and septic system.

T. Christon ended by saying that he would put together a list of suggestions and he continued this discussion until the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

**MINUTES:**

**Review of minutes for February 17, 2011**

B. Rogers made a **motion to accept the minutes for February 17, 2011, as written.**

B. Ball seconded the motion and the vote in favor of acceptance was unanimous.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

B. Rogers made a **motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.** L. Larouche seconded the motion and the vote in favor of adjournment was unanimous.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, April 21<sup>st</sup> at 7:30 p.m.

Pauline Ball  
Clerk

**Approved by the Planning Board on April 21, 2011**