

**Brentwood Planning Board**  
**Minutes**  
**November 5, 2020**

<b>Members</b>	Bruce Stevens, Chairman	Mark Kennedy
<b>Present:</b>	Ken Christiansen, BOS rep	Alternate, Brian West
	Kevin Johnston, Vice Chair	
	Steve Hamilton	
	Doug Finan	Town Planner, Glenn Greenwood

**Open:**  
Chairman Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:00 pm.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Finan, to give alternate West voting rights. All were in favor. Motion carried.

**7:00 pm: Continued Site Plan Review Application:** Applicant & Owner: Sig Sauer, c/o Jeff Chierepko. Property is located on Route 27, Brentwood, NH 03833 in the multi-family, professional, commercial/industrial zone, referenced by tax maps; 202.007, 203.018, 203.019, 203.026. Intent is to build a 4,000 sq. ft. building in the Area 51 section to be used as 4 (+/-) classrooms, bathrooms & showers.

Present: Joe Coronati of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc; Bruce Blazon from North Branch Construction. No abutters were present.

Coronati discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> review letters from Greenwood, SFC and Cummings. All of Greenwood's and SFC's comments have been addressed. There were two comments from Steve Cummings that were addressed but did not make it into our response letter; a typo in the narrative of the drainage report and add additional information for maintenance of temporary erosion control structures on site. Those items are in the narrative in the drainage report, not on the plans. Coronati will try adding a note that can be stamped, regarding not having a boundary survey done. Doucet Survey had surveyed the entire boundary, 134 acres previously, so Jones & Beach didn't re-do it.

Greenwood confirmed there is no bond for this project. Blazon asked about the email from Jason Grant and if that would suffice. Coronati commented Grant was talking about the 100' wetland setback and the turn-a-round wasn't in the wetland and is in a gravel area. Greenwood suggested they ask for a final letter from the Fire Department stating there are no concerns with the plan. Stevens added and date the most current and final plan set. Greenwood verified that the site plan is to be recorded and then the building permit can be issued.

Stevens stated the conditions of approval:

- All comments from Steve Cummings are satisfied.
- A sign off letter from the Fire Department.
- All state permits need to be obtained (NHDES-Water and Subsurface).
- Receipt of \$2,000, replenished as necessary, for escrow account to be used for future inspections & engineering fees.

Motion by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Finan, to grant a conditional approval of the Sig Sauer 4K sq. ft. classroom project with the conditions listed above to March 5, 2021. All were in favor. Motion carried.

*Note: Impact fee assessment based on a 4,000 sq. ft. x .67 = \$2,680.00 for the building.*

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**November 5, 2020**

**7:00 pm: Planning Board Work Session #2** to discuss proposed zoning amendments, subdivision and site plan language discussed on 10/1/2020. Board to re-visit senior housing and affordable housing.

Greenwood had put the percentages together for what the Town has for workforce housing, single family residential and 55+ (on file).

The following table illustrates the break-down of residential use  
Town-wide as of November 2020.

Total Units % of Total	Single Family Units	Age Restricted Units	Workforce housing Units
1365	1164	201	15
100%	85.30 %	13.60 %	1.10 %

Stevens said so with 1365 units, then almost 400 would have to be workforce units. Greenwood agreed and added, the threshold could be met if townhouses, duplexes etc. were allowed, however, the Town removed the workforce housing ordinance after Kennedy Circle, Autumn and Balsam went in. It could be revisited and re-enacted at some point. Greenwood pointed out that the state’s ADU ordinance basically says all single-family residences can have an ADU, essentially a “duplex.” Brentwood doesn’t allow duplexes (*ADU’s are allowed*) but there is a multi-family zone, where 20 acres is required with approximately no more than 8 units allowed, there is a limitation. There are several large parcels on North Road in that multi-family/professional office zone. Greenwood offered to call developer Falzone and ask for feedback as to why the multifamily hasn’t been used, if it’s based on density or whatever the issues might be.

Board discussed pros and cons of senior housing. The 20-year deed restriction and then it can go away and families can move in. They are limited to 2 bedrooms with no yards though and 20% can be sold to families now. Stevens commented that even with 25% age restricted, the chart shows Brentwood at half that now. Age restricted pays a lot of taxes without the school impact. Residents in age restricted in 15 years or so may experience more ambulance calls but Brentwood hasn’t experienced this yet. Board members agreed that ambulance calls are cheaper than school impacts. Greenwood commented the dynamic has changed, you used to stay in a community for life and your kids were subsidized. People now move to a good school district, stay for their kids, and take the subsidy that taxes don’t cover and then move somewhere else once kids are out of school. Greenwood said there is no state requirement that you have to have senior housing and the Town could remove it from the books but then the only design for Brentwood would be single family residential. Board discussed once a percentage is reached, it could be removed from the ordinance altogether. Kennedy commented the benefits haven’t been seen yet as all those homes were evaluated at 50K. Christiansen added as of April 1<sup>st</sup> of next year there should be a huge increase when they get taxed at full assessed value and in the last few months over 95K in impact fees have been received, mostly from 3 Ponds and impact fees go towards capital improvement projects. Greenwood added that the traffic counts are 10 trips per day for one Single Family house in a subdivision while age restricted is 1.4 trips per day. Board discussed does it make sense to add it to a specific zone, North of North Road for example? Board agreed they are expensive options and not affordable for many. Stevens suggested maybe if senior housing gets over 25-30%, maybe consider throwing it out then? The Board decided to table both senior housing (55+) and workforce for this year and to discuss again for 2022. Greenwood, Stevens, and Johnston to review zoning maps for possible future zoning amendments for senior housing for 2022 as it’s too late to formulate one this year with time constraints.

Bickum reviewed the zoning amendments discussed at the last meeting on 10/1/2020 with a couple of additional suggestions (on file).

## Brentwood Planning Board

### Minutes

November 5, 2020

1. P. 16 Section D. Table of Uses in Town Center Zone. Agricultural/Forestry Uses – changed X (not allowed) to S (allowed by Special Exception).
2. Remove the minimum square footage in Accessory Dwelling Units p. 120, was removed. 900.004.004.002 ~~No accessory dwelling unit shall have less than 525 square feet of living space. This allowance is less than the Town's standard dwelling unit size of 720 square feet because~~  
The accessory unit is not a stand-alone dwelling unit.....
3. Greenwood is still working on the wetland buffer formula for the zoning amendment.

#### SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS PROPOSED CHANGES – (on file)

1. p. 13 7.2.1 Change ~~Eight (8)~~ **Seven (7)** and ~~4-2~~ copies of the plat 11 x 17. Also, on subdivision applications, \$1,000 Fire consultant fee - **Add if applicable.**
2. p. 16: 7.4.7 Change ~~seventy-two (72) hours~~ **5 business days** after the decision is made and a copy of the decision shall be filed with the Town Clerk.
3. p. 16 7.4.8 A conditional approval shall be good for a term of ~~one~~ **two** calendar years from the date granted **unless an alternate date is established or extended by the Planning Board.**
4. p. 17 8.3 ~~Eight (8)~~ **Seven (7)** copies of the plat (twenty-two inches by thirty-four inches 22" X 34") and ~~4-2~~ copies of the plat (eleven inches by seventeen inches 11" X 17"), **along with a pdf version of the plan set**, shall be submitted....
5. **Add Appendix B to pg. 47** Change 20 to 21: ...to the Town Hall ~~20~~ **21** days prior to the date upon which the applicant wishes his/her application to be heard: ~~Five (5)~~ **Seven (7)** full size copies, and ~~5-B two (2) 11x17~~ size copies of the Final Plan. Note: **Take out fees and make note to see most current application for fees.**
6. P. 36 - **Add a new paragraph** to become **8.27 in Section 8** – Specific Plan requirements to read as follows: **8.27 The location of proposed driveways must be detailed on the plan. In accordance with Town of Brentwood Subdivision Regulations Addendum B Driveway and Other Accesses to Town Roads, driveways shall be placed no closer than ten (10) feet from a property line for newly created lots. Board approved verbiage on 9-17-2020 to be posted in the future for public hearings.**
7. P. 38 – E. Roads will not be accepted by the Town of Brentwood for at least three (3) years after
8. construction **of the asphalt binder course** is completed. **Add road signage 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.**
9. E. Roads will not be accepted by the Town of Brentwood for at least three (3) years after construction **of the asphalt binder course** is completed.
10. Until such time that the Town Of Brentwood accepts any road as a town road, the developer shall be responsible for **installing road signage; to include street signs and traffic regulatory signs (see section 9.2);** all maintenance and upkeep, including, but not limited to snowplowing, salt and sanding as needed.
11. P. 42 Section 9 – Mailboxes: **Add a NEW section 9.4** to address subdivisions with new roads and the post office requiring mail kiosks in lieu of individual mailboxes. From Post Office 30-page pdf.  
**9.4 During the design and planning phase (i.e., before plans and site plats are finalized with the appropriate planning/zoning authorities), developers and builders must notify the U.S. Postal Service of the planned development so that the Postal Service can determine the appropriate mode of delivery while considering input from the parties involved with the development. Developers and builders must plan to install centralized mail delivery receptacles in new residential communities, which include secure parcel lockers. Your local USPS Growth Manager will work closely with you to determine the best approach to providing mail delivery service to customers in your new residential development. It is important that you contact the Growth Manager in your area as early as possible in your planning process. Appropriate mail receptacles must be provided for the receipt of mail. The type of mail**

**Brentwood Planning Board**

**Minutes**

**November 5, 2020**

receptacle depends on the mode of delivery in place. Purchase, installation, maintenance, repair, and replacement of mail receptacles are the responsibility of the customer. Verify with the local Postmaster or Growth Manager, the appropriate locations for installation. The Postal Service annually publishes a list of USPS-approved mailbox equipment and approved manufacturers in its Postal Bulletin.

**SITE PLAN REGULATION PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:**

1. Page 10 8.4. Change 72 hours to 5 biz days.... within ~~seventy-two (72) hours~~ **five (5) business days** after the decision is made and a copy of the decision shall be filed with the Town Clerk.
2. Page 10 8.4.8 Conditional approval shall be good for a term of ~~one~~ **two** calendar years from the date granted **unless an alternate date is established or extended by the Planning Board.**
3. Page 13 9.2 Surveyed Plan ~~Nine (9)~~ **Seven (7)** copies of the surveyed plan, **along with 2 copies of the plat (eleven inches by seventeen inches 11" x 17")**, **along with a pdf version of the plan set**, shall be submitted upon application and these plans shall include the following information: **(1-2018)**

**Board Business**

- The Board signed the manifest.
- The Board reviewed and signed the affidavit of amendment for **Michaud Bus Sales** re: parking with the existing plan for tax maps 209.016 & 209.015; 325 and 329 Route 125 for recording.
- The Board reviewed and approved to sign the Dept. of Motor Vehicles retail dealer license permit for **Aspire Motoring, Inc** for 72 Route 125, Unit B, Brentwood, NH, tax map 217.023; formerly Burke's Trucks. Bickum said the new owner is Eduard Fandunyan, who emailed saying he just acquired the property and will be fabricating custom handicapped vans per order and his tenant, Aspire Motoring LLC will be a retail used car dealership with inventory and the two businesses would be different in nature. Stevens confirmed only one dealer license per site. Greenwood confirmed there are no more cease & desist issues on that site.
- **D&H Bond estimate:** The Board reviewed the bond estimate of \$65,088 from Steve Cummings for D&H Realty (Kenerson/BCK Excavation) tax map 208.016; 388 Rte. 125 for site work including drainage swale, porous pavement and arborvitaes (*landscaping*). Estimate on file.

Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Finan, to approve the recommended bond amount from the Town Engineer in the amount of \$65,088 for D&H Realty for 388 Rte. 125; tax map 208.016. All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Approval of Minutes:** Non-public from October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020; October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020; October 24<sup>th</sup> Sig Site Walk minutes.

1. Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by West, to approve the non-public sealed minutes from October 1, 2020 as presented. All were in favor. Motion carried.
2. Motion made by Hamilton, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Finan, to approve the minutes from October 15, 2020 as presented. All were in favor with Kennedy abstaining. Motion carried.
3. Motion made by Finan, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Kennedy, to approve the minutes from the Sig Sauer Site Walk on October 24, 2020 as presented. All were in favor with Hamilton, Johnston, and Christiansen abstaining. Motion carried.

Motion made by Christiansen, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Hamilton, to adjourn at approximately 8:30 pm. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Bickum,

Administrative Assistant, Brentwood Planning Board