

## **Sugar Hill Planning Board**

**May 7, 2025**

**Members:** Secretary Amy Venezia, Vice Chairman Steve Monsein, Chairman Rob Hayward, Margo Connors (Alternate), Jim Keefe, Arthur Chase, Patty Robertson, Rusty Talbot (Selectboard Representative), Mike Valentine, Kyle Kinsey

**Guests:** Deb Corey, Edward Cenerizio, Matthew Steele, Elizabeth Steele, Tim Burbank Jr., Claudia Hunt, Richard Hunt, Russ Gaitskill, Linda Gaitskill, Tom Smith, Tara Bamford (via Zoom)

Chairman Rob Hayward called the meeting to order at 5:30PM on Wednesday, May 7, 2025. On a motion made by Steve Monsein, seconded by Jim Keefe the minutes of the April meeting were moved to be approved. **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Master Plan**

The Board met with Tara Bamford on the Master Plan. All Board members are satisfied with the final draft. On a motion made by Steve Monsein, seconded by Jim Keefe it was moved to hold a public hearing on June 4 at 5:30PM on acceptance of the Master Plan. **7 votes in favor, Rusty Talbot abstained**

### **Conceptual Hearing**

#### **Lot Line Adjustment**

##### **Tax Map 217 Lot 1, 218 Lot 12 and R43 Lot 16 in Lisbon**

Tom Smith, surveyor presented the conceptual lot line adjustment to the Board. He explained that it was in the intent of the new owners to add land from the Lisbon Parcel to the Sugar Hill Parcel. The house is located on the Sugar Hill lot and the town line runs through this lot. They would like to adjust some land from the Lisbon side to add to the house lot. This would require a joint hearing with the Lisbon Planning Board where the current parcel sits in both towns and would need approval from both. The Board saw no issues with proceeding when the owners were ready to schedule a hearing. Tom Smith will get back in touch with the Board when they are ready to proceed.

### **Old Business/New Business**

Chairman Hayward noted that the Board was contacted by Split Rock Partners, LLC and informed that they were not going to be in attendance tonight and wishes to continue their hearing in June. He informed Board and audience members that we could discuss this proposed subdivision but there would be no discussions made.

Two abutter letters in opposition of this subdivision were shared with Board and audience members along with a letter received from Red McCarthy, Town Engineer after his initial review of the proposed driveways and lots.

Mr. McCarthy noted in his letter a concern with controlling drainage during development with this large and steeply sloped area. He noted that according to the placement of the homes on the driveway application submitted it would require steep driveways and in order to achieve a grade of 8-10% to allow for access by safety service vehicles the driveways would have to be serpentine in nature and would require considerable grading. He stated that his estimation of the clearing would require the need for a NH DES alteration of terrain permit. This permit requires the developer to come up with a runoff and erosion control and sedimentation plan. He noted this plan would be important as runoff would stress the drainage infrastructure on Dyke Road and protect existing development below on Dyke Road. He suggested that no action be taken at this time on driveway permits until the applicant develops a more informative plan on runoff control.

Claudia and Richard Hunt presented a letter with concerns in regards to Section 4.4 Stormwater Management and Section 4.3 M Drainage of the Sugar Hill Subdivision Regulations. They presented two pictures of a stream and wetland

on Dyke Road that has started running with the rain we have received recently. They noted that the stream is located beside one of the stakes for a proposed driveway and house lot. This stream crosses over into their property and is a big concern to them under normal circumstances and an even bigger concern to them with the disruption to the land with development.

Leah and John Micalizzi presented a letter with concerns about the proposed subdivision in regard to the driveway permits, drainage, road traffic, road damage, disruption to the neighborhood, and also environmental concerns.

Russ Gaitskill stated that he wanted to go on record as having the same concerns as noted in the letters received from the Hunts and Micalizzis.

Chairman Hayward stated that the Planning Board has to work with the regulations we have and can make recommendations but can't prohibit things that are not against the law. Property owners have the right to develop their property and abutters have the right to protect their property Patty stated. He stated that the Board will do their due diligence with this.

Concerns about the test pits being dug in winter when the ground was frozen was mentioned. Chairman Hayward stated that the concern could be brought to DES to take a look at further. Russ asked if wetlands is a DES issue and it was answered that yes DES does handle wetlands.

Other concerns brought up by those in attendance were concerns for increased traffic with construction vehicles and damage to Dyke and Hadley Roads, potential for blasting, noise and dust factors, more sediment running down and affecting ponds. Some clarification notes were Selectboard office gets notified of any blasting. There is liability for any damage to the area and abutters and prior to any blasting the company does come around to area homes that within affected area and they take pictures of the inside and outside of homes. Margo noted that the Planning Board responsibility is to the abutters and upholding the laws.

Chairman Hayward stated that abutters have the right to contact Doug Glover, Road Agent with concerns and they can call DES also as concerned citizens. Claudia noted that she had ccd' Allan Clark, Fire Chief on her letter to the Planning Board also. Rusty asked about wetlands being noted on the plans. He stated he had asked at the last meeting about wetlands in particular as they were not noted on the plans presented. Can the Conservation Commission be involved? Yes, they can. It was noted that members of the Conservation Commission were going to be in attendance tonight but then found out that applicants were not going to be present for the continuation of the hearing.

With no more business, on a motion made by Jim Keefe, seconded by Steve Monsein the meeting was adjourned at 7:00PM.

Submitted by:

Amy Venezia, Planning Board Secretary