

**Kingston Planning Board
Minutes**

**Site Walk
27 Jericho Drive, Kingston, NH
Tax Map R5 Lot 8-30**

April 25, 2015

Members in Attendance:

Richard Wilson, Chair
Carol Croteau
Stan Shalett

Ernie Landry, Alternate
Peter Coffin

Members – Absent: Mark Heitz, BOS rep., Glenn Coppelman, Adam Pope, Rich St. Hilaire, Alternate

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Planner, Ellen Faulconer, Administrative Assistant/Board Alternate, Dave Smith (Conservation Commission), Bob Smith (Conservation Commission), Jeff Sluder (Conservation Commission)

Public: Tim Lavalley (project engineer), Bob Villella (developer), Alan Bridgham (abutter), Theresa Rudnock (abutter), Andy Rudnock (abutter)

Mr. Wilson began the site walk at 8:00 AM with a quorum present; Mr. Lavalley pointed out on the plan the area where everyone began the site walk.

Mr. Lavalley informed the Board that the wetlands were re-flagged in the December/January timeframe by Tim Ferwerda per the 1989 Federal Manual; Meridian Land Services does the wetland designation. Questions were asked regarding the previous fill and the location on the property. Mr. Wilson asked if there was an answer to why the latest plan had the wetlands location moved. Mr. Lavalley said that currently there is no answer as to why there is a different line on the wetlands for the latest submitted plan. Mr. Wilson said there has been some concerns expressed that the line was moved so the requirements could be met.

Mr. Lavalley explained where the property line would be; it was not staked out.

Mr. Coffin asked about the drainage and the culvert; the culvert comes out adjacent to the area they are noting as contiguous; Mr. Coffin reviewed the area on the other side of the road in relation to the culvert noting that this area is the natural low point of drainage from under the road; the area being noted as “contiguous” is elevated due to the fill required for the roadway.

Mr. Lavalley pointed out the wetland “ribbons” designating the edge of wetland; Board members noted that the trees with the ribbons were actually in the wetlands not on the edge of the wetlands, especially on the western side of the wetlands. The area for the house and the previously filled wetlands was pointed out by Mr. Lavalley. He added that they would level out the “knoll” area (would be located behind the house) and fill-in the low areas to make it flat. He stated that while the area is close to the wetlands, it does not need an Alteration of Terrain permit. Mr. Rudnock stated that he believed if there were areas greater than 25% and grading within 50 feet of a wetland, an Alteration of Terrain permit was required. **Mr. Wilson stated that the Board would need to find an answer to that question.**

Mr. Bridgham expressed concern about the proposal to remove the hill (knoll) as the part being removed doesn’t stop at the property line but continues onto his property. That property line was staked out. He wanted to know what happens to his property, will the hill just be cut in half. Mr. Lavalley said that the hill is proposed to be built next to the hill, they don’t have to re-grade. **Mr. Wilson noted another question for Mike Cuomo was where they can and cannot dig; question about slopes.** Mr. Wilson stated that he had driven by the property about a month previously and there had been standing water in the area being proposed for the house. Mr. Lavalley said that the plan is a proposed grading plan and is showing where slopes over 15% can be removed and regarded but they don’t intend to necessarily do the regarding. He pointed out the septic area in relation to setbacks. Mr. Wilson noted that the test pit is not flagged which he believed was a requirement.

Mr. Lavalley discussed the house location again which was pointed out as the low area in the front of the hill (knoll). He stated that they would need to fill the areas to make it aesthetically pleasing and grade the land away from the home. Mr. Bridgham asked about his side of the hill and how that would look. Mr. Lavalley said they would have to stay a few feet away from his side of the hill and they would have to slope the area; since they couldn’t impact his property, they would have to slope the hill toward the house. Mr. Coffin stated that the way the slopes would need to be addressed, it would mean that the lawn was sloping into the wetlands and will change the drainage on the site. Mr. Bridgham stated that removing ½ of the hill would impact the remaining trees on his property and destroy or impact the root systems which would kill those trees. The Board noted that removing the hill which was acting as a natural buffer would change the drainage on the site with Mr. Bridgham winding up getting much more water drainage on his lot. Members of the Conservation Commission questioned why the test pit was done so far away from the proposed house location.

Mr. Wilson suggested ending the site walk as the Board had reviewed the property and that the any further questions would be discussed at the next Planning Board hearing. He suggested that Board members drive by the existing property to see the location shown on the plan of the existing 4,000 sq. ft. area as they leave.

The site walk ended at 9:00 AM.

