



TOWN OF WAKEFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Held in the Meeting Room

Planning Board Minutes

January 18, 2024

Approved

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	OTHERS
Tom Dube, Chairman Via Zoom	Johnny Blackwood, Alternate	Peter Gosselin, Building Inspector
Doug Stewart, Vice Chairman Via Zoom	✓ Stephen Leroux, Alternate	✓ Jen Czysz, SRPC ✓
Ken Fifield Selectmen's Rep.	✓ Priscilla Colbath, Alternate	
David Silcocks, Member	✓ Rose Cleveland, Alternate	Steven Whitley, Town Counsel
Dick DesRoches, Member	✓	Public Hearing ✓

Others present: Tom Dube via Zoom, Amber Marcoux, Peter and Lynn Lewis, Gill from Clearview TV

Mr. Dube recused himself and Mr. Stewart was asked to chair the meeting.

**Seat Alternates as necessary**

Mr. Leroux was seated for Mr. Dube.

**Public Hearings**

**Conditional Use Permit Application**

**Submitted by Katia Samuelson of Dube Plus Construction, of Hampstead, NH, for property located at 556 Pine River Pond Road, Map 40, Lot 29, a 0.90-acre lot owned by Watertown Village, LLC.**

**The applicant seeks approval of a Conditional Use Permit to use the building as a residential space and to create a landscaped area at the road front to display commercial signage for the property owner's personal business-Dube Plus Construction. The property is located in the Business Commercial Zone.**

Mr. Dube said this is the daycare building across from the Knotty Pine restaurant. He would like to make this a residential unit instead of a commercial unit. He would like to do a landscape display small out front for signage for his company. Mrs. Marcoux confirmed that the abutters have been notified, fees have been paid, the notice has run in the local paper and the application is administratively complete.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Silcocks to accept the application. (Vote 5-0)**

Mr. DesRoches asked, would the signage be allowed because it's business commercial? Ms. Czysz said the sign ordinance says if the sign is for a business that is off site, at a different location, it requires a Special Exception from the Zoning Board. She said it could be a

conditional approval tonight to obtain a Special Exception for the sign. Mr. Dube said he would do that if he decided to put up a sign. Mr. DesRoches said this is pretty straight forward. There's no impact and it meets all the conditions.

Mr. Stewart opened the public hearing at 7:07.

Mr. Stewart closed the public hearing at 7:07.

Mr. Stewart read the seven applicable conditions:

1.The proposed use(s) shall be only those allowed in this Ordinance by Conditional Use Permit; Residential uses are allowed in the Business and Commercial district with a Conditional Use Permit.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition one has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

2.The proposed use(s) is/are consistent with the adopted Master Plan; No anticipated impacts to the rural character. Promoting local businesses is an objective of the master plan as well as encouraging livable residential areas and commercial development.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 2 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

3.The specific site is in an appropriate location and of adequate size for the use; The property is adjacent to other single family homes and on the boundary of the Agricultural Zone. 1 acre of land is adequate for a house and sign.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 3 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

4.The use, as developed, will not adversely affect the character of the area in which the proposed use will be located; The proposed use is consistent with the character of the surrounding area.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 4 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

5.There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians; There is no known potential nuisance or hazard.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 5 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

6.The use will not place excessive or undue burden on Town services and facilities; There should be no burden on town services and facilities.

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 6 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

7.There would be no significant effect resulting from such use upon the public health, safety, and general welfare of the neighborhood in which the use would be located; There should be no impact upon the public health safety and general welfare of the neighborhood

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield that condition 7 has been met.**

**(Vote 5-0)**

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fifield, that we approve the application with a condition of approval requiring the ZBA grant a Special Exception to allow for a sign at an off-site business. (Vote 5-0)**

### **Conceptual Review**

Peter Lewis, TM 208-028, R2 Lovell Lake, 141 Red Gate Rd., Addition

Mr. Lewis said their camp was built six years ago. He said they have been coming up here more often and will probably become residents. They decided they need a garage. He may have to get another Conditional Use Permit for side setback from wetlands for an attached addition. He decided a smaller addition would suit his needs. It would be 12x20. Mr. Stewart said this is a conceptual review and anything said tonight is non-binding on either party. He is very environmentally conscience and cares about protecting the lake. He said other than the setbacks from the stream everything else would meet zoning. He said he will probably change the grade of the driveway and make a rain garden.

Ms. Czysz read Article 9, Wetland Conservation Overlay Zoning District says there is a conditional use permit the Planning Board may grant a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a reasonable reduction of the required setbacks or to permit a fill, dredge, or construction operation within a wetland after consideration of the following as applicable. Ms. Czysz said that the Board has the ability to reduce the buffer from wetland setbacks.

There are some things they would have to provide in exchange for the change in wetland setback. Size and environmental value of the wetland in question. Size and scope of the wetland and/or buffer impact. Necessity of the proposed buffer reduction and/or proposed wetland impact as it relates to the proposed project within the limitations of other applicable zoning and regulatory requirements. Perpetual protection of other wetlands within the Town through legally binding restrictions.

Variables to be considered include but are not limited to; size, environmental value, hydrologic value, significant natural value, scenic concerns, hydrologic association with another water body (including ponds and rivers), provision of public access. Mitigation methods and efforts accepted by the State of New Hampshire Wetlands Bureau and the Conservation Commission. Comment of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Stewart asked if the addition could be moved ten feet from the stream. Mr. Lewis Said that wouldn't be possible. Mr. DesRoches said he lived next door and erosion control would not be an issue as Mr. Lewis is an advocate of protecting the lake. He said that Mr. Lewis was allowed to build with the current setback so it shouldn't be an issue. Mr. Stewart said it looks like a reasonable ask to him. Mr. Dube suggested getting the shoreland permit first.

### **Board Business**

#### **Approval of minutes**

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Leroux, to approve the December 21, 2023, and minutes. (Vote 5-0)**

**Mr. DesRoches made a motion, seconded by Mr. Silcocks, to approve the January 4, 2024, minutes. (Vote 4-0-1)**

**Correspondence**

None

**Public comment**

None

**Set next meeting date**

February 15, 2024

**Adjournment**

**Mr. Silcocks made a motion, seconded by Mr. DesRoches, to adjourn the meeting at 7:30. (Vote 5-0)**

Respectfully submitted for approval at the next Planning Board meeting.

Priscilla Colbath  
Planning Board Secretary