Lancaster Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting

Meeting held in Auditorium

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM by Chairman Mark M. E. Frank followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Initial Business:
Roll Call:
Regular Members:
Present: Chairman Mark M. E. Frank, Justin Carter, Penny Noyes and Mark M. St. Pierre.
Absent: Vice Chairman Andy Nadeau, Selectmen’s Representative Leo Enos and Rusty Scott.
Alternate Members:
Present: Greg Westcott, Don Doolan and Maggie Jones.
Absent: Shane Beattie and Garret Savard.
Others present:
Planning/Zoning Coordinator Benjamin Gaetjens-Oleson.

At this time Chairman Mark M. E. Frank appointed Alternate Members Greg Westcott and Maggie Jones to full voting members for the night’s meeting in the absence of Vice Chairman Andy Nadeau and Rusty Scott.

To review and approve the minutes of the December 11, 2019 meeting.
A motion was made by Mark M. St. Pierre and seconded by Greg Westcott to accept the December 11, 2019 minutes as written. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

Appointment(s): None.

Application Submission(s)/Public Hearing(s): None.

Other Business:
Preliminary Conceptual Consultation(s): None.

Commercial Building Permit(s): None.

Voluntary Merger(s): None.

Recent Zoning Decision(s):
- Case 522: George M. Stevens Real Estate, LLC - Area Variance Approval.
  Benjamin Gaetjens Oleson stated that George M. Stevens (GMS) had bought the Church property beside them. It was explained the property was purchased by GMS to protect their interests and was later discovered that some of the land they thought was theirs actually belonged to the Church property. The land in question amounted to the majority of their parking area. Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson explained GMS has maintained and improved this portion for years assuming they owned it and allowed the Church to use it. The purpose of the Variance was to receive approval to move the lot line so they could come to the Planning Board later for a lot line adjustment so GMS would actually own what they and the large majority of the community believed they owned. The moving of the property line would bring it closer to the building than allowed as well as decrease the lot size even more below the minimum than required. GMS currently has no plans for the Church or the property. They only wished to protect their parking
area. Chairman Mark M. E. Frank asked how the Church property related to the stone wall of the cemetery behind it. Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson answered the stone wall is the general location of the rear property line of the Church.

  Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson stated that North Country Charter Academy has a contract to buy the Go-Go gas station at the north junction of Suner Street and Route 3 in order to relocate the school. Their intent is to get closer to Town so they can be more engaged but also make things safer by relocating out of a basement with concerning egress.

Training Topic(s)/Material(s):
- Hazard Mitigation-Role of Community Planning.
  Mr. Gaetjens Oleson spoke at great length about the roles of Land Use Boards on Hazard Mitigation planning. He gave examples of the reasons they are an asset (attached to the minutes) as well as handed out a sample of “Safe Growth Audit” questions that should be considered to evaluate if a community or development proposal is growing safely and responsibility. He told the Planning Board he would provide a digital and paper copy of the most recent Hazard Mitigation Plan to the Board for their reference.

Announcement(s)/Correspondence(s):
- Master Plan Update.
  Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson stated the Committee did not have a meeting in December but have one scheduled for the next day, 01/09/2020. This will finalize the survey so it can be distributed. After that there will be focus group discussions to gather more specific information and then the rewriting of the Plan will take place.

Other Business as may legally be brought before said meeting.
- Don Doolan asked about time limits on subdivision approval and if they could be voided. Mr. Gaetjens-Oleson explained that he is often confused by this because the threshold for rescinding approvals has to do with completion of proposed work. Most approvals the Board has given are simple subdivision that require no infrastructure construction. He does believe that if there are any substantial infrastructure improvements the time limit is 3 or 5 years for substantial improvements before a Planning Board could revoke an approval. He stated Technical Subdivisions are tricky as well as they sometimes require a conveyance of lands within a year of approval but based on the current procedure it is cumbersome to revoke the approval. He promised to look into changing the Technical Subdivision procedure to include the conveyance as well as determine the best process for revoking abandoned subdivisions.

Noting that there was nothing further to come before the meeting, a motion was called for to adjourn.

A motion was made by Mark M. St. Pierre and seconded by Greg Westcott to adjourn. A vote was taken and the meeting adjourned at 7:28 P.M.

Respectfully,

Sandra E. Doolan – Clerk

Approved: 2/12/2020

Mark M. E. Frank,
Chairman
ASSETS OF PLANNERS IN HAZARDS PLANNING

- Knowledge of developing comprehensive plans
  o Goal setting, development and adoption
- Familiar and comfortable with the public engagement process
- Think big picture
  o Long-term
  o Interdependence
  o Interrelatedness
- Intervention Points
  o Community visioning and goal setting
  o Plan/Regulation/Ordinance creation
  o Using land use tools for mitigation-subdivision, zoning, PUD's, landscaping requirements, etc.
  o Reviewing and determining on development proposals
  o CIP

ZONING

- Limit Development in areas prone to hazards
  o Flood
  o Wildfire
  o Coastal
  o Landslide
- Encourage Growth in safe locations

PLANNING (Subdivision & Site Plan)

- Strategic placements of roads
  o Evacuation routes
- Placement of lots & utilities
  o Minimize impact from hazards
  o Cluster Development is strategy

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- Buy Open Space/Flood prone areas
  o Make it public space-park, beach, water access
- Identify projects that should not be implemented
  o Sewer in flood zone
  o Bridges to areas that should not be developed
BASIC SAFE GROWTH AUDIT QUESTIONS

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Land Use
Does the future land-use map clearly identify natural hazard areas?

Do the land-use policies discourage development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?

Does the plan provide adequate space for expected future growth in areas located outside natural hazard areas?

Transportation
Does the transportation plan limit access to hazard areas?

Is transportation policy used to guide growth to safe locations?

Are movement systems designed to function under disaster conditions (e.g., evacuation)?

Environmental Management
Are environmental systems that protect development from hazards identified and mapped?

Do environmental policies maintain and restore protective ecosystems?

Do environmental policies provide incentives to development that is located outside protective ecosystems?

Public Safety
Are the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan related to those of the FEMA Local Hazard Mitigation Plan?

Is safety explicitly included in the plan's growth and development policies?

Does the monitoring and implementation section of the plan cover safe growth objectives?

ZONING ORDINANCE
Does the zoning ordinance conform to the comprehensive plan in terms of discouraging development or redevelopment within natural hazard areas?

Does the ordinance contain natural hazard overlay zones that set conditions for land use within such zones?

Do rezoning procedures recognize natural hazard areas as limits on zoning changes that allow greater intensity or density of use?

Does the ordinance prohibit development within, or filling of, wetlands, floodways, and floodplains?
**SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**
Do the subdivision regulations restrict the subdivision of land within or adjacent to natural hazard areas?

Do the regulations provide for conservation subdivisions or cluster subdivisions in order to conserve environmental resources?

Do the regulations allow density transfers where hazard areas exist?

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES**
Does the capital improvement program limit expenditures on projects that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards?

Do infrastructure policies limit extension of existing facilities and services that would encourage development in areas vulnerable to natural hazards?

Does the capital improvement program provide funding for hazard mitigation projects identified in the FEMA Mitigation Plan?

**OTHER**
Do small area or corridor plans recognize the need to avoid or mitigate natural hazards?

Does the building code contain provisions to strengthen or elevate construction to withstand hazard forces?

Do economic development or redevelopment strategies include provisions for mitigating natural hazards?

Is there an adopted evacuation and shelter plan to deal with emergencies from natural hazards?