

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders; Finer; Touhey; Kahn; Granfield; Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Flanders moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 23, 2004 and DECEMBER 14, 2004, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

1. **RICHARD G. JUVE** – Proposed minor subdivision of Tax Map S25, Lot 27J, into three (3) lots (5.13 ac., 6.14 ac., 6.68 ac.) located on Wall Street in the Residential District.*

Application, subdivision plan and abutter's list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF RICHARD G. JUVE FOR A PROPOSED MINOR SUBDIVISION. Voted unanimously.

2. **PATRICIA NESTOR** – Proposed major subdivision of Tax Map S09, Lot 10 and Tax Map U19, Lot 2A, into two (2) lots (3.17 ac. 20.19 ac.) located on Meredith Neck Road in the Meredith Neck District.

Application, subdivision plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Topo has not been submitted. The Board can either (A) waive this requirement in order to allow the application to proceed to public hearing or (B) the Board could vote to not accept the application and advise the applicant that topography for the proposed lot is required in order for the Board to accept the application and proceed to public hearing.

Flanders moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE NOT ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF PATRICIA NESTOR UNTIL THE COMPLETED APPLICATION HAS BEEN SUBMITTED. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. **ANN B. HUTCHINS:** (Rep. Dave Dolan) Proposed major subdivision of Tax Map S25, Lot 3, into three (3) lots (5.08 ac., 5.64 ac., 15.89 ac.) located on Winona Road in the Forestry/Rural and Residential Districts.

Applicant proposes to subdivide 26.61 acres into three lots. There is about 1,300 feet of frontage on Winona Road. This property is located on Winona

Road and lot is bisected by a district boundary. The three (3) house sites are located off Winona Road in the Forestry/Rural District and the rear acreage of each lot is located in the Residential District. All lots exceed the minimum density. All lots are relatively large and exceed minimum soils and slopes requirements. There is an existing house and several barns on the property. Gove Environmental has delineated the wetlands on the property. The yellow highlighted areas show the non-designated exempt wetlands and the request has been submitted to the Code Enforcement Officer. Topography has been done on a majority of the lots to demonstrate that in the worst case scenario, the lots meet the minimum soils and slopes requirements after deducting out the wetlands. The proposal is a 3-lot subdivision. One barn will remain on Lot #1 (5.60 ac. in size) and one barn will be removed because of the property line. Lot #2 has the existing dwelling and one of the barns and that's 5.09 acres in size and the southerly lot is 15.89 ac., Lot 3 extends back . There is one barn that will remain on Lot #1. We had juggled these lot lines back and forth trying to keep a couple of these barns. The third one as noted on the plan is to be removed because the proposed property line runs through the corner of the barn. The others do comply with the setbacks. Driveway Permits have been received from NHDOT. The most logical and desirable location on Lot #1 being contemplated is as shown although a driveway could be constructed and theoretically circumvent all the wetlands, the most logical thing to do is cross the wetland because overall there's less disturbance to the site. The proposed driveway on Lot #3 will be submitted to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception. A Dredge & Fill Permit is required from the State. Monumentation will be set and documentation will be provided to the Town. There is one barn that needs to be removed prior to recording of the mylar. There needs to be a stipulation relative to the removal of the existing barn on Lot #2. With respect to wetlands, there is a proposal to cross an 11' deep crossing of the narrow isolated wetland that runs parallel to Winona Road that triggers State and local permits that should be referenced on final plans. All three lots will be served by on-site septic. Acceptable test pit data has been submitted. The lots are large so there is no lot sizing issue and they have provided backup for the worst case scenario. Due to the lot sizes, there are no state subdivision permits required because the lots are in excess of 5 acres. I have suggested that the final plans be amended to indicate the location of existing septic and well information on proposed Lot #2. This has been done and there is no DES approval required as this is a pre-existing situation. In summary, it needs to be clear that the one barn which straddles the shared line between Lots #1 and #2 be removed prior to recording of the final plans. We do need State and Local wetland approval for their proposed crossing on Lot #1. Ralph Pisapia – What is the distance from this property to Waukegan?

Vadney – ¾ mile approximately. On the topo there, can you tell us which way it drains. Part of it probably drains toward Hatch Corner Road. Lot 3 drains towards Route 104, gets picked up and then drains down towards Wicwas. Pisapia – Will there be a direct influence on the lake? We will make an assessment of that when we review it. Edgar – These are very low-valued wetlands. They are probably a function of hardpan soil types and hillside seeps. They are basically isolated. Pisapia – It appears from that drawing that there are quite a few wetlands on the property. What is the current land use out there? Edgar – Lot 2 has an existing house and the outbuildings. Pisapia – Is it in current agricultural use? Vadney – It is just a single lot. Do you know if any of it had been put into current use. Dolan – I don't believe it is, but I couldn't say that with 100% certainty. Pisapia – Are we converting current agricultural land? No, it's not being maintained agriculturally. There's a lot of scrub growth growing up in what were once fields. Vadney – There wouldn't be any restrictions on that just being an old farm would there? Edgar – No, not in the current zoning. It is not active agriculture. Touhey – I notice there's a trail that goes through between Lots 1 & 2. Can you tell me anything about the existence of that trail? Dolan – It's just what they've been using to access around the property. If it's used for anything else such as snowmobile trails, I'm not aware of it. Hutchins – We use those trails for sugaring. Touhey – Any plans to open an easement for public use? Dolan – Not that I've been made aware of. Hearing closed at 7:18 p.m.

Flanders moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF ANN B. HUTCHINS ON TAX MAP S25, LOT 8, INTO THREE LOTS (5.08 AC., 5.64 AC., AND 15.89 AC.) LOCATED ON WINONA ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT AND RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT THE BARN THAT'S INTERSECTED BY THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN LOT #1 AND LOT #2 BE REMOVED PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR;
- (2) A NHDES DREDGE & FILL PERMIT AND MEREDITH ZONING BOARD SPECIAL EXCEPTION ARE REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS;
- (3) NHDOT DRIVEWAY PERMITS ARE REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS;
- (4) FINAL PLANS SHALL BE AMENDED TO INDICATE THE EXISTING LOCATION OF SEPTIC SYSTEMS AND WELLS ON LOT 2, TOGETHER WITH ANY CROSS-REFERENCES TO DES SEPTIC APPROVALS, IF ANY.

- (5) WRITTEN CONFIRMATION THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

2. **DEAN R. AND BARBARA J. BEDDINGFIELD** – Proposed major subdivision of Tax Map S08, Lot 2, into three (3) lots (3.18 ac., 5.18 ac., 10.31 ac.) located on Meredith Neck Road in the Meredith Neck District.

Applicant proposes to create 3 lots out of 19 acres (3.18 ac., 5.18 ac. and 10.31 ac.). The 10.31 ac. parcel is developed with a single-family residence, septic, well, driveway and outbuildings. Minimum lot size in the Meredith Neck District is 3 acres. All proposed lots exceed the density requirement. All lots are subject to soils and slopes requirements. The minimum required road frontage is 50'. Soils and slopes calculations have been added to the plan. Access will be provided over a common driveway crossing Lot 1. The State Driveway Permit has been issued and received. Wetlands have been delineated and 4K areas have been shown on the plan. The well radii is shown on plans. Existing buildings have been shown. Applicant's agent indicated that to move the driveway to avoid the wetland would be a hardship. An easement for the common driveway will be provided. He presented evidence indicating that he did not feel that the wetland in question is "Designated Wetland No. 8". Edgar – If that's part of Wetland #8, it's part of wetland #8 whether there's a road hardship issue or not. That is an issue Bill is going to look at as to whether or not there's a sight distance problem with relocating the driveway. That's not a rationale to make a case that's it not something that it might be. If it is wetland #8, it's wetland #8. If we're wrong, we'll be happy to admit we're wrong and then it becomes a non-designated wetland, but we're not going to make that determination because there's a hardship relative to a proposal that's being created by an applicant. What we did is you can see underneath that something that wasn't mentioned but this is a watershed divide on the Keith map which matches pretty well with this ridge and we scaled off approximately 600' or 580' off the base map and it comes pretty close to where these two fingers are. Knowing that it wasn't part of the prime wetland complex and knowing it was in approximate relationship to that watershed divide, Bill advised me that he thought the 100' setback applied. That was how he was evaluating the base map. We would be happy to take all of this information back to the office and spend some more time with it and get you a reaction to that. Vadney – Is there any value in a site walk? Not much you can see this time of year. Notwithstanding this issue, we have an easement for the common driveway and the like, but it's basically a

three-lot subdivision. We do have the added data on the soils calcs, they do meet worst case scenario, they've shown the wetlands and steep slopes have been deducted. They're tight but that's also assuming some of the most restrictive soils based upon the topography. I think there's some cushions open there. We have a common driveway that will require some legalese so at the end of the day when all is said and done, either Bill's made an incorrect interpretation, it becomes non-designated and it's a non-issue in terms of setbacks, but if he holds his ground, they can apply to the ZBA for buffer relief if necessary. We need to take advantage of this gentleman's work. You can leave that stuff with us and it becomes all part of the record that we can evaluate and we would be happy to reconsider the review that Bill's done and maybe touch base with the gentleman that did some of the cross-checking against the errors in topo and then we'll be able to bring that back to a hearing. Bayard – They can apply for relief. We have people cross wetlands, let alone cross buffers. Although it is sort of a transverse along the buffer... Edgar – We should get it right. Some good information has been brought that we need to take a look at. It may not be an issue. Vadney – First, it may not be an issue. Second, it may be an issue that could require ZBA relief or third, it may be that they could relocate the driveway. It's probably not a showstopper as far as the subdivision goes, it's just a question of getting administrative detail. Edgar – The relocation of the driveway could be a significant issue. You guys know that the knoll there where the house is and so you can come out and want to site a driveway close to crest and so if they kick it 65' uphill, it certainly is going to shorten the sight distance. What the sight distances are along the road and whether or not you get 400' and the like. Safety has to be first and foremost on the radar screen, but if it's wetland #8, it's wetland #8. If we've made a mistake, we certainly have to take all this under advisement. Vadney – Mr. Roseen, do you already have numbers on site distance. Roseen – It's right at 400', the current one. Vadney – The movement would worsen that. Flanders – I would like to point out that Meredith Neck Road is a state road so that driveway permit would have to come from the State and not from the Town. Edgar- It's clear here in the review and that's where the 400' rule comes from and as you know Bob, there are pretty good travel speeds on that road. People come zipping over that hill so it is a very fair concern. Regardless of where the driveway ends up, it will require an easement and details added to the plan. Richard Benson – The Bedingfields have done some wonderful things with that property. They have done a wonderful job and it is a pleasure to look at and a pleasure to meet them. We hope that the future owners will be as careful and thoughtful on behalf of the area and on behalf of the Town and we hope that the sales people who will have this in their hands are equally dedicated to this wonderful piece of road that you folks maintain in the Town of Meredith.

At this particular point, we have absolutely no objections of any kind and we wish them well. Vadney – Probably we should continue this until we can get a full review of the code situation on the wetland at a minimum and there may be other things. The abutters will not be renotified. Hearing closed at 7:45 p.m.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO JANUARY 11, 2005. Voted unanimously.

3. **MARK P. KISELY AND CHRISTIANE KISELY:** (Rep. Harry Wood)
Proposed major subdivision of Tax Map S25, Lot 30, into two (3) lots (40,856 sq. ft., 61,308 sq. ft., 18 ac. +/-) located on Birch Hill Road in the Residential District.

This portion of the Knisely property is located off Birch Hill Road and the property has frontage on both Waukegan Street and Birch Hill Road. In the past couple of years a series of plans have been submitted dealing with the Waukegan Street portion of the property. The first plan that came in was for a Boundary Line Adjustment on four existing lots being reconfigured making them more workable and compatible with the ordinance and then we came back with several additional lots, the easternmost one of which that shows up in the corner of this drawing. You can see that a great deal of the property between that and where we are working is a low grade wetland, it's forested and there are very few, if any, of what you would think of as cattails and things that would be really wet, the only place that type of growth predominates is in the corner where there's a culvert that drains out onto Waukegan Street and doesn't drain the area completely so you have standing water in this area, but the rest of the property you would think there's a lot of loam out there. This proposal is to create two lots serviced by municipal sewer. Previously, we had submitted to the Zoning Board for permission to connect to the existing sewer, but in order to access the lot from there we would have had to cross the corner of this protective buffer and they said "no", so the next proposal that was available to us was to extend the municipal sewer about 150' up the road, install a couple of manholes and make it more accessible without going through the buffer. In order to help compensate for the additional expense of that type of extension, we propose two lots. There is a wetland on Lot #2 and we show all of the buffers for that and we leave a buildable area on Lot #2 which is 6,700 sq. ft. and on Lot #1, you have 7,640 sq. ft., however, some of that is taken up by other things. We have a proposed joint driveway that would access both lots and on the opposite side of Lot #1, we have a 20' wide sewer easement so the rear property can access the sewer on Birch Hill Road. The frontage that remains for this property that is not obstructed by

wetlands is in the vicinity of the Knisely house which is on the other side of the road and there used to be a barn in this vicinity which they took down. That barn sat on dry land, but it's completely cut off from the rest of the property with the exception of a few dry islands. Because of that, we are proposing as part of this approach to take a small parcel on Waukegan Street that Mr. Knisely owns and merge it with the larger parcel and that will give him approximately 300' of frontage on Waukegan Street which is high and dry and would provide future access to the balance of the property. That's the essence of the subdivision with the exception of quite a bit of legal documents that need to be provided before any approval could be finalized. We would need in order to practically complete this both from the purposes of sale and protection of the people involved, we would need the sewer easement, driveway easement and maintenance agreement. We have a driveway permit now and we spoke to the DPW and they said they would amend it when the time came. We would need a DPW excavation permit to cut the road for the sewer. We would need to arrange payment of sewer access fees. They are requesting a well release for the well on Lot #1. Keep in mind that this is a suggested well location, it's not necessarily the final one that would come up, but as we've sited it here, it's about 25-30' from the edge of the road itself, but there was some concern that without a full 75' of separation, there might be some salt intrusion into the well and so the Town suggested that we issue a release. We would also need the merger of the lots and if the owner chooses not to do the extension of the sewer prior to considering a sales agreement, we would have to establish a performance guarantee for the extension of the sewer. At this instant, we believe that the sewer will be extended before the lots are sold. Edgar – From a zoning point of view with town sewer, density is 20,000 sq. ft. in the Residential District. Each of the 3 lots exceeds that minimum. With respect to wetlands, obviously what's not real clear visibly but the building envelopes are substantially reduced on these properties because of the buffers to wetlands. I don't believe we have anything from the wetland scientist in the file suggesting that they are low value. They are low value in the sense that they are not marshes and things of that nature, but it is a fairly large wetland and it is very close to the Town's water supply so there is probably some very significant value just by virtue of it's position in the watershed. They have demonstrated that there is a sufficient building envelope for both lots that are not encumbered by setbacks. What we've done on some other projects recently is we've looked at stipulations that there will be no encroachment into these setbacks. I think if this Board and the Conservation Commission and the ZBA knew hypothetically if owners of Lot 2 were to be building in the buffers, they probably would never agree to the lots being created in the first place. I think that if we are taking it on its face that 6,700 sq. ft. envelope is sufficient to locate some size of house,

then it would also be equally prudent for us to stipulate that there be no further encroachment into wetland setback areas and that issue would be noted on the plan and that will be a condition of subdivision approval with that potential put to rest. Driveway permits are required from DPW. We will need easement language for the driveway and sewer easements. It was brought to our attention that the ROW itself narrows down and if you look at the corner of Waukewan and Birch Hill Roads, on the left hand side of that wetland, you'll see the ROW line and that's about a 33' ROW and then it tapers back up to a full 50' once you get further in. I just noted that it would be a fair thing to ask to bring that ROW to 50', but as a practical matter, it's wet and the proposed improvements fit fairly well within the land that is provided so Mike reviewed that and brought our attention to it, but not to the extent of it being a critical issue at all. The applicant proposes to extend the municipal sewer from Waukewan Street to Piper Lane to serve the proposed two lots. The extension will involve at least two manholes and will be a gravity fed line. Bob Hill has recommended a design build approach whereby the applicant's contractor would receive construction specifications from Bob's office and Bob's office will oversee construction and inspection. Bob's feeling was that this is a fairly simple sewer extension, it's in the road, it's a gravity fed line and is a relatively short run and did not see the necessity for an engineering drawing on it especially knowing that we would have the construction inspection and testing protocols as well as an as-built drawing at the end of the day. A 20' sewer easement is proposed. Draft language should be submitted to staff for review. We will need permits from Public Works to dig the road up in 2005. Sewer access fees are applicable as this is a new development. It should be noted on the plan that consideration should be given towards providing a sewer easement over the balance of the Knisely property in order to provide at least the option to connect the Route 104 area under 104 down through this neighborhood via the sewer line to a main line on Waukewan Street. There are a couple of ways that some of the Route 104 B & I can be sewered. Wood – We have looked at this connection and may be willing to require the easement and since it is a property right to us and the way we chose to do that is to show a possible easement to the Town of Meredith or others for possible future sewer and/or water line 30' wide that runs through NH Route 104 ROW. Probably less than 30' is fairly common, but since this is in the vicinity of a front setback for us, there would be a 30' setback anyway so I arbitrarily set the easement at 30'. That would allow more than enough room for construction, maintenance and whatnot and we've given that a taper here on the end so they can get down to Birch Hill Road. Birch Hill Road turns away in this general area and they might need this taper in order to get into the sewer. We have reserved it and shown it on the plat and to that extent it's dedicated so someone else couldn't construct, but we

prefer not to physically deed that to anybody at this time, but we are willing to reserve. Edgar – With respect to water, we have on-site wells. DPW raised concern of the possibility that the well radii for Lot 1 extends well into the traveled way and Mike has recommended some form of release in the event road salt could impact the well water quality. Overhead utilities are available on Birch Hill Road in the vicinity of the proposed subdivision. We will need a unit cost estimate to be provided for staff review for purposes of establishing a performance guarantee for both sewer and the erosion control. We would need to review and establish those numbers in the framework of a public hearing. The form of these guarantees is either a letter of credit from a New Hampshire bank or cash. The Finance Director shall approve the format. In the alternative, there is an alternative provided for in state statute and that is if all conditions precedent to final approval excepting performance guarantee for the sewer extension, if all those other conditions are in place an applicant could proceed with construction of the sewer. Upon satisfactory completion of construction, inspection and testing, the plans could then be recorded. They would have that option available to them just like applicants in other developments. With respect to the merger, the concern is that the bulk of remaining land is wetland and this is a practical way to access upland portions that do remain back behind Route 104. Written confirmation that all pins have been set is required prior to recording the mylar. Flanders – On the width of the ROW for Birch Hill Road, I feel pretty strongly that we should make the adjustment in that easement so that there is a 50' ROW all the way down to Waukegan Street. It is not necessary to make any physical changes in the road there, but we've held pretty tight to the 50' ROW on any new projects and here we have a chance to clean up an existing situation that's less than perfect. Vadney – I would point out to you Bob and disagree with you that if you were going to widen that 33' you would have to come on the other side of the road. To put it on the side of the Knisely property, all it does is put a jog in the road into a wetland. I don't see it would buy us a whole lot. Flanders – I think this is a perfect time to clean this up, we would have the 50', we've been really rigid on that with new projects. Vadney – I would agree with you if it did something that was useable, but I don't see how that would do anything useable. Flanders – I think it would make our situation more consistent throughout town. John, on the back of Lot 1 it shows a 10' setback, I wasn't aware that we had any zone in Town that has a 10' setback. Wood – I have treated that as a side because on a corner lot we have two fronts and two sides and it is consistent with the setback on the adjacent lot. Edgar -Lot 1 is a corner lot with frontage on two streets. Zoning requires two fronts and two sides. Ralph Pisapia (representing the Conservation Commission) – I'm not quite clear on the number of lots, you talk about two lots and then you talk about three lots. Edgar – When the

project's finished there will be three lots, two new ones and the balance. Lots 1 and 2 are the new lots being created, but technically when the plan gets finished there's a total of three lots. Lot 3 was not discussed in the context of any impacts on the wetlands or wetland buffers. Vadney – That's right, because nothing is happening there at this time. Pisapia - But we are approving it. Wood – It's an existing lot of record a little over 18 acres in size and what we are doing is taking away the isolated, buildable area that fronts on Birch Hill Road and leaving the rest of the property. There is a note on the plan indicating that this remaining acreage is being merged with Tax Map S25, Lot 38, which will provide a dry access to the property which it doesn't have now. Edgar – Lot 3 would either be 20,000 sq. ft. or half an acre, it's going to be over 18 acres. It needs 50' of frontage, it will have 300' of frontage on Waukegan Street with access to a sewer. By merging that stand of pine with that bigger piece, that is the building site. It is high and dry and has access to a sewer with 300' of frontage. The merger of this interior piece with the lot on Waukegan Street really obviates any significant concern as to whether or not the 18 acre piece is buildable. Pisapia – I believe John mentioned there would be a stipulation included that there would be no infringement on the buffer or any wetlands that would be included in this approval. Is that accurate? Would that be applicable for all three lots, that there would be no relief for any wetland or buffer impacts? Flanders – On that issue you couldn't encroach on any of those buffers without ZBA action and I don't think this Board has the authority to rule. Edgar – You've done it on the Crestwood project and the concern is that if we're looking at this project today and if that was something that was worked out as part of the approval and is built into all those legal documents and when the homeowner buys the lot, there's no more legal relief. We are in a court case right now where we had gone through this whole routine, we established the building envelope, they went to the ZBA, the ZBA denied it and said this is a brand new subdivision, your house is too big. We are being sued over that so what I'm trying to do here is nip that in the bud. We can check with counsel if you think it appropriate to do that, but we want to make it fundamentally clear to any property owner that as a condition of this Board's approval, that there would be no further impact to the wetlands. Flanders – I do think it would be wise to run it by counsel to make sure that if we do that, we are acting legally. Kahn – My recollection is that in the case of Crestwood, Pat Wood took it a step further and actually agreed that in the subdivision approval that he would put the restriction in each deed. Bayard – Given the sensitivity of the area, it's a precaution that makes a lot of sense. Pisapia – I haven't spoken with the Chairman of the Conservation Commission, but if we had the opportunity and were knowledgeable that there's going to be a significant wetland impact on the proposed subdivision such as this, we then would recommend to the

Planning Board that you not approve such a subdivision. I just want to make a comment, Harry mentioned the low value wetland and others have done so in the past and I think we all need to be aware that's a relative term and it depends on which side of the equation you are. If you're a salamander depending on that wetland it is low value, but for a bird that depends on that for habitat, it's pretty important for those birds. Mark Knisely – In answer to Mr. Bayard, as far as the 30' proposed sewer easement, I intend to create that easement and I wish to retain ownership. As far as the Birch Hill easement, Harry can address that. Language for not allowing any further encroachments on the wetlands, I don't have a problem with that for Lots 1 and 2. I think it makes good sense. Wood – With regard to the restrictions on the lots regarding the buffer zones, Mr. Knisely has indicated that he would accept the restriction on Lots 1 & 2, but not on Lot 3 because we have no development plans at this time. It may be necessary to put in stormwater treatment, detention ponds, or a number of things that may involve the wetlands on that parcel. The things we are doing here and have done in the past are fairly simple projects, they are easily considered and contemplated with regard to their individual impact. The balance of the property will be treated as a whole. Any further access into the property will come from the other side and it will be necessary to deal with the whole thing at one time. With regard to Mr. Flanders comment on Birch Hill Road, I think Mr. Knisely, after the discussion I've had with him, would be willing to give up half of the difference. The existing Town road in that area was 33 feet when Harold Wyatt subdivided his property. He provided 50' ROW's because he was selling lots on both sides of the road. We would be willing to add 8 ½ feet on Mr. Knisely's side of the road and that would bring you up to 41 ½. Flanders – That sounds like a reasonable solution. Finer – I disagree with any more disturbance this close to our Town water supply. I think we're asking for trouble. Edgar – As outlined it has no impact, direct or otherwise, to wetlands and that's why we are looking at that stipulation to insure that is the deal. They've agreed to what I have outlined as condition #1. Hearing closed at 8:33 p.m.

Bayard moved, Flanders seconded, I MOVE WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF MARK AND CHRISTIANE KNISELY, TAX MAP S25, LOT 30, INTO 3 LOTS (40,856 SQ. FT., 61,308 SQ. FT. AND 18 ACRES), LOCATED ON BIRCH HILL ROAD IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT THERE BE A STIPULATION THAT NO ENCROACHMENT INTO THE SETBACKS IS PERMITTED, AS AGREED TO BY THE APPLICANT.

- (2) DRIVEWAY PERMITS FROM DPW ARE REQUIRED AND SHOULD BE NOTED ON THE PLAN.
- (3) DRAFT DRIVEWAY EASEMENT LANGUAGE TO BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF REVIEW.
- (4) THE 8 ½' BEING GRANTED BY THE APPLICANT BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING ROW THAT IS CURRENTLY NOT AT THE 50' STANDARD AND BE SHOWN ON THE PLAN.
- (5) DRAFT LANGUAGE FOR THE 20' SEWER EASEMENT BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW BY STAFF.
- (6) DPW EXCAVATION PERMIT IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
- (7) THAT SOME FORM OF RELEASE BE PROVIDED FOR LOT 1 IN THE EVENT THE WELL RADIUS OVERLAPS THE TOWN'S ROW.
- (8) PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE. A UNIT COST ESTIMATE SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR STAFF REVIEW AS IT RELATES TO THE PROPOSED SEWER EXTENSION AND EROSION CONTROL. A COMPLIANCE HEARING SHALL BE HELD FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE BOARD'S DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE GUARANTEE. THE FORM OF THE GUARANTEE SHALL BE EITHER A LETTER OF CREDIT OR CASH. THE FINANCE DIRECTOR SHALL APPROVE THE FORMAT. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, PROVIDED THAT ALL CONDITIONS PRECEDENT TO FINAL APPROVAL EXCEPTING THE PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE FOR THE SEWER, THE APPLICATION COULD PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION OF THE SEWER. UPON SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION, INSPECTION AND TESTING, THE PLANS COULD THEN BE RECORDED.
- (9) THAT THE REMAINING LAND BE MERGED WITH TAX MAP S25, LOT 38, FRONTING ON WAUKEWAN STREET.
- (10) WRITTEN CONFIRMATION BE PROVIDED THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 6-1 in favor of the motion.

4. **RICHARD G. JUVE:** (Rep. Harry Wood)

This property is located at the end of Wall Street on the left side of the private drive off the Wall Street turnaround. Three lots are being proposed which are essentially defined by the drainages. Boundaries have been placed within the existing drainages to make the boundary an integral part of that wetland so there's plenty of room for a person to build and they don't have to be close to their boundary. Wetlands on the site have been delineated. Topography has been established for placement of wells,

houses and driveways so we could evaluate the impacts. There is a deed restriction that these lots cannot be less than 5 acres in size. Test pits have been done. Potential house and septic locations have been shown. The driveways are also shown. There's three places on this property that we can get onto the lots without driving through a wetland. We will be within the buffer for the wetland, but we will not be in the wetland itself. The remainder of the sideline of Wall Street Extension created a wetland on its uphill side when they built the road. It is essentially a dam. The side hill runs from the Vutek property down through the Robin Way neighborhood onto this property and you have these flows coming down and the road acts as a dam. There are eight culverts that cross the road in that general area and the Department of Public Works has recommended that we replace/rebuild those culverts utilizing the materials which the Town approves for potentially Town acceptable roads. The ultimate desire of this improvement that goes along with this subdivision is to end up with a Town road extension that would run up to a turnaround to be supplied at the end of the traveled road. The original ROW actually extended further and went over to Winona Shores Road, but it is of poor quality and there's quite a few wetlands involved in that area. Town staff has made an evaluation of that and I believe the current standard is that it is probably not going to be connected through. We did go to the Board of Selectmen to discuss road standards and essentially came up with a cross section for the road which is essentially 18' of traveled surface, 1' shoulders, 4 extra inches of gravel in the top layer beyond the normal standard and no paving. Side slopes would be 2:1 or riprap depending upon the exact circumstances in this section of the road. There is an impact on the uphill side of the road from the standpoint that the DPW wants us to clean the ditches. The ditches at the present time are practically non-existent. In places we've had to scrape the soil up to form the road and that left an area which has collected water. Many of these culverts are 4" PVC which drain a little ponded area. Most of them weren't put in very well, they were in many instances set 4-6" above the lowest level of the water so the water just ponds and sits there. So what we would be doing is essentially re-laying those, replacing those that are not appropriate. The present road that's out there is, depending upon where you say it ends, 12 or 14 feet wide. We would be expanding that to 20 feet in all areas except one area that improvement will all be done on the downhill side of the road and the reason for that is to avoid the wetlands as much as possible. The wetlands here that show up on the downhill side of the road are essentially outfalls of culverts. We would be extending the length of the culvert 4-6' in most instances so they would be tied into the side slope of the new traveled way and we would end up with a 20' surface where vehicles could pass either way. The turnaround proposed would be a hammerhead type similar to what is at the end of Veasey Shore Road,

negotiated by the Town so that the equipment could turn around but because of the extremely low traffic count, they don't feel a full cul-de-sac is required. In fact, when the original subdivision plan was approved, there were provisions within it to remove the existing cul-de-sac if the Town road gets extended and the property lines run through the center of the cul-de-sac so that if this is completed and the Town were to accept this as an extension to the Town road, the portions of the cul-de-sac which are to the left of a 50' ROW would revert to the owners and the materials would be removed. Vadney – Right now the Town plows to that cul-de-sac? How far will the Town plow when this is finished? Edgar - When it's under construction, they'll plow to that cul-de-sac. This has not been accepted by the Town. Vadney – But we're going to eliminate that first cul-de-sac? Edgar – In my staff review, I make it clear that at one point and even the initial subdivision plan identified this ROW to be upgraded at some point in time in the future such as now and it also talked about the discontinuance of that cul-de-sac if something is extended further down. That makes perfect sense if the Town is maintaining the whole road. It doesn't make sense that if this is private and it will be private at the time this is built, the Town still needs a place turn around so that cul-de-sac shouldn't physically be removed until such time if and when we go all the way to the end. I'm looking at minutes of December 22nd when the slightly reduced standard was agreed to by the Selectmen and Selectman Flanders moved to accept the waivers as outlined in my staff review without accepting the portion of Town maintenance. At the time, it was my point of view and it wasn't the one that prevailed, but we have three houses on the road and will end up with three more houses so it will be at 50% which is typically what the Selectmen look for so my thinking was that if they pretty much carry the 18 feet of width that we have out there now, why not look at it as an extension of the Town road and be done with it. There was a lot of healthy debate about that and it was viewed that the Board of Selectmen not be obligated to take this over so when looking at the maintenance piece of allowing the reduced standards, the prevailing thinking on the Board of Selectmen was not to be in a position to accept something that was not up to a full standard. That vote was taken back in December of 2003. Flanders – At that meeting, the Selectmen didn't approve a reduced road standard. Since that time Mr. Juve came to another meeting and I think that took place in August and we agreed to waive the standards in the areas of the road width allowing the roadway to be off center slightly so as to eliminate impacts to the wetland and we also agreed to accept a hammerhead turnaround on the end without obligating the Town to maintain it. When this is all done and completed, Mr. Juve has the right to come back and ask the Selectmen to accept this for maintenance and at that time we may or may not do that. Vadney – That part I'm not concerned with. I am concerned because I

thought I heard you say that when this is done you would eliminate this first cul-de-sac. Wood - John is correct in his reminder. He doesn't see it on his copy, but based on his staff review, I did add the words that said, "Existing cul-de-sac to be discontinued if roadway is extended and another turnaround is supplied and road extension is accepted as a Town road". Vadney - If it's not accepted as a Town road, that cul-de-sac will stay. Edgar - Basically, and I do need to correct Bob on a little bit. In December the 3 waivers by the Board had to do with road standards. It wasn't a width issue primarily. At the end of the day, the Selectmen granted the waivers basically providing that as a private road. In August of 2004, the legal request had to do with how much engineering was going to come along with this. Mike had done a cross section and had laid out specifications for the kind of culverts and it is basically a straight shot, there's no vertical grade. If we had good survey, good wetland calculations in terms of wetland impacts, the question was put to the Selectmen whether or not from the Road Standard Ordinance, which requires plan and profile, did we need plan and profile in something that did not have those kinds of characteristics. What we have in the staff review is a couple suggestions for some clarifications. Wood - You did mention that you thought that more information on the impact was desirable and I simply respond to that by saying we are going to the ZBA at their next meeting in January and we also have to file with the State of New Hampshire so that information will be forthcoming. We also have not heard from the Conservation Commission yet to my knowledge. Whatever comes out of that discussion we would try to incorporate if we can. In general terms, the driveways will not pass through wetlands, they will only go through the buffers. There will be some disturbance if we try to ditch the uphill side of the road, even if that means taking a grader blade and making a one foot cut, that's going to produce a 2 foot disturbance the length of the road. We will be replacing 7 of the culverts. There's one in here that is a 48" culvert and I don't think that will have to be rebuilt. It will have to be extended, but not rebuilt. Vadney - You said some of the culverts are 4" PVC, what's the range? Do we have 8 total. Wood - Most of them are 12" corrugated metal pipe which were just dropped in the ground and buried. I think the PVC ones have croppped over the years. In the past, water tended to accumulate on the uphill side of the road and if it can't find a way out, it flows over the road. Obviously, we are trying to eliminate that from happening. The other impact will be the additional length to the culverts. When the road is complete, the surface will be approximately 8" higher than the road surface now. The standards call for 18" of crushed gravel and what's out there is crushed gravel so I would expect a contractor to remove the trees that are growing in the edge of the road, remove any other trees on that side where the improvements would be required, then to shape what's there checking to make sure that it's 18" of bank run gravel. If it's substandard material, it will have to be taken out. The 8" of crushed gravel is an extra request, normally it's 4". Vadney - My real concern is not to worry about how the road is built, but the fact that there's one 48" culvert

and now the road is going to be higher and be a bigger dam than it's been in the past and that's what caused an uphill wetland. There's not much elevation change in that 1,500 feet. Wood – Actually, there's more than you suspect. Vadney – Is there any threat if you make the dam higher, it'll force water towards the 48" culvert. Wood – Nothing's going to happen if it overloads it, what happens on the rest is there is no ditch on the uphill side of the road, the water doesn't translate up and down until it finds a culvert, it just sits where it is. If it can't get to a culvert, it goes over the road. The minor ditching, just simply drag a blade down through to take out all the root material and stuff that was never removed when they built the road will go a long way toward solving any problem. Edgar – With respect to the wetlands, we need the verification information as to who did the delineation, the certification number, the standard that was used and the date of the field work and a little bit of line cleanup work in terms of clearly identifying and labeling wetland setbacks, stream setbacks. Plans need to clearly indicate the amount of direct wetland impact and protect the buffer impacts. It's hard looking at all those lines on the roadway to try to get a feel for exactly the square footages of the impacts and that was part of what we had agreed with the Selectmen is that we can agree to a cross section that's reduced and you can look at waiving things, but the burden's on the surveyor to still be able to calculate, to show the proposed ROW limit of improvements and make the calculations relative to the wetland impacts. We knew we were going to be shifting the road a little bit in the ROW, but there still are impacts and I think it is prudent even though there is some overlapping jurisdiction, I think it would be prudent for the Board to understand the scope of what the wetland impacts are. Plans should be clarified clearly indicating the amount of direct wetland impact and protective buffer impacts being proposed for the roadway improvements and for driveway locations. We need a little bit of a drafting tweak on the cross section. We like to make sure that all the gravel that is brought into the site be crushed and the bank run extend the full limit of the shoulder so there's no misinterpretation. At this point the roadway will be private and that doesn't mean that people don't have rights to petition but it's been clear as to how we got there. It raises the question that Mr. Juve will have to address as to how this roadway extension be maintained. Right now and I don't know what the answer is, but you have three driveways off a driveway. You have Mr. Juve's, Mr. Bicknell's and Mr. Langille's driveways. In a perfect world, Mr. Juve and his three other property owners would come together and play a little catch up with what should have happened back in the early 80's and that would be to form some kind of an association or maintenance agreements amongst the property owners as to how the private road would be maintained. It's private now, it will be upgraded and remain private except there will be a total of six houses tying into it as opposed to the current three and that will

need to be addressed at future meetings of the Board. In talking with the Selectmen and this issue of the cul-de-sac being discontinued had come up. The thinking was that we didn't need to create a place for loitering and if we were going to extend our turnaround capabilities, then it should physically go away. That not being the case, the Town needs to retain its ability to turn around within the Class V portion of the ROW. The lots will be served by on-site septic and wells. Overhead utilities are available through the ROW. Those are probably going to need to be upgraded and relocated in some context so we need to see that information added to the plan. I suggest that Harry chase down to see if DES Terrain Alteration Permits are required. There are certain requirements that trigger terrain alteration within certain proximities to the lake. I'm not sure whether this falls within that or not. We will need to see some erosion control information added to the plan in terms of Best Management Practices for construction work. The existing zoning ordinance for the Shoreline District with respect to Lake Waukegan requires that there be no underground outside storage tanks for fossil fuels. The same language relative to Performance Guarantees that we've talked about in the past. With respect to the turnaround easement, it's on the land of the abutting property owner, Mr. Bicknell. Draft easements would need to be submitted for the turnaround. Executed deeds would be recorded with the final plans and we would need mortgage releases if there are any on Mr. Bicknell's property. The existing drive/road is privately maintained in some fashion. Some of the properties have year-round capability and are used year-round and somebody maintains something out there. Exactly who does it, how they do that and how these three lots would be incorporated into that needs to be explored and something brought back for the Board to have an assurance that things will be taken care of. Vadney – Are the existing utilities on the downhill slope, uphill slope or what? Wood – On the uphill side. To my knowledge, we will not be touching any of those poles. The poles are up and guyed away from the road. We are looking for your input at this time, this is the initial hearing on this and we need to go to the Zoning Board and so we would want to continue our hearing to no earlier than the 25th of January and at that time we would have the Zoning Board decision and we would feel comfortable with finalizing some of this. Edgar – This is an 80 scale and it might... Wood – I can change the roads, I can blow the roads up to 40's without any trouble. Kahn – It looks to me like your proposed house site on Lot #1 is in a wetland setback? Wood – The house can be within 50' of the wetland if that's a problem, I'll just move it over. Kahn – I think it raises the issue we were discussing before. On the other lots, there's plenty of room where you could put anything you want. Edgar – That would presume that is a non-designated wetland as opposed to a stream, Harry? Wood – It is a stream. Edgar – Setback is 75'. Wood – We will just move it over. Kahn – As for Lot #1 where wetlands constrict

what one can do, should we be thinking about putting restrictions on the deed and on the plan as to where improvements can be made? Edgar – Absolutely. Bayard – I agree with you since we are fairly close to the lake. Brian Langille – We live at the end of Wall Street. My big concern is that I'm downhill from there so if everything's high, there's a lot of water up there and if you're building it higher, I understand you're putting culverts in, but what happens down farther. There's a lot of water up there that runs year-round. Vadney – That 48" culvert we talked about, does that run full at times. Langille – Absolutely. Last year we didn't have much snow and the water ran across the road for a good two months in the spring, 80' feet wide, 4 inches deep. I walked all of that land and looking at this, I can't believe there's not more wetlands out there than what it is. Every square inch of it feels like you're walking on a sponge. Trees fall down constantly because they are very small rooted. I maintain the road so if it stays a private road, I certainly would be the one that maintains it. I haul in the dirt, I rent excavators, I do everything. I plow it. Vadney – This may be a chance to form a homeowner's association that can help you pay for it. Flanders – If you remember when we were working with the subdivision for REI, we discovered the beaver dams that had the water going down through this into Waukegan that really should have been going over to Wicwas and those dams have been removed so that water situation down here should be somewhat better. Langille – It runs right down my driveway. The area that ran over was right at the Bicknell's property. Mrs. Langille – Where would the turnaround be? Wood – We are proposing it right on the northwesterly corner of your property and I believe you've had some discussions with Mr. Juve regarding that. Vadney – And that would be a hammerhead style turnaround. The pink markers are wetland delineations. Mr. Juve doesn't even walk on this part of the road, he does none of the road maintenance because his place is before the driveway starts. If you get three more people on there, but the three new buildings, plus ours and Brian's, there's five people using that road and I wonder what happens when they start construction and trucks are coming in, moving trees out, that road in no way could hold up to any kind of construction vehicle. Edgar – That's why we're replacing it. There will need to be detailed construction sequencing in terms of how they maintain, we'll require one lane of traffic for emergency access purposes and for your necessity of getting in and out, you're not going to be isolated. They are going to need to, think of it as building half a road on the left side and then building the other half. They'll have to come back with a construction sequence that maintains the accessibility to everybody, not the full 20' but a lane of travel has to be available for emergency service and for your ability to get in and out of your properties. That has to be provided during the construction so they will be building the road in segments. Bicknell – There's no way two people can pass each other on that road.

Edgar – The way it is today. Mrs. Bicknell – We tried today, I had to back because he has a truck. Edgar – A minimum specification travel lane for a normal residential road would be a 9-10' lane. We are going with two 9's and we're trying to not put in a super highway there and ruin the character of the area. The balancing act would be that we try to match the road that is coming in and not overbuild. The structural aspect of that road, the strength of that road has to be the full 20 feet. It will be a substantial improvement to what's there, but not overkill. Langille – You're not touching any culverts down by Lot #3 and that still runs downhill right to my property and I realize it's my driveway, but it's just going to be the same thing. There's a huge amount of water that runs off of that Lot #3 that runs right at my house. It runs right into my door. Vadney – So this will just get it there quicker is what you're thinking? Wood – The wetland delineation you see here is the uphill side of what was flagged by the soil scientist and things below that are wet and this continues out and crosses the roadway and this whole section out in here of the possible future road is in wetlands. Vadney - There certainly is a concern on this site proven by the fact in 1,500 feet, you've got 8 culverts and we don't want to do anything that forces those 8 independent causeways or waterways to join up and make bigger downstream rivers into the pond. Pisapia – I just wanted to respond to something that was said having to do with the construction on a one-lane road. I had a personal experience on a one-lane and a building lot was approved and notwithstanding what John said that this would be accommodated, these folks came in and bought the road and we had one heck of a time getting in and out of our house and I just want these folks to know that they need to have something in writing that assures they are going to have access because I don't know if it was a screwup or if these folks didn't follow the rules, but we had a heck of a time. Edgar – Most recently we required on a project in another part of the community where out on Mile Point there were 8 homes at the end of the road and there was a full reconstruction going on what they viewed as their driveway and that driveway was to be converted into a road. We had gone through this very exercise and had something signed off by the Police Department and everybody else in terms of the kind of construction sequencing and traffic management so that it's very clear that there needs to be one lane of access available to the people being impacted by the ripping and tearing up of their driveway. The cost of doing this improvement needs to be guaranteed to this Board because relative to representations that are being made to you and this Board, this project will be dependent upon this improvement being made. Without this improvement being made, this wouldn't happen. There has to be cash or letter of credit in favor of the Town that in the event the developer defaults, at a minimum the driveway can be restored. If they record the plan, they have to guarantee the full amount. If they build under a conditional

approval, they have to guarantee site stabilization and the restoration of the driveway. Pisapia – The road now acts somewhat as a dam and is holding back quite a bit of that water. As I understand the proposal, they are going to upgrade the road and put in new culverts. Putting in the new culverts is going to increase the speed of the water flowing downhill into our water supply and this could cause further erosion downstream. It also has the potential of decreasing the water retention on the upstream side which basically is acting as a water detention basin and somewhat sediment control and it's highly likely that it could increase the rate of water flow off this property and you're going to decrease the amount of wetlands as well. At a minimum, I think the Board should consider that there should be some provision made for water detention basins on the upstream side to slow down that water as it goes downstream and to filter out some of the pollutants. Vadney – How many of the culverts are on year-round streams? Wood – Three. The rest are there because of things like the road overflow. We've got 24' of drop from this point to the side of the road. It's not flat land, there's not a large amount of ponded water. There's about a 6' strip along the uphill side of the road that tends to collect the water. It's all grown in with roots, brush, stumps and what not, so if we keep the culverts the same size and we simply guarantee that they run, that will cure the water problem in the road, it won't necessarily dump more water downstream. The ability of the water to get downstream happens now. Vadney – How far is it from the road to Lake Waukegan? Wood – It's 600-700 feet to the railroad tracks. Bayard – Does this water go into Monkey Pond. Vadney – No, this goes straight to the lake. Bicknell - It's a rushing water. You open the door and you think it's pouring, but it's not. It's the water coming off the hill. They diverted it when we almost lost our porch. Now it goes right down to the big culvert. Maybe you should have somebody like Fluet look at some of the drainage issues. The profile is not rocket science. Wood – We've anticipated that our wetlands application is going to have to be pretty complete to the State and that will provide a lot of information. Edgar – I think it would be helpful to provide this information to this Board so they would have the benefit of some of the realities downstream. It's not Mr. Juve's problem to anticipate everybody else's stuff, but it is appropriate for Mr. Juve to be responsible for any additional runoff. You will need an erosion control plan for these permits anyway so it's probably a prudent thing to get that additional input from an engineer, not necessarily a full plan and profile, but certainly be able to answer some of these questions. I would also like to respond to Mr. Bicknell, the comment about the private maintenance. You had mentioned that Mr. Juve may not have an interest in trying to figure this whole thing out because his driveway is right near the end of the cul-de-sac, but this is Mr. Juve's project and this Board is going to want to make sure that these three properties and arguably the people

across the street, there's some provision so even if we put you guys aside, just say you didn't exist, he needs to address how this private road will be maintained for these people. To my way of thinking, think of this as an opportunity. He needs to resolve to this Board's satisfaction some mechanism that's going to provide for private maintenance for these three properties and if I were somebody in the neighborhood, to me dividing by six is a lot more intelligent than dividing by three. There should be enough common ground here to get the folks to work out something that makes sense. His obligation is to provide at a minimum, a way which these three property owners will know what their respective responsibilities are. As a practical matter, you live in a neighborhood and you've lived next to people and you know you need to work together and this might be a perfect opportunity to clean that whole thing up and provide some pro-ration or some mechanism where you all know what the deal is. The other benefit of that is that it cleans up everybody's deeds. Finer – Where does Town sewer run through here? Once again, my concern is the Town water supply and I just can't believe that we're even considering putting in three septic tanks 600 feet from our water supply. It's absurd to even be considering it. Flanders – The sewer line runs up Waukegan Street, it does not run down Wall Street and the one comment I'd make, one thing we have to keep in mind here is that if somebody owns a piece of land and pays taxes on it, they have a right to utilize it within the scope of the existing ordinances, so you cannot say that because the water supply is 600' away, if a person has a piece of property, they can't build on it. Finer – No, but I can certainly voice my opinion and my concerns are for the Town water supply. Hearing closed at 9:58 p.m.

Flanders moved, Granfield seconded, THAT WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO FEBRUARY 8, 2005, AND SCHEDULE A SITE WALK ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 1, 2005, AT 10:00 A.M. AND MEET AT THE CUL-DE-SAC ON WALL STREET. Voted unanimously.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

- 1. PUBLIC HEARING ON ZONING AMENDMENTS – INTER-LAKES HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM ON JANUARY 4, 2005, AT 7:00 P.M.**
2. Authorization requested to sign Brunvand Plans outside a meeting. Voted unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

DECEMBER 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

The above minutes were read and approved by the Meredith Planning Board at a regular meeting on _____.

William Bayard, Secretary