

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders, Selectmen's Rep.; Kahn; Dever; Touhey; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey

Flanders moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 2008 AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR IPPOLITO REAL ESTATE TRUST** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment to convert existing warehouse space to retail showroom space, Tax Map S23, Lot 106, located at 193 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED 2009-2018 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP).**

Flanders – The report the Water Study Committee gave to us was it is a lot cheaper (about 50% or less) to put in a ground well land to run it can be 1/15th if there's things like you mentioned that need to be treated, that changes it to about 1/10th of the cost of running a regular system. The Water Study Committee has done a fabulous job. Bayard – I want to second that. They have given us a lot of material and wading through an awful lot with that and they've done an excellent job and I feel very confident that they and the new head of that Department will make good use of the money if it is set aside for them. They have a lot of things to improve the current facilities and then look at some plans as to what to do possibly in the future. Vadney – My second question is on the school, I see they put in a

Touhey moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION THAT THE PLANNING BOARD ACCEPT THE CIP PROPOSAL FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2009 AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN. Voted unanimously.

2. **AMBROSE LOGGING CO., INC.:** (Rep. Carl Johnson) (Sorell stepped down) Proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map R04, Lot 16, into five (5) lots (3.00 ac., 3.00 ac., 3.21 ac., 3.00 ac. and 5.27 ac.), located on Livingston Road in the Forestry Rural and Residential Districts.

Johnson – This property is a little more than halfway from Parade Road to Meredith Center located on the north side of Livingston Road. It was previously owned by the Locke family and purchased by Ambrose Logging Company last year and contacted us. They contacted me to determine how many lots could be created by virtue of the Meredith Subdivision Regulations. We did have the existing perimeter of the property, the total area of the parcel is a little over 17 acres and the first thing

they did was hire Ames Associates and Nicol Roseberry of Ames Associates went out to delineate the wetlands. There are a couple of wetlands towards the front of the property and there's one fairly isolated small wetland which is a non-designated exempt wetland in the middle and there are some disassociated wetlands and drainageways which are located to the northeast of the property. After the flags were delineated we located them on the plan and did a topographic analysis of the property to determine how many lots could be successfully created through the worst case lot sizing scenario. There is a zone line that transects the property, the portion of the property located south of that line is actually zoned residential and the portion of the property to the north is zoned Forestry and Rural. Because the majority of the property is located in the Forestry/Rural zone, we approached this in a manner such that we would develop the property as if it were all in the Forestry/Rural zone. It doesn't matter from a lot sizing standpoint because there are no municipal services here and the lot sizing would still be based on the soils and slopes but it does matter in terms of a density situation in that the density calculations are much less in the Residential zone than they are in the F/R zone. When we originally prepared the plan and submitted it, we did apply the setbacks in the F/R zone as they would be in that zone and we applied the setbacks in the Residential zone as they would be in the Residential zone. Upon review by Mr. Edney, the Code Enforcement Officer, his comment was if we were going to use the F/R zoning portion, that we would apply the F/R zone setbacks to the entire lots. In other words, there wouldn't be a setback change by virtue of crossing the setback line and I've made that adjustment to the plan so from a practical standpoint we're treating this all as a F/R subdivision. That being the case, the minimum lot size by density in the F/R zone is 3 acres so the smallest lot that can be created from a density standpoint is 3 acres and we have essentially approached this from a density standpoint. Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 are more regularly shaped and have frontage on Livingston Road. Lot 5 is a little bit unusually shaped in that it's what you call a flag lot or the pork chop lot where the minimum road frontage required for the lot is located over here, however, the access to that lot would be by virtue of an access easement across Lot 4 to get to Lot 5. It's primarily because in order to get the access through the 50' strip, you'd have to cross a wetland and the access across Lot 4 to Lot 5 does not require any additional permits from the Zoning Board for a driveway. That's a process we've done several other times where we've created a 50' strip that qualifies for the frontage but the access is actually somewhere else. There is an existing driveway to an existing dwelling that's on Lot 2 as well as a small entranceway to an existing carport that's on the same property. Mr. Ambrose met with Mike Faller from the DPW on site and Mike reviewed the staked out driveway locations for Lots 1, 3 and 4 and did make a field approval of those driveway locations. Driveway permits for those lots will have to be issued prior to final approval but they have been field inspected by Mr. Faller. The one recommendation he did have is that this carport situation be discontinued so there's a note on the plan that the driveway in that area is to be discontinued so there will be just the single existing driveway to the existing dwelling that's located on Lot 2. When we had the density and layout of the lots, we did the lot calculations based on the worst case soils and slopes

analysis. The Town of Meredith has a table based on the slope of the land and the quality of the soils that determines how big a lot has to be in order to qualify. The soils and slopes table is largely to ensure that there's enough area available for proper disposal and creation of a septic system. The worst case soils scenario essentially does away with the soil portion of it and just takes the topography of each lot and uses the worst case soils for that slope category to determine what would be the worst case soil situation to develop a lot and that is shown in a table on the plan. Test pits have been dug and logged for each lot. There is a possible dwelling site and a typical 4K area which is an area reserved for septic primarily for State Subdivision Approval and a proposed well location for each lot. There is currently an existing sort of an unknown septic system for the existing house on Lot 2 that's in working order, there is also an existing dug well on that lot that is in working order. The state mandates you show an acceptable well location and acceptable 4K area so we've done that. As you can see from the wetlands, there's both a 50' and 75' setback, the 50' setback from the wetland is the area surrounding a non-designated wetland that you can have no land disturbing activities and the 75' setback is a setback within which you cannot construct a septic system. You can have earth disturbing activities and locate a dwelling inside that 75' as long as you're not inside the 50'. In terms of the overall density of the project, you have an existing dwelling on the lot, so in essence you're creating 4 additional lots on the property which meet the minimum density for the F/R zone and also meet the worst case lot sizing scenario for the Town of Meredith. This development would require State of NH DES Subdivision Approval for 4 of the 5 lots, Lots 1-4 because they are under 5 acres. Lot 5 is in excess of 5 acres and does not require DES approval. I'll touch on a couple of issues from the Staff Report, the setback lines that Angela noticed in the original submission have been revised to reflect the setbacks in the F/R zone. The State Subdivision Approval will be cross referenced on the plan. We have submitted to the state and are awaiting comments or approval at this time. In the original application there was a 4K area shown for Lot 2 that has been revised, the 4K area was crossing one of the lot lines and now Lot 3 has a 4K area of its own which is centered around test pit 3A. The other utility services are provided along the power lines and utility lines that are located on Livingston Road. Angela has a comment on the road access regarding the second driveway on Lot 2 which is to be eliminated and noted on the revised plan that the driveway will be discontinued. The Fire Chief had a comment for Lot 5 that an adequate emergency access for turnaround is required similar to the subdivision that was done on Upper New Hampton Road. We've added a note like that for Lot 5. The new driveways that are to be proposed on Livingston Road will require driveway culverts and Mr. Faller is comfortable with addressing the installation of those culverts through the driveway permit application process. Angela requested that staff receive a draft easement to analyze the language regarding the 50' access easement across Lot 4 for the benefit of Lot 5. These are typically reviewed to make sure that there's language in there that one lot is being burdened by the easement and the other lot is being benefitted by it and also to determine how the construction and maintenance costs are going to be handled between the two lots and she's

suggesting that can be handled administratively. Touhey – I don't see that there are any wetland buffers being infringed upon except where they already exist on Lot 2. Johnson – That's correct. The building envelopes on 4 of the lots are big. The building envelope on Lot 2 is not exceptionally big but it's adequate for a home. At such time somebody decides to upgrade that septic system, a new test pit may have to be dug to determine that, but the test pits in the 4K areas for subdivision purposes are basically to demonstrate that there's some place on the site reserved for septic. Touhey – In the event that well or septic should fail, one has to go somewhere else. Johnson – Correct. The well has been tested and there is no problem with the water. LaBrecque – The application was deemed complete on October 14, 2008, at our previous Planning Board meeting. All the lots are within the 3-acre density for the F/R zone. The soils and slopes calculations are on the site plan. The setbacks have been revised so the comment under setbacks wouldn't apply because it's done and the state subdivision approval for the 4 lots should be cross-referenced on the final plans. Carl, are these 2' topography lines? I was measuring the slope with the Fire Chief and I kind of made that assumption. Johnson – It's actually a very gently sloped property and if you notice a great abundance in the worst case slopes calculations are the A or B under 8% slopes. LaBrecque – Another comment would be adding the relocated well location on Lot 2 per Bill's comment and under utilities that has all been revised on this new plan. Driveway permits are required from Public Works and should be cross referenced on the final plans. As Carl stated, Mike Faller did go out to the site, he inspected the site distance and took a look at all the possible driveway locations. Final signoff is required by the Fire Chief. As you know, we have a substantially larger fire truck than some of the ones they have had and so he just wants to be careful that when the driveway goes in, they are able to access the property. Additionally, the nearest fire hydrant is 4/10ths of mile down the road so if there's a truck in there fighting and another truck has to leave, they have to be able to pass and get back and forth. There are some culverts along the road. I did notice road drainage and on the final plans when Mike issues his driveway permits, he'll indicate what size culverts will be required for the new driveways. I didn't see any stormwater information on the plan. Under legal, draft easement language for the 50' access easement on Lot 4 for the benefit of Lot 5 should be submitted for review. There should be particular emphasis on the maintenance and use of the driveway and this could be handled administratively. Evidence that the pins have been set is required. The Planning Board has been discussing expiration of conditional approvals so if you decide 12 months is a good timeframe or if you would like to change that, I'm thinking we can incorporate that into our Notice of Decision so we have a standard set time for the duration of a conditional approval. If the Board wishes, we could schedule a site visit if the Board feels it's necessary. Flanders – We're developing 4 new lots here and there's no provision for fire protection provided on this plan so that requires the deed restriction that the houses be sprinkled. Johnson – That determination I believe is made by the Fire Chief based on the proximity of the project to fire fighting capabilities, I'm not so sure there's a law regarding that but that's under the Fire Chief's signoff. LaBrecque – As a rule of thumb if there's a

subdivision of 4 or more lots, they have to take a look at fire suppression so in doing that they take a look at the location of the nearest water source whether it be a hydrant, dry hydrant, pond or lake and accessibility to all of the houses, 4 out of the 5 will be right on Livingston Road and on Lot 5 there will be one approximately 700' back from the road so that's why the final signoff would be required for the Fire Chief. We did notice there is a fire hydrant between 3/10ths and 4/10ths of a mile which is fairly close. I believe he's going to write a Memo indicating what he specifically wants noted on the plan and possibly a 12' wide driveway possibly with one turnout in case two engines are passing. Johnson – We'd be willing to take the Chief's recommendation on a minimum width of the road, incorporate that in a plan note and also if he would like to have a turnout located somewhere between Livingston Road and Lot 5 within that 50' strip, we could demonstrate that on the plan. Vadney – What is the power line easement? Johnson – It's where the old power line used to go down through across the property, it's now abandoned. It should be shown on the plan because it's there. I wasn't able to determine if it's been extinguished in terms of actually being an easement. There aren't any lines there. The power servicing these lots is going up the road. Vadney – How does it get in the 700' to Lot 5? Johnson – It probably will go in with the driveway. They will probably put in at least 2 additional poles when they run the service out there. It's the option of the developer to stick it underground if he so desires in which case there would be a vault halfway between. Vadney – My point is will there be any possibility they'll use the make believe access point? Johnson – They could. There's a note that says no building within this strip. Whoever develops and builds that driveway, I would think about sticking them underground just from the maintenance issues. LaBrecque – When you bury an electrical line, you have to grant the power company an easement over which that line is running. Johnson – At the time the power company puts in additional poles or underground utilities, they acquire the easement to maintain that line. Linda French – Our property is abutting this property and when we built our home 5 years ago, it's extremely wet and always has been, our driveway has washed out twice. We were required to put in a lot of extra fill and Lot 1 which is next to us, the Town has the water going down the street and then they put it into the lot and it drains down onto our property. We have asked about that you note here it says Residential and the setback for our property is going to be increased, is that correct? It says 200' right now but that's under Residential and we're going under Forestry/Rural? Johnson – The 200' is actually the length of the line going from the road out to the back. The setbacks here are shown in the dashed lines and there's a table that shows the setbacks for the F/R zone are stricter than in the Residential zone so because we treated everything as F/R, the proximity from which somebody can build a house to your house actually got bigger by applying the bigger setback, it's now a side setback of 30' from that property line so where that pin is out on the front that you're familiar with going out to the back, the nearest somebody could construct a dwelling would be 30' away. French – Where would the house be because the driveway is right here, would the house have to be down in the back because isn't this all wetlands. Johnson – The proposed dwelling location shown on the property is just for purposes of demonstrating that you can get one in that corner, it's

outside of the wetland setback and it's outside of the municipal front and side setback. I showed a house that was about 60' x 28' which is an average size home. There's a beautiful area at the back where I would build my house. The Planning Board does not identify within each lot where a person has to build a house, we show the easiest way for purposes of getting approval. The driveway location is not going to change because that was approved by the Public Works Department as to where they would want the driveway for that lot and the driveway is outside the buffer area for the wetland. LaBrecque – The Planning Board doesn't identify where someone can build a house but it does identify by way of approving the subdivision plan where a house cannot be built, not in the setbacks and not in the buffer area to the wetlands so what's left over is the building envelope. Vadney – Mrs. French, it's against the law for the Planning Board to subdivide land into parcels in that Residential Zone that couldn't support a house so Carl's required as the surveyor to identify some place that you could build a reasonable house. Johnson pointed out the buildable area (in red) outside of the 50' buffer and the municipal setbacks. Vadney – I don't want to lose your point about the drainage. You said you had water coming off Livingston Road passing across what was going to be called Lot 1 and then entering your property? French – It's not just this year, it's every year even when we built, we had to do a lot of extra work and we've had to redo the driveway twice. As far as the culvert coming down, there is no culvert on that side of the road after Marge's home on that lot, the Town has the culvert going into Lot 2 or 3 and it shoots in there and fills up and I guess there are wetlands in there anyway. Hopefully, whoever's going to do this, we can't handle any more water. I don't know if having this buildable lot is going to help us, but we certainly can't have it hinder us. Every year since we've lived there, we've had extremely high water in the back yard and the driveway goes and I'm tickled pink to hear you're going to put in a culvert because we've asked for that for a long time. Vadney – It would seem we've got a few options, one would be a site walk to see it ourselves and one could be a condition that could be worked out by staff or whatever maybe or we could even, if necessary, hire an independent review of that if it's a real problem. Are you familiar with that drainage issue, Angela? LaBrecque – No I'm not, I just recall Mike Faller saying that all of the new driveway locations would have to have culverts. The two existing driveways both have culverts, but just looking at the topography, it looks like the drainage goes along side of Livingston Road, it looks like a swaled way all the way along the road. Johnson – One of the problems with Mrs. French's lot is they didn't have a lot to work with because it's a fairly small lot so they did a good job of getting a house, septic system and a driveway in there but the drainage ditch is along the northerly side of Livingston Road. If anything, in a stormwater event, an additional driveway with a culvert probably would slow the water down a little bit as it was coming down towards Mrs. French's driveway but if it's a Town issue, I think it's something to look into but I'm not sure there's anything happening on this plan that would exacerbate that situation. Vadney – I would agree with that but if you're adding a culvert on Lot 1 and I guess there's already a culvert on Lot 2 or maybe we're changing or putting one there, adding a Lot 3 culvert and a Lot 4 culvert could speed up the flow down through there, it could slow it down too. My concern

is really a bigger concern for that region, the Town has had to repair the manhole down at the stop sign a number of times in the last few years when the water comes down Livingston Road, it really comes down there so I do think we have to be careful and I don't know the drainage pattern on this particular piece of land but any changes to 17 acres up there could put more water out towards the road, I think it is something we have to look at. It's partly specific to this lot, but we need to make sure the Town has understood what's happening, Public Works and the Selectmen are aware of it because they've already spent quite a bit of money out there fixing ditches and repaving those washouts. (inaudible) LaBrecque – If the Board chooses to do a site visit, I could request Mike Faller's attendance. Flanders – I don't know that any of us on the Board are experts on drainage so I'm not sure what we would gain by going out there but it does need to be looked at. As you develop these lots, obviously, the runoff is going to get greater as you take trees down to put in a house and septic system it's going to speed the runoff so I think it would make sense to have Mike go out there and take a look at it to make sure we're not really making a bad situation substantially worse. Bayard – Wasn't Livingston Road one of the problem areas we had in one of these storms, if I'm not mistaken, we had a really big washout there? I wouldn't be adverse to going out with Mike and John on a site walk to get a better feel for it because I think if we're developing the property out here if there's anything we can do to help the situation a little bit in a reasonably low cost manner, normally you have to do some drainage and ditching anyway when you put in a development and certainly we've asked for road improvements when necessary and also for a little bit of drainage improvement is required to do this. Vadney – If nothing else, it may be if you're putting in those culverts and there's space for retention swales along that road, if she's already getting flooding anything added to it would worsen her problem. Touhey – I think if we go out and take a look, we're going to see land that is gently sloping as Carl describes it so we can eyeball it, but I think the effectiveness of us going out would be for us to have Mike Faller there with us because he evidently has some history with this flow coming down Livingston Road and we can then express their concern and Mrs. French could also be present at that site visit. Flanders – One of the things that's being used more and more now in projects, both residential and commercial, is something called recharge and that's sort of like a septic system and the theory is that the post development flow off a lot shouldn't be any greater than the pre-development flow so that would be another potential way to deal with some of the increased flow if it appears it's going to be a real issue. If it's an issue out there now, this isn't going to make it any better, it's going to make it worse, not because they are trying to do something unreasonable but when you take down trees you speed the flow of water off the property. Johnson – I understand and appreciate Mr. Flander's comments, however, we ran into this a little bit with the Eldridge situation which was a little bit different because it was a different slope category than this, but the entry level that's usually talked about when you talk about developments wanting the pre and post development issues to be the same is way beyond the scope of this development. This is a minute fraction of what those land areas are talking about in terms of disturbance and wanting that drainage to be addressed. Normally it's on a steeper slope and

normally it's for a huge 50,000-60,000 sq. ft. disturbed area where they start talking about the recharge and getting it back in. I think it's a great idea any time you have the opportunity to take the rain water and stick it in a can at the corner of your house to get it into the ground, that's a great idea because it just makes your yard nicer but given the slope, this is an A/B slope almost entirely along this lot, we have a couple of small areas where the slopes are bigger, but the great majority of it is the flattest slope in the Subdivision Regulations. I really don't think that's necessary at this level for 5 lots on 17 acres. Vadney – Carl, I appreciate what you're saying and 17 acres isn't normally a problem, but I do know several times this year there have been a number of places on Livingston Road where it has sheet flowed across the road, left gravel and debris and when it gets down to the Stop sign, there's enough flow and velocity that its done a lot of damage and since she has raised it I think we need to look at it in some way. It may mean a little more educated sizing of the culverts to help manage the flow. Annie Ruth Holmes – I've been on Livingston Road for over 30 years and I've wandered the woods in that area and the woods are very wet out there and Marge Locke's yard a lot of times was like walking on a great big sponge and you sometimes have to have boots on to walk in that yard especially in the spring. I hope everybody will go out there and look at the site. Public Hearing closed at 8:19 p.m.

Board comments: Bayard – On the whole it looks pretty good although you do have a weird flag lot but these are pretty good size lots he's putting in. I am concerned about the drainage and I think we ought to continue it and talk with Mike about ways to do some improvements out there so things don't get worse. I don't think we're talking high tech here but if we are some of that's going to be on the Town's plate but if there are some ways of dealing with it, I think that would be appropriate since we already have some problems out there. If you're going to contribute some more water to an existing problem it kind of behooves us to see that it gets mitigated to some extent. One thing we haven't talked about and we need to talk about this 12-month expiration on conditional approvals. If this is a continuation, its not an issue for tonight but I wanted to make it clear that we need to bring that up sometime.

Touhey moved, Dever seconded, IN THE CASE OF AMBROSE LOGGING COMPANY'S MAJOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FOR A FIVE-LOT SUBDIVISION, TAX MAP R04, LOT 16, LOCATED ON LIVINGSTON ROAD, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO NOVEMBER 25, 2008, AND THE BOARD WILL CONDUCT A SITE WALK ON NOVEMBER 8, 2008, AT 9:00 A.M., AND INVITE THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR TO BE PRESENT. Voted unanimously.

3. **ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR IPPOLITO REAL ESTATE TRUST:** (Rep. Carl Johnson)

Johnson – I represent the Ippolito's and we have a contingent of the brothers in the audience that can handle any of the technical questions you may have about the actual operation of the business. I am going to review of the site and bring you up

to speed about the course of events that had occurred and what we hope to gain by virtue of an approval of a change of use for the existing facility. If you recall when the Board last reviewed the Site Plan the business had showrooms largely in the front and this building in the back was the warehouse and they would store the furniture in that warehouse and then the furniture would be moved from the warehouse to the existing showrooms in the front of the facility. The dynamics of the furniture business have changed and initially there was a warehouse site purchased and built in Meredith off-site and now their warehouse is completely off-site so the business as it runs right now does not have any significant warehouse space to speak of in this facility. As such, and since there are no deliveries being made there and they had this big open space, they decided to convert that portion of what was the warehouse into showroom. A couple things happened when that occurred because there was not a way to get from the building proper to the building in the back so a walkway structure was built that connects this portion of the showroom through a hallway into the proposed showroom and also a walkway that comes up from the building proper down here into the showroom. That's one of the things that was constructed. Previously approved but never built was an addition to the back of the building. The dynamics of the site changed because there in that there are no longer trucks delivering furniture because the display furniture is here, the warehouse is off-site and then it's delivered to the person's home. The traffic coming in and leaving the site has been reduced significantly by the virtue there is no longer a warehouse there. The conversion of existing warehouse space to showroom space does require a change of use on the site plan and did not and that's one of the reasons we're here is to consecrate that change of use from warehouse to showroom. This is an after-the-fact application in that there's actually furniture out there as we speak. It's been there for awhile addressing another issue I'm going to bring up but the benefit if there is one is that there's been some history of this existing for awhile and there's not an issue with that additional showroom space creating additional traffic or parking that's problematic, it's simply providing more showroom space for the customers that are already coming to the store. When this all came about and Mr. Edney brought it to the attention of the Ippolito's that they would have to do something about this, we started talking to Chuck Palm who was then the Fire Chief and it became obvious that in order to do this and to have that be converted from warehouse to showroom space there would have to be some additional code issues addressed specifically the fire code issues with the building and the amount of space that the building occupies and whether or not it would have to be sprinkled so the Ippolito family hired SFC Engineering to do a review of the fire issues and Jeff Murphy, Project Engineer, issued a report regarding some of the facility upgrades and based on that it became apparent to the Ippolito's that they would have to sprinkle the building and I suggested that we sit down and discuss if there are alternative ways of addressing this issue without having to sprinkle the building because that's a huge financial undertaking given the general dynamics situation of the business as it sits so we did have a meeting with Rick Ippolito, Chuck Palm, the new Fire Chief, Ken Jones, Bill Edney and myself at the fire station to discuss the letter and discuss other methods that might be able to be accomplished that would solve the

fire issue and we did come to an agreement that with the revision of some of these interior walls to actually be fire walls that you could compartmentalize the building such that each would be treated separately instead of as an aggregate and when those firewalls are inserted and the buildings are treated not as an aggregate, you would not have to sprinkle the building they would be separate and along with that would come an upgrade of the alarm system. Currently, the alarm system that's there would not be sufficient code based on their new proposal. We had that meeting and the Ippolito's have agreed to abide by whatever the Fire Chief's recommendations are in terms of constructing those new fire walls. I've tried to include some of them on the plan so you can see them, it doesn't intend to be a code plan, there may be additional bits of information that need to be added. The additional code issues will have to be reviewed prior to the Certificate of Occupancy signed off by the Chief. There are things to do with the lighting, the exit signage, the alarm system and so forth but based on that meeting, the Fire Department was very happy with the solution we came up with so I don't have a lot of details on the plan about the code but prior to final approval all related fire code and safety issues will have to perform to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief. There are other safety issues inside the building regarding some railings and walkways and so forth that are also going to have to be addressed but those don't necessarily appear on the plan specifically. In terms of the actual change of use, I don't think that's a huge issue basically its just the conversion of this warehouse to some showroom space and the creation of this walkway so you don't have to go outside to get from one building to the other. It has been kind of a long process to get to where we are now but we're here asking the Board to approve the change of use and to make it incumbent upon the Fire Chief and the Code Enforcement officer to make sure the State Fire Codes are being complied with on the site. LaBrecque – As it appears on the site plan, the only thing that is changing is the conversion of warehouse space to showroom space. The existing retail business is permitted in the CB District, the lot coverage is at 60% and the maximum for that District is 65%. The setbacks are indicated on the site plan and the parking calculations essentially have changed by square footage but not changed by demand according to this site plan. The previously approved site plan basically had 9,000 additional square feet for warehouse and 9,900 actually just about 10,000 sq. ft. less for showroom, however, both showroom and warehouse both were approved with the same parking ratios so by swapping 10,000 sq. ft. from one to the other, essentially you still have the same demand of 112 parking spaces. At the previous site plan approval, it looks like in 1998 56 parking spaces were granted a waiver so as a result of this change of use from warehouse to showroom, the parking has not changed. I have driven by the site a couple of times but there didn't look to be a parking issue, I did see a couple of cars in places that aren't indicated as parking on the site plan but I did see quite a few empty spaces. Lastly, the Board reserves the usual right to review and amend per the site plan regulations. Johnson – In terms of the parking I don't know how many members were on the Board originally when we hashed out the parking, but we went over it pretty thoroughly. As Angela mentioned, we've all been by several times and with the exception of when they have a tent sale or semi-annual event,

there is never a parking problem on the site. LaBrecque – This site plan and this approval works for Ippolito's? If Ippolito's were to sell and another type of retail business wanted to come in, this site plan may not work for that but for this specific use and tenant, it does work. Certainly, it would take a more intensive review of the site and the parking if this were to sell and wouldn't be the same retail use, however, we wanted to have an antique shop and someone who sells gizmos and gadgets there and so on maybe that wouldn't work because you increase your employees. Touhey – I don't think any of us on the Board like to deal with a site plan change that is retroactive quite a period of time. This particular space has been used as showroom space 14 or 15 months. It really bothers me; it bothers me as a taxpayer because I would assume that this property as a showroom would be assessed differently than warehouse space. We have a Selectman here to take note of that and now we sit here as a Board and go back to approve what already exists. It just plain bothers me, Mr. Chairman. Flanders – Unfortunately, assessments can't go backwards or change in assessment. As a Code Enforcement Officer, what bothers me more than anything is the fact the proper fire codes weren't in place that any public in that building while it was being used incorrectly were at risk. This is troubling at best. Johnson – I have nothing to defend but I will say that Bill Edney and the previous and the new Fire Chief have been aware of the situation since shortly after it occurred. I'm not saying that its right but the facts are we have been trying to work through the fire issues in order to make the determination whether or not this was required to be sprinkled or have fire doors. The Fire Department did not have that information available to make that call until such time as we did the additional work to bring this plan up to speed and then we had the meeting. This is not a surprise to the Town right now, we've known about it and we've been working towards that end to get here. I don't think anybody likes to have after-the-fact approvals and we can take our licks where they are due, this Board isn't a punitive Board, you have to judge it on its merits now, I don't think you can say because it didn't come in the right order there is some penalty to be assessed. Flanders – The correct way to do this is resolve the fire issues after they discontinued the warehouse use and before they started the showroom use. Johnson agreed 100%. Bayard – Although we may not be a punitive Board, I think we do have the right sometimes to require that things go back to existing conditions which could be rather punitive in some cases, not so much in this one necessarily but some of the other ones we've seen did require quite a bit of cleanup. I will congratulate you on your cleverness about the parking since it's been around so long its working fine and I suppose it probably is. What happens when there are sales and the tent is there? Are there other places people can park or do they just fit in as they can? Johnson – The solution to that is to hire police detail to handle the traffic to keep them off the highway or keep them safely on the highway. It's treated as a special event and there's an application applied for to have this special event and there is parking assistance during the sale. Vadney – I'm actually in disagreement with Angela's comments and a couple of others, I'm not wildly pleased that we gave them a 56 space waiver years ago and to me my experience up there that is already a problem, most of the time there's not a problem but there are other times there are a lot or cars there. How

many times a year do they max out their parking lot? Chip Ippolito – We generally don't have a parking problem at all. We have quite a bit of parking in the back that doesn't get used at all. If we have our employees park out back and there are no more trucks entering the area now, we could park up there and alleviate the congestion in the front. Vadney – That may be the solution because the customers don't know there's parking in the back so they don't go there. The reason we generally park out front is to make it look like we're busy, but that has not been a problem for the past 10 months. Johnson – We do identify those spots in the back. Bayard - I think we should encourage the employees to park in the back especially on weekends and during the summer. Touhey – We're doing an entire site plan review, is that correct? Johnson – That's correct, this is a site plan amendment but the entire site plan is under review. Touhey – I had stated my disappointment with this site plan after-the-fact review. Maybe I'll feel a lot better if we can look at the site and look at the landscaping and lighting, I'd feel a lot better if I heard some improvements that could be made in the character of Meredith. We're trying to make Meredith more attractive, we trying to encourage downward directed lighting wherever possible. What types of things could be incorporated into this at this time. Johnson – I don't know of any existing problems there in terms of the lighting or in terms of the use of the site. There is lighting that is not downward directed which could be replaced with downward lighting that is in place at Harley-Davidson and what is going in at the Hannaford Shopping Center. The landscaping in front of the building, 20 years ago as Meredith was it was fine, but a lot of things are being done along Route 25 and Route 3 to make the entrances around town a lot more attractive. I think that would be a nice contribution. Vadney – I would like to make kind of a management statement on that, I certainly agree with your focus and the idea of improving wherever we can. I want to be very careful about setting any kind of a precedent that if anybody comes in for site plan review, we're ready to pounce on them for any little thing we think should be changed because that would lead in the long run to more and more people not coming for a site plan review and thinking catch me if you can. We don't want to set that kind of a precedent. I'm very sensitive to your thought, but I think we have to be very careful where we take the Board as we review the site plan on the warehouse conversion, anything that's a direct result of that I'm willing to jump on but I'm very hesitant to jump wider than that if you will and not just for this applicant but for all commercial businesses. Flanders – First of all, the whole site plan is up for review, a reasonable compromise because I don't necessarily disagree with what Ed's saying would be if the owners wanted to offer to revise the lighting to meet current standards and improve the landscaping and volunteer that I think that might be a good way to move forward. Vadney – I would agree but I don't think we should say our approval is dependent on them volunteering that. Johnson - I don't think Mr. Chairman that there's an issue with reviewing the lighting up there and changing to some of the cutoff fixtures, given the scope that's necessary to bring the building up to code, that's a fairly insignificant thing to deal with and I'm sure as you say, it will make a more attractive building. I think I agree with the Chairman in terms of getting into landscaping issues and so forth, this is a pretty clean site and doesn't have a lot of trees growing on it, but given the fact of how much

inventory and stuff is up there and remember that doing away with the warehouse there's a lot of outside storage that was taking place that isn't now because there are mattresses and stuff that aren't being stored there and in terms of the traffic, there is certainly a reduction in the number of vehicles coming in and out but we'd be willing to look at the cutoff fixtures as one aspect of it, if there are some landscaping issues that we can address fairly reasonably, I'm sure the Ippolito's would be receptive to that however as you mentioned I'm not sure we're comfortable making it like a bartering chip or so forth for what we're doing because we feel on the face of it given the erroneous nature in which it came about, and I explained this to the clients had this happened in the right order of events, the Planning Board would probably not have an issue with what you're doing because it's a reasonable request and actually ends up in a site that's used a little bit intensely than it is so we'll take that all under advisement and proceed. We have a good neighbor whose done well for the Town and I don't want to directly have the Board punishing people for now coming before the Board for a site plan review. Flanders – Meredith is obviously a very unique town and a lot of people in town have worked very hard to help guide it to where it is today and all the businesses in town recognize that the big picture is important. Bayard – I think anytime we have a chance to improve the lighting on a site and given this is a site review here is important and its not just because I like astronomy I just think it allows you to have development in town without it making look liker you're entering New Jersey with its orange glow so I'm a big proponent of downward lighting in fact I think we should make it mandatory rather than something that we strongly encourage. Touhey – On a different thing, maybe you can give me a handle where the restrooms are located in the warehouse space now and then maybe the Board will wonder if there should be something else. The warehouse does not have any restroom facilities; it was a dry building with no water or sewer in there. The main building has 3 restrooms in it; they are all in the south end. Flanders – The building codes are pretty specific about square footage and number of restrooms required.

Dever moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL IPPOLITO REAL ESTATE TRUST PENDING THE FIRE ISSUES, FIRE DOORS AND FIRE WALLS WHICH ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER AND THE FIRE CHIEF AND WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS NOS. 6 AND 17 AND THAT WE EXERCISE THAT RIGHT IF NECESSARY.

Bayard moved to amend, Touhey seconded, THAT WE REQUIRE THAT THE OUTSIDE LIGHTING BE DOWNWARDLY DIRECTED. Voted 4-2 against the motion.

Flanders – Mr. Chairman, I would prefer not to see that amendment, I think we can depend on the good faith of the Ippolito's to deal with the lighting. Dever – Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with Mr. Flanders. Voted 5-1 in favor of the motion.

3. **BLNB, LLC** – Public Hearing to determine compliance with conditions set forth in the Conditional Approval granted on November 13, 2007 and May 13, 2008, Tax Map S25, Lot 14, located at 181 Waukegan Street in the Business & Industry District.

Carl Johnson – This project has been before the Board previously and we also received Variance recently from the ZBA to allow a body shop at this particular location. Prior approval for this site plan involved 3 units, one was Mr. Leighton's personal storage, Triumph Auto Glass in the front and a mobile eye surgery unit to be located in the back and that client disappeared so Mr. Leighton came back in with a proposal to have the 3rd unit be the auto body shop which required a variance from the ZBA which we did receive. This being a dynamic piece of property that actual original client which was the body shop that intended to go into this facility is no longer interested, it's a different operation, it's a different body shop and Mr. Tatro is here this evening to answer any questions. When we went over the project before with the former client, the Board had several concerns and they granted a conditional approval subject to a compliance hearing to make sure that some of those concerns were actually constructed and met. One of the concerns centered around the possibility of a wrecked vehicle being delivered to the site and having leaking oil and/or antifreeze and so forth onto the property and wanted some type of a containment system and during the meeting and not being too aware we started talking about a concrete pad that would contain the fluids that would go into a separating system and that way prevent the contaminants from getting onto the site. That's how we left the meeting intending that was what we would do, we would come up with a system that would contain any vehicle that got delivered to the site and hopefully would make it onto the pad and hopefully be dealt with. When we revised the plan and submitted it for review to Bob Hill he said that under no circumstances would any outside storm water be allowed into this filter and then enter into the sewer system so we got into a problem with not being able to have this pad, you would have to cover it to protect it in some way and then we got into a situation we didn't know exactly what we were going to do and then the client that was coming in with that body shop went elsewhere. The client that is coming in there now has a completely different type of body shop business where he deals in fabrication of more custom type automobiles that are delivered to the site in good shape. It's a little bit of a different situation and we had discussions with Bill Edney and so forth and came to the decision to come to the compliance hearing with simply having the floor drains inside the building entering into the containment system, the oil separating system and then going into the sewer which has been approved by the Sewer Department and has been reviewed upon installation and that is actually installed on the site. There's not much to do with one of those systems, it's a standard structure that's prepared by Gilbert Block and is very similar if not identical to the one that's at the fire station that they put in and the floor drains. There's a note on the plan that says the floor drains are not to go in the sewer system and what that means is they are not supposed to directly go into the sewer system they are supposed to go into this

filtration system and then into the sewer system. That system is maintained infrequently because it takes a lot to fill it up and when there's a sufficient amount of material in there, then its cleaned out. Essentially, the floor drains inside the units go into this containment system and then into the system. The water system has been hitched up in accordance with the direction of the Meredith Water Department and that is noted on the plan. We had originally shown an outside propane tank and the tank is now an underground tank located at the rear of the building and because it's not in an area where there are vehicles, there's no need for the protective bollards that were originally proposed around the above ground tank. A portion of the parking lot has been paved. The building that's there now and we discussed this at the original hearing is actually 60' x 48' instead of the 48' x 48' and that was mentioned at the last hearing and the Board didn't seem particularly concerned the Board didn't seem to be too concerned whether it was the 48' x 48' or the 60' x 48', it doesn't change the lot coverage calculations because it was either calculated as building or impervious surface so that did not change. There have been some improvements to the area that's in front, there's a grass area that's been blocked up and improved. The Planning Board signed the plan in March and the Building Permit was issued in March.

Vadney – I have in my hand one to construct a 48' x 48' metal frame building and I signed the conditional approval November 13, 2007. LaBrecque – Correct, but the conditions had to be complied with and then it came back to you to sign the plan.

All the things I signed on that list, they did some of them and didn't do some.

Johnson – On the original plan, they were all done. The problem was the original client went away so the original plan you signed, all of the conditions of that approval were done. LaBrecque – Except the trees died. Vadney – The next one I signed on the 13th of May. LaBrecque – You didn't sign the plan in May, you signed the Notice of Decision. Some of those things have been done and some haven't been done, is that also true. Johnson – That's correct because when we were discussing the plan, we discussed the fact that there's going to be a building there of a certain size. At the time we were asking for the auto body repair shop and a lot of the issues in the conditional approval related to that specifically. #2 said and I made it clear to the Board if this guy goes away and some permitted use comes in, then that would be subject to review by the Code Enforcement Officer to let the permitted use go in, however, we would try to comply with all the conditions of approval for the auto body shop. Everything was done on that list that related to the original client. Vadney – That was just the Notice of Decision that I signed, I never did sign the drawing. LaBrecque - This is the plan you would sign, it shows the existing conditions compliant to the conditional approval that you last issued. LaBrecque – So essentially they would be applying to have a hearing on the exact same thing. Vadney - OK, if it was the exact same thing but what I was hearing you give us were changes. Johnson – There have been some changes but it's not always what the Board sees but very often times when you approve a site plan and you sign it what ends up being out there is a little bit different in a lot of subtle ways and not exactly to the plan. The Code Enforcement Officer determines whether or not changes to a site plan require filing the whole thing just like when the fish guy moved into the Doggie Days, they came in for a change of use but nobody was too

concerned about the plan. This is essentially the plan that we submitted for the conditional approval. There have been site improvements made based on that approval because a Compliance Hearing can only take place if you make changes so the Board can determine if you complied with their wishes. If we didn't do anything out there, we wouldn't be here because we wouldn't have complied with anything. Vadney – You're complying with something that you're not fully doing because you want to do something else. Johnson – The use has changed, the client went away. Keytown Auto Body was going to be the client to come in here and not every auto body shop is the same. Mr. Dever was concerned if a car gets into a crash, gets towed to the site and sits there and leaks oil. This gentleman, Tab Tatro, has a completely different type. He deals with higher end vehicles that he does repairs on. Vadney – I know what he wants to do but what are we here to approve tonight, compliance with what we did on May 13th? Johnson – You're here to say we complied with the specific conditions of your approval that pertains to what actually is going to be there. LaBrecque – It's not really a change of use like Carl says, there was an auto body repair shop, Keytown. This guy still works on automobiles so it's still kind of auto body repair, right? LaBrecque - The Notice of Decision requires a compliance hearing that's why they are doing a compliance hearing. The condition states the applicants are required to return for a compliance hearing prior to signing the plan particularly to review the details of the pad, drain and containment system. Johnson – Basically what you wanted to make sure was that before you signed the plan, we would have installed those things which we're here saying is what we're doing we're not required to so this is the plan you would sign. Johnson – At one point in time it was questioned whether we had to come to a compliance hearing because we weren't doing what we wanted to do, just sign the plan is what you're saying and we're saying because the use is the same, although a little bit different and the pad was a big issue and we want to explain to you why we're not having it. That's why we're here and did we comply? Vadney – You're no longer having this containment pad, however the ZBA said put in a pad. Johnson – No, the Planning Board talked about that. Vadney – The ZBA included it in their decision. Johnson – No, they just wanted to limit the number of cars that were parked outside to two. LaBrecque - ZBA motion is on Page 26 of your packets. Johnson - The ZBA's notice was to limit the number of dinged up cars. Essentially, all we're asking for is the approval of the plan that was submitted for the uses we have out there currently. Vadney – It will still be the 60' building? Johnson – That's correct, that's what is constructed. Tab Tatro – I basically do frame-up restorations on Corvettes, Chevilles, GTO's, Porsche's, basically what I do is high-end stuff. I don't want to get into crash stuff and I don't want stuff sitting outside. I'm not a production shop, most of the cars I deal with are \$50,000-\$200,000 job depending on what it is. Johnson – It's an extremely clean operation obviously as a result of what type of vehicles he works on so although it is the auto body type, it is different in substance. Vadney – As the ZBA requested we review this with the idea of two cars, should we amend our previous approval to include that two-car limit or make it a note on the plan. LaBrecque – Probably make a note on the plan and limit because now they have a special exception to run an auto body shop. What happens when Mr. Tatro

decides not to occupy that space anymore because he's fixed thousands of \$200,000 cars and he wants to retire so can another auto body guy come in who fixes wrecks. Johnson – You can craft that conditional approval to say that any change of tenancy would require Planning Board approval. Vadney – Do we have to include in our approval of this now, even though the ZBA said it in their statement, should we add that two-car limit. LaBrecque – That you require the ZBA's condition as a note on the plan. Bayard – I think it just needs to be a note on the plan and I agree if there's any change of use because the auto body here is a different use than repair, it's not a repair shop. Vadney – I'm just trying to get down to the real basics, add the two-car limit to the plan and add a note that any change of tenancy has to come back. LaBrecque – The landscaping needs to be replanted and maintained. We have the landscape contract with Color Scapes and you can incorporate that as part of that plan. Vadney – They passed a sketch a little bit ago that's kind of an indoor septic tank. Johnson – It's actually right outside the building, the floor drains go into the tank. Spill containment within the building (inaudible). Mr. Tatro has a number that's issued by the EPA dealing with all of the products he deals with and that's all handled through the EPA permitting process in terms of the contaminants so that's his (inaudible). I think the Board's trying to get a handle on the contaminants inside the building. Vadney – You've passed along this sketch that's outside the building that will EPA licensing do they have a standard use for storage, I'm sure you can't put certain things together. Tatro – I have a waste containment system that's pumped out once or twice a year by an authorized company. Bayard – If there's a spill inside the building, where would it go. Tatro – Speedy dry and rags to clean it up. I run a pretty clean tight shop. Bayard - If there is something they could go into the drains so if there is something, it would go into that. Johnson – The situation is if there's a spill inside as much of it as can be contained by other methods. If it goes into the floor drains, there's a separator that separates it from going into the sewer system. LaBrecque – As part of the compliance hearing, there will be a new notice and in that you can just have the additional conditions the Board discussed this evening. LaBrecque – Just a note to the applicant, you probably want to come in and revise our building permit because your permit doesn't match your site plan Your permit was issued per the previous plan that was signed off by the Planning Board and not per this site plan so your site plan approvals are consistent with your building permit you might want to have your building permit brought up-to-date so everything matches. There's going to be a stipulation that any change of tenancy will be required to come back for site plan approval so it's not a judgment call that the Code Enforcement Officer is going to make. Johnson – Since it was a condition of zoning approval, it should be noted on the plan.

Bayard moved, Dever seconded, WE FIND THIS SITE PLAN AMENDMENT COMPLIES WITH THE CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THE CONDITIONAL APPROVAL GRANTED ON NOVEMBER 13, 2007, AND AS AMENDED ON MAY 13, 2008, TAX MAP S25, LOT 14, LOCATED AT 181 WAUKEWAN STREET IN THE BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. A PLAN NOTE BE ADDED ABOUT THE ZONING BOARD CONDITION THAT NO MORE THAN TWO VEHICLES BE STORED OUTSIDE ON THE PROPERTY AT ONE TIME.
2. A PLAN NOTE BE ADDED REFERENCING THE LANDSCAPE PLANTING PLAN AND COLOR SCAPES MAINTENANCE CONTRACT.
3. ANY CHANGE IN TENANCY SHALL TRIGGER A NEW SITE PLAN AMENDMENT BE APPROVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD; AND
4. THIS APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO THE USUAL RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. **ROCHE REALTY GROUP FOR ROCKHOPPER ANTIQUES, INC.** – (Rep. Chuck Braxton) Pre-Application Conceptual Consultation to discuss possible development of Tax Map S23, Lot 104, located at 194 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

Braxton – This is a 7.3 acre site on the west side of Route 3 between Routes 104 and 106 more or less across the street from Ippolito's. There are 7.3 acres, 524' of road frontage and the existing business occupies the north end of the site. The parcel is in the Central Business District and the Lake Waukegan Overlay District. The proposal we'd like to discuss with you involves creation of a commercial pad site condominium. This is a building site for commercial use with underground utilities provided where the condo owner can construct a building to the architectural standards provided. Rockhopper Antiques does not intend to conduct this development. We took a look at a number of development scenarios for the property and concluded this best addresses the needs of the Town of Meredith business community for combined office and retail and business operation space. The condominium declarations could control a mix of businesses there and therefore a number of variables that would be of concern to you in an actual development proposal. Lot coverage is not significant, the initial concept involved or footprint dimensions not counting the current seasonal retail space of approximately 21,600 sq. ft., buildings would probably be 3 stories in height and so a total of approximately 60 at 5,000 sq. ft. in commercial space would be created. These buildings or pad sites would be scattered around the site. This is just one possible concept, the existing building is here, office retail in these locations and then more business type units toward the back of the site. Just to discuss a little bit of the site, there have been some site investigations done, there is a stream that cuts through the south end of the property and then there's also an area just west of Route 3 where the Rockhopper Antiques was granted a drainage easement to the State of New Hampshire DOT. That drainage easement connects to an existing culvert. There are also a couple of non-designated wetlands in the central area of the site. No development would occur south of the

designated wetlands where the stream crosses. There are two historic rights-of-way to access the property but the concept presented here envisions the use of the existing entry only and no creation for a second means of egress off the site. Two reasons for that are both of these rights-of-way have some questions about their use, the easterly one is 20' wide and is steep and difficult and there are some questions in the title regarding the westerly one. Furthermore, it would require a wetlands crossing to reach that area. In a Pad Site development the owner/member owns the footprint under the building and perhaps a small immediate limited common area, the rest of the site is managed in common for all of the buildings so the existing seasonal retail space and the pad sites would have common area for the remainder of the site. Vadney – If we give you permission to go ahead and build 6, 9 or 10 pad sites, the rest of the land remains just as it is. Will there be a possibility of you coming in later to add more pads to the land that wasn't built on? Braxton – No, you would be looking at it as sort of like a cluster development so that would kind of address what the end product would be. In the development process, typically the heavy site work's going to be done in advance of actual sales and then the buildout would occur over a longer period of time consistent with the architectural standards that were in the declaration. The control of that declaration could be with the members only or the Planning Board could say they want some oversight of changes to that and we're open to that idea. Vadney – We have seen a couple of these come in where the plan was to condo the front part of the lot and not condo the back part of the lot and not subdivide it in any way and then the owner had plans to do other things. The vision we're introducing this evening is it be one plan so you would know what you signed up for. In terms of the mix of businesses, for example, the office condominium can have limitations, there can be one lawyer, one real estate agency and you can't have another similar use, etc., so you can look at kind of use, time of use, parking implications, a number of things can be taken into consideration in developing the mix of businesses. Pad Site developments have been done in connection with larger shopping complexes, for example, in Tilton at the Tanger Outlet Mall where there is the main development and then there are pad sites that have been sold and use common facilities in that area. They don't deal with the entire boundary of the site but often times they will offer particular types of businesses a completed ready-to-go site for their business use. Here, we're really looking at something that would work consistent with an historic structure like the barn and with some of the dialogue Bob brought up earlier regarding the development of Meredith and the architectural standards. Vadney – You plan to keep the barn. Braxton – There's little over 8,400 sq. ft. of retail space in the barn, it is seasonal, heating costs would be tremendous but it is 3 levels of retail space. Our analysis concluded that it wasn't economic to remove it and it didn't create enough value to remove it so it was better to figure out how to make use of it there. Someone might want to do improvements to the building and make it into a year-round use and that would be separate. Vadney – I know when Burlwood's operating a lot of cars park down below. Will those spaces still be available for Burlwood? Braxton – Yes, it's a relatively small part of the overall site. Vadney – One of the concerns that jumps out at me is knowing where Burlwood has traditionally parked cars in busy times

and you are going to be driving your site traffic through that parking lot effectively and that's something we would rather not have happen but you may not have a way not to do it. The only reason the situation works at the shopping center is because the movie theatre is not usually open during the day. The parking is one thing I would certainly check out. Braxton – This is conceptual at this point and certainly some of the engineering and traffic flow questions would need to be addressed in terms of this area and how the parking would be laid out to service the buildings in this area. The math in terms of parking will drive the actual configuration. Vadney – You said 65,000 sq. ft. and that's the new stuff. Angela, what's the current multiplier for retail/office as far as parking? LaBrecque – Retail commercial is 1 space for every 200 s.f. of retail space and if it's storage it's 600 s.f. Braxton – We had a meeting with Angela and there is public water and sewer to the site and we're aware of water system issues and part of what we wanted to propose is if we have a flexible plan we'd like a way to bring you a plan and because of the economics propose a collaborative approach to optimizing the water system and the economics, we think there's a way to do that and certainly improve the Town's infrastructure at the same time. Bayard – Burlwood Antiques building would be part of the condominium. It seems to me if you moved the entrance down a little ways. Braxton – It gets pretty steep unless the landowner of the frontage to the south were to participate that's the next place between there and Kuzina Flooring there's a more gradual entrance to the site but that parcel's not part of it right now. LaBrecque – There is a 20' ROW to the south that enters the property from Reservoir Road but you would have to cross that stream and it's a non-designated stream with a 75' setback. Vadney – Would this be something you would try to build or control in some way that the buildings would be somewhat alike and it would be like a little village. The property is in the Central Business District and abuts the residential properties on both sides of Cataldo Road. Flanders – Where you have a commercial use abutting residential uses that puts a higher level of sensitivity on how you develop the site. We did mail a letter to the residential properties abutting this site. Touhey - The consideration might be a bigger buffer setback from the residential properties than is normally required. It's pretty densely wooded throughout the area here and at least what we've outlined here, we will try to maintain a lot more than the minimums in the development of the site. LaBrecque – I was reviewing this and Mike Faller from the DPW was in my office and he mentioned there would be substantial cut and fill and drainage concerns he would have and obviously there would be lots of improvements to accommodate the existing drainage and steep slope you have there and any the additional impervious that would be required because a lot of parking requires a lot of pavement. Touhey – Is that located in the Waukegan Watershed Overlay? That's a consideration we'll have. Flanders – You need to have recharge so your post development will not be any more than your pre-development. Vadney – Passing through the Burlwood parking lot will have to be looked at very carefully to make sure that's a safe situation. Lot coverage could become an issue, you're going to have a pretty long driveway and a lot of parking space, even if its gravel parking space, it's consider impervious. Residential properties on Cataldo Road are a concern. Touhey - You are going to have a lot of runoff from the parking lot

and in that area we're very sensitive to runoff. The two-acre overlay doesn't apply to commercial. You need to check on the Overlay District and how much it does or doesn't apply to commercial. I would expect with this size operation, we would require a traffic study. There's a bit of a grade into the Burlwood site and that could be an issue. Flanders - You need to get your driveway permit from the NH DOT because this is a state highway. Braxton - It might be a right-turn only coming out of the site and going up to the roundabout and then head north.