

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

Chairman Vadney called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 2004 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

### APPLICATION SUBMISSION

1. **ANN B. HUTCHINS** – 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.

Application, subdivision plan and abutter's lists are on file. Filing fees have been paid. A topographic waiver is necessary for a portion of Lot 3. Lot 3 is over 15 ac. and has plenty of useable land to satisfy soils and slopes requirements. Recommend waiver be granted. Recommend application be accepted and public hearing be scheduled for December 28, 2004.

Bliss moved, Granfield seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF ANN B. HUTCHINS FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND SCHEDULE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON DECEMBER 28, 2004. Voted unanimously.

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.

Application, subdivision plans and abutters lists are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted and public hearing be scheduled for December 28, 2004. Finer moved, Granfield seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF DEAN R. AND BARBARA J. BEDDINGFIELD FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND SCHEDULE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON DECEMBER 28. 2004. Voted unanimously.

- 3. **MARK P. KNISELY AND CHRISTIANE KNISELY** - 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.

Application, subdivision plans and abutters lists are on file. Filing fees have been paid. A topographic waiver is necessary. Municipal sewer will serve lots 1 and 2 and the remaining lot is 18 acres in size w/ sewer available. Recommend waiver be granted. Recommend application be accepted for public hearing and scheduled for December 28, 2004

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF MARK P. KNISELY AND CHRISTIANE KNISELY FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND SCHEDULE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DECEMBER 28, 2004. Voted unanimously.

- 4. **JOHN HODSDON** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed new Farm Stand on Tax Map S18, Lot 41, located at 85 Daniel Webster Highway in the Commercial-Route 3 South and Shoreline Districts. \*

Application, elevation drawings and abutters lists are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted for public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF JOHN HODSDON FOR PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. **HOWARD RICHARDS (PRODUCTION TRAILER AND DOCK) (Rep. Harry Wood – Associated Surveyors)**  
Continuation of a Public Hearing held on October 12, 2004, for a proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use and to construct an office/store and maintenance area with related site improvements, Tax Map S19, Lot 11, located at 21 Daniel Webster Highway in the Commercial – Route 3 South District. Application accepted October 12, 2004.

Wood- This business has been relocated to the former Jade Island Restaurant. They were given a temporary use permit to operate until they could get the site plan approved. They are proposing to remove four structures from the site. At the present time there are five. There is an existing house on the very south end of the property

that was previously used as a residence. It has been completely rebuilt inside and is continuing to serve as a residence. The former Jade Island Restaurant will be razed to the level of the basement floor. This will probably happen next spring. We would construct a retaining wall of architectural block style to separate the upper and lower level. There is about a 7 ft. difference between the slab and the pavement in front of the building. They will also remove three cabins. He would then construct an office-sales workshop. There would be 10 parking spaces, with employees parking in the rear. The existing coverage on the site will be reduced by virtue of removing structures on the north end. The new structure will be where there is paved surface now. There is a state application in the works for the frontage. The proposal is to remove pavement within the state ROW, along the frontage of the property. The state has indicated that they are in favor of this. At the present time, there is 12-15 ft. of pavement outside the traveled way. Although there are **No Parking** signs, people still pull off the road there all the time. We are proposing a very low berm along the frontage, except for two 40 ft. entranceways. We are proposing to ask for a conditional approval and the landscaping details would be subject to a Compliance Hearing. Utilities on site are pre-existing. They will be required to test the water before they can occupy the new structure. The front of the property is relatively flat. The site is squashed up against the highway. We are not proposing any uses to the rear of the currently improved surface with the exception of a possible future storage area on the rear north portion of the property. We are not asking for approval at this time for that. We are just thinking about it. Flanders-There are a number of wells here. It is my understanding that the well that is going to service this is the one down on the south end of the property, next to the house. You have the well behind the existing structure. Woods-That is correct. I showed it that way, and I found out a few days ago that Mr. Richards said he thought he would probably be using the one down near the house. We can amend that if that is a concern. Flanders-The elevations on the architectural rendering that have been passed out are all labeled incorrectly. South is west, east is really south, west is really north, and north is east. We need to straighten that out for the record, Granfield-When you take down the current building, is it going to be level or below the parking area? Wood- At the present time you have an entranceway in the front to the building. You go up a couple of stairs into the main dining area, and then down several stairs to get to the lower level. The main structure is two stories. We will be taking down the structure to the basement slab. We show the current sign in the island where it has been located for a number of years. The state has indicated that eventually they would like us to remove it. In terms of our schedule, we are talking about having the new building up by July 1<sup>st</sup>. The old building coming out between July 1<sup>st</sup> and December 1<sup>st</sup>. Once the former structure is out, if the state would like us to relocate the sign, we would then relocate it at that time because we would have more space. Vadney- I noticed on the lower level slab, it says, " raze existing building to slab level and use for display and storage". On the site walk, I believe the applicant said he would probably use it for minor maintenance. I wonder if we should note that. Edgar-A

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 23, 2004

NHDOT permit is pending and should be cross-referenced on final plans. I recommend that the final plans show the sewer line and its extension to the new building, with a cross-reference to the off-site sewer easement, with final sign off by Bob. The revised site plan indicates (11) 10' x 20' spaces including 1 handicap space. The Board must determine whether or not the 11 spaces are adequate. Parking should be striped. Whether or not the state requires the sign to be relocated, I think the Board should see the plan that shows the relocation. Sign design should complement the building design. There are two pole-mounted lights proposed. The electric company supplies the fixture. There are five building mounted lights submitted. I think we should see detail on these. A cutoff fixture detail has been submitted. The plan indicates that the frontage along and within Route 3 ROW will have pavement removed and planting of shrubs in a grass and bark complex on a low mound. Wood - We would address this the same as frontage. Edgar-We would like this to compliment the building. This could be accomplished at a Compliance Hearing. With respect to the retaining wall, design information should be presented. The site plan suggests a possible future display area to the rear of the to-be-demolished restaurant building. No grading, drainage or erosion control information was presented. If this is to be part of the approval, then additional information is necessary. If it is not, then it should be removed from the plan.

Bliss moved, Granfield seconded, I MOVE WE THAT WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR HOWARD RICHARDS PRODUCTION TRAILER AND DOCK, FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR A CHANGE OF USE AND TO CONSTRUCT AN OFFICE/STORE AND MAINTENANCE AREA WITH RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, TAX MAP S19, LOT 11, LOCATED AT 21 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE COMMERCIAL – ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. A NHDOT DRIVEWAY PERMIT IS REQUIRED AND CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS.
2. PLANS SHOULD BE AMENDED TO SHOW THE SEWER LINES AND ITS EXTENSION TO A NEW BUILDING, WITH FINAL SIGNOFF BY BOB HILL.
3. PARKING SHOULD BE STRIPED ACCORDING TO THE APPROVED LAYOUT.
4. PLANS SHOULD BE AMENDED TO SHOW THE ALTERNATE LOCATION.
5. PLANS NEED TO CLEARLY INDICATE THE PLANT MATERIALS INCLUDING TYPE AND SIZE. THIS COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED AT A COMPLIANCE HEARING.
6. THERE SHOULD BE DESIGN INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROPOSED RETAINING WALL.

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 23, 2004

7. THE LOCATION OF THE WATERLINE ON THE SITE NEEDS TO BE CORRECTED. Voted 7-0 in favor.
8. THE BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL.

2. **HOWARD RICHARDS (PRODUCTION TRAILER & DOCK, LLC) –** Architectural Design Review of a proposed office and maintenance building, Tax Map S19, Lot 11, located at 21 Daniel Webster Highway in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.

Edgar- Applicant proposes to construct a metal “Morton Building”. Elevations have been revised and submitted. In order to approve the application, the Board must find that the proposed structure demonstrates substantial conformity with the Criteria set forth in Sections B-1 (General Criteria, i.e. consistency with purposes and intent of the ARDO, and complimentary of the architectural heritage of the community) and B-2 (Building Criteria, i.e. mass, roofline, features, details, materials and color, gateways and scenic resources, design continuity etc,) of the ARDO. Richards-The west elevation is facing the road. It will have a green shingle roof with vinyl clapboard on front and on two sides of the building. The only sides that will show the white metal are the nonvisible sides. Flanders- I am glad to see you made the changes we asked for with the clapboards and the shingle roof. Is the intent to have architectural shingles? Could we please get that note added. Edgar-The distinction implies what? Flanders – The shingle has a texture. Looks more like a wood shingle versus a flat shingle. Vadney – There is nothing in the ordinance that would require this. Flanders – No, but I thought it was his intent. Richards- I have a question. You were talking about 5 lights on the building. Wood- I placed wall mounted lights on the building in three different places. Touhey – Just clarifying the use. About a month ago there were 4-5 boats there that were shrink-wrapped. I hope that is not what your intent is. Richards – No, I just offer shrink-wrapping service at this time of year, but we are not in the boat business. There will not be any boats stored there. Touhey – Will shrink-wrapping be done there in the future? Richards – I would like to. Typically, that would be done inside the garage and then the customer, at the longest, will drop it off on a Saturday, and pick it up the following weekend. Hearing closed at 7:45PM

Flanders moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A PROPOSED OFFICE AND MAINTENANCE BUILDING, TAX MAP S19, LOT 11, LOCATED AT 21 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT AND THAT THEY CORRECT THE LABELING OF THE ELEVATIONS AND ADD THE WORD “ARCHITECTURAL” TO SHINGLES ON THE PLAN. Voted 7-0 in favor.

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 23, 2004

3. **NORMAND AND ROBERTA MORIN (CASE 'N KEG)** – Compliance Hearing to review issues discussed at public hearing held on October 12, 2004, regarding a Site Plan Amendment to revise parking and access to existing business utilizing abutting lot, Tax Map U06, Lots 138 and 139, located on Mill Street in the Central Business District.

This application has been tabled and there will be re-notification to abutters.

4. **JOHN HODSDON** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed new Farm Stand on Tax Map S18, Lot 41, located at 85 Daniel Webster Highway in the Commercial-Route 3 South and Shoreline Districts.

Hodsdon-I am proposing to demolish the existing farm stand and construct a new one with substantially the same footprint: 20' x 45'. Vadney-The walk-in cooler will stay behind it. Hodsdon – Yes. The new structure will be 19'8" in ht. The old stand was constructed in seven different pieces from 1938 to the present. There will be a couple of doors on both sides plus sliding doors in the center. There will be a covered area in the front. This will be more in keeping with the rest of the buildings. This is under a Conservation and Preservation Easement. The "farmstead area" includes "historic structures" and "other structures". This is not one of the historic buildings. The house, barn and what we call the shop are historic buildings. We are proposing architectural shingles and we are showing vertical siding. LCHIP has concerns with the look of that. They are proposing that the shiplap siding be placed horizontally. LCHIP would also like the exterior to be painted gray or stained gray. I am not opposed to the recommended changes. Vadney-They would rather have novelty siding than vertical? Hodsdon- Yes. Vadney- I really don't care, but novelty siding has always been one of those "why were they invented". Finer-Excuse my ignorance, what is novelty siding? Vadney- It looks notched. Hodsdon – I tend to some extent agree with you, but I want to get going with the project. I don't have a strong feeling whether it is vertical or horizontal. Vadney-Most barns and sheds were sided vertically to shed the water better. Flanders-I agree with Herb. Novelty siding on this would be a travesty. If you put clapboards on it, it then makes it fit in with the farmhouse. Edgar- The main concern is to have horizontal siding, either clapboard or novelty. This is a bigger building. They want it to blend in more with the farmhouse. LCHIP have a position of legal standing with this by virtue of the easement. Whether you agree with novelty siding or not, this is coming from an organization that has some standing. Vadney- What's the penalty if John says no? Hodsdon-Delay. Flanders-Let me ask another question. The person who suggested novelty siding might not even know the difference between novelty siding and clapboards. I think vertical siding is more in keeping, but if they want to see

something horizontal, novelty siding will look like it belongs in a different location. Finer-They are recommending either one, clapboard or novelty. Vadney – Yes, but clapboard is expensive. Flanders- I don't see that novelty siding is a showstopper, but it sure doesn't make much sense. Edgar - You guys haven't gotten into this level of detail on most projects. For the most part this wouldn't come up. Vadney-This is the first time someone from out of town is telling us what to do. Vadney-I don't want to slow John down, but it would make me mad if you had a nice plan that you liked and then they come along to say " go to novelty board". Flanders – This might be one of those issues where John calls LCHIP up and says the Board doesn't think novelty siding is going to look good. If you talked to someone who knew the difference between novelty and clapboards, they probably would say, " why did we ask for that, you're right". Finer- Can this be handled administratively? Kahn-They asked for either or. Edgar- If the Board was to make a motion to approve it and John wants to revisit the siding issue with LCHIP, you approve it with the flexibility that would allow us to go back to that. Finer-Can we take that one step further and let John have a recommendation from the Board. Vadney- I don't want to slow you down. I will be happy with whatever you like. Hodsdon-This is not an historical building. They are taking the stand that it is subject to Section 2.B.2 and Section 3.B.1 of the Conservation and Preservation Easement. Flanders- The last thing I want to do is hold John up, but with all due respect to LCHIP, the vertical siding you went with would look best. You can quote me on this. Novelty siding will look "hysterical not historical". Edgar-If you don't have strong feeling, let John work out the siding issue with the easement owners. This would allow him to get going. Bliss-Although I agree with John, I also think that the whole idea of an architectural review is that we are thinking of the looks of the building. If we as a Board are saying that we don't like the looks of this, easement or no easement, it's not going to go. I have no problem with the demolition getting started, but I would like to see us pursue this. If we pass this one, what's going to happen with the next one? The bank has a mortgage on my house, are they going to call me up and tell me I can't paint it a certain color. Hearing closed at 8:20PM. Voted unanimously.

Flanders moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A PROPOSED NEW FARM STAND ON TAX MAP S18, LOT 41, LOCATED AT 85 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH AND SHORELINE DISTRICTS AS SUBMITTED BY JOHN HODSDON FOR HIS NEW FARM STAND AND THAT WE ASK THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING BOARD TO WRITE A LETTER TO LCHIP ENCOURAGING THEM TO ALLOW THIS STRUCTURE TO BE BUILT WITH A VERTICAL SIDING THAT IT HAD ON IT TO BEGIN WITH BECAUSE WE FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT IT IS MORE IN CHARACTER WITH THE WHOLE PROJECT. Voted 7-0 in favor.

Edgar- The Boards understanding is that we will be proceeding with demo permits and building permits as we continue to work out the details. Vadney- Right. Edgar – Everyone knows we are proceeding with permitting while we work out the details. Flanders- The way I understand it, he really doesn't have to come back. If they draw a line in the sand, and say it has to be novelty siding, it will be handled administratively.

#### Pre-Application Review –

1. **ROBERT PIPER, JR.** – Pre-Application Conceptual Consultation for a proposed subdivision of Tax Map U04, Lot 2, located on Carder Lane in the Residential District.

Piper -I am proposing to divide a 3.29 acre piece of land into two separate lots. Currently there is one house on the land and that will remain. The division of the land would leave one lot of approximately 1 acre and the other lot with the house on it, would have approximately 2.29 acres. There is town sewer. This property is only accessible over a private road, which right now provides access to the 5 other houses on it and on Waukegan Street. Three of the houses have access to their property only through the private-Carder Lane. Flanders-It looks like this initial ROW is narrower than a 50' ROW. Piper-The road down at Waukegan is skinnier than the ROW up top. Flanders-How wide is that? Piper- 15 feet. It is a private road. Flanders- How do you access your house now? Piper-Up Carder Lane. Flanders Carder Road is only 15 ft. wide. Piper – Its an easement for the sewer. Edgar – No, prior to the sewer going in, Carder Road existed. Flanders- In the past, we have been pretty consistent with not moving forward with subdivisions that have less than a 50' ROW. Edgar – That and road standards. Depending on what the facts are, the Board may require improvements up to and including a range of options up to and including a full specification road. Until we look at the facts, we don't know what the upgrades will be. Zoning aspect requires 50' of frontage for the new rear lot on an improved road. This would be private. What is the current maintenance scenario? Who is going to maintain what? I understand this has been an issue in the past. This would have to be addressed. Flanders-This would be a huge departure from anything we have done in the past and a dangerous precedent for us to set. Edgar – Precedent being, not requiring upgrade of the road? Flanders- No, it would be dangerous to approve this in this configuration. Bliss-John, if this is moved around is this a doable project? Edgar-The main issue is that the Board has not done subdivisions on a road that is classified as a driveway. Flanders- Because of the width of the road, not having 50' of frontage, no cul-de-sacs or hammerheads, this is a fire issue. Finer- Mike Faller is against this. Flanders- I think this is a dead issue. Hearing closed at 8:35PM.



## TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

1. Zoning Ordinance Workshop – The Planning Board will conduct a workshop on Tuesday, December 14, 2004. The purpose of this workshop will be to discuss the possible creation of “Village Commercial” and “Village Residential” zoning districts. Vadney- There will be two public hearings in January. We need to start thinking if it's a good idea to have new zones, and if so, how big to make them.
2. Volvo: They have come back with a new sign design. I spoke to the owner and gave him the background, sharing the Boards concerns and the value of an architectural review. They have come back with a monument sign that is 15' in length, 8-½ ft. off the ground. It will have an Allen Block base to match planter bases at the building. They are looking for a conceptual nod from the Board. This design is more in character with the project. Bliss – I would like to see it shortened. The 15' dimension is too long. Edgar- Would like to see it closer to 9'.
3. The LRPC Commission Meeting will be November 29, 2004 @ 6:00PM @ the Chase House.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan  
Planning/Zoning Clerk

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

---

William Bayard, Secretary  
Meredith Planning Board