

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

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2004, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **PATRICIA NESTOR:** Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.
Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment between Tax Map S09, Lot 10, S11, Lot 22, and U19, Lot 2A, located on Meredith Neck Road in the Meredith Neck District.

Applicant is in the process off producing a Boundary Line Adjustment between brother and sister. This application is being withdrawn and another plan will be submitted for the next cycle. Abutters will be re-notified. Application withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

2. **JEANNETTE BUCKLEY REVOCABLE TRUST AND DAVID BUCKLEY:**
Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.
Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment between Tax Map S22, Lots 19, 19A and 19B, located on Pease Road in the Forestry/Rural District.

Application, Boundary Line Adjustment plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted as complete and proceed to public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF JEANNETTE BUCKLEY REVOCABLE TRUST AND DAVID BUCKLEY FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT. Voted unanimously.

3. **CHARLES AND KAREN THORNDIKE PARTNERSHIP:** Rep. Harry Wood - Proposed Site Plan Amendment to convert an unused parking area to boat and trailer storage space, Tax Map S24, Lot 17, located on Reservoir Road in the Business/Industry District.

Application, site plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted for public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF CHARLES AND KAREN THORNDIKE PARTNERSHIP FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **NORMAND AND ROBERTA MORIN (CASE 'N KEG):** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.) - 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 139A, located on Mill Street in the Central Business District.

Johnson – At that public hearing we presented a proposed site plan amendment that involved an expansion of parking, merging of the abutting lot and the filling of the wetland to provide access to the rear of the building and we are in the process of providing topographic data for grading and some additional analysis for the drainage. We are working with Mike Faller from the Town in terms of the driveway access and also State of New Hampshire in terms of wetland delineation. I didn't want to pass up the opportunity to have this data available if we had the information which we do not so I would ask for a continuance of two weeks which would be plenty of time to give John the information to review it prior to the meeting. Vadney – Topo on that lot can't vary by about 6 inches does it? Johnson – It's fairly at grade right now, but the subtlety is such that whether it grades towards the back or the front and the question to be asked is really of the Town and/or the State, would they rather have it drain to the back and into the wetland which is essentially a drainage area and then go around and be somewhat treated or drain directly into the front where there are two existing catch basins, so those are the details we are working on. But, you're right, there's no significant grading. Vadney - We need a motion to continue. There will be no re-notification to abutters.

Flanders moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO NOVEMBER 23, 2004. Voted unanimously.

2. **REI LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST:** (Rep. Allan Clark) - Public hearing to determine compliance with conditions set forth in a conditional approval granted on September 28, 2004, for a major subdivision for 58 townhouse condominium units and a site plan for site improvements on Tax Map S25, Lot 11B, located on Waukegan Street in the Residential and Business/Industry Districts.

Edgar – In the decision of September 28, 2004, there were two conditions that required further follow-up review from the Planning Board in the context of a Compliance Hearing. Those conditions being Condition #14, which is the issue of the Performance Guarantee and Condition #15 which is the Board's review and signoff on legal documents. That is the sole purpose for tonight's meeting to review those two items. With respect to the first item, the Performance Guarantee, unit cost estimates have been prepared by the engineer of record and submitted for staff review. At our request, we have received two sets of numbers, one is for the entire amount of the guarantee if in fact the entire project had to be guaranteed and that's in excess of a million dollars. You've got grading, sewer & water, road work, off-site improvements, site stabilization, factors for inflation contingency and the like. That's a baseline background number. They have also submitted an estimate based upon a lesser scope of guarantee should the applicant decide to proceed under a conditional approval. The applicant has indicated his desire to commence construction under conditional approval at such time that all other conditions are in place. That's not the case at present, there's still a couple of loose permits and that type of thing, but when all those permits and all other outstanding issues are in place, they would proceed under a conditional approval. This is similar to what was done at Meredith Bay Village and is also what is occurring now at Crestwood. Under a conditional approval scenario, it is necessary that the applicant guarantee a limited scope of concerns. In this particular case, that still includes erosion control and stabilization on-site, connection to the Town's sewer and water and restoration of ROW work as they proceed with the extension of the water main on Waukewan Street. This scope as I indicated is limited as plans under this scenario are not recorded and at this point there would be no conveyable real estate. In other words, there would be no third party. The estimates have been reviewed by Mike Faller and Bob Hill and they have requested increases to the initial numbers that were submitted and the recommended total for the Board's consideration as recommended by staff is \$109,291.00. The applicant has prepared a revised outline as to how this process will proceed. Basically, the long and short of it is that when all other conditions are satisfied and the Letter of Credit is posted for \$109,291.00, we will give a notice to proceed, we would have our typical construction inspection program in place, they would install their erosion controls and begin construction. As they begin to put infrastructure in the ground at some point in time in the future, in all likelihood when most if not all the infrastructure is in, they would come back to us in the context of a

Planning Board public hearing, what we referred to at the Meredith Bay Village condominium project as a progress review. Technically, it is a compliance hearing. The purpose of that hearing will be to review the status of what's actually in the ground. The engineer of record will be certifying as to what's in the ground, when it's passed inspection testing. We would also have recommendations coming in from Mike and Bob and at that point whatever residual amount of work yet to be completed would then be guaranteed at that point in time. At that time, the Planning Board would establish the appropriate figure, the Letter of Credit would be issued, following that the plans and all documents would then be recorded and at that point, they would be in a position to convey condominium units that have been under construction up to that point. This concept has been reviewed by Bill Edney, the Code Enforcement Officer, and myself and is acceptable. For the Board's information, this is essentially the same process that the Board approved for the Meredith Bay Village condominium project, which proceeded very smoothly. With respect to the legal documents, condominium documents had been previously submitted to the Board and discussed at public hearing. Revisions were made based upon Board comments and staff comments. In a nutshell, there were some suggestions made that have all been incorporated into the documents that highlighted some of the more significant ones, mainly that the required landscape management plan is now incorporated as an appendix document to the declarations, the salt issues that were identified during the review process in trying to minimize non-point pollution will all be built into the management plan. We have also built in that the Landscape Management Plan falls within the responsibility of the Board of Directors, so it's clearly enumerated, as in the By-Laws, as the responsibility of the Governing Board. Some of the common area uses have been clarified. A series of recommendations from the Fire Department relative to key entry systems, alarms and sprinkler systems and clarifying that those types of features be considered for the most part common area so in the event we have an issue with the alarm or the sprinkler, we're dealing with the Association not individual unit owners. There is a provision in there that certain provisions of the declarations can't be amended without Planning Board approval. Most recently, as of this morning, I had a good conversation with Allan and suggested a couple minor clarifications, identified as Items 1-3 in my staff review. I had asked for additional clarity as to what sections specifically cannot be amended without Planning Board approval. For example, we added the provisions to the documents regarding the Fire Chief's requirements and those are things I did not want to see undone by an Association. That's the Planning Board's call. I also suggested, just as a matter of clarity, that the

roads be clearly identified as part of the common area. It is identified in the By-Laws as part of the Board of Director's responsibility to maintain. Clarifications in both the Declaration and the By-Laws of the Association that neither the Association nor the individual unit owners can alter the exterior of the buildings. We have gone through architectural review, we had concerns about the initial review, you approved an amended version and they just can't go in and make changes to the exterior of the buildings without Planning Board approval. I think these clarifications are minor enough that they can be handled administratively. We would check off that those adjustments had been made prior to the recording of the plans. I discussed those few additional items with Allan and they have been agreed to by them. We have a recommended figure for the Performance Guarantee of \$109,291.00 and in my perspective we are in good shape. Hearing closed at 7:20 p.m.

Bayard moved, Flanders seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE AS BEING IN COMPLIANCE REI LAND DEVELOPMENT LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST AND THAT THE PROJECT TOTAL FOR THE PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE IS \$109,291.00 TO BE IN THE FORM OF A FINANCIAL GUARANTEE THAT IS AGREED TO BY THE TOWN OF MEREDITH AND FURTHER THAT THE CONDOMINIUM DOCUMENTS APPEAR TO BE IN ORDER AND THAT THE FEW MINOR ISSUES THAT ARE LEFT OPEN WILL BE HANDLED ADMINISTRATIVELY. APPLICANT WILL COME BACK FOR A FOLLOW-UP HEARING SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

4. **JEANNETTE BUCKLEY REVOCABLE TRUST AND DAVID BUCKLEY:**
Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.

This plan is definitely more complicated than it has to be. Essentially, David and Kelly Buckley own a 3-acre house lot on Pease Road. David's mother, Jeannette, lives in a house on a 200' x 200' lot. David also owns a significant parcel of land (18 acres) and additional land to the southeast. Mrs. Buckley is intending to sell her house and in order to sell the house and not have anything left to do with the surrounding Buckley land, we are doing a little boundary line adjustment. David has some woods roads which are primarily maintenance roads for accessing the undeveloped field. He has some Christmas trees, but this is largely undeveloped land and he's also moved from Pease Road to Colebrook. When he sells this lot, are some additional roads accessing the top of a parcel that he wanted to have completely on his parcel and not on the house parcel. Basically,

what we are doing is shifting around some parcels. David and Kelly's house lot will increase slightly from the 3 acres so there's no change that would effect the density standpoint. This is a previously developed lot with a septic system and a house. There are no issues with any sizing of the lot. Mrs. Buckley's lot actually gets a little bit bigger. It goes from about .953 acres to 1.205 acres so that gets a little bigger. As a result of switching some parcels around, the 18.64 acre parcel gets slightly lowered to 18.228. Vadney – What is parcel “W”. Johnson – Parcel “W” is a part of the existing 3-acre lot that David and Kelly own that's going to be transferred from David and Kelly to David. Probably the way that's going to happen is if they sell this, it will be sold minus parcel “W”. As usual, the boundary line adjustments shall be executed prior to recording of the plan. Since he does this in a different ownership, they could actually deed from David and Kelly to David, so he would get this and it will be merged into the 18 acre piece. Parcel “X” is a portion of the 18-acre piece that's going to get merged into the house lot. There's a couple of smaller parcels, parcel “Z” is to make Mrs. Buckley's lot a little bit bigger. Parcel “Y” is a small triangle because one of these access roads cuts across the corner of his mother's lot. They don't want that road to be on his mother's parcel because when they sell that, they don't want it going across someone else's lot. So we are shifting some parcels around. Basically, there are no non-conformities created as a result of it. I've added in the setbacks to show that the existing dwellings are not affected by what we are doing and largely, it's just a housekeeping thing to try to get the family's land in a position where they could sell it and not have some potential encroachments or problems down the road. If you remember, there was a boundary line adjustment down below between David Buckley and his sister who is Burrows, that we just went through last fall. This is a kind of a big piece that actually borders the Town of Meredith's reservoir parcel and they want to retain this pretty much in its natural state. At the time we created this 3-acre lot, they didn't really want to go back this far, but they had to because of the 3 acres and at the time Mr. Buckley was alive and didn't want to have any land in the back. This is the way they would like to have it now. Edgar – It appears as though the items on Page 9 extending onto Page 10 have basically been addressed. They have added the reference to the zoning district. They have added the before and after lot sizes and the after adjustment setbacks. They are not creating any non-conformities. A note has been added that all parcels shall be merged and not sold separately. In this case, as Carl indicated, we have technically three different ownerships and so we are in a position where we do need conveyance deeds for each of those parcels. The deeds need to be submitted for staff review and we require executed deeds to be recorded with the mylar. To the extent there's a mortgage on

any of those properties that are involved, a release would be necessary. If there are no mortgages on any of those properties, the applicant needs to verify in writing. The applicant shall be responsible for all recording fees. Plans would be amended to include all existing monumentation, but more specifically, we typically require that the surveyor of record verify in writing that all necessary pins associated with the transfers (and I've calculated that about 5 have to be set) to reflect the new conditions. Those would be the only two conditions, providing the deeds and verification of pins. Hearing closed at 7:29 p.m.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN TAX MAP S22, LOTS 19, 19A AND 19B, LOCATED ON PEASE ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT AND SINCE THE THREE PROPERTIES ARE IN SEPARATE OWNERSHIP, DRAFT DEEDS NEED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF REVIEW AND EXECUTED DEEDS NEED TO BE RECORDED WITH THE MYLAR. TO THE EXTENT THERE'S A MORTGAGE ON ANY OF THE PROPERTIES, RELEASES WILL BE NECESSARY. IF THERE ARE NO MORTGAGES, APPLICANT'S ATTORNEY SHALL VERIFY IN WRITING AND APPLICANT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL RECORDING FEES. FINAL PLANS SHOULD BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE ALL EXISTING PINS AND MONUMENTATION AND THE SURVEYOR OF RECORD SHALL VERIFY IN WRITING THAT ALL NECESSARY PINS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSFERS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING OF THE MYLAR. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

5. **CHARLES AND KAREN THORNDIKE PARTNERSHIP:** (Rep. Harry Wood)

This property is located between Route 104 and Reservoir Road. This Annalee Dolls production facility has changed dramatically in the last couple of years and no longer employ the number of people they did previously and all of the site is not being used. They have a fairly good size parking lot here, which is not in use except for the storage of some vehicles that may or may not be repaired at some future date. Applicants are requesting approval to convert to winter boat storage. They propose to lease the parking lot and leases will not be long term; they would be renewable annually so if they decide to do something different, they can simply terminate the lease within the span of that year. A portion of the parking lot is unimproved. Boat storage should be limited to the improved parking area only. If the lessee wanted to make the changes necessary to

improve this area that he be allowed to do that provided he follows proper procedures. Plans should be amended to note that the site is located in a public water supply watershed. Storage is limited to boats and boat trailers. All boats stored on site shall be drained of fuel prior to storage. No boat or trailer maintenance shall occur on site. The good thing about the area is that there is a security team that patrols the property so the site will be secure. Vadney – What is the difference between improved parking and unimproved parking? Edgar – Back when this was done, there were two shaded areas on the plan. These areas were identified for future improvements that were not approved per se. We don't have grading or drainage plans. They were just noted as proposed future extension of the parking lot. They did clear it when they cleared the site, but they have not physically made any improvements, so it's a rough surface not tied into the drainage system. I think it would be poor practice on the Board's part to approve uses of land in areas that is basically raw land. The proposed storage area is approximately 1 acre in size. Applicant is OK with that as long as they can hold out the option for somebody else to come back in with a grading plan, the drainage and everything that needs to be done to prepare it for parking or storage and the like. Edgar asked who would have access to this area, it was noted that this would be additional storage for a company that winterizes and stores boats for the winter season. Wood - They would prep the boat wherever they do their normal maintenance routine and then bring it to the site and park it. It would be the company that holds the lease that would be accessing the site. Edgar – The reason I ask that is because we still have activity in that last building and we need to make sure there is a segregation between the deliveries and warehouse traffic and I believe that's probably why that green line is so far away from the end of the warehouse to provide adequate space so that people can access the warehouse without conflicting with the boat storage. This site would not be visible from the highway. Hearing closed at 7:40 p.m.

Flanders moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT APPROVAL FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR CHARLES AND KAREN THORNDIKE PARTNERSHIP TO CONVERT AN UNUSED PARKING AREA TO BOAT AND TRAILER STORAGE SPACE, TAX MAP S24, LOT 17, IN THE BUSINESS/INDUSTRY DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: (1) PLAN NOTE THAT THE SITE IS LOCATED IN A PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY WATERSHED; (2) STORAGE SHALL BE LIMITED TO BOATS AND BOAT TRAILERS; (3) ALL BOATS

ON SITE SHALL BE DRAINED OF FUEL PRIOR TO STORAGE; (4) NO BOAT OR TRAILER MAINTENANCE SHALL OCCUR ON SITE; (5) FINAL PLANS SHOULD BE PRESENTED IN PROFESSIONAL FORM, THAT IS, NOT IN RED INK AND MAGIC MARKER; (6) BOAT AND TRAILER STORAGE SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE IMPROVED PORTION OF THE PARKING AREA UNLESS THE REMAINDER OF THE LOT COMES BACK FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT AND (7) THE BOARD RESERVES THE USUAL RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. ERIC A. ROSEEN LLS FOR DEAN R. & BARBARA J. BEDDINGFIELD:
(Rep. Eric Roseen)

This is a proposed two-lot subdivision for the applicants. The current lot is about 19 acres and we would like to create two additional lots. Lot 1 will be 3.1 acres, Lot 2 will be 5.1 acres and the remaining acreage, Lot 3 will be 10.3 acres. Two permits are required from the State, one for subdivision approval of Lot 1 and also for a new driveway to serve both of these lots. There is an existing driveway into the field, but it's not practical to use it because it runs right into wetlands. A new common driveway is proposed to avoid the wetlands. The proposed driveway is approximately 60+ feet away from the wetlands. I believe the sight distance is 400' in both directions. Edgar - Eric and I chatted briefly on the phone, but I haven't had a chance to spend a lot of time looking at the plans, lot calcs. to demonstrate that they meet lot sizing requirements in the context of the soils and slopes provisions. We talked a little bit that there might be a little bit of adjustment here and there, but we have a fair amount of land area to work with. We do have State permitting because it's a State road. The wetlands have been professionally delineated. We wanted to make sure we had all of the setbacks on there for leachfields as well as lot development so that we can look at whether or not there's any impacts. Roseen - Do you anticipate any impact with respect to any aspect of this project, direct impacts of buffer impacts or are they all noted. We will need test pit data, typical test pits. One property is developed right? So we need to make sure we have as much conditions information in terms of septic location and any cross reference to state approvals, well locations and that kind of stuff. Roseen - They are both old systems, it's a very old house. Flanders - When I look at the scale at the bottom of this map, it looks to me like the edge of the driveway is right up against the edge of the wetlands. The surveyors plans had been amended to show the correct setbacks. Vadney - Is Lot 3 further subdividable? Roseen - I

have to say that it's possible based on land, but access would be an issue. Somebody would have to get correct access on Meredith Neck Road. It's kind of difficult. Edgar – Because of the acreage involved, this would be considered a major subdivision so the process would be that you'd submit the formal application, it would be accepted at one meeting and scheduled for hearing at a subsequent meeting. It will not be scheduled for expedited review. If somebody could provide good access to that piece, it's very suitable land. Bayard – John, you don't see any problem with soils or slopes or anything like that out here? Edgar – I haven't reviewed the calcs., but because of the acreage that's involved, we have real topo so we know exactly what the average slope of the property is. We actually have wetlands so that's calculated and netted out so we can net out steep slopes and we net out wetlands and look at the balance of the buildable area. If that meets our worst case scenario which would be a ledge lot, D slope, you have to show 4 acres of residual land or just under 4 acres, 160,000 sq. ft. Either they meet that requirement or they need to provide additional soils mapping to verify exactly what is out there. My guess is they will probably make some adjustments to meet the worst case scenario or if it's that tight, they'll come in with a soils map. Edgar – What are the gross acreages on the smaller lots? Roseen – One is 3.18 and Lot 2 is 5.18 and I might mention that I have run those calcs., so I'm pretty confident that these are OK. Is the driveway to the existing house a difficult driveway. Roseen – It's not ideal by any means. Edgar – Has there been any thought to an alternative location? Does this subdivision restrict Plan B if they want to put in a safer driveway someday? Roseen – I would assume that's true. Nobody's given that any thought. I guess you could move it on the right side of the house and it would be a better situation than it is now. Edgar – It's something to think about. If there was a desire to put in an alternative driveway and if it has not so good sight distance, just make sure you reserve yourself an easement right or think it through before you create the other frontage lot. Vadney – The boundary is substantially east of that house.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

1. **WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE:** Edgar reviewed progress made by the Watershed Advisory Committee. The Committee hopes to have a report presented back to the Planning Boards of the 5 watershed towns at year's end or thereabouts. One thing the Committee is looking at doing is filing for a grant through DES. One of the things that became really apparent from what we are looking at is that we don't have a lot of real data on Lake Waukegan. We have some deep water spot monitoring

by volunteers from one of the shore owners associations which is very helpful and which has picked up some not so good trends, but here again, it's just two spots on a 912-acre lake so we want to look at developing some data closer to the tributaries. We have 17 of the state sub-areas within the watershed, several streams and tributaries that are in each of those sub-watersheds so we are thinking about trying to apply for a grant to DES to be able to develop some additional water quality data that also starts to look at not only water chemistry, but what's actually at the microscopic level looking at what's living in the lake and how healthy is the lake from the perspective of the low end of the food chain. Typically, scientists tell me that there is impaired water quality, things that should be living in the lake aren't there in proportions that they should be, so they start sampling tributaries in different spots based upon certain indicators to confirm from that perspective what the health of the lake is. When we do that type of assessment, we would also be doing some water quality testing in the tributaries as well to try to see how things are going.

Generally speaking, the water quality in Lake Waukegan is very good, there's no major flags that have jumped out at us, but this is the time to get a good baseline which we don't have right now. The idea is to look at possibly getting a grant from DES to begin to develop that baseline. One of the neatest aspects of this grant is that Plymouth State has recently created an environment center for their undergraduate/graduate level program. The thrust of that is the Biology Department is really looking at building community relationships by taking the University out into the community and providing community assistance. They are very interested in this project. We have met with them and they see this as a potential long-term relationship with this project because this is an outdoor laboratory for them to take their lake ecology course and not just test for the sake of testing, but test for the sake of helping to develop a better understanding of the health of the lake and our particular self interest is served because of it being our water supply. They would be providing the soft match in this case so there's really no major out-of-pocket for the Town. We would be looking at a grant from DES and Plymouth State matching it. Their thinking at this point is that it would not be a one-shot deal from Plymouth State's point of view and it might be something they might make a longer term commitment in terms of working with the Town to develop more and more data on the watershed and the lake. If it meets with the Board's approval, I would like to craft a letter for the Chairman's signature to indicate it's support for the grant application. One of the elements typical in this grant application is to indicate community support and in our case, our Master Plan recommends a watershed approach which this is and highlights this particular watershed as a high priority because of being a water supply. It's kind of a no brainer for the Planning

Board to be supportive of the work the Committee's doing and more specifically to develop better data on the lake itself. Edgar – The project that we're working on is sub-regional in nature because it involves 5 towns. There are 5 towns that make up the watershed so the Town of Meredith would be the applicant because we are providing the administrative support for this thing, but it would be in the context of the 5 towns moving forward on various fronts as we implement the management plan. We are primarily focusing on Lake Waukegan, but I think as we start to get a better feel for the health of the lake, we have a lot of folks that are really interested in what we are doing, the Fish & Game folks want to start programming Waukegan a little bit more into their program to do some fish assessment work. DES is very supportive of what we are doing. Initially, it's a 5-town effort right now in terms of the makeup of the Committee. We would be the applicant because we are leading the charge. We will be talking about it at the Committee level Wednesday evening and if it meets with their approval, then I'll go into an overdrive mode to pull the grant together. I'm working with Rick Vande Poll who has worked with the Conservation Commission in the Town before. He will be basically the scientist overseeing the technical aspects of it and then working with the Plymouth State students. He also teaches at Plymouth State so there's a really good connection there. We have a few things that are uniquely lined up at the moment and we very well may be able to pull it off. I don't have the amount of the grant in writing yet, but I think we are looking at a total of \$75,000.00 over a two-year period. It would be a 60/40 split, 60% grant money, 40% match from Plymouth State. USGS has created a phosphorous loading model for watersheds that has been in existence for about 12 years and they have been looking for some small watersheds to run the numbers on. Phosphorus is a critical nutrient because it's basically what drives the plant life in lakes and we have seen a trend in the lower level of the lake of increased phosphorus levels. They are at a level where it's not alarming, it's not problematic, but there's a very slow discernible increased trend in the phosphorus levels in the lake and if you were to project that over a long period of time, that's probably not a real good thing, so that does need to be looked at more carefully and that's one aspect as another player in all of this, we may be looking to the US Geological Survey who has indicated a desire to work with communities and running their model, but in order to run their model, we need more data to input into the model. Vadney – If you keep it with the Town, with the assistance of the 4 other towns and then with a contract with Plymouth State, to me that's something that might look good to the public. It was the consensus of the Board to have John craft a letter of support for the project for Chairman Vadney's signature.

2. **ZONING:** Typically, this is our zoning season and Herb represents the Planning Board on a working committee that has been slaving over looking at the ordinance and trying to gear up for a rewrite. I don't think we've made the kind of progress that we had hoped by this time of year and the committee still has some decisions to make so as a group we haven't made any hard and fast decisions. There's a lot to it and my personal view is that it is better that when we put out something to the voters, it has to be right and has to be carefully crafted and that's much more important than getting something out for the sake of getting it out. If it means that we push into the next year to continue to work on it, we are looking at rewriting cluster and a bunch of other things. We have met a lot, but, we still have a lot of work to do and I can't report at this point that we are going to be rolling out a draft in the immediate future. We will continue to meet and keep you posted. Flanders – On the review that you've done thus far, are there any areas that are really glaring that we should try to get a handle on in this cycle even though we are not going to do the whole thing? Any areas where we're exposed because of substantial deficiencies? Vadney – Adult businesses I suppose is one. We are protected now only because we are not protected and the argument is whether or not to leave it that way or to actually try and get an ordinance that specifies someplace in town specifically, thereby excluding all the other places. The other things are more location, new zones and things, but we are still working on them. Edgar – To answer your question Bob, I guess it depends on what level you look at things as being problematic. If you look at it in a broad context, we probably have 200 or 300 things that could change, but we haven't found a provision or paragraph that hasn't caused some discussion at the committee level in terms of clarity, overhaul, get rid of, change or amend. Just about everything could get touched. In terms of glaring highest priority, I don't know, but we are meeting again on Monday. For example, the Wetland Ordinance needs some fixing, that might be one, but part of the problem is good news, but it's problematic. The good news is that as part of the natural resource inventory, we have altogether better wetland mapping now than any of the stuff that's built into our ordinance. Vadney – But that's not something we could possibly get ready in the next three weeks. Edgar – Probably not. Flanders – It sounds like you're saying there isn't anything glaring that we really should jump right on this cycle? Vadney – There's always that issue of the adult business stuff. Right now, one of the businesses on Main Street could convert to an adult bookstore overnight. Change of

occupancy, no change of use. Is that something you want to guess won't happen or do you want to try and designate an area. Edgar - We have a draft on that particular topic as part of what the committee has reviewed. We haven't spent a lot of time with it because we have been primarily focusing on really critiquing the existing ordinance and not yet getting into the new stuff. The plan is in the new ordinance at our committee level to present that back to you folks and the community for an overlay district that will regulate adult businesses. That has been our discussion and with our consultant, we've created a first draft. The question is do you spring that on now or do you wait for the contents of the whole ordinance. Bayard - I think it might be better putting it in as an overall document. Vadney - From a strategy standpoint, that once we bring it out in the public, it's probably going to cause a lot of letters to the editor and arguing and it might be worth bringing that out early because that's a single argument you might be able to make in a clearer way and then it would be part of the ordinance and it wouldn't be a new addition to the full rewrite next year. Flanders - Maybe taking this up at your next meeting would be appropriate and just report back to us. Edgar - I'll bring this back to the gang with a very pointed question as to whether or not and when I say the gang, it's basically Chairman Vadney, Chairman Mack of the ZBA, myself and Bill Edney and Carol, Town Manager, who's on the committee. Touhey - I really want to support Herb's suggestion. I have spoken to John about the adult entertainment issue feeling that there should be something in the zoning ordinance. I think there's danger in just waiting for something to happen, it could happen overnight and once it's in, it's in. I don't think people are going to be shocked to hear that come out as a separate issue. Edgar - I generally agree with you. I have been the one that's brought it up time and time again. When we get to this point and it may be at our next meeting, just keep in mind that the down side to regulating it is it becomes a permitted use somewhere, so everybody over here who's going to benefit from it not being allowed is going to be cheering you on. The ones over here where it's going to become a permitted use are going to be saying why did you pick my district.

Meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

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

William Bayard, Secretary