

PRESENT: A. William Bayard, Acting Chairman; Flanders, Selectmen's Rep.; Dever; Kahn; Touhey; Lapham, Alternate; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Dever moved, Flanders seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 2010, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **WALTER & PATRICIA OHNEMUS** – Proposed minor subdivision of Map S08, Lot 2, into 2 lots (5.00 ac. and 5.31 ac.), located at 183 Meredith Neck Road in the Meredith Neck District.

LaBrecque – This is a two-lot subdivision located on Meredith Neck Road. The subdivision plan, checklist and abutters list are in file. Application fees have been paid. It's recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Flanders moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION AS READ AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

2. **JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment between Map S17, Lots 15 & 16, located at 42 Upper Ladd Hill Road & 21 Upper Mile Point Drive in the CB and Comm. Rte. 3 So. Districts.

LaBrecque – This is a Boundary Line Adjustment to convey .56 acres to Lot 15 from Lot 16. The Boundary Line Adjustment plan, application checklist and abutters list are in file. The application fee has been paid. It is recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Dever moved, Flanders seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT AS COMPLETE AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

3. **JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK** – Proposed Site Plan to construct a new bank building with related site improvements on Map S17, Lots 15 & 16, 42 Upper Ladd Hill Road in the CB District.
4. **JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK** – Architectural Design Review of proposed bank building, Map S17, Lots 15 & 16, 42 Upper Ladd Hill Road in the Central Business District.

LaBrecque – The proposed Site Plan is for constructing a new bank, as well as Architectural Review of the new building. They were here at our last meeting for a conceptual discussion. The applications, checklist and abutters list are in file, as well as the Site Plan. Filing fees have been paid. It's recommended the applications for a Site Plan and Architectural Review be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Flanders moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR NORTHWAY BANK AS READ. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC. FOR LAND ACQUISITION, LLC –** Continuation of public hearings held on October 27, 2009 & December 22, 2009, for a proposed major Subdivision of Tax Map S17, Lot 2, into 8 lots, located on Upper Ladd Hill Road in the Central Business District. Application accepted on 9/22/09.

Mike Dibitto – As the Chairman indicated, you've been looking at this plan for a little while and would like you to bear with us one more time. In December, our thought was we might construct a short piece of road in order to try to clean up the driveway issues on Upper Ladd Hill. Angela, the Community Development Department and Public Works have been very helpful because we recently had a meeting and made great strides towards cleaning it up and one of the suggestions Mike Faller made was to avoid building that short piece of road until the next phase comes in. In concert with the Department Heads, I think we came up with a much cleaner situation for this phase of the development. We're still going to access two lots off what eventually will be the ROW for the remainder but we're only going to do that temporarily as a common driveway. That eliminates the need for the Selectmen to look at this again until we have the final plan. We will come in with a common drive between Lots 4 and 3 which will service two lots, Lot 3 and Lot 1, and that eliminates some of the issues we had about accessing Lot 1 off of Upper Ladd Hill. Lot 8 was kind of one of the hang-ups. We were trying to deal with Lot 8 which we kept looking at as an 8th lot even though we didn't intend to build on it. We put a note on the plan that says "Lot 8 is not a building lot, it is for future development". We're hoping it will not need to have a driveway accessing it since it is not a building lot. The common drives are actually going over land of Lot 8 so we will have frontage there, but we will clearly delineate the plan so there's no confusion at this time. That way we can use that for two lots, we moved the driveway we had planned to bring off the new road and we're combining it with the driveway to Lot 5 for a common drive and that grade works very well. It was kind of difficult grade wise coming in off the new roadway so that eases the grade situation and then we have another common drive up at Lots 7 and 6. We are moving that slightly uphill to avoid relocating that utility pole. No changes have been done on the lot configuration; we've just been working this driveway situation pretty heavily. I believe we have the best scenario now. With your approval, we will put the finishing

touches on this plan and hopefully be in for conditional approval in March. We are doing a water system study of calculations through a 3rd party consultant just to verify pressures and what will be adequate or at least what our resolution to any shortfall in pressure would be as requested by the Water Department. We are providing a 25' easement over Lots 2 and 3 as requested. We're not going to modify the remainder until we have the future layout. This way we can do it in one shot. Understanding how many reiterations we went through here, we recognize there may be a couple on Phase II so we prefer to deal with it later. We are not proposing any change in the status of that parcel at this time. There was a question from the Water Department about this angled easement for water where we come off the existing 16" main, we determined there is a conflict with the drainage on Upper Ladd Hill Road which really precludes us from coming straight out to Upper Ladd and heading uphill so circumstances really dictate that we pretty much need to keep it the way it is. Flanders – In looking at Lot 2 and the existing water main easement that goes to the tower, it goes right down the middle of that lot and you haven't got much of a building envelope on either side there. Dibitto – We're really planning to build on the uphill side of that lot and we will bring in a plan of the houses we are planning to build. These are going to be cottages of fairly modest size and they will be done in a village style so we have done the site plans to assure we can fit them and we'll be happy to bring that plan in so you can see it as well. LaBrecque – Just to touch on what Bob mentioned about the limited building envelope, we've spoken about this both here at the Planning Board meetings and with the applicant and as he stated, they have house plans for the small building envelope and I stressed at our last meeting that marginal building envelopes are not granted zoning relief because that's the way they were made so you can't make smaller envelopes and then a future owner comes in for zoning relief, so it has been added to the staff report that "zoning relief for a larger buildable area is not granted on new lots of record" and shall be noted on the subdivision plan. We did have a meeting on February 10th and the Water Department was there as well as the applicant and his engineer and we discussed developing a hydraulic radiant to show the elevation of the water tank, the pressures and a bunch of engineering so that should be coming in for the Water Department to review just to ensure there is enough pressure to get to the homes, where in each home there will also be a pump that boosts that water pressure within the house but first you have to get the water to the home and hopefully that study will come back and show there is adequate pressure. With respect to the road, they were thinking about putting in a road to alleviate the shared driveways. There was a single driveway for Lot 5 and now its being shared with Lot 4 so that eliminated one driveway and there is now a shared driveway to Lot 3 and Lot 1, because the road would have to be engineered, built and reviewed, the profile would have to be developed and brought to the Town for review and that would just have more for Lou Caron to review and they would have to go to the Board of Selectmen to explain they are looking for road waivers for width on a dead-end road that's only a couple hundred feet in length and its really going to be expanded later on. Instead of going through all that it was easier to have a couple of shared driveways and we addressed that by having a note on the site plan stating Lot 8 is not designated as a building lot as it will be further subdivided in the second phase

of the development. In the event that Phase 2 does not occur, a waiver is needed from the Board of Selectmen to have a shared driveway to 3 building lots. Lot 2 has its own driveway. Also discussed was the subsequent phase to this project which is another 25 or so lots. Due to the condition of Upper Ladd Hill Road, we discussed proportionate share improvements so in discussing the off-site improvements, we developed a condition that really doesn't pertain to this phase but would then come into play later and the details of that can also be worked out later on with a note that reads something to the effect that off-site improvements to Upper Ladd Hill Road will be determined during Phase 2, it will be assessed on a cumulative basis to include this 8-lot subdivision and the condition would run with the land should it have a different owner later on down the road. We also discussed about having subdivision documents so if there is a homeowner's association you were thinking about establishing, then we would need specimen deeds for each of the lots because there are quite a few easements all over, slope easements, drainage easements and shared driveways so either way you want to approach that would be fine. Ann Sprague asked about the size of the lots and the proposed square footage of the houses to be built? Dibitto – The lots range from approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ acre to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre. The footprint of the house is probably going to be 600-900 sq. ft. They will be multi-story and some may also have walkout basements. I have a question on the sample deeds and easements, would that be something that needs to be submitted prior to approval or is that a condition of approval? LaBrecque – That could be a condition of approval. Public Hearing closed at 7:23 p.m.

Flanders moved, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO A DATE SPECIFIC, MARCH 23, 2010. Voted unanimously.

2. **WALTER & PATRICIA OHNEMUS:** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.)

The Ohnemus family owns just over 10 acres on Meredith Neck Road. This house is very close to the road; actually portions of it are in the road. The property is primarily open field and the proposal before you is to subdivide the 10.31 acre parcel into one 5-acre lot surrounding the existing dwelling and some of the buildings and paddocks and to create a new vacant lot 5.31 acres in the back. The proposal is hinging around a new driveway which will be a common driveway. You can see that Lot 2 is essentially a flag lot with the frontage coming down on Meredith Neck Road on the left side of the existing house. This is being done because the existing driveway for the dwelling has extremely short sight distance to the right. There's a mirror on the opposite side of the road and anybody who has exited there generally rolls down their window to see if they can hear any cars coming so it's a fairly dangerous situation. We've petitioned the State of NH to grant a driveway access on the other side of the house and the condition would be to discontinue the existing driveway to the house so you would have a driveway which has virtually unlimited sight distance looking to the East and significantly better albeit a little bit less than 400 feet looking to the West. Part of the driveway permit that was submitted to the State involves some grading along this portion of the road to take some of the banking away to maximize the sight distance looking

in that direction but you're essentially taking a potentially dangerous situation and improving it by quite a bit so the driveway permit number isn't on there because the State has not issued a permit number although they have approved the driveway itself so that will be something that will be added to the plan upon them issuing the actual number. The topography is very gently sloped in front of the lot, slightly more sloped in the back of the lot but the calculations because the lots are of significant size meet the Town's lot sizing requirements, Lot 1 actually has 2.33 lot equivalents and Lot 2 has 2.10 lot equivalents based on the worst case scenario. The worst case scenario being that the worst case soil type for each particular slope category is used to calculate the lot size, therefore, you don't have to do a site specific soils map. The test pit that's on Lot 1 was a test pit that was done at the time of the original subdivision. We dug a new test pit on Lot 2 and that's also in the file. It's a fairly simple subdivision that does not require State of NH DES approval because the lots are 5 acres or greater. One of the comments in the staff review was regarding the Fire Chief's review of driveways in excess of 500' and this driveway could potentially be in excess of 500 feet so we would add a note that a sufficient turnaround for emergency vehicles would have to be constructed on this lot subject to the Fire Chief's review. It's somewhat self-serving in that any house back here would have oil deliveries, etc. and they would want to make sure the trucks would be able to turn around and normally that type of a turnaround is a sufficient size for emergency vehicles. It's a note we've put on other plans and we can add it to this plan as well. We would submit draft language for Lots 1 and 2 for the deeds because Lot 2 would be subject to a driveway easement for Lot 1 and Lot 1 would be benefitted by an easement across Lot 2 for the common driveway. There would also be language in the deed that upon construction of the driveway to Lot 2 the existing driveway for Lot 1 would be discontinued and that is probably going to be written into the State of NH's actual physical driveway permit anyway. The surveyor will provide written evidence the pins have been set prior to recording the mylar and there is a comment regarding the subdivision approval being valid for a period of 24 months at which time the final approval must be obtained or a public hearing be held to grant additional time. These two lots meet all the other requirements of the Subdivision Regulations. LaBrecque – One quick comment under roads and access, the driveway permit is required from the State of NH. Touhey – I certainly commend the movement of that curb cut, just anything to get off the top of that hill. That's a blessing to all of us who live on the Neck so that's a great move. The land that the common driveway is on along that stonewall, is that actually part of Lot 2? Yes. So in this case, Lot 1 is benefitting from the easement over that driveway. We gained about 85' by taking the bank out a little bit. Public Hearing closed at 7:36 p.m.

Flanders moved, Dever SECONDED, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINOR SUBDIVISION FOR WALTER & PATRICIA OHNEMUS, TAX MAP S08, LOT 2, INTO TWO (2) LOTS, (5 ACRES AND 5.31 ACRES) LOCATED AT 183 MEREDITH NECK ROAD IN THE MEREDITH NECK DISTRICT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) A DRIVEWAY PERMIT IS REQUIRED FROM NHDOT AND SHALL BE REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS.
- (2) THE FIRE CHIEF SHALL REVIEW AND APPROVE A PLAN NOTE WITH RESPECT TO EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS.
- (3) DRAFT LANGUAGE FOR THE DRIVEWAY EASEMENT ON LOT 2 FOR THE BENEFIT OF LOT 1 SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW. THERE SHALL BE PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE MAINTENANCE AND USE OF THE DRIVEWAY. THIS COULD BE HANDLED ADMINISTRATIVELY.
- (4) THE SURVEYOR OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.
- (5) THIS CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF 24 MONTHS, AT WHICH TIME FINAL APPROVAL MUST BE OBTAINED OR A PUBLIC HEARING MUST BE HELD FOR THE PLANNING BOARD TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TIME.
- (6) ABANDONMENT OF THE ORIGINAL DRIVEWAY SHALL BE REQUIRED EITHER IN THE EASEMENT OR THE DOT PERMIT.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

3. **JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK – BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT:**

Jim Keenan representing Northway Bank. Also present is Ann Sprague, the owner of Map S17- 15, Richard Olsen, Sr., VP in charge of retail development and Diane Smith from Thorne Survey and Ross Cutledge from Engineering Assistance and Design

Jim Keenan – This is the lot line adjustment we're requesting, approximately ½ acre out of a total of 11 acres. Diane Smith – As Jim said, it's about a half acre adjustment between the larger 11-acre parcel and the Sprague parcel which is just over an acre. The intent was to increase that future bank site for the site plan to make a safe and effective driveway access. This exchanged land is not something that's essential to the larger parcel site plan, there's an existing building on that already so this wouldn't involve their development. LaBrecque – There is a note showing the lot line to be discontinued and the land area of the parcels after the development is also noted on the plan. There's also a note on the plan that states Parcel A will be combined with Lot 15 and won't be a separate lot of record. The setbacks per the district following the adjustment should be noted on the plan and the applicant shall provide a draft conveyance deed for staff to review. The executed deed should be recorded with the mylar and the applicant shall verify in writing whether or not a mortgage exists on Lot 16. If so, there should be a satisfactory release. LaBrecque – The strip around the road opens up to a larger lot and goes quite a ways up to the top. There's no complication if we approve this tonight and we continue the other part to a later date? LaBrecque – That's fine because this isn't finalized until the Board signs it. Keenan – The Bank will not

purchase either parcel of property if you do not approve the site plan so it would be a moot issue at that point. Public Hearing closed

Dever moved, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE IN THE CASE OF JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK FOR A PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT ON TAX MAP S17, BETWEEN LOTS 15 AND 16, 42 UPPER LADD HILL ROAD AND 21 UPPER MILE POINT DRIVE IN THE WAUKEWAN WATERSHED AND CENTRAL BUSINESS AND COMMERCIAL ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICTS, THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) SETBACKS FOR THE DISTRICT SHALL BE INDICATED ON THE PLAN.
- (2) THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A DRAFT CONVEYANCE DEED FOR STAFF TO REVIEW. THE EXECUTED DEED SHALL BE RECORDED WITH THE MYLAR. THE APPLICANT SHALL VERIFY IN WRITING WHETHER THERE EXISTS A MORTGAGE ON LOT 16. IF THERE IS A MORTGAGE, THERE SHALL BE A SATISFACTORY RELEASE RECORDED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONVEYANCE DEED.
- (3) THE SURVEYOR OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

4. **JAMES KEENAN FOR NORTHWAY BANK – SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW:**

Jim Keenan – We talked about doing the design review, do you want me to put the building up or do it a little bit later because at the last meeting I think the building was fairly acceptable to you at that time except you asked for a couple of doghouse dormers which we did include into the main roof to try to cut the shingle look and give a little bit more character to the building and that has been done.

Bayard – It would be nice to take a look at it but I don't know how much detail we will go into this time because this hearing may be continued.

Ross Cudlitz – The entrance is further uphill on Upper Ladd Hill Road towards the circle. I spoke with DPW about this and they had no heartburn over that location. There's about 25,000 sq. ft. of total impervious area being proposed on this 1.69 acres total. We're going to disturb about 48,000 sq. ft. into the tree line to get the whole thing done. There's a circular counter-clockwise pattern coming through the project. I did run it by Ken Jones and he had no real problems that he expressed to me. I talked to the Brian Carroll at the Water and Sewer Department and they are working on locating the existing 4" sanitary sewer that comes off the property from the old structure that was there. Once they get an accurate location and depth for us and assure us that it's functional, our plan is to tie into that existing

one instead of opening the road up and making a big crater. Looking at the storm water relative to the project, the watershed for this property goes back up to the tower on Upper Mile Point Drive and as you know a lot of work was done on the drainage system coming down that road. The existing condition came down into the property and it went through a raw cut ditch from SE to NW right through the middle of the property and was dumping out down on the property line with the abutter to the culvert that crosses Upper Ladd Hill Road right here. If anything, our interruption of this water course is going to be a benefit to this abutter to the North of us because when I was out there heavy runoff would jump across the property line and go across his driveway and now we're intercepting that from getting into his driveway regardless. The simple plan of the whole thing is to take the uphill storm water, divert it around the developed area and take it back to where it currently comes from and then capture and treat water quality in quantity from the impervious developed areas. We're going to do that by going through a closed storm drain system and running it through a proprietary system. The downstream defender is one of your black boxes that will capture oils, grits and floatables and attached phosphorus to the sand particles if it gets that far. There are sumps in all these basins so I fully expect the TSS, the solid loading to the downstream defender will be pretty small. Storm water runoff quantity is less than the existing; the review engineer will probably go over all that stuff during staff review. We have ample parking spaces, more than required. Maximum lot coverage allowed is 65% in the Central Business District; our actual coverage is 40%. Maximum building height is 45' and I don't think it's anywhere near that, the architectural review will go over that. Our proposed disturbance is 48,000 sq. ft. total. Parking spaces are 10' x 20', the minimum ADA space is 12' x 20' and ours is considerably over that. We have some extra space to the right of the front door so I extended the ADA space. We have 17 spaces provided, only 13 are required. As far as snow removal goes, there is very limited snow area on the site so the applicant will have to contract with an outside entity to remove the snow from the site. At the back side of the property to the Northeast there's a wall that runs all the way around the back of the property cutting back into the hill and the maximum height of the wall is around 15 1/2 - 16'. There will be an architectural concrete block wall. Above the wall is the cutoff ditch. A landscaping plan has been provided also in your plan sets. The only substantial changes to C-1 are all the notes you didn't have to your left. Nothing changed on the development itself, the riprap, the wall, the pavement, the piping system, the grading, none of that is different on the drawing you're getting now, the only thing different is all the notes and the name of the road changed to Upper Mile Point Drive. Russ did a pretty good job of going over just about everything in the report. Because of the BLA, the setbacks will be different because it will have two road frontages so you will have two fronts and two sides per the Zoning Administrator. I'm also wondering what the status is going to be of the well that's on the portion that you'll be taking the .56 acres. Is that something that won't be used? Keenan - We don't know what the status of that well is at the present time. We do know there is a well on the Sprague property that is functional and that is the one we recommend using. There is another well that is part of the new acquisition. The current owner doesn't use that

for anything or want to retain any ability to use that one? Keenan - To my knowledge, no but the attorneys have spoken to them about that. We have no questions on the well itself and we don't plan to use it. Bayard - If it's going to be discontinued and it's a dug well, we generally like to have them filled so it doesn't present a nuisance in the future. We will look into it and see what kind of well it is and if it's an open hole in the ground, we'll get it covered and filled in. The well we're going to be using is in the middle of the parking lot and the catch basin will be dropped over the wellhead of the existing well. Mike Faller from the DPW reviewed the proposed driveway location and he does agree that its close to the STOP sign but the stop line for the cars is actually quite a bit so you can actually stop there and look up Upper Mile Point because you really can't see Upper Mile Point from that stop sign so you can probably stack 2 maybe 3 cars and then there's quite a bit of queuing space or stacking ability on the site itself should the cars back up. The Board voiced that as a concern at the conceptual discussion and Mike reviewed this and both he and I went out to the site and figured out where the driveway was going to be and had a look at everything and he felt it was acceptable. Lou Caron is reviewing the drainage and the storm water analysis provided by the engineer. There is a lighting detail on Sheet D-2 of your plans and it appears to be a cutoff fixture, but the bulb is recessed. I confirmed with Sharon Lighting and their plan is based on that cutout you see. With respect to snow storage, it is limited for snow removal. You intend on removing the snow from the site every time it snows. I don't know if there's another location the propane tank could be in because that corner could provide some snow storage especially in your small storm events. Keenan - I assume they are going to push snow off onto that open area as best they can for a while. LaBrecque - The propane tank gets buried but it still has the elements that come up to fill it and if that's the only possible area for snow to get put, I would hate for it to get hit. Keenan - I wanted to run the tank location by the Fire Chief before I pick my final location. I was trying to split it between the abutter and the building. LaBrecque - The size of it determines the distance it would have to be from the building and if it were buried vs. above ground, then that actually also determines how far it can be from the building. The signage was looked at by Bill and he noted a total of 240 sq. ft. is permitted and I know you show 2 freestanding signs but I guess those are 2 possible locations and 1 of the two signs will actually be chosen so in calculating the sign area we could obviously do that for one of the signs. You provided some sign details to me last time but the sign area I don't think is the way we calculate sign area. I think we calculate it per the letters and not the whole square. There is only one person who decides on how we do that. Bayard - As part of architectural review, we also might consider that so just be careful. Kahn - There is some concern about some past history with signage. Your sign detail is part of your packet on Page 13. The freestanding sign has a monument stone base that ties in with the stone used on the building so it's consistent with the architecture. Flanders - Lou, the Code Enforcement Officer is the one that makes the decision on that. If somebody disagrees then the only recourse is to appeal his Administrative Decision to the ZBA. Kahn's response inaudible but he was questioning the signs and their allowable size. There have been questions in the

past. Flanders – I'm not disagreeing with what you're saying, I'm just telling you legally what the process is. Bayard – We do have Architectural Design Review, we certainly would put our 2 cents in. Keenan – The building basically is Colonial in looks and we did add the 2 doghouse dormers. The building is approximately 31' to the ridge on the main building and probably about 43' with the cupola. The windows basically are standard. The shingles are architectural in style and charcoal gray in color. The shingles would probably be hardy plank. I have used hardy plank on several buildings and had no trouble but I have noticed with hardy plank you have to go 16" on center with your vertical studs and use 5/8 plywood on the outside of the building so you don't get the weaving effect from the hardy plank itself. The back of the building would have the drive-up and canopy and the railing effects around the canopy. Flanders – Where is the HVAC equipment? Keenan – The HVAC equipment will be put on the canopy and that's why the railing is where it is. The equipment would be covered to keep it off the ground. We do not plan to have a dumpster because of the confidentiality of the bank records so what the bank does is have the cleaning people do shredding of all the stuff that's there. Keenan – The building is fully handicap accessible. We haven't talked on whether we will install an automatic door but the door will be fully accessible handicap wise. There would be a 5' turning radius in front of the door, the doors would be 3' wide so it could handle someone in a wheelchair. The inside of the building would be fully handicapped accessible, the bathrooms and all areas within the branch itself. There will there be two drive-up lanes and a drive-up ATM. Basically, we are going to have two ATM's in the building, one will be a full function ATM in the front vestibule and the drive-up ATM would be strictly a cash dispenser. The reason we do that is to try to keep the traffic in the front of the building vs. the back of the building. Dever – What is the height of the cupola? LaBrecque – Those don't count towards the building height, it's the roof ridge. The way Ross has designed the lot; it has multiple stacking capabilities so its not going to make it congested under any conditions. There is no basement, just a slab on grade. The mechanical room is in the building itself on the first floor. Because this is going to be a truss building, we thought of putting a stairway in so we could put it on the second floor and put the furnaces up there also for the HVAC equipment. LaBrecque – We may as well do a site visit while we're waiting on Lou Caron to do his review of the drainage analysis. Bayard asked if the Board needed to do a site inspection. Does the Board think we need to do a site inspection? Flanders is not in favor. Keenan – How about we lay out where the driveway is, put the stakes in where the building is so you could drive by and take a look at it just as easy as a site visit. Public Hearing closed at 8:17 p.m.

Flanders moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN AND THAT DATE BEING MARCH 23, 2010. Voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey

Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

The above Minutes were read and approved at a regular meeting of the Meredith Planning Board held on April 27, 2010.

s/ A. William Bayard
A. William Bayard, Secretary