

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

Sorell moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 27 AND FEBRUARY 10, 2009, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

Dever moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE SITE WALK MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 2009, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

Bayard would like to reopen Dunkin Donuts application to review the parking and turning movement issues. Flanders suggested that the Board call them in under the right to review and amend. It's been bad for a couple years now and would like to see the Board take another look at the situation. Bayard – I think there are better ways to handle their traffic and get it off the highway. (inaudible) LaBrecque – I believe John has been in touch with Dunkin Donuts in the last couple of years and copies of the site plan have been copied for them so I think that issue has already been opened up. I can certainly take over where John left off. I know John has had a lot of correspondence with Dunkin Donuts but I don't know that he's used the words "the Planning Board is planning to call you in to review and amend" and I think maybe you need to tell them that. Bayard – I think the first thing might be a report back as to what the current status is or it may be far enough along that they may agree to something and we could look at that. Vadney asked if everyone here on the Board is sympathetic to calling them in or looking into it seriously. It was the consensus of the Board to definitely look into it seriously. Sorell – They could move the parking lot around and that would give them a lot more stacking. Vadney – Angela, everyone here is in agreement so you can tell them the sense of the Board here tonight is that this is a serious problem we want looked at and it will get called in one way or another. Flanders – I'd like to see us go a little bit further and get the message to John and to the applicant that the resolution needs to take place before Memorial Day. Bayard – I would like Angela to report back within 2 weeks or a month, I'm not sure I want to wait until Memorial Day because if you do that, that's when they will come in. Flanders – They will have to come in for a hearing, we'll have to agree on a plan and they'll have to have it in place by Memorial Day because that's when traffic starts to get busy around here. Dever – That might be a little short fused, there's a lot that has to be done. Let's let Angela do her thing and then come back to the Board. Flanders asked that Angela share the dialog with John that we're looking for a resolution by Memorial Day this year because they can't do the work during the middle of the summer and we will have lost another season.

1. **MARK MURPHY FOR MICHAEL & MICHELE MERRILL** – Continuation of a public hearing held on February 10, 2009, for a proposed Site Plan to construct a bank with related site improvements, Tax Map U15, Lot 14, located at 71 NH Route 25 in the Central Business District. Application accepted February 10, 2009.

Applicant as requested that this public hearing be continued to March 10, 2009.

Vadney – I want to point out that this does not include an architectural design because they are asking for a waiver of sorts that we do after they figure out who the bank is. LaBrecque – I spoke to Dan Ellis from Ames Associates and he requested that the public hearing and discussion on the Murphy bank be continued to March 10, 2009, because we are currently addressing some concerns of the Board as well as some preliminary comments from the Town Engineer. I know that the Board's primary concern with the proposed bank site is traffic. I received a phone call from DOT informing me that the number he had previously given me with respect to daily vehicle trips in their peak hour is incorrect. The correct number for expected peak trips of a bank this size is 153. Per DOT a traffic study and scoping meeting is required for any driveway permit involving trips over 100. DOT expects the results of the scoping meeting will be a requirement to restripe the existing left turn lane for Citizens Bank to a shared center turn lane. We have located the existing striping from the entrance to Meredith Bay Development to the east side of the entrance to Dunkin Donuts and we'll be retaining a traffic engineer to prepare the traffic study and submit the required applications to DOT. At the March 10th meeting, we will expect to present to the Board a proposed center turn lane configuration for their input. Vadney – From what I could see on the site walk the other day, it looks like very scant stacking space between where people eastbound will be turning into Citizens if you want to have space for two cars, then that second car is going to be in the way of the proposed driveway. LaBrecque – DOT's initial comments to them were about centering the driveway between Irving and Etcetera, however, in light of the new center turn lane being used as not one designated right or left, but rights and lefts for any driveway in the area for which they do that multi right or left turn lane, then they may consider that conflict and maybe permit the driveway to be closer to one side or the other of the property versus it being centered between the two existing driveways. The DPW gets invited to these scoping meetings and I'll be there to voice our concern of the turning movements and to see what type of input they're given. Vadney - Because the applicant isn't here and has requested this hearing be continued if anyone has any comments we want to make, Angela can get them to the applicant in the next couple days. LaBrecque - I believe that they do not expect the site plan to change unless Lou Caron's comments come back indicating significant changes and basically it was just some beefing up of the infiltration system to put in some under drains so the water flowing out of the infiltration system doesn't undermine that bank. They were also suggesting that the parking lots of the Irving Gas Station and the bank could be connected somehow and that would alleviate some turning activity on Route 25. Vadney – I generally support those, however, this is one that could be a real problem if you start getting backups up toward the high school because of the way the summer traffic gets tied up in this area. I would be a little hesitant to go with the off-road linking. LaBrecque - The only two possible changes to the site plan is maybe that connection and maybe the driveway location being shifted, other than that I think the actual site plan itself, building, parking and infiltration, will all remain the same as was presented previously so any change would be out in the ROW. I'm willing to accept the DOT's required changes as it affects the circumstances around the site plan. Vadney – You mentioned all the changes are in the ROW and that's my concern because in

the minutes, the Board stated they would like to see more information on the Route 25 ROW on what the limits are and how it will be used because it looked to me if they have to widen the least bit the real pavement in order to put a real center turn lane in there, we end up using more of it to include a wide enough center turn lane and that kind of stuff, the radiuses these guys are allowing are 100% in the ROW and if we use some of that ROW, they don't have the radius to get into their parking lot. Lapham – I'm curious on the drive-up that was delineated and whether there was going to be an ATM on the outside of that drive-up as there is at MVSBS. There could be a problem there with vehicles exiting the site if one is proposed and if so, how are we going to handle that if one is planned. Flanders – There isn't room enough to do that. If anyone stopped at an ATM on the outside there, nobody else could get by. Lapham – I don't think there's room either, but I didn't see anything saying there isn't going to be one. Bayard – If they decide they need to widen the road slightly or even the way it's currently configured, I don't know how feasible it all gets. Vadney – We need to make sure their turning radiuses are OK. LaBrecque – I sat down with Chuck Palm, Deputy Fire Chief, and we put some turning radiuses on there and they are nearly 50 feet, which he says are OK for his trucks. Flanders – Right now this is all supposition because we don't know what the traffic engineer, the town engineer and DOT are going to come up with for changes in the driveway location so we're wasting our time now, we're just guessing about what if's, we need to wait to see what they come up with and then discuss this. Vadney – I think we've raised the issues tonight and that's all I want to do tonight because the applicant's not here to defend it in any way. LaBrecque – They have acknowledged that your major concern is the traffic turning and circulation. I think we need to make a motion to continue.

Flanders moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS PUBLIC HEARING TO MARCH 10, 2009, AS REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANT WITH NO RE-NOTIFICATION. Voted unanimously.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

1. Annual OEP Spring Planning and Zoning Conference is scheduled for Saturday, May 2, 2009, at the Radisson Hotel in Manchester, NH. Registration Deadline is Wednesday, April 22, 2009. Anyone wishing to attend should contact the P & Z office.
2. DES Annual Drinking Water Source Protection Workshop is scheduled for Friday, May 1, 2009, at the Grappone Conference Center, Concord, NH. Anyone wishing to attend this Workshop should contact the P & Z office.
3. Duration a Conditional Approval is Valid – If you guys all agree and feel comfortable with it, I can just plug in 24 months and if you want to adjust it one way or the other. Does the Board want to impose that stipulation on all applications or just subdivisions? Vadney supports the two years other than in some extraordinary cases. Less than 2 years starts to be punitive. To try to put

a one year limit on anything starts to be tight. I think we mostly got into this from the standpoint of subdivisions never got done and after a number of years, they would come back to find out where it stands. I'm not so sure on the other kinds of decisions we make whether or not we need a time limit on it. Flanders - A lot of the site plans require zoning, either special exception or variance, and after one year would expire so those types of applications would be self regulating. My suggestion is to do 24 months on subdivisions and see what happens. Bayard – Some of this stuff is only good for one year and we're doing 2 years. Once final approval is given, they are protected by statute for 4 years. They are only protected against zoning changes only. You have to make a substantial investment in the 4 years in order to keep a subdivision open.

Flanders moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE PLACE A TIME LIMIT OF 24 MONTHS ON CONDITIONAL APPROVALS FOR SUBDIVISION PLANS. Voted unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

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 _____.

William Bayard, Secretary