

Present: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Worsman, Selectmen's Rep.; Kahn; Bliss; Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Bliss moved, Sorell seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 30, 2007 (ADDENDUM TO APPROVED MINUTES) AND FEBRUARY 27, 2007, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW

1. **McFARLAND-JOHNSON, INC. FOR CROSSPOINT ASSOCIATES, INC.**
Pre-Application Conceptual Consultation to discuss a conceptual site plan review of the Meredith Shopping Center, Tax Map U15, Lots 1 & 4, located on NH Route 25 in the Central Business District.
2. **JIM MURRAY FOR SENIOR HOUSING OF NEW HAMPSHIRE** – Pre-Application Conceptual Consultation to discuss proposed development of Tax Map S17, Lots 16 & 7, located on Upper Mile Point Drive in the Shoreline District.

Senior Housing of New Hampshire is going to be affiliated with Golden View Health Care Center on Route 104 in Meredith. We have skilled nursing, rehab. nursing home and assisted living services there. Senior Housing of NH is going to be another non-profit entity that is going to have senior housing with services and we're looking to develop approximately 80 senior living units with services and it would be comprised of a mix of two and one bedrooms and studio units for elderly individuals who would need assistance with the activities of daily living. Vadney – This title, Senior Housing of New Hampshire, is this a branch of many places or is this the only Senior Housing of New Hampshire? Is this like an LLC or something? Murray – It's 501c.3. Vadney – But it's associated with Golden View? Murray – We're going to be affiliated and the attorneys are going to have to work out the specifics of that affiliation. That's pretty much where we are at this point, we're waiting for our feasibility study to be completed on the 26th. At that point, we're going to develop the material for the Site Plan Review and come back to you and then our understanding is we're going to need to go to zoning for a Special Exception. We need to get clarification exactly whether that would be a Special Exception or a Variance. I guess we just wanted to get a general sense of any questions you have that you'd like to see addressed other than what is presented in the material for the Site Plan Review. Vadney – How many acres do you have up there? Murray – Approximately 12 acres, the larger portion is commercial and the other part of the land I believe is non-waterfront Shoreline District. Vadney – This is probably stuff that's not my business but I'll ask the question just so I'll get an understanding of what's going on. You said 80 units, that's 80 individuals? Murray – Correct. Vadney – It wouldn't be like 80 couples or something like that? Murray - In a two-bedroom or one-bedroom unit, you could have a couple. Vadney – So it's 80 building units? Murray – Correct. Vadney – And some mixed combination of one's, two's and three's? Murray – Yes. Vadney – Are these basically like efficiency apartments? Murray – It will be a mix of two-bedroom, one-bedroom

and studio apartments. We did go look at other properties similar to this and there was a wide range in square footage but until we get the feasibility study back, we're not sure on what the square footage would be for the units, what the range would be. Vadney – If this is a 501.c.3., does that mean the occupants would all be low-income, government assistance? Murray – No, not necessarily. Vadney – I'm just confused as to why it's a 501.c.3. Murray – Why it is. Golden View is a 501.c.3., Taylor Home is a 501.c.3., it's basically because you're not profit driven so basically it just means any surpluses are rolled back into the property. In other words, you don't have stockholders. Vadney – I didn't realize Golden View was a 501.c.3. How is that land taxed, John? Edgar – Right now I think it's just vacant land. Vadney – No, I mean how is Golden View taxed? Building Value or is it off the roles. Edgar – I don't know off the top of my head, Mr. Chairman. I know that just to be tax exempt from a Federal point of view doesn't mean that you're tax exempt from a State of New Hampshire point of view and there are ongoing debates about that. Jim, do you know exactly how Golden View is treated off the top of your head, do you know whether you pay taxes or not? Murray – I'm not exactly sure but I know we pay taxes, I'm not sure as to the exact status of how that's worked out but it's a significant amount that's paid to the Town. Vadney – You're the first piece of land as you start up Upper Mile Point Drive? Edgar – It's the first one and the one behind it on both sides of the road. It does not include Lot 7 and it does not include the one across the street from 7. It only is 16. Worsman – For the record, we're talking about Lot 16. Vadney – John, how does that piece of land divide out density? Edgar – Let me just back up in terms of Lot 7 and I have no reason to suspect that Lot 7 is not involved other than the fact that I know we're near the height of land probably near the border between Lot 16 and Lot 7 and I do recall back many years ago, there was a resort hotel being proposed on the height of land and they ended up using part of Lot 7 to accommodate some of their drainage issues. Whether Lot 7 is involved or not, we'll have to wait and see when the survey comes in and they get into the grading but I believe I'm not sure if it's Ben himself or what the ownership structure is but I believe you essentially control both properties don't you. Murray – That's correct. The possibility certainly exists that Lot 7 could be involved somehow potentially and until we get into a design mode, we don't really know. For purposes of the agenda, I think we put both lots down as possibilities. I know Bill had met with Ben to review whether or not conventional residential densities like you would think of a typical project applies in a case of essentially the type of housing we're talking about. I don't remember exactly where it shook out on it but I know Ben has met with Bill to kind of review the whole density issue. Murray – We got some feedback from Bill regarding the nature of the building and part of the building will be a licensed health care facility and I'm not sure on the specifics but there were provisions as to how density would be applied in that situation, that it wouldn't fall under the traditional density rules. Vadney – OK, that's something we've got to pay close attention to at least. Murray – Is that a planning or a zoning issue? Edgar – In the first instance, it's a zoning issue but it affects what you're going to plan on the ground and typically the Board, when zoning questions come up, the Board is aware of that and very often it's not uncommon to have gray areas or things that have to be interpreted. In the first

instance, it's Bill's call as the Zoning Administrator, but as a practical matter, the Board has to deal with all of the ramifications on site planning aspect of it as well so it's sort of a shared responsibility but in the first sense of applying the ordinance, it's the Zoning Administrator's administrative decision that starts the process. Vadney – Water is another issue if you're talking 80 units, I don't know what the limits on that are. Edgar – One thing you'd want to do, Jim, on the water side is make it a high priority to touch base with our Water Department. We had a study done several years ago for the Board of Selectmen and the Water Department and they had flagged various capacity issues at the Treatment Plant and the Water Tower. The Selectmen have been working on several of those issues; we've implemented a rate structure change. Several years ago the Selectmen had done this study and it raised some pretty serious issues and the Selectmen and the Water Department and CIP have been working on a lot of issues so things aren't as bad off as they were understood to be a couple years back but there still are questions that come up on a case-by-case basis as to pressure and capacity. You do have a booster station in the area that I believe there is a deal that Ben's aware of with the developer of that area so there's that to be concerned about but what I would make a high priority is touching base with Bob Hill, our Water and Sewer Superintendent, and review any capacity questions that may pertain to the development of the property. The sense that I got in talking with him on other unrelated projects is that it is very often a case-by-case basis depending on variables that are beyond me to comprehend quite honestly but it's not something that you want to assume just because there is a water pipe nearby and the Water Department would really be the ones to follow up on and make sure you have in a sense guaranteed capacity in the event you move forward with the project and you want to make sure there aren't any surprises on the water side. What I'm suggesting is the #1 priority on the to do list should be to follow up with the Water Department on water capacity. We've been advising other applicants that have projects that are water dependent of the same thing. There's an analysis that comes out of the Water Department to determine whether or not there's any problems or questions with capacity, pressure, volume and those kinds of things. Bliss – Did you say this was going to be individuals and one building for assisted living; can you give us an idea of how it's going to be spread out? Murray – It's going to be one building and a portion of the building would be separate and distinct for people who have particular needs and then there would be a separate and distinct part of the building that would be for people who had other needs and we would break it down probably into at least 3 distinct areas. I believe our understanding of the information we've gotten so far is that there would be certain individuals that would be more independent and they would receive services such as housekeeping, laundry, 2 meals a day and then there would be another program that would be designed for memory support basically for people who have Alzheimer's or related dementia, that would be a separate program in a separate area of the building but all service is through the main core of the building. Bliss – Just more of a comment. I'm just wondering how the abutters on Upper Mile Point and down on the other side are going to welcome a project like this and how the applicant is going to be welcoming as far as buffers and items like that because it's my understanding there are some pretty pricy

houses on the other side of that hill and if I had that kind of house I don't necessarily know if I'd want that type of unit in that area so I'm just throwing out my opinion. Vadney – Where do you expect your driveway to come in, will it come off from Mile Point? Murray – I believe it will and also we have a 25' easement by Farah's building on Northview Drive. Edgar – Right on the shared line between 17E and 17F. That was part of an arrangement that was made when the rear lot line of 17E was adjusted and approved by the Board back when we were looking at the Tower and the office expansion that occurred. There was a Boundary Line Adjustment at that time and I think the easement was depicted on the site plan. There's also sewer on Northview Drive and as part of the utility planning, there very well could be a sewer connection running through there. When the booster station for the water went in on Upper Mile Point Drive in anticipation of providing additional service in the area, the booster station was oversized and the Selectmen had executed a capital cost recovery agreement with Walker Harmon such that if people were to tap into that system, the infrastructure that the developer had front ended, there would be some kind of a payback clause and as part of that whole development of those 2 subdivisions, there were negotiations with the principle in this project so there's probably a series of tradeoffs that were negotiated back and forth would be my guess. That will come to light when we go into a development mode. Worsman – Who owns Lot 19A? Edgar – Lots 19A and 19 are owned by the New England Forestry Foundation. They are locally known as the Storer properties. On Lot 19, there's a farmhouse and initially the property was subdivided to separate the farmhouse from the rest of the acreage and the rest of the acreage was deeded to the New England Forestry Foundation for conservation purposes. It's known as Storer Memorial Forest. There's a little sign to that effect on Route 3 down near one of the driveways, then Lot 19 was acquired as well and my understanding is there's a life estate held by the individuals that are in that house but essentially both properties from a long-term point of view will be conservation properties. Vadney – Do you have any rough idea of traffic generation for an 80-unit facility like this? Murray – We don't at this point but a large portion of the individuals won't have cars. Vadney – Sometimes it means more traffic because they have visitors. I'm sure that's an easy one to get. Edgar – What we'd be looking at there wouldn't be a full-blown traffic impact study, it would be a trip generation analysis and the Department of Transportation probably would be interested in that in terms of the impact to the roundabout that will be constructed later this year because this is the 4th leg of that intersection. Towards that end, as many times as we've all driven by the assisted living facility on Parade Road, there's 60 units there and I can't remember having to stop to wait for someone to turn left to go into the facility so generally speaking, I think given my limited knowledge in this area that these are generally relatively low trip generators. There's not going to be anywhere near the traffic you'd have from an 80-unit single-family subdivision, for example, or 80-units of conventional multi-family. Edgar – It is something that should be quantified and it's not something that's really difficult to ascertain. A Traffic Engineer would be able to do it fairly quickly. This is a private road so it gets back into some of the negotiations that Ben and Walker had about formalizing the ROW through Ben's property. I'm sure he didn't give away his

rights to access. Vadney – How does the layout of Mile Point Drive coincide with the actual realignment that the State is doing up there right now? Edgar – It's pretty close. The road was built in this ROW and the trafficked intersection was designed in part to align with this leg so if you look across the street at the property line between Lots 1 and 2, that's probably pretty much where that realignment to Parade Road is coming in to the roundabout. The tax maps are not accurate in terms of reflecting reality so Upper Ladd Hill Road will come across Lots 14 and 15 and intersect with Upper Mile Point Road coming to a "T" and there will be a landscaped panel between the Route 3 ROW and Upper Ladd Hill Road separating the 2 roads. Vadney – You mentioned that Upper Mile Point is a private road but also the last few feet of it is going to become I guess public road because it's going to tie in with the roundabout. Edgar – When you come in straight, Herb, and then you go into that "S" curve you're in a climb and then you're in that reverse curve and the road straightens out and right in the general area where the word "Mile" is, it's more or less a straight stretch and fairly flat stretch. As a practical matter, for the width they're going to need, my guess is they will be up on the wider part of the site, but even if they are getting back to Pam's concern, if they are not using Lot 7, they control a substantial amount of distance between them and the subdivision from a buffering point of view. I don't know how many of you were on the Board when the Brick Manor expanded, there were all kinds of perceptions that were thrown at the Board in terms of visual images of folks sort of zombieish walking the streets because they heard about something down in the southern tier, someone got loose so we did a whole bunch of research at the time on security issues and you'll probably want to be ready for those questions in terms of doors, bracelets, locking systems and cameras and that kind of thing when you have a dementia unit like that, people can wander and there have been reports of people wandering not necessarily in Meredith but those were questions that were raised when a facility such as the Brick Manor abutted other residential areas and we went through all the questions with the licensure folks and had the assurances, because the abutters had called for a chain link fence or some kind of a perimeter fence. Worsman – How many units do you have at Golden View? Murray – We're licensed for a capacity of 126 people but we utilize some of those units just as private units even though they are licensed for two people. We have 15 assisted-living units and that part of the building is licensed for 22 and then we have 110 licensed nursing home beds, but we only utilize 106 of those at a maximum capacity. The maximum capacity we would have at any one time would be 121 people. Worsman – When you bring all this forward, you've got sewer and water generation from that facility now, those would be pretty important when you talk to Bob to compare whether you're going to be hitting our capacity or not. You do have a system you're using and you have some of those numbers available. Murray agreed. Edgar – The use would be subject to the Architectural Review Ordinance whether you bring it in with the Site Plan or following the Site Plan, the Board would be looking at the exteriors. The Board typically is not going to get into internal floor plan issues, it would be pretty much exterior elevations and as I mentioned to you before, let me know when you've selected an architect. When you get a little further along with the civil engineer selection, certainly encourage

them to touch base with us at a staff level and we will do what we can to flag as much as we can on the front end. I just want to re-emphasize one more time the importance of touching base with Bob Hill on utility capacity questions, because if there is a problem, you need to find that out early on. Bayard – Just to reiterate a little bit what Pam said and especially in terms of trying to retain, I don't know how much vegetation is up there, but you're going to have a fairly large building and it would be nice to keep some of the trees and stuff if you can in the area rather than cut the whole place down, build and then drop in a couple of maples or whatever as people often do. It would be nice to put it in its natural scene if you can. Vadney – Traffic planning should be pretty straightforward but there would certainly be a questions to be answered, water, lighting, layout, so far you've said somewhere up on that land and in theory I don't see how we can oppose the idea of somebody putting in an 80-unit assisted living hospital, if you will, residential care. Sorell – What zone is it in? Edgar – I think it's Central Business on the Route 3 corridor side and non-waterfront shoreline on the rear. The rest would just be administrative and Board action for Boundary Line Adjustments. Edgar – In this case, depending on where the development falls, I'm not sure if they'll need any boundary work or not. It really depends on how the building is situated. They do control both properties; they could also accommodate it with easements. Bayard – The obvious stuff is fire, police and those kinds of things. I assume it would have to be sprinklered, right? Edgar – I would follow up again with Bill on the zoning to make sure, as your thinking evolves, that you've got his readout on which district applies and the density and all like that. As you're deciding to move forward and getting a little more formal, you want to touch those bases again and make full use of us at the staff level to answer questions. One thing we've seen happen on some other bigger projects if the architect's decision in terms of how they pigeon hole the building is critical to which codes apply and that should be reviewed by our guys jointly up front to make sure there are no surprises down the way. You don't want to go through all the site planning work and then find out there's an interpretive question on a building code that could have been resolved early on. We've had a couple go that way that needed course correction after a lot of money had been spent on a building. Murray – I believe Dave Dolan is handling the survey and zoning issues for us and he was following up on that today and I'm hoping to hear back from him this week with what he found out. Bayard – If you want to come in again with a pre-app because usually pre-apps are a little more defined when we see them, but for larger projects, we have had people come in 2 or 3 times even, sometimes with the pre-app before they even go forward and I think it's productive. Vadney – I would agree with that if there are things that you're not sure how we'd go on them, just come ask us a simple question. It is better to do it when the paper's blank than when you've already started. Edgar – The next level would be pre-application, what we're doing now is a conceptual discussion. There's nothing really defined. The next level is pre-application design review so once you get your survey and you have something to look at on paper and if there are some ideas you're kicking around and want some feedback on some aspect of design, that would be the next step. Another advantage of Design Review is the law requires that we notify abutters and that's another early way relatively to get abutter

input. The more you can flush out early on, the better it is when you're in a more formal mode. In some projects, people have opted to knock on some doors and not wait for certified mail to come out of my office. A lot of times people will come in with a perception that something bad is going to happen and it's an uphill process for everybody to get comfortable with change and so some folks elect to knock on some doors and introduce themselves to the neighbors and to talk about the project more informally before something comes from my office by certified mail. Murray – Right now we're basically just waiting on a feasibility study and it may come back and say it's not going to be 80 units; it's going to be 60 units. Basically, the feasibility study will tell us what's feasible to build based on the demographics of the area and once we get a unit number, then the architects can do the footprint and begin to put together something for you to look at more formally. Vadney – The more you come back to us up front will really save you money in the long run because you don't want to start designing something that's going to run into a snag.

CORRESPONDENCE

Edgar – Mr. Chairman, we do have one correspondence item in front of you from Dave Dolan. This has to do with the Guilbeault subdivision that we conditionally approved in February for two house lots being carved off the host lot. The main lot has the house behind the wetlands that we saw and as part of the staff review, I flagged the fact that we had this wetland crossing to the rear lot, the developed lot, and had recommended that the plan reference related driveway and wetland permits for that property so the subdivision plan when recorded would have a record of all related permits. When they did that review, they found that the wetland crossing that we kind of parked near when we drove on the property had gone through a local review and approval through the ZBA but had not been through the Dredge & Fill process so they immediately filed an after-the-fact Dredge & Fill Application with NHDES and that is pending. The substance of this letter dated March 9th in light of the fact that they had obtained the Special Exception and noted that on the plan, the two proposed lots, the real focus of the subdivision, do not have any wetland permits required. They've noted on the plan the DES Dredge & Fill Permit is pending and addressed all the other conditions. This letter is requesting the Board to consider signing the mylar and recording it given the fact the plan contains a note that the Dredge & Fill on the host lot is pending and all the other conditions have been met. Dave goes on to say that he appreciates the Board's consideration and is respectful of the Board's decision as it must consider all the best interests of the community as well as the applicant's desire to move forward so Dave asks that we bring this to your attention for your consideration. Bayard – Obviously, we're not intending to set any precedent here. It appears to have been an oversight that John caught and this may be a reasonable way of dealing with it, not desirable, but reasonable. Kahn – The only question I have, there's no point in holding up these folks with the subdivision but on whose calendar does this remain so we make sure it eventually gets done? Edgar – I've brought it to Bill's attention as well from a code point of view or an enforcement point of view and they have filed. They have not shirked it at all when

this was uncovered by Dave; he was looking to find the permit and couldn't find it. He found the Town's permit but not the State permit. Within a matter of a couple of days, they did the additional fieldwork and filed the application so they jumped right on it. Some ball was dropped a couple years ago but we're aware of it, Bill's aware of it and we'll keep an eye on it. Kahn – So it's Bill's open file.

Bayard moved, Kahn seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ALLOW FOR THE MYLAR TO BE SIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER FROM DAVE DOLAN DATED MARCH 9, 2007. Voted unanimously.

Bayard – Just keep in mind this is not considered a precedent for future purposes.

Edgar – The last thing I have, Mr. Chairman, this was initially driven by the Board's position that was taken back in January on moving forward with development of a cluster provision for consideration in 2008 and I just wanted to outline some of the things that in addition to development review and supporting all the different Boards and Committees, these are some of the highlights I'd like to be shooting for this year. First off, according to Carol, the Board of Selectmen will be finalizing their appointments April 2nd at which time they will decide who the ex-officio representative will be and then at our meeting following that we would be in a position to have our organizational meeting and just for everyone's information Herb, Ed and Lou's terms are expiring. They each have sought reappointment and presumably that will all be taken care of on the second of April. At our meeting on the 10th, we would have our election of officers, we would determine who the Planning Board's rep is to the CIP and then we would move forward. As we move forward, in my budget and the Town's budget is a provision included for an additional staff Planner position. This is an important position that will at some point assume some of my responsibilities regarding development review and others. Obviously, that will be part of the budget discussion tomorrow night. We hope to begin recruitment for this position thereafter and most importantly I'd like the Board to think about having a representative participate in the interview process. Whether it's the Chairman or someone else, I think there should be a Board representative. I haven't talked with Carol about this but I'm sure she'll be agreeable. It's ultimately her appointment but she will be looking for my recommendation. The Assistant Planner would basically be assuming a lot of responsibilities in working with you guys, not exclusively, ultimately I'm going to be responsible for the development review process but the person is going to be helping out on a lot of fronts not the least of which will be development review.

Vadney – My concern on this is I don't believe in hiring Planning Interns because you spend all your time training them and then they go somewhere else and you start training another one.

Edgar – If we don't get the right candidate, there's no reason to move forward. We have to make sure we get a well rounded person with some good experience that can fill a couple different roles as the case may be and that's how we're going to market the opening.

Vadney – I'd like to see the job description written to not specify Planner but to say you want a Planner and/or Surveyor and/or Civil Engineer, try to pick up somebody who's got experience.

The trouble with planning is often times there might be a surveyor out there that's retired and wants part-time work and he or she would be up to speed but they are not going to apply for it because it is call a Planner's job.

Edgar – The second thing I wanted to point out and this follows up on a discussion we had back when we were looking at the zoning petitions and that is the Natural Resource Inventory that is under the domain of the Conservation Commission. The second phase of that work will be wrapped up probably in April or early May and this could very well be an important tool we'd be using in the future to help guide regulatory changes, not the least of which might be cluster and so I'm just flagging here and I'll keep you posted that as that presentation is scheduled, it's important for as many of the Planning Board members to participate in that and learn as much as we can about the NRI and the significance of what the consultant's done. Depending on how that review goes and what the flavor of the Board is, it very well could or should be an amendment to the Community Plan. Most importantly, I wanted to mention the issue of the Cluster Ordinance. Whether we had an approved amendment or defeated amendment tonight, the bottom line is that we need to work on it. I've kind of laid out here what I think is important. I think it's important that we get started this spring and have opportunities for public participation. I've gathered copies of 10 or 12 other ordinances in other communities as well as some other reference materials and I'll be in a position to start collating that information in some fashion for the Board but I think we need to have a public participation process and following that we would get into a drafting mode and perhaps another informational meeting in the summer on the draft that we've come up with. I want to make sure we're all on the same wave length in terms of going forward with this as a priority in 2007. Vadney – I just wanted to say there are 2 or 3 things I think you probably already have been thinking about but I want to emphasize them here so we can start thinking about these. One is the very title of "cluster". Three hundred and something people voted against this tonight, probably partly just because the word "cluster" scares them a little bit and I've read in various planning documents, the idea stays the same but if you can throw a better word at it calling it "planned open space" or "housing with set asides" or whatever you might want to call it, something where the first word isn't cluster right in their face. Another thing is what size to use? I guess we'll look at rewriting it for the whole Town but at any rate you have to have a pretty good reason to pick the number of 3 acres, 10 acres, etc., and each of those has its benefits and its problems. Another thing is the bonus. Right now we say the Planning Board can give up to a 10% bonus which doesn't apply to very much unless you've got a lot of land to get that bonus and because it doesn't come in partial increments, it only kicks in at the bigger picture. As far as I know we have no criteria of what we would bounce that against so if you're going to put something in there like bonuses, I think we should aim at having some criteria so that a person reading our ordinance would say if I'm willing to not be anywhere near wetlands, etc., I'll get this bonus. Edgar – The underlying thing I think will be important is philosophically what, if anything, would be a basis for providing a bonus. We've had this bonus provision, you've never pulled the trigger, probably because it's so confusing but

we've never gotten into a real 10% bonus. Vadney – We have no criteria at all. Edgar - A lot of the ordinances will get probably a little bit too complicated but as a matter of philosophy, do we need a bonus and if so, under what circumstances. It's typically an incentive to do something and if someone is going to get a bonus above and beyond what anybody else would get for going down this road, what is the quid pro quo? That's just something to be thinking about. One thing that comes to my mind, if we had a piece of property for which we wanted to insist upon public access, just as an example, that would be over the top a little bit to require that of everybody that dedicated open space but if someone is willing to provide an easement to the Town is going to guarantee public access, that might be an example where we throw a bone at somebody. When I do the research I'll be giving you examples of what other towns have done and why they've done it but that's something to be thinking about because one end of the extreme would be you shouldn't have to give them a bonus to do the right thing. This is going to be the right thing when we're done with this whole layout option so one extreme would be why give someone a bonus to do the right thing and that sort of gets back to some of the criticisms we've heard about not encouraging more growth than would otherwise happen. On the other hand, you want people to pull this trigger, you want people to do this kind of layout and so do we need to guide people to that option? Vadney – You actually have an extreme further than that, do you make clustering or planned open space mandatory or with a fallback to not do cluster, does that have to be the first option? Edgar – And that sort of ties back into the NRI because the NRI is going to fine-tune 10 areas in the community or so where we have something very special, unspoiled and very exemplary for this community in terms of habitat, forest features and combinations of features and these have been pretty well documented and they will be pretty well defined in this April presentation. What if a project wants to put 50 houses in the middle of one of the areas? There may be a circumstance that triggers a requirement that we do make it a required not an optional plan. That's something to think about. Do we go that far or not? Are there circumstances where we want to say that this is the way we subdivide under certain circumstances or not? If we make it too complicated and too expensive to go this route for purposes of the planning side of it, it will be a disincentive for people to do it so in some respects we kind of have to keep this in mind that we can get so caught up in the complexity of the regulation that someone's going to say, why do I want to do this? Worsman – One piece of that, because the bonus has always gotten me, I'm thinking of just the Pease Road subdivision that we're working on. The developer will benefit from the cluster, he's not going to have to be putting roads all over the place, he's not going to have to be going down over the hill, so from the developer's point of view, it's a huge cost savings to be able to consolidate everything all in one small area. Why should we give him a bonus for something that's going to save him money anyway but I do want to add the provisions that the Fire Chief had talked about, i.e., the distance between houses, we want to make sure we don't have them so close that we create another entire issue that people are on top of each other and therefore constantly arguing with each other. Edgar – I think in terms of Ironwood's case we haven't provided any bonuses but the point is well taken that there is a benefit

that's accruing just by virtue of going to reduced lot sizes which means reduced road lengths and which means reduced cost and so therein lies sort of this philosophical divide. Is there already enough benefit accruing to a developer such that you don't need to provide any bonuses or is there a subset of potential scenarios whereby a bonus would be appropriate and I use the public access as one scenario. That is something to be thinking about and as you go to the April planning conference and you talk to any colleagues or do any of your homework, be thinking these terms because I'll lay out some options and do some research but at the end of the day some of these forks in the road are going to be decisions you guys have to make to give guidance on the actual drafting of the language. Kahn – I would say we're premature in trying to discuss exactly what sort of terms we're going to have in terms of bonuses, size of lots and things like that. I think we should be thinking of it in terms of not only the FC District but the FR District as well because we're going to have the problem out there too. My guess is what we come up with for those districts will not fit for other districts so we're probably going to end up with two models. What we need to start with is kind of a shopping list of what we could do and I don't see that there's any point in trying to discuss it now. On the other hand, I really don't want to be going to public meetings during the holidays. I think if we can't get it done by then, we should give up for another year. Edgar – To be a little more positive about it, I think if there's a consensus expressed tonight to move forward, we'll be hitting the ground running after the NRI meeting. I think that meeting will be an important element of all this. Worsman – I think the community is expecting us to go forward with this provision. Over the last year in the Forestry/Conservation District, the people have spoken and said, we don't want it, we don't like it, do something about it. We said we will do something about it so we've got to do it. Bayard – This is perhaps between John and I because I don't know if anyone else showed up but if you recall, we went to a meeting where there was a discussion about clusters and the guy gave a good slide show on them so besides the fact that there is material to take away from that which I thought was good, we might want to consider some type of slideshow if you're going out to the Rotary, the Legion or other groups, it might be a good way to show what a good cluster is and what a bad one is and here's how we plan on directing toward the good ones. Edgar – I think part of the public participation process in the first instance is really educational and what is the potential of a good ordinance. I'm actually meeting with my colleague from Laconia to share ideas as to what their issues were and what they found out through their research and some of the things we've been talking about and I'll be doing that with other colleagues. We'll be getting some reference materials from the gentleman you spoke about because there are guides and models we might be able to use. Vadney – I don't know that this has to wait until the NRI is done; we couldn't complete it until the NRI probably is done. Edgar – I'm not going to wait, it's just that in terms of having a public informational meeting to try to do something between now and April is probably pushing it. We're all on the same page; we are going to move forward and I'll be moving forward posthaste on my pieces of it and start feeding you information and a few things will be coming together in the spring and we'll get cracking. One other item I wanted to mention, when we conditionally approve

projects, they are made subject to any road standard waiver issues that have to be addressed by the Selectmen and Colette and I have labored through enough of those and as part of our goal-setting discussions with the Selectmen, they agreed that based upon a lot of my input and their own views is that we really need to improve upon these regulations. Not the least of which is the fact that they don't really belong as a Selectmen's Ordinance. The NHMA's advised us that they are really subdivision regulations so that's where they really belong but the trick is going to be to make sure that we develop these standards in a way that we have consensus between the Selectmen, who would be on the receiving end of acceptance inquiries, and this Board that is signing off on projects and has the regulatory authority and the staff that is dealing with all the nitty gritty. By staff, I mean myself, Public Works, Fire Department those kinds of agencies that would have an interest in road standards. We've done some work, I put a fairly extensive outline together and the Selectmen have made it a priority of theirs to want to move that ball forward from that point of view, I think my sense of some of the Selectmen's meetings that I've been to is I think it's getting bogged down and stuff that probably doesn't need to be on their plate at that point in time. It is important that whatever the Planning Board approves and however we get there is in such a way that the standards themselves don't become an issue whenever something comes back before the Selectmen for possible acceptance and that's really what all the guidance is out there from the different legal authorities. There are structural kinds of components to the rewrite, there's need for flexibility and we're going to deal with a few of them. For example, we are going to deal with some of that cluster stuff that Ironwood's looking at which is not all that different quite frankly what we have out at Grouse Point which is a clustered condominium where you have some common driveways servicing a larger number of units. Trying to deal with a variety of issues that have cropped up over the years on road-related issues is an important priority. I don't know yet if the Selectmen have determined in their minds the strategy on how to improve these regs but as a practical matter, it is going to involve a high level of coordination between this Board and the Select Board. There is some money in the budget intended to provide for the technical support that we would need when we get into the engineering kind of questions. It was a Selectmen's priority in '06 as an '07 goal and I don't see that changing and we'll have to spend some time in workshops between the Boards and the staff to get to the finished product. There's nothing earth shattering relative to the fees other than the fact that they were promulgated in 1986. As part of anticipating the budget review, I pulled together about 8 or 10 communities, many of which are surrounding the lake, similar size communities from other parts of the State to see how people deal with their application fees in terms of both the methodology in calculating the fees and the fees themselves. We weren't as far out of whack as I thought we would be but there is definitely a need to upgrade the fees. The Department generated \$135,000 in departmental revenue but the bulk, which was about 67% of that revenue, was building permit related and not planning application or Planning Board related. It was a result of a major overhaul of the building fees that was done a year or so prior. The subdivision and site plan fees totaled about \$12,000-\$13,000. 00, which is a drop in the bucket compared to the amount of time

we put into these applications. A lot of that is a customer service, community service thing but it does suggest that we should take a look at them. I will pull the information together for your review so you can see some comparisons and contrasts with other communities and we'll have that discussion. It takes the shape of a regulation amendment to adopt a new fee structure. Bayard – I think it is nice that we provide a service and all but on the other hand, some of these projects are multi-million dollar projects in which we're doing an awful lot of the architectural, engineering, etc., design work for someone that could perhaps be doing some of it either on his own or at least paying a more significant share of it so I'm not adverse to having somewhat higher fees. The other thing you can do is put a cost-of-living escalator in and maybe round it to the nearest dollar or \$10 dollars so it doesn't have to be reviewed as often. Probably one of the reasons you found the other ones are low, they probably haven't done a review in 10 years either. Worsman – I was the one pushing for the Planning Board fees. I'm trying to get each of the departments to be more cost-effective as well as cover the fees that their department costs. It may be a customer service department but who are the developers that are coming in, they are not from Meredith, they are from Massachusetts, Connecticut or Rhode Island. It's not customer service for our local people. Bliss – I think for as big a project they came in on today, they should have been a little bit more prepared. Because if John is customer service or whatever, we're volunteers I don't really want to sit here for an hour and he didn't even have the design up there. I think we should have some type of a stipulation saying we are willing to help and this is what we are looking for. Vadney – I want to echo what Pam said. Crosspoint came in for the October Farm facility and they pretty much had nothing to say. Basically, they said that's the building we're interested in and we're going to make it better. They had no detail other than the supermarket part would be 30,000 sq. ft. In that case, they sat in the back of the room for about 4 hours and then got up and had nothing to say. At the same time, we do want to have pre-apps where we can help these guys out early but we don't want to do too much of their work. Edgar – Let me explain how it works and if you want me to direct some emphasis differently, I'd be happy to do it. I have been encouraging applicants in the contemplative stage to at least come in and let you know something is going on to dispel the rumor mill, here's the team, here's generally what we're doing and they weren't expected to have a lot of plans tonight. This wasn't in lieu of a design review, this was a pre-con conceptual. The same with the shopping center, there's rumor mill central all over town as to what's this and I encouraged them to come in at their earliest convenience to meet with you to at least say I'm the one that bought it, here's my engineer, we haven't spent a lot of time figuring it out yet but at least we are the ones so if you have any thoughts or issues, let us know. If you'd rather I not encourage people to come in at that level, I can certainly convey that. Bliss – I enjoy that they come in but I don't think we should spend an hour on a pre-app that they have no meat in yet. I don't think that's a good use of our time. Vadney – You could have given us the update they gave us without them. I guess the thing that surprised me is that he didn't seem to even know where the lot was, he wasn't sure of the size, he didn't know where the driveway would be coming off. Bayard – I didn't think the October Farm one was

bad. This one didn't seem to have enough information. Edgar – As a practical matter, I think you have to realize we get everything from home occupations and people that draw on the back of napkins to major developers. Bayard – I didn't get much out of this one for an 80-unit project.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey

Administrative Asst., Planning & Zoning

The minutes were reviewed and approved at a regular meeting of the Planning Board held on _____.

William Bayard, Secretary