

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

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Kahn nominated the following slate of officers for the coming year: Bliss seconded. Voted unanimously.

Herb Vadney, Chairman
Roger, Vice-Chairman
William Bayard, Secretary

Finer moved, Kahn seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 27, 2007, AS PRESENTED. Six (6) voted in favor, 1 abstention.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **MEREDITH VILLAGE SAVINGS BANK:** Proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use to establish professional offices, Tax Map U07, Lot 109, located at 8 NH Route 25 in the Central Business District.

The applicant proposes a change of use to convert second floor unoccupied commercial space to a small 990 sq. ft. law office. The second floor space has been previously used as apartments and for retail storage. The subject building is the white building located in between the new MVSB office building and the building on the corner of Route 3 and 25. No work would occur to the exterior of the building and there is no site work with the exception of a small landscaped walkway. The application, project narrative and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Due to the limited nature of the proposal, the applicant has requested that the Planning Board waive a formal plan submittal requirement. I would recommend that this waiver be granted and the application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE REQUEST OF MEREDITH VILLAGE SAVINGS BANK FOR A CHANGE OF USE. Voted unanimously.

2. **REALGREEN LAND & LAWN CARE, LLC:** Proposed Site Plan Amendment to create a storage area for landscape materials, i.e., mulch, loam and stone with related site improvements/parking, Tax Map S15, Lot 31, located at 470 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

The applicant seeks to amend the second phase portion of an approval that the Planning Board granted in late 2006. The Phase I building, about a 1,500 sq. ft. building and parking construction of 7 spaces, are essentially complete except for final stabilization that will occur this spring. The proposed amendment would replace the Phase 2 portion of the building that has not yet been constructed with an area for outside retail sales and storage of landscaping material such as loam and mulch, as well as an additional 10 spaces for retail customers. There are no changes to the third phase which remains at a conceptual level. The application, site plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. I recommend the application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Sorell seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR REALGREEN LAND AND LAWN CARE, LLC. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **MEREDITH VILLAGE SAVINGS BANK:** (Rep. Lee Mattson) Sorell stepped down.

Lee Mattson – The office that the Bank is proposing to have approval for is for me. It's on the second floor in the front of the building next door to the Bank. It's very simple, it's been renovated somewhat inside with new wiring for internet, telephone and outlets, painted and cleaned up a little bit. Outside there's going to be a paved walkway about 2 feet wide and 20 feet long. Edgar – There's a correspondence item from Alison Whynot from the Bank in your packet. The law office will consist of one attorney, one full-time employee and one part-time employee and the applicant has requested the Board waive any additional parking requirements associated with proposed use on the basis that the existing parking on the site is controlled by the bank and is adequate to support the additional use. It's a pretty straightforward change of use. I think this is unique to the extent that the Bank does control both adjoining parking areas and its an existing structure that has been used previously as apartments so there is some history of the use of the site. Vadney – We did look at this piece of land in great detail about a year and a half ago and that whole corner is owned by the Bank, right. Edgar – That's correct. One thing I spoke with Alison about and she's here in the audience if you have any questions of the Bank and that is some of the parking for this use could probably occur in that lot in between the building and the pizza shop, a couple of spaces along the white building. On occasion those parking spaces have been used for outside retail display and that parking lot is not approved for outside retail display. We spoke about it and the Bank ha assured me that they would be bringing that to the attention of their client to make sure that valuable parking is not occupied by displays. Basically, if you think of one per employee and some amount for an occasional closing kind of

thing, you're only looking at a magnitude of probably 3 or 4 spaces maximum and the Bank's view is that between the parking in the immediate area that they control and the history of the site, they believe those parking spaces can be absorbed by what they already have. Bliss – I have a question as far as which side will the entrance on. Is it on the Bank side or the parking lot side? Mattson – The Bank side, there's a stairway that leads to the second floor that starts about halfway down the side of the building on the Bank side that goes straight up. Bliss – Is that where some of the parking will be? Mattson – No. Bliss – So they'll have to walk around the building. Mattson – The parking comes to within about 10 feet or so of the building and then the walkway that will be constructed will go in a straight line in between the Bank and the white building parallel to the sides of each of them to the doorway and it won't continue to the street, it's just going to come from the back. Vadney – I looked at that the other day and it appears that door hasn't been used much lately. There was no walkway to it.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE MEREDITH VILLAGE SAVINGS BANK'S PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR A CHANGE OF USE TO ESTABLISH PROFESSIONAL OFFICES ON THE SECOND FLOOR, TAX MAP U07, LOT 109, LOCATED AT 8 NH ROUTE 25 IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. THE PLANNING BOARD ACCEPTS THE WAIVER OF ADDITIONAL PARKING ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND THE BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

2. **REALGREEN LAND AND LAWN CARE, LLC:** (Rep. Harry Wood)

Wood – Our proposal is to amend the previous site plan that was approved. You may recall that the previous application called for a 120' long combination warehouse structure along the side of Route 3 and as a part of Phase 1, they erected a 30' x 50' section of that building for Real Green's use only. They decided not to put up the entire building. At this time, they'd like to amend the previous approval to allow storage and sales of lawn care landscaping materials in the same location where the building would have been placed before. The grade on the site would be raised to the point that was called for in the original site plan and landscaping type blocks would be placed along the setback on Route 3 and the materials would be stored behind those. There would be such things as ledge pack, mulch and other landscape surface materials that could be sold to the public. The second sheet of the original plan which was the engineering and drainage for the site remains exactly the same. With regard to the previous landscaping plan, unfortunately due to the prolongation of winter, we don't have that in place yet but it is coming very soon. There were two amendments to the landscaping plan that was submitted to you for plantings along the side of the building to help soften that up a little bit if you've been up that way on Route 3 North, you'll notice

that the building just sits up by itself a little bit and that is due to 2 reasons, the grade on the southerly side of the building was not brought up to its full height along the entire length because they are only putting up one-fourth of the building, that will now come up to the original grade and the plantings along the side of the building will help soften that. You may recall that there were plantings along the 30' setback strip along the side of Route 3. There also will be a couple of extra medium size trees placed along the abutter's sideline because in construction of the drainage swale and whatnot that were in that area, it was necessary to take out a couple of the trees that were there so they plan to replace those. It's somewhat of a simplification and less intense use probably than would have occurred if the entire building were erected. We have proposed to have 10 additional parking spaces placed in the Center Harbor portion of the property. I think you have a letter from Center Harbor indicating that if those parking spaces are 10 feet from the boundary or if we have a letter from the abutter, they do not consider it necessary to have site plan review for that parcel. We did find after construction, I was doing some additional mapping and we noticed that the shed that's shown on the property to the rear of the main building was 1.7 feet over the town line. They own the adjacent property so that's not overly critical. What we were trying to avoid with that originally was to escape Center Harbor's jurisdiction. We've indicated on the plan that we intend to move the structure, it is capable of moving it, however, the owner has opened the discussion with Center Harbor and will determine whether or not they go to Center Harbor for what would essentially be a variance or they will move the building, one or the other, and I simply would report back what they have chosen to do with regard to that. I think the original plan called for the building to be totally in Meredith, we were simply trying to avoid the taxation problems that arise when you end up straddling a town line but during construction that particular building was not staked for its location and when they got all done and looked at it real seriously, they found out that one corner was across the line. That's essentially the presentation. Edgar – Harry pretty much covered it. It's pretty straightforward, all the utilities are existing at this point because we've implemented Phase 1, we're tied into the sewer, we have an underground electrical service, we have an amended DOT Permit relative to the switchouts and uses. We do have written confirmation from the design engineer that the project will not affect the previously approved design plans. The owner has confirmed that site stabilization for Phases 1 and 2 would occur this spring. The owner has also confirmed that the back wall of the material bins facing Route 3 would be anchored. This is a question that came up in staff review as to whether or not there would be any safety considerations with a block wall in that location, not only will it be anchored but it's basically going to be one block high which is 2 feet so it's not a significant wall in terms of height, it's basically one row of blocks that are about approximately 2 feet high and then they would also be screened with some landscaping in that area. The dumpster location has been relocated on the site plan as indicated and would be screened. It would be located on the south side of the building. That's

pretty much it, I think from a conditional point of view we're just dealing with the final resolution of the building location either relocated as per the original plan or some level of relief from the Town of Center Harbor and the issue of review and amend. Other than that it's fairly straightforward. Vadney – I do want to make one comment that when this came before us in the past, of course, it had architectural design review. I remember there was a long discussion about the roof line and the cupola on top of the building and a number of other things and now I'm seeing where the building won't be there, there will be a row of blocks and you just mentioned they are 2 feet high? Edgar – It is my understanding the block dimensions are 2 feet high and there would be one row of them so essentially the blocks would be visible. Vadney – These will probably be the leftover concrete blocks they make out at the cement plant and used for that type. Edgar – I don't know if they are leftover or made for that purpose but the landscape plan, I have the amended one here and essentially they will be running 8 shade trees along the street and then there would a series of about 3 or 4 groupings of shrubbery planted in front of that wall to break it up but here again it's only going to be 2 feet high. Vadney – That is something over the years we've tried to maintain the entries to town with a reasonable look and sometimes they take those road barrier type concrete blocks and they don't add much to the area. I'm think these are probably.. Wood – Mr. Chairman, a jersey barrier is almost twice as high so this is a very minor containment. The entire purpose of it is simply so that you can push against the material behind it and scoop it up. Vadney – These are basically the 2' x 2' x 4' kind of block. Wood – That's correct. They are very similar to the blocks in front of this building, only they are not granite. Vadney – That's my only concern is that we do want to keep that looking relatively nice. Edgar – I had spoken to the applicant about it and that's why they had amended the landscaping plan to beef up some of the shrubbery plantings in that area. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, I guess I have two concerns. One is I travel that way to work every day and while the building and stuff looks good and it's an improvement, it does look out of place on that small piece of land and I'm a little concerned that the grade is going to be built up, it's already pretty high up there so I'm a little leery, I know there is more land out in the back but I don't know if this is proper, that's just my feeling. Kahn – I was just going to suggest, I heard John say they were going to plant shade trees along Route 3. If you are concerned about screening the blocks and the stuff piled behind them, it seems to me it would be more appropriate to have a screen of evergreens, you get a better effect. Edgar – I think the idea was kind of a combination of both. The reality is that they are retailing mulch and loam and that type of thing. Our concern we had at the staff level was not knowing what the initial height of the wall was and kind of envisioned something 6' or 8' high, kind of like a prison wall effect and in the context of the gateway considerations that would have been way too much so that was clarified that basically they are going to be 2 feet off the ground and have a series of landscape plantings that will break it up so I don't think that's going to be visually obtuse. Vadney – I do caution you though, Bill Finer made a

statement a minute ago and he's correct, there are a number of places where they have some of these similar barriers which are only 2 feet high and they use those to corral the low stuff and push against with their lifts but they bring in the truckloads of stuff and there's piles of bark there 20'-30' high sometimes and they really fill them up. There are some big piles. Edgar – From my point of view I wasn't thinking that the piled material was going to be particularly disruptive visually, I was thinking more of the height of the concrete and what that would look like if you just had a barren concrete wall 6' high and 30-40' long or something that could look pretty radical but it's one block high with landscaping. I personally don't see it as being something that's going to look terribly out of place. Vadney – With the right to review and amend I guess we could watch it. Worsman – Any salt or anything like to be stored on-site? Harris – (inaudible -no mike) Worsman -You do have salt? Does that create any kind of drainage issue we need to flag? Edgar – Is that similar to what we looked at on Waukegan Street. Harris – Yes, that's stored under cover. Edgar – But it does raise a follow-up question. What would be stored outside and the reason I ask is to follow-up on the water quality angle? Its one thing to have bark, mulch and loam, is there anything that could be stored outside that would represent a water quality issue relative to Hawkins Brook? Harris – No (inaudible – no mike). The mulch will be at the back of that proposed (inaudible-no mike). Wood – Mr. Chairman, in response to Mrs. Bliss concern about raising the land; it would not be raised any higher than that in the vicinity of the building now. It's just a perpetuation of the original designed grade. I think there's about a 1 foot drop over the 120' just to ensure drainage. Vadney – Is this abandonment of the approval we gave for the building or is this temporary storage of mulch but later on come back for the building? Edgar – My understanding is its a complete site plan amendment that would replace the prior approval so if a year from now change their minds and want to put the building back, they've got to come back to you. Hearing closed at 7:29 p.m.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE REALGREEN LAND AND LAWN CARE, LLC, PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO CREATE A STORAGE AREA FOR LANDSCAPE MATERIALS WITH RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, TAX MAP S15, LOT 31, LOCATED AT 470 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION TO BE HANDLED ADMINISTRATIVELY: (1) THAT THERE BE A RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUE REGARDING THE SHED THAT IT EITHER BE MOVED OR SOME NOTIFICATION FROM CENTER HARBOR THAT ITS ACCEPTABLE EITHER THROUGH VARIANCE OR SOME SORT OF LETTER AND ALSO THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS #7 AND #17. Voted 5-2 in favor of the motion.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEWS

1. **STEPHEN T. HALLETT FOR STEPHEN T. HALLETT CHILDREN'S TRUST - TRUST** – Pre-Application Conceptual Consultation to discuss a 16-unit multi-family development on Tax Map U03, Lot 14, located on Westview Drive and Massachusetts Avenue in the Residential District.

Steve Hallett – I'm here with my engineering firm, Tri-Tech Engineering out of Dover, NH, Robert Stohl and Doug Larosa – I've just handed to you the Project Narrative and a small set of the plans as to what we're proposing for the site. This is the Gerrity property just above the lumber company on the hill overlooking Lake Waukegan and we have gone back and forth with 4 or 5 schematic plans calling for more units and so forth and as you can note on the plan there is a lot of wetland down below and after meeting with Mr. Edgar and his staff at various times, we came back to this smaller rendition of 16 units. This building I've actually built down on Kittery Point right over the bridge from Portsmouth and it's the same structure. In my process of doing Meredith Bay Village, I've had quite a few people ask for a certain type of product and this will meet that need for some of those people. Doug Larosa – Mr. Hallett has employed us to help him with his development on Tax Map U03, Lot 14. As he said this is the former Gerrity property that's approximately 9.36 acres. His proposed use is a 16-unit Residential development. We realize we are close to a designated wetland so we've tried to be sensitive with our lot design. This brown line indicates the 100' designated wetland buffer. We also have a small area of wetland at the bottom of the existing ROW to this property. We are going to have to go through that wetland to access the property, that's the only access point so we realize that we'll be going for a Special Exception as well. Again, each of these units are laid out so there's a foundation that comes up, these will be set up above and have a good view of Lake Waukegan. There will be a one-car drive under on each of them, one car parking behind potentially and each space has another available parking spot so there should be adequate parking for these units. The topography, of course, slopes downhill. Up here at Mass Avenue, we're coming downhill. We go down about 30' across the site. That does add the potential for views but it also does add for a little bit of delicate handling in the grading and the water drainage. Hallett – We would be incorporating a couple of things into this. (1) There is an existing access easement that isn't utilized that runs this length of the property line down so we propose to upgrade that and add stairs where possible and so forth and we can open that up for the neighborhood that's above here so they can utilize that to get down to the public beach area. (2) I've also been in discussions with Peter Gerrity in terms of working with him in trying to facilitate the pass system to connect to Town albeit on either side of the track and we have talked to the DOT, the Railroad Commission and so forth and that's an ongoing process as well so there will be two elements to the development. Vadney – That map you have up there right now, I take it that amoeba looking

thing is the wetland you've delineated there, that whole bigger piece. Hallett – Yes, it is. Vadney – That proposed access road, a couple of years ago when they condominiumized the big house on the corner, above the Mass Ave. extension, we looked at this intersection. Edgar – Actually, it's Mass Ave. from right to left. That stud there is part of what I believe at one time was called Westwood, it's currently called Westview. It's unimproved. Hallett – When I was talking with Mr. Gerrity and so forth and was looking at this property, we had assumed from the information that was available at Associated Surveyors that was a 50' ROW and after Carl Johnson did a little more work, he actually found that it was not, it was actually part of the road system that dead-ended right at the site and it was actually 33', as well as all of Mass Ave. was the same. Edgar – One of the things that we'll need to resolve a little bit, I don't know if you researched this to the point where you know who owns the fee in that 33' by 180' long stretch. It looks from the documents I've found in the Town Clerk's office that when the Town took over the roads in that area, it went on Westwood now Westview, it went from Hillrise to Mass Avenue and I don't know whether the Town controls that ROW or if it's viewed as private. I don't know if any of your research could shed any light on that because I just did a cursory review, it seemed to suggest that the Town does not control that and if it's not part of your property in fee, then who controls it, who's permission do you need to upgrade it? Hallett – I asked that question a while back and we have had some title work done, I did not bring that with me, but I believe it is actually controlled by the Town but I will verify that again when I bring that in. Edgar – It looked like it was early 70's when the petition and layout occurred for the Town to take that over so if you have anything we can cross reference against our files that would be helpful. When I was reading through the road file, there was a plan that shows the 33' road network throughout the whole neighborhood and this was part of that at the time. The petition that presumably was acted on, that's one piece I didn't find yet, but the petition describes the ROW in detail that the Town was asked to accept and it went from Hillrise with certain linear measurements to Massachusetts Avenue. At least what I looked at didn't seem to necessarily go all the way down to the frontage of this property so I didn't spend a lot of time with it. I wanted to make sure I checked with the applicant to see what their title attorney had come up with as well and then we'll put our heads together but it's an important one to get to the bottom of obviously to figure out whether this is a Selectmen's issue as to the Selectmen being OK with the upgrading of a ROW or is it something that the developer has a clear ROW over some private land. From a title point of view, the status of that ROW is something we'll have to get our arms around before they file. Vadney – That was my original question when I asked about that intersection was actually a physical question. As I recall that land, when you leave Mass Avenue and head north on that little stub, there's a substantial drop there or a pretty good grade. Larosa – There is a good grade through there, that is correct and part of our engineering work is to make sure that we're meeting an acceptable grade. We've done a profile through there and

we do need to fine-tune our engineering but that's something we're concerned about as well. Bliss – When we did that site walk, I remember too that behind the Hinchey's was very, very wet, it did level off a little bit but then it was wet and that's not even marked. Larosa – Yeah, we did have wetlands work done out there by Gove and he has delineated no wetlands behind the Hinchey's. Vadney – It's probably a question of distance, how deep is the Hinchey lot? Larosa – It's a little less than 200' deep. Vadney – And then you've got maybe 300' when you come to the wetland and about 200' you'll be in the buffer is what I'm seeing there. Larosa – Yeah, about another 200 feet. Vadney – We went down in there a ways and that may have been the wetland. Kahn – Mr. Chairman, I seem to recall that there was a seasonal stream in there. Vadney – There was a stream that runs just to the west of the Hinchey property, remember that one we traced it down. Kahn – As I recall, it ran downhill. Hallett – There's a very distinctive one right in this area here and it actually comes across this driveway. Vadney – There's one that has a culvert under the road right there by Westview and there's a large culvert by Jack Rideout's house. Larosa – Yes, and that's what Mr. Hallett was saying, there's a runoff that runs through this property. Vadney – There is another one coming off the corner of the Freeman property and going toward the Hinchey property to the west, there's a drainage there and there's a culvert that runs down across the lawns. Edgar – If you look at map 6A which doesn't have the topo on it and if you can kind of visualize where the intersection is, even though its not shown, look at approximately where the intersection is and you can get a pretty rough idea with Mass Avenue coming in, that one house was on the corner and the next one in was the Freeman residence. That will give you a rough idea, probably right about where the word Massachusetts is on that plan somewhere in that general area is probably about where that condominium project is. Vadney – There was a pretty substantial drainage that comes off right there by the beginning of the word Massachusetts and it runs down between the Hinchey property and the Peterson property, it runs underground but its got some breaks and stuff in it and then that runs into, I think that's what Lou is referring to when you get out in the woods, it then becomes a fairly deep swale and spreads out a bit, but its certainly a drainage. It may be doable engineering wise but it's something that would have to be studied. Hallett – I've been there a few times and made a point of going (inaudible) and I've noted that there's a lot of uncontrollable drainage up above. Hopefully, our development will be able to improve a lot of what's already existing there. I've been there when it was shedding all down in here all over the place with no control to it at all. Larosa – This is a ridge right here so this is a plateau so the drainage isn't going to get across that. Vadney – The reason we all know quite a bit about it is that's what we were chasing and if I remember right, the one that runs down by the Hinchey property then turns to the east, in other words to the right on that map as you're looking at it and the other ones because of that hill, they all go out toward Lake Waukewan but from the Hinchey property on, it runs the other way. It ends up going to the same place because it goes down into the bigger

wetland below but in the meantime, it meanders to the east a bit. Larosa – When we do our drainage analysis and get a little bit further into it, we'll address all of these issues specifically. Finer – Where does this flow to. Vadney – Sooner or later it goes into Winnepesaukee, it does not go into Waukewan. Kahn – It goes into a culvert on the Wickes property. Vadney – It basically runs underneath the lumber yard. Edgar – It goes behind Sally's School of Dance, it goes under Main Street, basically pops out at Lang Street and if you look into the woods on Lang Street you'll see kind of a ravine and it basically flows from there through the side of the fire station and dumps out into the Bay on that side. Kahn – I'm just not sure that when we were traipsing around in there for purposes of the Freeman condominium, I don't think we really looked at the western portion of this territory to see where things were going there. I think we did establish that the condo was draining eventually into that culvert in the middle of the Wickes property but I don't know that we really looked at this. Edgar – What Lou is speaking to is that if the site does not drain into the wetland that goes through that culvert, if there's some of that western end of the site that drains into a different subcatchment, it could trigger the 2-acre overlay district. Hallett – I'm comfortable with everybody taking another look at that. I've had my wetlands people take double and triple looks on that before I proceeded ahead so I'm comfortable with re-looking at that to verify that. Vadney – I would like you to look at it, but I'm pretty sure you're correct. John, didn't we walk out there and look at the drainage at the far end of the railroad track? Kahn – We walked along the tracks but we didn't really check to see what was going on above the tracks or whether or not there was anything going off to the west there. Hallett – It kind of has a real distinction, there's not even a gradual drop-off it kind of stops and then it's headed right into this way. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, as it relates to the wetland issues, I'd like to bring up a couple comments that we've shared with Steve. Initially when we met with Steve on an earlier concept that was about 28 units as opposed to the 16 currently, we had met with various department heads to try to flush out any issues and certainly 16 units puts less pressure on some of these issues than the 28 but there still are considerations that have to be looked at. On the wetland side of it, the wetland is a designated wetland that's where the larger setback comes from, it's very critical from a water quality point of view and we're only at a conceptual stage, but if you look at some of the corners of the units that are right up near the setback line, as a practical matter a general construction rule of thumb might be around 20' around a building foundation to construct a building with all the equipment and everything that's necessary to both build a foundation and establish finished grades so we want to be very, very clear on the front end what the total impact of this thing is and you guys should be doing everything humanly possible to avoid the special exceptions. In the driveway, there's some degree that's unavoidable because there's wetland in the driveway whether it's a driveway for one house or a bigger impact for a project like this but the fact that we can fit all the squares outside of the setback doesn't necessarily mean that your grading plan is likewise going to

be outside of the setbacks. You need to be taking a real hard look at that to make sure that we don't inadvertently misrepresent what the wetland impacts are. If you need to make adjustments to the building sizes or configurations or number of units, you certainly should be doing what you can to avoid those. There is a special exception required for the multi-family dwelling and we heard a lot of concern that was raised by the Massachusetts Avenue neighborhood relative to a 3-unit conversion within an exterior building in this immediate area and so the concerns on traffic and those kinds of things need to be examined very carefully. I would suggest touching base with some of the neighbors to perhaps try to feel them out because there are probably a few tonight that will share some perspective with you but it is predominantly single-family. We do have a 3-unit multi-family but we don't have anything of the magnitude of a 16-unit multi-family. One of the earlier concepts had the traffic going out a different direction. This concept has the traffic going out basically Mass Avenue so it does require a special exception which is basically a neighborhood issue and you just need to be prepared for addressing the issues that would be raised at a neighborhood level. Mike has reiterated his concerns with respect to the approach to the intersection, intersection related concerns that would have to be carefully looked at. The Fire Chief had raised his standard concern with projects like this and those are twofold: one is whether or not building separation is required. Looking at the plan and I know it's conceptual but it looked like it might be two buildings as opposed to one. There's sort of an angle point that is sort of colored in and if we're looking at two buildings and there's a separation requirement, it's something you need to follow-up with the Chief on. A 50-foot separation requirement would be problematic for a couple of those units. I don't know if the plan is one building or two, it wasn't real clear. Hallett – One building. The other issue that he raised preliminarily is the fact that if he has to fight a fire in the building, there are NFPA requirements that require him to have access to the building. It's where a lot of the fire lane regulations come in, it doesn't mean you need a race track around the entire building but you would want to sit down with the Fire Chief and start to proof out the plans as to how you could demonstrate that you comply with the applicable fire codes relative to getting around a building in the event there was a fire in the back of the building. Essentially what will fit in that area is what will determine the yield of the project. The biggest issue and I mentioned this to Steve, something that's developed in the last year or so and that has to deal with the questions of water capacity. The Water Department conducted a study a year or two ago of the water system and that report has been presented to the Board of Selectmen. That report showed that there are questions regarding peak demand and what that implies in terms of water storage and water treatment capacities in the Town. The Town Selectmen and the Water Department have been working on a variety of measures to address those capacity concerns, not the least of which is a rate change that's intended to encourage more conservation as well as capital improvements, some of which are being implemented and some that are on the drawing board. The long and short of

it is that the Water Department has raised the flag and they've asked me to raise the flag to all our projects that are dependent on water to make sure they touch base with the Water Department so the Water Department can run some hydraulic analysis as well as capacity analysis. The long and short of it is that the availability of water can't be guaranteed at this point and we need to work through with the Water Department and ultimately the Board of Selectmen in terms of how any available capacities are allocated in the future. I've shared this with Steve, I've shared it with a couple of the other projects that are in the audience that are also likewise dependent on water. It is just something that we don't have all the answers at this point but it's something I'm sure the Selectmen will be picking up again in the spring as they get into some of their workshops. Hallett – We are talking with the Water Department. Larosa – We did talk to them and my initial impression was that the 16 units using about 80 gallons per day per unit which is a number that we've looked at for metered buildings like this, it was my initial impression that Mr. Hill was comfortable with this project having water and sewer available. Part of that would be the Town's looking to loop their waterline in this area so we would provide a 20' water easement for a 12" waterline between Waukegan Street and Mass Avenue for looping of the waterline. Hallett – Basically that would go under that trail system I talked about to connect down to the lake area. Vadney – It's interesting you talk about a 12" water main because it seems like isn't the sewer line through there is like 2½" or something. We got involved with that on that other division. Larosa – Mr. Hill has indicated that's an 8" sewer main. Vadney – Where does it run? Larosa – It runs in Mass Avenue and we'd have to pump up to it. Vadney – Where would you hook on? Vadney – That was an 8" in that area? Larosa – That's what Mr. Hill told us. Vadney – Because one of them was like a 2 ½" pump system. Kahn – It wasn't the sewer, it was water. Larosa – A loop in the waterline would help any pressure or quantity problems. Vadney – I was thinking more of the sewer where you would be connecting and pumping. Edgar – Every project's a little bit different. They have different demands, different peaks, different fact patterns; I'm just doing my duty by raising the flag. I've raised the flag privately, I'm raising the flag publicly and I'm sharing it with any projects that are dependent on water to make sure they are going through whatever analysis the Water Department requires and then as a practical matter at some point, you and others will need assurances that if you start down a road that you'll have water at the end of the road and it's not something I have control over and this Planning Board doesn't either. If I were in your shoes and other shoes that people are looking at water-dependent projects, I would be trying to resolve that at the outset. Kahn – John, is this the Residential District. Edgar – This is the Residential District and multi-family is a permitted use by Special Exception. Kahn – How does it work out with respect to density. Edgar – 10,000 sq. ft. density with municipal sewer and water. Basically, the density is less of a driver than the land capability. The upland area around those orange units that are not encumbered by setbacks essentially what can reasonably fit in that area is what will determine the yield

of the project. That will be more restrictive than the zoning. Kahn - How do our setback requirements apply, I realize they don't apply between the individual units in the condo, but how do they apply as between the abutting landowners? Edgar - The setbacks would be applied around the perimeter and the issue there won't be the setback, I mean if they are in a setback for parking or something, it's a special exception but the issue there that will have to be taken into account is from a statutory point of view, multi-family isn't considered residential, it's site plan related so think of it as, even though people will live there, it's subject to site plan review and our Site Plan Review Regulations require that when a non-residential use subject to site plan, meaning all our site plan uses, when they abut a residential use or district we require buffering and so if you look at the back side of those lots, I think you've flagged a fence or something like that but at the end of the day there will be a need for buffering between the project and any residential uses in the surrounding area so you have residential to the left, residential between yourselves and the street so those areas would require some degree of buffering so as you kind of fine-tune the positioning of everything, you need to keep that in mind. Maybe a fence works, maybe it doesn't, maybe there's natural vegetation that may be helpful and maybe it's a combination of things. It's also an area where you might benefit from some contact with the neighboring property owners to get a sense as to what they think might be an appropriate screening device. Hallett - That was my plan. I typically like to on all my developments is put a very nice buffer in terms of solid arborvitae or something but my first step was to of course meet with Mr. Edgar, meet with you as a Board to the concept, then I plan to give plans to the abutters. I will then have a meeting of all the abutters and we definitely would have a buffer that would be acceptable to all. Bliss - Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow-up, at least I believe John said this, but I'm very concerned, I would like to see the numbers come down and not be 16. It does look like, I know this is not to full scale, but you're right up on the buffer lines on all four corners and that really concerns me. Can you tell me exactly how far away those are? Hallett - We're trying to define exactly how much of our wetland might be subject to the 100' buffer or less buffer and in doing the site plan, I initially told them just to hold the maximum and when we take the next step I do plan to get out there to see if any of it is transitional wetland in there or if it's all held to the 100' buffer so that's part of my answer. The rest of it as you can see, we did hold everything to the 100' buffer, this kicks out so we're naturally pushing this forward. It doesn't leave us very much developable area on the site. Vadney - In effect, what you're looking at there is probably this development is going on about one acre is that right? Hallett - Maybe between an acre and two acres. Larosa - 1.6 acres. Bayard - I just wanted to reiterate the problems with water out there. It's not just our capacity limit, I think to some extent there was some line size limits out there. They may or may not be further down but if the pipe isn't wide enough, it's going to have to be rebuilt and we're going to want you to help on that. Edgar - Basically, the first part of the water analysis is called a hydraulic analysis and what they'll do is plug in

the variables of this project into a model that includes all the pipe sizes of our system and all the pressures of our system and they'll be able to model if they have a kink somewhere or a choke down that doesn't allow them to provide the necessary pressure and volume they need for the project so that's the first part of the analysis and then the second part is looking at the peak demand flows including fire flows in relationship to the benchmark that was established in the report that's been delivered to the Selectmen so that analysis is pretty important and I guess it's good news if Bob is comfortable with it but here again I think you just need to continue to follow-up with that and make sure you get whatever assurances you need like all the other developments will be advised to do so that at the end of the day assuming you were to get final approval, there isn't a water issue staring at you when you get there. Kahn – We have 3 ½ stories here, how tall are these going to be? Larosa – A lot shorter in the front than they are in the back. Kahn – So they are going to be more than 3 ½ stories in the back? Hallett – Close to 30 feet. Vadney – I'm glad Lou asked the question because as I look at these pictures, they both look like 2 ½ or 3 story but I thought the slope of the land would cause the front side (lake side so to speak, the Gerrity side) to be substantially.. Hallett – I wanted every unit to have a view to the lake so the front side is here and we're trying to, and again we haven't gotten specifically and succinctly to that point yet to incorporate the foundation systems into the sloping grades out back. Vadney – So they won't have walkout cellars so to speak. Hallett – At this point, they weren't because of the design. As we get further information they may in terms of the bottom floor. Larosa – Actually, you're going to have the front of the building retaining the slope, that's the best way to explain it and the back, depending upon the construction methods, it can be a walkout but that's going to be a living area. Vadney – I'm no expert on this but I would say that's something you should check with the Fire Chief as well. John, remember the discussions we had about walkout basements on the Ironwood property and the distance to the next buildings and various things. Chuck Palm was quite concerned. Edgar – That particular issue wasn't so much the walkouts as it was building separation and that's a combination of really the codes and whether the buildings are going to be sprinklered. If this is one building, it probably has to be sprinklered by code so there is no building separation issue. The bigger issue is that if we're going to walk out the back side of these buildings, we need to anticipate those finished grades in relationship to any buffers or any other stabilization issues so that you're looking at a full impact of the project not just its schematic foundation but whatever would go with it whether they are decks or patios or lawn areas or anything like that. We don't see it yet at this point because we're in a conceptual stage but it's important that we see that full picture. Kahn – I don't recall what our maximum height requirement is in the Residential District but how does it apply in a situation where the land drops off and you have more than 3 ½ stories in the rear. Edgar – I'll double-check the zoning but basically the methodology is from the lowest point of grade to the ridge so we would go at the base of the walkout to the ridge. It's not an average like some towns

do, it's the lowest point of grade. The maximum height is very permissive in the district. Someone said 45' and it very well may be that. It would not include cupolas, chimneys or unoccupied adornments of a building. Worsman – My concerns are actually mirroring Pam's. You've covered the entire buildable section with impermeable product. I'm sure that's going to be a paved driveway and one contiguous building. To put that in a residential neighborhood just doesn't seem to fit with the goal that I think, I just recall all of the arguments we had to put 3 condos in one home and I voted against the issues so I don't know how this will pan out but the way it looks, it looks like you've covered every buildable spot with impermeable product. Hallett – Again, that's perception. You've got a heavy setback here and if you look at the topos, the grades, although I appreciate the setbacks and respect that, these grades drop steeply down on land that is still useable. It could be used for recreation and so forth but it has a distinctive grade and a distinctive start to the specific wetland itself so when you take that into consideration, I'd have to respectfully disagree with you. I don't think we've impacted the entire site to that overwhelming degree at all. Vadney – This is a pre-application review, you might say this is your friendly audience because the next time you come before us will most likely be a noticed public hearing and the abutters could have come tonight but most don't attend pre-applications but when it comes to the noticed meeting, I'm fairly sure this will fill the room. We've got a number of issues that I think all the Board members have spoken to, drainage and buffer issues, ownership of ROW issues may be an issue but even if they are not, the physical layout of the land and the grade at that intersection because if you're adding 16 units, you're going to be looking at something like 150 to 180 cars a day passing through. You do have a road approach and grade issue. I think construction sequence even though it's one building, how you start and how you finish will be important to us from the wetlands standpoint and be important to you that you don't paint yourself into a corner so to speak because it is going to be a restrictive site. Fire access, particularly radiuses and stuff getting in, I'm sure you'll design those correctly but as far as a passage around the back side of the building and the like is another concern that Chief Palm could help you with. Does anyone have something that I've missed. Bliss – I would just like to say because the way it's drawn right now, where it is so close to the buffers as we just saw in our last application that somebody was over the line and they are going to have to move a building and I would have to say as a Board member because you are so close if something did happen, I don't care whether it was the contractor or who it was and they went over that went over that line, I'm going to want it moved so I would say you need to give yourself a little bit more buffer so that doesn't happen. Vadney – It will be a problematic site to building on but you knew that right from the start. Hearing closed at 8:12 p.m.

2. **VANESSE, HANGEN, BRUSTLIN, INC. FOR LAND ACQUISITION, LLC -**
Pre-Application Design Review of a proposed 71 unit multi-family development on Tax Map S17, Lot 2, located on Upper Ladd Hill Road in the Central Business and Shoreline Districts.

John Dibitto – I'm the Manager of Land Acquisition, LLC, the applicant. With me tonight is George Matarazzo and Michael Leo. George Matarazzo, Landscape Architect/Land Planner – We were here back in December and since that time there have been several meetings by our people with John and the Town staff on the site plan and I'd like to bring you up to date and try to summarize where we've gone with the plan. The plan itself hasn't changed much but I'll get into that in a second. One of the things that has changed more dramatically is the product that we're building out there. If you remember back in December, we were proposing a single-family development grouped in a way that were cottages along the road. In discussions with John and other staff people, we felt there was no way within the regulations you could accommodate that so the comment was that if you could come up with an attached product in a way that would meet the regulations better, that would be better for everyone. What we did was we still wanted to create a community and neighborhood where when you drive through, you felt like each of the homes was an individual home or a cottage so you didn't have a series of row houses even though on the plan you're going to see them attached but the way we attached them was by the method of the garage so the feeling as you drive down the street someday will be of individual houses with garages between. In some cases to keep the separation so that from the street you're looking at a gable face, a typical single-family house, we didn't connect the buildings at the second level. In fact, you can see in this sketch that little upper deck is above the garage so the feeling is of a single-family house albeit attached by the garage element. We still think we've captured the spirit and the concept architecturally of the community. We've never built this anywhere before but we felt that the character of Meredith and some of the things that are happening around the lake and even in the Village, this would really create a wonderful, charming character of a neighborhood. The big change was the attachment of the houses themselves. A couple of situations on the houses, we looked at architecturally and again this is conceptual but even with cupolas, even with little widow walks up in the upper level. Again, when John was mentioning the height of the building, those were exceptions in your regulations but they sure add a nice character to the houses themselves. In some cases, where the grade would drop off behind the houses, we showed the cottages as being more of a very low profile because we're going to use the walkout lower level as living units on those particular homes. The site plan is still pretty much the same as it was back in December and essentially with some minor exceptions, it's still the same plan although we attached the units instead of having single-family. One of the things we did was off of Upper Ladd Hill Road which is on the left-hand side of the plan, we brought the entrance in right at this point, it's a split entry, median

strip island landscaped feature so that it feels like a sense of entry. We put a small clubhouse and swimming pool/ activity center right out here off of Ladd Hill Road. Vadney – Is the entry of that road about where the path is now? Matarazzo – Exactly, it's where the water main comes down. We felt why not use the water main as part of the ROW so we left 20' in front of the buildings off the side of the road for the water main easement that comes right along and goes to the tank which is shown on the plan. The road itself follows the contours. You can see that dark blue line on the map is the wetland and then we have all the setbacks related to those wetlands. We did make the road and Mike Leo can follow-up on the discussion of this, we did bring the road and connected in to the abutting neighborhood with a street and basically group the houses in clusters of 2, 3, 5 unit buildings throughout the site. Vadney – Roughly, what is the total elevation change from the left-hand point to the lower end of the property? Matarazzo – To be specific, Mr. Chairman, this is the high point and these houses will look over the top of the units down here and well over these on the lowest point of the site. The site now is somewhat cleared. Somebody logged it. You do get peeks of the lake and you get peeks of the church steeples in the Village albeit those are winter peeks so I don't know that you're going to get that same look in the summer but our idea was that each home would look and get the best maximum view. We've got a lot of wetland and wetland becomes in my opinion part of the amenity on the site and a very nice amenity. We are utilizing the grades and in some cases as you can see, the architecture works its way up the hill and down the hill. Where it goes down the hill, we'll have walkout lower levels, where it works up the hill, we'll have the garages under and then you walk up into the unit so in a way the change to the plan was really a very nice change because in the earlier plan, we didn't have as many garages and we think the buyer will like that extra space so it was a way to accommodate two-car garages in some of the units and maximize the value of the homes themselves. In the road itself, we were careful and with VHB and Michael Leo careful to site the road in a way that minimizes the crossing of the wetlands and Mike can go into that in a little more detail if need be. We are also proposing a sidewalk or walkway all the way along the road so you could walk all the way out to MacDonald's and maybe someday down Upper Ladd Hill Road but also in our discussions, we didn't show it on the plan but the thought of linking this maybe to the back of Hart's Turkey Farm so if you want to go for dinner and you want to walk, you can. Also, eventually as land gets developed toward the lake, maybe there could be some easements or access points to work our way and get pedestrian access down that way. The concept obviously is to create a small Village, it's to create a character of a neighborhood that is in keeping with what surrounds us. As you know, it's actually an interesting sight. To the North of it is very commercial but to the South is residential and so early on our concept was to not have such a big house but smaller single-family houses. Now the concept is still to have the look of single-family houses but they will be attached so it's basically a single-family attached neighborhood, each with a firewall and sprinkled as individual

units. Vadney – Approximate square footage of the homes? Matarazzo – They range from 1,500 to 2,000 sq. ft. and maybe some of them are more and some might be slightly smaller but that's a good number to work with. They each have garages, they each have parking spaces and on the plan we are showing accommodations because we do have setback restrictions, but we are showing patios or decks that go beyond what's above the garage just to make sure that if homeowners want an extra patio or extra deck, we can accommodate those, especially in this particular unit where we are not using the top of the garage as a living area. Vadney – Are you implying that you could then put living space above the garage instead of just a roof? Matarazzo – Well, perhaps if that roof was high enough, it isn't in the concept right now but theoretically if it was allowed within the zone that could happen. Most likely in this kind of unit, these are all probably truss framed units so it's never going to happen but we really thought about the lower level being the extra advantage. This land slopes very nicely and in every case, we can take advantage either going under and up or in and down so the advantage of a site like this is to take full advantage of those grades. I wanted to bring you up-to-date on that because it's pretty much the plan and the number is 71 units and I think we were pretty close to that, we were up in the 80's the last time but the formula came out that it's 71 units. I know there was a lot of discussion that deal with engineering and site considerations but the big change for you or in my opinion was the architecture and the configuration of the buildings. Mike Leo, Engineer and Project Manager for VHB - I'll just give you sort of an overview where we've been with the plans and some of the road design and then I did want to talk to you a little bit about some of the waiver requests that we anticipate to build this development. To start with what we're anticipating here are to be all private roads to fit in with the community that we're looking at developing, more or less a private community with private roads. There is one main thru road or spine road that comes off of Upper Ladd Hill Road and connects up to Upper Mile Point Drive. Initially, we were looking at a cul-de-sac dead-end configuration to keep this community more or less separate and private but in talking it over with the Town Planner and the Zoning Officer, we decided it would be best to have a thru road for safety and for other reasons so we've got this main thru spine here and then we've got several dead-end roads off of that. Right now we're just referring to it as Road B which comes off of there and dead-ends as shown on the plan (behind Ippolito's), Road C would go down hill and dead-end as shown on the plan (behind Hart's Restaurant) and then two other shorter spur roads off of that. Vadney – All 71 units are proposed to be a condominium with common ownership of the entire piece of land. Leo – The entire piece of land would be owned by one owner and the roads would all be private. There would be a private ROW associated with the roads but that is there more for setback purposes than anything else and when we did it initially, we had clusters of houses off of private driveways and in reviewing the ordinance, you can't have more than two homes off a single driveway before it needs to be built to something closer to Town standards so that's sort

of what drove us coming up with this configuration. The property generally slopes from South to North towards the lake and towards the railroad tracks so all your drainage and everything is heading in this direction. There are two wetland areas associated with the property. There's a large wetland area up in here (pointed out on the plan) and there's also another wetland area that comes down through here and associated with this particular area there is a stream that flows through the property. The top of the hill is right up in here so most of the water that's feeding the wetlands is more or less ground seeps that are breaking out on the surface and running down slope. There is one small wetland area that sits right on the property border back in this area. Generally what we're proposing is that the roads have a 40' ROW associated with them and that all the homes be set back approximately 20' off the pavement and hopefully 25' so there's room for a car between the road and each one of the houses. I don't know if you have any specific questions related to the road layout or design. We did sit down as a preliminary discussion with the review engineer, Lou Caron, and showed him road profiles just to get some preliminary feedback. He gave us a few comments that I generally concur with, he wanted to make sure that where we're intersecting with existing roads or have road intersections that we've got a negative grade from the thru roads such that the drains will drain away from the road. He had a couple of good suggestions about trying to flatten up the grade of the main road where we're keying into such that there's a little flatter platform that you can slow down and stop and turn into the road. We generally concur with his suggestions on that. I would be happy to answer any of your questions relative to design or I can talk about some of the waivers that we will need to proceed with this and it is my understanding that the waivers we would need would be through the Selectmen because it's the Selectmen's minimum road standards. I had submitted to John a Memo with the list of waivers with a date of April 9th but I'll just run down through them. The first item we would need a waiver for would be for a Type III road section which is a local road which these are. Currently, the Town typical doesn't have a curb section so we would want a waiver to be able to basically eliminate the 3' shoulder and instead provide a curb which we're considering a Cape Cod asphalt berm right now. The next one we're looking at in keeping with trying to minimize the amount of pavement and impervious area on the site, looking at the secondary roads which are roads B, C, D and probably this one up in here, the Town's requirement right now is 20' wide for a road, we'd like to be able to go 18' wide in those areas. We would have 18' wide paved with 3' gravel shoulders on either side with the exception if we go to a curb section, it would just be 18' wide paved up to the curb without the shoulders. Vadney – That might work but one problem you always end up with in these places is no matter how narrow the road is, somebody will try to park along it and if you're down to 18' to begin with and people have a party or whatever and they start parking, you'd have some pretty restricted areas. One of the things and we spoke of that a couple of times, we have two multi-family condominium projects in Town fairly recently approved, Meredith Bay Village and

Waukegan Village and in each of those instances we had carefully located a couple overflow parking spaces in banks of 3-5 placed strategically throughout the subdivision to allow for overflow parking to some degree but to try to keep people from not parking on the street so we've shared that with these folks and I would expect that we would see something like that in the revised plans. We also looked at eliminating some open drainage where possible to provide for a little more utility on the roadway, whether it's just the sidewalk or the front yards of some of these units. Some of the open drainage would be significant and given the grades we're at, it might be a better mousetrap going with some private or some closed drainage and it might make for better use of the road and better use of the front yards of some of these units. We did talk about some of the overflow parking and ways to try to accommodate that. Leo – We did talk about adding some parking spaces and whether there was room either perpendicular or parallel to the road and as far as the drainage goes, one of the reasons we were looking at curbing is so people don't have a stone ditch going through their front yards. Edgar - The travel lanes on the spine road would be bigger and then we would go down to the 9' lanes like we have on Leighton's project and Paquette's and these others where we have no thru road potential, a relatively small number of units looking at 9' lanes plus shoulders as opposed to more than that and so the hierarchy would be that the potential thru road would have 11' lanes. Leo – We were talking a 22' wide paved section. Edgar – The cul-de-sacs would have 9' lanes, consistent with what the Selectmen have granted in the past and the reason for the waivers essentially is we have a one size fits all cross section and if we're going with this kind of curbing and that kind of thing, it's got to be signed off by the Board. That's one of the reasons why we wanted to front end some of this review with our engineer and he doesn't see anything from an engineering point of view that's problematic with those proposed cross sections, as well as the profiles and we're within maximum grades. We have good intersection designs and that kind of thing so that we don't have any, because this is not fully engineered, they've done the road plan and profile but we haven't gotten into all the grading and utilities and the idea is to try to start crossing some things off the list and if we can try to get our arms around what the road issues may be, at our level are they manageable or are we way out of the box. We think we've gotten to a point where the cross-section waivers for this kind of a subdivision would be generally consistent with what we've allowed in the past. Leo – The next thing we are looking for a variance on are the dead-end roads. We are looking at putting in an L-shaped turnaround as opposed to a full cul-de-sac again to cut down on the pavement and keep ourselves out of the wetland buffers but in each of the cases, we would have it set up so that a truck would be able to pull forward, back into an L-shaped area and then turnaround. We did get some comments from your Fire Chief saying that all turnarounds would need to meet his criteria and I haven't sat down to meet with him yet to see what kind of vehicle he has but I'm assuming that he would be OK with this configuration and that he could get his trucks in and out of there. We would be asking for a waiver not to use cul-de-sacs. Edgar – Here

again, we have employed hammerheads in the past. We have a one size fits all turnaround configuration specked out in the road which is basically a conventional paved circle. What we've been looking at from day one in all of this is basically private roads. Mike Faller has raised concerns that with so many driveway cuts along the way, he had concerns if the Town were to be maintaining these in the future. He would have concerns with respect to the number of driveways and so we've talked about stipulating in any approval process that the roads be private and be noted on the plans, noted in the deeds, noted in the condo declarations and then if and when the Board of Selectmen act on any waivers, I would be recommending to them that they premise any waiver on that as well. That's consistent with what we've done on some other projects to really flag the fact that these are private roads and that these types of waivers and agreements are premised upon what is represented and try to document that as thoroughly and as best we can and that has been reviewed with the applicant and that's the premise upon which these discussions have advanced. Vadney – As I see the scale and the layout of these houses, it would appear that in effect the driveways are everywhere. They are basically almost touching each other as you go down through here. Kahn – Where do you put the snow? Vadney – Snow could be a problem. I was thinking more from the safety standpoint if you do want strictly private roads and I don't know what you can control for speed limits, but this never could be accepted as public roads because of the density and the closeness to the street. There's no way you could maintain a 25 MPH speed thru most of that. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully like to disagree with John. I think we have had a lot of subdivisions come through but not one with 71 houses and my feeling is if you're putting in 71 units, you shouldn't get a road waiver. That's a lot of people going through there and to scale that road back, I don't feel comfortable with a waiver for the road. I think we have to be somewhat careful on the waiver, 50' is quite right but I'm not sure of 40' and definitely it's a lot of traffic through there so it's something that needs to be looked at pretty hard. Bayard - I didn't quite follow what you said you were planning on the curbing. Leo - What we're looking at is using Cape Cod berm. Bayard – What is a Cape Cod berm? It's sort of a sloped asphalt curb; it's used pretty frequently for most of New England. It's about a foot wide and it slopes from about 4" high down to about an inch high. Bayard – Our regulations highly discourage asphalt curb, we encourage using granite, partly because they get chewed up a lot in the snow removal for one thing, although maybe the slope type might not get chewed as much. Leo – The asphalt curb does tend to get pushed out by the plows. The Cape Cod berm which has a gentle rise and the plows do gouge it but they usually tend to ride up it and not take out the whole section of the curb. Bayard – We do encourage granite. Worsman – Again, I have to go with Pam, we have created and allowed some waivers for road standards but speaking as one Selectmen, that is a thru-road for 71 homes and I would be very, very careful about asking for a waiver for that. Leo – Just to mention, the waiver we're looking for on width is not for the thru road, as a matter of fact the thru road

we're looking at making 22' wide where your standard is 20'. Where we're looking for the waiver is really on the dead-end side roads where the traffic would be less. Vadney – Am I correct in understanding here that the parking, although some do have at least one in-garage parking space, most of the parking is basically the distance from the edge of road to the building, a car length in rough terms. Edgar – With the exception of the addition of overflow parking that's not yet shown, that's what we've approved at Meredith Bay Village and Waukewan Village. Vadney – In other words the buildings are built without a lot of offset. Matarazzo – Mr. Chairman, except on the side where the sidewalk is, we gave a little extra room so the cars when they are parked in front of the garage, they are not blocking the sidewalk so there is extra room in there for those automobiles. Vadney – Do you have extra parking for the clubhouse or is that considered a walk-in? Leo – There is parking shown in front of the clubhouse. Kahn – How many spaces? Leo – I think there are about 6 spaces shown right now. Matarazzo – The idea is that you would walk to the clubhouse to use the swimming pool or any kind of gym that was in there. In my experience, we've done communities with as many as 250 homes with only 5 parking spaces at the clubhouse so when you're designing a clubhouse that's specifically for the residents; it's a different thing than if you're designing an athletic facility for the whole Town. We can add more spaces if you feel it's necessary but we'd like to keep that to a minimum if we could. Kahn – With all due respect sir, you've got the clubhouse at the extreme upper end of your development, you don't have it centrally located and I don't remember how many feet you've got between the clubhouse and Unit 62 or Unit 58, but I would guess if they've got to walk, they're not going to walk. Matarazzo – You may be very right, I'm not arguing. Some people probably are going to demand that parking space but a couple of other things come into play here. One of the reasons we do have a sidewalk and talk about these sidewalks is one of the biggest amenities in communities today, walking trails or sidewalks and people are looking to get that little bit of exercise walking from here to there. Sure there are going to be those few that are going to say no way or they're handicapped and can't do it and as I said, if you want more parking spaces, we can look at it. We can put parking all over this site if we want. You understand the idea here was to keep this somewhat urban in some character that's why the narrow streets, the smaller buildings and not overdo it, not do McMansions out here but keep it as a little village feel as you drive and walk thru. The other thing was to make it pedestrian. I agree that there are a lot of driveways along there but there is also landscaping shown and we're going to do a landscape plan that's going to go along with it but some of the fun character about a village like this is that the buildings are close. Look at your own Town, I think the most fun thing about the Village of Meredith walking around is that all the buildings are very close and very tight and I think in a residential setting, this is what's happening here. I think this street right here is going to be a wonderful street to walk down and to drive down. I think this little enclosure right there where the buildings come close to the street is going to be a wonderful feeling when you drive through it

and that's part of the reason why we're asking for the waiver not on the main road, but the other roads just to get less pavement, less structure in this landscape and more architecture. Vadney – I certainly appreciate that and I think from a pretty standpoint you've done very well, it would be a pretty thing. I do share the concern over the clubhouse. To be frank, the site is roughly 2,000 feet long heading downhill so I guess the beauty of putting the clubhouse there, at least on the way home you're going downhill but it would be problematic. Matarazzo – We did put the clubhouse at this point (end of Road C) at one time, we thought that was a neat spot because it was down in the lower part of the site, probably the least view right there but the more I thought about it or we all talked about it, I felt very strongly that it should go here and it's a little bit of marketing as well as design but you want to create the image of your community right up front and if you go through a variety of planned communities, what do you see the first thing when you drive in, you see the tennis courts, you see the clubhouse, you set the tone of the community in that area and so it's a little bit of that and also it was a great way to utilize this nice open space in this area and not put houses right up against the road so they have to walk a little bit, yes. Bayard – Are you envisioning these as seasonal type homes or are these going to be pretty much year-round? Matarazzo – They will be designed as year-round homes, but I'm sure there's going to be a certain number of people that are going to use them only in the summer or only in the winter. Bayard – That does get into an issue going to a clubhouse. The winter can get pretty nasty up here and that's where you probably are going to see more people want to drive their car up to the clubhouse or guests. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, I'm going to throw out my pre-application speech again. I get very concerned when we're seeing this amount of detail and we're talking about different angles of how the road's going to go and what's going to be done, but yet no abutter to this project has been noticed. Edgar – That's not correct, we notified abutters on this project. Bliss – My question then is why is it a pre-application if they have been notified? Edgar – The answer to that is we should be beyond this at this point. There are two levels of pre-application, the first is conceptual, that's why you saw the prior project's schematic only. This has advanced to a level of engineering design that the prior project did not have and so therefore we agreed to notify abutters because we are now talking a little more specific about design. We have received an abutters' list, we've notified abutters and I'm sure we have a couple here that have responded to that notification. Kahn – One comment I have has to do with buffering but first I wanted to, John, at some point I had asked you and I've now forgotten as to part of this downhill portion is in the Shoreline District, the uphill portion is in the Central Business District, how did we arrive at the density and does the solution we've arrived at justify the density they've got down in the Shoreline District. Edgar – The majority of the lot area is in Central Business and so we verified a correction of a boundary that had appeared on an earlier plan but the bottom line is that the majority of the property is in Central Business and that allows multi-family by Special Exception. In Bill's review of the zoning, he wanted the density

broken out by District so we applied the Shoreline density which is a lesser density than CB, we applied that density to the amount of land area in the Shoreline. That's why the numbers came down from 80 some odd units to 71 based upon Bill's review of the density. For purposes of distribution of the units throughout the property, Central Business would govern as it governs the multi-family nature of it, however, the actual density, the number of units the property would yield would be a combination of the two. That's how Bill has viewed the density determination. Kahn – Are you saying that the number of units in the Shoreline section of the property is greater than the density that would be permitted under the Shoreline requirements? Edgar – If you go to the plan set, C-1, we have a 10,000 sq. ft. density for the CB district and we have a 25,000 sq. ft. density for Shoreline so given the amount of area in each of those districts, calculations are based upon those requirements. Kahn – So the area in Shoreline supports 22 or 23 units? Edgar – That's correct, the calculation is on Note 2 on that particular sheet but essentially that's what it was. No, its units, I'm looking at the math here, it's 199,000 sq. ft. and change divided by 25,000 sq. ft. per unit so the Shoreline gave a yield of 8 and the CB District gave a yield of 63.4, that's where the 71 came from. Kahn – Does that interpretation jive with protecting the water in Meredith Bay, loading up the shoreline with 23 units instead of 8. Edgar – The issue of water quality is going to have to be addressed on the project regardless of the distribution of the number of units. Kahn – I'm just not sure that the interpretation that you've come up with holds water. Edgar – It's not my interpretation, I'd be happy to ask Bill to qualify it but his view was that the density is determined by each of the two districts; however, they could be distributed throughout the project. If you would like me to ask him to clarify that, I would be happy to. That was his interpretation and his guidance he had given to the applicant. Vadney – Could they then take that same point and ask for a cluster and put all 71 down on the shoreline? Edgar – Lou is correct, there are no cluster provisions that would allow for minimum lot sizes and all that kind of thing. Kahn – Let me go to another point and that is behind every one of these units there's a little square, I assume that's a patio or something. What is the distance, for example, on units 18, 22, 26 between the end of the patio and the lot line? What are we dealing with the CB setback line? Is this like the previous situation where we have a site plan review so that the CB setback line isn't necessarily so for site plan purposes? Edgar – Could you restate that? Kahn – If CB had a 5' setback and we decided that this was insufficient for site plan purposes.. Edgar – You have a building setback prescribed for in the district and like with the other project which is on my notes to cover tonight if it's not otherwise brought up is that we do have the issue of needing to provide buffer by virtue of your site plan regulations when a multi-family use abuts a residential use and if you go to the tax map in your packet so you can get a visual feel of the lot layout surrounding the property, there would need to be an adequate buffer particularly along the road up to the left-hand corner of that subdivision where it's pretty tight. They meet the building setback which is a zoning issue;

they'll also need to deal with a buffer issue which is a site plan issue. Kahn – Does this plan leave enough room along Road B and down to #39, #71 and #63 to provide sufficient buffering for the properties to the South which in my opinion is going to require a lot of buffering. Matarazzo – I agree, I think we can buffer it with landscape material or some fencing and I would recommend landscaping over fencing but the answer to the question in this area, there is a 10' setback shown. All the houses in that area are 30' back, those little patios are indicated as 12-15' so they are 15' off the property line but all the buildings themselves are set back in this case 30'. Here it's a little tighter, I agree, this building is probably pretty close to the setback line. Kahn – Since this is a pre-application, I just want you to know that I am not going to be satisfied with a stockade fence; I am going to have to have for my purposes a very significant amount of landscape buffering. Matarazzo – I agree with you, Mr. Kahn, totally agree with you. One of the issues is the way the ordinance is drafted, it basically says that in order to have a condominium, you need a Special Exception. We've reviewed that with our legal counsel in the context of the current law relative to condominiums and as an administrative matter, Bill's advised the applicant that we would not require that Special Exception for the condominium form of ownership as is currently provided in the ordinance. On the advice of our legal counsel we believe that requiring such an exception would not be permitted under New Hampshire law so it goes to the discussions we've had on condominiums and forms of ownership that can't be discriminated against. With respect to the water system, all of the comments that I made at the previous conceptual still apply. The applicant is aware that there are significant questions that need to be addressed relative to water capacity. They have escrowed funds with the Water Department to conduct that analysis. That analysis is ongoing and at this point I don't know what the results of that are but everything I said at the previous review is basically the same that we have to model the hydraulics of the project and look at the capacity as well and make sure that if the project were to proceed and get built that an applicant can rely on the availability of water. The difficulty the Water Department and Selectmen are going to have is that we have several major projects coming at once all looking at capacity questions. The one we just heard before, the one we're hearing now and I think it was two weeks ago we met very informally with folks who are looking at doing the elderly living facility and we also know that the project on Pease Road is contemplating water as well to obviate some of their well issues so as a head's up Colette you've got 4 or 5 fairly significant projects that are in this gray area if you will that are going to be needing guidance in the future as to whether or not they can rely on water capacity and in this particular case, this review is ongoing. We had hoped to have it for tonight but we don't. They have escrowed the funds and the review is in the works and that report will be generated within a week or so. In terms of all of the big issues, that's a real big one that the applicant's aware of and we're working on. I'll take the liberty of calling a set of second tier issues that assuming we have water and assuming there are no following zoning problems and assuming we can get a

reasonable level of road standards agreed to with the Selectmen, there's another host of issues that will need to be addressed. We have a water main going through this property for which the Town has an easement and how that water main is positioned on the landscape relative to all the houses, we have to be very careful that if we dig up the easement to access our main which is a very large main or in the event of a main failure, we don't have any inordinate problems associated with that. The issue of looking at the possibility of a thru road comes from your own regulations and in the first cut good planning would suggest that if you abut other subdivisions that have anticipated thru connection or the possibility of thru connection that someone should likewise look at whether or not there's any real possibilities here. From the applicant's point of view, they could just as easily put a cul-de-sac at the very end of this thing and go for a cul-de-sac waiver. But if you recall for those of you that were on the Board when we reviewed the Mile Point subdivision and if you look at the tax map that's in your packet, it's pretty clear that the ROW for that before it takes the sharp right down to the water anticipated possibly connecting to abutting properties. That was years ago. In fact, that was even before the Lake Ridge Subdivision was even on the radar screen, that was the days of Don Simpson when he was looking at a huge project called Hart's Marketplace and that's when that ROW was established with intent of it possibly thru-connecting some day. It doesn't mean that it will but at least it will keep those options open. When the applicant was before us at a staff level, we said you need to be anticipating whether you have the legal right to connect, it's a private road network and they will have to address that issue with the homeowner's association so it's not a given but there's always the potential that maybe the Town owns Upper Mile Point Drive someday. We don't have a crystal ball, we don't know who's going to own what someday but if the Town wanted that road and wanted to be able to thru-connect to some of the other abutting properties, it would involve potentially a corner of this piece of the property so we've asked the engineer to look at where the Mile Point stub is if you will and some of the adjoining property to see what would be a reasonable alignment. It doesn't mean that it gets built, it doesn't necessarily mean that it makes it a thru road but from a preliminary point of view we wanted to at least anticipate that to see if it made sense to provide for this which is consistent with the direction that you have in your subdivision regulations. The plans were revised to address those possibilities twofold, one is to connect potentially to Upper Mile Point Drive and then secondly to at least have the potential of connecting into a large undeveloped piece at the upper end of Upper Terrace Avenue. The Morse's, when it's their turn to subdivide, may have no interest in thru-connecting but we try to look at utility connections and loops and things like that whenever it's practical to do so. Another issue in this second tier is building separation and we've had some general comments from the Fire Chief given these preliminary plans that has been shared with the applicant and will continue to refine based upon sprinkler requirements and so forth what the fire codes will require for building separation and plans will be evaluated from that point of view as well with

possible adjustments. There are 3 direct impact wetland crossings on the spine road as it traverses the hillside and I've encouraged that the Conservation Commission be brought into the loop sooner than later to do its site inspection and to provide for direction as needed. They will be advising this Board when we get formal, they will be advising the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the Special Exception applications and they'll be advising the Wetlands Bureau relative to the Dredge & Fill Permits so the bulk of the wetlands, if you see some of the open spaces in the center of that plan, those are basically where the two wetland systems are. If you look at Road C that goes straight up off the spine in the middle, the green spaces to the left and right of Road C are the wetlands and where the stream systems run down through the hillside seeps on the left, stream on the right and we spent a lot of time talking about drainage with the applicant because as you know for those of you that were on Board when we did the Clinic site plan, we have a stream that comes off this hillside that is in between Hart's Restaurant and Harley-Davidson and where it crosses Route 3 at that point, it comes onto the Clinic property. Where it exits the Clinic property, it goes through somebody's basement and when we were reviewing the Clinic site we were hyper sensitive to that and made sure we collected 100% of that site drainage and diverted it away from that house. Similarly, when we dealt with the Harley-Davidson project, we were equally sensitive to that and were making sure that we were collecting all the water in large underground basins and diverting it likewise away from that channel. Now we have a project that will be sending water down that stream one way or the other and we've emphasized on numerous occasions the importance to really take a real hard look at that and make sure we have excessive levels of caution built into that impact. I don't relish the day that if we were to make a mistake on that one, it would be a significant mistake so we have to err on the side of caution and we've had several discussions with Mr. Leo about that and he can maybe speak to a couple ideas that he has on that but they are well aware we have to be very, very mindful of the downstream conditions in terms of impacting downstream properties. Here again, these are second tier issues. We've spent most of our time dealing with the legal review on some of the zoning, the road standards trying to flush out where they are, what they are and the water system. Those are what I would call the first tier issues, those are the 3 big ones that we've been spending time on. The second tier ones to continue on that list, the phasing of the project's going to be critical, there's a substantial amount of grading on here. This is a hillside and we've been talking about all these cuts and walkouts and everything, this is not a flat site, there will be a substantial amount of grading involved and given the size of the project and the amount of grading is something that we have to here again be very, very vigil on in terms of phasing and construction sequencing. We talked about the overflow parking and the possibilities of some pedestrian interconnectedness and we also mentioned the necessity for the residential buffer, all of the things that would be taken into account. Things that would follow from that in my mind would be the architecture; site lighting is another one that we would

want to look at in terms of the impacts to abutting properties and making sure that we don't light this thing up like a ski slope. Along the same token, you want to provide adequate lighting to assure comfort and safety and the like so there's a balancing act there and we'd be dealing with solid waste issues, fuel, street numbering, mailboxes, a whole host of details when we get into the in depth plan review but for now we've been focusing on zoning, roads and the water system and then starting a dialogue on the second tier. In closing, the only other thing that we know is out there that Mike Faller has raised and we haven't really addressed it yet and that is looking at off-site conditions relative to Upper Ladd Hill Road. Upper Ladd Hill Road is in terrible shape in terms of its pavement condition and the intersection with U.S. Route 3 is kind of an oblique angle, kind of a sharp angle to the right and so when we start looking at the traffic and those kinds of things, we should be looking at that intersection as well. I'm sure Mike will be making recommendations relative to Upper Ladd Hill Road itself. Here again, it's an important issue, we just are starting to plow through these issues one by one and we haven't gotten into that in detail but Mike has been part of a couple staff level reviews of these preliminary plans and it's an issue he's raised. Worsman – Which part of this property sheds into Waukewan? Edgar – There have been 2 preliminary reviews of this project, the very first preliminary review with Vanesse Hangan was to address that issue and they had presented a downstream drainage analysis that confirms that this water actually enters into the wetland we were talking about on the previous project and based upon our knowledge, as well as the engineer's confirmation, that water then goes into Meredith Bay so while some of this property might be topographically in the Watershed, that's not where the water goes and that analysis was the very first item that they looked at because it has such a dramatic impact on density and that was presented to you and the Board in depth at a previous meeting. Vadney – That's actually one of the pieces of land that was controversial when that overlay district was put forth. I want to take a minute to open this up to the public and see who is here to speak either for or against or just to educate us on this piece of land. Ann Morse – Property owner at 12 Upper Terrace Avenue, the 14-acre parcel that's just above Meredith Bay. I'm very concerned about drainage. As you're saying, it's all coming our way and I'm very, very concerned as to the impact and I know I've had conversations with these gentlemen and it's great, their designs and all that, I just am very concerned about how that's going to be handled. I know they've talked about a porous asphalt system and I did a little research on it and I hope you will do some research as well because I'm not at all comfortable with it. I also wanted to know if there were any more waivers that we got side-tracked on here? Bayard – I want to reiterate what Lou said. We also have to do site plan review. Somebody can interpret this and say we can mix and match and whatever, it's legally questionable but we've got a note here that it's 199,000+ but under 200,000 sq. ft. there which would even in the CB District only allow you to have 19 down in the Shoreline District. I do have concern, there's a reason why we have that as the Shoreline District and there are reasons for

the density down there. Now, quite frankly, if you had 10 units down there and it says 8 maybe that's an argument where the mix and match might work but putting 23 down there to me really kind of defeats the purpose of that and you could, like Lou said, what if we put them all down there if we find a way to fit them, there's got to be a limit to that and that's the reason why it's the Shoreline District. I'm not sure what the magic number would be, perhaps it's 8 but I certainly don't think it's 23. I do like some of the concepts, the village and some of the other stuff, it's nice looking housing and all but I do have a problem with that. Leo – The last one I talked about was the L-shaped turnarounds for the dead-ends. The next one was actually touched on by the Board would be a waiver request to allow a 40' ROW width or private ROW width for the roads where a 50' is required. Again, we're trying to keep this village concept and keep the buildings a little closer to the road and a 50' ROW would be a somewhat prohibitive separation wise from front of building to front of building and then I have two more things. The next one is probably for a little bit of discussion. We had looked at this property and we understand there are drainage issues out here and this is a slope with seeps and there are abutters downstream that would be affected by whatever we do as far as drainage goes and we've been looking at low-impact development drainage scenarios for this project. We are looking at possibly a mix of conventional type of catch basin and detention ponds but in some of the flatter areas and dead-end roads one of the things that was mentioned was a porous pavement something that would allow the water to seep directly through the pavement, be stored in the gravel sub-base and then be allowed to either percolate into the ground as the ground would accept it or it would be metered out through an under drain pipe back to surface wetlands and just the way that works if you're not familiar with it is instead of providing your typical 24-inch section of pavement, you wind up with a section of pavement that's about 40" deep or possibly even deeper depending on what we come up with a structural design on it and what it's got is a gravel reservoir course below the typical pavement section that's designed to hold an entire storm event in that course and over time it would either allow it to percolate into the ground or typically as a backup we have an under drain system down there that allows that water to slowly drain out into a surface wetland over time so instead of a rain event occurring and then within 10 or 12 hours all the water leaves your property, the water would sit in this subsurface area for a day or two and typically a soil becomes saturated and over time it doesn't all just disappear into the groundwater, a lot of it seeps out through slopes and that's exactly how these wetlands are created and try to mimic that condition with porous pavement. Vadney – Let me point out that we are aware and Mrs. Morse mentioned that there are some drawbacks to that pavement and it is wonderful stuff working properly but in an area where you sand roads in the winter time, there are some problems of it clogging up with that sand and not working the way it was designed. Leo – Porous pavement does need some additional maintenance and as part of doing a low-impact development design, we would put together a storm water maintenance plan that would have to be part of the

condominium association's responsibility to take care of this. They would have to go out and inspect the pavement every spring and every fall it would need to be vacuumed if necessary or pressure washed to get any accumulated debris off of it. The University of New Hampshire has a test section they've been looking at and they have been sanding it actually fairly heavily and what they found is that you can put a lot of sand on this material and it will still absorb pretty much the heaviest storm you can get in this area. They do a sample where they take a 5 or 7 gallon bucket of water and just dump it over on the pavement and it only goes about a foot or two and disappears right into the ground. It's very porous material so you can actually clog 40% and still have that same porosity in it. Other things we were looking at were for the roofs themselves is putting rain gardens behind the buildings on the down slopes, we'll jerk the gutters or the rain off the back of the roof into these gardens and allow the water to seep into the ground or put stone drip edges around the building hooked to underground infiltration areas to again help try and put some of this water back into the ground. What we're going to be looking for is to see whether or not we can get the Planning Board's concurrence that we could look into this and see if we could get the Selectmen maybe to agree with us that that might be something we could do for some of these roads and then we'd have to work it out and back it up with all of the design and engineering that goes with it to prove that it would work for this site. Vadney – Does anyone want to comment? I would certainly think it is something we could look at and we'd keep an open mind about it. Leo – We wouldn't do it on the whole site, I think the main road where this is the thru road we would leave your conventional pavement with swales and detention ponds but these spur roads and the back ends of them might be a good place to do that. Edgar – Mike, do you get the same structural benefit with this type of pavement without all the sand aggregate in the mix like you normally would have? Do you have the same structural value that you would have with regular bituminous. Leo – The upper layer, the pavement itself and I need to do a little more search on this, is more suitable for local traffic than it is for heavy trucks. They may have a different mixture they can use on the highways but the section itself because it's deeper for local roads actually provides a better structural base than any conventional pavement section. Instead of whatever you're using now, 18 or 24 inches, you're going to have 40 inches of structure base there. It's gravel over a crushed stone which is a good base material and because it goes down deeper and below the frost layer, it tends to have actually a little more life to it. Vadney – There are a number of design features they can modify the mix and it is used on highways and probably a different formula for it, but the only one I know of in New Hampshire is I-95 down through Hampton by the toll booth down in that area, there's an area where they have installed the porous pavement. You'll notice it on a really rainy day, you don't get the spray off the tires like you usually do when it's raining because it soaks in. Leo – The other thing too is it tends to require less sanding and salting because it's a porous more abrasive surface, you get a better skid resistance on it because the water tends to go through it.

If you get rain and it starts to freeze, most of the water has already gone through the pavement rather than sitting on it and freezing. One last issue in talking with John earlier today about the adjacent subdivision, we understand that the roads that we want to connect to are currently private and we would need to get permission from that association to tie into the roads. In the event we have difficulty doing that and we don't really anticipate that, but in the event that we do, we thought it might be worth getting the Planning Board's opinion on whether or not we could end this development in a cul-de-sac in this end of the road. The Town's regulations are a 1200' maximum length and that would be a cul-de-sac of about 1,700', 500' in excess of what the Town allows. Bliss – If the roads were built to the regular standards without the waivers, would you lose any units? Leo – The road pavement width, we could go to a 20' pavement width and not lose any units. The road ROW width 50' vs. 40', would push the buildings further out and would force us into a redesign. Matarazzo - Part of the answer to that question and also the question of the units and the number of units in each area of the site, when we're designing a project like this it's sort of working both ends towards the middle. If you like what you see here which I like very much because I think it's an appropriate use for the site, then that unit is wide. What you're seeing as a footprint on here is a 40' wide footprint. The wider you get the more land you use. If, for instance, the road changed and the width of it changed or somebody said we don't want as much density here, what we're forced to do, but design wise what happens is you make the units narrower and I would not like to do that. I think our goal here was to create this single-family look with the decks and garages as part of the connection so that's why you see the units sited the way they are. We could move things around and we had the discussion about the road at the staff level and if the road changes, then we would have to change the units to make the numbers work for us. I guess I'd ask you as a Board, look at the product and see if the end result is something that we all would like to see in our community. If not fine, we can change a lot of things on this plan but if the design and the look of the houses is the right thing for the site and the community, then we hopefully have to adjust other things. Nothing can stay perfect and I guess that's where we're coming from. If you like this, which we like, then that's the reason why we have so many units there and we wanted to bring those buildings closer to the roads because we think that's a great look in a more urban area. Vadney – I certainly appreciate your last comment, I'm not one to quibble over whether this site can support 71 buildings or 61 buildings, to me once you pass 3 buildings it's probably overbuilding and so I'm willing to accept that the number is going to be substantially bigger than 3 so I'm not one to sit and quibble a whole lot between 71, 61 and 62 or something like that, I would rather see a good layout with 71 than a bad layout with 61. That being said, Lou has raised a good point about crowding so many into the shore area. At the same time, I would be able to argue for the other side of that to a degree, that from a visibility standpoint those down on that level would be almost invisible from most places I would suspect. I'm not sure of the lay of the land

down in there, I've walked it but I'd have to go on it again to verify it, but in a way, yes they are in the shoreline district but they are back enough to where they would be somewhat disguised. Edgar – They might be more visible from the Bay. Vadney – They might be more visible from the Bay but I suspect the ones at the top of the hill will be the most visible from the Bay. It's tricky when you get out there looking up at tree ridges and stuff but the number I think we'll have to work with that, I would like to see John, Bill and whoever else is required in conjunction with you folks to work, I guess I'd like to see the numbers even though they don't necessarily apply just so I can scope it better, what if it was all shoreland, what if it was all business and what's the determination and how far can you crowd it one way or the other. I certainly appreciate your thought that a good 71 is better than a bad 60. Worsman – To kind of give a little bit of a summary from what I'm hearing, I have to tell you that the Board of Selectmen have chosen "water quality" as their #1 issue. Meredith Bay is a critical piece. Putting those so close to the water, we know it's down slope and it's a vicious down slope, I would like to see them work real hard to keep that out of the shoreline zone. Edgar – We will and that was one of the first things we said from the get go, no matter whether it's single-family, multi-family, 10, 20, 50, 80 units, water quality is going to be critical whether it goes into Waukegan or not and so that point has been drilled home on more than one occasion. What is the nearest distance to any part of Winnepesaukee? Matarazzo – It's a goodly distance. It's about 900 feet. Edgar – Here again, I think the point is that as you look at various stormwater management strategies that water quality needs to be real high on the list, not just detention but looking at volume and looking at water quality and the downstream properties ability to receive the drainage. I would agree with Colette that water quality obviously needs to be a real high priority and I know in my conversations with Mike that he understands that. Leo – Just to mention the Shoreline District when you look at the zoning map is not a uniform line setback from the lake, it's sort of jogs up into our property in certain areas, the CB District actually jogs down closer to the lake so I don't know what the criteria was for laying out the Shoreline District but it seemed to follow more or less the property boundaries that were in existence at the time. Vadney – It's probably the way it was, closest to 300' or something like that. Worsman – The other piece was the buffer in this upper left-hand section between that and the residential properties. Privacy is a big issue up here and eliminating that additional or asking for a waiver on that buffer; I don't know how that would go over. In this lower left section, you asked one of your waiver requests was to reduce the buffer footage between the house and the end of the property line and you also said that the deck extended into that buffer. Matarazzo – We didn't ask for a waiver there. We were just saying that the setback in this area is 10', our houses are actually set at 30', the decks go out as much as 15' but the houses are all set well beyond the setback requirement. Finer – In the Shoreline District I would really like to see that dropped as close to 8 units as possible. There's a reason for the density that we have in there and I would encourage the Selectmen to deny

any road waivers. There is very limited parking on this site and as soon as you get #28 here having a Christmas party, nobody's going to get past there because people have to park in the road and if you start shrinking your roads, I think you're asking for trouble. Leo – Just one last comment. We were looking at this initially as a site plan with all private roads and no ROW's and we understand the need for ROW's so we did look at some other developments in town that included Waukegan Village which I think has a 40' ROW and Meredith Bay Village which has a 40' ROW as well so I think a lot of the waivers that we're requesting are what we noticed on other site plans and the Site Plan Regulations that we reviewed anyway don't give us the guidance we need to develop the site and that's why we spoke to the Town Planner and we came up with these waiver requests to build what we thought would be somewhat consistent with the ordinance. Edgar – As Mike's indicated what we did do is when we were back in the single-family mode, this property could support a certain number of single-family 10,000 sq. ft. lots, it's just that it wasn't going to get to the yield level that the applicant's looking for. That's not my determination, I'm not the one buying the property and so what were some other options were to look at it from a multi-family point of view and that discussion led us to looking at two fairly recent projects, one being Meredith Bay Village and one being Waukegan Village. None of them are exactly the same fact patterns but they are at least multi-family Meredith Bay Village condominiums and in those cases they had the perimeter setbacks, they had the 40' ROW, that type of thing and so that's absent any more specific regulations in either the zoning or site plan that's the best we could share with them in terms of what we've had for recent approvals in terms of multi-family condominiums and that led them to a redesign to what you see here. That doesn't mean that guarantees the Selectmen will grant relief, but what we were trying to do and it's effectively what we've had tonight is to air that out. It's not a staff call. They know that and I know that and so we're trying to flush out the water issues, we're trying to flush out the zoning issues and we're trying to flush out these road issues as best we can so that they can then have a session with the Selectmen to talk about the road issues having gotten a readout from this Board and our consulting engineer and continue to narrow down those first tier issues and cross them off the list and then proceed into more of a final design mode. Vadney – I appreciate that thought that it is good to look at those other two units. I would point out one major difference between Meredith Bay and Waukegan Village and this project from a road standpoint, this one has something like a 200' vertical drop in it one way toward the lake and I think the other roads in the other two are relatively flat. Edgar – Unlike the other ones, we've spent their time and their money to front-end the road plan and profile review so we received today a correspondence from our consulting engineer, we've spent a fair amount of time with the engineers last week going over plans and profiles and from an engineering point of view we want to improve two intersections because of those grades. Clearly, it's a different site, it's a sloping site. I shared with Mr. Matarazzo our Critical Area Viewshed Analysis that was done years ago and the resulting

Hillside Best Management Practices to see when we get into the architectural side and landscaping side, if there's ways we can improve to the extent its visible to try to do what we can to consider the fact that it will be viewed from afar from various locations not the least of which is going to be the water. We are sensitive to the fact that it is a hillside but it is what it is and we have to try to minimize the impacts as best we can. Vadney – The last thing I would say on the roads, I appreciate the attempt to use a narrow ROW, less pavement and to keep the roads in a private situation but as John pointed out many years before us they had allowed for the possibility of a loop road, we're talking about it now and it will probably happen sooner or later and I suspect and I'm not worried about the next 10 or 12 years, I'm thinking long-range for the Town of Meredith, 40 or 50 years from now, very likely Upper Mile Point Drive and this new road if built as proposed will turn out to be Town roads and remember we've done the Paquette project up off of Pease Road where we gave some waivers on what they could do there, but we did lay out the idea that it would be a good route for fire trucks to go and you have to expect people no matter which development they are living in to take the short way out and the like and I expect this would become a loop road of sorts so I really hesitate cutting those standards too low. I'm certainly willing to give a bit, but I think we want to assume it will become a Town road at least a long time in the future. Matarazzo – To sum up Mr. Chairman, I see this going in a direction I feel bad about that we're not going to get that waiver for the roads and you don't like the number of units down in this area of the site. Unfortunately, we need to get the 71 units, the density allows it and I fear that where we will lose it now is in the architecture. Obviously, you're in control here but I would ask you to really think about what it is we're trying to do. We can design townhouses in here or houses that are attached, it's not what we want to do and we thought we were coming in here with something very special even if we design it the other way it will still be special, I'm not one for designing anything that's not nice looking but I would really like to have you think about what happens when you widen the road and force the units up the hill. Maybe there's a compromise in there someplace to allow us to do this and I'm just saying this because a lot of work went into this and a lot of thought went into this concept of the architecture. It will still be 71 units but not the same; I guess that's what I'm concerned about. Vadney – I certainly appreciate that and I agree with you that it would be nice to keep the architecture and I'll be pretty flexible in what we can allow, I do think we need to be careful on the roads and maybe what you have is fine as long as the Fire Chief and others say yes that could become a public road and we could traverse it and do the loop, etc., so I'm certainly willing to do that. We've walked the site but we need to walk it again now that we know more about the layout and really get a feel for how those lower houses fit on the land and the like. Matarazzo – I think that's an important thing to walk the site because it's very distinctly different from there to here. In fact, in here we left these pockets because that's where all the specimen trees are. There are some nice pines in there and toward the lake there are lots of pines off our property. When you walk

the site and with this plan in hand, I think you'll see what we were trying to achieve and the feeling of the site and with some of these sketches with you. Bayard – We're referring to other plans that we did and somebody's going to say we put in 23 units down in the Shoreline District. I hate to say, it's somewhat of a concern about precedent. I like the looks of this, I feel in some ways we're being told if you want this nice thing, you've got to put a whole lot down here. I'm not even so much concerned about the 40' myself on this one. I am a little concerned about some of these side roads especially if we're putting all this curbing in that you can't really get by some parked cars. Maybe that idea of having some offsets here and there might do it or maybe widen it up just a little bit. You've got small movement toward the clubhouse, there might be some give here and there but I am concerned that we are setting a precedent by putting so much into the shoreline. Vadney – The density in that lower piece is to a large degree based on Bill Edney's interpretation of the code and it's very likely that he's right and the trouble with all laws is sometimes they don't work like you thought they might and they may have us on that one, I'm not saying they do, but they may. They know that it's an issue that we're well aware of. Morse - What's the building setback when you're approaching a wetland buffer zone, how close can you get? Edgar – It depends, the wetland closest to you folks is a stream and I believe that comes with a 100' setback and there are other non-designated wetlands on the site that would be either 50' or 75' so it depends on the nature of the wetland and the wetlands are all shown on that particular plan and the respective buffers so there are 3 wetland crossings on the road and in the first cut notwithstanding the road, all the dwelling units are outside of the buffers. Other than the roads, there wouldn't be any impacts. Like the previous project, we raised the question that we have to look at the footprints of the buildings to make sure as we grade around them, we're anticipating that as well and making sure that's factored into avoidance so it's 100' for that one stream and then I believe 50' for non-designated wetlands elsewhere throughout the project. Morse - I welcome the Board to walk through my property if you'd like to see how it is on the Winnepesaukee side down stream just to get a feel for what's going on. Vadney – Thank you, I would appreciate that. The site walk will most likely follow another hearing but at any rate when we do, if you would like to attend with us, we don't take public comment at them but you can point out landmarks we might miss or something like that and it would be very helpful. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, I have one question and then a comment. Can you tell us how you get to Unit 71, 70, 50 and 49? Matarazzo – That's through your regulation that says we're allowed to access two units with one driveway. Edgar – There are 4 common driveways in that concept on the whole plan. I've sat here and bit my tongue, where do you live, sir? Matarazzo – I live in New London, New Hampshire. As a Board member, I don't appreciate you coming in and telling us what we need or what would look good here. I take a little offense to that and a lot of us have lived in this Town a long time and I am just saying I don't think that helps your case. Matarazzo – Excuse me, but I'm obligated to tell you what. You've told me by

your regulations that I have to do architectural review so I have to show you plans that I think fit the character of your community, I'm not telling you this is what you have to build or what you have to do, I'm meeting your regulations that's all I'm doing. I'm asking, I would never tell you what to do. I'm asking your guidance, your approval, your satisfaction with what we've done that's all I can do. Vadney – Sir, I appreciate that too and I will say that there are things following our rules and ordinances that could be done on this site that would be a whole lot worse than what you've shown us and I think the architecture is certainly handsome, the layout is a nice layout whether it fits and will work remains to be seen by some additional code negotiations and code readings. Could I say one thing about possible future use of these roads if they do become Town roads. We tried to anticipate that a little bit by making sure that the road extension here was to Town standards and that the road pavement going through the main spine would be to Town standards in case they ever got in a position where they had to be Town roads. Vadney – If that fits the Fire Chief and the others, that's fine but I'd hate to see us do it in a way that would preclude that and I'm willing to be a little flexible on some of the other spacing and things as much as we can. Jim Miller – I want to talk about the density change. I think Bill Edney's taking a more conservative approach on this than has been taken in the past. Usually when you have two different zones affected, the density will be the same as whatever the new zone it goes into. In other words, this should have been all the same density as Central Business if it were treated the same way as it has been in the past. I think Bill is taking a very conservative approach on this by applying the Shoreline density to that portion and the Central Business density to the other portion. In the past when those decisions have been made, we've actually seen the zoning map change and as far as I'm concerned, there should not be a line on here any more that shows Shoreline, it's all Central Business. Vadney – Bill is very good at reading these codes so I say we may not really be tickled with that reading but it may be one we don't have a lot of fight over. Linda Johnson – Just to add what Jim said, a number of years ago when we made that one 19-acre lot instead of 9 pieces, it was discussed then about making it all Commercial and basically they said it was the same tax rates so they didn't change it but it is all one lot and was supposed to be Central Business.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant

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

William Bayard, Secretary