

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice Chairman; Flanders; Selectmen's Rep.; Kahn; Touhey; Lapham, Alternate; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Sorell moved, Flanders seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2009, AS PRESENTED.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **BKK PARTNERSHIP** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use from a professional office to a craft shop, Tax Map U06, Lot 40A, located at 73 Main Street, Central Business District.

LaBrecque - This is a multi-use building on Main Street across from the Post Office that has apartments up above and businesses down below. The applicant's proposing to change the use from an office to a retail business where they will be selling arts and crafts. The application, checklist and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. A request to waive the formal site plan requirement has been made due to the limited scope of the project as it is just a change of use and there will be no exterior modifications to the site. It is recommended a formal site plan waiver be granted given the limited nature of the proposal. It is also recommended the application for site plan amendment be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Touhey moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF BKK PARTNERSHIP FOR A CHANGE OF USE AND THE WAIVER OF A FORMAL SITE PLAN BE GRANTED. Voted unanimously.

2. **KRISTEN B. MONTANA** – Proposed 3-lot subdivision of Tax Map U07, Lots 14 & 14A (5.06 to 6.10 acs.), located at 1 Blueberry Hill Road, Meredith Neck.

LaBrecque – There are two existing lots currently and they are proposing to adjust the line of one of them and basically split approximately 11 acres into two parcels, one being about 5 acres and the other one 6 acres. The application, checklist and abutters list are on file. The filing fees have been paid. It is recommended the application for subdivision be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Sorell moved, Flanders seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF KRISTEN B. MONTANA FOR A 3-LOT SUBDIVISION AS PROPOSED. Voted unanimously.

3. **MARK & MARIA YOUNG FOR ACCUFAB CORP.** – Proposed Site Plan to construct a 9,600 sq. ft. metal building for light manufacturing purposes with related site improvements, Tax Map S23, Lot 64C, Annalee Place and Reservoir Road, B & I District.*

4. **MARK & MARIA YOUNG FOR ACCUFAB CORP.** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed 9,600 sq. ft. metal light manufacturing building, Tax Map S23, Lot 64C, Annalee Place and Reservoir Road, B & I District.*

LaBrecque –The proposed site plan is for the purpose of constructing a 9,600 sq. ft. metal building for a light fabrication use and there will also be two bays that are rented out which the uses are not known at this time. The application, checklist and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. It's recommended the application for site plan amendment and architectural review be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing on May 12, 2009. The applicant would like to give a brief presentation on what actually is being proposed. It is also recommended that we do a site visit before our next hearing.

Touhey moved, Kahn seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF MARK AND MARIA YOUNG FOR A SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING ON MAY 12, 2009. Voted unanimously

5. **MARK & MARIA YOUNG FOR ACCUFAB CORP.** – Site Plan and Architectural Review. (Rep. Carl Johnson and Erin Darrow)

Johnson – We understand you would like to hold the public hearing at the next meeting but I thought it would be helpful to explain the project a little bit so when you go on the site walk, you will have some information that might help you in terms of things you might be looking at while you're on the site. This is one of the former Hartson parcels located on what was formerly Hemlock and now Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. The wetlands on this property were delineated by Nicole Roseberry from Ames Associates. The topography of the property is such that the upper portion of the property is located at the southwest corner and slopes gradually down towards the wetland. Mr. Young owns AccuFab Corp. and is currently in the old Annalee building (Chuck's Corner). The property is zoned B & I and he is proposing a 9,600 sq. ft. building and approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of that would be occupied by AccuFab Corp. The remainder of the building would be divided in half with two units to be determined at a later date, similar approved uses in the zone, light industry. The 6,000 sq. ft. is a little bit unusual because AccuFab essentially is a 2-person operation, occasionally a 3-person operation and there's virtually no members of the public that are going to come to his business so the mass of the bulding is not an indication of how much parking the site would determine. The AccuFab business really generates 3 or 4 parking spaces and they have occasional deliveries that deliver stock to the site. The other portions of the building that would be occupied, there would be a note similar to notes on other plans that it would be limited to the low intensity type uses that wouldn't generate a lot of parking. We're trying to develop this site in a manner that there's parking nobody is ever going to use so we're showing about 22 spaces on the lot. Information has been provided in your packets regarding construction of the metal

building, Color chart and Mr. Young selected the colors of the building. We do have some landscaping elements that have been incorporated into the plan to dress up the frontage primarily on Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. Erin is going to give you a report on the grading to let you know how the property was graded and some of the drainage and grading elements to give you a sense of what you'd be looking for. Erin- The intent of the stormwater management and drainage design is to keep the flow of water in the general direction where it currently flows to an existing state. We are incorporating as much low impact development infiltration techniques as possible which will utilize both landscaping and infiltration to help control and manage storm water. We are not having any impacts within the wetland buffer area so we are keeping as much natural vegetation as possible. Additionally, for purposes of identifying the need for parking, we made the assumption it's a rather conservation assumption that would lead to probably more parking spaces that will be needed that 50% of the proposed building area will be utilized employee type area and the other 50% would be utilized for warehouse and storage and machinery and what have you that could be fully automated. There are a total of 22 parking spaces available and this could accommodate any other uses that might occur other than the light industrial and potential warehousing that is very likely for the site once it is developed so essentially we're trying to impact as little of the lot as possible. At the final developed stages, less than 25% of the lot will have impervious area in the form of building and parking.

Flanders moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS APPLICATION TO MAY 12, 2009, MEETING AND SCHEDULE A SITE WALK ON MAY 9, 2009, AT 8:00 a.m.

6. **VAN DER VELDE ASSISTED LIVING CORP.**- Site Plan Amendment for building expansions of assisted living structures & related site improvements, Tax Map S21, Lot 12, 153 Parade Road, Res. & FR.*
7. **VAN DER VELDE ASSISTED LIVING CORP.** – Architectural Design Review of proposed building expansions to assisted living structures, Tax Map S21, Lot 12, 153 Parade Road, Res. & FR.*

LaBrecque – The Applicant's proposing a site plan amendment and architectural design review to expand the two assisted-living buildings in the rear part of the property to include 9 additional rooms for double occupancy. The site plan, checklist and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. It is recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Flanders moved, Kahn seconded, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN APPLICATION AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **MARK MURPHY FOR MICHAEL & MICHELE MERRILL** – Continuation of a public hearing held on February 24 and March 10, 2009, for a proposed Site Plan to construct a bank with related site improvements, Tax Map U15, Lot 14, located at 71 NH Route 25 in the Central Business District. Application accepted February 10, 2009.

Applicants requested a continuance to May 26th meeting.

Flanders moved, Kahn seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE YOU THE APPLICATION OF MARK MURPHY AND MICHAEL AND MICHELLE MERRILL TO MAY 26, 2009, PER THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANTS. Voted unanimously.

2. **SACHELS REALTY TRUST** – (Rep. Carl Johnson) - Continuation of a public hearing held on April 14, 2009 for a major subdivision of Tax Map R07, Lots 49 & 50 into 9 lots (ranging from 1.69 ac. to 9.07 ac.) located on Meredith Center Road in the Residential District. Application accepted on March 24, 2009.

Johnson – Subsequent to the last public hearing, the Board conducted a co-site walk with the members of the Conservation Commission as well as the members of the Zoning Board and some staff. We have made some modifications to the plan based on that site walk. As you will recall, there are some areas that included some small wetlands that were being investigated and redefined by Randy Shuey and Nicole Roseberry. Those wetland areas are wetlands that were occurring at the end of the cul-de-sac near the hammerhead turnaround and one of those areas was actually previously determined to be a non-designated, exempt wetland. After reviewing the technical specifications of that wetland, it has been determined not to be jurisdictional so that wetland for all practical purposes is not a wetland anymore by jurisdictional standards. The other small borrow pit which is at the end of the cul-de-sac was also reflagged based upon some intensification of the soil samples in that area and that wetland decreased in size and actually became a wetland that is under 3,000 sq. ft. so now becomes non-designated, exempt. Its still a jurisdictional wetland but under the Meredith Zoning Ordinance does not have a 50' protective setback from it anymore. There was one other small finger of a wetland which originally was flagged as being jurisdictional and after the reinvestigation of that wetland, about 50% of that extension of the finger of that wetland was determined to be non-jurisdictional so the flags were re-hung and remapped by us and we've redone the plan to show the increase in the buildable areas that result from those wetland modifications. Because the buildable areas increased significantly we opted to take 2 of the lots which were previously going to be duplex lots and made them individual lots. The original configuration of the subdivision had 9 lots and had enough duplex units to make 14 total units. At this particular juncture, we're having 11 single-family lots with 3 of those lots having the ability to support a duplex so we're still ending up with 14 units. Per the soils and slopes

calculations of the property, we're entitled to have 16 units total so we're still under the number of units that are able to be supported by the soils and slopes. The Conservation Commission recommended that we attempt to relocate a portion of the roadway slightly to the south to try to minimize the impact to a wetland finger that's coming down from the north and I believe their suggestion was to move it at least 10 or 12 feet and we were able to move it almost 20' away from that wetland so we did move it as far as we could. There are a couple of engineering details that prevent us from moving it any further, one of which is the entrance out to Meredith Center Road is locked by permit, there's a telephone pole there. You can't move the entrance any further south because of that pole. The design standards dictate a minimum of about 50' coming off of the highway so you don't have anybody coming out onto the highway at an angle so we held that 50' tangent coming off the highway and then constructed a curve to the left and a curve to the right to be able to minimize the impact to both those wetland areas. We have a very minimal amount of direct wetland impact and buffer impact on this project to begin with and we have significantly less as a result of what we've done. Paul Fluet investigated the possibility of doing away with the retention area that we had which was between lots 5 and 6 and at this point had not problem, it was not a detention issue, we weren't trying to keep water from going anywhere because we have no downstream abutters that would be affected by it so he was able to provide the necessary treatment along the easterly side of the road and was able to do away with that small retention area altogether so that provides the adequate treatment for what little amount of runoff there was as a result of constructing this road and also decreases the effect into the buffer because that detention area was originally entirely in the buffer area. As we mentioned, we meet the density which is 40,000 sq. ft. The subdivision plan will be updated to identify the type of wetland as per the soil scientist's recommendation. The Conservation Commission concerns were addressed as I mentioned. Lou Caron is in the process of finalizing his comments, he's issued a letter already to Mr. Fluet and he has made some changes to the plan based on Mr. Caron's review. We did submit a wetland map and will submit a revised wetland map with the wetland scientist's stamp on it as part of the final approval. We do need to go to the ZBA for a special exception for the minor wetland impact and that will be a condition of final approval. We also need DES approval for the wetlands crossing and that would be a condition of approval. We do need state subdivision approval for most of the lots because they are under 5 acres. We have indicated that the services for this project, electricity, cable and phone, will be underground. We're in the process of communicating with the utility company to discuss the construction phase. We did receive a DOT driveway permit for the property that was issued June 1, 2007 and will expire June 1, 2008 so we do need to have that renewed. That driveway permit was good for 16 units. We do need to go to the Board of Selectmen for a waiver for the 1,000' road length and also the reduced roadway standards. The Fire Chief has reviewed the hammerhead turnaround at the end for adequacy. We will be providing a storm water pollution prevention plan as part of the package. There's a performance guarantee that's required and there are 2 elements, one of which is the sediment and erosion control value, the other is the total unit cost

estimate for constructing the road. The applicant normally has the option to either building it or bond it. If he chooses to build the road, he would have to post the performance guarantee for the sediment and erosion control and then he would construct the road and upon final approval by the inspecting agencies, he would then be able to record the plan. The other option is to post the entire performance guarantee of the road in a manner sufficient to the Town Finance Department and then the subdivision plan could be recorded and lots could be sold. We're not positive which way we're going but that would be determined prior to final approval and the cost estimate would be reviewed at a public hearing. If this hearing were to be continued that we be able to handle it during this process instead of having a second public hearing just to deal with the unit cost estimate on the road if that would be acceptable to the Board. We would also have to submit some draft language for some of the lots, there are some easements that go across a couple of lots, the most important of which is an access easement for the lot that was previously subdivided. That lot has access over the existing travelled roadway which comes from Meredith Center Road and that access will be discontinued and a new access will be provided to that lot going down this lot line and connecting with the existing roadway at that point. We will submit language for that easement prior to final approval. It has been suggested a note be added to the subdivision plan indicating no further subdivision is permitted. We do have a note reserving the right have two-family homes on those lots that can support them. The conditional approval will be valid for 2 years and we are agreeable to that timeframe. Mr. Vaal has come up with a suggestion to have residential covenants that are incorporated in the deed for these lots with some things to increase the quality of the development that happens in a subdivision and there will be some boilerplate type things about no obnoxious or offensive activities, there would be no signage except for 1 sq. ft. professional sign or somebody decided to go for a home occupation. The disturbed area of the lots would have to be landscaped and loamed. No dumping or storage on the lots, no capped foundations so the dwellings would have to be able to complete their dwelling in a reasonable timeframe. No camper trailers or mobile homes and no unregistered vehicles. No commercial vehicles over 1½ tons permitted to park overnight. Some of those things are covered by the Town's regulations but others aren't. LaBrecque – I forwarded the Conservation Commission's comments to Lou Caron. He has reviewed them and said they would be fine incorporating the box culvert and moving the drainage area which Paul Fluet already did and sent it to Lou for review. I would request from Carl prior to the next hearing that we have the revised numbers for the wetland and buffer impacts so we can incorporate the exact square footage into the decision. There are a few of Lou Caron's comments that haven't been addressed yet, but after talking with Paul and Lou, there may be a better mousetrap for the road design as far as the amount of disturbance, grading and the shoulders so they may possibly be requesting some of that in road waivers. We will have Mike Faller's final review by our next hearing. I need to have the unit cost estimates from the engineer nailed down before our next meeting so it can be reviewed by staff and the comments back. They don't meet the road standards so they will have to go to the Board of Selectmen for a waiver.

Ralph Pisapia – Meredith Conservation Commission – We participated in the site review and based on what I've heard tonight, the Commission is relatively on board with this project and appreciates the cooperation of Mr. Vaal. Vadney – I appreciate having 4 of the Commission members walk with us the other day. A quick summary of things you still need: (1) revised impacts to the buffer and the wetlands, (2) some of Lou Caron's comments incorporated into the final engineering plans for the roadway and the grading, as well as the review of the roadway by DPW so we can get together unit cost estimates for the performance guarantee. Touhey – I just want to tell Carl that it was very clear as to what you had laid out so I want to thank you for that because it was easy to see. Hearing closed at 7:32 p.m.

Flanders moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO MAY 12, 2009. Voted unanimously.

3. **BKK PARTNERSHIP – Rep. Butch Keniston**

The property in question is 73 Main Street and it is the building across from the Post Office. It has existed in its present configuration since 1987 which is 3 retail spaces on the ground floor with apartments above. The area that is identified by shading here was previously occupied by Fairway Funding, a mortgage office and prior to that from 2005 back, it was a retail space. Most of the time it was an office supply store and then a quilt shop. The space adjacent to it is Hawkins Photography and that's been there for more than 20 years. The proposal is for a lady to do an Art Gallery, Crafts and Gifts type of low intensity retail use. She's proposing to allow other artists to display their work in designated locations for a fee. For that fee, they won't have to be there, she will be the person that handles the sales. It's a very straightforward retail use and nothing will change on the outside of the building. The parking requirements would remain the same. The zoning regulations that apply to the use are identical between the office use and the retail space. As a side bar, Angela asked me to bring some peripheral information that I have about the rights we have to municipal parking. We are probably the only property on Main Street that actually has a formal claim on the parking and that's due to a situation that took place in the original subdivision whereby we granted and deeded to the Town the access to the municipal parking around the back. Prior to that, access to the parking was not owned by the Town, I was the owner so when the subdivision was done, that situation was formalized. LaBrecque – As the applicant stated, retail business is permitted in the Central Business District. There will be no modifications to the exterior of the building or the site. Main Street tenants and employees are encouraged to park in public parking lots to free up parking on Main Street. That's something the Board typically reminds all of the Main Street business owners about. The maximum building signage allowed is 32 sq. ft. A sign application is required from the Building Department. The applicant is encouraged to have a sign that is consistent with the character or the downtown. Down lighting and cutoff fixtures are also encouraged for both building and sign lighting. The Board does reserve the right to review and

amend per site plan regulations Nos. 7 and 17. Lapham – The only concern I have is when the quilt was there, they held classes and they were in the evening. Are any classes proposed? The applicant has indicated she may do some type of teaching at a time that is not going to conflict with the sales activity and she will be conducting that herself and not hiring other people for that. She has indicated it would be times alternate to the business activities. As far as responding to the parking issues and the other things Angela had mentioned, because we are very much aware of the parking situation in Town, we actually put it in our commercial leases to notify the tenants not only that they are expected to not take up available parking on the street and to use what's available behind the buildings and also we make them aware of the Town's snow removal ordinances too. Hearing closed at 7:39 p.m.

Kahn moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THIS CHANGE OF USE FOR BKK PARTNERSHIP FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR A CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE TO RETAIL BUSINESS, TAX MAP U06, LOT 40A, 73 MAIN STREET AND THE APPLICANT IS ENCOURAGED TO HAVE A SIGN THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CHARACTER OF THE DOWNTOWN, DOWN LIGHTING AND CUTOFF FIXTURES ARE ENCOURAGED AND THE BOARD RESERVES THE USUAL RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 7 AND 17.

4. **KRISTEN B. MONTANA:** (Rep. (Frank Yerkes)

During the public hearing portion for Montana, an abutter to this project was in the audience and announced he had not received abutter notification. He has not seen the plan and would like a chance to look at it. Because of this notification error, the public hearing was cancelled and the applicant's agent was instructed to provide a corrected list of abutters and fees and the project would be placed on the next agenda for application acceptance and public hearing.

5. **MARK & MARIA YOUNG FOR ACCUFAB CORP.** – Site Plan and Architectural Review. (Rep. Carl Johnson and Erin Darrow)

Johnson – We understand you would like to hold the public hearing at the next meeting but I thought it would be helpful to explain the project a little bit so when you go on the site walk, you will have some information that might help you in terms of things you might be looking at while you're on the site. This is one of the former Hartson parcels located on what was formerly Hemlock and now Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. The wetlands on this property were delineated by Nicole Roseberry from Ames Associates. The topography of the property is such that the upper portion of the property is located at the southwest corner and slopes gradually down towards the wetland. Mr. Young owns AccuFab Corp. and is currently in the old Annalee building (Chuck's Corner). The property is zoned B & I and he is proposing a 9,600 sq. ft. building and approximately 6,000 sq. ft. of that

would be occupied by AccuFab Corp. The remainder of the building would be divided in half with two units to be determined at a later date, similar approved uses in the zone, light industry. The 6,000 sq. ft. is a little bit unusual because AccuFab essentially is a 2-person operation, occasionally a 3-person operation and there's virtually no members of the public that are going to come to his business so the mass of the building is not an indication of how much parking the site would determine. The AccuFab business really generates 3 or 4 parking spaces and they have occasional deliveries that deliver stock to the site. The other portions of the building that would be occupied, there would be a note similar to notes on other plans that it would be limited to the low intensity type uses that wouldn't generate a lot of parking. We're trying to develop this site in a manner that there's parking nobody is ever going to use so we're showing about 22 spaces on the lot. Information has been provided in your packets regarding construction of the metal building, Color chart and Mr. Young selected the colors of the building. We do have some landscaping elements that have been incorporated into the plan to dress up the frontage primarily on Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. Erin is going to give you a report on the grading to let you know how the property was graded and some of the drainage and grading elements to give you a sense of what you'd be looking for. Erin- The intent of the stormwater management and drainage design is to keep the flow of water in the general direction where it currently flows to an existing state. We are incorporating as much low impact development infiltration techniques as possible which will utilize both landscaping and infiltration to help control and manage storm water. We are not having any impacts within the wetland buffer area so we are keeping as much natural vegetation as possible. Additionally, for purposes of identifying the need for parking, we made the assumption it's a rather conservation assumption that would lead to probably more parking spaces that will be needed that 50% of the proposed building area will be utilized employee type area and the other 50% would be utilized for warehouse and storage and machinery and what have you that could be fully automated. There are a total of 22 parking spaces available and this could accommodate any other uses that might occur other than the light industrial and potential warehousing that is very likely for the site once it is developed so essentially we're trying to impact as little of the lot as possible. At the final developed stages, less than 25% of the lot will have impervious area in the form of building and parking.

Flanders moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS APPLICATION TO MAY 12, 2009, MEETING AND SCHEDULE A SITE WALK ON MAY 9, 2009, AT 8:00 a.m.

3. **VAN DER VELDE ASSISTED LIVING CORP:** (Rep. Carl Johnson)

This is Forest View Manor on Parade Road. This project was approved by the Board several years ago. The original structure is located at the front of the property and there were two additional buildings added at the rear of the property. The proposal this evening is to do a major and a minor addition to each one of the

existing buildings that constitute the first expansion of the property. The first expansion is located in Building #1 and is to be expanded out on the back corner. The second expansion is a slight bump out of 6 feet of Building #2. The second expansion on the second building is a similar 6' bump out. The first expansion is to facilitate the adding of 6 rooms. Essentially, its creating a wing shape here and it would be an expansion of a hallway with some additional rooms and what that does is create a courtyard which is located interior of the existing building and the expansion so the residents would have the ability to be outside and not actually leave the building per se, they would be in the courtyard. Similarly, the expansion to the second unit is in a similar manner, it's a little bit unusually configured but there's a hallway leading to an expansion of 3 rooms and that also creates this courtyard effect which allows the residents to be outside and not actually leaving the confines of the facility. Some notes have been added to the plan as per the Staff Review. The original plan had some wetlands delineated on it and we've added the setbacks onto the plan to show that all of this construction is being done outside of the 50' buffer so there's no Special Exception required by the ZBA. There are no wetlands that are impacting the second expansion, that's to the second unit. With regard to the expansion of the second unit, there are some underground water tanks that will have to be relocated. We did investigate expanding this building to the rear, there is a slope, a banking if you will, that was constructed as part of the development of this unit and by relocating the wing off to the side, it does create a kind of unusual configuration, however, it does allow for a lesser impact to the surrounding topography by putting the addition in that location. The 6' bump out that's occurring on the first unit pushes it fairly close to the existing access way so we're going to relocate that access about 3', remove about 3' of pavement and add about 3' of pavement in a different area to accommodate the access way. Basically, nothing will change, it will just give them a little bit of room as you pass by that corner of the facility. In conjunction with the site plan revision we are asking for architectural design review. The architecture is going to be the same as the existing buildings, we're just expanding them so the pictures pretty much say what the style, configuration and the architecture of the building's going to look like, it's going to look identical to the photographs in the file. The same types of materials and colors will be used on the expansions. There is a complete set of architectural plans for the expansions available to look at. For each one of the expansions, we also have a floor plan which shows how the layout of the units is going to be. The existing land area and the amount of coverage calculations have not been done and will be noted on the final plan. It is significantly under what's allowed in this particular zone. The expansion of this does require coming back to the Planning Board because it is a revision to the original approval so that's why we're here. There are issues that have to be worked out with DES in terms of the septic system load on the property. This property is serviced by 2 large community wells and also the community septic systems and the builder and developer are working with DES to resolve all of those issues. Those will be handled by Mr. Edney in the Certificate of Occupancy process to make sure we're meeting all of the requirements of DES in terms of the septic. The contours have been shown on this plan and there is not going to be any change to the surrounding

grading. Both of these expansions are going to be such that the original grade outside of the foundation is going to remain largely undisturbed. With regard to the expansion of the first unit, there is going to be one access way which comes up to the back for utility service, beyond that its going to be basically expanding out onto the slope and from the point of the foundation downward towards the bottom of the slope, the grades shall remain largely undisturbed in that area. Prior to construction, there will be sediment and erosion control silt fencing put in that area to protect the wetland, there will be no such mechanisms necessary on the expansion of the second building. The site currently has 41 parking spaces including 4 handicaps and the demand for the site plan requires 15 spaces so we already have more spaces than we need so there's no extra demand to parking resulting from these 2 expansions. The manner and use of the property is the same, nothing's going to change in terms of what these rooms are used for, the uses are identical to the use that's existing in both of these facilities right at the moment. The owner and builder are both here if the Board has any questions about the specific nature of the expansion. Vadney asked the total number of new rooms. Johnson – I believe its 9, 6 and 3. LaBrecque – I'd like to point out on Page 71, there is an evaluation of the septic system, the parking and the water supply. Basically, someone went out and evaluated the existing septic system and its capacity and the land's capacity to withstand additional loading and it was determined that 9 rooms or 18 beds and 3 new employees could be accommodated with the existing septic system that is there so I don't know what type of approval is required from DES, but I figured they would have some say either way so that's why I put that in the staff report, I'm not sure if a formal approval is needed. Johnson – Any modification to an existing system in terms of the load has to be reviewed but I'm not sure of the exact approval process. He also took a look at the amount of water and found that was adequate enough to accommodate the new rooms as well. There is a letter going back to 2000 in the file from Jack Dever indicating that the use was permitted by Special Exception and that an expansion of the use would require site plan approval and the State would have to take a look at the septic approval. Johnson – The lighting is going to be similar to the lighting that's there now, downward shining. No additional outside lighting is proposed. LaBrecque – I requested that the grading elevations or the contours at least on the second page be shown just so its obvious that the land on the existing building located on the south side of the property does slope away from it. This addition is not being put into a hillside. The architectural design review for these existing buildings was approved with the site plan back in 2002 and it is consistent with what is there today. I am requesting that the architectural labels be labeled so you know exactly what portion of the building is the addition for any future review of the file that may occur. Vadney – Is it correct that the last time we looked at this site plan was for the original brick building when they added the new front? Johnson – It was after the expansion. This was the original Meredith Brick Manor facility that you granted site plan approval for originally. Vadney – You show an existing daily design flow of 5,000 gpd, do you have any idea what they use on a peak day? Dan Martin – The use on a peak day is 400 gpd. Johnson – This is typical, the design load is always magnified by a huge factor in terms of what's actually being used and DES

does use historical data to determine the ability to expand a system but when you calculate your loading its based on a huge number and its very rarely approaching that number. There are 60 current residents and 78 are proposed after this project is completed per Ann Marie Van Der Velde. Sorell asked how the water is measured. Johnson – Water meters from the wells. LaBrecque – There are several requirements that are necessary for this type of assisted living facility that Bill reviews and the state permits. Marguerite Crocker – The existing facility is about 200' from my well and I'm interested in where the septic is going to be because I don't want my water to be contaminated. Johnson – There's actually no new septic systems proposed as a result of this expansion, they are using the existing septic systems that are there, just adding to them. Normally for a residential well, there's a 75' protective well radius for your well so it will be significantly further away from your well than that with the existing system so basically the answer is no change to what's existing. Flanders – The septic systems here are significantly down gradient from Mrs. Crocker's property. Hearing closed at 8:35 p.m.

Touhey moved, Kahn seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT SUBMITTED BY VAN DER VELDE ASSISTED LIVING CORP., FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 153 PARADE ROAD, TAX MAP S21, LOT 12, TO ADD 9 ADDITIONAL ASSISTED LIVING BEDROOMS OF DOUBLE OCCUPANCY TO THE FACILITY. ONE BUILDING ADDITION WILL CONSIST OF 6 ROOMS WITH A COMMON LIVING ROOM AND THE SECOND BUILDING WILL HAVE 3 ADDITIONAL ROOMS AND THE PROPOSED ADDITIONS WILL BE THE ONLY PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE SITE, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THE FINAL PLAN SHALL INCLUDE THE EXISTING AREA, THE AMOUNT OF PERMITTED COVERAGE AND THE AMOUNT OF COVERAGE PROPOSED WITH THE BUILDING ADDITIONS.
- (2) THE FINAL PLAN SHALL SHOW THE EXISTING WETLANDS AND BUFFER AREAS.
- (3) ALL ASSOCIATED STATE APPROVALS FOR ASSISTED LIVING FACILITIES SHALL BE OBTAINED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
- (4) THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE DES SEPTIC APPROVAL, IF NECESSARY, FOR THE ADDITIONAL ROOMS TO BE CONNECTED TO THE EXISTING SEPTIC SYSTEMS.
- (5) THE FINAL PLAN SHALL INDICATE THE ELEVATIONS OF THE TOPOGRAPHIC CONTOURS SHOWN ON THE PLAN.
- (6) THE PLANNING BOARD ENCOURAGES DOWN LIGHTING. THE BUILDING LIGHTS REQUIRED AT THE NEW EXITS SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE REST OF THE BUILDING LIGHTS.
- (7) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 7 & 17. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Touhey moved, Kahn seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL SPECIFICATIONS AS INDICATED IN THAT THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AND THE PLANNING BOARD FINDS THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE, ON THE CONDITION THAT THE BUILDING ELEVATIONS WILL BE REVISED TO INDICATE WHICH PART OF THE BUILDING IS EXISTING AND WHAT PORTION IS THE ADDITION. Voted unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Plan Signatures: Site Plan – Don Hoyt’s Junk Yard

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

The above Minutes were read and approved at a regular meeting of the Meredith Planning Board held on May 12, 2009.

William Bayard, Secretary