

PRESENT: Roger Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bill Bayard, Secretary; Bill Finer; Lou Kahn; Colette Worsman; Selectmen's Rep.; Ed Touhey, Alternate; John Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Kahn moved, Bayard seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 8, MAY 22, MAY 29 AND JUNE 9 (SITE INSPECTION) BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **RCC ATLANTIC, INC. D/B/A UNICEL FOR MEREDITH NOMINEE TRUST NO. 1-** Proposed Site Plan to construct a wireless telecommunications facility with related site improvements, Tax Map R11, Lot 1, located at 18 Hatch Corner Road in the Forestry/Rural District.
2. **WANAKEE UNITED METHODIST CENTER:** (Kahn & Sorell stepped down, gavel passed to Bayard) Proposed Site Plan to construct a new shower house and other necessary changes and site improvements to enhance summer camping program, Tax Map and Lot Nos. R19 – 11, R20 – 7 & 8, located at 75 Upper New Hampton Road in the Forestry/Rural and Forestry/Conservation Districts.
3. **WANAKEE UNITED METHODIST CENTER** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed shower/bathhouse on Tax Map and Lot Nos. R19 – 11, R20 – 7 & 8, located at 75 Upper New Hampton Road in the Forestry/Rural and Forestry/Conservation Districts.

Edgar – The applicants propose to construct a new 36' x 60' shower house/bathhouse located in the vicinity of the camping area on the east side of Upper New Hampton Road. The facility is designed to support up to 150 campers and includes a laundry facility. On the west side (the lake side), applicants propose to construct a 30' x 40' open air picnic/program pavilion, a small woodshed and relocate one existing yurt which is essentially a round structure that they have housing in that's like a tent platform. The proposed improvements are for the comfort and safety of the campers and do not increase camper capacity. The applications for Site Plan Review and Architectural Review, building elevations and abutter list are all on file. Filing fees have been paid. I would recommend that both applications be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Worsman seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FOR WANAKEE UNITED METHODIST CENTER FOR PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

4. **ROBERT HALE ANDREW & PHYLLIS ELDRIDGE TRUST** – Proposed Major Subdivision to subdivide 15.73 acres into 5 lots (3 ac., 3 ac., 3 ac., 3.63 ac. and 5.11 ac.), Tax Map S02, Lot 1, located on Old Center Harbor Road in the Forestry/Rural District.

Edgar – Applicants propose to subdivide a 15.73 ac. parcel into 5-lots ranging in size from 3.00 – 5.11 ac. The property is a corner lot fronting on two Class V roads and is undeveloped. The subdivision application, abutter's list and subdivision plans are all on file. Filing fees have been paid. This is considered a major application by virtue of the number of lots proposed, therefore, by regulation acceptance and the public hearing on the merits of the application must occur at separate meetings. Therefore, I recommend the application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing and I recommend also that the Planning Board establish a hearing date to begin formal consideration of the application with additional abutter notification required. Finally, I would recommend that the Board schedule a site inspection prior to the public hearing. Bayard - Plan indicates parcel is 15.73 ac. and the total of the 5 lots adds up to 17.74 ac.

With respect to the 26th agenda, we do have a pretty busy agenda. Carl, do you have a particular preference as to the hearing date? Johnson – The hope of the applicant is to be scheduled for the next available meeting. Edgar - Just to give the Board a sense of what has come in, we do have the cell tower project that was pushed from tonight to the next cycle, an 85-unit assisted living facility which is one of the water impact projects the Selectmen have been dealing with, the shopping center redevelopment filing on Route 25, we have a small change of use on Main Street and we have a 32-unit pre-application with the Laconia Area Land Trust so that's what we have in the queue for the 26th. Acreages on subdivision plan do not add up.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION WE ACCEPT AS COMPLETE THE APPLICATION FOR ROBERT HALE ANDREW & PHYLLIS ELDRIDGE TRUST FOR A 5-LOT SUBDIVISION, SET A HEARING DATE OF JULY 10TH WITH A SITE INSPECTION FOR SATURDAY, JULY 7TH AT 8:00 A.M. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **RAFD REALTY, LLC: (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.)** Continuation of a public hearing held on May 8, 2007, for a proposed Site Plan Amendment to construct a building addition and related site improvements, Tax Map S23, Lot 33, located at 57 Reservoir Road in the Business & Industry District.
2. **RAFD REALTY, LLC** – Continuation of a public hearing held on May 8, 2007, for an Architectural Design Review of a proposed addition to an existing building, Tax Map S23, Lot 33, located at 57 Reservoir Road in the Business & Industry District.

Carl Johnson representing Dick Dearborn – This is an existing piece of property that's located on the corner of Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. We had agreed to provide some additional information to the Board two weeks ago so we would have it ready for tonight's meeting and Mr. Dearborn subsequently met with Chief Palm and Bill Edney on the site and primarily Chief Palm was concerned or interested in the access to the building with regard to a 45' box truck that they have as a firefighting apparatus being able to turn around in the back of the building. He fully admits that he doesn't need to have a turnaround that would be like the turnaround at the end of a road where you have to have a cul-de-sac so they could just drive around. He doesn't mind doing a 3 or 4 point turn but likes to have something so that when they get in there, if they were to get in there that they wouldn't have to back out. In doing that and in conjunction with some discussions with Paul Fluet who is the engineer, we did away with the access point access point coming out to Annalee Place. Because of that we did not have the engineering information available for two weeks ago to be reviewed for tonight's meeting. We did submit the engineering review yesterday which is going to be forwarded along with the fee that Mr. Dearborn paid for the Town's consulting engineer to review that plan. I wanted to take the opportunity since we were on the agenda tonight just to bring the Board up to speed and basically what we're going to do is access the back of the building through the existing access way off of Reservoir Road, we're going to the left of the building and if you had a chance to go out to the site, we did put some grade stakes out which identified the roadway going out to the back. There will be a turnaround that's going to be reviewed by Chuck Palm based on his site visit with Mr. Dearborn in order to get his 45' box truck around and Mr. Fluet has also done a drainage swale to pick up some of the sheet flow coming off the site in this location and has incorporated that as well as a catch basin and piping system going into a riprap swale which eventually will go into the ditch line further on down in Annalee Place. I wanted to let the Board know that we're trying to be responsive to the Town's concerns. Mike was concerned with the driveway entrance coming off Annalee Place and we've eliminated that, he was really pushing to try to use something because this was a non-commercial application of the property, trying to do something with the existing cut onto Reservoir Road and we've responded by putting the access road off to the left. John is going to speak to you a little bit about some of the scheduling issues. That's the update and essentially it's the same application which is dealing with the access and drainage issues as we saw fit based on the staff report that was given to us at the last hearing. We are going to have the engineering reviewed and come back before the Board at a subsequent hearing. (Kahn – inaudible) Johnson -This property, I don't have the plan in front of me, I think is 5 acres so you're looking at just the front portion of the lot. There's a wetlands issue here that bisects this portion of the property from another upland section of the property that's not being utilized. If you look on the original site plan application, it lists the lot coverage and the lot coverage is based on the entire piece and I think it's very low amount of coverage. (Kahn – inaudible) Johnson – There are lots that front on Commerce Court that abut this. Kahn – Somewhere in here there's a stream. Johnson – This is a drainage that comes down through, there's

also a drainage that comes down through this area and it's a situation where the wetlands are located more than 25 feet from the centerline of the drainage so it's the 50' setback from the wetlands that's the determining factor. Bayard – I have not reviewed what was done in the prior application but I did notice there was some cutting and some other stuff on the site walk that did lead me to have some concern. I think we'll need to make sure we have the prior application, the details on what's already on the site listed and see if any remedial action needs to be taken prior to accepting this. Johnson – One of the things that we did do is mark out the 30' setback, I don't know if that was clear enough in the field but we did mark that which would delineate the area of the so-called buffer and I have spoken to Mr. Dearborn about the possibility of adding some additional landscaping. When the roadway was coming up here, we were actually going to have a landscaped berm on the roadway but when we did away with the roadway, I don't know if it would look that great to have a berm there like in the middle of nowhere but we had discussed some additional landscaping issues that the Board may address at the public hearing. Edgar – It's the same issue as the last application in terms of what the schedule looks like. Worsman – What else is on in July? Edgar – Just the one you scheduled previously. Kahn – July 10th sounds like a good date.

Kahn moved, Bayard seconded, that this hearing be continued to July 10th, 2007.
Voted unanimously.

3. **WANAKEE UNITED METHODIST CENTER:** (Rep. Michael Moore) (Kahn and Sorell stepped down)

Mike Moore, Site Director for the Wanakee United Methodist Center – I will go through the site plan and what it is that Wanakee is proposing. Last year I came before you and we had been working on a site plan in order to get that approved there was some prior work before my wife and I came on as Site Directors and that site plan was approved which brought the Town up to speed on our site plans that were on file as far as what we have at Wanakee and the location of it. What we're looking to do with this proposal is 4 parts of construction. The first major one is the shower house. The site plan reflects the shower house in its location on the east side of Upper New Hampton Road. The shower house's main intent is to provide safer and more adequate bathing facilities and toileting facilities for the campers in our summer program. It is a 3-season structure, it is not going to be heated for year-round use and as such it does not do anything to change camper numbers at Wanakee. We still are operating with the same bed capacity that was previously accepted. It does provide showers and toileting facilities as well as a laundry facility and this addresses that. The first one is the shower house. There are a couple comments within the staff review which I believe we will be able to address quite easily, one is about the water coming up here and ensuring that it's adequate and that we do not need to drill a well. In my conversations with well companies within the area based on the information that our state well has and the well that serves this site, there should not be an issue with the water production. Currently, we have lines that were installed by the Town that are 6' under the road across from the

farmhouse as shown on the map. So it's using existing lines that had been capped at the point we shut off a water system here. The additional proposal is for a pavilion and the pavilion is down closer to the waterfront and is on the west side of 104. The pavilion as listed is measuring 30' x 40'. Within the staff review, there was a question as to whether there was enough leeway to be able to meet the setback for issues such as grading or overhang from the roof. We've redrawn the pavilion, it still has the same look but its dimensions have been narrowed to 24' to provide the 3' buffer zone on each side based on that for issues of grading or issues of an overhang. The pavilion is not going to have any utilities to it and is not going to be constructed to have utilities go into it, it will just be strictly for dry weather picnic space as well as program space for the campers. There's two pieces to the other proposed construction, relocation of a yurt which is a round temporary tent. It had currently been used for staff housing, no longer will we use it for staff housing but instead it will shift over and become sort of an office space for our program personnel in order to better meet the needs of the campers and then the other one is a new shed, which is listed here which would store a cord or 1 1/2 cords of wood so it stays dry. Edgar – As Mike indicated in working this application with Camp Wanakee, we had them do a professional delineation up on the lake side to make sure we knew exactly where that was so we do have accurate wetland delineations. The final plans just need to add standard plan notes as to who did it, when and to what standard but we do have a letter in the packet. We do have a designated wetland up there so it was important that we do the delineation. We are in a fairly narrow unencumbered area with this pavilion so if they can make that building a little smaller or relocate it would be another option but just to make sure it's mostly on sono tubes so we're not in a big grading plan. We just wanted to make sure we have enough reasonable space to locate this thing without inadvertently getting into a wetland setback and it was a little tight, they've provided a little bit of extra leeway. As an FYI, Bill would probably require a foundation certification, stake the building before we do it and confirm everything before we start pouring the tubes as part of the building permit process just to make sure we've got it right where it needs to be. We do have a state septic plan, I believe that design is in the works for the bathhouse, it's a fairly significant system because of all the laundry and showers I think it's at least a 4-chamber system with 3 to 4 tanks to it and any approval of the bathroom facility that you see on that drawing would be subject to the state septic approval that goes with it and that should be referenced on final plans. The septic system is up on kind of a level spot up on the hillside but the side does tail off and I've suggested in the staff report that the Board stipulate that the applicant submit erosion control measures associated with that septic system and then that can be signed off by Bill during the building permit process. It's not a big deal, it's a straight fix to put some silt fence in there but we are on a hillside and if we were in the middle of construction and we had a big rain event, we probably would lose a lot of material down the hill. It's not a big deal and I've suggested it can be incorporated as part of the septic plan/building permit process. The plans show a proposed propane tank in the parking lot that would feed the shower house for purposes of hot water and as we do in other cases, we like to have the Fire Chief sign off on final plans so the detail that would be added to the plan

would be the size of tank, number of tanks, above ground or below ground and that kind of information. It meets all setbacks, the big question is to make sure that when we have a propane tank located in a parking lot that gets chock full during peak summer camp use that we just don't have people backing into any of the tank components so there would be a pretty quick fix that Chuck would work out with Mike in terms of placing some boulders or something so it's readily accessible for the fuel company but not something that someone could back into. We have standard language on review and amend and it's a fairly innocuous application but we have gone to significant lengths with these folks to get the plans updated and we're now on a cycle of when they want to do something, they come in and we talk about it, we get them lined up to come back and off we go so I think we're in pretty good shape and other than anything outstanding obviously, it's a septic design that needs to go with the bathhouse. Other than that, it's fairly straightforward. Touhey – There are a number of latrines scattered around the property, there are also a number of leachfields that have been built at different times, are they all tying in, are some of them abandoned or what is the status? Moore – On this site plan is what was approved last year and all of the latrines are currently useable and each of the septic systems and leachfields are all independent. Touhey – All the latrines are tied in, right. Edgar – The latrines are effectively holding tanks that are all grouted and sealed and pumped out regularly. What this does though from a septic point of view, it just takes pressure off everything else. There's places for people to go to the bathroom, there's places for people to shower and if we're not adding kids to the equation, as a practical matter, it just takes pressure off everything else so we're going to put less in the latrines, we're going to put significantly less into some of the septic systems so this is a major step in the right direction in terms of getting a new disposal field on the site so we're not adding to the beds but we're adding to the septic capacity so the net affect of that has got to be taking a little pressure off other aspects of the site. Bayard – Before we take a vote, I'd like to just address the architectural design review. Moore – Within the architectural review, all of the construction will not be visible from Route 104 or Upper New Hampton Road or Lake Pemigewasset. They all have a buffer of trees or are in a forested location or just set back quite a bit. They all are keeping in style with what is currently at Wanakee with sort of that camp feel. They all are built with pitched roofs both for snow load but also to maintain the style of the facility and Wanakee's facilities are dating back throughout 60 years of construction or even a little bit longer when it was previously Camp Meadowbrook. The shower house is shown with siding, whether it's siding or shingles is still sort of a discussion point within the building committee itself. Whether the roof is metal or a shingled roof would also kind of be an option but again although it is at the top of a hill above Upper New Hampton Road, the building that it's closest to is not at all visible even in the Fall when the leaves are down. Bayard – The pavilion appears to just be sort like an open area. Moore – It's fairly standard, nothing fancy but it's just on posts going up and then just open air and then the pitched roof as well. Touhey – I assume there's electric power going to the washroom. Moore – The washroom will have electricity and our hope is unless the electric company comes back as we start to dig trenches to bury the electric lines going up the hill as well. Edgar – The site plan shows from the parking lot

underground water which I would raise the question whether or not there's enough pressure to get water up the hill and they followed up on that with their well company and think that they do which is fine. Obviously, we don't grant a C.O. until we have operational water but on the site plan from the parking lot you have a propane line coming up, an electric line coming up and a water line coming up from the general parking lot area up to that site. That as a practical matter during construction would involve signoffs from the Co-op, running the power and their specifications for the trench and conduit and that type of thing so that's all covered. Bayard – I don't see the parking area, is that on the plan? Edgar – Basically, a hole in the tree line, you see the word parking there, so what you see right where that driveway coming in, that's an opening and that squiggly line is the outer limit of the tree line so that's essentially the parking lot. Bayard – I assume it's a non-paved parking lot. Edgar – If you look to the top of that opening, you'll see all of the undergrounds coming in, the water line, electric and propane service. Hearing closed at 7:35 p.m.

Touhey moved, I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN PRESENTED BY WANAKEE UNITED METHODIST CENTER TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SHOWER HOUSE AND OTHER NECESSARY CHANGES AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS TO ENHANCE THE SUMMER CAMPING PROGRAM, TAX R19, LOT 11, R20, LOTS 7 & 8, LOCATED ON 75 UPPER NEW HAMPTON ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL AND FORESTRY/CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) FINAL PLANS SHALL NOTE WHEN THE WETLANDS DELINEATION WAS DONE AND TO WHAT STANDARD;
- (2) NHDES SEPTIC SYSTEM DESIGN APPROVAL AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (3) THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT PROPOSED EROSION CONTROL MEASURES AS PART OF THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS AND THOSE MEASURES SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION;
- (4) THE FINAL PLANS REGARDING PROPANE STORAGE AND SERVICE SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE FIRE CHIEF;
- (5) A FOUNDATION CERTIFICATION SHALL BE REQUIRED FOR THE PAVILION;
- (6) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS NOS. 7 & 17. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Finer moved, Worsman seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, HAVING FOUND THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN OUR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW, ORDINANCE, I MAKE A MOTION WE APPROVE IT AS PRESENTED. Voted 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Johnson – Mr. Chairman, I was the surveyor on this project and I was wondering if it would be appropriate for the Board to vote on the possibility of having the plan

signed outside of regular meeting because many of the issues in the conditional approval are administrative and plan notes and we could do those fairly quickly. Board had no problem with this request assuming availability.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

Edgar - Cluster Ordinance - We're going to start feeding you guys information on cluster. I'm awaiting Rick Van de Poll's final Natural Resources report because that will have a fair amount of influence over how we describe some of our open spaces and some of the elements of the cluster so that should be done by the end this month but I want you to have that in your hand so when I'm referring to it, you know what we're talking about and how these critical natural resources are distributed throughout the community. The second thing that's going on is myself and a couple other people have been invited to a meeting this Saturday up in Chemung to talk with some of the residents up there about a variety of zoning questions or how the FC District will build out. One of the fellows that has agreed to participate in this meeting is the Dean from U Mass, Amherst, by the name of John Mullen. It turns out he's also the guest speaker a week or so later at the LRPC's annual meeting. He's somebody that deals with rural planning issues and open space planning issues. I've spoken with him on the phone and have started a dialogue with him about some things we're trying to do whether it's some of the aesthetic issues of our road standards or yield plans, how we describe and require certain elements of open space in cluster, these are all things that he has direct experience with so I'm going to be picking his brain this Saturday on that and that coupled with our Natural Resource Inventory we'll then start feeding you guys some information and we'll move that along this summer.

Worsman - How does the process work for changing the cluster ordinance?

Edgar - I would envision a little bit of dialogue from us up front, maybe even a public meeting to talk about open space, conservation planning and I'll have done a lot of the research already, a lot of it's already in process right now in terms of what other places have done and different elements of an ordinance so there would be dialogue with you guys in terms of what you are looking for in the ordinance and some feedback on some draft stuff. There should be some public participation to gain some general insights. I don't view Saturday's meeting at Freeman's as public participation. This is kind of an invitation only type of deal. I think that I will probably gain a lot by being able to grab this guy's ear and learn from him in terms of what his experience has been so there needs to be more work on my part to pull some research together, that needs to be shared with you, there needs to be a public participation phase and then I think we would have a draft and an open period for comment and the idea has been to try to have that draft ordinance something that you're comfortable with pretty much in hand by the end of the summer so we'd be able to shop it around a little bit and not find ourselves having to scurry around in December.

Worsman - Is this something that would go before March Town Meeting?

Edgar - Yes.

Bayard - I think this is a good opportunity to put something in there that could be a pretty good cluster ordinance. There's an awful lot that can go into them. One of the things I've mentioned to John is that we might even be able to sneak in some low-income

housing trying to do something toward getting low-income or work force housing where appropriate. Edgar – What a lot of communities do and I haven't completely gotten over this hump yet, a lot of places will provide density incentives to reach certain objectives. Certainly what we have in the ordinance that says good planning is crazy, it should be good planning at a minimum just to be given the option to design that way. But when you get into something like affordable housing where there's a potential advancement of a public policy, that's maybe a legitimate area where you provide a bonus based upon certain criteria. Another one might be issues of public access. What if we had a hunk of open space that was substantial and it abutted an existing trail system; there may be a benefit if we provided public access. You can't force public access on the green areas but there could come a time when it might be highly desirable so that might advance a public objective very much so. I'm cautious about incentives but if there's a strong enough argument to advance another planning policy, it may be legitimate. One of the criticisms that we heard in the throes of battle out in the western end of town has to deal with the fact that some people view cluster as encouraging development and in some districts maybe incentive is appropriate, maybe out in Chemung from a sprawl point of view, you probably wouldn't want to encourage affordable housing anyway at a 10-acre density, you're not going to find it anyway. I will be coming back to you with menus of sorts for you to think about certain things. You guys have gone through this many times and we've gone through repetitive drills where we all know where some of the weaknesses are Colette brought up the yield plan. In my conversation with Mr. Mullen, it sounded like he feels that one is very critical but he also explained that he's had experience in communities where they are so rigid, they had the inverse effect of discouraging cluster because essentially they were so onerous that developers were saying why do it. Given all of our discussions and experience with the clusters in the last several years, anything that you in particular want me to zero in on, chances are I've thought about it, but let's not assume that, send me an e-mail

Meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

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

William Bayard, Secretary