

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders; Granfield; Finer; Kahn; Touhey; Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Finer moved, Kahn seconded, THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 8, 2004, BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **38 MAIN, LLC** – A proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map U03, Lot 23-1, into five (5) lots (10,049 s.f., 11,710 s.f., 15,747 s.f., 26,953 s.f. and 20,060 s.f.), located on Massachusetts Avenue in the Residential District.

Application, subdivision plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Technical review fees have been paid. This is a major subdivision due to the number of lots proposed (5), a public hearing must be scheduled for a separate meeting subsequent to the acceptance. Recommend the public hearing be scheduled for July 13, 2004.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF 38 MAIN, LLC, FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR SUBDIVISION. Voted unanimously.

2. **REI LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST** – A proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map S25, Lot 11B, into 58 Townhouse Condominium Units located on Waukegan Street in the Residential and Business/Industry Districts.

Application, subdivision plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Technical review fees have been paid. This is a major subdivision due to the number of units proposed (58), a public hearing must be scheduled for a separate meeting subsequent to the acceptance. Recommend the public hearing be scheduled for July 13, 2004.

Bayard moved, Flanders seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF REI LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC, FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR SUBDIVISION. Voted unanimously.

3. **REI LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST** – Architectural Design Review of a 58-Unit Townhouse Condominium in 11 buildings, Tax Map S25, Lot 11B, located on Waukegan Street in the Residential and Business/Industry Districts.

Application, architectural plans and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Technical review fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted for public hearing on July 13, 2004.

Bayard moved, Flanders seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR REI DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST. Voted unanimously.

4. **REI LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR BRADLEY A. LEIGHTON 1998 TRUST** – A proposed Site Plan for site improvements, including road construction, water, sewer, drainage, landscaping and lighting relative to a condominium subdivision located on Waukegan Street in the Residential and Business/Industry Districts.
5. **BRIAN ALLEN** – A proposed Site Plan to construct a 50' x 100' metal building for private non-commercial storage of vehicles and related site improvements, Tax Map S23, Lot 33, located on Hemlock Drive and Reservoir Road in the Business & Industry District.
6. **BRIAN ALLEN** – Architectural Design Review of a metal storage building, Tax Map S23, Lot 33, located on Hemlock Drive and Reservoir Road in the Business & Industry District.

Applications, site plan, architectural plans and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted for public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATIONS FOR BRIAN ALLEN. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **EQUIVISE LTD. FOR CRESTWOOD ESTATES SUBDIVISION:** (Rep. Patrick Wood, Mike Malynowski) Continuation of public hearings held on April 27 and May 25, 2004, for a proposed 59-lot residential cluster subdivision, Tax Map S20, Lot 3, located on Parade Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted April 13, 2004.

There have been some changes made to the plan that we discussed. We have also received the comments from Mr. Kahn on the Declarations. Some of the things we've been asked to do, we have done our best to

accomplish as much of them as we can. We met with the Selectmen last evening about the Class 6 highway situation and I have talked with Town Counsel on that and we've got some language in the declaration that we've been working on and it's very close to being finalized. We've also discussed the dedication agreement on concept and the phasing agreement. I think we have an agreement on the substance, the final language we are tweaking a little bit but are very close to getting that set. We met with John Edgar and the Town Manager for the Town and talked about some of those issues and the concerns she might have prior to meeting with the Selectmen. A report has been received from the Archeologist basically saying that all of the concerns raised have been addressed. There isn't anything out there on the site that she was originally concerned about even the Neal Farm issues. The stone circles were located and are right below Lot 42. We don't know what they are. They are over 300' to the cul-de-sac and 175' to the nearest disturbance. The stone circles were approximately 6 ½ - 7' round. The ZBA application has been prepared and will be filed tomorrow morning for the cluster housing and the wetland issues. The NH DOT approval for the access onto Route 106 (Parade Road). Peter Schauer has submitted a more recent report on the wetland issues. He met with the Campbell's and Mr. Campbell's concerns were on wetlands that were on RSK Management Investment's property which is to the East of this property. They walked around and were comfortable that these issues were not related to our property. He's also gone over the property with people from the NH Wetlands Bureau addressing the concerns that they had and as he said in his Memo, we've investigated each impact area, the vernal pools, checked the wetland boundaries in a number of locations to determine accuracy and the wetland boundaries in all locations that we checked and I believe the Wetlands Bureau is satisfied with the work performance and the visibility of this project. The school impact issue has been addressed. Mike Malynowski has some comments on the plan and the changes that have been made on the engineering aspects. Some of the changes were based on review by the Town's Engineer. The alignment of Crestwood Drive has been adjusted to facilitate the grading along this abutting property to try and get that away from that property. Some reconfiguring of the trail systems as it crosses Redwood Circle, goes up over the road and then down along Crestwood to ease in pedestrian traffic so they weren't climbing a 12' or 15' steep grade to traverse the road. We have shown the alignment of these as well. Some of the other things we have done is that these two ponds have been slightly regraded based on discussions we've had with DES concerning our Site Specific application, as well as these ponds in here. We're still in discussions with them. We have been in discussions with DES and Lou Caron regarding some of those minor issues. One of the other

things we did do is install proposed guardrail along the outside bank of Crestwood Drive. The road will be super elevated and guardrail will be installed on the outside bank of that road to keep cars from coming this steep embankment and going off the road. Wood - Some of the major issues that were raised by Mr. Kahn related to Lot 34, the septic lot and in the Declaration, these lots 29-38 all will have an easement to that, they are obligations for maintenance and if they don't do it, the Association has the right to enforce it and to put a lien on one of their lots if they haven't paid their share of that. We haven't decided whether or not that lot will remain a common lot or whether it will be deeded specifically to those lots so they each are the owners of that lot and therefore, the other owners in the development don't have any obligation at all. Some of the issues deal with development restrictions and enforcement. There have been some relatively recent changes to the statute dealing with that. RSA 674-21a deals with development restrictions that are enforceable, so if we make a commitment that is going to be open space which we have made designated space, the Town has the authority to enforce that without any further action on our part. The conditions you can impose, you have to make sure that those items are fulfilled. When we put together the agreement on the phasing and the approvals, we will keep all of that in mind. Bayard - If you transfer the ownership of that lot to the specific individuals, does that effect the calculations at all? Edgar - No. We've asked that all the open space requirements for the cluster not include ROW's, drainage improvements, cisterns or anything that is developed, open space should be undevelopable open space and not include things that are quasi-open. The roadway will be common land that will be maintained by the Association, but that's not open space. We need to make those distinctions between those types of features. However, they treat that septic field, that will be some version of common land either specific to the nine property owners or specific to the Association or some combination, but it will not be part of the open space calculation. Wood - It won't be developed other than having the septic systems on there, but it will remain open. Edgar - The common areas cannot be put in current use. If someone needs open space to satisfy zoning or a regulatory requirement, by statute they are not allowed to put that in current use. The Assessor will pick up additional value based upon the common interest they have in 107 acres of open space. Vadney - Is the common space postable? Edgar - The way this is structured which is not our issue, there is not a public access right that comes with this, this is privately owned property that does not provide for public access. To the best of my knowledge, there would nothing that would preclude these folks from posting this land against hunting. Kahn - How do you plan to deal with the wetland buffers in the house lots? Wood - We have put specific language in the Declarations and it will also go in the

deeds for those lots specifically that there will be no impact upon the wetlands or the buffers, so if they violate it, they violate a condition of the deed and they could be subject to claim by the Association. Wood – I can't guarantee to you nor can anyone that someone isn't going to come in and ask for Special Exception. I can't guarantee, all I can say is we put the language in that says you can't do it and that's the best we can do at this point. Edgar – I would recommend we get through hopefully the last version of the declarations and restrictions, we would also be looking at draft language for deed restrictions and making sure we doubled them up both in the declarations as well as the deed restrictions, so it is in essence a condition of the approval and I think that would discourage most people for asking that relief and it certainly would put the ZBA in a pretty strong position to basically say that the Planning Board found that we have established a maximum threshold wetland impact as a function of what we have relied upon from the applicant in representations and we have memorialized that into the approval. No one can claim they didn't know what was going on and no one can claim that we all didn't act reasonably at the time of subdivision. Touhey – Can you explain a little bit about the pedestrian way, where does it begin and where does it end. Where does it begin and where does it end? Malynowski -Primarily, the trail system is meant to sort of follow the existing Class VI road as it comes through the site. There are sections where we we're putting in our new roadway so at those points the pedestrian trail will end at the road. There are sufficient shoulders to allow pedestrians to come across and pick up another set of trails to take them out to back common areas. There are also trails that run along here to get them closer to the entrance to Route 106. Edgar – Basically, on that particular issue, the way our Town Attorney has recommended that we set this up is when this plan gets recorded with the relocated ROW, we are in essence constituting a dedication for public use and that would allow for all practical purposes and unrestricted opportunity for the Town to accept that piece as a public way in the future after it's built by the applicant. All legal documents, Declaration of Covenants, the Dedication Agreement, etc., come back at a Compliance Hearing because it does involve your discretion that you see the final documents and be comfortable with how this development is packaged together and that should come back at a Compliance Hearing. This has been reviewed with the applicant's attorney, there's no objection as this is just following state law and the advice of Town Counsel. With respect to zoning issues, we do have a Special Exception requirement for the cluster. As Attorney Wood had mentioned, we do have a DOT permit requirement and I understand that has been issued, but I have not received it yet. The permit should be cross-referenced on the final plans. When I talked before about the issue of the Class VI road providing a secondary means of access to the property

from the Route 3 end, that has been reviewed by our safety officials and they do not have a strong opinion one way or the other as to whether or not that is a necessity. Because the applicant is going with underground utilities, the issue of trees constituting a problem is really moot. Surely that issue will come back before the Board of Selectmen when they have to deal with the length of the dead-end road as a waiver to the road standards. The Fire Chief and Lt. Morrow have specifically reviewed that and do not have a strong feeling one way or the other. There will be waivers from the Selectmen that are required in a couple areas. Here again the dead-end road, they are looking at a cross section consistent with what we did at the Paquette subdivision which is a slightly reduced width of road. These cul-de-sacs clearly are not designed thru road issues and individually they serve very low volumes of traffic. The thru road is being designed with 12' lanes and 3' shoulders because it will have higher volumes someday. They do not want to hamper the Town taking over the roads. Road names have been reviewed and adjusted by recommendations from the Fire Chief to avoid 9-1-1 problems. The Selectmen have to endorse the road names. Road names need to be added to final plans before recording. With respect to engineering, following the last meeting our engineer had flagged the fact that the two engineers needed to sit down and review and long list of relatively smaller items. That has been accomplished. Plans have been resubmitted to Lou. Lou has virtually completed his review of the revised plans. He does need to do some final double checks on the drainage calcs, but there is a very short list of further adjustments and there's no objection from an engineering perspective for a conditional approval provided that we make any approval subject to Lou's final signoff on the very last set of plans. They have incorporated all of the alignment issues that we asked them to look at, both at the entrance, at the steeper sections and at the intersections and the like. Because of the complexity of this project, we have over 8,000 feet of road, four or five ponds, a lot of drainage and road work in all of this requiring an extensive review on Lou's part. We received an initial \$3,200.00 review fee to cover that and have gone through that technical review. For purposes of getting to the point of the review letter which I just mentioned, we will need the Technical Review Fee Account replenished with an additional \$1,000.00. It is hoped we will not have to spend all of that and any unused portion of that account will be returned to the applicant. A NH DES Terrain Alteration Permit is required for terrain alterations. State Subdivision Approval is required. One of the judgment issues you need to think about is whether or not you feel it is necessary at this time to require a State Design Approval for the community septic system. In this particular case, the community system is a function of Phase III. There will probably be a public hearing between the phases anyway. If we don't require the design for the community system, we should at least see the collection lines

for the force mains that would go up into these leachfields in the road plans for that cul-de-sac to make sure from a road design perspective. We are not necessarily going to revisit all that at the third phase to make sure those roadways have been designed to anticipate the sewer pipes and that has been done and reviewed by Lou as it relates to the pipes in the roadway not the leachfields. We need to make sure that the underground electrical/cable needs to be reflected in the road cross section. Cisterns need to be addressed because of the proposed phasing. One cistern will be placed in Phase I and serve Phase I on the front end of the project. There will be a second one a little further down that will satisfy phases II and III. We've always envisioned two, it's just a function of where they were. Those locations have been worked out. With respect to legal, we've received draft Articles of Agreement which is basically a document submitted to the State that legally sets up the homeowners association. We are also in receipt of draft By-Laws. There's not a lot of real substance to these documents. The real meat is in the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions and we had the benefit of Lou Kahn taking a look at those and offering up some comments for revisions. There seemed to be two categories of open space that didn't seem to jive. Applicant needs to clarify that the open space needs to be open space. If they want to dedicate some land for a pool, clubhouse or playground or something like that, we encourage that and would be a great amenity, but that's not open space. If they want to snip a lot off or reserve the ability to not sell a couple lots and convert that to common space for a pool, playground or something, all well and good, but those kinds of improvements don't get developed in the open space. The other issue was the whole Lot 34 business and the real issue there wasn't so much the mechanics of who owns what, but at the end of the day who governs what? Who's going to make sure that the tank gets pumped, who's going to know if we're following the Best Management Practices for the leachfield, who's has the responsibility to see that those system systems are taken care of. I don't want the Town of Meredith to be the fall back on any of this stuff. The final review of these documents should occur at a compliance hearing because of the discretionary nature of the Board's signoff of those documents. Because of the substantial legal issues involved with this project, the applicant is responsible for all of the Town's legal fees associated with Counsel's review of the Declarations, Dedications Agreement, Project Phasing Agreement. With respect to the wetlands, some of the areas of concern by abutters Dearborn and Campbell are actually located on property of RSK Management. The NHDES Dredge & Fill Permit is required for the wetland crossing and should be cross referenced on the final plans. A Special Exception is required from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for development within the protective wetland

buffer areas and should be cross referenced on final plans. Peter Schauer is communicating with the State relative to the best way to accommodate vernal pools in relation to the roadway design. The resolution to this issue needs to be reflected on the final plans. As a result of the last meeting, some additional archeological investigation was done. No significant archeological resources will be impacted by the project and no further study is warranted. No Indian artifacts were found. There are fairly technical and legal issues associated with phasing. There are engineering-related issues and we need to make sure prior to final signoff that the drainage, the roadway turnarounds, the cisterns and performance guarantees that would come with it can stand alone as we go through phasing. We also need to look at the State permits as we go through the phasing to ensure that the permits remain extended and otherwise valid and we are not dealing with any expired permits. We also need to be assured that the open space requirements are complied with on a phase-by-phase basis and that we also need to address the vesting issue. Town Counsel should review this aspect of the project before anything gets final approval and after Town Counsel and I have done our review, then the Board would be asked to consider this at a compliance hearing. Another compliance issue is the Performance Guarantee. Once we get to final engineering design, then we will be in a position where the design engineers can complete the unit cost estimates for Phase I development and that number will come back to the Board with a recommendation for purposes of the performance guarantee as our standard practice is that amount needs, by statute, to be established and approved by the Board at a compliance hearing. The form shall be either cash or Letter of Credit and the format shall be approved by the Finance Director. The Post Office does not deliver mail on private roads. These roads will be private at the outset until the Town of Meredith decides to take them over as Town roads. Provisions for mail delivery acceptable to the Postmaster should be provided. The applicant has addressed the issues we've asked him to look at. Three issues need to come back for compliance review. One is the package of legal documents, the second is the phasing scenario and the third is the performance guarantee. Wood – Provisions will be made at the beginning of Crestwood Drive for a gravel pull-off and a mailbox structure. Discussions have been held with the Postmaster and the final plan will show the turnaround. Kahn – Is the pathway going to be available to the public? Wood – We don't plan for that to be public. Crestwood Drive would be a public ROW. Bayard – I don't see the need at this point of doing the septic design for the Phase III section. It will be required at the time it goes in. I doubt the requirements will become less stringent over time. Hearing closed at 8:27 p.m.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF EQUIVISE LTD. FOR CRESTWOOD ESTATES FOR A PROPOSED 59-LOT RESIDENTIAL CLUSTER SUBDIVISION ON TAX MAP S20, LOT 3, LOCATED ON PARADE ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR A CLUSTER SUBDIVISION BE OBTAINED FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT;
- (2) THAT THE NHDOT PERMIT BE CROSS REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS;
- (3) THAT THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN APPROVE ANY PROPOSED ROAD NAMES AND THEY BE REFLECTED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (4) THAT ANY ROAD STANDARD WAIVERS BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN;
- (5) THAT THE TOWN'S ENGINEER SIGN OFF ON FINAL PLANS;
- (6) THAT THE APPLICANT BE REQUIRED TO REPLENISH THE TECHNICAL REVIEW FEE ACCOUNT BY \$1,000 DUE TO THE MAGNITUDE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE PROJECT AND REVIEW REQUIREMENTS. ANY UNUSED PORTION TO BE RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT;
- (7) THAT NHDES TERRAIN ALTERATION PERMIT BE OBTAINED AND CROSS REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (8) THAT NHDES SUBDIVISION APPROVAL BE OBTAINED AND CROSS REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (9) THAT THE UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC AND CABLE BE REFLECTED IN THE ROAD CROSS SECTION ON FINAL PLANS;
- (10) THAT THE CISTERN LOCATIONS BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL PLANS AND DESIGN DETAILS BE APPROVED BY THE FIRE CHIEF;
- (11) THAT FINAL REVIEW AND SIGNOFF OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS SHALL OCCUR AT A COMPLIANCE HEARING;
- (12) THAT THE APPLICANT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL OF THE TOWN'S LEGAL FEES ASSOCIATED WITH COUNSEL'S REVIEW OF THE DECLARATIONS, DEDICATIONS AGREEMENT AND PROJECT PHASING AGREEMENT AND IS SUBJECT TO A COMPLIANCE HEARING;
- (13) THAT A NHDES DREDGE AND FILL PERMIT BE OBTAINED FOR THE WETLAND CROSSING AND CROSS REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS;

- (14) THAT A SPECIAL EXCEPTION BE OBTAINED FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR ANY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE PROTECTIVE WETLAND BUFFER AREAS AND BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (15) THAT THE RESOLUTION OF THE BEST WAY TO ACCOMMODATE THE VERNAL POOLS IN RELATION TO ROADWAY DESIGN BE REFLECTED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (16) THAT THE PROJECT PHASING SHALL BE REVIEWED BY TOWN COUNSEL AND STAFF BEFORE ANYTHING GETS MEMORIALIZED INTO A FINAL APPROVAL AND THE BOARD SHALL SIGN OFF ON THE PROJECT PHASING AT A COMPLIANCE HEARING;
- (17) THAT A PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AT A COMPLIANCE HEARING. THE FORM WILL BE EITHER CASH OR LETTER OF CREDIT. THE FORMAT OF THE GUARANTEE SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE FINANCE DIRECTOR;
- (18) THAT THE FINAL PLANS INCORPORATE PROVISIONS FOR MAIL DELIVERY ACCEPTABLE TO THE MEREDITH POST OFFICE AS THE POST OFFICE WILL NOT DELIVER MAIL ALONG PRIVATE ROADS;
- (19) THAT THE TIMEFRAME TO ACHIEVE FINAL APPROVAL IS NINE (9) MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS DECISION. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Flanders – I would just like to make a comment. I think the applicant has done an excellent job working with the Planning Department and has stepped up to the plate to all the things we've asked of them and this looks like an excellent project. Vadney – I would add to that, there's probably nobody in Meredith that really wants to see this piece of land developed and obviously several from Laconia that don't want to see it developed either, but it's one of those things. It was going to happen sooner or later and I think they've done very well working with John, John's done an extremely detailed scrub of it and we're ending up with a project to be proud of so to speak even though we would prefer it stay in forest, but that's not our choice. So I congratulate you all in having worked with us very well. Wood – We would also like to thank the Board and John and all of the Town Staff. This has been the type of process that you want to have everyone of these go through. This is working together. We are not adversaries, we have one goal to do it right and to do it the best way we can and so we appreciate the work that John has put into it. He's obviously very detailed and thorough and one of the best there is in the area and you know that. Vadney - That means the Northeast. I would also like to take a moment to thank Lou Kahn, who did a very detailed and time consuming review of the Covenants

2. **MARK AND ROBIN BRADY** – Proposed Cluster Subdivision of Tax Map R01, Lot 8, into (3) units located on Hatch Corner Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted May 11, 2004.

This property has frontage on Winona Road and Hatch Corner Road separated by a portion of the northerly reach of the Hatch Brook Prime Wetland. Applicants propose to create a cluster subdivision on a 14.43 acre portion of this lot. The proposed cluster is on the Hatch Corner Road portion of the parcel. The property abuts a Conservation Easement deeded to the Town. The total acreage to be developed is 14 acres with 11.04 acres to be entered into a conservation easement. The net density is 4 acres per unit. The ZBA has approved the cluster concept. Lot sizes are less than the minimum lot sizes required in this area. Hatch Brook divides the property from the Brady home. A draft conservation document was provided to the Town today which allows for forestry management of the property. It also reserves the right for the Conservation Commission to create trails on the property. Three homes are proposed on the northwesterly portion of the site. The wetlands have been delineated by a wetland scientist. The notes on the subdivision plan indicate the presence of a wetland on the southwestern corner of the common area/open space. According to the Prime Wetland Maps, this wetland may be part of Prime Wetland (No. 30). The wetland scientist needs to review the prime wetland maps. The functions and type of wetland will be delineated. If it is a prime wetland, setbacks may be affected. Development will still be concentrated in the same area. All three lots have frontage on Hatch Corner Road. A common driveway will service Lots 1 and 2 which will alleviate sight distance problems. The driveway locations have been field approved. Permits will have to be pulled at the time of construction and will be subject to an access easement for Lot 1. There is a 50' perimeter setback for a cluster development. There may be some issues regarding setbacks. Test pit data has been submitted. Draft language for the easement has been submitted. If the Conservation Commission doesn't accept the easement, the same language would be used. The Special Exception has been granted and needs to be cross referenced on the final plans. State subdivision approval is required, as well as common driveway easement language. Pin placement prior to recording of the mylar is required.

Flanders moved, Granfield seconded, I WOULD MOVE THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE 3-LOT CLUSTER SUBDIVISION OF MARK AND ROBIN BRADY, TAX MAP R01, LOT 8, INTO THREE UNITS LOCATED ON HATCH CORNER ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT THE FINAL PLANS CROSS REFERENCE THE ZBA APPROVAL;
- (2) UNLESS THIS IS PROPOSED AS A ZERO LOT LINE CONDOMINIUM, SIDE AND REAR SETBACKS PER THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT MAY NEED TO BE ADDED TO FINAL PLANS. THIS NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED WITH BILL EDNEY. FINAL PLANS SHALL BE ADJUSTED, IF NECESSARY;
- (3) THAT THE SOILS AND SLOPES CALCULATIONS BE CHECKED AND THE PLAN SHOULD CLEARLY INDICATE THAT WETLAND ACREAGE HAS BEEN CALCULATED AND NETTED FROM THE CALCULATION;
- (4) THAT THE FINAL PLANS NOTE (1) THE NAME AND CERTIFICATION NUMBER OF WHO DID THE FIELD DELINEATION, (2) THE DATE OF THE FIELD DELINEATION, (3) THE DELINEATION STANDARD THAT WAS USED; AND (4) WHO SURVEYED THE FIELD FLAGGING.
- (5) THAT THE WETLAND SCIENTIST THAT DID THE DELINEATION SHOULD REVIEW THE PRIME WETLAND MAPS, ACTUAL WETLAND CHARACTERISTICS AND THE PRACTICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ACTUAL WETLAND AND THE MAPS TO DETERMINE WHAT IS PRIME AND WHAT IS NOT;
- (6) THAT THE COMMON DRIVEWAY SHALL BE SHOWN ON FINAL PLANS WITH THE EASEMENT AREA INDICATED AS APPROPRIATE;
- (7) THAT THE TEST PIT DATA SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW WITH THE NUMBERED PIT LOGS CORRELATING WITH NUMBERED SYMBOLS ON THE FINAL PLANS;
- (8) NHDES SUBDIVISION APPROVAL IS REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS.
- (9) LEGAL DOCUMENTS (COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS) NEED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF REVIEW THAT AT A MINIMUM ADDRESS THE PURPOSE AND LIMITED USE OF THE DEDICATED COMMON AREA/OPEN SPACE. A COMPLIANCE HEARING SHALL BE HELD FOR THE BOARD TO SIGN OFF ON THESE PROVISIONS. THE COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS SHALL BE RECORDED WITH THE SUBDIVISION PLAN. APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL RECORDING FEES.
- (10) DRAFT EASEMENT LANGUAGE SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR THE COMMON DRIVEWAY TO INCLUDE SHARED MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES;
- (11) WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET SHALL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

3. **BRIAN ALLEN:** (Rep. Carl Johnson) (Flanders stepped down)

This property is located on the corner of Hemlock Drive (Annalee Place) and Reservoir Road just opposite Annalee Dolls. The parcel is 4.18 acres in size. Applicant proposes to construct a 50' x 100' metal building to house his collection of automobiles. A Morton type building is proposed. This is a non-commercial. Very few parking spaces are being shown as all of the parking will occur inside the building. Three (3) parking spaces are being shown. A 14' x 14' overhead door will provide access to the building. No signage is proposed on the building. This building is not open to the public. The existing entrance from Reservoir Road will be utilized to access the property. No trees will be cut within the 30 front setback. To help screen the long face of this building, the building colors will be earth tones. A bathroom will be provided and the building will be connected to municipal sewer. A well will be drilled on the property. A registered, professional engineer's grading and drainage plan will be provided. Property is located in the Waukegan Watershed. The land slopes gently. Lot coverage is only 7 ½%. Most of the lot will not be affected by the construction taking place. This is a Business & Industry neighborhood. Several buildings in the neighborhood abut this property. One or two security lights will be provided outside the building. Existing driveway cut will be used, but it still needs a driveway permit. Landscaping will be minimal. The site is heavily wooded and the screening there now is far beyond anything we've ever required. Plan notes this is a non-commercial site. Zoning District and setback distances need to be labeled on the plan. A Driveway Permit is required from the Department of Public Works. Grading information needs to be provided for staff review. A spec sheet should be provided on lighting. No floor drains. Architectural Design Review is required. Three parking spaces are shown on the plan. A plan note should be added to the plan indicating any outside vehicle parking is limited to areas provided for parking. No signage is proposed. Hearing closed at 9:33 p.m.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR A 50' X 100' METAL BUILDING FOR PRIVATE NON-COMMERCIAL STORAGE OF VEHICLES AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, LOCATED ON HEMLOCK DRIVE AND RESERVOIR ROAD, TAX MAP S23, LOT 33, IN THE BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT THE FINAL PLANS NOTE THE ZONING DISTRICT;
- (2) THAT THE FINAL PLANS LABEL SETBACK DISTANCES AND NOTE LOT COVERAGE;
- (3) THAT A DPW PERMIT BE OBTAINED AND CROSS-REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS;

- (4) THAT THE FINAL PLANS INCLUDE NOTES THAT PROHIBIT OUTSIDE REPAIR OF VEHICLES, VEHICLE WASHING, STORAGE OF CHEMICALS, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, ETC., SIMILAR TO WHAT WE HAVE REQUIRED FOR OTHER PROJECTS IN THE LAKE WAUKEWAN WATERSHED;
- (5) THAT A PLAN NOTE BE ADDED TO THE FINAL PLANS INDICATING GRADING, FINISHED FLOOR ELEVATIONS, DRAINAGE AND EROSION CONTROL/SITE STABILIZATION INFORMATION BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY STAFF;
- (6) THAT A DPW EXCAVATION PERMIT IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION/EXCAVATION IN THE ROW;
- (7) THAT A PARKING WAIVER IS REQUIRED;
- (8) SHOULD THE TYPE OF USE CHANGE, IT WOULD REQUIRE REVIEW BY THE PLANNING BOARD;
- (9) SUBJECT TO THE USUAL RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A METAL STORAGE BUILDING, TAX MAP S23, LOT 33, LOCATED ON HEMLOCK DRIVE AND RESERVOIR ROAD IN THE BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

1. **LRPC ANNUAL MEETING** – June 28, 2004.
2. **WAUKEWAN WATERSHED COMMITTEE** – Next meeting is on June 30, 2004. The Committee is going on a tour of the Watershed. It is a field day/evening type trip to pretty much cruise the entire limits of the Watershed.
3. **LRPC** is working on a Transit Study looking at the feasibility of an expanded transit service with the Laconia Transit Agency. We are going to be doing some survey research in early July (9th and 10th) to get a little bit of survey

data to look at that in comparison with some demographic information in the area. If anyone is available to do some volunteer survey work, we have 3 locations in Town.

4. **ZONING COMMITTEE PUBLIC FORUM** – July 1, 2004 - To receive public input on people's views about zoning issues. What works, what doesn't work, what have been their experiences? It will be held at the Harold Wyatt Conference Room from 7:00 – 9:00 P.M.

Plan Signatures: 18 Mile Point Drive Realty Trust – Subdivision Plan
 18 Mile Point Drive Realty Trust – BLA (Plan "A")
 18 Mile Point Drive, Ltd. – BLA (Plan "B")
 18 Mile Point Drive Realty Trust - Tree Clearing Plan

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Assistant
Planning/Zoning Department

The above minutes were read and approved by the Meredith Planning Board at a regular meeting on _____.

William Bayard, Secretary