

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders, Selectmen's Rep.; Kahn; Touhey; Dever, III; Lapham, Alternate, Edney, Code Enforcement Officer; Harvey, Clerk

Bayard moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 9, 2009, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **SHERMAN W. SALTMARSH, JR.** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer 7,429 sq. ft. from Tax Map U22, Lot 12, to Tax Map U22, Lot 10, located at 34 & 30 Sachem Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

Edney – Application, plans and abutters list are on file. Fees have been paid. I recommend the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Sorell moved, Dever seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF SHERMAN SALTMARSH, JR. FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT TO TRANSFER 7,429 SQ. FT. FROM TAX MAP U22, Lot 12 to U22, Lot 10. Voted unanimously.

Carl Johnson – This is a Boundary Line Adjustment that's taking place on Sachem Cove Road on Lake Winnepesaukee. The applicant owns several parcels of land in this particular location. This proposed BLA involves transferring a small portion of land that he owns from one lot to another parcel that he owns. The applicant owns the subject property which is his main house along with the back parcel. He owns the parcel immediately to the West of this parcel. He owns the other parcel that's involved in this BLA as well as 3 parcels of land on the other side of the road. It's a very unusual piece of land in that the subject parcel to the East, the entire front of that proper is a solid piece of rock and there's no useable lakefront although it is lakefront, pays taxes on lakefront, it really is not useable. It's probably about a 12-15' difference in elevation from the lake to the to the to so the access for that piece of property is a dock that was constructed on the very westerly portion of that ledge. When Mr. Saltmarsh purchased this property upgraded that dock and actually drilled into the side of the ledge and the dock is suspended on the ibeams that are into the ledge so there's no permanent post there going down into the lake. With the exception of that small sliver of land that gets the accessway to the dock, there's no functional useable lakefront for that piece of land. Additionally, when it came time to upgrade the septic system for that property, because of conflicting well radii and different site characteristics, it was impossible for him to locate a new system on that parcel of land so he had David Ames design a septic system which is actually on the other piece of property. DES approved that system and you're allowed to have a system on another piece of property and at such time that Mr. Saltmarsh would sell either one of these pieces of property separately as it is, they would have to be burdened by an easement and this would have to be benefitted by

an easement for that septic system. That system is installed and is operating today. In trying to figure out how to best use his properties in this area, it became evident that he would really like to give a little bit of useable lakefront to what we call the brook property as well as enough land to fully encumber the septic system that's on that property. There is one small shed on that piece of land that he wanted to go with the brook property so what we've done is created this highlighted sliver of land that's about 7,000 sq. ft. and that piece of land is going to be transferred from his main piece to the brook parcel so that parcel would now be about 24,000 sq. ft. and the existing house lot would be about 25,000 sq. ft. What he's really doing is taking two pre-existing, non-conforming lots of record and really making them more equitable in terms of their area and more useable in terms of the frontage and the septic system. If he were to convey this lot, he can convey it as a lot by itself, it would have frontage and it would have the septic system entirely on its own property. Because we were actually taking land away from a previously existing, non-conforming lot of record, we were required to go to the ZBA and receive a variance to make the main lot more non-conforming. A variance was received from the ZBA in order to allow that to happen. Now it's just a matter of getting approval for this adjustment from the Planning Board. The other aspects of the Z.O. in terms of setbacks and frontage are being met. There was a question about the existing septic system on the house lot. The existing system is behind the house and its of an older vintage but is still functioning fine so there's no reason to replace. However, Mr. Saltmarsh did hire Dave Ames to prepare a septic system plan because he owns land on the other side of the road, there is a septic plan which was approved by DES to construct a septic system for this house on the other side of the road at such there was a problem with the existing system. There are no well radius issues or lot sizing or loading issues related to the septic. We did not show a well on the house lot and I found they draw water from the lake. Touhey – Is there a well on any of these lot? Johnson – There is a well on the brook lot. When the septic system was approved, there's a waiver for that because the septic system is in the radius. Edney – The only comments we have from the staff level is that the applicant would need to submit a draft deed for Parcel "A" for review by staff and monument locations need to be verified in writing prior to recording the mylar. Johnson – Doug Hill prepared that deed for Mr. Saltmarsh. I gave Mr. Edney a copy this evening. We have set the monuments already. Kahn – No mortgages, Carl? Johnson – There is a mortgage and there will be a partial release provided prior to recording the mylar. Hearing closed at 7:12 p.m.

Dever moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE IN THE CASE OF SHERMAN SALTMARSH, JR., FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT, TAX MAP U22, LOTS 10 AND 12 ON SACHEM COVE ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT, AND WE APPROVE THE BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) SUBMIT A DRAFT DEED TO PARCEL "A" FOR REVIEW BY STAFF.

- (2) VERIFY THE MONUMENT LOCATIONS PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.
- (3) PROVIDE A PARTIAL MORTGAGE RELEASE PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

PRE-APPLICATION DESIGN REVIEWS

1. **STEVE SMITH & ASSOCIATES, INC. FOR LRGHEALTHCARE** - Pre-Application Design Review of a proposed plan for expansion and redevelopment of Tax Map U02, Lot 35A, located at 238 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

Steve Smith – This property is located in two zones, Residential and Central Business. We submitted a concept plan of our proposed redevelopment and also submitted tonight a reduced package of plans, not to confuse you, but to try to give you a little bit of history of this site and why we're back here tonight with our presentation for design review. In late 1997 and early 1998, we came to the PLB for review of this site and the first plan you have in your packet is an existing conditions plan. The overall boundaries of the property have been highlighted and the zoning line has been highlighted in red. The zoning line followed one of the parcels of land at that time. This was originally in 3 parcels when we came to the PLB in 1998. There was the health facility that was all in Central Business and then there were two other parcels in the back and both had residential houses on them. The medical office is about 6,200 sq. ft. We presented a Site Plan to the PLB for redevelopment of this site which is the next sheet in your packet and this was a proposal where we merged the lots. We propose to remove one of the residential units and the other stayed. Our proposal was to put an addition onto the existing structure of a little over 6,380 sq. ft. to expand the medical office itself. We proposed to construct it in two phases, Phase I was to build an access road which would come from Lower Ladd Hill, we built two of the parking lots (1 & 2), we installed our drainage system for the entire site, we installed a detention pond to treat all of the storm water, and the lighting and walkways to the building. That part of the phase got constructed but we never moved forward with Phase II which would have been to complete parking lot 4, to build parking lot 3 and to put this 6,380 sq. ft. addition onto the existing building that you see there today. The existing building has a flat roof in the front. It was decided basically it wasn't a good plan and it didn't really make sense to rehab the existing building and add to it. We are looking now at a different proposal and would like to abandon the existing building that is there and build a freestanding medical facility of 14,000 sq. ft., about 1,600 or 1,700 sq. ft. larger than the original proposal. We propose to remove the existing residence so it will be all medical use at the site. We propose to finish a portion of the original parking lot that was going to come off the lower entrance and in addition to that, build a new parking lot where the existing building is today so at the new building you would enter the upper level of this building from the upper parking lot and you

would enter the lower level of this building from the lower parking lot and as part of that plan, we would eliminate one of the points of access which would be the access up the hill so you would have one access off Daniel Webster Highway and another access off Lower Ladd Hill Road. As part of that redevelopment, Smith showed the Board what the proposed building will look like. The new design gets rid of the flat roof completely and it's certainly a much different look to this site than it would have been if we had actually gone forward and made that addition and had a 13,000 sq. ft. addition with a flat roof on the front side and pitched roof on the back side. We're here tonight just for design review to get the Board's input. We are early in the stages here of our layout of the plan and thought it would be a good time to get some feedback from the Board. Ward of Samyn-D'elia, Architects – We have two objectives here, the building's around 14,200 sq. ft. and is on two levels. The east side which is facing the current medical building and will be facing the upper parking lot is sort of the main entrance area. You would come in, go into the clinic and there's a handicap ramp that's all under a porch area. On the lower level which is sort of facing the north, you'd be going into the occupational therapy section and the blood lab area as well as radiology and staff break room and the mechanical area. The upper level is a clinic, the lower level are those facilities I just mentioned. The building is a rectangle approximately 70' x 80' sq. ft. The idea of the design is to get away from the clinical look that most clinics have and be a little bit more of a user friendly residential type of style. It also seems to fit with the Meredith design motif that you like to see here in town and reflects some of the architectural images that you might find on the hotel buildings and some of the other buildings in town. The materials on the outside are going to be some type of textured siding. We intend to keep the large trees on the property. Vadney asked clarification on the location of the front door. Smith – We have 2 points of access because we have the upper access and then the lower access from the lower parking lot. There will be an elevator at both entrances so you can go up and down from the inside from one level to the next. Kahn – On your eastern exposure facing Route 3, the second floor, can you break up that expanse, it sort of looks like a barracks. Ward – We'll work on that. The examining rooms are on that side and the doctors want them all exactly the same. Smith - That side also is going to have somewhat of a filtered view from this tree line and this little narrow piece of property that sits in here and we will be doing a landscaping plan but our hope is to keep some forest in here to give that just a filtered view to help break that up and make that look smaller. We met with Bill and the Fire Department and we're making some minor changes for him on turning radiuses and he's requested that we keep this original residential driveway as an emergency access to the back. As part of this project, we were required to get a Special Exception for our transition of medical into residential. We got that on the last project and we're going back to the ZBA to get that renewed in terms of this process. Kahn – Where are we on water? Smith – As far as we know, we don't have a problem with water. We are going to be giving them what our water uses are to really determine that but based on our early conversations with the Department Heads and relative to water, we don't have an issue that we know of. Flanders – It does seem that the view that's going to get the most exposure traveling up and down Route 3 is probably the least attractive so if you can do something to spiff that

up a little bit. That entrance toward the parking lot is beautiful; it's too bad we couldn't have that pointed at Route 3. If you can work on the exposure to Route 3 which is the one everybody's going to see the most of, I think we'd be in real good shape. Smith – We've turned the building as much as we can to try to get this view coming up the hill. Vadney – It's kind of like we've tried to make it attractive as you come into town, this would be attractive when you're leaving town. Touhey – As far as impervious coverage, what exists now and what it will be when you finish this project? Smith – We don't have those figures at this moment but we know we have to have those. Will the existing detention pond be adequate for any additional impervious. Smith – Absolutely, and we did design that detention pond for all of Phase 2 and installed it to cover Phase 2 also and we're looking at how this relates if we had gone ahead and built Phase 2 relative to the pond. We've had some discussions with your Department Heads to determine whether or not they've had any problems with that pond so we're looking at that and we certainly understand that. Vadney – What about the stream that runs to the northerly end of the property and comes across from Harley. Smith – Our proposal is not to touch that. Our design originally and our philosophy is still the same, is that we've allowed the water from across the street to pass through like it always has, all of our new water we've collected and directed it towards the detention basin. Vadney – This new construction will only affect the detention basin. Smith – That's right. Again, our design is to bring all the water to our detention basin and leave that stream alone. As you well know, that stream goes through our property and actually goes under a building. We were aware of that right from the beginning and we've done everything to keep any of our water from going in that direction and we continue to have that philosophy and work on it that way. Flanders – When they did this project before and did the first 2 phases of the parking lot, the water traveling through that stream and under the abutter's building actually were diminished substantially. A lot of the water that used to run under that was diverted over here to the detention pond. Vadney – You'll see that the flow is still pretty substantial there. Smith – The flow is substantial and we recognize that but that is correct, we designed the parking lots to catch that water in catch basins and send it to the detention pond. We do understand that there have been some problems with some heavy rains relative to that brook and we've even talked with our clients about that in terms of that but our belief is that's coming from the other side of the road. They've got 2 twin 30" pipes coming out of the driveway out there that drain into this and I'm not familiar with what they did for detention. Vadney – The purpose of my question tonight is to verify that anything you're doing with this new project will only affect the part of the drainage that goes to the detention pond. Smith – Yes, we'll continue to do that. Bayard – Can you give us an explanation as to why you're doing this as opposed to using an existing building and adding onto it? Smith – I believe the explanation we got from the hospital was that the existing building is in such bad shape that economically it didn't make sense to try to retrofit to that and use that existing building. That was the idea originally and it's not going to work. Peter Russell, Chairman of the Buildings & Grounds Committee for LRGH – The initial building was built in the 60's and it is in very, very poor shape and all the doctors in there right now will tell you that when they're examining people, they can't use their stethoscopes because they

can't hear because of the road so rather than spending mega money to try to take care of that Route 3 wall and looking at the building in its present form and its aging condition, it was decided that it made much more sense to build new. Vadney – That does beg the question as to why your examining rooms face onto Route 3 because that's where the noise comes from. Russell – Obviously, we'll have better construction so it won't be the same scenario. Dever – I know for a fact that building is very damp. Downstairs there's a humidifier rolling all year long. Flanders – Just for your information, Steve, you mentioned you didn't know what they were doing up there at Harley, a large portion of that parking lot has a recharge system underneath and there is a detention pond on the north end so they've done a lot to handle the drainage up there on-site. I'm not saying that the flow off the site isn't greater than it was before but it's not by much. Smith – I'm not saying that either, I'm just not familiar with their site. Vadney – We are just pretty sensitive on that stream that goes under the abutter's house because we've looked at several pieces of property uphill from that and every time they come in that becomes a sensitive topic. Smith – We clearly understand that, I think it was when we were in here in 1997 and 1998 and that's why we directed all the water and built the detention basin and put the catch basin system in the new parking lots to get it away from there. Kahn – I take it you're building this with a view to expansion, more doctors, more lab, personnel? Smith – I think there's a reasonable expansion there. Kahn – How many years out are you projecting as far as doctors, Peter? When do you plan to run out of space? Russell – What we're hoping to do is actually get this under construction this winter or next year and its slated for 5 or 6 doctors right now in the future but it depends on how it grows but we also would like to offer some specialty doctors there as well that might be there 1 or 2 days/week and also we're trying to expand the laboratory so we can offer x-rays so people won't have to go to Laconia. Kahn – Is there a provision being made for a potential future expansion? Russell – Not really at this point in time. We're hoping that increasing its size from about 6,000 sq. ft. in the current building up to 14,000+ will last us awhile. Smith – We do have some ability in the attic area of this building to expand if we needed to expand. Vadney – To build on Lou's question, you think this footprint you're offering right now will be the now and the future's footprint, you won't be going out in any direction? Russell – That's correct. Smith - I'm not sure we can go out in any direction to be honest with you. I think the only thing we could do is we have some attic space that could be converted to some use but I don't think we can go out anymore with the building. I think this is the maximum as far as the building footprint. Vadney – Have you done anything with the parking? This design represents the amount of parking spaces required for the square footage that we're doing. We do know that the parking spaces we have there now are way over what they've needed in the past, we feel this is probably going to be the case here too and we're going to try to monitor that to keep a good handle on how that's functioning. Vadney – I know this plan calls for leaving the driveway where it is and that's fine. Would there be any advantage to you in the layout of your lot if you move that driveway anywhere. Smith – Which driveway are we talking about? Vadney – The main one where you go in. There's really no way we can, elevation wise we're pretty stuck with that. Edney – Steve has reiterated the fact that there are going to

be evaluations done on drainage and currently I believe Brian Carroll is doing a water flow test on the hydrant so there are a number of things that are in the works, that are very preliminary at this point. Allen Parker - We're under the assumption that where the existing clinic is, you're going to bulldoze that and then use that existing footprint and make it larger. Vadney - No, they are going to move uphill almost across from Hart's. So if you were coming down Ladd Hill Road, the house that's immediately on the right-hand side is leaving? What's going to happen to the existing clinic building? They are going to operate out of the existing building until the new building is ready and then tear the old one down and move into the new one. Eventually the existing building will go. That's where the parking lot is going to go. At that point, you are going to put in more drainage where the building exists right now and have that go to your basin. Smith - That is correct. There won't be any parking to the north of the existing footprint. That will be the parking lot entrance. The entrance right here is the lower entrance coming into the parking lot, then you go down and we have a parking lot this way and that's all staying. This road is staying. This was already built for parking; we just didn't put it in. We are adding more spaces. The new building will be located on top of the house that's there now or very close to it, the existing clinic will be taken down. You'll come in this entrance, turn and come into a parking lot right here where the old building is and that's going to be all captured and we show the catch basin system here that's going to go back into the detention pond that will capture any of this water. What does happen now with the existing building because we didn't do anything here, what water ran into the brook today will now be captured and taken this way so we're taking this water and actually capturing it and bringing it back to the pond. Everything that comes across the street comes through this system which we've always left alone and taken everything of ours away from it. Allen Parker asked questions about where the water will go but it was inaudible. Smith - We're designing it and grading it so we're bringing it to catch basins that are going to collect it and take it to the pond so it never gets to the brook is what we're going to do and just so you know, we designed the detention pond originally for full development of this site. We just didn't go through with the additions and what we were proposing and we've changed it and moved it around a little bit. Mr. Parker - Where you have more asphalt where the existing building sits, how are you going to control the water? Will you make the pond a little larger? We don't know yet, we have to do the analysis first. Mr. Parker indicated he had seen the pond overflow. Smith - We have talked with the Town and we're not aware of it ever being a problem. We've inspected it and we believe its functioning properly. It gets silted in over time so it may need some maintenance. Vadney - I've checked it a number of times over the years and I've never seen any sign of water and debris having matted down the grass on it or anything and I'm surprised if it ever overflowed. Flanders - I know originally when they designed that detention pond, it was to take care of the whole site and everything in addition they took that way, but you need to keep in mind that these systems are designed for 100-year storms and sometimes we get a storm that exceeds that. Last year, Waukegan Street got washed out and Winona Road was washed out and closed for two months. There was a storm that focused right in that area and if that type of event happens, no matter how you

design it, you will get an overflow. What I'm trying to point out is that from time to time Mother Nature messes around with us and there's no way you can plan for that totally. Smith – That is actually why we designed an overflow with the detention pond itself and direct it in the direction it goes in. Vadney – I guess in summary we certainly support the idea, the clinic's necessary and as John pointed out here, it's a bit mildewy down in there at times. The building is old and pretty close to inadequate. This seems to be a handsome design depending on where you're standing and the basic idea overall looks like a good program. You've heard the comments; they will be taking a close look at the parking requirements, the water infiltration and lot coverage. Design Review closed at 7:50 p.m.

BOARD DISCUSSION RE: SIGNAGE - Vadney – I met with Bill the other day to discuss the signage proposed for Towle House. Edney – we've gone back and pulled the plans out, recalculated the signage based on what the ordinance allows and they are actually 2 sq. ft. below on either side what they are allowed by ordinance. I think if you were to go up there now, it has softened itself a little bit with the painting, removal of the scaffolding and those kinds of things that kind of made it jump out. The landscaping isn't completed but there's no doubt, it really pushes the limit to what is allowed by ordinance. It spurs some thoughts about how that might change a little bit, perhaps incorporating that into the architectural review so it does get a preview by the Board. Short of redrafting and we had done a redraft back 3 or 4 years ago when we proposed a number of zoning changes and we can certainly pull that back out and take a peek at the process we went through and the process we were going through at that point. I think in the long run, if it were part of an architectural review and an opportunity to look at proposed signage and it's dimensioned out, you'd have an opportunity to comment on something like you see up there. That being said, that is probably the outer limit of what is allowed in our ordinance for signage. Vadney – They've got quite a bit of frontage and of course that sign sits up on the front corner and stands in your face as you go up the hill, I think part of it we can't control but we can influence a bit when we look at the architectural design, if there's any question at all on the signage, we can ask for a standoff view of what the sign will look like on the building or in front of the building or wherever. We've been maybe a little lax in just saying if you've got so many feet, put it up where you like. We've also been fairly lenient in saying those details can be worked out administratively, but I guess we ought to keep in mind when we do that, they go straight to the limit of the book and Bill and Angela and John's hands are pretty well tied. If we're still holding back on the Architectural Design Review, there might be some negotiating room so that may be one way we can control it. The other thing is we can tackle the ordinance and try to carve it down some. If we do, maybe we can do this as part of architectural design anyway, we probably ought to have something in the law that says you're authorized this much signage but you can't hook it to a device that's 10 times bigger than the sign and say that doesn't count. Kahn – The other suggestion I would make is we have height limits on sizes of buildings; maybe we should have height limits on signs. A sign would not be nearly as obstreperous if it were flattened out. Edney - The way the ordinance reads is take a measurement from the adjacent roadway and can be no more than 20' above that height so there is a height limit but I

think when you look at that height limit, my feeling is that if that sign were 100 feet further east, it wouldn't have the dramatic impact it has because right now the notion is that it hides the building and what a grand old building. Dever – When you're heading west, you've lost the front of that building to that sign. Edney – And again, I think in looking at these things in a design review, placement of the signage is just as important as the sign structure and dimension as well. Vadney – I rode the street after we discussed it 2 weeks ago and interestingly in my estimation as ugly as the Harley signs may be up at Harley, in a way they are less in your face than this one, although they are big ugly signs so to speak, they are on 2 skinny poles. This one has the big thick poles and the roof above it and it makes it stand out even more. The High School has a pretty big edifice, they've got a brick sculpted setting for it but then they've got a really neat little Inter-Lakes sign and the same down at Meredith Bay Village where they did the stone work with a nice little sign added to that and here on the hill, they took the full amount. An interesting point is you can't see through that sign, all these others you can see through the posts, you can see through the structure somewhat and this one you can't see through it. Flanders - In Hooksett, the size of the sign is calibrated based on its distance from the road. Bayard – I'm not sure but maybe the Design Review Ordinance should be strengthened a little bit. That might be easier than going through full-fledged details of what size, how far, etc. Lapham – I drove up there also and their sign is a little more elegant than some of the other signs around town and I give them credit for that. Edney – They actually pulled a lot of the detail on the sign off the building. Vadney – Where the sign goes is going to be an important issue and I think we can control that to a large degree. Edney – I certainly think as you've mentioned, Herb, that it's at least going to give you some negotiating room because if it doesn't happen in this venue and it gets to our office on a staff review, the ordinance is the ordinance until it changes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

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 July 14, 2009.

R. William Bayard, Secretary