

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

Sorell moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2007, 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.

Applicant proposes to construct a 90' high monopole wireless telecommunication tower with access via NH Route 104. The site is approximately 170 ac. in size and includes a residence with access from Hatch Corner Road. The tower would be located within a 100' x 100' compound and served by a 2000' +/- access drive. Application, site plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. I recommend the application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Sorell seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF RCC ATLANTIC FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY WITH RELATED IMPROVEMENTS. Voted unanimously.

2. **38 MAIN, LLC** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment to add commercial space to an existing mixed use (commercial/residential) building, Tax Map U07, Lot 131, located at 38 Main Street in the Central Business District.

Applicant currently owns a mixed use commercial building on Main Street. The site is located in between Patricia's and Abondante's. Applicant proposes to convert existing unoccupied unfinished space to 560 SF of additional retail space on the second floor. It is my understanding that the proposed space would be wholly located within the existing building and there is no site work involved. Application, site plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend the application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Sorell seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR 38 MAIN STREET, LLC, TO ADD COMMERCIAL SPACE TO AN EXISTING MIXED USE BUILDING. Voted unanimously.

3. **MSS REALTY TRUST of 1995** – Proposed Site Plan to construct an 85-unit Senior Living Facility and related site improvements, Tax Map S17, Lot 16, located on Upper Mile Point Drive in the Shoreline and Route 3 South Districts.
4. **MSS REALTY TRUST of 1995** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed 85-Unit Senior Living Facility, Tax Map S17, Lot 16, located on Upper Mile Point Drive in the Shoreline and Route 3 South Districts.

Edgar – Applicant proposes to construct a licensed senior living facility. The facility will consist of three distinct areas: 41 supported independent living units, 20 assisted living units and a 24-bed memory support care wing. The various levels of senior living would be incorporated in one multi-story building located on a 10.72 ac. lot. The lot is currently undeveloped. A variety of services are provided to the residents including dining, health screening, wellness, personalized health care, medication management, medication administration and specialized activities. The proposed facility will be affiliated with Golden View Health Care. Applications for Site Plan Review and Architectural Design Review, plans, exterior elevations and an abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Technical review fee has been paid. I recommend both applications be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Finer moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS OF MSS REALTY TRUST FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW. Voted unanimously.

5. **CROSSPOINT ASSOCIATES, INC.** – Proposed Site Plan to rebuild and expand existing retail space with related site improvements, Tax Map U15, Lots 1 and 4, located at 38 NH Route 25 in the Central Business District.
6. **CROSSPOINT ASSOCIATES, INC.** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed commercial building, Tax Map U15, Lots 1 and 4, located at 38 NH Route 25 in the Central Business District.*

Edgar – The subject of this application is the Meredith Shopping Center on NH Route 25. The shopping center complex consists of 3 buildings including the cinema, a smaller retail building that we know locally as the Village Greenery and Sundial Shop building and a larger retail building that currently includes Brooks Pharmacy. The buildings are located on 11.17 acres, much of which is wetland. The larger retail building currently consists of 42,000 sq. ft. of space. The proposal including a combination of demolition and building expansion would result in a net gain of 9,800 sq. ft. of additional retail space. The building expansion portion of the proposal is to accommodate a grocery store. The grocery store tenant has not yet been identified. The revitalized shopping center would eliminate a significant eyesore, create additional employment and significantly add to the tax base while providing the public with more retail options in the village core. The applications for Site Plan Amendment and Architectural

Design Review, site plans, building elevations and abutters list are all on file. Filing fees have been paid. I would recommend that both applications be accepted for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Sorell moved, Kahn seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS FOR SITE PLAN AMENDMENT AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR CROSSPOINT ASSOCIATES. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RCC ATLANTIC, INC. D/B/A UNICEL FOR MEREDITH NOMINEE TRUST NO. 1:
(Rep. Pete DeMarco and Dan Hamm, Engineering Consultant)

DeMarco – I just received John Edgar’s staff review summary report for the tower. We’ve been to the ZBA on this site for a Special Exception to cross wetlands and for a variance to locate the tower in a sensitivity zone. The Planning Board staff has made a comprehensive review of our proposal and made a number of comments and I think Dan can address them. Dan Hamm, the principal and Professional Engineer for Hudson Design Group contracted to RCC Unicel. The basic concept of this design is to build a 90 foot monopole approximately 2000 feet off of NH Route 104. We are accessing the site off Route 104 via an existing curb cut that’s overgrown and the current owner used to use for logs and then up an existing woods road close to the top. We will be upgrading it to make it work out better. We’ve applied for Dredge and Fill Permits through the NHDES and we’ve also applied for an official road cut. DeMarco – It’s an existing woods road that’s been in existence since 1938. Dave Almstrom owns this property with wife Betty – This was an existing logging road that was put in after the hurricane of 1938. There was a massive blow down of trees and the field that was up here was used to store the logs that were sawed here. They were brought up from Wicwas Lake. Route 104 as it is presently was not there, it was the old Route 104. This road here goes all the way down to Hatch Corner Road and it’s a fire trail. I opened it up on the advice of the Soil Conservation Service from Laconia, USDA Soil and Conservation District. Wilbur Phillips was the design engineer that came up from the State Extension Service and he laid out all these roads. This part here doesn’t exist (pointed out on plan), this is very, very steep. I have been up and down with my skidder and I take out just bad trees, blow down trees, crooked and rotted trees and I have been operating it like a tree farm without getting the designation. I don’t want notoriety. They had advised me to leave this grown up here so that people wouldn’t be accessing it. I talked to the abutter, Mr. Larson, and said I really didn’t want to go up through the ledge here because there would be sight visibility problems and there’s about 30’ of ledge to blast through and it would make a very wide open area, quite an ugly looking area but it would then invite the traffic right up through into this area. This is the old road, it’s a ledge bottom, it’s solid, the only time there’s any water around this area is when the snow melts off and right now its bone dry. Hamm – We’ve provided NHDES with the drainage plans for the Dredge & Fill Permit for the small wetland areas

that we are going through and we tried to follow the existing woods road as much as possible so as not to disturb any additional trees. RCC proposes to construct a 100' x 100' square compound with a monopole in the middle. It will be galvanized so it will be gray in color and a small 10' x 12' equipment shelter. All of the utilities will be run up along the edge of the road overhead, I believe, so as to minimize the disturbance on the ground. Vadney – You say the pole will be 90' tall, how tall are the surrounding trees at least after you've cut the 100' square? They range around 60-70', the average is about 60'. Vadney – Is this one after 8 or 10 years of growth you add to the antenna or what do you do? Hamm – RCC would stay at their current height, the growth shouldn't affect them that much because of the location. Edgar – As many of you might know, we definitely have a black hole out on 104 relative to cell coverage and I believe that the intent largely here is to fill that need out on the western end of Town in the Route 104 area. If you look at that particular design, you'll see the spacing for up to 4 carriers so the carriers at the top wouldn't be impacted by the vegetative growth but certainly the carrier that's right at the tree line could be. I don't know how that would work but in any event it provides for co-location which is a good thing, it means there could be up to 4 carriers working off the pole and that is kind of a balancing act because at the end of the day, it may mean less poles overall in that part of Town. Our standard practice is to have all related permits cross-referenced on final plans. In this particular case, there are two ZBA applications that were acted on recently, one being a Use Variance and the other being a wetland crossing. Wetlands have been delineated by Kathleen Surowiec, CWS #172 and these final plans as Planning Board site plans should be amended to include the standard language as to who did the work, when they did it and to what standard. We do have this information in the ZBA file but it should carry over to this particular plan set. A Special Exception was granted in Case #2780A to construct a wetland crossing within the non-designated wetland area for installation of a culvert. Hamm pointed wetland area out on the plan where the crossing will go. Edgar – There would be no occupancy of the compound in terms of anybody spending any considerable time at the compound shelter. It's basically an equipment shelter which has been the case with the two other towers that we have in Town, there are no septic or water services proposed and here again that is consistent with other tower sites in the community. Overhead power and telephone service will be brought in from NH 104. The plans indicate a 20' wide utility access easement to provide for the overhead lines and I've indicated that the applicant should be encouraged to coordinate with the NH Electric Cooperative relative to a utility plan if that has not yet been accomplished. As was indicated, there was some level of an existing access onto the highway but it certainly at this point is not permitted for tower access so therefore a NHDOT Permit is required and should be referenced on final plans. According to the Lakes Region Planning Commission, this portion of NH Route 104 is a controlled access ROW meaning that there may be limitations as to the number and/or location of access points. Generally speaking, access points were granted as part of a public hearing process required during the development of the highway construction project. I share that just from an informational point of view. The

tower compound itself would be served by a 2000' long, 10' wide access drive. It is my understanding that the proposed access corresponds in part with an access road that dates to 1938 or thereabouts. The intent is to be as least disrupting to the environment as possible according to the applicant. The plan labels a 10' wide access drive as a woods road and it's not clear from the plans how much of the proposed drive corresponds with the existing drive and how much new construction is anticipated and where the construction is necessary to obtain the proposed driveway specifications. The plans indicate that the access driveway would be gated at the Route 104 entrance. The final plan set should identify the amount of disturbed area and provide a detailed erosion control plan prepared by the design engineer to include the compound area, culvert installations and the construction portion of the 2000' access drive. I raise the question under fuel supply as to whether or not the site would have backup power generation and if so, there is a field component that may come with that and to the extent there is a fuel component, the final plans should be signed off by the Fire Chief as and if necessary. A small Performance Guarantee would be required to guarantee the satisfactory site stabilization during construction. The design engineer would provide a unit cost estimate on forms provided by my office. Staff would review the estimate and make a recommendation back to the Board; the Board would establish the amount of the guarantee following a public hearing unless otherwise delegated to staff. The form of the guarantee would be either cash or letter of credit. The format of the letter of credit or cash agreement would be approved by the Finance Director. Bayard – Who would be on the cell tower right now? Hamm – Unicef & AT&T roams on Unicef in this market. Bayard – Do other cell phones have roaming access or how does that work? DeMarco – They can, it depends on our spectrum and what deals they make. Everybody pretty much deals with everybody else if they can. It's a capital expense issue, they would rather go on our tower and we'd rather go on theirs. We certainly would much rather have them on our tower or roaming on us so we can get money for that. It's not restrictive in any way. Being what it is, I know AT&T has a roaming agreement with Unicef, I don't think Sprint, Nextel or Verizon could roam on our signal; they would have to go on the tower. Bayard – When does the proposed construction for this start if it were to go forward. DeMarco – Within 90 days, we would want it completed by winter. Vadney – Will you plow that 2000' long driveway in the winter? DeMarco – Probably not, usually it's ATV or snowmobile access in the winter. We have a lot of mountaintop sites. There will be no back UP fuel on the site. Kahn – As you're going past this site on Route 104, you're not going to see this tower or you're not going to see it from the West, but as you're coming from the East, is that tower going to be visible from 104 as you're going West on 104? DeMarco – I had submitted to the Board a complete set of photo simulations showing all the viewpoints where the site might be visible. Bayard – You're not planning on making this look like a funky pine tree or anything like that? DeMarco – No. Hamm – Did you notice in the photos, photo 6 is taken going eastbound on 104? I believe there are sensitivity areas that we are asked to take pictures from and those are the results. Roger Rist, Meredith Center - Someone stated when we started that we need cell phone service in that area. It

is very true, I have none at my house and I've grown to depend on it and I would urge you to grant this application. Linda Johnson, Dolloff Brook Road – We drop calls all the time over in that section because of the black hole and I would urge them to get Verizon on there. Bayard – To be honest with you, perhaps this may be a stepping down comment but I do think it would be very good personally. I'm not stating companies, but I'm just saying having a tower there that does have reception would be very beneficial to people in the area. The one photo that's missing is coming from the East on Route 104, coming westbound on 104, there's no photo and I think that's where it's going to be most visible. Hamm – In your By-Law there is a sensitivity map, Town of Meredith Wireless Communications Overlay District Map and it actually recommends highly significant viewpoints so we tried to hit all the ones that we found where the tower would be visible from. If it's not in there, it's probably because we couldn't see it when we flew the balloon. Touhey – I would just briefly comment that assuming that when people drive they are looking to a great degree where they are going, looking straight ahead, so the curve of the road in that area would have them looking over the Lakeland School perhaps and looking out on Lake Wicwas so unless they made a concerted effort to look to the right, it's not going to be something that's going to be straight in front of them. Kahn – You show the tree line, is that all around the tower? Vadney – My concern would be, it doesn't matter how tall those trees are if the thing is sitting on a hill and is quite a bit taller than the trees that are not sitting on the hill. Edgar – For all practical purposes, the height of the tower was determined by the Zoning Board of Adjustment pursuant to the granting of the Use Variance. Kahn – Dave, are there trees to the east of this site? Dave Almstrom – There are trees to the east, the west, the south and the north. When you stand like this, you cannot see anything in any direction. If you look up, the trees are all mature trees and they are not going to grow any taller? This is on a rock site so they can't grow any taller because they've been there 60 or 100 years. The soil won't support them to grow any taller. This is going to be about 30' higher than the trees, there's already power lines that go there that are 60' tall and you can't see those from anyplace even from 104 except for where the wires cross Route 104 but the answer is there are trees all the way around and this will be the least visible tower in Town. I don't think anybody will be able to see it or know it's there and that's the way I want to keep it. I want to keep this land as it is. My intention isn't to develop this land. When they first came to me, I said no, this is my land and I'm really taking care of it. When they showed me where they wanted to put the tower, I said this isn't so bad. It's on a rock outcropping, there are no neighbors, Linda Johnson lives quite a ways down and this was the first proposed site, the one that somebody had proposed was right behind Linda's house and I didn't like that nor did I want it on Mr. Larson's property so it's set in 150' from Mr. Larson's property on a rock outcropping and you cannot see anything from there. Touhey – What is the size of the area to be clear cut? Hamm – It would be approximately 100' x 100' and then we'll put the fence in on the edges, the minimum amount we can. Kahn – Can we specify a buffer be maintained around the site? Vadney – John, do you know of any precedent for trying to buffer something over that long distance? Edgar – No, one of the prior applications we had reviewed was to try to

limit the degree of clearing so the footprint is minimized, therefore, try to maintain as much of the existing vegetation as one can and I'm thinking of the Berry site up off Gilman Hill. No, I'm not familiar with that, if it's something the applicant is willing to agree to place on the plan 50' in the context of a 170-acre site may not be viewed as terribly onerous and it may provide for an added level of benefit. The flip side of that is just simply that the Zoning Ordinance delegates to the ZBA all those issues of discretion relative to the height and placement and the Board's primary function in all of this is to look at the ground issues as opposed to the visual issues. That's not to say you couldn't get into that a little bit but this is a little bit different path because they received a Use Variance so the issues of the height and whatnot by ordinance are within the discretion of the Zoning Board. For example, the ordinance deals with whether or not a site should be camouflaged or not as an aesthetic issue and that is delegated to the ZBA. DeMarco – RCC has no objection to a vegetative barrier. We never have and never will. We don't want these things to look like eyesores either, 50' is probably a bit extreme when the whole compound is only 100' x 100' and in order to be able to accommodate equipment shelters for the carriers, it wouldn't work. I would think 25' to these. Edgar – I think its 50' outside of the compound not inside. DeMarco – That's no problem whatsoever. Edgar – When the plans come back in show the limit of clearing as a practical limit of clearing and then measure 50' from that. Hearing closed at

Bayard moved, Sorell seconded, I MOVE THAT WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF RCC ATLANTIC, INC. D/B/A AS UNICEL FOR MEREDITH NOMINEE TRUST NO. 1, WHICH IS A PROPOSED SITE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT A WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY WITH RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS, TAX MAP R11, LOT 1, LOCATED AT 18 HATCH CORNER ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THE ZBA DECISION (CASE #2780) SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS AND THE PLANS BE CORRECTED TO NOTE A 90' MAXIMUM TOWER HEIGHT PER THE USE VARIANCE;
- (2) THE FINAL PLANS SHALL NOTE WHO DID THE WETLANDS DELINEATION, THE DATE OF DELINEATION AND THE STANDARDS EMPLOYED AND BE STAMPED BY THE WETLAND SCIENTIST;
- (3) THE ZBA DECISION (CASE #2780A) SHALL ALSO BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (4) A NHDES DREDGE AND FILL PERMIT IS REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (5) A NHDOT PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR ACCESS TO NH ROUTE 104 AND SHALL BE REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (6) THE FINAL PLANS SHALL IDENTIFY THE AMOUNT OF DISTURBED AREA AND PROVIDE AN EROSION CONTROL PLAN PREPARED BY A DESIGN ENGINEER TO INCLUDE THE COMPOUND, CULVERT

- INSTALLATIONS AND THE DETAILS OF WHAT CONSTRUCTION WOULD OCCUR ON THE 2000' ACCESS DRIVE;
- (7) THE 50' BUFFER BEYOND THE CONSTRUCTION LIMIT OF THE FENCE BE NOTED ON THE FINAL PLANS;
 - (8) A PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE IS REQUIRED TO GUARANTEE SATISFACTORY SITE STABILIZATION DURING CONSTRUCTION. THE DESIGN ENGINEER SHALL PROVIDE A UNIT COST ESTIMATE ON FORMS PROVIDED BY THE TOWN. STAFF WILL REVIEW THE ESTIMATE AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING BOARD. THE PLANNING BOARD IN A SUBSEQUENT MEETING SHALL ESTABLISH THE AMOUNT OF THE GUARANTEE FOLLOWING A PUBLIC HEARING. THE FORM OF THE GUARANTEE SHALL BE CASH OR LETTER OF CREDIT AND THE FORMAT OF THE GUARANTEE SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE FINANCE DIRECTOR;
 - (9) THE EROSION CONTROL PLAN AND THE LIMIT OF CLEARING INFORMATION GOES HAND-IN-HAND WITH THE PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE SO IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO REVIEW BOTH OF THOSE ITEMS AT A COMPLIANCE HEARING;
 - (10) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 7 & 17. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Edgar – Mr. Chairman, how would you want the determination of compliance to be held? It's likely that the Performance Guarantee issue should come back to you unless it was otherwise delegated to staff and I think that the erosion control plan, the limit of clearing, that information kind of goes hand-in-hand with that so it would probably be appropriate knowing that we don't have those plans in any fashion at this point would be to review both those items at a Compliance Hearing. Hearing closed at 7:48 p.m.

2. **38 MAIN, LLC:** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.)

Johnson – This property is located at 38 Main Street and is diagonally across from the Town Hall. Abondante Restaurant is to the North and a multi-use building is to the South and Mill Falls parking lot is to the East and Main Street to the West. This building exists as a multi-use building; there are some businesses in the building as well as some residences. Currently, there's an antique shop located in the front section of the building, there are two 1-bedroom apartments and currently in the back which was a portion of the antique building is currently vacant and upstairs from that was a space that was used primarily for storage and it's the space that the owners propose to renovate, upgrade and turn into some existing commercial space. As you know, for many of the businesses on Main Street there's limited parking. There is an existing driveway to the North of the building with some limited parking to the back. There is parking on Main Street, there is the existing Municipal lot to the north, there is some municipal parking on Plymouth Street and there is parking on a first come, first

serve basis, at the Mill Falls Marketplace and this potential increase in the square footage of this building would theoretically add about 3 spaces necessary for the parking, a very minimal addition for the amount of commercial space that's being proposed. As I mentioned, right now the space really is used in a storage capacity, the proposal is to create and upgrade the entrance to the upstairs portion of that building. There would be an employee washroom and the rest would be a combination of the retail and storage space. It's a pretty small space; it's about 28' long and 20' wide. John Edgar did provide what may be the world record for the shortest staff review summary in the history of the Meredith Planning Board but nonetheless there are a few comments on there. The use is a permitted use in the Central Business District. The proposed 560 sq. ft. of additional retail space is a hypothetical parking demand of 2.8 spaces assuming there's no storage and there probably would be a little bit of storage in any type of space that would be out there. Signage at this point, there are some signs on the building. There is a free-standing sign outside and the signage would be handled separately as part of a sign application permit when a prospective tenant is identified. As with all of the Certificate of Occupancies that are issued in Meredith are reviewed by the Code Enforcement Officer and if a particular use was proposed for this commercial space which would not be in concert with the surrounding commercial uses or would be too intense, that would be a use that would not be allowed in the building and essentially we're talking the old video store versus a furniture store type thing where there are some uses that probably would not be accommodating on this site and that would be handled by the Code Enforcement officer through the Certificate of Occupancy process and then if that use was not issued a permit, they would have to come back to the Board and receive additional site plan approval for that use. The types of uses that are acceptable here would be the antique store type use, the Bella Beads that's a portion of the front is another type of use that would be similar to the types of uses that are in that area that are not very high demand or as high demand as some other uses, such as restaurants and that type of use because of the limited nature of the space and the access issues. There is currently an access easement that was granted to provide this stairway which gives an adequate entrance to the building. The property line goes quite close to the building down here towards the back so there was an access easement granted to construct that particular stairway. This is an upgrade of the existing site plan, it gets us a base line to be using for the building, it shows some of the utilities. If the Board should entertain a conditional approval, I would ask that the Board authorize the plan to be signed outside of a regularly scheduled meeting so we could make a few of the plan notes and changes and they could be issued a building permit to start construction and renovation to the space upstairs. Touhey – Where would the staircase be? Johnson – It's the existing entrance. Touhey – So that staircase is at the furthest end of the building from Main Street, that entrance there? Johnson – That's correct, the entrance to the upstairs is actually inside of the existing building so there's no new outside entrance being proposed. Touhey – The 28' x 20' block that you have at the bottom of the plan, exactly where does that fit into the existing. Johnson – There's a shed-type structure

which is to the back of the building where you can see there's an additional red line, which would be the face of the new inside upstairs and would go towards Main Street from there. Touhey – So it's at the very rear of the building. Johnson – It's at the very rear of the building and if you were ever in the back of the building, the antique shop had some additional antique items in the back seasonally and it's actually upstairs from that so I've actually added a note to the plan that says "proposed commercial up, existing commercial down" on this plan. Touhey – Does that staircase access more than this retail space, are there apartments up there or anything. Johnson – Not by that access. The apartments have separate access points along the building as does the access to Bella Beads and also to the antique shop from the front on Main Street. Bayard – I assume there's an existing site plan that has that as storage, I'm just wondering why it's even in front of us almost if this is sort of a retail/commercial building to begin with. Wouldn't this just be a use variance or an occupancy thing? Edgar – You're changing the use from space that has no prior formal approval to retail space. Johnson – Currently, right now the area that's back there is seasonal, there's no heat or plumbing, it's storage, basically a loft and the applicant had meetings with Mr. Edgar to discuss what would trigger site plan approval and what would not so basically what was determined is if they wanted to change the commercial use of the existing commercial area downstairs that would not require coming before the Board because that is existing commercial space but since we are changing the use of the area upstairs, that would be the trigger that we come before the Board. Edgar – Our practice is when something like this comes before us to have Bill and Chuck go out, meet with the owner, go through the property to give them a heads up as to code related issues and to be honest with you, I'm not sure if that's happened yet or not in this case, I wouldn't be surprised if it has and all of that would be picked up during the building permit process so access questions, utilities, safety issues, exit lighting and all that kind of stuff is part of the building permit process and would be signed off by both of those gentlemen prior to the upstairs being occupied. Worsman – My biggest concern is parking, to add additional commercial space, I'm concerned that the parking, we already have some tight parking in that area, what exactly would they be using that space for. Johnson – That hasn't been determined at this point, they do not have a tenant for that space and that's why I mentioned that during the Certificate of Occupancy process is a review of what type of use would be there and any type of use that would demand a high parking volume or a high traffic trip generation probably would not be permitted by the Certificate of Occupancy process and would have to come back to the Board for review. Any of the uses that are similar to the ones that are in the building now which have low traffic impact, low parking impact or marginal parking impact would be handled through the Certificate of Occupancy. This process is similar to the Village Perk building in that there was a building there that had essentially a downstairs was used commercially in the past but the upstairs had not been and they are in a similar situation where they have a much bigger building and they don't have any on-site parking, they rely on the Main Street parking and people finding spaces in parking lots. One of the things that John mentioned is that

employees should be encouraged to park in the municipal lots and walk up to free up as many spaces as possible. In the summertime, there's the exaggerated problem of parking on Main Street but also in the summertime, they enforce the 2-hour parking limit and they have a Cadet that goes around and checks to make sure the vehicles aren't staying there for a long period of time so the employees can't park on Main Street like they do in the wintertime when there's not a parking demand. Worsman – Does this have any connection with Latchkey? Johnson – 38 Main Street, LLC is not related in my knowledge to Latchkey. One of the principals in 38 Main, LLC, may be but I don't know the answer to that specifically. Rusty McLearn, representing Hampshire Hospitality Holdings – We are in favor of your granting this project. This is Edith Horne's old building, it's the top story of that little barn in the back, it's a great little space and we need more retail space on Main Street so we're very much in favor of it. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, Carl with respect to your representations about similar uses to what's currently being permitted, in those instances that you describe, we usually have a plan note that flags that it's being permitted for low impact only and that changes in tenancy may require subsequent amendment. I think it would be appropriate to put that note on this plan. Johnson - I have similar notes on plans and I'd be happy to add that note so that it flags it for any potential people that are interested and for owners down the road of the building that it is a process that's reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Town. Edgar – I suspect that something that's this small (560 sq. ft.) is pretty small and it will be somewhat self controlling, you're not going to have a high trip medical facility here or something like that operating out of that confined space and I do agree with Rusty that to the extent we can reasonably find some additional places for retail without upsetting the apple cart is not just good for the individual property but also for Main Street as a whole so if anyone is contemplating a motion, I would just ask that you require that plan note relative to the similar low-impact uses and we can work out the language at an administrative level. Several years ago the Board struggled over Main Street parking because there really is no way to assign it and pretty much took the philosophy that as long as incomers were somewhat in scale with what was there, we wouldn't try to divvy up the parking. Should a really large generator come in, we would certainly have to probably take a different look at that but we've been pretty open. Edgar – I think part of that also is an attempt to continue to maintain economic viability of properties that have to compete with a lot of external forces to make their economic viability happen so I think that's an additional consideration. Hearing closed at 8:03 p.m.

Kahn moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR 38 MAIN STREET, LLC, TAX MAP U07, LOT 131, AND THAT WE GRANT A PARKING WAIVER AND THE SITE PLAN BEAR A NOTE INDICATING THAT REVIEW AND AMEND MAY BE NECESSARY IN THE EVENT OF ANY GREATER INTENSITY USE THAN STORAGE THAT IS NOW CONTEMPLATED, LANGUAGE TO BE DETERMINED ADMINISTRATIVELY, THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY

APPROVALS PROVIDED IN SITE PLAN REGULATION NOS. 7 & 17 AND THE BOARD HAS AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE OF THIS PLAN OUTSIDE OF A REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

3. **MSS REALTY TRUST of 1995 – SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW:**
(Rep. Jim Murray, Paul Fluet, Engineer and Chuck Griffin, Architect)

We are proposing an 85-unit Senior Living Community with 3 distinct areas, one is supported independent units (41 units), assisted living (20 units) and 24 units of a memory support program for people with dementia related cognitive disease. At Golden View we've had a lot of demand from the community asking for these types of services and we think this plan addresses it. Paul Fluet – Basically what we have is the buildings are in the middle of this site and we have a perimeter roadway that's about 1,600 feet long that goes all the way around the site, comes back onto itself and when we were designing the road, we basically had some entrances that we had to meet to receive people at grade so when we developed a plan and profile of the whole road which is in the full packet of plans, we had to meet doorway entrances in 5 different places. I believe there's no road grade over 10% on the entire road but it sort of does meander up and down a little bit. We have 48 parking spaces around the perimeter which are where the road expands in width and a number of other spaces. Internal to the building itself, we're looking to have 40 underground parking spaces. Those locations at this point in time may depend on the ledge profile because we haven't actually done any auger holes or borings on-site to determine how deep we can go before we reach ledge so our plan will be over the next couple of weeks to do some probing, come up with a GPS profile that we can put into a computer similar to a contour map but it will be a ledge contour map and then be able to figure out how many cubic yards of ledge will have to be removed to do the various footings and garage parking area because some of this is fairly deep. This is the high part of the site and this is the low part so the site is sloping in this direction that's why we have a cut here and then some fill on this side. In terms of utilities and talking about the water supply, we met with Bob Hill on-site and originally we were going to run the water and sewer together up this woods road but decided that the water's already on the north side of Upper Mile Point Road so we were just going to keep it running along Upper Mile Point Road in the ditch and off the pavement and then come on to our site right in here. At that point our water line splits and we have a hydrant located in the front of the building and a hydrant located in the back of the building. In terms of other issues with water supply that we're still dealing with is this water system is the Mile Point development booster station that's going to feed this. There are two issues, one is the excess treatment plant capacity that we have to determine and what our flows are and compare that. We do have water meter readings historically from the Water Department but those are quarterly readings. Basically, four times a year, you're going to get one point of data. I asked Jim to start to get some more accurate but daily meter readings so that we have some idea what kind of day-to-day fluctuations we're having not just every 3-month fluctuations. Vadney – Are you talking fluctuations of the Town system? Fluet – Just at Golden View because

we're considering that to be like a model water supply demand that will kind of mirror this somewhat. Vadney – There should also be some generation factors, facilities like this exist all over the country. Fluet – They do but we don't want to necessarily use the book value because sometimes the book value is kind of conservative. Vadney – It might be too high in your case. Fluet – It might be too high and we're trying not to exceed that 10% treatment plant capacity. That's a big thing that we have to deal with that we're trying not to exceed 10% of the remaining treatment plant capacity. I think the book values are 90 gallons per day per person and we would like to see just how that compares to some real life numbers by using Golden View or if there's any other places in or around the area, then we may be able to get some Taylor Home type of numbers too, all of which we are just starting to get into. In terms of the booster pumping station that was originally designed for 20 homes that were part of the existing subdivision that's there, 40 future homes and that was fed by one pump. We added and I did that design for Walker Harmon's project. We put a second pump in there so technically we've got another 40 plus 20 so that's 120 homes and then there's a 500 gallon permitted fire pump in there so there is some excess capacity in the pumping station but at this point in time, what we need and are getting from Carter Sprinkler Company is just what the demand will be in the building for the fire sprinkler system, what the hydrant flow might be required out in front of the building and then add that or meld that into the normal daily demand for the building and see how close our pumps that are in an existing pump station work out. If they need to be upgraded or one of them needs to be upgraded, we may be able to do that, that may be the cheaper way to kind of solve the problem we have if we don't have an adequate pumping and pressure capacity. In terms of sewer, that seems to be the easiest of the problems to solve. We're basically collecting sewer on the back side of the building and we have plenty of downhill to get the sewage where it needs to go so there's no issue with sewage, we don't have to build a pump station or anything like that. Drainage – We have catch basins and pipes pretty much around the building bringing water in a number of different directions. Like I said, the road kind of goes up and down so every time you go down and up again, you kind of have a spot where you've got to collect water and do something with it but the majority of our water, we're thinking, will end up in some kind of a detention treatment infiltration pond and we are intending to do other things for treatment like grass treatment swales where the volumes are a little bit smaller on the other side of the building. We haven't worked out all of the details in splitting all the flow, for example, part of this building is going to have a flat roof so we're going to have some water that comes off the roof that we'd like to be able to direct separately and not run it necessarily through your treatment system because it's really not water that needs to be treated off a roof or clean water from a gutter or something like that. We are going to do a Site Specific approval for this project because we are exceeding 100,000 sq. ft. We're going to have to do the standard EPA storm water pollution prevention plan because we exceed an acre and we have a small wetland on-site that we're going to deal with the Wetlands Bureau. I think it's a non-designated so I don't think it's a Town issue but it still is a state issue, I think what we're going to do is it's less than 3,000 sq. ft. so we're going to try and do an expedited application

for that basically to fill it. We're not going to try and save any of it, it's right in the middle of the building. The plans submitted include a 25-set of drawings that has lighting layout, landscaping that we can talk about if you want to and basically I'll open up for questions. Touhey – John, is this in the Waukegan Watershed? Edgar – No, as they indicated it's draining from the bottom to the top of that page and basically it's heading towards Meredith Bay. Fluet pointed out the tower site on the plan. Edgar – There could be a small amount of drainage that comes out the driveway, the left swale on the driveway exit and that's kind of right on the divide right here so that's site is going down towards the roundabout and I don't have it all mapped in my mind but a small amount of that water may end up in the Waukegan Watershed and here again, it's something we need to look at from a treatment point of view which I've discussed with Paul. Fluet – What I think I can do is right at this driveway we're just about at the top of the hill and it's kind of flat in there so what I'm going to do is try and create a grass treatment swale in the adjacent roadway ditch just because the road isn't that steep in that area and a grass treatment swale has to pretty much not have hardly any slope on it so I think I can get that in this area. Edgar – You also talked about with the amount of soil work that's going to be done to get that ledge profile is to get a real good feel for the soils types themselves and what their infiltration capabilities might be. We just had a presentation last night at a Selectmen's meeting where Jeff from UNH was certainly encouraging towns to look at more and more infiltration as a way of treating water and here again, it's soil dependent if you have shallow to ledge, you're not going to pull that off and if you have a high water table, you won't pull it off so when we get some test pit data and some of the ledge probe data, we'll have a better feel for what the treatment options are. Edgar – This is an introductory hearing so I won't go over all the line items but essentially we have a zoning line that's indicated on the plan with a dashed line. The applicant has been to the Zoning Board and received a Use Variance. It's a flag lot and the development site that you see is essentially the width of the flag and the stem of the flag is the roadway itself that basically goes down to Route 3 and they were before the Zoning Board of Adjustment back in May and received a Use Variance to permit the project from a zoning perspective. We don't have a well-defined zoning ordinance relative to these kinds of facilities and our past practice elsewhere in the community has viewed this in the context of the zoning which addresses convalescent homes and nursing homes and that type of thing. As indicated, a wetland scientist has reviewed the property. The wetland that Paul spoke to is 700 sq. ft. in size and appears on the existing conditions plan. As was indicated, the analysis is ongoing relative to two issues, one the broader issue of treatment plant and storage capacity and the second issue is the actual hydraulics necessary to provide adequate water to the site. Upper Mile Point Drive which is the roadway on the top of the page is a private road and it is my understanding the ROW is on the land of the applicant which is Mr. Sanders. Essentially, he and perhaps some others control the actual private road that he's tying into. Steve Pernaw has done a Trip Generation Analysis which is in your packet and he's confirmed from his perspective that the proposed Senior Living Facility is not a major generator of traffic and that the traffic from this development would not significantly impact

operations of the nearby intersection, however, a NHDOT permit was issued when the subdivision road went in initially and the current permit limits it to the two subdivisions with the homes, 36 houses I believe between the two subdivisions. This project would necessitate that the DOT review that Trip Generation Report and issue an amended permit for the impacts associated with the new intersection.

As Paul indicated they are still developing some of the details on the engineering relative to drainage. We're awaiting that final report and at that point we would conduct our review on the drainage. We need to be very mindful of downstream impacts and looking at infiltration alternatives if the soils are suitable and certainly looking to go beyond conventional detention methodologies for storm water quality treatment. The applicant proposes a total of 88 parking spaces that are split between the secondary lots on the perimeter road as well as the underground parking and the parking summary just indicates what the total is and we need that broken down by use and see how we're ascribing the number of parking spaces based on the various levels of care that are provided in the proposal. We need a little additional breakdown on how we got to the 88 total. We want to make sure as we review the plan and profile knowing that we have 3 secondary entrances to the project and service entrances and that kind of thing as well as the parking garage, that we verify that we have adequate all season sight distances at all those areas where those access points and loading zones intersect with the perimeter road. We do have a detailed landscaping plan on Sheet L-1. A lighting plan has been submitted and includes 15 pole mounted cutoff lamp fixtures. This is important for any number of reasons. It is near the height of land and the hillside faces Meredith Bay and if we didn't have cutoff lighting, this site would be heavily visible from other distances. We do have one relatively small ground mounted, free-standing sign with exterior illumination that's being proposed just to indicate the name of the facility. The plans are currently under review by the Fire Department and I just raise standard questions as to the nature of the fuel that would serve the building needs to be identified. To the extent that the fuel supplies are located outside of the building, we need to know the type of fuel, number, location and size of all tanks and how the tanks would be protected and the dimensional relationship between the tanks, any lot lines or buildings. At a future point in this review process, we would need performance guarantees on site stabilization as well as connection to the municipal utilities and we do have a detailed set of architectural plans for the Board to review tonight as well and I think it would be appropriate to ask the architect to present those plans at this point, Mr. Chairman. I would, however, just summarize that we're not in a position from my point of view to take any action on the application tonight. I think the Board should conduct a site inspection of the property, not that I want to flag any particular problems with the site other than the fact that it is a big project and our practice has been to inspect projects of this magnitude. We would need to continue the hearing to a date specific and we would need based on everybody's input to pick a hearing date that would allow sufficient time for the Board to conduct its inspection of the property, the timely submittal of any additional information including the drainage report and any additional information in the completion of the staff reviews that I've indicated are currently outstanding. Peter Russell – My question is in relation to the water

main that's being proposed and if, in fact, there's an easement to the Town or will there be an easement to the Town for water mains through this property to Northview Drive. This was discussed a number of years ago and the idea would be to gain a route from the pump station through this property to Northview Drive so that water main could be extended further in the future by the Town. My question is has that actually been proposed or could it be considered at this point in time and the second part of that would be, I would suggest that any water main that's built in extension actually be built size-wise large enough so it could be extended by the Town in the future. Vadney – John, have you had any discussions with the applicant? Edgar – I personally have not, it's a very good question and I think it does need to be addressed. At this point I don't have Bob's review comments so his review is pending and I will certainly pass that along. To echo that and Paul, Peter and I were all involved in that at the time that the pump station was designed, not only to meet additional housing in this area, but potentially to go down to Route 3 and so if there is an opportunity to provide for an easement on the property through Northview Drive, it would be appropriate to do so. Fluet – The water main like I said comes down here, we have a gate valve pipe and then a cap on it so we're providing for continuation down Upper Mile Point Road to Route 3 but I don't know if you're thinking that you want to go cross-country to Northview Drive. Vadney – Would there be an easy way to do an easement that would skirt your property or skirt your buildings at least. Fluet – I think as you head up to this corner, you're heading up to the very highest piece of land. Edgar – The cul-de-sac up here is in the bottom left-hand corner of the plan. Fluet – I don't know, my thought would be I guess if it's going to come here, it's still coming up hill to about here and then you would be starting to go down hill. I don't know if it would be easier to continue it down to Route 3 and then come back up Northview. Vadney – We won't think about it any more here tonight but it is something that any time we can get a simple easement where it's not a burden on anyone but it could be a great advantage in the future, we like to do that so give it some thought. Fluet – I see something here on the plan that says easement for benefit of subject property, see Note 5. That Note 5 is on Dave Dolan's plan so I'm not sure what it is. Ben Sanders – We have right here an easement through Scott Farah's property to Northview Drive so if you're just looking for an easement to run the water, I'd be willing to give that to the Board. Vadney – We won't design it here tonight but it's something we'll discuss privately because if we can do that and be an advantage to the Town in the future and not be a burden on you folks, it makes sense to do it. Also, as Peter mentioned, the proper sizing of the main, we'll take a look at it. Fluet – I think it's an 8" line. Chuck Griffin, Chairman of EGA Architects – The lowest level of the site, there are 3 entrances into the building and you'll see here the main street is out here, entrance drive comes up and the first place we enter the building is the parking garage at this location. We come in here for the underground parking and there's also another access to the same underground parking garage at this location. Earth is mounded up on these walls on the exterior to screen the foundation wall and then you can see how the parking garage extends back underneath and dotted above here is the building, part of building is dotted in that location. The next level where we get into some housing, these all stack obviously

you've seen plans before but this is the independent units, the pool area, exercise room and we're still benched into the earth at this location but its exposed out to grade here. The high part of the site is in this location or if you look at the site plan, it's the lower left-hand corner. There's quite a bit of slope across this site from lower left or the bottom of the engineer's drawing to the top so here we're still acting as a bench with the building acting as a retaining wall. The other thing that's occurring here as the drive comes on around, this is a service access for the building so it's tucked in underneath and its structured service that leads into a corridor system and up an elevator to serve the kitchen above. This is the main level of the building, the first time that you can walk from one end to the other of this structure because of its slope so here you're up two floors above the parking garage, there are 3 stories in total above the parking garage in the structure. The pool is below. Now you've got the entrance drive and the major drop off where you have administration, café, kitchen, dining rooms and all the different food service capabilities, country kitchen that are served from the kitchen and then at this area is memory support so the kitchen supports the staff in the dining areas for memory support from this location. Again, the kitchen is served from underneath in a corridor system up to an elevator. We also not only have the drop off for the main part of the building, but you come a little further and in both cases portico shares to have a drop off for memory support so they each have their own entrance. One floor up, you have the uppermost floor of the independent coming across the main entrance. Here are the portico share roofs, the pool roof and this is assisted living on the top level so you can see that it just builds as it comes across the site. In all cases the highest building is 3 stories above the parking garage. If you look at it from the end of the parking garage, it's 4 stories in height. Worsman – What are the points coming off? Griffin - The points are sun rooms. We have beautiful views from this location and we find people, if you can step out of a space and get a little bit beyond the wall, the envelope of the building, then you can look down the side of the building, these sun rooms or sunspots we're calling them, make these residential spaces so much more pleasant to live in than if you don't have a balcony feel. They are not balconies; they are internal to the building. Worsman – How do we interpret that from the outside? Griffin – They are expressed as bays. This is the last floor of the building as its topped out and some details that are in front of you but this is the proposed light fixture, it does pay attention to sky shine, has a cutoff, you can see it in the specifications and also this is the proposed sign that's at the front gate. Each of those sunspots or sun rooms you can pick up because there's a shape that pops out of the roof that just breaks through the roof edge and you can see where they are. Also, these windows are not shown full size because you're looking at them on the diagonal. Here it gives you an idea of how this property steps down, garage underneath, principle or next floor and up here would be the main drive level as seen at the is height and then one floor above. Here are more elevations, each elevation is shown and there's a legend here so you can see what elevation goes where. What we're using for an architectural motif is just drawing on the very significant history of design in New Hampshire with the old beautiful hotels that were in the woods, the old shingle-style architecture so the idea of the building is to ground the first floor with the darkest color and then have

string courses, the things that carpenter gothic involve and then a field of shingles and then a plain top course (rendering shown). The next time we meet, I would propose to have a sample board showing these various products but what we're proposing is a green roof, I know you have a few in Town but I think it's a wonderful expression and a great way to get color and interest to a building and then a white or off-white band at the upper most level and this would most likely be material like hardy plank and then below it the field of shingles would be in vinyl and this would be a light tan and then the lowest level would be a darker tan or grayed beige. This rendering shows the full 4 stories where the garage door enters and here you can see up at the entrance it's expressed as 2 stories. We've had a lot of luck, you can see at Taylor Communities is one of our buildings. If you go there, you'll see that by pulling these roof forms down over the windows and getting some deep soffits really make the building look lower and feel like it hovers in its appearance. Bayard – How does this work out height wise with our height ordinance? Does it all fit in? Edgar – Bill and Chuck were asked to look at that specifically, I don't have the numbers in front of me but basically there are two different methodologies for the determinant of height. The fire codes are different than the zoning and my understanding based upon Bill's review of it is that it does comply with the height restrictions. I can be more specific on that when we meet next, Bill, but we did look at that a few weeks ago and my understanding was that it does comply. Touhey – Approximately what percentage of the 10+ acres are going to be developed? Griffin - We have 11 acres and we have a footprint of 41,000 sq. ft. as compared to 483,000 so that's less than 10%. Edgar – Twenty-three (23) percent of impervious coverage, that doesn't include all the extra grading but it's 23% of building, pavement and sidewalks. Touhey – What do we allow in that area? Edgar – 30%. Bayard – I guess that's the controlling factor then as far as number of units in a situation like this. How dense could you get that, I guess it would just be based on the 30% coverage? Edgar – Basically, that's correct. This is from a zoning point of view not being viewed as conventional subdivision from a density point of view. This is a licensed medical facility, there's not going to be individual ownerships, there's medical services being provided, it may look more like a hotel or apartment building if you will. Yes, there are assisted-living units in there so there are dwelling units in that context but it's not being viewed from a density point of view as though you would be approving a condominium or the nearby single-family residential development so the answer to your question is, yes, that the controlling factors are primarily lot coverage and things of that sort. Bayard – Again, another obvious thing, I assume the Fire Department will be quite active in reviewing everything on this. Finer – What is the height of your covered entrances? Griffin – We have to make them high enough to fit a bus under them and I don't remember off the top of my head what that magic number is but it will take a bus. Worsman – I know you're aware of it, but Bob Hill and our water people and all of the departments have been working very hard to watch this project and see where we're at water capacity wise. Just when you're using the numbers, make sure they are on the higher side and I know that's hard for you to do because it's going to bump up against our 10% but from the Town's point of view that's going to be real important. Griffin – OK, I understand what you're

saying generally. There is a lot of data on that on a national basis as was pointed out earlier by the Chairman. Bayard – Do you have the metering installed on Golden View yet because the summer peak is what matters so the sooner you can get some daily metering on there? Jim Murray – Right, we are doing daily meter readings so ours is a pretty consistent use of water, it doesn't change from day-to-day or on the weekend. There's a population that we have at the facility that is consistent throughout the year. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that I do believe it's appropriate not to take action and schedule a site inspection. We have additional drainage work to do and some additional staff work to do. Bayard – I think it looks really nice just as a general comment. Vadney – It is a handsome building for the size, it would be difficult to disguise so you might as well make it pretty and it looks like you did. Kahn – I was just going to add what Bill just said. Bill and I attended the Lakes Region Planning Commission dinner last night and the speaker, Dean Mullen, U Mass at Amherst was throwing out statistics like crazy but the statistics he was throwing out were indicating that New Hampshire and this area of New Hampshire are graying rapidly. He had some statistic about people 85 and older and how that was the fastest growing age group or something like that, very scary but we need that housing. The other thing he said was that we need work force housing so we're getting it at both ends. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, if we could just ask the applicant to stake the driveway if it's not already staked as well as some general orientation to the building footprint. I don't think we need every jog in the foundation but just a rectangular sense of the outer most corners perhaps. Kahn – I think it would be very helpful if the applicant sent some staff along to give us some guidance as to the site, never mind just staking it. Ben Sanders – They are going to stake it I think either next Monday or Tuesday, John and they are going to start clearing some of it so they can do the ledge probes. It should be cleared out by the 21st by the time you guys show up and somebody from Golden View will be there. The public is welcome to walk the site with us, but we do not take public input at that time nor do we deliberate. Hearing closed at 8:49 p.m.

Kahn moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO JULY 24, 2007, AND THAT WE SET A DATE FOR A SITE WALK ON SATURDAY, JULY 21, 2007, AT 8:30 A.M. Voted unanimously.

4. **CROSSPOINT ASSOCIATES, INC.:** Site Plan and Architectural Design Review (Rep. Brian Colburn, McFarland Engineering; John Hueber, Brian Furz, Crosspoint Associates; Peter Bolton, Chris Williams Architects)

The project is located at 38 NH Route 25 and is the existing shopping center. Also on the site is the existing theater along with another smaller retail building that contains the Flower Shop and the Sundial Shop. The site is split into two zones. The majority of the front part of the site is located in the Central Business Zone where the back portion which is mostly wetlands is located in the Residential Zone. The existing use as I mentioned before are the movie theater, the large retail store, it has had a variety of uses over history including grocery stores, Ben Franklin,

Wardo's, some stuff like that and then the small retail space has 5 spaces and I think only a couple of them are in use at the present time. The property is also located in the Prime Wetland Buffer for Hawkins Brook. This dashed line shows the wetland buffer. We have been to the Conservation Commission and the Zoning Board of Adjustment and have received approval for our work within the buffer zone. We are not proposing any direct impacts to any wetlands as part of this project. Some of the other existing conditions are drainage; the front parking lot is split into 2 drainage areas. This portion flows overland directly into the wetland right off the parking lot, the same with this portion of the parking lot flows toward the wetlands by the dry cleaners. The roof area of the large retail building is collecting in a closed system that discharges into the wetland. The roof area of the large retail building is collecting in a closed system that discharges to the wetland and the back portion of the pavement sheet flows backwards so there's quite a bit of impervious area on this site. We tried to highlight that here with the green being the existing green space, basically everything that is white is pavement and there is currently no storm water treatment being performed for storm water that enters the wetlands. Traffic currently enters at this entrance, circulates in the parking lot going to the various uses and exits at the western entrance going both left and right onto NH Route 25. There is an access point here that accesses the bank property and that will be maintained as part of this project as you will see on the site plan. The existing parking spaces are 9' x 18', somewhat smaller than the spaces shown in your ordinance. There are 220 of them which if you totaled all the ones up, are less than what the required amount would be if this were a new facility. Again, there is very minimal green space on this site. The applicant proposes to demolish the portion of the building here, expand the building footprint and construct basically what amounts to a 9,800 sq. ft. building addition. The proposed use for this area is a grocery store with all the other uses maintaining what they are today. Also as part of this, we're doing quite extensive site improvements, reconstructing the entire parking area, providing additional parking, maximizing some green space. In terms of access to the site, we're proposing to make one full access both in and out on the more easterly one and also pushing it more easterly and this gets it farther away from the effects of some of the congestion caused by Route 3 and 25. This also helps with some of the site circulating traffic, trucks would enter here, go around the back of the building, access the loading docks in this area, come back around and then exit this way. This entrance here would just be a right turn in and right turn out kind of access point. In terms of parking, we've provided additional spaces based on the 9,800 sq. ft. building addition, we've also provided in excess of that amount. Based on the one space requirement for 200 sq. ft. of sales area along with the one space per 600 sq. ft. of storage area, this would require 43 additional spaces. The plan we show has 55 additional spaces so there's 12 extra there. The size of the parking stalls remains at 9' x 18' so we are asking for a waiver from the site plan requirements requiring the 10' x 20' parking space, but again we're just kind of maintaining the parking size that exists on-site today. In terms of drainage, we've tried to provide some treatment where we could. Basically, because of the flatness of the site, there was not really a lot we could do engineering wise. We were able to take the high point in the parking lot

and shift it over basically one parking isle. We did this to maximize the amount of paved surface that we sent to our treatment swale that's located here before water discharges into the wetlands. The remaining area of the parking lot will still flow this way and we've provided like a grass filter area here, the best we could without getting into the wetlands and disturbing any of that vegetation. The proposed building along with the existing building will still be serviced by roof drains discharging directly to the wetlands and the back portion of the paved area will sheet flow over grass where we could before it entered the wetland. We met with NHDES Site Specific Program and went over that with them and we've subsequently submitted our site specific application this week and this was the approach that was discussed and pretty much agreed upon by NHDES. We've also met with NHDES Wetlands Bureau in terms of our buffer impact. As I mentioned before we've received ZBA approval for that Special Exception and based on the comments we've received from them in our meetings with them, I look forward to positive review of that as well. In terms of utilities, the site is serviced by existing water and sewer. We would maintain that. The existing conditions to the existing buildings with new service connections for the proposed grocery store building addition. We have received comments from the Water & Sewer Department, most of those comments were having us show the existing service lines and connections to the existing building. In terms of lighting, we have included a lighting design. The fixtures we are showing now are shoebox style cutoff fixtures for this portion of the design. Based on comments we've received from John Edgar, we are looking into providing some more architecturally sensitive fixtures and Mr. Bolton is going to speak to that a little bit more. In terms of landscaping, we are showing our intent but it is by no means complete at this point. Our intent is to screen this back area here with some trees. We're showing white pines right now and we're going to look into making sure the white pines are appropriate for this application in terms of being so close to the swampy area. We may need to go with a different type of species, We've received some valuable information from John Edgar about what types of species will survive in this kind of application. The landscaping we're providing in front of the building will be susceptible to salt tolerant and not have a lot green space to receive water from as well. Both the lighting and landscaping plans we plan on modifying to better fit into the context of the area that this project is located. One thing I wanted to point out again on the front sheet was the additional green space where it makes it more aesthetically pleasing, lowers runoff and just provides a better look to the site. Again, there are no direct wetland impacts. We do have impacts to the buffer but again all those things have been approved and we are waiting on NHDES approval. We did have a meeting with the state in terms of the driveway permit application because of the change in use and the relocation of the driveway access points. WE are applying for a driveway and we have had a scoping meeting with them and based on the minimal traffic impact of this project being only a 9,800 sq. ft. addition, we are only being required to submit our striping plan that shows the length and left turn pocket here along with our new access points. Some of the things we discussed with them were by moving this access to the east, we would lengthen this left-turn area providing more storage for vehicles wanting to enter the site. We

do have plenty of queue distance for vehicles wanting to make left and right turns out of the site having to wait for traffic during peak hours and making sure this island is adequate enough to discourage people from making left turns in when they are only supposed to be making right turns in. Basically this project is going to result in 40 additional trips during the peak hour which is on Friday afternoon in July and half of those will be entering the site and half of those will be leaving the site and based on the counts we received, about half would be going east and half would be going west so you're only talking basically 10 trips unless you divide it into all 4 categories, 10 trips in each direction. Vadney – The west exit, the right in, right out, is that in the same location as the current? Griffin - No, it's moved slightly to the east I believe. Vadney – How many feet would that be? Griffin – Probably about 50-60 feet. Vadney – How about the easterly entrance? Griffin – That's a similar distance to the east. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clarify something at this point. We've heard of a 9,800 sq. ft. addition, it's a 9,800 sq. ft. net gain in building space. The grocery store is 31,000 sq. ft. new construction, plus/minus so the new construction addition is 31,000 sq. ft., but when you factor out what's being demolished, it's a net gain of 9,800 sq. ft. Bayard – My guess is if it's successful, you're going to generate more than 10 trips. Our analysis has always looked at this as fully built out and obviously it's not now so there would be more than 40 additional trips. Bayard –Will this retain the bank access? Griffin – Yes, that access point will remain right there. Bayard – John, maybe you can help me on this, what are the old design criteria we had in the old ordinance. Edgar – We didn't spec out an aisle width but essentially the existing conditions plan is what we would call a 60' module so it's 18', 18' and 24' and should add up to 60' and that's essentially what you have there currently and under this reorganization of the parking, that's the standard being applied. The current regulation as indicated in the staff report, would be 10' x 20' which is a 24'. We didn't spec out aisle widths so given all of that, certainly as we look at primarily new development, this is a little bit unique in that it's a redevelopment site and we're looking at a net gain of 55 spaces in the context of 220 that are already there but the 9' x 18' without a specific aisle width is what we had on the books and the current regulation is 10' x 20' with a 24' aisle, giving you a total of 64'. Vadney – I understand the desire in some ways to get as many parking spaces as you can but the Board has for a long time been very hard over about the 10' x 20'. I've been a little more flexible than Bob was but we have squeezed some of the small developers to really stretch their lots to get the 10' x 20's and I'm wondering here, I'm not saying the 10 x 20 is absolute, I'd be willing to look at something like a 9 ½ x 19 or something. I guess my question from an engineering standpoint, what is the limiting factor if you look at 9 x 18's vs. 10 x 20's, what is the dimension that hurts you the most, is it the 20, 20, 24, would 19, 19, 24 help you because we do have the Town pretty much standardized everywhere we've been able to on 10 x 20's. I can see that with this configuration, you will be providing more spaces than are actually required by the analysis so I'm wondering if those extra 20 or so spaces thrown into a slight modification of 9 ½ x 19 and meet in the middle somewhere. The 9 x 18's are a bit confining. Griffin – One of the things we were wrestling with is that the existing site does not have the required amount of parking per your regulations so what we

were trying to do is maximize the amount of parking and try to come more into compliance with those regulations. So, I guess the answer to your question, changing either dimension would hurt us because it would reduce that number. We could look at that but when this thing starts being developed again, that could become a problem and from an engineering standpoint, we've done parking lots a lot and 9 x 18 is what use as a standard most of the time. Our confining thing in this parking lot is that we're surrounded by wetlands. There's no where to go to provide additional spaces. We understood that the 24' aisle width is appropriate to maintain. Griffin – Just as a first guess, it's about 10% larger size. We're providing 275 spots so you'd lose so we would not be able to get that additional required amount. Vadney – One of the reasons and Bill alluded to it and Mr. Flanders was hard over on this partly for this reason. It's a tourist area and many of the people, particularly the ones that will be going to a grocery store, drive in and will see oversized vehicles, motor homes, etc. , and it doesn't take very many motor homes placed into a 9 x 18 row of cars before nobody else can get through. The 10 x 20's do help that quite a bit. I was a little deceived by this grouping of numbers, I thought they were currently exceeding what they needed but there is no number here that says what the new amount of square footage would be in parking spaces. Edgar – We have received a communication from them where they've broken down the net additional space that is the subject of what's different in terms of starting with 4,200 and ending up with 5,100 and change. They've broken that down as 80% sales area, 20% storage and if you then apply the parking requirements accordingly, 43 would be required for the 9,800. Vadney – That's my point, that is applying that 80/20 only to the 9,800 new space, I'm wondering what it is for the finished building. Edgar - The analysis that has come in focuses on the 9,800 and is an assumption that the existing number of spaces is generally adequate for the existing uses. In other words, that's what's there today and then the focus is primarily looking at what the net effect is of expanding beyond what's already approved by the Board. Vadney – When this is all done and when there's X number of square feet on that site, what the appropriate amount of parking would be if you had nothing there and were starting from "0". John Hueber – Mr. Chairman, essentially we looked hard at this issue because we knew the 10 x 20 was something that was desired by the Board and we tried to achieve that. Unfortunately, because of the constraints of the site, what we thought the best policy was to increase green space as much as we could and our experience is with building shopping centers and mostly supermarkets at these shopping centers is that a 9 x 18 space works very well. We actually don't build 10 x 20 spaces and find that it's very adequate. To address your point as to number of spaces, there is an excess of a 4:1 parking ratio here which is usually our minimum standard for the number of spaces necessary for commercial development. We don't believe that it's appropriate to build something with less than that because you do put a constraint on customers and the merchants and the second reason is if it doesn't work for them and it doesn't work for the Town, we won't be successful and that goes to our access and approaches and everything, we have to look at that very hard. We in our professional judgment and we've been building centers for 25 years, we think it will work very well. To some extent, I know this is a little self

...serving but we are very pleased to announce that we hope to enter into a binding agreement tomorrow morning with a retailer who will operate this store. We fought a battle here because it's a very small store by today's standards. We didn't want a big store, we wanted a smaller country type store that was operated by a professional operator that was satisfied with what we could provide them and we're delighted to say that we've actually convinced someone that will take the site and we hope to finish up a lease with them in very short order so I'm concerned if we minimize the parking for them, we may in fact put ourselves in some jeopardy of actually finalizing our agreement. I understand your point and it's very well taken and frankly if we had the luxury of putting in larger spaces, we would. Vadney – I would just like to see some calculations but see if you could scale in by maybe losing 6' of grass somewhere, that you could go to 9 ½ x 19's because we do have a lot of motor homes, campers, trailers, boats and stuff that get pulled through there. What if we tried to come up with an area, maybe we could designate some areas where we put some larger spaces in. Often times, that works. Vadney – I think it would be worthwhile to look at some options like that. Bayard – I'm not a big fan of losing a lot of green space but if we lose a few spots on the parking, rearrange it a little bit just to get a little extra width, I think the 24' is very helpful. I think we're in agreement that we can look at this, I would just like some direction, do you still want the additional 43 based on the calculation I provided or do you just want to look at how many spaces at 10 x 20 we could get. Do you just want to look at how many spaces at 10 x 20? Vadney – I would just like to see how hard it is to fit a bigger size, I won't say 10' x 20', but a bigger size that would be a little more useful to larger vehicles and show us the number. I'm not wedded to the 43 number at all. I would be willing to go down on the number probably, but I think the size is important. Most of the year, it's not going to be very full. Kahn – I think parking is one concern, the concern I have is the traffic movements at the east end of the property. I'm seeing left turns out of that property meeting left turns out of Dunkin Donuts and I think you've got head-on collisions there galore so I think moving that over to the east end of the property is kind of like the situation we had with the proposed development down on Meredith Center Road. You don't have time to react, somebody comes shooting out of Dunkin Donuts, somebody comes shooting out, you're looking in different directions and they are going to meet head-on. I think this should be pushed back in that direction and give people some reaction time. Vadney – Was there any thought given to a single opening in the middle of that parking lot? Griffin – This access point was driven by our circulation on-site only because of the truck movement. We needed this larger width or we'd start hitting a lot of spots. With the ability to maybe lose a few spaces, we might be able to move that entrance point down an island and eliminate some of the spaces here, that's something we can look into. Vadney – The traffic there is as you already know, is a serious problem and as Lou has pointed out, Dunkin Donuts has probably become our most acute traffic problem in Town. Griffin – Fortunately the peak hour for a shopping center site like this is in the afternoon and Dunkin Donuts has their madness in the morning. Bayard – There are issues over there and whether the parking should be changed at Dunkin Donuts might be something that should be looked at in which case if we move that over. There are problems

with trucks and cars sometimes stacking up out into the roadway at Dunkin Donuts and that could make it difficult. Touhey – What was the rationale was that made that entrance into the proposed area we're talking about one-way. Because obviously if the traffic is just going into the proposed supermarket, we don't have that problem of left-hand turns coming out of the supermarket and out of Dunkin and meeting head on. John, do you know what the rationale was that that only became an entrance to that supermarket parking lot? Edgar – You mean the existing configuration. No, I don't know that predates me. Hueber - One of the reasons we chose to move this entrance down this end of the site was for a couple of reasons in addition to what Brian pointed out is it also gave us an opportunity to lengthen this queue lane for left-turn in which we felt was very important and that extra 50 or 60 feet gives you quite a few more cars and that's a turning movement that's important to this roadway and we wanted to pull things away from the main intersection down here which we all know has been a continuing issue in terms of getting traffic through it. This works, gives plenty of stacking room, doesn't clog the main line and we can hold a lot of cars in our parking lot without congesting our parking lot and get people out. It gives people the opportunity to go right out, to get the left out further away from the back of the queue from the main intersection. It's kind of like the parking spaces, we balance a lot of factors and said it's a redevelopment of the site, what can we make work that will best suite the community and best suit the facility. Vadney – One of the things that struck me on that proposed easterly both the left and right out and a right in is the centerpiece of that which would be the hand going towards Center Harbor, it looks to me like if people are coming down and going between your green spaces there and that narrow row of cars, they are going to be interfering with the ones that are coming and trying to turn west. Usually when you see that left turn, right out and then the entrance to it, there's a long queue line behind it. Barbara Goren – I've got a very serious problem with your left lane. Anybody coming to my store coming down from Center Harbor will never be able to take a left because you're extending your left turn, you won't be able to get into my store. The parking lot is a serious problem. The school buses are there every morning, forget motor homes, and forget tractor-trailers. My biggest concern is this left-hand turn is not going to allow anybody to get into our store and that is a major concern. Vadney – She's afraid you left-turn stacking lane will cut in front of her access points. Furtz – That left-turn lane exists today. You're extending it to the east, you're not moving the westerly portion at all. Goren (inaudible). Vadney – It's not clear to me from this sketch that it's going to change your access too much but we'll certainly take a look at it. Peter Russell – (inaudible). They are extending the left queue on the east end. Furtz – We're actually moving the entrance point 65-70 feet to the east further away from that property. Peter Russell –(inaudible). Rusty McLear – I'm representing the Main Street Program, we haven't had time to study the details and the engineering all the things you're discussing now, but the general premise of what they are trying to do is certainly something that our Board supports as strenuously as we possibly can. Prior to Mr. Hueber buying this property, they came into town, they came to meet with us, asked what were sensitive issues, they hired a local architect somewhat at our urging so we just wanted to be here in

support in of the premise of the project. Obviously, we don't know the full details. This property used to be a key part of the community and it has been an eyesore now for a year. Vadney – I know I feel that this is a giant step forward and so I'm very happy to see it. Today, Don Jutton sent an e-mail that he asked to be placed in the record. He basically says it's a long overdue improvement and he strongly supports it. Peter Russell – I wanted to speak in favor of redevelopment of this proposal. I think you've got a lot of issues till to look at but I'd like to see this go forward and I'd like to see the redevelopment of this site. I think you really have to look at the traffic issues. I think you've got to look at the Dunkin Donut issue and the Flurries issue as well. Kahn – Would our review and amend include parking and traffic flow. Edgar – There's nothing that would exclude that but I would try as much as we can not to rely on that provision for something as fundamental as what we're talking about. Peter Bolton – The existing building is an eyesore and I think what we're doing is on the south face on the west elevation basically upholstering it with new materials, clapboards, traditional materials and details, wood trim, gable roofs, bearing roofs, different scales and textures and whatnot. The roofing material is architectural grade shingles; we have clapboards painted in muted tones and a brick base with either pre-cast concrete or granite sills. Brooks is located in through, an existing tenant who will remain and this end of the building is vacant and hopefully will be filled soon. On the east elevation we returned clapboards, trim work and roofing materials approximately 30' to the north and from that point on back it will be pre-cast concrete panels but something we will have to work out with the tenant that will be in that space. The rear of the building is again include pre-cast concrete panels and the existing building from Brooks on over will be existing materials possible painted at this point. I've got a blow up elevation of the south elevation including the pylon sign that's located on the site and block cutout letters for the signage for the individual tenants. I have photographed the site and this view from the southwest view is standing in the MVSB parking lot looking towards the northeast, the building itself is electronically modeled and rendered and the existing theater will be clad with clapboard material and/or paint it. Renderings provided of the proposed new building. On the south view, again the theater on the left-hand side we've clad it with clapboards, trim work and paint just to upgrade it a little bit. There might be some further discussion with the tenant to maybe develop more stylized arcade canopy. Across the front of the building, you can see the truss configuration with the open timber for the canopy, Brooks elevation is highlighted with a gable entry point, we've got gable dormers over the canopy hopefully letting light into the canopy area on the front of the building. Brooks will remain operational during the construction. One reason for keeping a false roof on that building is the existing steel structure has got some practical limitations on the structure and we can add onto it so that structure is fairly modest so we kept the added roof. The other building is part of the complex by default. We might upgrade the exterior with clapboards, trim work, paint and maybe some minor roof modifications to it just to make it more a cohesive whole. Touhey – The green space that you have from Route 25 to the first parking spaces that are vertical to the highway, how wide is that? I'd like to suggest that you be more creative than

what your pictorial shows. I can see where some nice rock work could be topped off with plantings. Meredith takes pride in the color and the flowers that we have and one need only look at the very narrow fencing we have along the docks for example and where planter boxes have been put on the top. I don't want that kind of fence here, I don't think that would be attractive when you have 5-7 feet to work with. Bolton – Just doing the rendering pragmatically there are some things that you think of that might be done differently and that is maybe look into more additional plantings there, maybe some low trees, flowering trees. There might be some things there to enliven it and sort of embellish it a little bit more. Touhey – Could I suggest some kind of a raised planter because that would then camouflage the cars as you pass by on the road, you'll probably only see from the hood of the car up. Bolton – That property is owned by the State but we will look into it. Kahn – Mr. Chairman, I think we should continue this and take a look at particularly the traffic conditions. I really like the architectural design, I applaud the redevelopment of this shopping center but I think we've got to look particularly at the traffic, maybe at the parking and so I think we ought to continue it and go take a look. Hearing closed at 9:47 p.m.

Kahn moved, Bayard seconded, THAT WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO JULY 24TH AND THAT WE DO A SITE WALK ON SATURDAY, JULY 21ST, AT APPROXIMATELY 10:00 A.M. Voted unanimously.

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEWS

1. **LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST** – Pre- Application conceptual consultation to discuss possible development of Tax Map U11, Lot 63, located at 31 Boynton Road in the Residential District.

Bob Reals, Housing Development Director, Laconia Area Community Land Trust – I passed out a tax map and on the back side a listing of what's been going on since I was last here, December 12, 2006. Board was supportive of project on the 12th with two suggestions: (1) take wetlands into consideration, and (2) not have the road go through the Park. In January of 2007 we went in front of the Zoning Board and requested a variance from the 10-acre minimum for the Park. We wanted to subdivide out the Park not expand it at all and make it 2.6 acres and leave the remaining 7.6 acres for affordable work force housing. Our request was denied and it was suggested we talk to abutters about purchasing 5 acres. We talked with the abutter and the handout tax map shows that additional 5 acres. We met with the Selectmen in January and the Town selected our CDBG application for extending the sewer down and resurfacing the road. We did a market study and in March we came up with a mix of 3 one bedroom, 17 two bedroom and 12 3-bedroom units as a mix of affordable housing. We didn't make the April deadline on the tax credits so we're going again at the end of this week with our tax credit application. They would fund the majority of this development and in May we met with Mr. Edgar and Mr. Edney regarding the conceptual design of this new 10-acre parcel. That's the history to date. Vadney – I need some clarification on this

black line you've drawn on the map. That's what I'm going to talk about now. This map was produced by Harry Wood of Associated Surveyors and basically this is the parcel you have on your map and this is an additional 5 acres owned by True Road, LLC, Bob & Ed Ambrose. It was 56 acres, we would buy 5 acres which would make it 51 acres and we would be proposing at a later date that we would come in and request a border line adjustment and that would expand our lot that's 12.6 acres to include the 5 acres for a total of 17.6 acres and then we would subdivide out where we would have the park. The units that were up by the road would be moved to the lower corner and then the entranceway would come in to serve the 4 buildings with 8 units each so this is our new design based on comments from the Board regarding a different type of entrance as opposed to going in the center of the Park, moving the units and our feedback from the tax credit application was that this is a much more useful design. Edgar – Bob, could you explain the necessity after you annex the 5 acres why you need to then subdivide it. Reals – The current Town zoning for a manufactured housing park is a 10-acre minimum so we have 5 acres here and then we'll have an additional 5 acres that will be joined for the 10-acre minimum for the Park. We worked very hard not to displace current homeowners so that's why we plan to relocate their homes, keep the park, give the owners the opportunity working with NH Community Loan Fund to set up a Co-op for their Park similar to the one in Meredith Center and if not, the Land Trust would own it and we would provide a long-term lease to the current owners. That would leave us with 7.6 acres for our 32 units of affordable work force housing. Vadney - You've added a cul-de-sac and the stem of the cul-de-sac passes those trailers to the south anyway and then you've taken the 6 trailers that were to the east and you've moved those down around the cul-de-sac. I think that's a big improvement. Reals – It preserves the 10-acre minimum for the manufactured housing park but it still allows us the 7.6 acres we need for the density for the 32 units. Vadney – That gives you a better layout for your buildings. Reals – The wetlands have all been demarcated and we've got a 50' setback as required. We have a little bit of wetland here and a little bit in this corner here. Vadney – I think this is a giant step ahead of the previous plan. Without that road going through the trailers, it is far better for the existing and the future. We are meeting with Town Departments this week and into the future. There's always a possibility that we may not be able to move these and preserve them so there's also the option of taking a row down this side and doing a similar configuration on that but this is our first choice. Worsman – Have the residents that are going to be relocated been notified and kind of consulted on some of this? The procedure goes as soon as we sign a P & S to purchase the park, then a certified letter goes to all the residents by the current owner saying they have 60 days to form a Co-op and set up the park. At that point, we will be knocking on their doors and introducing ourselves but prior to that NH Community Loan Fund will be going around explaining the idea and the State Law which allows them to form a Co-op. The ones that have asked the current owner have been told that we're looking to develop affordable housing. Initially, when we came to you, the owner didn't want to sell this park so that is why we were coming up with the initial configuration. He has since come around and said maybe I can sell the whole

thing. He talked to one of the residents he thought would never move and he said as long as I get a lot similar to what I've got, I'm willing to move so that opened the door to the movement of these units down here. We will be talking to the current owners and abutters. Nobis Engineering will be doing some borings along Boynton Road and in the Park on July 2nd and 3rd. We believe it's 30-60 feet of sand but because we have to bring the sewer in from Route 3, we need to know before we come with our official plan what we're up against. Worsman – You've talked with Bob Hill and talked with him about the project and you've been assured you will have water? Reals – No, we're not assured, we're just in the current procedure as I remember it as the first project approved by the Planning Board gets their allocation of water, we're in the queue with all the other projects. Worsman – It's not a matter of a set aside, it's a matter of capacity. We are reaching the end of the capacity and as each project comes through and John can speak to this as far as the regulations a lot better than I can, I just simply know we are bumping up against capacity. Edgar – Bob's well aware of that, we talk about it on a regular basis. Reals – We did put in our water study in May so we've filed our paperwork and Ray Korber is doing the study. From a sewer point of view, we learned from Bob Hill that the sewer is deep enough at Route 3 so by going all the way out, we can use gravity so that's a positive. Vadney – On the cul-de-sac where you hope to locate the 6 trailers, will they just have cul-de-sac parking or will they have areas beside their homes. They are supposed to have 2 spots per home so this would be gravel parking as they have now next to their homes. This would be a paved area for the fire truck and other turnarounds as opposed to what we're suggesting. Edgar – What has to happen process wise is there would be a Boundary Line Adjustment where Parcel A gets transferred from Ambrose to these folks conditionally approved, then there would be a 2-lot subdivision that would distinguish the park property potentially from the multi-family and then there would be detailed site plans for each of those two lots so you'd have a coordinated site plan submittal for the mobile home park as well as the multi-family. At that point we would be looking at the utilities for everything. This is just a schematic, it has not been engineered and so those unit placements around the cul-de-sac are more for illustration than anything, that orientation could shift as a practical matter once the parking and things like that are considered. We should also be looking at some extra spaces for a little bit of overflow in both facilities so that if somebody comes over to visit, there would be an area for overflow parking. Water is at the site currently so there would be a water extension provided we get over the capacity hump. Sewer brought up from Route 3. We met with the Fire Chief and looked at some fire access issues to see how we might tweak it a little bit to improve it from that point of view. Vadney – Are the boundary offsets for homes the same in a cluster like this? Actually, we talked about whether or not there was a need or benefit in going for a cluster design. One of the follow-up discussions is there's a mobile home park ordinance that talks about 10,000 sq. ft. per pad and the discussion that's open ended right at the moment is we know we can't go below a 10-acre gross area threshold for minimum park size. The discussion that's to be had is if we're not increasing the number of units at the park and let's say the functional area per each pad is 6,000 sq. ft., then could we mimic that with the relocation of

those trailers. In other words, not increase any non-conformity and that's part of the discussion... Vadney – My question is more specific than that. I see there are a couple of abutters there but these will be coming fairly close to their property, what would the offsets be? Edgar – Because it will go under Site Plan review, they'll be subject to unspecified buffering requirements until we get into a final location, we won't know to what degree that buffer is but Bob it is important for you to absorb this, when we have a property that's subject to Site Plan review such as this and it abuts a residential use or district, you need to be looking at buffering on a case-by-case basis. Sometimes the distances are so great, existing vegetation is fine and Herb's bringing up the point that some of those trailers may butt up fairly close to the line, they clearly would have to meet a rear setback but there's also a buffering or screening requirement so there could be some landscaping or things like that that may come out in the wash. Towards that end to the extent that you can position them in such a way as to minimize that, that would be to your benefit. Bayard – I'm a little confused with some of the, there's 7 around the circle; it looks like there's a double wide. Reals – This one is an outdoor storage building right now. The residents currently have snowmobiles parked in various places so we thought we could centralize that. Bayard – Those 6 are being moved, are the other 6 staying exactly where they are or will they move slightly for road accommodation. Reals – They will stay right where they are. This is the 7th because we have a stick-built house here, we may have to take the house down to have the entrance this way. We have the other option of doing the entrance where the current road is which allows us to keep the house. Either we take it down and put this unit in or leave it up and not have that unit. Edgar – There's a sight distance question at the elbow in the road and that's going to be reviewed with Mike I believe to see where the optimum, there's less than 400' available currently and so we're trying to look at what the reasonable optimum driveway entrance would be from a safety point of view. Probably at the end of the day that will drive things as to where they engineer the entrance point, there are a couple options. Vadney – As a pre-app conceptual, I hope you can do that top layout, I think it would be far more functional for everybody and more aesthetic as well. Kahn – If you're asking these people to set up a Co-op, I hope you are going to take them by the hand step-by-step and help them set up the Co-op because otherwise they are going to be adrift. Reals – The NH Community Loan Fund I think has done a number of Co-ops in the State and is going to be taking the lead on that and they've helped Co-ops as small as 5 units. Edgar – Do you have any elevation drawings of the buildings you envisioned? I know that you've showed them to me in the past, do you have those handy just for a quick look by the Board? Reals – The concept is an 8-unit building and 7 of the ends will be one story and the middle units will all be two-story townhouses, 2 or 3 bedroom. The 7 ends will all be handicap accessible and the buildings will be staggered in some form to give the look that you see in the elevation. Touhey – Not being familiar with that area, what was that land used for, is this a second use, is it forested? Edgar – It's basically a sandpit. Colette, given light of what we heard from Jeff Slosch when we talk about suitability of soils for infiltration, this is one of the few sites where infiltration is a reality, in fact, it might even be a problem because it perks so well. It's basically

nothing but sand. We had seen a proposal years ago for expansion of the park and all the test pits came in for septic and it's basically just a big sandpit so essentially you're in a valley, it's an aquifer area and there's a lot the engineers can do without having to create ponds and all kinds of things so this would probably be an ideal candidate for what's called low-impact development in terms of storm water treatment and management. Vadney – It looks like you've made progress.

Meeting adjourned at 10:13 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 10, 2007.

William Bayard, Secretary