

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

Finer moved, Sorell seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26, 2007, AS SUBMITTED. Voted unanimously.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **GEORGE T. FELT FOR APOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC** – Proposed Site Plan to construct a professional office building and related site improvements on Tax Map S17, Lot 17H, located on Northview Drive in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.
2. **GEORGE T. FELT FOR APOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC**- Architectural Design Review of a proposed professional office building on Tax Map S17, Lot 17H, located on Northview Drive in the Commercial Route 3 South District.

The applicant as you indicated proposes to construct a 3,200 sq. ft. single-story dental office building. The site is .69 acres in size; the site includes a portion of an abandoned cottage which we observed when we inspected the nearby property, the Energy Savers warehouse. The applications for Site Plan Review and Architectural Design Review are on file. Abutters list, site plans and building elevations are on file. Filing fees have been paid. The Technical Review Fee has been paid. I would recommend that both of the applications for Site Plan Review and Architectural Design Review be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR GEORGE T. FELT FOR APPOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

RAFD Realty has asked to be continued. Edgar – We have a correspondence dated July 10 indicating that the engineering and drainage review for the above

project is still being developed. We anticipate the information being completed and reviewed in time for the meeting of August 14th so that would be the continuance date.

Finer moved, Sorell seconded, THAT WE CONTINUE THE APPLICATIONS FOR RAFD REALTY, LLC TO AUGUST 14, 2007. Voted unanimously.

3. **ROBERT HALE ANDREW & PHYLLIS ELDRIDGE TRUST: (Rep. Carl Johnson)** (Bliss stepped down, Touhey on Board) – Proposed Major Subdivision to subdivide 15.73 acres into 5 lots (3 ac., 3 ac., 3 ac., 3.63 ac. and 5.11 ac.), Tax Map S02, Lot 1, located on Old Center Harbor Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted June 12, 2007.

Johnson – I am representing the Andrew and Eldridge families this evening. This property is located on Old Center Harbor Road and Gilman Hill Road and the property has been in the family for several generations. It's about 17.1 acres total with 3-acre zoning in this area. We are proposing 5 lots, the 3 lots that have frontage on Gilman Hill Road are 3 acres, Lot 4 is 3.63 acres and Lot 5 is 4.47 acres. Based on the staff review on a couple of issues we were working on, the acreages are fractions of an acre different than what was originally shown, it's still 5 lots, the lots still meet the density requirements and the lot sizing by worst case soils method chart still indicates that all of the lots have a minimum of 1.0 or greater lot equivalent for non-wetland soil types. The wetlands on the property were delineated by Nicole Whitney from Ames Associates. We located the wetland flags on the map and show the appropriate setbacks, both the 50' setback from non-designated wetlands as well as the 75' setback for septic systems. Ames Associates visited the property and dug test pits on all of the lots and all of the lots have an acceptable test pit for leachfield purposes. The applicant met with Mike Faller from Public Works to look at the property in terms of driveway access and looked at some entrance points and also discussed the possibility of reducing the number of access points on Gilman Hill Road by having a common driveway. Right at the moment, the driveways proposed for the lots, Lots 2, 3 and 4 will have driveways which come off Old Center Harbor Road, and there will also be a common driveway access to Lot 5 and Lot 1 will come off of Gilman Hill Road. So we have 4 driveway locations for 5 lots, one of the driveways will be a common driveway servicing 2 lots. There is a Public Service line which comes across the top of the property and cuts diagonally across. Today, Mr. Eldridge located and handed me the actual deed for that easement. The easement width as it crosses the property is actually a little narrower than what's shown currently on the plan and so that will have to be revised but one of John's staff comments addresses the PSNH transmission line and will speak to that in a moment. There are overhead utility lines both along Old Center Harbor Road and up Gilman Hill Road so the access to utilities will not be a problem for any of these lots. We do not show proposed overhead utility lines because as with most properties, many of the lots do not know exactly where the house will be. Some of the lots have considerable building envelopes and the actual location of the house will be subject to whoever

purchases the lot and where they decide to have their house. What we can do is provide sufficient draft deed information for the lots to clearly indicate there will be the ability to cross over the lots with power lines should that be necessary to get to a certain lot. The only one that really would be problematic would be Lot 5 because it is in the back. Lot 5 is a little bit unusually configured, if you notice the frontage for this lot is actually on Old Center Harbor Road with a 50' strip, it's a flag lot and the access is through the common driveway coming off of Gilman Hill Road. That illustrates the Town of Meredith's difference between access and frontage. You are required to have frontage on a Town road or a road built to Town specifications but you're not required to use that frontage provided you can show access somewhere else. The draft deeds that will be submitted will show a common driveway coming across Lot 2 and the corner of Lot 1 for the benefit of Lot 5 and that's primarily because the access to Lot 5 is through an area that entered into the protective buffer of a non-designated wetland. Because it did that, we were required to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment and receive a special exception and the special exception was to enter into and go through the protective buffer of a non-designated wetland. We received that approval and it's noted on the plan. The 30-day appeal period for that approval is passed and there were no appeals filed so that Special Exception is fully granted. The benefit of that although it's a slightly longer driveway, there is no direct impact to any wetlands on this property. The subdivision is designed so that each one of the lots has a sizeable building envelope sufficient for constructing a driveway, leachfield, home, garage, yard and not have any direct impact on any wetlands. The only minor impact was passing through the buffer zone but that driveway can be and will be constructed without any impact to the wetlands. In John's staff review, he picked up on a couple of things that I've added to the plan. We have added all of the overhead utility information lines, the major public utility easement that goes across the top of Lot 1, I've added the protective radius for a proposed well site to demonstrate that a well could fit on each lot without the benefit of a well easement. Again, when this is a subdivision, we show a possible home location, we show a possible well location and we show a 4,000 sq. ft. area reserved for septic centered around a test pit for each lot. Should an individual purchase the lot in which to construct a home site and/or well and/or septic system in a different place, they are entirely allowed to do so provided it meets all of the other requirements of the Town. That issue would be addressed through the Code Enforcement Office through the issuance of a Building Permit. As I mentioned, the buildable areas primarily for Lots 1, 2 and 3 are significant and there may be an opportunity for a person to locate their home and/or septic system in an area different than what we show and that is not all that uncommon. The applicant has also discussed with Chief Palm, the firefighting and water supply requirements and as you know for lots of 4 or more you're required to demonstrate that you have adequate firefighting capabilities or an individual early alarm sprinkler system for each home. In this particular case, because there's only 5 lots, a 30,000 gallon cistern would not be economically desirable for that few number of lots so as with several subdivisions that the Board had approved, there will be a restriction put on the plan and also in the draft deeds that the homes constructed on these properties would have an early warning individual sprinkler

system. Of the two methods in my discussions with Chief Palm, he actually is more comfortable with the early alarm sprinkler systems than the cistern and that primarily is because the fire is being fought to some extent prior to the Fire Department arriving on the scene. The cistern merely provides that there's an adequate alternative means of water after they get to the site. John also noted there are several cellar holes on the property and wondered if the cellar holes had any particular historical significance. This property as I mentioned has been in the Eldridge and Andrew families for several generations. Paul's great, great grandfather actually was the one who constructed the hotel on the site and there was a hotel on this site at one point in time and just as a matter of interest for the Board and members of the public, this is the hotel that was actually on that property and you can see it was a significant structure and that was located in the front portion and so the family is aware of its own personal historical significance but according to Paul the cellar holes themselves are just that, they are old cellar holes and anything of any historical significance has probably been long removed. The hotel was burned down in the 50's and there's been nothing there since. We'd be happy to show the cellar holes on the site for the purpose of anybody that would be interested in purchasing a lot, but according to the applicant and the owner, they are not of any historical significance. Over the last few days, we have gone out and set all the monuments marking the corners of the lots so the plan will be updated when we reach the point when we're submitting a mylar to show that the monuments have been set. Because of tweaking one of the areas on Lot 5, all 5 lots are subject to State of New Hampshire DES Subdivision approval. That application will be made and submitted and the plans will be amended to indicate the approval numbers prior to recording of the mylar. The applicant did meet with Mike Faller on the site and Mike evidently has recommended to the staff that the applicant contribute an amount of \$10,000 towards the graveling of Gilman Hill Road and Old Center Harbor Road and in my discussions with Mr. Eldridge that amount wasn't the amount he remembers being discussed but I think between Mike, Mr. Eldridge and staff, we'll discuss what that number is and Mr. Eldridge said based on those discussions, we would agree to an amount not to exceed the \$10,000 and based on what we come up with in a further discussion with Mike Faller, that number could be less than the \$10,000 that's in the staff review. At this point, we would not want that to be a hindrance to the approval. Edgar – We did do an inspection on Saturday with two members of the Board and myself and a couple of abutters. We went in the property up in the area of the power lines and worked our way through the interior of the property and came out through Lot 4 near the driveway and then poked in along the road looking at the cellar holes and then kind of came back. As part of that review and certainly, Bill and Lou can speak to their own observations but there was definitely eyeballing the issue of the drainage on the roadside and to the extent we're following up with Mike on gravel issues. We very well may want to follow up on that. I don't know if either road is designated as scenic but whether or not additional ROW would be helpful to the Town in some future point is certainly something that could be looked at. One of the things we saw that was a little bit of concern, if you look on your plan where you see the label Gilman Hill and you see that common driveway coming in, it's right

about where there's a discharge from the roadside ditch onto the property, it's right immediately upslope from that driveway location. The driveways were flagged when we walked it and they are right next to one another so I raised in the staff review that we need to locate that and make sure we're all in agreement as to how we move forward with that. It raises issues relative to the driveway but certainly that could get worked out but more importantly, we just want to make sure that we maintain our ability to drain the roadway. How long or how short that's been there, I don't have any of the history on that and that would be something we would need to follow up on with both Mike and Paul to make sure we're all moving forward in agreement. Johnson – Mr. Chairman, could I address that a little bit. The field crew did go up there today and it was their recollection that that was not there when we did the original mapping. This project has been going on for a little bit over a year but is there now so we did locate it today, we took measurements on it as well as we mapped the entire ditch line that's on Gilman Hill Road so we would be able to provide that information on a blowup similar to what we did with the Melo property on Chase Road. We produced a little plan that Mike Faller could look at and I'm sure the applicant would be as interested in making sure the drainage on Gilman Hill Road works as well as the Town so we'd be happy to work with Mike and if it came down to some additional ROW width that the Town could work in to solve some of the drainage issues, I'm sure that could be worked out. As Carl indicated, we noticed we had the power line easement somewhere on the property and as you can see from the amended plan, the proposed driveway to Lot 1 is within the easement area. In all likelihood, that's not an issue with PSNH but I think we would need to have some confirmation that the driveway is not at any cross purposes with the terms of the power company's easement. It is a transmission line, it's not a service line and they have communicated with us over the years that if anybody's going to work within their easements, that they be notified. We typically don't have too much PSNH stuff in the Town so it doesn't really come up very often but we would just need verification from the utility that they are OK with the driveway. As was indicated, Mike is OK with the driveway locations but had requested a contribution towards the graveling and as Carl's indicated perhaps that needs a little further discussion with Mike as well as the discussion on the drainage discharge points and the ditch line. As Carl has indicated, there is one common driveway that would require an easement over 1 and 2 for the benefit of Lot 3 and we would typically review draft language to insure that the benefits and burdens are clear as well as provisions for the common part of the driveway as it relates to private maintenance. Kahn – John, I would just point out there was also a drainage issue down at the corner of Lot 3 where Old Center Harbor Road and Gilman Hill Road came together. It was a real ditch down in there. I'm a little confused, Carl, it looks like you're showing sort of in the middle of this both the 50' buffer and the 75' buffer, why is that? There's a 50' buffer from a non-designated wetland for building purposes, you cannot construct a structure within the 50'. There's a 75' setback for septic systems so the two setbacks are critical because it demonstrates (1) the area that's suitable for a septic system and (2) the area that's a non-buildable area. Edgar – For purposes of interpreting the plan, if you look at the test pits, they are all outside of the outermost line. In other words, the test pits

indicate that the leachfields and the test pits exceed the 75' septic setback. For purposes of the building envelope, you would use the 50' line and then carry that around the wetlands and then incorporate sideline setbacks and that's basically how you would evaluate the actual building envelope. Kahn – My only concern was that there be enough of a building envelope outside the buffers so that we don't have constant trips to the ZBA to build garages, outbuildings, patios and whatever. Johnson – I think what we've done over the years is a pretty good job of designing a lot such that we do that. The area that you think of as usable is actually larger because your yard, you can plant trees and bushes within the setback area and so the smallest, what I call the usable area, is an area that's on Lot 4 and it's about 30,000 sq. ft. or about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre of usable area on that lot. You're only allowed to have 30% lot coverage in the zone, 30% of 3 acres roughly is an acre so you're providing a big buildable area on each lot and then, of course, the other lots are significantly greater than that. If you were to get into the situation where you have 10,000 sq. ft. or 8,000 sq. ft., then you're getting into the area where it's difficult to put a yard, garage and pavement. Edgar – Just for purposes of looking at the envelope on Lot 4, if you put a scale stick to the right sideline and carry that out to the 50' mark, it's about 100' wide and if you go from the upper 50' mark down to the bottom of the 4,000 sq. ft., it's just under 200 ft., maybe 180' or something. Essentially, that would be the envelope within which you'd be locating a house. Touhey – It's a typo I think, but under that easement for the driveway, it's across Lots 1 and 2 for the benefit of Lot 5, I think you have down here Lot 3. Kahn – Is Gilman Hill Road one of our old 2-rod roads? We have on occasion expanded 2-rod roads into 50' roads. Johnson – I think in this particular case and most other cases, Mike looks for the 17' so he would have 25' on one side of the centerline regardless of the width when he's dealing with one particular issue so as I mentioned, I don't think there'd be any resistance at all from the applicant to dealing with the drainage issues if they can be improved. I think whether the roads are scenic or not, I think one of the prominent features of the property are the stonewalls that go up there and I don't think anybody would want those to be destroyed and I know that Mike has talked about areas where there are scenic stonewalls if there were to be ditch work done, they would actually move the walls back instead of taking them away and that's probably something the applicant would probably be interested in having remain would be the stonewalls. Bayard asked for location of cellar holes. One of the cellar holes was rather lengthy. Eldridge – The hotel was referred to as the ell which is the longer portion of the hotel that you see here and the main part of the hotel was here and then there was also a barn off the end of the hotel. The entrance to the barn is the deeper cellar hole that you see nearest Gilman Hill corner. What may appear to be a long stretch would be the foundation underneath the ell and then that came forward and you can still see the remnants of this cascade of terraces down in front of the building. The bottom one of those cascades has been pretty much removed to build the swale that goes along that side of the road. Anything else you might see along a range road type of situation and I think that shows up here. Is that the area you were referring to? Bayard – I think what I was referring to was there's there's a very long and narrow like one of these Roman walkways, it's

probably at least the length of the tables here. Eldridge – Along Old Center Harbor Road? Bayard, Yes. Eldridge - That's just a retaining wall, it's still there and it's down in this vicinity. There was another structure across the road here that was just a garage that was part of the hotel complex so there may have been some kind of access to either farm animals or whatever down to that area there as a rangeway. The only thing I'm particularly familiar with is the retaining wall area along here. Bayard – I'd like to see some cellar holes saved, I realize we can't save all of them but the interesting ones like that would be of interest. Kahn – It was a very irregular cellar hole. The other one toward Gilman Hill Road was more rectangular and just very regular in shape. Touhey – The wetlands are rather disjointed, they don't necessarily connect with each other. Is there any reason to believe that there are vernal pools here or anything else that needs special attention? Edgar – I'm not aware of any vernal pools, maybe Carl could speak to that but essentially there's no direct impacts that relates to the project. There is only one buffer impact and that is where the common driveway threads the needle between the two points. We did confirm they are no streams so essentially you're looking at probably hillside seeps. Whether or not there's a vernal pool in here somewhere I don't know but essentially there are no direct impacts. Admittedly, those two corners, it's not the easiest thing to discern out in the field where one starts and where one stops and just as a way of information that's probably important to re-verify at some point when the driveway goes in because it's not tremendously out in the field but basically all I can say is there are no direct impacts. There is one buffer impact that has been permitted and the envelopes do not necessitate any further encroachment into the setbacks. Pam Bliss (Speaking as an abutter, not a Board member) – I have a couple of concerns although I don't have a problem where the house is but first of all buses won't go up that road, they never would for my kids so I don't know how they are going to go up now and it's not that much further up there. I don't know how people are going to plan on getting their kids to school. The other thing is the mud. We have a couple areas on the road where you get ruts probably a foot and a half deep and they probably go 150 to 200 yards. One of them happens to be right around this area on Old Center Harbor Road and then there is one down further just past the Electric Co-op and the little gully there that gets pretty bad. Mike's tried to take care of it, but it is really muddy. I am wondering what is going to happen with the snowmobile trail? That is a major snowmobile trail that goes through there on the power line. We've talked about Old Center Harbor Road and Beattie Road is right off to the side which I'm sure many people are going to use but that is a designated scenic road whereas Gilman Hill and Old Center Harbor Road are not. My other question is that the other piece of property across the road that the Advent Church owns has a view easement from the property so I'm curious as to how many trees are going to be cut and how much more drainage and runoff we're going to see as the trees get cut. Pictures were submitted regarding the washouts that occur along the road. Vadney – I didn't quite understand your comment about the view easement. Johnson – I can address the factual information in terms of the view easement. When this property was sold, it was sold with the restriction that this property had a view easement across it and one of the concerns of the applicants tonight was

since this was going to be a church, they were concerned with the height of the steeple and the structure so this property is benefited by a view easement on the property across the street. How that plays into how many trees are going to be cut, I can't speak to that. There is to my knowledge no restriction on how many trees can be cut in this particular zone. There are some zones that have restrictions, the Shoreline zone does have restrictions against clear cutting and to my knowledge there aren't any here so I'm not sure how I could best answer that concern. Vadney – I'm still a bit confused. You're saying this property being subdivided has the right to maintain a view across the top of the church. Johnson – That is correct. Vadney – How much elevation change is there? Johnson – If you took the center of this property on Old Center Harbor Road, we called that and this is local datum, not USGS data, we called that 500 and the top right-hand corner of the property on Gilman Hill Road is 580 so there's 80' difference in elevation between the center front and the corner. If you took the very lowest point of the property and went to the upper corner, it goes from local datum 480 to local datum 580 which is 100 feet. Vadney – Does the church property drop off downhill quickly toward Route 25. Johnson – That drops down from Old Center Harbor Road down to Route 25 and quickly I'm not sure but it does drop down. Edgar – It should be noted as an easement of record that this property benefits from. It's not a regulatory matter for us. Vadney – The same probably for the snowmobile trail but do we know if this is an official State designated trail? Edgar – Paul may have a better feel for it. My guess is it's probably a pretty substantial trail given the nature of the cleared power line but whether it's part of a numbered system, I don't know. Vadney – Do you know if the snowmobile trail has any easements by the power line or by your property or whatever? Eldridge – No, we've never granted an easement for a snowmobile trail there. We've been aware that it's there and have no objection to it but there's no documentation permitting passage by somebody else as far as I know over that corner of the property. Vadney – I think Pam's concern would be that the new owner would probably have an objection because the power line goes right across his driveway so that would probably not be a good place for a lot of snowmobiles. Suzanne Aucoin, Old Center Harbor Road – My concern is the wetlands on the other side, how it's going to be affected by this development. I feel it's going to impact my property but also the new properties on Route 25 and I just wanted to know if that's been addressed at all. Vadney – You're saying drainage from this piece of land once it gets across Old Center Harbor Road if that drainage is increased. Aucoin – I would imagine it has to be increased at some point, the trees are going to be cut down so the drainage is going to increase which is going to increase the wetlands on the other side of the road down to Route 25. Vadney – And that is where in relation to NH Electric Co-op land. Aucoin – It's east of the Co-op. Johnson – My company also did the work for the property which was sold to the church and that property does go down to the vicinity of Route 25 and that property does also have a wetland complex very similar to this one on it and it's my experience that the number of lots and the general configuration and size of driveways and homes on a 17-acre property having 5 home sites is not normally significant enough to cause any immediate drainage problems. If you look at the proximity of the building envelopes, the

building envelope on Lot 4 because of the configuration of the wetlands in this area and the setbacks, that house is going to be probably 250-300' up from the road so there would be a significant amount of land area between the house and the ditch line on Old Center Harbor Road to handle any residential type drainage. With the properties that are on Gilman Hill Road, again the properties sloping this way and there's probably 200-800' in buffer capability for the drainage coming from those and then as well as the home site that would be on Lot 5. The wetlands themselves actually provide water storage and buffering capabilities. The normal types of residential development of this size in my experience don't present those types of problems. In meeting with Mike, he does have a plan to upgrade Old Center Harbor Road and the contribution from the applicant towards the amount of gravel is probably to address some of the concerns that Mrs. Bliss had about the ruts, but Old Center Harbor Road itself with the ditch lines also provides an additional buffering and treatment capacity between this property and the property that's located across the street heading down to 25.

Vadney – Where are the culverts that cross through there? Johnson – There's a culvert that crosses at or near the intersection of Gilman Hill Road and Old Center Harbor Road and then there's another culvert that's towards the low-end of the property. There's one on Gilman Hill Road almost at the end of it. Vadney – It would seem to me, we don't want to design the road here tonight, but if Pam's description of the mud is accurate, there's going to have to be some bones put in there and some good drainage in order to pave it and that's when I think this lady's comment might, depending on how that paving is done and the rebuild of the road. Right now the road is sopping up a lot of water, it won't be and could start coming across a little quicker.

Johnson – As I remember and maybe Mrs. Bliss could give us a little bit more information, it seems to me that the worst section of the road is where it's flat and that's typically, when you have dirt roads, where you have the worst problem because the water doesn't really go anywhere, it just kind of sits there and that's probably where the worst part of the road is where it's flat? Bliss – A number of the abutters are here and they can probably attest to that. This one here is a little flat and it's just where you go up the grade. The worst one is probably about 50' from my house and it goes almost to the back side of the electric company about 200' but it definitely is not just the flat parts. As I think of it, there's one more at the beginning of the road, there's also another one which Mike did put a lot of gravel in this spring but it just washes away again.

Vadney – My point is the water probably won't come off this property a whole lot faster but depending on how that road is modified; it might collect it a bit differently and then dump it onto the land that she's speaking of.

Johnson – I think it's important to understand that the contribution that the applicant would be making towards the road improvements may not be at all along the frontage of their property, it may be identified and Mr. Eldridge just mentioned to me that in talking with Mike Faller, he was talking specifically about the areas that Mrs. Bliss was talking about so the financial contribution that the applicant is making doesn't have to be in the vicinity of his property, it could be used anywhere on the road to make the road improvements.

Frank Michel, Old Center Harbor Road – I've had the pleasure of living on Old Center Harbor Road for approximately a year and a half and it's very interesting at certain times. The

concern I have and I did a site walk Saturday with a few members. We have a critical situation on Gilman Hill. I have a lot and it's stonewalled, ditch, road and this spring we experienced drainage runoff that was excessive going onto our yard. Luckily there's only one other family that lives up there and I don't see how 2 cars can pass and that's in the spring or summer when it's dry. In the winter, it's nearly impossible so I don't know what's been discussed thus far but it is critical that someone pay attention to Gilman Hill. Old Center Harbor Road is wide enough that we can make ditches all year long but Gilman Hill is insufficient, actually so is Beattie Road. It's critical, it's not safe and I have an 11 and 15 year old and the condition is unacceptable as it stands but since the Berry's are the only ones that go up and Mrs. Merrill occasionally in the summer, it's not critical but drainage is a problem. I have the benefit and the burden of also being involved with other projects and what Mike Faller did just recently and the Selectmen condoned on Chase Road was taking 15 or 17 feet on Chase Road to widen the road and in all due respect, again this is a home job because I don't want you taking 15' of my property because I'm not developing it, but this is an opportunity to at least get easements for potential drainage, widening, etc. I don't know if anyone's discussed what the grade is going up Gilman Hill or what the grade is going up Beattie Road, I'm not a road guy but traveling it every day, you can't get 2 cars passing on Beattie and you can't get 2 cars passing on Gilman Hill and as a public servant and I said it last night, safety trumps everything else so this is our opportunity to make it right and I'm in favor of development that's done correctly and the safety and welfare of our citizens on that road trumps everything else. Johnson – For Mr. Michel's benefit, we did discuss some of the issues regarding Gilman Hill Road and based on John's staff review, some of the drainage improvements were made subsequent to our original mapping of the property so what we did, the field crew went up and mapped some additional drainage things that had been done since we started the project which was about a year ago and we mentioned that we would be producing a plan similar to what we did at Chase Road showing the drainage existing and then have Mike take a look at that and if he felt it was necessary to gain additional easement width across the frontage of the applicant's property, we would be willing to grant them that easement width so the improvements could be made should they need to make them. The easement being made doesn't necessarily mean that the improvements would be made right away but it would benefit the Town in that the extra ROW width would be there should they need it in the future. Vadney – So you're saying the applicant will offer the roughly 17' easement. Johnson – We threw the 17' out because that happened to be what the Chase Road easement was because of the width of the road, whatever the number is to make it to 50', I think that's why he was working with the 17 feet. If you remember in the Chase Road easement and also with the Ducharme property we also said if you should need more than 17' for drainage, in that particular case it was straightening out some curves, we'd be willing to grant more so I think what we're talking about here is maybe not unnecessarily burdening the property with an easement in areas where it's not necessary but in those areas where the drainage easement would obviously improve Gilman Hill Road to the benefit of the abutters, it also improves the property to the benefit of the applicant so it's a two-way street

and we'd certainly be willing to entertain granting additional easement width for road improvements because it benefits everybody. Edgar – I think there are several issues that the DPW can weigh in on and then we'd all benefit from. As you recall on the Chase Road project Carl did the existing conditions plan, we met with Mike and then we came back to this Board with a game plan. We had the issue of the discharges onto the property, we have the downstream drainage condition between Old Center Harbor and Route 25, we have the issue of the amount of money and how it might be allocated, we have Frank's concerns that he just spoke to, we have the issue of easements and widths and where it may or may not be needed and the issue of reviewing the roadway plan so I think there's a fair amount of drainage-related issues that we can buy some time, get to Mike on these points and then come back to a continued hearing with some more specific information for the Board. Michel – Carl, what is the grade on Gilman Hill and what's the grade on Beattie, I'm just curious? Johnson – I'd have to calculate the grade, I don't know it off the top of my head. The grade of the existing road is nothing we can do anything about. As an applicant, we can offer the Town additional ROW width and monies for road improvements but when we're building a road, we're subject to certain grades and certain road elements. When we're developing off of it, we're subject to the issuance of a driveway permit from the Public Works Department and we've met with them on the site and we've gone over some of the issues and based on that site visit with Mike Faller, we reduced the driveway cuts on Gilman Hill Road by one because of the drainage issues. We've already demonstrated with mapped drainage structures that were put in subsequent to our original mapping of the property and we'll be working with Mike as to how that affects the driveway entrance. Tonight we've discussed the willingness to offer additional ROW width on our side of the line for roadway width improvements, drainage improvements, structures of the kind that would improve the situation. Vadney – We only allow two homes off of a driveway and Gilman Hill is in effect a driveway right now for one family. It's a pretty thin, narrow, poor quality road which only services one home. We are now looking at the lower part of it servicing 4 homes, the existing plus Lots 3, 2 and 1. Johnson – There would only be 3 homes, the driveway for the corner lot is off Old Center Harbor Road. Michel – My comments were and again I'm pro development done the right way. Make sure you experience Gilman Hill in the winter when only one car can get by. I'm just pointing it out because it's real. I have no beef other than do it right, this is our chance. Safety trumps everything else and those who took the walk realize it's a small road. Vadney – The lower part of Gilman Hill, I think the Board may want to look at bringing that up in quality so at least 2 cars can meet for that 500-600 feet or whatever it is up into there. If it remains so that 2 cars can't meet safely, that's a Town road issue and it's something we would be very careful about. There's an antenna up there too that must periodically see at least some size trucks going to it, even though it's not a home, it has some traffic to it. It's easy to say funnel the drainage and increase the drainage capability up in there, but we have to be careful because the more we improve the drainage up high, the more it runs down onto the low stuff so be aware of that. Sabina Prescott, Old Center Harbor Road – To make a point with Mr. Michel, even the Old Center Harbor road in the springtime, 2

cars can't pass and I can tell you right in front of my house which is 32 Old Center Harbor Road is one of the muddiest areas and no matter how far away I do live from Gilman Hill, we do still have water issues down my way also. My second question is about Gilman Hill Road and I understood there was a comment made about the stonewalls on both sides of Gilman Hill Road and I understand that if we do widen the road, it was offered that the stonewalls would be preserved or rebuilt and I'm just curious as to whose cost that would entail? Edgar – The simple answer is we're not there yet. It's a good question, but we don't have an answer until we look at the road, get more input from Mike and bring that back to a public meeting, we'd have a better feel for that. Richard Juve – I heard that Gilman Hill was a driveway, could somebody elaborate on that because I was once trying to do a subdivision and my driveway turned into I-93 so would somebody tell me what a driveway is? Vadney – I inferred it is similar to a driveway, it is not a driveway. It serves as one more or less. Kahn – Mr. Juve, I have viewed your extension off Wall Street, I viewed, as recently as Saturday morning, Gilman Hill Road. Gilman Hill Road is bigger and wider than your driveway. It is a problem road, though and as soon as we're done getting comments here, we're about to send this back for review by Public Works of Gilman Hill Road, Old Center Harbor Road and Beattie Road for both surface width and drainage. Bayard – I do have a concern about the driveway onto Lot 1 between the ROW with the power line and the snowmobile trail. It seems to me it would be preferable if that were moved. I know we don't like to have 3 houses off of one driveway but it seems to me it could perhaps be moved slightly and alleviate most of the problem. I do have a question on the view easement. Right now there's a field at least in part of that property, is that property subject to total cutting if the abutter requested it. How does that easement work? Eldridge – The area the view easement covers is now cleared because we couldn't grant a view easement until we saw what the view was so we cleared the whole area that was to be part of that view easement on the lower property and that is now clear. Generally speaking, it's a triangular piece that's the corner of Beattie Road and Old Center Harbor Road are two sides of that triangle and then there's a diagonal line that goes across from where it's cleared on the west side down Beattie Road to where it is not cleared. The other parts that were cleared were the parts that were going to be used for that easement at the time. I think the church may have done some other minor brush cleaning since then. Flanders – Mr. Chairman, I haven't been up there and looked at this because I didn't realize I was going to be filling in for Colette tonight but if my memory serves me correctly, it's standard to assume that every new house will generate 10 trips/day so we're talking about 5 lots here, that's 50 trips/day we're going to be adding to that road if all 5 houses are built and we need to make sure that road is up to it. Kahn – When we were out there on Saturday, we did not look at Beattie Road at all and it probably should be looked at. Touhey – We have seen a lot of tree removal in some developments and when you do remove a lot of trees, you influence the drainage which results in additional runoff and aesthetically it affects the appearance for all of us so my question might be in light of that and in light of protecting wetlands which we all wish to do, would you have any objection to a condition that would prohibit the removal of trees in the wetland area and that

would include the 50' wetland buffer? Eldridge – I don't have any way to answer that question now because I don't have any information necessary to determine what impact that would have on the project. Both this property and the property below it have been managed woodlands prior to this and we certainly had professional foresters in there advising us in our harvest and so forth over the years and my first recollection of this property was around 1955 so I've walked most of it as a kid, but I still wouldn't be able to determine in any way what it is you're asking me and I don't believe you really know what it is you're asking me either because you don't know what impact it would have. Touhey – OK, I was not able to participate on the site walk so I'm asking this as a general question. We have considered this and we have put this as a condition on other sites. As I look at this, you have your septic system, you have your home sites, it would appear to me that the 50' buffer around the wetlands could be protected without any tree cutting, I'm not saying the 75' setback but merely the 50' setback and I would ask the Board that we consider that in an effort to protect the wetlands and cut down on additional drainage. Johnson – I was at the public hearing on one of the projects that I think Mr. Touhey is talking about where they did restrict the property. I believe that was a project that had 27 conditions to the conditional approval but the Water Resources Conservation Overlay District which is the district that encompasses all of the wetlands in Town and which is the part of the ordinance that determines the setbacks and the types of the resources and their significance has very few permitted uses, you can't do much in it but the first permitted use in the district is forestry. There is no restriction to cutting trees in the wetlands. As a matter of fact, the ordinance specifically states that it is the first permitted use in the district so I think the Board should be careful when they are restricting a use that's determined by the Zoning Ordinance to be a permitted use and I think it's wise to be looking at the effects of major cutting on the property and how that may affect the drainage. In terms of aesthetics, you will remember in the Clover Ridge subdivision, we did provide areas that were restricted cut zones to benefit some of the aesthetic qualities and many of those restricted cut zones happen to be in the proximity of the wetlands and that's something we could look at with the applicant but I would caution the Board to be restricting a use which is one of the few permitted uses in a zone determined by the Zoning Board. Touhey – Just a response to that quickly, yes that is true, I am well aware of the allowance of the permitted use of forestry but we've also seen what that has done to some subdivisions and some lots and Waukegan Street is a classic example. Vadney – I would say that I do agree with what Carl said about the permitted use part of that and I would also add that I am very hesitant to get the Planning Board too deeply involved in that type of cutting restriction because they are pretty close to impossible to enforce. How many Code Enforcement Officers do you want in Town out there pacing off feet from a wetland when a tree gets cut. It's a very difficult one and if you can't enforce it, you shouldn't really make that your policy. It seems to me that on the western portion of that property from the western wetland over, there's really no skin off anybody's teeth if the timber were preserved over there. It doesn't block anybody's view. Johnson – I think Mr. Eldridge's comment about not realizing right at the moment and making an agreement to something he doesn't really know the impact, if you

have some discussions about that and he were to identify areas of the property that he felt had a minimal or no impact, he may be willing to take some of those suggestions of the Board and incorporate them in his plan. Kahn – I'm throwing this out for Mr. Eldridge's consideration that if you want to think about something where it's not really as troublesome as if you had trees blocking view lots, it's the western end of the property from the western wetland over.

Kahn moved, Bayard seconded, I MOVE THAT WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO AUGUST 14, 2007, AND IN THE MEANTIME STAFF BE INSTRUCTED TO CONTACT THE DPW TO HAVE THEM RECONSIDER WITH DRAINAGE AND SURFACE ON GILMAN HILL ROAD, OLD CENTER HARBOR ROAD AND BEATTIE ROAD AND REPORT BACK AT OR BEFORE THAT MEETING. Voted unanimously.

4. **KENT L. BROWN FOR MEREDITH CRESTWOOD ESTATES, LLC.:** (Rep. Kent Brown)

Kent Brown, Owner & Developer of Crestwood Estates off of Parade Road – As part of my development agreement prior to entering into the next phase, I was to appear before the Board and present the bond amounts and review the status of the permits prior to commencing construction. My plan is to begin construction of Phase 2B which would be Crestwood Drive and Hickorywood Circle beginning in the next 2-3 weeks. Edgar – This project had received approval from the Planning Board for 59 lots subject to phased construction. The approval required that prior to entering any subsequent phases, the applicant must return to the Planning Board for two specific and limited purposes and that being to establish an appropriate performance guarantee amount associated with the new phase and confirm that all the permits are still applicable. Phase 1 I believe is indicated on that plan up above which is the primary entrance coming in off Parade Road. There are several houses that are built and essentially that phase is complete so pursuant to that development agreement, we're back before the Board to determine the performance guarantee amount. As we did with the first phase, the applicant proposes to construct the road proceeding with typical pre-construction conferencing, materials testing, construction inspections, all the kinds of signoffs that are associated with road construction. A partial guarantee would be in place to guarantee site stabilization. Lots would not be conveyed out of this phase either until the roads are complete or the remaining improvements are guaranteed. The applicant's design engineer submitted a unit cost estimate for site stabilization, there is a significant amount of road work which is the basis for an estimate of \$52,424.00 which is recommended for Board approval. I've also recommended that the Board stipulate in any decision that under the partial guarantee scenario, lots shall not be transferred out of this phase until (a) the road construction and related infrastructure is complete to the satisfaction to the Town or (b) the applicant provides performance guarantee suitable to the Town for the completion of the road improvements. Essentially, what we have here is it's analogous to an applicant proceeding under conditional approval. So with that said, typically we look at the

erosion control components and they have been estimated at \$52,424.00. and that's the recommended amount for purposes of the limited guarantee so I would recommend that amount. Kahn – John, are you suggesting that the completion of road construction to the satisfaction of the Town and the performance guarantee is something to be done administratively or does that have to come back to us? Edgar – The satisfactory completion of the roadway is not a Planning Board function so that's an easy one. The issue of whether or not the performance guarantee needs to come back is kind of a tough one. If we get started and for whatever reason they change horses and want to bond the thing right away, I would send it back to you guys because it's a big number and if, on the other hand which is basically the discussions that I've had with the applicant, their intent is essentially to complete the road first so they have marketable property. To sell the property you need to drive into the subdivision and appreciate it. So essentially I think they are looking to build the road and maybe a top coat of pavement or something like that, if we're in that kind of environment, we have historically looked at that as an administrative discretion because they are not talking about a lot of money so it sort of depends. If it was a big scope and a big number, I think we are obligated and appropriately so to come back here. If at the end of the day, we've essentially built the road and they want to convey lots and we're missing a top coat of pavement or need some additional stabilization that would be typically the type of thing you've delegated administratively.

Kahn moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE WITH RESPECT TO MEREDITH CRESTWOOD ESTATES, LLC., TAX MAP S20, LOT 3, CRESTWOOD DRIVE, THAT WE APPROVE THE AMOUNT OF THE ESTIMATE FOR SITE STABILIZATION PURPOSES OF \$52,424.00 AND THAT WE STIPULATE THAT LOTS SHALL NOT BE TRANSFERRED OUT OF PHASE 2A OF THE DEVELOPMENT UNTIL EITHER ROAD CONSTRUCTION OR RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE IS COMPLETED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE TOWN WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ADMINISTRATIVELY OR THE APPLICANT PROVIDES A PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE SUITABLE TO THE TOWN AND TO BE DETERMINED AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD FOR COMPLETION OF THE ROAD AND ALL RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE PRIOR TO ANY CONVEYANCE. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

5. **GEORGE T. FELT FOR APOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC:** (Rep. Jim Bolduc) (Flanders stepped down) Proposed Site Plan to construct a professional office building and related site improvements on Tax Map S17, Lot 17H, located on Northview Drive in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.
6. **GEORGE T. FELT FOR APOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC-** Architectural Design Review of a proposed professional office building on Tax Map S17, Lot 17H, located on Northview Drive in the Commercial Route 3 South District.

Jim Bolduc, Lepene Engineering & Surveying – We have prepared the site plan that you'll be considering tonight. We made a submittal on June 20th and had a site walk and visit with the staff and Town's review engineer, Lou Caron and since then have made some revisions to the plan to accommodate some of the concerns and questions that the staff and review engineer expressed. I've got both the June 20th plan and the revised plan, July 6th plan that I'll walk through. I'm going to basically use the staff report and kind of follow through some of the things that John has noted on the staff report. We are in the Commercial-Route 3 South District, it's a cul-de-sac street, Northview Drive, and there are existing businesses down at the intersection with Route 3 including Energy Savers. There is a business at the top of the hill, a professional office building and the rest of the lots on either side of Northview Drive are vacant. Dr. Felt purchased this lot several years ago with the intention of putting in his own dental practice. He has an existing practice down the street on Route 3. This will be a dental facility that he will own and operate as Appollonia Dental Group. We have roughly a .7 acre lot and we're planning to put up a 3,200 sq. ft. office building and associated parking. In the Route 3 South District there is no classification for a dental office, professional office is an allowed use. There is a medical office or clinic which requires a special exception and in consultation with the staff, we believe that this qualifies closer to the medical aspect of a professional office so we have filed an application for a special exception for dental office use in this area. We have also filed a special exception for parking in the setback. Here on Northview Drive we have a 50' setback so we have applied for a special exception for parking in the front setback. We're covering approximately 53% of the lot with the building, parking and the walkways. Our utilities include an existing 8" sewer line that's in Northview Drive that we'll be connecting into and we're proposing a water well on site for our potable water service. We did have some comments from Bob Hill about the sewer service. In particular, he wanted to see a pipe size which we've added to this revised plan. He was concerned about the landscaping and the root systems of the proposed landscaping near the service connection and we've put notes on the drawing to reflect that the bushes can't be any more than 5' from the service connection and we've also made a series of changes to the details that he refers to on the sewer detail sheet including a few note changes. We had originally proposed overhead electric; we've got two power poles that were very conveniently at either one of the property corners. We were going to bring in overhead utilities into the system but after our site walk, the applicant agreed we would go underground so we are now showing underground utilities and put a detail on the plan showing the conduit runs that we'll certainly be submitting to NHEC for further review. Roads and Access. We have had a visit out there with the road agent and have gotten an approval for a permit for our driveway access. We have since that site visit expanded the driveway from a 24' to a 35' in response to some of the questions that we had from the Fire Chief. What we elected to do on the project was to place a fire access lane on this side of the building and in order to accommodate the type of vehicle the Chief needed to have turn into the driveway, we expanded that driveway, pushed it a little bit further up the road and made it wider so it would be a little easier to access for his vehicles. Drainage and Stormwater Management. The entire site flows from the eastern

corner down to the west corner. Right now all of the flow sheet flows across the site goes down into the ditch and closed drainage system that's on this side of Northview Drive. What we're proposing on the grading and drainage plan, we're collecting the water on-site, putting it into a small detention pond at the low corner of the site in order to retain the peak flow. We're replacing a swale along the back of the property to collect some of the water from the pitched roof of the building and place it into a stormwater recharge system, a series of 3 pipes along this edge of the property connecting again down into the existing catch basin on Northview. Overall, the modeling that we've done including both the detention pond and the pipe system along the property line shows an overall decrease in the flow coming off of the site in the 10- year, 25-year and 50-year storms. In the two catch basins at the low end of the parking lot we've called for oil/water separators for those facilities. At the same time, in response to some of the comments that we got from Lou Caron, we've added stone check dams rather than hay bales and we've added stone check dams along the existing ditch along Northview and added some additional silt fence along Northview. The parking criteria that we have on the site plan, we didn't have specific criteria for a dental office so we used the medical office criteria for 150 sq. ft. for space and came up with 22 spaces. The original plan had 23 spaces on it so we exceeded the parking requirement by 1, however, when I revised the plan to add that fire lane on the side of the building, I elected to eliminate that end parking space so now we have exactly 22 spaces. The doctor had also submitted a letter to the Town that he estimates he needs no more than 18 spaces during the peak operation of the business, estimating the number of staff, the number of patients that were in service and the number of patients waiting, he estimated he'd never have any more than 18 cars parked in his parking lot but we've elected to meet the requirement for the 22 spaces. On the off-street loading, again the implementation of this drive lane on this side of the site has allowed us a space over here for deliveries and again the doctor has written a letter to the Town describing the types of vehicles that would normally come to his operation and believes those types of vehicles will have easy access both in that parking area and to the building to be able to off-load their deliveries. Landscaping. We've provided a landscaping plan and have located a series of shrubs along the edge of the property over here to try to screen the detention pond which are never really very attractive and we've got several trees spaced around the site. We have tried to match some of the landscaping that was approved for the Energy Savers site. We've used the same plant types, the trees and the shrubs in an effort that whenever Energy Savers is built, we have some consistency driving up the street with the same types of plans and same types of trees. Lighting. We have two wall-mounted fixtures on either side set up near the eaves of the structure that will pass light near the entryways to the structure and also part way out into the parking lot and we have two pedestal mounted lights at the front of the lot to light up the entrance. In response to some of the staff comments, the detail we've showed for these wall mounted lights on either side now have a small shield to go over them to try to keep the light from casting out too far beyond the site itself. Fuel Supply. We're anticipating the building will be heated with oil and there will be an oil tank in the basement of the building. We've also called and shown a position for a propane tank in the back for emergency power services.

Waste from a facility like this was a concern and the doctor supplied a letter to the Town showing 3 different waste streams that come out of a dental facility and how those wastes are handled and picked up and properly secured and removed from the site. They won't be part of the waste stream that we have for the dumpster. Overall, I think we've improved the project significantly from the June 20th submittal, we've incorporated all of the input that we've had from the staff and the review engineer and we're hopeful that we'll be able to achieve a conditional approval tonight for our project so we'll be able to move forward later this week to the Zoning Board and have a public hearing for the two special exceptions for the use within this zone and for the parking in the setback. Bliss – How many dentists are going to be working out of this office, just the one or are there going to be more? Bolduc – I don't know the answer to that. Most of my experience is that there's a single dentist that works in the office and has a staff of hygienists and other folks that do most of the cleaning and treatment of folks. Edgar – The floor plan indicates 5 examination rooms, but one doctor's office. It's not extensive; it's a relatively small facility. Edgar – First, I'd like to say at the staff level in working with Jim, we've been working on this project for a while and have had several staff level meetings going over the zoning issues and making sure we had a complete set of plans so I appreciate Jim's desire to try to work out as much as we could on the front end, I think it has been helpful. As indicated by the staff review and Jim's comments, when we got our engineer involved and we started looking downstream with the Energy Savers project, there was a lot of uncertainty as to exactly when they would build their project and the reason for the plan changes, it was decided by the applicant that rather than depend a lot of downstream for timing, legal easements, questions about whether or not there's excess capacity in their closed system, rather than address it with those levels of uncertainty, the shift or the revised plans that I've spoken of basically were intended to make sure that for the 50-year storm event, there's no increase in runoff from the site period without having to go through those other issues I've indicated so that's the reason for the shift that followed our discussions between the engineers. The plans have been revised to reflect comments that had come in from Mike and from the Fire Chief and what I've indicated in the staff review because we have not reviewed the revised engineer yet, it reflects conceptually everything we talked about in terms of trying to get infiltration, I think the test pits must have come back acceptable, so we're trying to get water back in the ground where we can. The concept is to not have to depend on the downstream property for easements and the like so the plans, as I've reviewed the revised plans, they reflect the intent of everything that we've talked about the staff level, however, we have not had a chance to do the final review of the numbers. What I've suggested, to the extent that the Board was willing to grant the conditional approval, I would recommend strongly to the Board that we require a compliance hearing on this and not review it as an administrative matter because there will need to be a Water Department signoff on some changes, the Fire Department will be very happy to see the change but they haven't seen it yet, it does reflect the discussion but they haven't signed off on it yet. If the Board were inclined to grant a conditional in this particular case, I would recommend that the Board stipulate that the final plans and the engineering signoffs come in at a compliance hearing. Everything is going in the

direction that was expected from a staff point of view, it's just that we haven't had a chance to do the final takeoff on everything. I'm not aware of anything that has been presented that is at odds with Bob, Mike, Chuck or Lou's comments. We also need an erosion control stabilization bond on the project and that would necessitate a subsequent hearing anyway. They've been focusing on getting the drainage revised so that is an outstanding piece that would need a performance guarantee and that would necessitate a public hearing. We also have the architectural review and I believe Jeff is going to speak to that aspect of the project. Jeff Parks, Bauen Corp. – The plans you have show the architectural design. The building footprint itself is about 3,200 sq. ft., approximately half that square footage is full basement and at this point the other half will be a crawlspace. As John had mentioned earlier, there are 5 operatory or exam rooms there. We have two entrances to the building, one for staff and one for the general public. There are some areas of preparation, sterilization, labs throughout the middle of the building. The building construction itself will be wood framed with a wood truss roof. The exterior siding will be either cement or a hardy pine project typical of what's on this building and the Police Station building. As the plans show now, I don't know if the changes you have show the cultured stone or the split face cultured stone, I think you still may have brick. What is going to change is the metal roof. We've talked to the doctor and I believe at this point we're going to go with a 35-year architectural shingle rather than a metal roof. Bliss – What color is it going to be? Parks – We're still at the point of picking out colors, I believe we were looking at a green roof but it's going to possibly be a gray roof now. An early rendering showed the clapboard siding as being yellow, but I don't think that's been decided. After long discussions back and forth, we decided to change from the metal roof to asphalt shingles. Board members did not have a problem with a metal roof. We've tested that camp building for asbestos and there's nothing in there so at some point that is ready to come down once approvals and site work starts. Bliss – I like the change to the shingles. I do think because of the size of the building, the shingles will be more subtle. Bayard – I also like the idea of the shingles if they want to go that way. Hearing closed at 8:55 p.m.

Bliss moved, Bayard seconded, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR GEORGE T. FELT FOR APPOLLONIA DENTAL GROUOP, LLC, FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT A PROFESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDING AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON TAX MAP S17, LOT 17H, LOCATED ON NORTHVIEW DRIVE IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THAT BOTH SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS FROM THE ZONING BOARD SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON THE FINAL PLANS, ONE IS FOR USE AND THE OTHER IS FOR PARKING IN THE SETBACKS;
- (2) IF THE APPLICANT CHOOSES TO GO UNDERGROUND WITH THE UTILITY SERVICE, FINAL PLANS SHALL BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE NHEC TRENCH/CONDUIT REQUIREMENTS;
- (3) A STATE OF NH COMMERCIAL DISCHARGE PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR THE APPLICANT TO DISCHARGE MEDICAL WASTE INTO THE TOWN

SEWER THAT TIES INTO THE WRBP REGIONAL SYSTEM. THE STATE PERMIT SHALL BE REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS AND ANY APPROVAL SHALL BE MADE SUBJECT TO BOB HILL'S SIGN OFF ON FINAL PLANS IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS REVIEW COMMENTS DATED 7/3/07;

- (4) A MDPW DRIVEWAY PERMIT IS REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS;
- (5) THE BOARD SHALL REQUIRE A DULY NOTICED COMPLIANCE HEARING FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEWING THE FINAL SITE AND DRAINAGE PLANS;
- (6) FINAL PLANS SHALL INDICATE THE SIGN LOCATION;
- (7) FINAL PLANS SHALL INDICATE THE FUEL TANK LOCATION, TANK SIZE, UNDERGROUND OR ABOVE GROUND AND APPLICABLE SETBACK DISTANCES. FINAL PLANS SHALL BE SIGNED OFF BY THE FIRE CHIEF.
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
- (9) SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S USUSAL RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND AS PROVIDED IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS NOS. 7 AND 17.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDING ON TAX MAP S17, LOT 17H, LOCATED ON NORTHVIEW DRIVE IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT, AND THAT WE FIND THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 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