

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Worsman, Selectmen's Rep.; Finer; Kahn; Bliss; Touhey, Alternate; Dever, John III, Alternate; Faller, Public Works Director; Harvey, Clerk

Kahn moved, Worsman seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 24, 2007, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

**APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS**

1. **B & N DESIGNS, LLC.** – Proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map S25, Lots 30 & 38, into 5 lots (2.26 ac., 3.82 ac., 4.45 ac., 5.60 ac., and 6.94 ac.) located on Waukewan Street in the Residential District.

Application, subdivision plans and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. This application is considered a Major Subdivision due to the number of lots proposed. Accordingly, the acceptance of the application and the public hearing must occur at separate meetings. Recommend the application (1) be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing, (2) a site inspection be conducted prior to the public hearing, (3) the applicant is requested to have the surveyor provide sufficient stakes in the field to facilitate the site inspection (driveways, house envelopes) and (4) the public hearing be scheduled for 8/28/07.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF B & N DESIGNS, LLC, FOR A PROPOSED MAJOR 5-LOT SUBDIVISION AND SCHEDULE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR AUGUST 28, 2007, AND CONDUCT A SITE INSPECTION ON AUGUST 25, 2007, AT 8:30 A.M. Voted unanimously.

2. **TRUE ROAD, LLC AND LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer 5.0217 ac. from Tax Map S14, Lot 29, to Tax Map U11, Lot 63, located on Boynton Road in the Residential District.

Application, Boundary Line Adjustment Plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend the application be accepted as complete for purpose of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF TRUE ROAD, LLC AND LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT. Voted unanimously.

3. **LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST** – Proposed subdivision of Tax Map U11, Lot 63, into two (2) lots (10 ac. and 7.62 ac.), located on Boynton road in the Residential District.

Application, subdivision 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.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST FOR A 2-LOT SUBDIVISION.

Voted unanimously.

4. **LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST** – Proposed site plan for 32 units of multi-family affordable housing and relocation of seven (7) existing manufactured housing units with related site improvements, Tax Map U11, Lot 63, located on Boynton Road in the Residential District.

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.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN FOR 32 UNITS OF MULTI-FAMILY, AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Voted unanimously.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **ROBERT HALE ANDREW & PHYLLIS ELDRIDGE TRUST** – Continuation of a public hearing held on July 10, 2007, for a proposed Major Subdivision to subdivide 15.73 acres into 5 lots (3 ac. - 5.11 ac.), Tax Map S02, Lot 1, located on Old Center Harbor Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted June 12, 2007.

The applicant has requested that this hearing be continued to the next available Planning Board meeting.

Finer moved, Kahn seconded, that the hearing be continued to Tuesday, August 28, 2007. Voted unanimously.

2. **GEORGE T. FELT FOR APPOLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC.:** (Rep. Jim Bolduc) Public Hearing to determine compliance with conditions set forth on July 10, 2007, for a proposed for a proposed Site Plan, Tax Map S17, Lot 17H, located on Northview Drive in the Commercial-Route 3 South District. Application accepted July 10, 2007.

Jim Bolduc, Lepene Engineering – We had a conditional approval of the project last month and then we went to the Zoning Board and received a couple of special exceptions for the location of the dental office on Northview Drive and parking in the setback. We had some issues at the time of conditional approval that needed to be addressed and this compliance meeting tonight was expected to go through those issues. There was a review Memo from Lou Caron that had two comments we had addressed on the grading, drainage and erosion control plan G-1. We've

added the beginning and ending of the granite curb and the inclusion of the test pit data. We dug 2 test pits out there in support of the salt water infiltration system we had designed along the side of the property and Lou had asked that we put the test pit data in there. On Sheet D-1, a detail sheet, there was a conflict in this detail for the infiltration system between the elevations that were shown on the plan and the elevations that were shown on the detail. I believe we had these two elevations on the right-hand side transposed on the detail we had provided before and Lou pointed that out to us and asked us to correct it. We had a review memo from Bob Hill with a couple of comments that were still outstanding as of last week on a detail on Sheet D-2. Bob had asked that we show the pipe size and pipe materials on the detail. We had them shown on the plan view but he asked that we show them on the detail so we added that and then there was a phrase that he wanted added to Note #12 which reads "from the sewer collection main". We had made some revisions to that note previously at his request but he wanted that phrase added to it. On the unit cost estimate we had submitted on July 30<sup>th</sup> John had some comments on Friday where we had increased the cost of the catch basin. We're tying into an existing Town catch basin out on Northview Drive with our drainage system and I had put an estimate in for the connection into that catch basin. In the upper left-hand corner you will see there's a core and boot existing catch basin and the original estimate I had provided to the Town in John's opinion was several hundred dollars short of what he and Mike Faller considered appropriate for that work in the Town ROW so we increased that amount and I believe that was all taken care of. Those are the only changes that were required between our previous meeting and this compliance hearing.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THE JULY 10, 2007, DECISION FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN FOR GEORGE FELT FOR APPOLLONIA DENTAL GROUP, LLC, TAX MAP S17, LOT 17H, LOCATED ON NORTHVIEW DRIVE IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT. THE AMOUNT OF THE PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE IS SET AT \$3,334.00 AND THE DISCHARGE PERMIT SHALL REMAIN AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITION PRECEDENT TO FINAL APPROVAL AND SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL. Voted unanimously.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

3. **RAFD REALTY, LLC:** (Rep. Carl Johnson) 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. Application accepted May 8, 2007.

4. **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. Application accepted May 8, 2007.

Carl Johnson, Associated Surveyors – There is an existing 50' x 100' warehouse building that Mr. Dearborn uses for his personal storage of automobiles on this property which is zoned Business & Industry and located at the intersection of Annalee Place and Reservoir Road. The property other than the building that's there now is undeveloped. The total area of the lot is 4.1 acres and the property is bisected by a wetland complex, essentially the southeasterly portion of the property is the portion of the property that's being developed so the wetland to the northwest is being left undisturbed. After completing the first building and receiving site plan approval from the Town, Mr. Dearborn decided he needed more space for storage of his automobiles and we came back with a proposal to add an equivalent amount of storage space behind the existing building. That application was made in May, it was reviewed by several agencies of the Town, it was sent to Lou Caron for design review and there were several changes that occurred as a result of the input both from Town of Meredith staff and also from Mr. Caron. What we have here this evening is the site plan that we hope to receive conditional approval for this evening. We've addressed all the engineering concerns, Mr. Caron has issued a review of the engineering and in working with Mr. Fluet, who is the design engineer, has come to a resolution of all the issues. We originally had proposed an access off of Annalee Place but Mike Faller had some concerns about the location of that driveway and also some of the associated drainage issues which have been resolved so we have abandoned that entrance off of Annalee Place and we have come up with an alternative means of access at the back of the building which comes along the westerly portion of the building with a roadway and we've proposed to construct a couple of turnouts here to allow not only emergency access to the building but also to allow Mr. Dearborn the access to bring his vehicles back in there for the door that's at the back of the building. As you can see, the result because of some of the slopes on the property, there are some riprap slopes that are proposed primarily to the northwest and that's to retain the buffer which is associated with the wetland complex which bisects the property. We are not required to go before the Zoning Board because we are staying completely outside of that buffer. Because of the drainage issues and some concerns that Mike had with regard to the capacity of the existing ditchlines on Annalee Place, we are now proposing a detention pond which will take the drainage on the site and based on Mr. Caron's review and Mr. Fluet's design, the peak flows will not be increased as a result of any runoff. There may be a minor increase in a 50-year storm but essentially this will handle all of the drainage. What Mr. Caron required us to do even though there was an existing building on the site, he requested that we start over from zero and do the calculations as if this is an undeveloped site and do the analysis so you'd have a higher level of confidence that the drainage calculations would be sufficient. I believe Mr. Faller has reviewed what's being proposed and he's satisfied with the drainage containment

we have on site. Chief Palm has reviewed the project in terms of the emergency access and he's also satisfied with the issue of public safety and access to the building. There are a couple of notes on John's staff review and I've made changes to the plan. I did revise the lot coverage calculations to reflect gravel as impervious surface. As you can see from the chart, I've separated out the 10,000 sq. ft. in buildings and separated out the existing parking areas and access ways to come up with the lot coverage calculations. Some of these notes actually go back to the prior meeting and I had already made the changes to the plans I submitted but there are a couple of notes regarding the delineation of wetlands and so forth and all of those notes have been added to the plan. There is a comment in the staff review about the drainage and storm water management which I've mentioned and John's comment is Lou has indicated that he agrees with the conclusions reached by Paul Fluet in his drainage assessment. We have also submitted erosion control details as part of the plan set. John does make a comment about a parking waiver. As we talked before with the previously approved building, because this is a private use, the parking is not really a function of the size of the building as a building that might have some other commercial applications. Essentially, there are no cars there other than the cars in the building so when Mr. Dearborn arrives and maybe one of his workers, there may be a couple of cars there from time to time. Essentially, the size of the building, the mass of the building is not determining the parking so we've shown some parking spaces in the front which would be utilized when Mr. Dearborn and maybe one of his employees is there and essentially we're asking for a waiver from the requirement of 16 spaces, we're providing 4 so we're asking for a waiver of 12 at this particular point because this particular use does not drive the parking to be higher. In conjunction with that, there is a note on the plan regarding the specific approval that should be granted to this property and indicating that it is not necessarily in any way an approval of any future applications of the building. In other words, Mr. Dearborn currently owns this building and he has it for his personal use. At some point in time, he may sell the building and a future owner may wish to do something else with it and at that time the use may be severely limited based on the fact we don't have the parking and there may be some access issues and so forth and that's clearly understood in the minutes of the meetings, there are also plan notes to that effect so I think what John is getting at is that in no way is the Board indicating that the next owner can show up and have 10,000 sq. ft. of commercial space that he can do with what he wants. We do still have the note on there that there's no outside repair of vehicles, vehicle maintenance or washing, storage of chemicals, hazardous materials, etc. John asked that we have Sheet E-1 stamped by the engineer, wetland scientist and the surveyor. That can occur prior to filing the plans. We do not have the stamp of the wetland scientist currently on the plans but that sheet is not the actual site plan, it's an accessory sheet that's in the packet. We can make sure we have that stamped. An incorrect road name on Paul's plans has been corrected. There was a question whether the Annalee Dolls sign is on this property or in the ROW and whether or not there is an easement. I don't know where that sign is, we didn't map it, it's not part of the application, it doesn't seem to be a very big deal to me but I'll be happy to look into it. I do not believe that if it is

on the property, there is an easement but it was there when the property was purchased and it hasn't been an issue until now. The Architectural Design Review, essentially it's the same structure as before and there's no real outside lighting. The building materials are identical and we did a plan packet which showed the same type of structure that's there now. If you've had an opportunity to go by the building, it is neat looking for an industrial type building. The property is well maintained and well kept and well manicured. There's no trash, it's all inside storage. It looks like a pretty neat site. There is one issue regarding the performance guarantee that I'd like to address. John says that 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 shall establish the amount of the guarantee following a public hearing. In this particular case, I would like to request that the Planning Board allow staff to look at the unit cost estimate that's supplied by the engineer to determine whether or not it's sufficient. We are not bonding road improvements, we're not bonding the construction of the building, there are no utilities associated with the project and the amount of the unit cost estimate is probably going to be a couple thousand dollars for site stabilization, basically silt fencing and so forth to make sure the project gets going. If Mr. Dearborn decides to stop the project, the town would be able to come in and stabilize the site. I don't think this really rises to the level of having a public hearing to discuss such a small amount? For this particular project, it seems to me that we could let staff decide if the amount is sufficient enough. If staff decides there is an issue or if the applicant decides there is an issue, then we would have to come back to the Board to establish the amount. I spoke to Paul Fluet regarding this and he didn't think it was going to be a very large number to rise to the level of a separate public hearing. I know Mr. Dearborn would like to get going as soon as possible on this project so if the Board could consider that request, we would be very grateful. Finer asked if Chief Palm's request regarding the access and if it can handle apparatus up to 60,000 pounds had been answered. Johnson – The engineer has verified that and it will be added as a plan note. Johnson pointed out the 4 parking spaces for Bayard. Worsman – In the original approval there were trees in between Annalee Place and the building. Those have been cut down. I would like to see a note on the plan that the landscaping be replaced. I'm concerned that that was part of the original approval and those trees have disappeared. I guess we also need to know whether the Annalee Dolls sign is located on that property. Mike – You have a note in your staff review comments. Faller indicated everything looked good as far as the proposed changes and he accepted everything. Finer asked if the question regarding whether or not it's a dam had been determined. Johnson – The State of New Hampshire has revised the limits for dams and this doesn't rise to the level of a dam. This does not need any dam permit. Bayard – I just want to clarify on the space here, on the plan we have a retention wall, catch basins and then you have an area that's kind of gray? Johnson – What I'm trying to do is to leave the actual site plan void of a lot of the engineering detail because it gets to be a little bit too cumbersome but I think you're

referring to the detention pond that shows up on the engineering plan which will be part of the approved set and that includes the detail in terms of the grading within the detention pond and the culvert sizes and those types of issues that were reviewed by Mr. Caron. Bayard – Will that then entail the elimination of trees and stuff in that area. Johnson – If there are trees in that area, they will have to come out. Bayard – It does not appear anything will be blocking the view along that busy road so I think that definitely reinforces our concern about the previous area and up to the edge of the retention pond that that be replanted or at least the trees that are there not be cut. Johnson – I guess my answer to that is we don't intend to cut any more trees than what the engineering will dictate. The original plan note was to leave the trees within the 30' setback undisturbed. The great majority of the detention pond is outside of the 30' setback so those trees would not be in conflict with the original 30'. We staked out the 30' setback for the Board to review on their site walk and based on John's comments and photographs; there were only a few stumps that were evidently cut within the 30' area and those trees according to Mr. Dearborn, were the trees that were diseased and in danger of coming down. They weren't cut for lumber or any other reason other than they were not healthy trees. The remainder of the site remains meticulously landscaped. There's not a lot of underbrush on the site but it's not overgrown with ugly vegetation. When we were proposing the roadway coming in from Annalee Place, we talked about having some landscaping along the roadway but we're not proposing the roadway there any more. The road's going to be on the uphill side of the building out of sight so we didn't think that the landscaping at that point would be necessary. If you plant trees at that elevation, we are not going to be able to plant trees that are going to block the building because there's a drop in elevation from the street side to the roadway. We were going to vegetate the edge of the roadway to conceal the roadway leading up through there, but since we eliminated that we didn't propose that vegetation. Bayard – I'm still a little uncomfortable, I'd like to see a little bit of trees put in where they were removed. It looks like some of them may have been removed for the proposed driveway. Obviously, trees grow and certainly initially it would have no impact. Bayard (inaudible). Vadney – The detention pond itself is going to take up roughly 50% of the area and road construction activity around it, I wouldn't expect to see those trees when they're done. Bayard – I'm talking the other area in front of the other building. Obviously, they are going to clear out the trees in the detention pond and probably a little bit on the sides. Johnson – One point I think the Board has to remember is that originally we didn't think that the drainage being caused by this site was significant enough to warrant a detention pond. That was something that was essentially directed by staff and the town consulting engineer so we're doing it to comply with the concerns that we've had about the drainage. We were putting the drainage detention pond in the only area that would accommodate the issues put before us. The other thing I think is important to remember is this is a 4.1 acre site and the lot coverage allowable by the Zoning Ordinance is 65% lot coverage. According to the plan, we are at 13.9% lot coverage and as I mentioned before, two-thirds of the property is being left undisturbed and the vegetation is going to remain there so we're talking potentially about 65% of 4 acres being allowed to be covered by buildings and impervious

surfaces and not be in violation of the zoning ordinance and we're proposing less than 14%. Bayard – The last approval requested that there be vegetation left in that particular area, it's been removed so I'd just like to see those few trees replaced. Johnson – We will be happy to count the number of stumps that fell within the 30' setback which is the area previously restricted and plant trees in the vicinity of those stumps that will grow to a sufficient height to eventually help screen the building. Bayard – That's all I'm looking for. Worsman – Carl, remember that we are looking at a building that has 4 parking spaces that is enormous and sometime down the road somebody's going to look to this Board to inhabit it with something else besides antique cars so it would behoove this Board to make some wise decisions so we have room for parking if we ever needed it. At this juncture, we're approving a huge building and making some concessions on the parking so hopefully the applicant will work with us as far as screening and things like that. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, I disagree with Colette. I do feel in the minutes and the notes on the plan that we're going to have it stipulated enough that if anybody comes back with anything else, they do have to come back before the Board. If this applicant is doing one particular thing with it and that meets his needs, I don't think we should restrict it more. We can't work with what we don't know about. Johnson – Mr. Chairman, if a future applicant were to come before the Board and propose a use that required additional parking, I think what we're trying to stress through out plan notes and the minutes is that plan may very well include lots of landscaping because you'll be increasing the lot coverage and so forth and maybe reducing the amount of existing vegetation that's there. As I said before, we'd be happy to replenish those trees in the buffer area. Vadney – We might lament the loss of some of those tall pines but many are already gone and I suspect if this building were to be put to a different use other trees would probably fall to make room for parking. There are unintended consequences to all of these decisions and that's one I think we're going to have to live with. Pam's correct, we have a plan note on there that say's if you want to change the use of this building, it has to go back before the Board at the time and that will determine if there will be any additional parking requirements or whatever. If you want to volunteer to put some kind of a hedge row or whatever in there that shields the building and if they are happy, I certainly don't mind. Kahn – I don't know what to do about it, but when this turns into a commercial use, there will be an application to put parking in the wetland buffer sure as shooting and that's the only place it can go because the only other place it can go is in the wetland. There's no other place for parking. This note we're putting on the plan to me is a waste of ink because it's obvious as can be that sometime in the future when Mr. Dearborn passes on, there will be an application to put parking in the wetland buffer or in the wetland so we're fooling ourselves. Vadney – Possibly, but I don't know how we can make one any stronger than that, it will have to go to the ZBA at the time and we'll play the cards as they fall at the time, but right now we've at least specified the best that we can. Johnson – During my analysis when we were talking about the parking issue and the road relocation, there are several other areas on the site available for parking. They would require extensive grading, retaining walls but nothing that's unusual, certainly nothing that rises to the level of some of the buildings that have already



been approved in the Town. There are plenty of places for parking other than in the wetland buffer. I've done a lot of applications before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for special exceptions within a wetland buffer and I can tell you that I would not be very confident going before the Zoning Board trying to get a special exception for this particular property. We'd have to build parking elsewhere and it can be done from an environmental standpoint and it can be done for not every application of the building but for most future commercial applications. You might remember that this building slightly up the hill is gargantuan in terms of size in relationship to this building and if you had to have a parking space to meet all the requirements for that building, you'd have several acres of parking. They don't rise to the level of requiring that much parking. Vadney – It is true that commercial properties that size can require hundreds of parking spaces and sometimes even factories only have a handful of parking places so all we can do is put a note in there that says it has to come before the Board to evaluate parking, traffic and all the other things. Jeff Fagnant – I was wondering if there's any reason if this does come back in front of you why you can't just deny it if it doesn't meet your specifications. Vadney – It is possible that we would do that. It very likely could come back before us and it would be a relative benign thing and not require many changes at all. It could be less parking than the 12 or the 4 they are asking for. We've had some large buildings used for furniture storage in the past and a truck just comes every day and very few cars are ever there. We just can't estimate on that, right now we've just put a note on there that it needs to come back for review and there may be no issue at all. As Carl pointed out, there are places if they were to dig into the hill and put in some retaining walls at the north end of the building where they are showing a truck apron, there could be some parking added there. There's probably some that could be put on the east side of the building. I would think without going into the wetland, they could come up with 20 or 30 spaces, but that's just a guess. We'd certainly look at whatever the plan was and go with the ordinance at the time.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR RAFD REALTY, LLC, FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO CONSTRUCT A BUILDING ADDITION AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON TAX MAP S23, LOT 33, LOCATED AT 57 RESERVOIR ROAD IN THE BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) WE GRANT A PARKING WAIVER OF 12 SPACES AND IF ANY ADDITIONAL SPACES ARE NEEDED, THEY WOULD HAVE TO COME BACK BEFORE THE BOARD.
- (2) SOME TREES SHALL BE PUT BACK IN WHERE THEY HAVE BEEN CUT DOWN AS NOTED BY THE SURVEYOR.
- (3) 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

HAS AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE AMOUNT OF THE GUARANTEE IN LIEU OF ANOTHER PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD OR STAFF CAN SEND IT BACK BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD. THE FORM OF THE GUARANTEE SHALL BE EITHER CASH OR LETTER OF CREDIT. THE FORMAT OF THE LETTER OF CREDIT OR CASH AGREEMENT SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE FINANCE DIRECTOR.

- (4) THE ENGINEER SHALL VERIFY THAT THE PROPOSED ACCESS CAN HANDLE APPARATUS UP TO 60,000 POUNDS AND THAT SHALL BE NOTED ON THE FINAL PLANS.
- (5) THE EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN (SHEET E-1) SHALL BE STAMPED BY THE WETLAND SCIENTIST AND THE SURVEYOR.
- (6) PLANS SHALL BE AMENDED TO INDICATE THE APPROVAL IS FOR NON-COMMERCIAL PERSONAL STORAGE USE. ANY OTHER USE SHALL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL.
- (7) THE FINAL PLANS SHALL SHOW THE LOCATION OF THE ANNALEE DOLLS SIGN IF IT IS LOCATED ON THIS PROPERTY.
- (8) THE BOARD HAS THE RIGHT TO RESERVE AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATIONS NO. 7 & 17.

Voted 6-1 in favor of the motion.

Bayard moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR RAFD REALTY, LLC, AT THE SAME LOCATION AND THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPERTIES IN THE AREA. Voted unanimously.

**5. TRUE ROAD, LLC AND LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST –**

Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer 5.0217 ac. from Tax Map S14, Lot 29, to Tax Map U11, Lot 63, located on Boynton Road in the Residential District.

Linda Harvey, LACLT – We're a non-profit affordable group that has a mission to develop housing that's affordable to the local work force and we've done a lot of very successful work in the City of Laconia and several years ago the Select Board Town Manager, Town Planner and business community of the Town of Meredith came to us and asked if we could come and help the Town of Meredith because of the great job we have done in the City of Laconia because we need rental housing for our local work force. A couple years ago we worked hard but were not successful; we couldn't find land at that time at a price that we could afford to make it work. At the urging again of the Selectboard more recently who voted to re-invite us back and urged us to come help again, we've been working with the town leadership and the business community to find land that would work for housing. Somebody at City Hall was aware of the land on Boynton Road and introduced us to the owner and we started discussions and have made great progress and it looks like we might have a wonderful housing project for your citizens. Bob Reals

is really our in-house expert and unfortunately he couldn't be here tonight but other members of the development team are here and can sort of do the technical talk for you and I'm available to answer other questions. Harry Wood, Associated Surveyors – Our project breaks down into several different steps in order to get to the final review. The first one of these we've already filed with you and which I have on the board now calls for a Boundary Line Adjustment between U11-63 and an adjacent property. There is no intention of increasing the trailer park in size, there are 13 units, one of them being a house at the present and the plans are to have 13 afterwards but the ordinance calls for a minimum 10-acre site for a trailer park. Although the use is already there on 7 acres, there was no desire to try to process it at anything less than 10 acres so the Trust went to the various abutters in the area and worked out a solution where in this particular instance, they would acquire just over 5 acres of land from the adjacent owner, True Road, LLC, better known as Ambrose pit property. The Ambrose property is vacant at the present time. It basically is a wooded area with a snowmobile trail running through it so at the present moment there's no intention of changing that as it would be fairly removed from the developed portion of the site. We have already set the boundary markers on the 5-acre parcel. The reason for that was so the participants could view the limits of the property and make sure that's what they had agreed to. Usually when we have a boundary line adjustment it has a number of conditions, one being that there's a mortgage release if one is required, the pins be set and the document be executed prior to recording of the plan. In this particular instance, we would add one additional condition and that is that the BLA is subject to the approval of the second item to come before you which is a Subdivision and then further conditional upon the approval of the site plans that deal with the two parcels that will be created. In essence, this is a technicality to bring the overall property up to the total size required by the ordinance although we do not intend to develop any portion of this 5 acres. Bayard – I'm not really familiar with this area so what impact does this have on Ambrose in terms of any impervious surface, are they grandfathered in or what's the impact on the Ambrose property of transferring some of this land, if any. Wood – The Ambrose property is approximately 50 acres in size and it has no impervious. It has piles of rock, piles of gravel, piles of sand and even the rock areas are just stacks of it. It doesn't prevent water from going down through it or returning. Some of the 50 acres would be wetland conditions but this area is kind of isolated, it's kind of off to one side and the only concern that Ambrose had with regard to this conveyance was that he wanted to be sure he could still get off of Ambrose Road if he had to in order to go down into the remainder of his property and you can see we've shown it up there's just under 250' of frontage on Ambrose Road that would allow him to either come in that direction or possibly create an additional lot off of Ambrose Road. Vadney – Is there such a word as pervious, we use impervious? That's basically a sand pit. Wood – Mr. Chairman, I think the staff review basically indicates that if action is taken on this, it should be conditional upon the approval of the secondary issues such as the subdivision and the site plans. Comments open to the public in case some abutters were there just for the subdivision portion of the meeting. We will not be approving the whole thing tonight and will do a site walk. Laura Rice,

Ambrose Road – Ambrose Road is a private road and you've had conversations with Mr. Ambrose about a lot being maintained for him and access, I just need more information as to whether or not that's going to be a thruway from Boynton Road because right now Ambrose Road is a dead-end private road and there is no access all the way down through and we'd like to keep it that way. Wood – There is no plan to connect Ambrose Road to this particular project in any way, shape or form. Mr. Ambrose also has no plans at the moment to do anything off of Ambrose Road. He simply asked us to make sure that there was room to come in that way or to create an additional lot if it ever happens in the future. He's just looking at it as the value of his land and for you it would in all probability, because of the residential nature of Ambrose Road, it would probably only end up being one additional house lot. But again, if he were to do anything, he has to come in here and you'd have a chance to see what he's doing. Morrison – I'm here representing the person that's handling the estate of Medora Morrison which is one of the lots that runs along the northern side of Boynton Road. The question I have is from Lot 63 to Lot 67 on your map and Lot 68, what effect is this housing development going to have on these properties. Are they going to be able to be sold or is it something that's going to put a big cramp in real estate because a lot of these properties right now don't have Town sewerage, which if you're going to run it up to this building complex, I assume they are going to have it on Boynton Road too. Vadney – Harry, do you know where that line's coming in? Morrison – The main thing I want to know is what's going to happen to all these other properties. Vadney – As far as this project, I think I can say nothing, but there will be some change in the neighborhood which I would speculate with the sewer and things, it could be an advantage. Chris Nedeau, Nobis Engineering – Sewer is planned to go all the way up Boynton Road to the project and there will be services stubbed to all the lots along Boynton Road as well. Louann Breen – The sewer that's going up Boynton Road, do the homeowners have to connect to that and are they going to pay access fees? Vadney – I believe that's the rule but I won't guarantee that is the case. What about water is that also going to this new development? The water line is also planned to be extended to that. I don't know if this is the right time to discuss that but water is an issue in Town right now. We need to discuss that further, maybe later in the meeting? That's a big issue with this development. Vadney – We will be discussing that? Linda Harvey – I don't know all the details but I know that the Meredith Town Master Plan called for bringing that sewer line up there anyway in 2009 and that's the plan in the Capital Plan and the requirement at that point would be that the neighbors would have to tie into it at that expense. We are proposing to bring that line up and save the Town \$300,000 of expense to do that and we're talking with the Town right now and one of our proposals is we're asking them to waive the connection fees for the neighbors so we're advocating for that right but that will be a Town decision. ??Are these maps available, I think you guys had a presentation last week and I was away, can we see those at another time. Vadney – All of the information is always available at the Town Hall Annex at the Planning Office. We're talking right now about the Boundary Line Adjustment but in a few minutes we're going to talk about the Subdivision and the proposed actual change in what they are planning to do for buildings. I think when

you see those plans; you'll see how they are going to affect the neighborhood. My guess is it will actually move things away from the houses you're talking about, 63 thru 68, it will move things a bit away from those because of the way they're swinging some of the existing mobile homes down to a new cul-de-sac and then putting their new buildings to the back end of this modified property so that will become a little clearer. The Boundary Line Adjustment is just assembling a piece of land that can then have those things happen to it but it should help those few houses in that immediate area that you mentioned. Matt Goodwin – You said you had purchased 5 acres to meet the ordinance of 10. Did I also understand that you said you wouldn't do anything ultimately with that, you would just be doing it to meet the ordinance or did you say you would be developing that additional 5 acres? Wood – At the present time, there is no requirement or expectation of touching any portion of that 5 acres and there would be some additional vegetation on the parent parcel which would also remain. There are a couple of wetlands on that side of the parent property and that increases the buffer to where it's going to be developed so there will be as a minimum, a 50' buffer plus the wetlands plus this entire 5 acres will remain pretty much as it is and the trail will still be available for the uses it's been put to in the past. Vadney – What it is, the Town ordinance requires that any mobile home park have 10 acres before it can become a mobile home park, it has nothing to do with the density of how many mobile homes you can put there, it has to have the 10 acres. This one was built on 7 acres sometime in the past, they are just adding that land to bring that up to code even though they could say they are grandfathered and not do it. As part of that, they are shifting some things around and I think 7 of those units will be moved. They came to us last December or so with a preliminary design that had a road going pretty much through the middle of the trailer park to get out to the new buildings they were planning to build and we suggested that there might be a better place to put that road and they came up with a very innovative way to do it by making this land modification and moving 7 of the homes. I think it's going to improve things for everybody in the neighborhood. I think the new buildings will be situated in a much more convenient area or setting and the way they are shifting the mobile homes, I think it will probably turn out to be a pretty good plan. That's the reason for the shifting of land and the Boundary Line Adjustment to get that piece of land assembled so they could then do this. Carol Cassell, Boynton Road – I'm not happy at all with this. The road is not wide enough and we already have a lot of traffic on that road and it is supposed to be a dead-end but we still have a lot of traffic that goes through. The road that comes out from the Park, people do not stop and they don't even slow down. We've almost gotten hit before because we'd be going and all of a sudden somebody will fly out. If we have more people there, we're going to have more problems and you're not going to widen the road that much because of the cemetery and Ambrose is on the other side so when you basically have a horse & buggy road down through there and you're going to have all this traffic, it looks to me like there will be traffic jams. It sounds as if the road is coming out differently than what I had heard so I don't know if it's up more on the bend of the road or just where it is but I know that for a while with some people living across from me coming out of their driveway, a lot of times during the winter they would be spinning out of their

yard and when they hit the road, I thought the car was going to hit me at times. There could still be that same problem but the road is not that wide and as was said earlier, you don't want to hear about the water but its there. If we don't have enough water now how are we going to have enough water to bring a whole lot more people to be using water? I think that is a big issue along with the road and because we have a little bit of a wooded area, I don't think it needs to be built on. Think of our poor animals that need a place to live with some food instead of all hot top or all dirt. Also, what about the fire and everything, you've got a house here with all kinds of people in it. There's a whole lot here not being brought up. I think this is supposed to be low income but from what I've heard, if this is low income and it costs more than what I can make a year to be able to go into this place, how is it low income? I think a whole lot more should be said and looked into because to me it doesn't look like a very good situation with the road and everything. Vadney – I can't answer all those questions but some you'll see will be answered in a few minutes when we get into the details of what they are planning to do. As far as the road, we will be looking closely at that bend in the road, the traffic coming out of there and traffic control and also I know there will be some discussion on a bike lane but I think that's now disappearing and there'll be a sidewalk or something but we'll see what they present. Public hearing on BLA closed @ 8:20 p.m. No further action will be taken on the BLA this evening.

6. **LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST:** Proposed Subdivision of Tax Map U11, Lot 63, into two (2) lots (10 ac. and 7.62 ac.), located on Boynton Road in the Residential District.

Harry Wood – The second necessary step in the proposed development of this site would be a Subdivision of the overall combined property. In order to manage the two proposed uses efficiently, it makes sense to separate them. We'd have a 10-acre parcel for the mobile home park which would have exactly the same number of units that are there now and then the additional 7 acres of property would involve the new proposal. This is the plan that was submitted for the Subdivision portion and again the Subdivision would be contingent upon the Site Plan being approved. If final action were never taken on the site plans, neither the boundary line adjustment nor the subdivision would occur at least not for this particular applicant at this time. Wood - There was a layout of Boynton Road in 1861 which came in from Route 3 and ended before it got to the Blaisdell residence, however, the usage for well over 20 years has continued beyond that and the Town would claim that their road goes further and would include both the Rollins property and the ones on the other side of the road. I believe the water goes up all the way at the present time. The sewer would only come up to the project and then a stub would be placed for possible future extension up to the other homes which would be Rollins and beyond. That detail has not been finalized, it's just a recommendation from the Water & Sewer Department to be a stub placed in that location. Vadney – Harry's pointed out a couple of the major features so you'll know how to look at that map. The entire area in pink is the assembled piece of land and now he's going to show you how that interior one gets subdivided out. The entrance off Boynton

Road is pretty much on the corner. In order to simplify things, there's only one entrance proposed for the two properties. There would be a new roadway or driveway whichever you care to call it going into this project and both properties would use the same access. The access would be moved from where it is now further into the corner where it's easier to see in both directions. Right now the road coming out of the Park can't see very well to the right because there's a dwelling in the way. That dwelling is to be removed and you're almost beyond the corner so you have a tendency to drive out of there without bothering to look to your left. As this is configured, it will be more of a stop where you come out of the Park because you're beyond the curve. The proposed division would follow the interior pink line. The existing units which are located in this area and the existing dwelling, those 7 existing uses would be relocated down into the lower portion of the property so they would be further away from the neighbors rather than closer. The new project which is not shown in this at all except for the driveway access will be on this central piece which is labeled Lot 1. What we've shown here are just the boundaries of the proposed subdivision and a statement that the subdivision would be proposed with municipal utilities and it does not show any use or improvements or details with regard to the project on this particular plan. Those details would come on the site plan which will be discussed in a moment and without the approval of the site plans, this Subdivision probably will not occur. If we subdivide it as they're asking, the two properties will be one piece of property with the 13 or 14 mobile homes on it and it will be that kind of a gerrymandered hook and the "U" shape and the second property will be the center piece which will be the new homes that Linda and her staff are proposing. That's what he means when he says the two properties, he's not referring to any of your properties and he's talking about this piece of assembled land being cut into oddly shaped pieces to serve those two purposes. Vadney – I think now the best thing would be to get the proposal and then they will go into the details of how they are going to move the several mobile homes down into a new cul-de-sac and how they are going to take the second parcel and put 32 units on it. We'll hear the details and along with that some of the questions about how the road will come out and meet up with the existing Boynton Road and maybe the safety concerns that you have will be answered.

**LACONIA AREA COMMUNITY LAND TRUST** – Proposed site plan for 32 units of multi-family affordable housing and relocation of seven (7) existing manufactured housing units with related site improvements, Tax Map U11, Lot 63, located on Boynton Road in the Residential District.

Chris Nedeau, Nobis Engineering – To orient everybody, Chris pointed out Boynton Road and the existing driveway to the trailer park. There are 12 existing mobile homes and one free-standing stick built house on the front of the lot. This is the Ambrose property over in here and to the back, the area that will be annexed to this lot. There is a PSNH ROW that runs down through the site and Kelly Lane. The proposal is for 32 new units of work force or affordable housing. The new 32 units will be in 4 buildings, each building will have 8 units apiece. Each unit will be two

stories so it will be like a townhouse configuration with one of the end units being accessible and just a single-story. We are moving the existing driveway over to get a better sight line and widening it out to 24' wide. It will be a private driveway; it will not be a Town road. The driveway will come in about 600', two 600' legs to access the 4 buildings that we have on the site. We also have a 400' cul-de-sac that's going to service the 6 existing mobile homes on this side and the 7 new units that will be relocated from up here to down here on the cul-de-sac so you can see here the subdivision line runs roughly between the two developments. The existing site is serviced by municipal water which runs right by the site. We are actually going to tap into that with a larger line so that these buildings can be sprinklered. We'll be running a 6" water line up through around the site. The existing mobile homes will be tied into the water system as well. Some of them already are, but we are obviously going to have to do the new units as well. The existing site is serviced by septic systems so what we're doing is tying into the existing sewer down on Route 3, we're extending the sewer line 1,100' up Boynton Road, we're providing sewer service stubs to each of the houses on the way up Boynton Road, a stub for Kelly Lane for future tie-in if necessary and a future stub for the units for the houses that are further up on Boynton Road. We'll be carrying the sewer into the site; we have to construct an additional 1,200' of sewer to service the new buildings and the existing mobile homes. Storm water drainage for this site, we are cutting some trees, we are adding impervious area, fortunately this area is very well drained it's a very well drained gravel so all the storm water that will be running off the paved surfaces will actually be infiltrated back into the ground so we're proposing a series of very shallow detention areas, they are not ponds so they won't be full of water, they'll just actually allow the storm water to collect in them and then they will infiltrate into the ground. Per ordinance we are required to have 53 parking spaces for the proposed 32 new units. In the new units there will be 3 1-bedroom units, 17 2-bedroom units and 12 3-bedrooms units that will require us to have 53 parking spaces. We are actually providing 64 for overflow for visitors that might be coming in and visiting. Each of the mobile homes will have their own gravel driveways off of the paved road. We are providing as required a 50' buffer around the newly relocated mobile homes which is required by the ordinance. We do show in the lighter green the areas that will be retained as vegetative cover and trees. We inadvertently cut out some areas in through here that can be put back in as part of the 50' buffer to the mobile homes. We've used the term mobile homes throughout the night, the units will actually be upgraded to hopefully manufactured homes, not some of the ones out there now that you see. We are enhancing the landscaping on site, we're providing some additional buffering particularly on the entrance road for this residence, we're providing an evergreen screen which is not there now to try and screen more against the house. Again, we are pushing the driveway entrance further away from this house as well to try and buffer and screen that residence more. We'll also be adding some tree buffers between the two properties. I'll mention that Laconia Area Community Land Trust is pursuing what's called LEED certification for the project and if you're not familiar with LEED certification it's an acronym that stands for Leadership, Energy in Environmental Design. It's a program put out by the US Green Building Council to promote



healthy building that are low energy users, they are sited properly on properties, they are clustered so you don't have to tear all the trees down. There's a huge list of things required to obtain LEED certification and that's something that LACLT is striving for on this project. This will be the first project of its kind in the State. We invited abutters to a meeting last Tuesday night, we sent out 25 invitations, 5 people showed up and we had a very good back and forth with the abutters, explained what we are doing and we want to keep the lines of communication open with the abutters and certainly would want to talk with them further and help them understand what we're proposing. I know it's a lot to digest in one evening and one quick plan so far away from you. Linda Harvey – They said at that meeting they were really satisfied and none of them came tonight so I'm hoping it's true. Of the 5 abutters that showed up, I don't believe any of them are here this evening. On the plan the brown areas are wetlands and per the Town requirements, we're maintaining a 50' buffer from all the wetlands on the site so we are not disturbing any wetlands or wetland buffers for the project. Vadney – I'm intrigued by the statement that when you relocate the 7 units, as I understand it, the stick built house will be destroyed and it appears that the 6 mobile homes at the north end will also be destroyed or moved or whatever and you'll have 7 manufactured homes put down at the cul-de-sac, is that the plan? Linda Harvey – There's a mix of units there, some of those units are owned by the owner of the property and are rented out by the occupants and other of the units are owned by the occupants and they rent the lots underneath them and some of them quite frankly are in pretty poor condition and our goal is to upgrade those units for sure and we met with the occupants a couple weeks ago and talked about how we might help them for the units that we might end up owning, we are absolutely upgrading those. For the units that are owned by their occupants, they were very interested in upgrading their units and we have access to programs that could help them with favorable financing and we have financial counseling and other things. Vadney – Of these 13 existing homes, how many of those do you expect to end up owning? Harvey - The owner currently owns 4 so at a minimum 4 of the units and there may well be current owners who are not interested in staying, they would rather rent either in the new units going up or give up their units because there's no way they could even move them because they are in such horrible condition. Vadney – My real question, I'm a bit concerned because right now you're doing nothing with the 6 or 7 units that are not changing in any way. Your plan is to upgrade those as well? When it's all said and done, your 32 completely new units and then 13 existing units, you will have acquired the entire parcel of land and you'll own everything as far as land goes or will the owners still own the land underneath the mobile homes. Harvey – That's an interesting question. One option for the occupants of the existing Park is they have the option under State law and with our encouragement to become homeowners and to collectively buy their park and form a cooperative. There's already at least one of those in Meredith and I think about 35% of the parks in the State have converted to cooperative ownership and so we invited members of the New Hampshire Community Loan Fund that helps people think about if that's something they would want to do so they've already had several meetings with the occupants and we would fully support that effort and do it in conjunction with them.

If they choose not to organize and become cooperative owners, then the non-profit Land Trust would in fact become the owner of that property and lease the lots to the occupants. Vadney – My real question is simple, will all 13 of the mobile homes have the option to be upgraded to a replacement home? Harvey – Absolutely. Bliss – You mention affordable housing, can you tell me in your mind what is affordable housing and how will the rent work, will they be owned, will they be like condos, what is the plan there? Linda Harvey – We were asked by your Town leadership and the town employees to help create housing that was affordable to the local work force and that really is our emphasis in Laconia. We've been doing development for close to 15 years and our focus is the workers. Our program doesn't work for people who don't have jobs or who have no income. There are different poverty programs that are available for those folks but our folks target the people who essentially make under \$14.00/hour. The rent is set, it's not like a public housing project you might have heard of where people move in their rents are subsidized such that they pay 30% of their income in rent. That's a typical public housing or subsidized housing model. That's not our model at all. Bliss – Can you give us an estimate of what the rents will be for a 1-bedroom vs. a 3-bedroom. Some people think things are affordable and they are really not, that's what I'm concerned about. My other question is if this is going to be affordable housing, are there any Federal monies coming into it and how long will it have to stay affordable housing or could it in the future go into something else? Linda Harvey – I can tell you that there are at this point about 11 sources of financing that will be packaged together to create this and much of it is Federal funds. The largest piece of it is a program called Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and we're hoping to hear this month that we'll be awarded those credits. It is Federal funds. All the different financing has different retention restrictions on it, most of them run between 20 and 40 years but as a non-profit community land trust, our absolute mission is about permanent affordable housing so that everything that we create has deed restrictions that guarantee we're creating community assets that will be assets for the community in perpetuity. Bliss – Could you get us those rental fees for the next meeting? As far as the units themselves, what is the height of the buildings, I'm assuming they are probably two-story? Nedeau – That is correct. Bliss – As we look at the dimension of the 5 acre parcel that we're talking about adding to this parcel, how are these abutters on that 5 acres of land and up above going to look down onto this proposed subdivision. Nedeau – The buildings are two stories, they are like two-story townhouses. The grade in this back area does go up quite a bit and it's all wooded back here so the property back here to the east is much higher than the buildings down here. Vadney – But the 5 acres being added will have nothing done to it. Nedeau – That's correct. The 5 acres is not associated with the 32-units of affordable housing so these 5 acres actually back here are being tied to the manufactured home park and there are no plans for development of that, that 5 acres will stay as is. It's pretty much not buildable because of the steepness of the slope back there and the wetlands. We are proposing to maintain recreation trails or enhance some recreation trails in and around the site. There are quite a few trails particularly up the power easement that will be tied into the site for people to walk. Bliss – This probably isn't going to

sound very good but if I were an abutter knowing you were wanting to put this development up and I was up on this hill, those trails would concern me because you are talking about a huge population coming in that hasn't been there before. I as a Board member would like to see trails down on their part but not on their 5-acre parcel. Maybe something towards the park that's going to gear them over to where they should be but, not up in the woods around the other abutters. Linda Harvey – That was a requirement of Mr. Ambrose, he wanted to make sure that we preserved the trail that's always been available to the community. ?? Not add trails, preserve the trail that's there. Harvey – That was our plan. We're not going to add trails. Vadney – They are just not disturbing what has traditionally been used as a trail. We'll do a site walk on this and we would like you to point out the location of the trail. Mike Faller, PWD – I believe all of you have my staff review comments. I want to bring your attention to Item #11, the ROW of Boynton Road. I did some brief research and in the beginning I wrote the report and said 33', I have done some further investigation and as Harry eluded to earlier, it appears it could be 25'. I question the road profile of what I've asked for puts it outside the ROW limits and its concerning. The Board needs to be aware of Boynton Road and approximately 1,100' or so in from Route 3 but having a 25' ROW doing a subdivision, the Board needs to be aware of that, it's a concern. We all know bus stops have been readjusted throughout the Town of Meredith. The kids walk along Boynton Road to Route 3 which is the bus stop. I'm sure 32-units of 3 bedrooms and 2-bedrooms and 1-bedroom units, there's going to be a number of kids that are going to be living here at some point in the future. These kids are all going to be walking down Boynton Road to get to the school bus stop so Boynton Road is clearly a concern of mine. I was pretty emphatic that we do need a sidewalk on that road and having 25' really limits what you can do. I question do we need more ROW. That entails approaching abutters so there's a lot here that the Board really needs to look at. I think it's a great concept but getting to it might be a little bit of a problem. Vadney – I'm glad you brought that up because I forgot to. We do have some questions on the road; do you have any specifics on that tonight? Nedeau – On Boynton Road or on the proposed driveway? Vadney – Boynton Road. Nedeau – At this point we've received the comments from Mike and staff and originally we were not proposing to do anything other than extend the sewer up Boynton Road but again that's under discussion right now with staff as to what appropriate modifications to the road might be. Vadney – Harry, do you have any additional comments on Boynton Road itself? Wood – The only thing I can add is that I met with Mike the other day and discussed the 1861 layout and the usage that's there now slightly exceeds the width in the 1861 layout. Most of the monuments that are set for the properties on the side of the road appear to be set at 33', that doesn't mean they are necessarily correct but it indicates the portion of the abutter's property that they anticipate using is approximately 33' wide as you progress up and down the road. The Town of Meredith owns the cemetery parcel so there is a possibility of a couple of feet there if it's absolutely necessary to accommodate sidewalk or whatever and that's the majority of the length of the road right there. When you get beyond that up towards the entrance to the site as I say the majority of the monuments appear to be about 33' apart and it's kind of similar

to the length of the road in that the 1861 layout doesn't get to this site but the usage by the Town over more than a 20-year period is well beyond this site. It goes almost to the gate going to the pit area of Ambrose. Faller – Again, one of the further comments there is I really do think we need to have some survey done and really depict what's there and have some deed research whether it is 25' or 33' would be nice to know and I think the Board would have a better feeling going into this knowing what's there. Vadney – That's certainly something we have to get down very clearly. Carol Cassell - I'd like to point out is I'm hearing that the abutters here have gotten notices about other meetings, this is the very first meeting that I have heard anything on. I've heard a little bit from a couple people that this was going on so chances are there could be more people that did not know about this other than just myself. How is this really going to better our area by you move in with these big buildings and a whole bunch of people and what about our taxes, we're paying pretty high taxes now, what is it going to do to our taxes because everything that Meredith seems to do and probably other places too not just Meredith, our taxes always seem to keep going up and nothing stays the same or goes down. How much more is this going to be costing us and how much more is this going to be putting up our taxes? Vadney – Those are questions that we cannot answer because we do not have the ability or the wherewithal to do so. Harvey – I don't know if this is helpful but a lot of times when people hear that a non-profit is being involved with housing development, the assumption is because it's often true non-profit groups are exempt from paying property taxes and I can tell you that as a founding principle of the community land trust motto, we pay full property taxes on all of our inventory. In fact in Laconia, we have paid in excess of a million dollars of property taxes to the City of Laconia. Cassell – The taxes will still go up because more people are going need more. I think its time we quit buying or whatever, we've got more than enough. We've got more probably than what Boston's got, Community Center and Police Station, we're way over. When I go by this place here, day and night lights are always on, I'm paying for these lights and these other people are paying for these lights and all of this that's going on. We don't make all that big money, some people do but some of us don't. Vadney – That's one of the most interesting conundrums of Town management. All towns are at their optimum level because if people leave, they have to raise taxes to cover the expenses and if more people come in they have to raise taxes to cover expenses. Morrison – Correct me if I'm wrong, but all this does for Lot 64 on up to 67 and 68 according to my map is somebody shoves a sewer pipe there and tells you to hook onto it. The other problem is that most of those lots are going to lose some frontage if you don't have 33' up there, right? Vadney – That's somewhat likely, yes. Morrison – Most of those lots are very small now, you take 10 or 15 feet off of each one of them, somebody's going to have a problem. The Town of Meredith right now has one of those lots assessed for \$115,000.00 and I'd like to know who the people were that they sent up there to assess that because obviously they've got something wrong with them. There's not a place up there worth that much money that I can see. The lady here says it's going to give you a problem with the taxes, the taxes are already giving us a problem. You can't sell most of those places for half of what they are assessed for so how are you going to

do anything once this outfit gets in there? Vadney – Interesting points. I do think if there's a ROW issue and whether or not there would be any additional encroachments, I don't know but if there were to be, I wouldn't think they'd be more than 2 or 3 feet on each side or something of that nature from what Harry and Mike have told us. It wouldn't be the 15 or 20 feet off the front lawn but I think there could be some that lose 1-3 feet or something in that range but that's just speculation. ??A couple of you have sort of brushed your hands at the other houses up Boynton Road, those mysterious few houses. We happen to be one of those. Can you give me an idea of what the legs are on a project like this, how long do you think it would take to do something like this. Nedeau – You're asking how long it would take to construct the project. Particularly a project of this size would take about a year to construct anywhere from 9 months to 1 year. You would expect that once they had their financing and their approvals in place and construction began, you'd have folks moving in about a year from that point. ?? Fantastic. We've already talked about the narrow road. I can only imagine the fun it's going to be for me to get down to one of those other houses up there going through the construction area and a year's worth of your construction in the whole area, now you've mentioned this might have great advantages. We're one of the houses up there, we're not getting the sewer according to this plan, so what benefit are we getting, in fact we might be losing frontage. We're not getting anything out of this and we're getting a bunch of houses, frankly, we don't really want. Now we've got two-story houses and we don't have a whole lot of that down Boynton Road or any of the side roads really so this is really not doing us any favors I don't think. Vadney – I did want to add to this lady's question about the notification of that informal meeting you said you did not know about and I don't know who they notified on that and I also don't know where your house is in relation to this. What state law requires and what the applicant does as far as notification of abutters, they are direct abutters to the property or directly across the street from the property. Those are the ones that are legally required to be noticed. Wood – We also notified people along Boynton Road up to the project. Cassell – I am right across from the house that's being torn down. I have never gotten anything until this last letter for tonight. Vadney – I won't worry about what didn't happen, but in a few minutes we are going to continue this for a second hearing and there could be a third and fourth hearing too but we'll be continuing it tonight and when we do that, we'll set a date for the next hearing and that will be your notification. You won't be getting more letters. If any of your neighbors like you not knowing about it, please pass it on to them. We will set a date before we leave here tonight on when the next hearing will be and also a site walk. Deb Brien – We did receive notification of tonight's meeting but we did not receive anything for last week and we are abutters. Feel free to ask questions on the Boundary Line Adjustment we looked at first, then the proposed Subdivision of that realigned piece of property and then once it's subdivided, this is what plans to be done to the two portions of it, the moving of the mobile homes, two new 600' stubs for the 32 units. Luann Breen – As a mobile home owner, I'm concerned about the mobile homes. When you talk about moving the homes, there's a lot of expense involved with the new law with putting cement slabs, tie-downs and all of that, who is going to pay for that and then

with upgrading the homes is that also going to be a burden on the mobile home owner now? Harvey – Are you an owner in this particular park? Breen – Inter-Lakes Mobile Home Park. We met with the occupants in this Park and they seemed pretty excited about the opportunities we would have for them and it's a combination. Breen – Who's going to pay for it? Harvey – It's a combination, we'll be paying for the bulk of it but people will also be making contributions depending on their circumstances and what they want beyond what we might be providing. Vadney – If they just wanted to move their existing mobile home, you would prepare the new site with a concrete slab and bring that up to standards. If they should want to upgrade to a manufactured home or something like that or walk-out basements, there could be some cost sharing. The details would be too complex for tonight but that gives you the idea and you should also pay close attention to what they are talking about, there could be some advantage for you. ?? If I understood this correct as part of your planning, you're also going to make some ponds out there to collect the water and let it sit. We have wetlands that a lot of times we wished we didn't have because of the bugs, mosquitoes and everything it collects, why aren't you putting in a hazard by doing that? Vadney – I suspect with the amount of gravel out there, those ponds won't hold very much. Nedeau – Actually, it's a technical term, a detention pond, all it does is allow the water to infiltrate in and there will not be any standing water in those areas. They are very shallow, 2-3 feet, and the water just collects in them and then infiltrates into the ground immediately so they won't be wet and they won't become wetlands. Vadney – It's simply a place to store storm water while it soaks into the ground and in that gravelly area, it won't take very long so there will not be wet ponds there, they are dry ponds if you will most of the time. Faller – We said earlier that we weren't extending any trails to the existing trail, the black lines going from the parking areas out, is that basically a footpath extension to the trail itself and one's actually showing through the wetland area there down below so if that could be clarified? Nedeau – I think the initial proposal was to extend the trails but I think what we're hearing tonight the abutters would prefer not to see any extensions. We do show some trail connections, there is an existing path through here to the power easement that we are just relocating because there's going to be a manufactured home in its place. These other trails are, I don't believe they are existing, we're proposing them but it may be something we have to take out if the abutters aren't interested in having that. Vadney – That's something I'd like to hear all of you folks in that area weigh in on because the Board has for quite a few years had kind of an unwritten policy that any place that we can when subdividing land if there's a nice convenient place whereby putting a 10-15' wide easement across the corner of somebody's property that won't be a great hindrance to that property that allows people the legal right-of-way then you can walk through neighborhoods and stuff and you may not be aware but there are a number of these existing. There are a lot of those things laid out there. These would be a similar kind of thing if they are not a great hindrance to you, we try to put some of those in there kind of as roots for the future. Nedeau - The existing trails run along the 5-acre parcel that's being annexed. There is an existing trail there to the power line easement that runs along the entire southern boundary. There is also a trail from the mobile home park out

to that easement as well. We're going to continue to have that access to the easement down here, we're proposing two other trails whether the abutters want them or not, we'd be open. Vadney – That's something for you to think about whether you think those would be a good thing for the future. Laura Rice – That one trail I think you're talking about actually runs, I'm the abutter on this side of it, it's like a main corridor for the snowmobilers and it comes onto the power line and I know the power line is used extensively and I think if you were to take that away, I'm not saying you will, but I think that needs to be maintained. I don't think there's a lot of space there really on the other side into the park for just trails. I think you should keep the snowmobile trail, but I'd just as soon not have anyone walking around my back yard either. Bliss – If I can just do a follow-up to that, when I say I don't want to see trails, I want the existing trail to stay there to the power line. It's all the extra little trails and I just did a quick calculation just to give you an idea if we've got 3 1-bedroom units, 17 2-bedroom units, and 12 3-bedroom units, that's 105 people and that's only counting one person per bedroom except a couple. That's a lot of people and that is my reasoning for not thinking you should have all these trails to protect the abutters but I definitely think this one should stay. My other question is in this affordable housing is someone with a 3-bedroom house going to be able to have 8 people living there and are there stipulations on how many people can live there? Harvey – Quite frankly, I don't know what the code is for Meredith but I know what the code is for Laconia and I can't imagine us wanting to do anything different even if your Town allowed more but we would never allow more than two people per bedroom. Bliss – Who is in charge of that? Are you guys the management company that is in charge of making sure that if somebody says they've got 4 living there, that's what it is? Harvey – We out-source our property management to a professional property management company but as owner we set the criteria, the selection policy and the occupancy rules, we set all that out and then the property management company enforces it. Bliss – The reason I ask this question is because if you have more people in there, it's going to be a heavier burden on the land, the water and on the unit. Harvey – That's not a burden we would want. Leif Kimball – I live right here which abuts all of this. You say there are 13 units over there. Nedeau – There's 12 and the house. Kimball – Do you consider the storage trailer as the 12<sup>th</sup> unit that's not connected to anything? You can't count that storage shed as somebody living there. Nedeau – No, we're not. Kimball – Yes you are because you're saying there are 13 mobile homes. Nedeau – You might be right, we might be talking about 13. I'm just checking here what we show. Will Starace - I believe the negotiation when they were talking with John and some of the other people, but because we had to tear down the stickbuilt house, they agreed to make the storage trailer into a useable living unit, not that exact unit but a space. Vadney – You're saying John Edgar agreed to that? Starace – I believe John and Bill Edney discussed that with Bob Reals and whoever he had with him but that's the information I received. Bayard – Is it currently a two-family house? Starace – The house itself is a single-family, but there's considerable expense. Vadney – We'll check into that and what authority or ordinance they used to do that I'm not sure so whether it would stand I don't know. I appreciate you bringing that to our attention because I didn't know that.

Kimball - I've been living here for 17 years. Another thing is with all these units here, I think my throat's going to be sore from hollering to these people to get the heck off my lawn so I would like to see them put in a 6' stockade fence all the way around here to eliminate that plus I would like to see them, if this is going to go through, who's the main backup for this, the driving force for this? If it does go in which I really hope it doesn't, I hope you people can say no to this, that there be speed bumps all through here starting from the beginning all the way through because it is a problem with the traffic. Vadney - We could ask for speed bumps in the area but that shouldn't be a problem to anybody that's living in there, we can't ask for speed bumps on Boynton Road which is a Town road. We will certainly look at some type of traffic calming on the whole thing. (somebody's talking - no mike). We can check into something like a stockade fence if that's something that the people want. Breen - We didn't even get to the water situation. You need water for all of these people and all of these units and that's a big problem in Town. Vadney - In effect, I suspect in the short term there's certainly no water problem and there may be for a week or two while they iron it out but it appears that things are going to get better, I guess I should say it appears things might not have been as bad as they thought so the good news is that has brought this to our attention and we are paying attention to additional hookups but there is now a great awareness by several levels of town management of the necessity to manage water quotas and we're doing that and the others are doing that as well. The amount of water this development would add will not be substantial compared to what's available. Nedeau - The estimate is actually 11,000 gallons/day and Laconia Area Community Land Trust has paid for a separate engineer to review our water generation calcs and verify that they are around 11,000 gallons/day. Bliss - How can you tell us that if you don't know how many people are going to be living in each unit? Nedeau - There are guidance documents that are put out by the State that estimate based on a particular unit and a number of bedrooms in a particular unit. They always aired on the conservative side for the estimates and those are peak demand usage rates as well. Are dogs going to be allowed in the Park? Vadney - We have no control over dogs. Harvey - I can tell you "no". Seeing-eye dogs are allowed that's a State law, but we don't permit dogs on our property. ??Will the people that have animals now have to get rid of them? Harvey - If there are existing dogs in the Park, that's a separate issue. Vadney - I don't want to make it sound like this is a done deal or that you won't have a chance to come back and ask for things like a stockade fence, add trails, subtract trails, we'll be looking at all this again and we'll set a date for continuation. We'll leave all 3 of these issues open. What we really need is you folks to give us your questions as the neighborhood is so when we go out and do a site review and we see what these folks are bringing in to us, we know what questions to ask. Kimball - I know right now that Glen Rollins is going to be selling his house and the other abutter to this, John Connell that lives on Kelly Lane, he's putting his house up for sale to get away from this type of stuff. Morrison - A question on the water drainage. If we have a year where we have a lot of snow and ice which we might have when they do their plowing there and I assume they are going to use salt, is that going to run into the ground I assume with the water because it doesn't



separate it, anybody that's got a well up there might not be on Town water and it's going to affect them or any of the others. I guess that's a watershed area up there if I'm not wrong with that swamp out back. Vadney – I guess sooner or later it makes its way into the lake but they will be meeting all of the NHDES rules as far as buffers, riparian areas, etc. on any waterways or wetland areas, there's not much wet on this actual site. Nedeau – No, it's shown in brown here on this plan. Vadney – Will salt be an issue, probably no more than the parking lot at the theater. DES and others will be paying attention to it. We can't give you a definitive answer on where the wells are. Miller Lovett, Selectman – I just want to state in summary the position of the Selectboard. Any questions on planning issues or water I'd refer to Colette as the Selectboard's representative to the Planning Board so I'm not talking in that area. I do want to state very forcefully that the Selectboard has set as one of its 10 goals for the two-year period the provision of more work force housing in the community as a great need. I want to clarify, I haven't heard anybody else use this here, we are not talking about low-income housing, we're talking about work force housing for police officers, teachers and so forth, affordable housing which is very difficult to attain in Meredith at this time. The Board, long before I was on the Board, began working on this I don't know approaching 10 years perhaps and they are hoping something can happen and now it looks like it might be able to happen. I think the comments that came from the public and the concerns expressed by the Planning Board are very important. The Selectboard per se does not deal with those issues, it refers and trusts the work of the Planning Board to guard the public interest, the Selectboard's interest and fairness to all of our citizens and people like Mike Faller to ensure that roads are adequate and the Fire Chief to make sure that safety provisions are met so all of these concerns are very important and they are concerns that the Selectboard would have but as I say, those concerns are handled through the various officials of our Town and the Planning Board, the ZBA and so forth. The central message I bring is the Selectboard is very interested and hopes the public in general is interested in providing more affordable housing in our community and it looks like we have a real live option at this point. God forbid this project can't be worked out with all the problems that may be connected with it, we're going to be back until we can find a way to take better care of housing options for a large sector of our community and people that want to work here and live here. The central message is the Selectboard is behind this and one way or the other, we're going to find a way to provide for work force housing and we appreciate the time and energy the citizens put into this and the time the Planning Board puts into it. Public portion of hearing closed at 9:30 p.m.

Bayard – I'm somewhat familiar with the LEED certification and I was wondering if you could look into the water issues that may be coming up with that. I know that one of the criteria for LEED's is water conservation and given the concerns there are over water in Meredith, I understand that there probably is more of an operational problem than an actual shortage during the two weeks that we had some lowering in the tank. It is something I'd like to see addressed and I think it is something that would be addressed through the LEED'S program so that may be of

interest. There were some other comments that John had including stuff about recreation areas and all to that I'd like you to look at and perhaps comment on in the next meeting. Kahn – I guess what I'm proposing is a completely unofficial off-site walk and that is there was a lot of concern expressed as to whether or not this is going to be an improvement to the community or is it going to be a detraction. Could you give us the locations of some of your units in Laconia so that if we wanted to we could drive by and take a look and see what kind of an operation you run. I think it would be a good idea to give them sort of publicly so that some of the folks here who are concerned about this want to see the quality of your operation; they would have an opportunity to do so also. Harvey – I can tell you briefly the most recent projects we have completed in Laconia, just recently the Mechanic School in the Lakeport area. A few years ago a sister school, the Batchelder Street School, those two represent larger units. Most of our stuff is duplexes. And then what's referred to as the old Vernitron site on Union Avenue is Mill View complex and it has garden style units and the City of Laconia was very happy to get rid of the horrible eyesore and tons of hazardous waste that we removed to make that project happen. So those are our very most recent and I'm happy to forward addresses to you. Kahn – I think it would be good, not just your most recent ones, but the ones that are ongoing so people can see how you maintain them and how you operate them. I'd like to see not what you built last year, but what you built 5 or 6 years ago. Harvey – These are in the last 5 years but I'd be happy to send you the list, but there are 40 some odd properties. Vadney – e-mail at least a partial list to Mary Lee and we'll get it from there and if the public wants, they will be available through the Town Office as well. You are invited to attend the site walk, we do not deliberate at site walks that's against the law, we just ask questions about the lay of the land. We want to see where the boundaries are existing, where the new boundary is with the Ambrose property added, we'll be looking and we'll probably walk the center lines in rough terms of what the new road system will be. We'll also pay close attention to what Boynton Road itself looks like and we should at least if not this site walk, we'll do another one some other time but get as much information as you can about the current layout of that road so we can start evaluating that and flag the way you'll be coming off of Boynton Road into your property, how that's going to move. Also flag any existing trails and/or proposed trails so we'll know really what we're talking about and the public is welcome to join us on all that. I would also propose an extended site walk for the Board. We'll walk the public roads in that area, I know we're all familiar with that area, but if we walk those roads and see how it relates to this property it would help us. You're welcome to follow us along on that too of course. If you want to invite us onto your own property that's your business, we'd welcome the opportunity but we'll basically walk the public road and wait for any comments that might get answered. We felt we could be ready to respond to comments and resubmit plans on September 10<sup>th</sup> for the September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. If you typically do a walk the Saturday before the 25<sup>th</sup> that would work out to the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Vadney - We have a fairly controversial issue coming up on the 25<sup>th</sup> and it might be a fairly long meeting. Nedeau - We are facing a funding deadline. There are certain times of the year when you can apply for the funding through NH Housing Finance Authority so there is a bit of a time

crunch and we had hoped to come in again in August but we realize there are too many issues to discuss back and forth. We'll do it the 25<sup>th</sup>.

Bayard moved, Kahn seconded, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS MEETING TO SEPTEMBER 25, 2007 AND THAT WE DO A SITE WALK ON THE BOYNTON ROAD PROPERTY ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2007, AT 8:30 A.M. Voted unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Authorization granted to sign Juve Subdivision Plan and SRB Site Plan outside a regular meeting.

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 August 14, 2007.

---

William Bayard, Secretary