

PRESENT: Bill Bayard, Chairman; Roger Sorell, Vice-Chairman; John Dever, III, Secretary; Peter Brothers, Selectmen's Rep.; Liz Lapham; Ed Touhey; John Edgar, Community Development Director; Mary Lee Harvey, Adm. Assistant, Comm. Dev. Department

Brothers moved, Lapham seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2011, AS PRESENTED.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **WINNEPESAUKEE FORGE FOR CHARLES W.H. LOWTH, JR.**– Proposed Site Plan for a change of use from auto repair shop to light manufacturing with an accessory salesroom on the upper floor of existing office building, Tax Map S25, Lot 10, located at 5 Winona Road in the Business & Industry District.

Edgar – The purpose of this site plan is to change the use in one of the buildings from automotive repair to a light manufacturing business with an accessory salesroom. This business is currently located in the B & I District on Foundry Avenue. Application, checklist and abutter list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. A waiver for topography and wetlands has been requested due to the site being already developed. Recommend waiver for topo and wetland information be granted and application for Site Plan Amendment be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Touhey moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR WINNEPESAUKEE FORGE AS COMPLETE AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

2. **WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR.** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer even exchanges of 2,800 sq. ft. between Tax Map S19, Lots 4 & 5, located on Daniel Webster Highway and Latchkey Lane in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.

Edgar - The applicant is proposing a BLA between Lots 4 and 5 that will provide for an even exchange of land between the two lots. The purpose is to allow a small garage built on the property line to be totally within Lot 4. Both lots are under the same ownership and Lot 4 is currently under site plan review and Lot 5 is developed with a single-family dwelling. Application, checklist and abutter list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application for BLA be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Touhey moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR. FOR A BLA AS COMPLETE AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

3. **WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR.** – Proposed Site Plan to construct a new 50' x 90' building and convert an existing 50' x 90' building into rental space used for wholesale business with no outside storage, auto/boat equipment sales, service and repair with no gas station and office space. Proposal includes relocating a custom motorcycle business to the site as well as making related site improvements. Tax Map S19, Lot 4, located on Daniel Webster Highway and Latchkey Lane in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.

Edgar – The proposed SP Amendment is located at the former Harper's Boat business. Applicant proposes to construct a new 50' x 90' building and to convert an existing 50' x 90' building into 6 rental spaces total. The spaces will be used for wholesale business with no outside storage and auto/boat equipment sales, service and repair with no gas station which includes the applicant's custom motorcycle business. Office space is proposed above for each of the businesses or potentially rented separately. Application, checklist and abutter list is on file, filing fees have been paid. Recommend application for SP Amendment be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

4. **WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR.** – Architectural Design Review of proposed new 50' x 90' building, Tax Map S19, Lot 4, located on Daniel Webster Highway and Latchkey lane in the Commercial-Route 3 South District.

Dever moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION FOR WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR. AS COMPLETE AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted Unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED 2012-2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP).**

Jack McEwan (sitting in for Lou Kahn) I'd like to express the Committee's appreciation to John Edgar, Brenda Vittner and Phil Warren for the amount of help and organization that got us through our meetings this summer. The number allocated last year for ETF's was for capital expenditures \$\$185,000 and the amount allocated this year is \$425,000. It's a pretty substantial increase but over the last 2 years the Committee has been concerned with the fact that we have not set aside money needed for replacement of capital equipment on a regular basis owing to financial conditions and we're hoping to have the opportunity to make up for some of it. Thanks to Brenda Vittner, interest payments were lowered on our bond debt, some of the bonds were paid off and it provided a substantial increase in the amount of money we had to allocate to ETF's so departments with the greatest needs came out to be Public Works, the Fire Department and as a part of Public Works, road repair and maintenance and those were the only 3 ETF's that got money this year. A part of that is the fact that they received none last year. The

last couple of years it's been reduced substantially and that means putting off road repairs and equipment replacement. They were passed over for a year which means, especially in the case of the Highway Department, their equipment is a year older and that much closer to replacement. As you know, in the past the target for capital spending either in the form of bonding or ETF's has been 1.8 million. The last couple of years its been reduced substantially and that means putting off road repair and equipment replacement. The \$425,000.00 that was put into the ETF's you can find on the last page of the report. In the coming year, \$175,000.00 was allocated to the Highway Department, \$150,000.00 to the Fire Department and \$100,000.00 to catch up on roads. We have a grading system in Public Works that prioritizes which roads need which types of repairs and right now the total amount stands at 1,036,000.00 and we gave their ETF \$60,000 last year and we're adding \$100,000.00 this year so I think we're still running behind until we get some money out of the State. This is a general overview and it's a complicated report in the details. If anyone has questions, I will try to address them. Edgar – The Committee met during the spring and then resumed its work in the fall and basically came to these recommendations in a unanimous fashion. As a practical matter we've needed to defer on capital spending because of the economy and for the foreseeable future we're not going to be addressing the needs of the community fully. We understand it's a very pragmatic approach recognizing that we need to start climbing out of this hole but it won't happen overnight. When Jack mentioned the passing on capital equipment for last year, I had suggested its been since we started into the recession for the most part, we have not replaced any of our larger dump trucks, plow rigs that have high miles on them nor have we started squirreling money for a piece of fire equipment apparatus based upon its schedule so that pretty much is coming to a grinding halt in the last several years so essentially we're looking at trying to restart that not fully but to get going a little bit in that direction. When Jack refers to the million eight its important to realize that in our CIP to keep everybody honest and grounded, we include existing debt service so when we talk about a million eight in spending a million five of that is existing debt service so realistically in general terms, you're looking at 300 or 400 hundred thousand dollars in cash going towards a piece of equipment or going into a trust fund. All the other 1.5 million is essentially paying principle and interest on previous decisions made by Town Meeting so it's not 1.8 or 1.5 in cash that's going out that's the debt service. Part of our strategy moving forward is trying to maximize the benefit we get when we have debt retirement so as debt comes off line rather than inflate the operating budget by that amount; we're trying to have the discipline to target that capacity towards capital. When you go to the summary page in the report, we had picked up one error in the 2011 debt service number in the report, it has no impact on our recommendations but when you look at 2011 and 2012 it changes those numbers. The total CIP in 2011 was \$1,475,619.00 the total recommendation for 2012 is \$1,533,348.00, a net increase all things included, debt and projects, of \$57,729.00 so essentially you're looking at a \$57,000.00 increase over the prior year recognizing its less debt, more trust fund payments to try to get the equipment program back on track. A final clarification is when we were working with Public Works, there's a software the Department uses to assess road

conditions and we haven't been keeping pace with what the Department would like to fund but when Jack mentioned the \$100,000.00 that's above and beyond the operating department budget so if you were to dive into the Public Works budget, you'd see large line items for gravel, pavement and things like that are essentially a lot of our road work. This is an additional \$100,000.00 above and beyond that. We're trying to lessen the slippage and trying to get us pointed in the right direction but then being very realistic about the fact the economic conditions are what they are, there's nobody looking at the near term future saying things are going to change radically so we've tried to keep it very much in relation to last year's spending levels so there's a net increase in this recommendation from here, this is a recommendation coming to you by your sub-committee. The Board would take some action on a recommendation, then that goes to the budget folks and then goes through that budget process as it has in past years, ultimately, some version of all this ending up in front of the Town Meeting for its consideration in March. Brothers – Mr. Chairman, as the Board of Selectmen's representative on the Planning Board and also having served for many years on the CIP individually, this exercise is much appreciated and very organized and we've had some very dedicated individuals over the years, both new and old members who have chosen to serve on this very important Board. Back in the early spring when we chatted with the Chairman of the Board and the Board of Selectmen, we tried to give a little bit of direction in terms of the level of spending that we thought we could reasonably support in light of the economy and overall conditions and the need to continue to actively support our capital improvement programs. The CIP has been level up until this year, it will be 3 straight years and one of the reasons I think that both the CIP and the Board could support that was knowing we had done a diligent job for the prior 6 or 7 years leading up to that of identifying the priorities and funding them when the economy was stronger including various capital programs, the debt services for obvious reasons needs to be included in there but our target of the million eight has basically been put on hold for at least the last 3 years and that was pretty much an instruction all the way across from the Board based on what we felt the community could and should support based on the economy. However, all of us including the CIP recognized wholeheartedly when you've had a fairly robust CIP Program that does give you the opportunity sometimes when we have rainy days such as the economy's been over the last 3 or 4 years and that's allowed us to live off of some of those significant improvements we were able to make when times were better and we could allocate those resources of people, materials and funds so one of the things we recognized as a Board this year in our early deliberations in terms of setting some goals and priorities was the CIP needed to be supported. We've basically held it at bay for 3 years and if there were any extra funds that could be found this year, we wanted to try to rehab and divert those funds into the CIP Program. It made it a huge challenge for that Committee to make an assessment, create the priorities and I just wanted to reinforce the additional \$100,000.00 supplement to road work as part of our plan over the years, we have a fairly good size number that's allocated, I believe its around \$500,000.00 that we regularly allocate to our streets in terms of rehabbing, paving, gravel and maintenance and repairs so this is an additional amount that will be carried as a

separate line item and that is for the sole purpose of identifying that it is a priority. We don't want to let those roads go too far and yet we're going to continue to be challenged. Unfortunately, 2012 based on everything the Board has been able to see up to this point, tells us that there aren't going to be any surprise resources of excess revenues, if anything, more will be pushed down to the local level. The Town is only a quarter of the pie, we have the state and school budgets and the county and there's pressure all the way around so our intent is to be as realistic as we can, and at the same time we value the recommendations of the CIP and commend them for coming forth with the recommendations after very careful consideration of the needed priorities so I'd like to take this time to publicly thank them for their due diligence and effort. McEwan – I neglected to mention the fact that we did get assistance and advice from the Selectmen which was very helpful. It framed our conversations. Brothers – Or at least constrained them. Bayard – There were a few years I recall when it wasn't quite as hard in some respects because there wasn't any money. Brothers – It's like all aspects of municipal and local governments, there are times when it's been much easier. This probably will continue not to be the case for a few years. McEwan – Thank you Peter and John for the help. I know I left a couple items out and I'm glad you filled them in for me. Bayard – Thank you for your work, We do appreciate it. I know it's a good Committee, I enjoyed my time on it and I think the people on that Committee do a lot of good work and have come up with some creative solutions a number of times and I would like to thank you and the rest of the Committee members. McEwan – I think the CIP Committee in many respects makes our town different from a lot of other communities in New Hampshire.

Brothers – First of all I'd like to make a motion that we open the public hearing on the proposed 2012-2021 Capital Improvements Program and then get the public's input. Bayard – Are there any comments from the public, additions, questions or anything?

Brothers moved, Dever seconded, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE CIP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2012-2021 AS REVISED ON 10/25/11 AND PASS THAT ON TO THE BOARD FOR BUDGET DELIBERATION PURPOSES. Voted unanimously.

Bayard – Thank you very much for your work and also I'd like to thank the Town, Brenda, John, Phil and the Selectmen for helping to make it a good process in this town.

2. **WINNEPESAUKEE FORGE FOR CHARLES W.H. LOWTH, JR.:** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.) (Lapham stepped down)

Johnson – The proposal we have before you this evening is basically a change of tenancy to an existing property that has multiple uses currently existing on it. The change to be made is actually a little less intense than the current use of the property, however, it is different enough where the Code Enforcement Officer as

well as the Acting Town Planner decided it would be prudent to come before the Planning Board as a Site Plan amendment. The property has frontage on NH Route 104 as well as Winona Road and currently on the property are two businesses one of which is Seeley Plumbing Contractors and they occupy an accessory office space in Bldg. #1 which is the first building coming off of Winona Road and they also occupy Bldg. #2 where most of their material is stored. The second use currently on the property is Brian's Truck Repair which occupies Bldg. #3, which is a 60' x 40' building more towards the rear of the property. Up until a short time ago, there was actually a 3rd business, Bauen Corporation, occupying the 2nd floor of Bldg. #1, but that is currently vacant. The proposal requires no changes to the physical nature of the property at this time, basically one tenant is moving out and another tenant is moving in. Brian's Truck & Repair is going to be moving from Bldg. #3 and Winnepesaukee Forge is the business going into that location. In conjunction with that, Winnepesaukee Forge is going to be creating an accessory salesroom which Mr. Little likes to call a gallery of sorts, although the term gallery really doesn't fit in the site plan regulations. Its going to be a place where he can show some of his fine art work that's being produced in a forge so the proposal will be to have Seeley remain as is on the 1st floor of Bldg. #1 and continue to occupy Bldg. #2 with material storage and then Winnepesaukee Forge will be in Bldg. #3 as well as having the accessory salesroom in Bldg. #1. The lot coverage calculations are essentially unchanged, no proposed reconfiguration of any of the paved or gravel surfaces. We have a parking summary that's based on some square footages and some additional signage put on some of the buildings. There was a previously approved site plan by the Board which showed a free-standing sign in the front of the property which is not there currently but we wish to put that back where it was originally and there are also some single-sided signs on the building, two 4'x8' signs on Bldg. #1, one 4'x8' single-sided sign on the forge and one 4'x 8' double-sided sign at the road 64 sq. ft. in size. The total proposed signage is 160 sq. ft. which is well within the limits that are determined by the site plan regulations. In terms of the activity on the site right now, Brian's Truck Repair has more employees currently than Mr. Little would have in a forge and also traffic trips per day going in and out of the site with people getting their cars repaired and also the trucks going into the site to be repaired is probably significantly more than the traffic trips per day that Mr. Little would get going into the site as part of his business. We talked a little bit about trips per day and the parking requirements and because of the nature of his business, he requires significantly less parking than does the existing business. We're showing the amount of parking driven by the shear square footage of the building, but because of his particular business that's way over what we use. Fortunately, in this particular case, the parking's already there so we're not creating parking that isn't going to be used. I know Mr. Touhey doesn't like to see a lot of parking spaces that aren't ever used because it takes up a lot of space that could be used for more productive but the parking essentially is already there, as part of getting in and out of the site, the gravel parking areas are not going to be changed but the spaces are there should they need them. The reality of the 2nd building component with Mr. Seeley being a plumbing contractor, we can't say for sure but the indication is probably that he's almost at the point of outgrowing that

particular site and at some point in the future, if his business continues to be successful, he probably just by sheer need would have to relocate to a different location. If that were to happen and its not part of what the Board's approving now, but Mr. Little's vision for the property would be to get in that building another artisan, perhaps a cabinet maker or some other crafts person in that location and then Bldg. #1 would be a gallery or showroom of two separate artisans and you'd have that particular artisan in the middle building and the forge in the back which would be a nice fit for the property. Again, that's not before you, right now the existing plumbing contractor is part of this site plan amendment which we're asking the Board to approve. Angela developed a staff review and one of the comments had to do with the square footage that was being represented on the plan and what was being represented on the Assessor's tax cards and I actually took a look at the Assessor's cards and I guess the numbers Angela was looking at were a little bit different, but at any rate I met with her this afternoon and we went over my calculations and they do represent the actual square footages around the building and she requested that I revise that parking summary to reflect the individual buildings. She also expressed to me that the terms of the parking are not that critical because the parking demand is going to be so much less than what's actually there and even if it wasn't, there's kind of this giant gravel area out there now occupied by miscellaneous equipment that you could park cars if you had to, but we don't want to do that. As part of getting this site plan approved, a lot of the automobiles and the other miscellaneous material out there on that site would be removed as part of the business leaving there so the site would be cleaned up a little bit. The site is serviced by a well and leachfield. There are no changes to that. Essentially, there are employee washrooms and bathrooms that are servicing the site and there's no change to that with the exception of the amount of employees that are on the site is going to go down a little bit and eventually in the future if Mr. Seeley were to go to a different site, then that would probably go down further. One of Angela's comments was it wasn't clear if the free-standing sign is existing or new. It was existing, it's down so it's proposed to be put back in the spot that we show towards the front where it says sign. Everything else is existing. Dever – Carl, I know from being somewhat familiar with the site at this point in time, Seeley's vans are generally parked in front of the warehouse when they're not in use and as I view it, they come in the morning, get in their truck and leave and then come back and leave. It doesn't show essentially where the delivery areas are laid out where the majority of their vans are parked. Are they going to convince them to put them someplace else? Johnson – As you noted, the majority of their business takes place off site, they load the stuff in the morning and go off site. I go in there during the day when I have my car fixed but that could be an issue, we could put a note on there if that would be beneficial for the vans to be parked on the side. Dever - It doesn't create a traffic problem or anything, I just know that's the way it happens now. Johnson – They are parking in the delivery area pretty much is what you're saying. Part of it is probably a security thing. Touhey – A question about the parking spaces that are at the proposed forge area, you're getting about 30' there of parking spaces. Touhey - Parking spaces are 10' x 20' so we have 10' to make the swing? Johnson – There's actually an existing reciprocal access

easement that goes all the way onto the other property so although there's a line there going down through the middle of the property, there's a reciprocal access easement so you have quite a bit more area to go by, its pretty much a free flow of traffic going behind those cars parked there. Brothers – Where is that noted, if it's not on the plan you've got less than 10' to swing in there. Should there be some reference to the reciprocal easement? Johnson – It says 30' easement and probably should say 30' reciprocal easement, I could add that to the plan. Edgar – perhaps include the County recording information. Touhey – Within that 30', the 20' for the parking space, is that part of the easement? The cars actually park closer to the building than what the approved site plan shows. I believe the existing easement is a reciprocal access easement that also includes land on the south side. Touhey – I think Peter makes a valid point that the easement should be noted in the notes on the plan as well as in the site plan itself. Johnson – I'll put that information on the plan. Johnson – Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment, if you were to entertain a conditional approval on this plan, most of the comments here are administrative comments to be handled through the Planning Department and in order to facilitate the quickest sale of the property, if you could grant us the privilege of signing the plan outside of a regularly scheduled meeting, we could probably make those note changes fairly quickly. Edgar – Angela had asked that there be clarification regarding the accessory use and essentially that was addressed in Carl's presentation so for purposes of conditions, the first administrative condition would just be the clarification of the parking summary as we discussed and I think we all agree there's adequate parking on the plan but we could provide a little more clarity in the summary, Second, we would clarify the plan in terms of mentioning and dimensioning the reciprocal easement with an appropriate cross-reference to the recording information. As a condition statement made by the Board, you would allow for plan signatures outside a meeting and then our standard condition about reviewing and amending any approval and that would be 4 statements of a conditional approval. Bayard – I don't think there's much clarification needed for the parking, perhaps just noting which building goes with which parking area. Johnson – I had that conversation this afternoon with Angela and we agreed I would make that a little bit clearer. Touhey – I remember a site plan coming before this Board a few years ago and part of the approval required the cleaning up of that back lot, the removal of abandoned vehicles and the like in that lot at the time. I don't know to what extent that was accomplished and I note it states here automobile and other material to be removed in addition to having that on the plan, I think that should be part of the approval we make here this evening. Johnson – I think at that last go-round, it was construction materials that were associated with another business that was also located at that site, not so much Brian's Truck Repair because he was coming in new at that point so it was something related to a business that isn't there now. Some of the vehicles there are there now are associated with Brian's Repair and those are the materials that we're saying are going to be removed from the site. We did the original site plan and subdivision years ago and the problems that arose there were related to some wetland issues that were out back and we had wetlands delineation and we had some areas that were regraded and mitigated as part of that process and there

were some construction materials that were also out there that have been removed from the site so it may be 3 steps forward and 1 step back in terms of the old site plan and the new site plan but the material I'm referring to now doesn't go back that far. The materials that are there now to be removed are essentially associated with the truck repair business. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, I can confirm that when that wetland issue popped up, the issue was raised and it was corrected and that edge was restored. David Little – One of the conditions of the transfer of the property is the site be cleaned up prior to closing. Public hearing closed at 7:47 p.m.

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE IN THE CASE OF WINNEPESAUKEE FORGE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT, S25, LOT 10, LOCATED AT 5 WINONA ROAD IN THE LAKE WICWAS WATERSHED AND BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT, THAT WE APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT AS PRESENTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THE PLAN SHALL CLARIFY WHAT THE ACCESSORY OFFICE ON THE FIRST FLOOR OF BLDG. #1, AS REFERRED TO PREVIOUSLY THIS EVENING, IS ACCESSORY TO.
- (2) THAT THE PARKING SUMMARY BE CLARIFIED BY BUILDING.
- (3) ANY RECIPROCAL EASEMENTS FOR PARKING AND ACCESS BE NOTED ON THE PLAN.
- (4) THAT WE ALLOW FOR PLAN SIGNATURES OUTSIDE OF A REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING;
- (5) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 6 & 17. Voted 5-0 in favor of the motion.

3. **WAYNE H. AHLQUIST** - BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT, SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW - (Rep. Dan Ellis)

Dan Ellis – This site was the former location of Harper Boat Sales & Restoration Business. In 1996 the house and other structures were red and the house was actually white before it was removed this year. It's my understanding there was a site plan previously approved for this site in 1987, revised thru 1999. Many aspects of the site at this time were actually grandfathered, certain aspects of the use as well as several of the buildings that don't meet setbacks, etc. In May of 2010 the site property went up for auction due to foreclosure and the applicant acquired the site at the auction and actually lives next door and his residential property is to the east. As it wasn't a planned purchase, Mr. Ahlquist's initial objective was simply to clean up the property. The conditions of the site and the buildings even since 1996 had significantly deteriorated so last year two existing buildings on the site were replaced within the footprint. One of them was the large garage and also the smaller garage. This year the house was removed and everything else out here for structures were also removed. Part of the site was repaved including this portion of Latchkey Lane which is a private road and generally the site is much different in appearance today than it was just a couple

years ago. The 2 buildings which were replaced within their original footprint last year only for Mr. Ahlquist's personal use and purposes associated with his residential site next door. Since then, Mr. Ahlquist has developed some plans to return the property to its commercial usage and that would involve constructing another building on the site and associated parking. It also would involve the conversion of this garage recently built into 3 rental bays. During the survey for this site plan, it was discovered that although the small garage that was replaced as shown on the 1987 site plan as being in a different location than it was assumed to be when it was replaced, we actually discovered that the property line goes right through that garage and shown highlighted in yellow on the plan. Part of the proposal tonight is to resolve that issue by doing an equal area swap (2,800 sq. ft.) with Mr. Ahlquist's residential site. It would make this existing garage conforming to the proposed lot line; there is a corner of the garage that would still be in the setback to the motel next door. However, the changes we're making would make the garage conforming to the lot line between the commercial site and the applicant's residential site. Bayard – These were approved by the Building Inspector to have these replaced? Ellis – Yes, and as I mentioned the confusion was because the Site Plan for 1987 shows the garage being completely on the property, although it did not conform to setbacks. A significant area of the applicant's residential lot actually has been encroached upon over the years by the gravel parking associated with the boat storage so lot lines are not readily apparent on the ground so that is how the replacement in-kind transpired, the assumption it was completely on the property when it was not. As I also indicated, these two buildings were originally replaced in-kind in the same footprint for strictly residential purposes associated with Mr. Ahlquist's residential site next door which is why that could be done without site plan review in Mr. Edney's opinion. Now the changes to divide this building into 3 rental units and add another building triggered this site plan review. Lapham – Could you go back a few sentences to where you said something about the corner of the property and the motel next door, could you clarify that for me. Ellis – What I said was our proposed boundary line adjustment will accomplish making this existing garage conforming to the setback requirement when viewed in light of our proposed line, however, it does not correct the issue of being in the setback of the property line adjacent to the motel. Dever – I don't see it on here but you said the applicant's lot where his home is located is a residential lot, is it in the residential district or is it a commercial district. Ellis – It is in the Commercial-Route 3 South District as well but it is currently a residential lot. Dever – With this boundary line adjustment, a substantial part of the existing parking lot now becomes on the lot of his residence where you show the edge of the gravel back here. Is he going to provide an easement for the use of that, does he intend to remove it and restore it to green, what's the intention for that area? Ellis – The intention at this time would be to leave it and the reason being Mr. Ahlquist actually has an RV that could be parked on that gravel surface and that would be associated with his residential use. It's not out of the question that in the future if these properties are no longer in common ownership they either would be removed and restored or perhaps an easement granted for it to be used for commercial purposes but neither of those are the intent right now. Dever – I noticed when I

went by the other day, there were several 40' truck trailers stored in that area and my question is if it's going to continue to be used, would it need an easement to continue any type of use like that for the commercial side of this. Ellis – Right now no because it's in common ownership. As far as I know, those storage trailers are left over from Harper and are temporary storage trailers and will be removed. Public Hearing on BLA closed @ 8:02 p.m.

Site Plan – Brothers – Just to get my bearings a little bit here, it seems we had a kind of limited residential and commercial use, now by putting up new buildings and a site plan application and making it more intensive on the commercial piece. Could someone refresh me in terms of the zoning classifications of the immediate property owners around it, is it exclusively commercial and just the one house in the back of Mr. Ahlquist being residential, what do we have to the north here as well? How defined are we into the commercial piece vs. residential? There are 4 house lots on that cul-de-sac. Ellis – Latchkey Lane is a private road, it proceeds past the site up to a cul-de-sac with 4 house sites off Latchkey Lane that are in the Commercial-Route 3 South District. Brothers – Even that far off the corridor? Ellis – Yes. To the north of this site is the Bear Tree Lodge Motel, across the street is J.B. Scoops, to the South is Docks Unlimited so it is fairly exclusively a commercial neighborhood with the exception of Latchkey Lane which is kind of out behind that commercial use. As I already mentioned, there are two buildings currently existing on the site and there's been a significant amount of changes to the site in the last year and a half. The existing larger garage is a 50' x 90' with 3 overhead doors. The smaller garage is a fairly residential looking two-car garage 20' x 30'. The larger garage is currently divided into 2 sections and used by the owner for storage. The proposal is to put up another 50' x 90' garage which would be divided into 3 rental bays and to divide the existing large garage into a total of 3 bays as well, there's 2 existing and we'd like to have 3 total. Initially, the owner would like to move his custom motorcycle business to the site and utilize one of the rental bays as well as the office space which would be above the proposed building. The proposed building would be a full 50' x 90' first story and kind of a half story above within the roof rafters that would be 16' x 90' and that would be office space. The retail aspect of Mr. Ahlquist's custom motorcycle business is conducted primarily on the internet; it's more of a wholesale nature with some assembly, small scale fabrication and service. The need for retail parking is very limited; it's expected to be on a one customer at a time basis. The remaining rental bays would be rented to small businesses or individuals for use as storage for equipment or goods and also as service areas. It's anticipated the renters uses would be of similar nature and impact as that of Mr. Ahlquist's business. In meetings with Bill Edney and Angela the use was determined to fall into the wholesale business with no outside storage category or the auto/boat and equipment sales, service and repair category and in that category, gas stations are not permitted. These are both permitted uses in this zone and there are no renters lined up for the other 5 rental bays but if there is any issue with a proposed renter in terms of use, we understand it would be necessary to come back before the Board for some kind of site plan amendment. The smaller residential-style garage would function as parking and storage

associated with the office space. Everything on the site plan exists with the exception of the proposed garage outlined in purple and the pavement immediately in front of it as well as a strip of gravel. There would be some paving associated with this site plan as well as landscaping. Right now the site is basically rough graded, the pavement has been installed, landscaping would occur in the spring, planting of grass and trees. The proposed coverage for the site is 64%, 65% is the maximum allowed. The 1987 site plan approval called out 65% coverage, I'm pretty sure it ended up being a lot more than that but there were some boat storage areas shown that were not considered gravel so they were not counted as coverage and over the years the use has kind of crept to the outer limits of the property and beyond so I do believe the coverage we're proposing reflects a significant improvement to the site. There is a proposed stockade fence to the north, right now there's a 6' chain link fence that runs down this property line adjacent to the motel. The applicant would like to put up a more privacy style 6' stockade fence that would help separate the two properties in terms of privacy and buffering to the motel. There are some maple trees proposed to be planted along Latchkey Lane as well as at the corner of the property. The parking calculation was a little bit complex but in meetings with Angela, we believe we came up with a solution that meets the requirements of the site plan review regulations and the details of that were basically that we had to make some assumptions about the use of the buildings, approximately half of each rental bay, we've designated as storage for the purposes of the parking calculations. Storage requires one space per 600 sq. ft. and we have 600 sq. ft. of storage per unit so that's one space per rental bay. The remainder of each rental bay which is 750 sq. ft. we called industrial in terms of the parking table only. In other words, the use we're calling out really doesn't fit into the parking table as many uses don't. Industrial requires one space per 250 sq. ft. so that's 3 spaces plus the one space for the storage which means we need 4 spaces for each rental bay. The office space requires 1 space per 200 sq. ft. so we need 29 spaces if we follow that calculation and what we're proposing is 22 spaces. The garage bays are quite large so we felt it was reasonable to assume a car could be parked in them if necessary for the owner/occupants use of parking to free up parking spaces elsewhere on the site so that would be 6 rental bay garages for a total of 6 spaces and then 2 in the residential garage so we actually have a total of 30 parking spaces and feel that's more than adequate for this site. If parking becomes an issue, we do have quite a bit of room on the property for more parking if we were granted a special exception by the ZBA to have parking within the setback. Because this is a corner lot, it has a 50' setback from Latchkey Lane which is a private road, as well as a 50' setback from Daniel Webster Highway so we have all this pavement here without a special exception can't be used for parking. There is an existing sign on the site and a proposed sign would be constructed in the same location and we'll cover the sign under the Architectural Design Review. Bayard asked the name of the place? Mr. Ahlquist's business is Acme Choppers. Right now it's in the O'Shea Industrial Park in Laconia. Dever – I have to say right up front that what it looks like now, as opposed to a year or two ago, is substantially better. My personal feeling is this should have all been done before we started tearing things down and building it back but that's not a decision I

get to make. It is my understanding Mr. Ahlquist is a manufacturer of custom motorcycles, one at a time but he is a manufacturer of motorcycles. One of my issues with that is that manufacturing is not allowed in this zone. To do that requires a variance. Mr. Ahlquist actually fabricates custom motorcycle parts. We had this discussion with Bill Edney and Angela and it was felt that this type of fabrication and assembly was not considered manufacturing. It's a very low impact use and that was the consensus of that meeting. Dever – I've looked at the website, I'm familiar with the business and I know he makes his frames and will create a whole new motorcycle for you and then go through the VIN number process I assume to do all of that so that is my view of it. You're saying the zoning officer has found that it's more of a light fabrication and assembly type of thing than what I would call manufacturing in terms of one at a time kind of thing, very low impact use. Sorell – Do you actually build the engine or do you bring an engine in and re-do it? Ahlquist – For the most part we recondition vintage engines for the motorcycles. We're not a licensed manufacturer, we don't build brand new motorcycles from scratch. We usually take vintage motorcycles or engines and parts and then build new chassis and components and then resell them or do that work for customers but we're not an actual motorcycle manufacturer, we're not approved to apply VIN numbers or issue titles for motorcycles. We don't have any standard models or anything like that. Sorell – So you take an old motorcycle and put a new frame under it using the engine and transmission. Ahlquist – In some cases we do and in some cases we even use the existing frame and do more of a custom or modified restoration. We do a handful a year, we do anywhere between 6 and 8 a year so it's really low volume as far as that aspect of the business. Bayard – What are the other aspects of the business? Ahlquist – Service and repair of motorcycles and we also sell motorcycle parts on-line through e-Bay and through our website. Touhey – How many employees do you have? Ahlquist – 4 full-time employees. Dever – Obviously, Bike Week, do you have a lot of visitors or do you have a fair amount of traffic come to see your shop or come to see you or do you spend most of your time down there? Ahlquist – We used to when we were on Route 3, I don't know if any of you were familiar with our previous location, we were located right next door at 45 DWH for a few years and when we were there, we saw a spike in volume during that time. Where we are now, we are really off the beaten track and last year we had to go out and peddle our wares a little bit more than we had in previous years. Edgar – Do you anticipate setting up vendors at this site during Motorcycle Week? Ahlquist - As of right now, I do not. Touhey – How many units are proposed to be used for storage at this time? Ellis – A total of 6 garage bays that would be split between storage and service use in addition to the office space. The office space will be above the proposed garage which has 3 units underneath. Touhey – Can I get into signage a little bit here? It looks like you're asking for a total of 232 sq. ft. of signage and you make the reference to the sign at the former Towle House site and we're all familiar with the sign that exists there today but you're stating this sign would be of similar height (18' 3" and would be 17' wide which is 6' wider than the Towle House sign on Route 25. I think that's excessive and maybe some of the Board members would also want to comment on that. I realize you're probably going to put some signage

on it for different tenants and they come in, however, I think that can still be done and I think your visibility on Route 3 is excellent as cars go by, certainly I would feel much better with a much smaller sign. Ellis – I would like to point out that those are Angela’s comments, I wasn’t intending to compare the sign to the Towle Hill House sign, although I do think it would be somewhat similar construction, it has decorative pillars and I would point out that a great part of the sign’s height is accomplished within this gabled area which is for the purposes of complementing the building’s architecture. If we were to cut off the sign at that height without having that gabled roof, it is our opinion it wouldn’t tie in as well to the architecture of the building and is not as attractive. In terms of its width, I have a photo but this is the existing Acme Choppers sign located on the building at Mr. Ahlquist’s current location. It measures 14’ wide by 4’ high. That may sound large but that sign was actually located previously as Mr. Ahlquist mentioned, he used to have a business right next door to this site and that sign was actually mounted in those signposts. When you’re driving by at 50 MPH, it’s not quite as wide as you think. Also, the width of the sign is driven by these decorative pillars; outside dimension is actually 18’ 3” to the outermost extreme of the base of the pillars. In other words, the interior of the signposts is designed to accommodate that 14’ wide sign; the rest is merely the decorative components of the sign. Bayard – Can we assume you’d use either that sign or something similar? Ellis – Yes. Touhey – The individual shingle of the individual sign for the tenants, you have space there for 6, it would appear that each of those individual signs is at least 7’ long. Ellis - Actually, they are about 6’ long by 1’ 5” tall I believe. There is some dead space shown in between the signposts and the shingles themselves merely for brackets and so forth and that’s kind of pushing the width out a few inches. Touhey – I think the traffic going along there is probably traveling at about the same speed as it would at the Towle House and that being the case, I don’t see there’s any need for it to be any larger than the one that exists there. Again, part of the design of the sign was to accommodate this existing Acme Choppers sign. Touhey – As far as the peak, that is aesthetically pleasing, it is a small portion of the sign, I think we have something similar to that up at the Towle House as well. Ellis – Am I hearing that the concern is more with the width of the sign than the height? Dever – Personally, I know that traffic moves a lot faster by this site than by the Towle House and the one at Towle Hill looked pretty big to me when they put it up but now once its broken up and has signs on it, the initial structure was pretty large but personally I don’t have a major issue with this structure as it is. It looks much better than what was there previously. Lapham – This was within the ordinance, right? Ellis - Yes, the ordinance actually allows for a height above the edge of the pavement, we’re asking for 17’. Assuming the sign actually may be a few inches lower than the edge of the pavement when it’s installed and the total square footage is within the allowance of the ordinance as well. Brothers – Also, it is set back quite a bit off the highway as well. Ellis – It’s a major highway so the width of the ROW does necessitate moving it quite a ways off the edge of pavement. It’s actually about 20’ off the edge of the pavement. Touhey – You asked me if I objected to the height or the width, I object to both proportions, 18’ high is three 6’ men standing on top of each other. I don’t think that is necessary on that route for visibility. I think it would

be far more pleasing to have a sign more in keeping with the smaller size. Ellis – I would just point out that the ordinance allows for 20' and this sign is actually significantly shorter than the neighboring signs, Docks Unlimited and J.B. Scoops included. Bayard – I will point out that we do an architectural design review. It may be something that's allowed, but it doesn't necessarily mean that it's appropriate for the architectural design review. Bayard - Your place may or may not be a good example, but if you put a flat roof building or something with glass all over it or something weird looking, it may not fit in even there and also if you're downtown, there are certain things that may or may not fit in so that is part of what we look at in the architectural design review as to how it fits not just whether it meets the exact inches and height restrictions. Bayard – Let's do a little more on the architectural design review and then maybe open it all up for any further comments and get public input. Is the new building going to be similar to the one you have now? Ellis – The one we have now is basically the typical New England vernacular style with clapboard siding and double-hung windows. This existing building does not have dormers; the proposed building which will be closer to the road has 3 dormers proposed on the front and 3 on the rear. The corner which is closest to Route 3 and also faces Latchkey Lane would be glass windows for purposes of display from the interior and the elevations from the end actually kind of look similar to a cape style structure. Ellis passed pictures around to show the existing buildings that were on the site and were replaced by this 50' x 90' garage. In terms of architectural details and textures and so forth, we feel the building as proposed more closely meets or matches the general feel of Meredith than what was there and its also designed to kind of soften the commercial use with more of a residential appearance to it. Lapham – The staircase we're seeing here is the office access to that loft. Yes – That shows up on your site plan to the rear of the building. It is an office access and fire escape. There are stairs within the building as well from the first level. Dever – On the other building that's constructed now, is there office space above. Ellis – Just storage. I see they've put some trees in, have you considered a little bit of shrubbery in a couple of the spots. Ahlquist – The landscape additions will be fairly substantial, we'll make use of some flowers and shrubs and mulched areas. Bayard – I think we'd like to see some of that on the site plan because right now the site looks pretty barren. Touhey – When you look at the pictorals we have, we're looking at the building on the same plane and we're not looking at it in respect to a sign and the total height of this sign as I understand it is 17'. From ground level to the edge of the roof is about 13' so the sign is going another 4' above that. I just think the height is not in correct proportion, I think there's plenty of visibility on Route 3, I agree the traffic moves along faster on Route 3 than it does on 25, particularly at the curve at the top of the hill. I'd like to be able to see what a sign there would look like; I just think the sign is out of proportion once again and won't get my vote of approval for the architectural design review unless we can do something with that sign. If that requires us to do a site visit to get an idea, bring something out there as a sample, I do think that is an entryway to the community, Route 3 South, as is Route 104 and I think we want to keep it in conformity with the best side of Meredith we want to put out there. Lapham – I think since this is within the regulations, as a small business

owner in this town, signage is really important to people for their businesses. I don't find this sign offensive and I think when you have 3 other businesses going in there with their signage, I feel that this fits on that particular area of the roadway and small businesses need to have signage. Also, this sign will be at least 3 feet lower than the base of the building that you see so the 4' above will actually be about a foot higher than the eave. If its really that much of a conflict, we could change the pitch of the top and bring it down a foot or two if that would be more pleasing but that would take away from continuity of the rest of the buildings that are also there. All the signs in that area are at least 18' if not higher and there's a very large sign holding an ice cream cone across the street. The existing sign is about 20' tall. A picture was provided showing the sign without the gable and in our opinion it's much less attractive. Edgar – Our ordinance doesn't mandate exterior illumination but when you get into larger signs, sometimes that becomes a question mark because it can look like a large billboard illuminated at night. Have you thought about how that might be illuminated and whether there's an opportunity to go with exterior lighting vs. internal? Ellis – We haven't discussed that at length, I know the existing proposed sign is internally illuminated. If there were an issue with that, the same sign could be used and externally illuminated. Brothers - I personally like the sign with the gable on it. - The interior illumination with a sign this size, I would definitely go for down lit exterior lighting vs. interior illumination. It would be much more in character with both the sign and the community. Bayard – It's got an architectural accent to it. I believe the applicant is willing to light the sign externally only. Brothers – On the site plan map, where we have the gravel area just before the wetlands where the paving stopped on Latchkey Lane, was there any consideration to putting grass on that triangular piece that's being conveyed to the residence vs. leaving it all gravel. Ellis – I think that question came up earlier, right now Mr. Ahlquist is planning to continue to use that gravel area for his own residential purposes because he does have a travel RV trailer that could be parked there. Jim – That's the only area on his personal property site that he could park that RV that's out of the road. Bayard – Is there any way you could cut back the size of that, it appears to me the RV may not require the entire graveled area? It's only 30' wide, it's pretty small. There's a wetland and a wetland setback on the property, is there anything new being proposed within that setback that would trigger the wetland ordinance or is it all pre-existing developed area that's either gone from gravel to pavement or the rebuilding of the building. Ellis - No, we're reducing somewhat the amount of coverage within that buffer area. Edgar – Has that been removed already in that particular area or is that to be removed as part of this project? Ellis – It's partly both, partially been removed already and part of it is proposed to be removed. On the BLA plan you'll see some gravel immediately to the east of the small residential garage and in order to keep our coverage down, we figured that was as good an area as any to remove some gravel and plant some grass in place of it. Edgar – I just suggest that the final plans be tightened up to reflect the areas where that type of work is to happen so from a compliance point of view when the code guy goes out there to do the C.O., he knows what was expected in terms of any adjustments to pre and post lot coverage going from gravel to green area. Touhey – We are talking that all of these spaces will be used

for wholesale business with no outside storage. Ellis, correct. Touhey – And no auto/boat/equipment sales, is that a correct statement? Ellis – No, the intention of this summary was to state that these rental bays could be used for one of two purposes or a combination of those two and these are quotes from the zoning ordinance so potential use #1 would be wholesale business with no outside storage, potential use #2 would be auto/boat/equipment sales, service and repair without gas stations. Touhey – No outside storage related to those uses? Ellis – Correct. Touhey – Therefore, no storage of shrink-wrapped boats or that type of thing? Ellis – Correct. Dever – I have a couple of comments about the issue that the previously existing garage came down and was reconstructed and continues to remain in the setback substantially. Mr. Ahlquist was given permission to do that but I have an objection to tearing a building down that's encroaching, the rule is its gone away and when it goes back up, it doesn't continue to encroach without going to get a variance. The other is when I touched on manufacturing earlier and I'd like to read a definition out of Black's Law Dictionary. "A manufacturer is a person or entity engaged in producing or assembling new products and that manufacturing is a thing that is made or built by human beings as distinguished from something that is a product of nature. Any material form produced by machine from our own shape composition of matter." Again, I state the improvements to the space, the improvements to the lot, the proposed signage I have no objections the buildings look great and everything else. I have an objection to the use, although it's defined as something else, it is what it is so I'll go on record as having those objections. Bayard – I do feel this is another one of these gray areas and maybe its because of the economy we're in now, but that seems to be what we're getting a lot of. We had approved this once before, we had some issues with it and I think one of the things I do want to tell the applicant is it needs to, assuming this is approved, we aren't looking for this to be an expanded version of putting together motorcycles and things of that nature. It is kind of in the gray area here. There is service & repair and there's other things like that and there are arguments whether it's an accessory use to what goes on the internet and all but this one's close in my mind. Ahlquist - The square footage of this building as far as actual work space is substantially smaller than what we're using right now. There's absolutely no way we can expand any of the current operations. Most of the reason we're moving is for economic reasons or actually downsizing the business by moving into this place so it's not something that's going to expand out of control, it's quite a bit smaller than where we're operating right now. Dever – Obviously, you're going to have the office space up above in the new building to be constructed and then one or two bays down there. Ahlquist – We'll have two bays for the operation that we're doing right now which is smaller than what we're utilizing currently. Ellis – I would like to run through the staff review summary, there are some items I'd like to address. The note relative to the zoning district has been added to the plan. A note relative to floor drains not being permitted has been added. Future tenants – We understand the note regarding future tenants means if any shortage of parking should arise, we understand we would need to address that through another site plan review application. Bayard – If you had a use come in that requires substantially more parking, I think it may trigger a site plan review. Edgar – When

you don't know specifically what the uses are going to be, how do you deal with the impact of the unknown? Recognizing when people build rental units, they don't always know who the tenants are going to be so typically the Board will look at trying to build in a stipulation that allows for an amendment or re-review even though its just a tenant. There could be a scenario where it could impact the approved site plan beyond what was envisioned when the original approval was granted so sometimes the Board builds in stipulations that allow the Code Enforcement Officer to kind of make that call. Bayard – We also have the right to review and amend any approval.

Dever moved, Touhey seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR. FOR A BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FOR TAX MAP S19, LOTS 4 & 5, LOCATED ON 55 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY AND 12 LATCHKEY LANE, IN THE NEAL BROOK, MEREDITH BAY WATERSHED IN COMMERCIAL ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT AS PROPOSED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) SETBACKS AFTER THE ADJUSTMENT SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN.
- (2) SHOULD ANY MORTGAGES BE PLACED ON THE PROPERTY PRIOR TO RECORDING THE TRANSFER, THE MORTGAGE COMPANIES WOULD HAVE TO PROVIDE MORTGAGE RELEASES OR SUBORDINATION AGREEMENTS AS APPROPRIATE AS DETERMINED PRIOR TO THE RECORDING OF THE MYLAR INCORPORATING THE TRANSFERS INTO THE MORTGAGE.
- (3) THE SURVEYOR OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Bayard – Do we need to worry about mortgage releases on these? Ahlquist – No mortgages at this time. Edgar – Do you guys see anything coming with respect to the recording of this plan? Let's assume these all get approved and you're trying to get your foundation in, do you see any loans or mortgages coming down the pike? We need to be mindful if there is a mortgage placed on the property before the transfer, essentially the owners of the property which in this case would be in part the mortgage companies, they would have to consent to those adjustments and incorporate those transfers into the mortgage. Brothers what harm would it be to cite that as a condition, if there are none, then it's not a problem. Then we would have to make that determination prior to recording the boundary line. Ellis – We are planning on setting these pins and having a mylar within a week. Do we want to make an amendment to that to cover that condition? Bayard – Is that agreeable to the second. It's agreeable so we'll just add that on.

Lapham moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR. FOR A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT, TAX MAP S19, LOT 4, 55 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE

NEAL BROOK, MEREDITH BAY WATERSHED IN THE COMMERCIAL ROUTE 3 SOUTH DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) IT SHALL BE NOTED ON THE PLAN THAT THE SITE IS LOCATED IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3 SOUTH ZONING DISTRICT.
- (2) A NOTE SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN STATING FLOOR DRAINS ARE NOT PERMITTED.
- (3) A SEWER PERMIT IS NEEDED PRIOR TO OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT.
- (4) GIVEN THE UNCERTAINTY OF THE FUTURE TENANTS, THE APPLICANT SHALL COME BACK TO THE PLANNING BOARD TO ADDRESS ANY POTENTIAL SHORTAGE OF PARKING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH COVERAGE AND SETBACKS.
- (5) THE PARKING CALCULATIONS SHALL BE REVISED TO REFLECT THE CORRECT AREA OF 1,350 SQ. FT. FOR EACH RENTAL UNIT AND THE ASSUMED DEMAND.
- (6) A NOTE SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN THAT STATES THERE SHALL BE NO STORAGE OF VEHICLES OR BOATS OUTSIDE THE BUILDINGS.
- (7) A NOTE SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN STATING ANY SITE LIGHTING OR BUILDING LIGHTS SHALL BE CUT-OFF FIXTURES AND A CUT SHEET OF THE LIGHTING DETAIL SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL.
- (8) TO THE EXTENT THE FREE-STANDING SIGN IS LIT, IT TOO SHALL HAVE EXTERNAL CUT-OFF LIGHT FIXTURES.
- (9) THE FINAL PLAN SHALL NOTE THE TANKS ARE ABOVE GROUND AS WELL AS THE SIZE OF THE TANKS.
- (10) A NOTE SHALL BE ADDED TO THE PLAN THAT STATES ANY ADDITIONAL DUMPSTERS SHALL BE SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW.
- (11) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 6 AND 17.
- (12) ALL CONDITIONS PRECEDENT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
- (13) THE PLANNING BOARD AUTHORIZES THE PLANS TO BE SIGNED OUTSIDE A REGULAR MEETING.
- (14) LANDSCAPING DETAILS SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE FINAL SITE PLAN.

WAYNE A. AHLQUIST, JR. – ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW

Lapham moved, Sorell seconded, - MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF THE NEW 50' X 90' BUILDING, TAX MAP S19, LOT 4, LOCATED ON DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY AND LATCHKEY LANE IN THE COMMERCIAL-ROUTE 3-SOUTH DISTRICT. THE PROPOSED DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE. Touhey – My negative vote has to do with the fact I do not feel the sign in its large size is in conformance with our Architectural Design Review Ordinance. Voted 5 – 1 in

favor of the motion.

PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS AND ADOPTION OF VOLUNTARY LOT MERGER FORM AND FEE.

Edgar – Dever moved, Touhey seconded, to open the public hearing regarding adoption of voluntary lot Merger Form and Fee.

Edgar – We've been over this with you before but we've made a few adjustments since the last meeting. We looked into Lou's concerns regarding whether this provision would have any effect on the zoning provision about zoning creep. We did follow up through LGC's legal department and if the Town has any continued concerns about zoning creep, it would be affected through further amendment of the Zoning Ordinance, not through this provision. Angela has provided this information to Lou. We did incorporate Peter's commentary regarding bringing all municipal assessments to current, not just taxes, so if we had municipal water and sewer outstanding, we would include that. Angela formatted the draft into a Subdivision Regulation format and did some general renumbering. Our understanding was that the general consensus at the last meeting was rather than just an instruction sheet, we would benefit more by having it in regulation form so the structure of the document formatting wise was tweaked. There would be a need to establish the Planning Board's designee to administer this. In the past it's been done by the Code Enforcement Officer. We have suggested we would designate both Angela and Bill so if somebody's on vacation they could tag-team it. Finally, there's the issue of the fee and we're not looking at a big fee, we want to try to cover our own costs so you're probably looking somewhere in the \$50-\$75 range and that's kind of a recommendation on our end. We have a Town Recording fee which covers our cost to run to the Registry and do that part. There's also the charge that we actually get for the recording of the documents at the Registry so our costs into it are probably about \$68 is what we envision. Generally speaking, if you hold to the \$50.00 Town Recording fee that probably would be a reasonable number. Dever – Do we need a motion to accept these. John's done a lot of work and a great job on this and I can probably tell you there will be at least one other town in the Lakes Region that will be looking very closely at this process.

Dever moved, Brothers seconded, I MOVE WE ADOPT THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE GOVERNING OF THE PROCESS OF VOLUNTARY LOT MERGERS AND THE FEES AND DESIGNEES (TOWN PLANNER AND CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER) FOR THE TOWN AND WILL BE KNOWN AS SECTION X. OF THE LAND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS IN ITS ENTIRETY. Voted unanimously.

TOWN PLANNERS REPORT

The Waukegan Watershed Advisory Committee has asked Angela and I to look at whether there are some simple practices that could be considered relative to the

Waukegan Overlay District so we're in the process of kind of formulating some ideas around Best Practices for Water Quality Protection. Things that don't say you can't do things but if you're going to store hazardous waste outside, it should be contained on an impervious surface and should be covered and things like that

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey, Adm. Assistant
Community Development Dept.

The above Minutes were read and approved at a regular meeting of the Meredith Planning Board held on _____:

John W. Dever, III, Secretary