

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Brothers, Selectmen's Rep.; Dever, III; Kahn; Touhey; Lapham (not sitting); LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Adm. Asst.

Sorell moved, Brothers seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2011, with one correction. Touhey noted, in the case we considered at our last meeting, Thomas & Nancy McGinty for the Appalachian Mtn. Club, was the accessory parking lot on Lovejoy Sands Road, it is my recollection that Bill made a motion for the acceptance and at that point I suggested an amendment. The amendment was not voted on but I do recall Bill indicated it be included in his motion. What I suggested was that the parking lot be designated as use of the AMC only. Voted unanimously with correction.

### APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use from a bowling alley to a retail store, Tax Map U10, Lot 34B, located at 351 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

LaBrecque – The proposed Site Plan application is for the purpose of a change of use from a bowling alley to a Family Dollar store. The application and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Its recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Sorell moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN APPLICATION OF JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **AMBROSE LOGGING CO., INC.** – Proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map S24, Lot 12A, into two lots (17.80 ac., 28.31 ac.), located on Pease Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted January 25, 2011.
2. **AMBROSE LOGGING CO., INC. AND SIMEON AND LEIGH WILLEY** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment between Tax Map S24, Lots 12 & 12A, located on Pease Road in the Forestry/Rural District. Application accepted January 25, 2011.

Carl Johnson – I'm representing Ambrose Logging Co., Inc. and Simeon and Leigh Willey for this combination two-lot subdivision and boundary line adjustment. With regard to the relationship of the two, the boundary line adjustment would not be taking place if not for the subdivision and I'll explain that a little bit later. Basically, this project is located just northwest of the Clover Ridge Subdivision. It's over 50-acres in size and currently Simeon Willey owns a lot here that they have their home on. The balance of the property you see here is owned by Ambrose Logging Company. Prior to this application there was a former access way that actually went up and was utilized by the Haskins family and also for a lot that has no frontage

which is currently owned by David Blake at the top of the knoll and was also incorporated as part of an emergency access way for the Clover Ridge Subdivision. Mr. Blake and others went through the process of relocating that access way to fall within the stonewalls here and now the Haskins property is no longer serviced by the access way that is currently the access point for Mr. Blake and also for the balance of the property as you see it. Before you this evening is a two-lot subdivision. Ambrose Logging Company is attempting to subdivide the 50+ acre parcel into two pieces leaving 28.31 acres for one of the lots and 17.8 acres for the other. Incorporated in that and because we need to have frontage on a town road, state road or road built to town specifications, we are creating a 50' strip with frontage on Pease Road which satisfies the frontage requirements and Sim and Leigh Willey will be conveying through boundary line adjustment this Parcel B which is the strip that will be the access for Lot 2, Lot 1 and Mr. Blake and the 50' frontage minimum will be satisfied as being the frontage for Lot 2. Sim and Leigh are giving up Parcel B which is essentially 50' wide by 325' long and in exchange they are getting 7 acres so they are getting substantially larger more than doubling the size of their lot giving up this small portion so what we end up with are two pork chop shaped lots. Currently, there are multiple users of this driveway as it is right now. Mr. Blake uses this as the only access by vehicle to his property. It is still incorporated as part of the emergency access for Clover Ridge Subdivision but that's not utilized except for an emergency. What's being proposed is to have 3 parcels accessing from that point, one being Mr. Blake and then each one of the two new lots we're creating. Although Lot 1 will have access to Pease Road, their access would be over this existing driveway. There was substantial work done for that driveway to get the driveway in that location, there were wetland applications to the state that were undertaken as well as Zoning Board of Adjustment approvals from the Town of Meredith and engineering work done to make sure the culverts for this driveway were adequately sized and so forth so a considerable amount of time and money was spent to develop this with the primary goal of getting the Haskins out of the loop, utilizing the scenic nature of going up between the old range road so Mr. Blake would have access to his property and at the time it was the access to the Ambrose piece. Because the Town of Meredith only allows 2 dwelling units to be accessed off of a single driveway, this application will require a waiver from the Board of Selectmen. If the Town Planning Board were to issue a conditional approval for the subdivision because it meets all the lot sizing and other requirements of a subdivision application, it would be predicated upon receiving the waiver from the Board of Selectmen to allow Lot 1, Lot 2 and Mr. Blake to all be using that driveway. We feel that's a reasonable request, this is a wider than normal driveway, its paved and as I mentioned before, there were several hours spent analyzing the hydrology of the site and Steve Smith Associates from Gilford did an engineering and drainage study to make sure the culverts were adequately sized. This essentially is already in place and Mr. Blake uses that as the access for his driveway and also in place from the Y out to here is a driveway that's being utilized for the access to what's now Lot 2 because they are in the process of developing a home site on this lot. It's a little bit cumbersome to explain but its simple in nature in that we're creating a two-lot subdivision and we're going to attempt to obtain a waiver from the Board of

Selectmen to use that driveway for 3 homes instead of 2. The alternative would be to relocate the driveway permit that was issued by the State of New Hampshire down here and for somebody to have to construct a driveway to go up through here to access a buildable area for this lot doesn't seem very practical. There would be a lot of unnecessary disturbance of quite a bit of land to get access. Currently, not of concern to the Board though is the person that's interested in purchasing this property is interested in lots, developing Lot 2 primarily and then just holding onto this one for the near future. In terms of the density, we have a 3-acre density requirement and we're creating a 28-acre and 17-acre lot. We did test pits and we did sufficient topography to demonstrate that we meet the minimum lot sizing requirements. There are some wetlands in the area but are not necessarily mapped for subdivision purposes because we demonstrated there is sufficient upland portions of the property to meet the minimum requirements. As I mentioned, the road frontage requirements are being met by the pork chop shape, we'll have septic systems and wells and Angela has a note prior to signing the plan, the waiver must be granted by the Board of Selectmen. There are some easements that should be noted on the final plan, not the least of which is the easement that's allowing Mr. Blake to cross the property to get to his land and that's not an issue. The surveyor of record shall provide written evidence that all pins have been set prior to recording the mylar. Angela has a comment regarding the further subdivision of the parcels and at this point in time, there's no indication that anybody's thinking of further subdividing and if they did, it would be a completely new ballgame in that you'd have to be designing roadways built to town specifications of considerable length to subdivide so there's no guarantee that will never take place but as you can see from the configuration of both of these lots, it would be an undertaking to say the least in order to come up with a subdivision plan for those lots. If you recall during the original planning phases of the Clover Ridge Subdivision, at one point in time there was talk of connecting the Clover Ridge Subdivision road with another road that came out and connected to Pease Road and that was 10 years ago. I have heard nothing to that extent for the last 5 or 6 years, it's pretty much a dead issue in terms of connecting it to anywhere. If the Board is acceptable to a conditional approval, it should be noted that the BLA's would only be consecrated if the subdivision was going to take place. Vadney – When did we look at the new driveway for Mr. Blake's property? Johnson – It was done last summer. You went through the process about a year ago. Vadney – How did the culverts and stuff that got laid out handle the water, were there enough water events? Blake – It has worked fine since they were put in. Some preliminary work was done after the approvals and the culverts were put in about a year ago. The work was completed last summer after everything dried out. It was fine graded and paved and they have been working fine since they were put in. We've had some pretty heavy rains and it has not been a problem with Pease Road and it's gone as Steven Smith's office directed. Johnson – One of the other things to mention, Mr. Chairman, in the process of developing this lot, we've done some topography for the prospective owner and the prospective developer of the lot and the actual building, the home site and so forth, the great majority of it is over the crest of the hill so there would be no contributing drainage from the home site coming down into this and the driveway as I mentioned is already

constructed. Touhey – Parcel A has a driveway permit, Parcel 12 has an existing driveway for the home that's there, are those both going to be kept when this is one parcel? Johnson – This driveway permit was granted by the State when we did the original subdivision subdividing this off of the big piece so this essentially was the approved access for the 50 acres. What happens is it goes right through the field and would negatively impact to some extent Sim and Leigh Willey so what Mr. Ambrose is proposing to do is to grant Sim and Leigh this 7-acre parcel. This strip would not be the access; it's only the strip that would be necessary for frontage. This driveway permit would be, I'm not sure it would be negated, but it wouldn't be used. I can't answer whether it would be abandoned, it was granted and the State would allow them to use it except when this line is discontinued, this is not going to be the driveway permit associated with this so I would think it would be voided because you're not technically allowed to have 2 access points for a single dwelling on a State road. Brothers – On the current paved driveway that Mr. Blake has for access to his house, how wide is that driveway? Blake – Its 14' wide. Brothers – I noticed beyond Mr. Blake, there are two more lots, how do they gain access at the present time or do they not? Johnson – Those are lots that are part of the Clover Ridge Subdivision and the subdivision road has a separate entrance which is south of this parcel and goes up and comes down and terminates. Brothers – On the portion of Lot 1 that's being conveyed, that obviously was done in order to give Lot 1 access? Johnson – Frontage. Brothers – If the Board at some point based on Planning Board acceptance of the 3 lots using this, would that then be abandoned? Johnson – It's not abandoned, its still there. It's a strip of land that continues going out to Pease Road with 50' of frontage. It's just that the town distinguishes between frontage and access, you're required to have frontage but you're not required to have that frontage be your access. If the BOS fails to grant the waiver for 3 lots to be accessing this subdivision, this subdivision would be history. There would be some application before you for some other subdivision because nobody's going to want to build a driveway 1,000' feet to get into the buildable area there. Over the years, there has been substantial discussion by the Planning Department about freeing up this restriction of only 2 on a driveway under certain circumstances. It makes more sense to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> instead of building another road. A 14' paved surface is certainly in most instances wide enough to serve 3 single-family residences. The BOS has also entertained many applications for reduced roadway standards even for subdivisions and the Vaal property is a good example where it's an 11-lot subdivision but still a full-blown width town road doesn't really benefit anybody so we went to the BOS and received a waiver to shrink it down a little bit. Bayard – Does Mr. Blake's driveway go across the Morrow property? Johnson – Mr. Blake's driveway used to go across all of the land that was subdivided for the Clover Ridge Subdivision and by relocating the driveway to this side of the wall, he now goes over none of the Clover Ridge or Haskins until such point as you get to this "Y" and then he goes up benefitted by the old ancient easement that was granted as part of the Clover Ridge Subdivision all the way to his house. Carl pretty much touched everything on the staff report and he did some calculations on the area that was upland. Johnson – We did topography on the 2 lots. LaBrecque - We didn't get soils and slopes but I imagine on 17 acres you could easily calculate one

building lot but since you've done something, then I would take a copy of it for the file. Carl explained the difference between access and frontage. I did note the plan does not show OH utilities going into the property and I'm not sure if it goes down to Mr. Blake's house or comes up from Clover Ridge, but however that is planned to be part of the driveway easement that it be incorporated not just for access but possibly to bring utilities into the property. Blake – There's an overhead line coming down across Clover Ridge to a pole and overhead up to my property. I have conduits underground to the stonewall and I have an agreement with Ambrose Logging that they can utilize those conduits and connect up and run power from that point on in or should the power company want, the present pole is actually on their property and they could go from either location as far as I'm concerned. LaBrecque – With respect to roads and access, our shared driveways are defined by an access going to 1 or 2 dwelling units so the Town's always looked at it as if it's more than 2 dwelling units, then it's a road and if not building a road, then you would have to get a waiver from the BOS. The Planning Board, as they've done in the past, will suggest or let the BOS in their motion or in the minutes, let them know they support the shared driveway especially given that it's paved, it's 14' wide and the emergency vehicles have the ability to go down there with ease so to make that part of the record or potentially part of the motion to share your support with the BOS for that. Obviously, disturbing more land would not be the better choice. With respect to easements, all the easements that are in place currently would have to be revised to incorporate and reflect the new lot that's being thrown into the mix. Mr. Ambrose did not own the land that Mr. Blake's driveway previously went across. There was some discussion as to who actually owned that land. Mr. Blake now has an easement from Mr. Ambrose to go across Mr. Ambrose's land. LaBrecque – He also has one from Willey and he won't be going across Willey's anymore either. Johnson – Mr. Ambrose, by benefit of the BLA would own all of the land and Mr. Ambrose is on the plan if you see there's an end of the access easement to Lot 1, that would be the easement that Mr. Ambrose would be granting to the purchaser of Lot 1 so they would have a means of getting to their lot. Just to be clear about this whole driveway thing, if push came to shove or there was some issue with the Town road, you would only have to upgrade this driveway to a point 50' beyond here and that would be even sillier than any other option because once you have 50' of access on this and potentially you could petition the Town to take over the road because it would be constructed to Town road standards and I can tell you that's something Mike Faller has expressed to me in the past that they really don't want to do if it's not practically necessary. LaBrecque – I want to remind you that Carl did request the BLA be approved in connection with the subdivision plan and that could be incorporated into the decision as well. Blake – For the record, I'm speaking in favor of this, it's consistent with a written agreement I have with Ambrose Logging relative to the construction and maintenance of the driveway that we would share in the construction and maintenance of it and that agreement is on file with the Town and the easements and everything are on file at the Registry of Deeds from this previous approval. While I'm up here, I'd like to speak in favor of the BLA adding that meadow to the Willey property. I think it makes sense and looks right to do that. They mow it all now as one big lot and it looks like the right thing to do. Fred Hatch

– Obviously, I have major concerns with the reconstruction of the driveway because of the 100-year flood we had a few years ago that did a lot of damage to my property, all of which was uninsured. However, the thing I wanted to comment on is the 7-acre field added to the Willey house lot. The public that lives on Pease Road has expressed to mostly my wife, that their absolute requirement that the field remain open because it makes Pease Road a little closer to a country road. Our family certainly agrees with that, we're very pleased that the Willey's have found a contractor, at least for the time being, that does the haying on the field once or twice through the summer and feeds his animals or somebody else's with it. To my mind, that's a very fine result to this more complicated process. Vadney – I agree on that field, it's certainly a nice looking field and we have had concerns about putting a driveway across it and also from the drainage because it is a shallow to ledge place. I think if we keep that field, it's a great advantage. Johnson – One of the other interesting aspects is not necessarily part of the subdivision but Mr. Ambrose is undergoing a field restoration, he's taking this wooded parcel and turning this into all field which will be very nice up in their to have an old field. At one point in time, as you all know, it was all field and that will benefit everybody. Brothers – In terms of the driveway in that the driveway coming in is the focal point of the discussion going forward and perhaps when it comes to the BOS, I think it would be beneficial to show the entire length of the driveway for Blakes into his property so we can see exactly what is documented. Vadney – That driveway is already built, the only part that's notional is the part into the upper lot. Johnson – So noted and when I approach the BOS, we'll have that added to the plan for informational purposes. Bayard – On the easements, we don't have them in front of us, Angela, are you comfortable with what we have there now or do you think we need some changes because of what is going on here? LaBrecque – All of the easements that were required in connection with the driveway were recorded and we have copies of those so there's a revision to the covenants for Clover Ridge that addressed the change in the driveway. There were easements granted to Blake from Ambrose and Willey and then an easement granted to Ambrose from Willey so all of those will then be carried over to these two new lots once they get conveyed so there will be a conveyance deed and in that there will be an easement addressed. Johnson – With one exception, the easement from Willey to Ambrose will be extinguished by virtue of the BLA. The Lot 1 easement will be part of the deed and as per normal, deeds are normally submitted to staff for review to make sure there is that easement provided in a draft form for Lot 1 because it will be their access if we receive the waiver from the BOS. LaBrecque – The staff report basically states any existing easement should be noted on the plan and a draft easement showing the revision of both having a new lot and not having Willey in the mix anymore should be submitted to staff. Public Hearing closed at 7:37 p.m.

Touhey moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN REGARDS TO THE  
AMBROSE LOGGING COMPANY, INC. AND SIMEON AND LEIGH WILLEY FOR A  
PROPOSED SUBDIVISION APPLICATION, TAX MAP S24, LOT 12A, LOCATED

ON PEASE ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT, IN THE HATCH BROOK WATERSHED, I PROPOSE WE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE APPLICATION SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) PRIOR TO SIGNING THE SUBDIVISION PLAN, A WAIVER MUST BE GRANTED BY THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN FOR A SHARED DRIVEWAY TO SERVE 3 HOUSE LOTS AS RECOMMENDED BY THE PLANNING BOARD.
- (2) ALL EASEMENTS OF RECORD SHALL BE NOTED ON THE FINAL PLAN.
- (3) A DRAFT DRIVEWAY EASEMENT MUST BE SUBMITTED THAT CLARIFIES SHARED MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN THE 3 AFFECTED LOTS. THIS EASEMENT COULD ALSO BE USED TO CLARIFY ADDITIONAL ITEMS SUCH AS UTILITY ACCESS.
- (4) THE EASEMENT LANGUAGE BE CONSISTENT WITH PRIOR EASEMENT LANGUAGE RELATIVE TO THIS DRIVE.
- (5) THE SURVEYOR OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.
- (6) THIS CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF 24 MONTHS, AT WHICH TIME FINAL APPROVAL MUST BE OBTAINED OR A PUBLIC HEARING MUST BE HELD FOR THE PLANNING BOARD TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TIME. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

Bayard moved, Brothers seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN TAX MAP S24, LOTS 12 AND 12A, LOCATED ON PEASE ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) THE FINAL PLAN SHALL NOTE THE CHANGE IN CHANGE IN SIZE OF LOT 12 FOLLOWING PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT.
- (2) THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE THE DRAFT CONVEYANCE DEED FOR STAFF TO REVIEW. THE EXECUTED DEED SHALL BE RECORDED WITH THE MYLAR. THE APPLICANT SHALL VERIFY IN WRITING WHETHER THERE EXISTS A MORTGAGE ON LOT 12A. IF THERE IS A MORTGAGE, THERE SHALL BE A SATISFACTORY RELEASE RECORDED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONVEYANCE DEED.
- (3) THE SURVEY OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR. Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

1. **JONATHAN T. WHITE REALTY, LLC:** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.)

Johnson – Mr. White has owned the bowling alley building for some time now. The site is just north of the old Police Station and just south of Prescott Park. It's about an acre and a half and right now there is the existing building and an associated parking area to the north and associated parking area to the south. The proposal that's before you is a change of use. The bowling alley essentially has been removed, the components of the bowling alley are no longer in the building so its

essentially just the building. It is in the Central Business District so a commercial department store is a permitted use in the district so this is a change of use. Obviously, significantly different enough from a bowling alley to warrant a site plan review by the Planning Board. There are going to be no exterior changes to the physical limits of the parking area or the pavement on the lot, that's going to remain the same. There are two entrances to the property, one to the north and one to the south. Essentially, you enter the site and there's a parking lot associated with the building to the south with a travel way between the two entrances and there is a small parking area located to the north. By prior approval of the Planning Board, Mr. White actually constructed an addition to the former bowling alley and created a lounge area and a game room with pool tables and pinball machines. The addition will be coming off so the addition approved by the Planning Board and the sheds that are there are to be removed. The physical entrance to the building had always been off of the front facing Route 3. Because of the configuration of the Family Dollar store and the difficulty with trying to get delivery trucks to the back of the building, they are now going to have the storage facility and the offices in the front of the building with a loading dock in the front and have the major entrance to the building on the side. The great majority of traffic will come into the parking lot from the south entrance, park in the existing parking area and leave from the south entrance. There would be no reason to go up this alley and go out. The engineers from Family Dollar have analyzed this mechanism for truck deliveries and its very adequate. The lane width is adequate to have the delivery trucks come in here, stop, the merchandise would go into the storage area and then the truck would leave thru the south access, come in thru the north and leave thru the south. The frequency of deliveries from the Family Dollar store of this size is approximately one per week so its not like you have trucks going in there every day like a grocery store where the products have shorter shelf lives so about once a week they get a delivery and that would be the extent of that entrance. Employee parking and the dumpsters would be located to the north of the building and the screened dumpsters are shown on the plan. We will on the Architectural Design Review plan show some detailing on the screening, the nature of the dumpsters to show you exactly what that's going to be like, as well as some landscaping elements here that would be included in the architectural design review as well as some details about the signage and the actual canopies that are going to be covering these entrances. When I first analyzed the project and spoke to the client and put together the site plan review, I indicated to him that I didn't think it rose to the level of architectural design review so for the first time in a long time I was mistaken. According to staff, it is subject to architectural design review and therefore we will be submitting for the next cycle some information from the Family Dollar store that will incorporate the signage and what they intend to do to make the building look a little better. As you are probably familiar with that building, it would be hard not to make it look a little bit better, but nonetheless we will be showing some architectural features that will be added to the building during the architectural design review. The purpose of this meeting is to basically go over the change of use issue and the general functioning of the busubess. I don't think there are any major issues and looking at the staff review, they don't appear to be any issues that are of any great concern. Family Dollar as



you know or not know, has about 4,500 stores so its not a company that doesn't have any indication of what they do for business. They have looked at this site in terms of the parking and we are requesting a parking waiver based on the technical application of the parking calculations to this building were a little bit short, but based on the very comprehensive history that the Family Dollar stores have regarding how much parking is necessary for a particular market given a particular store size, this is more than adequate for that use. To relate it to anything that's been in Meredith in the past, I don't know if you could relate it to the Ben Franklin store or Wardo's store. It's the same general size of the facility and 20 spaces or so was normally plenty adequate for the Ben Franklin store to have available for customers and that store had everything. In terms of the parking waiver, I don't think that's going to be an issue because they do have such a substantial amount of information and they are not in the policy of leasing out space that doesn't have adequate parking. They would seek out a different site. There is a note regarding the wetlands, this is a prime wetland that's essentially all of Prescott Park and comes around in back of the old Police Station, down in back of Meredith Ford and so forth and that is not mapped as part of this application because there are no changes to the exterior limits of what we're dealing with that are applicable to any part of the Meredith Zoning Ordinance so we didn't apply the mapping of it. It is what it is, it had previous site plan approvals regarding minor things that happened on the site and so the wetlands were not mapped. Angela would like to have a note on there designating which wetland it is that isn't mapped and we would be happy to provide that information on the plan. We do have a handicapped entrance with a ramp (pointed out on the plan). There is a slight increase in the elevation from the parking lot to the actual physical entrance to the building that would require a HC ramp so that's incorporated on the plan. As I mentioned there will be storage in the front and a small office restroom, its serviced by municipal sewer and water and there are no issues there. It's serviced already by overhead utilities and there's no change anticipated for that. The existing sign on the property is located in the island in the front of the building. The intention is to use the existing sign as it is with an additional sign placed on the front of the building and initially that sign is 4' x 25'. Based on the discussions I had recently, it may be a little bit smaller than that but either way both of those signs are under the square footage allowed by the ordinance. Angela indicated the current lot coverage is 36.8%, 65% being permitted and as I mentioned, there's no additional expansion of that coverage. A parking waiver is requested for 20 spaces and the loading area is proposed to be in the front of the building which is the easy location for the trucks to get in and out. Angela would like to have the site plan note what plantings are proposed by type and number which we'll incorporate on the architectural design review element. The fuel storage is inside the building, there's no outside storage of fuel. Right now we are scheduled to file the architectural design application by March 7, 2011, which is the deadline so I don't particularly see any need to approve the site plan at this time if you'd like to continue it until that meeting, then we can do it all in one hearing. Vadney – I agree with the sketch you've given us as far as the truck parking, but I know most truck drivers of that type of small piece load like to back up to a loading dock. Johnson – It won't be happening here because there is no room to back up to

it. What was forwarded to me showed the trucks coming in this way and exiting to the south. Vadney – Will there be an island or berm or something between the truck and the road? There already is. If you look at the plan, there's a lawn area that the sign is on, then there's a paved walkway and then another lawn area between there and the road. Vadney – As long as we're approving it like that and stays like that I have no problem. Johnson – There are no changes proposed to that. I mentioned the distance between the curb which is easterly of the sign and the building is more than wide enough for the truck to be there and also if some car decided to go in that direction, its 30'+ so it's wider than Route 3. Touhey – That certainly is an island that's there and it is there now. It's not a berm, it doesn't have any elevation to it to speak of and I think if we all had our way, we would definitely turn this building 90 degrees but the building is as it is and with the wetlands in that area that we do know about, we're not going to run a truck around the building, but having a loading dock that visible to Route 3 is not beautifying that stretch of Route 3 and you know what the next building is, we have the park land and then the Community Center look real nice so when you do your architectural design, I know you will use all kinds of creative imagination to come up with something that will make that look like other than a loading dock. Vadney – The current entrance to the bowling alley is at grade and we're using the term loading dock but there won't actually be a raised typical dock where you back up to it. Johnson – I don't believe so that will be part of the architectural design review, it will be a front elevation of the building looking in. The existing entrance to the building is roughly in the middle and that's going to be discontinued and the actual entrance is going to be located further to the south. In terms of a loading dock, that hasn't come into the conversation at all, but that will become obvious when you see the elevation of the building looking from Route 3 in you'll be seeing what you'd be looking at if you were driving by and turning your head. Vadney – My suggestion for bringing that architectural to us, I don't see physically any other way to do it than this since the building is a single-story building and the current entrance is at grade and the front of the building is horizontal that it wouldn't be a loading dock. There would be an elevator on the back of the truck that lowers it down and then they would hand truck it into the building so when the truck pulls away and he's done his deed, the building could actually could look better than it does now because it will just be a blank building you paint a mural on or something. There shouldn't be any reason for any elevated dock or anything that would be ugly. Johnson – When I was first made aware that we were requiring architectural design review for this building, I think I mentioned to Angela that the first thing that came to my mind was putting lipstick on a pig. Brothers – That aside, I think Ed's comments are appropriate and maybe it's the language on there, it does refer to it as a loading dock and I look at that as saying OK on a scale of 1" we've got a 20' raised platform there so if there is a different distinction that might take some of that fear out of it for me, I would appreciate it along with the scope of what might be done in terms of an elevated berm or something out front to minimize that. I don't think that's an unreasonable request. Touhey – When they tear off that canopy currently on the building over the entryway, they are going to be tearing off the lounge area, that side of the building is going to look like real trash and obviously they built onto it so they're really going to

have to do something with that end of the building to make it look presentable so I don't think they should be reluctant to do some neat stuff you can suggest to them. Johnson – The agreement as I understand it between the Family Dollar and the owner of the building is for the owner is to be contributing towards. Right now it is going to be a lease situation, Family Dollar is not purchasing the property so there is some agreement between the two parties to do substantial improvements to the building and Mr. White, just for edification, he also was the person who purchased the former Grad's Clothing Store in Meredith that is now the Village Perk and did the renovations of that building and I think its an example of what he's capable of doing. Dever – Lighting? Johnson – Lighting will be part of the architectural design review and there are not upwardly shining lighting encouraged so there will be none. Dever – I know that presently I believe there's at least one street light that's shared from the DPW side. Vadney – The building itself we all know is not pretty and not in particularly good shape and one option is to let it fall into the cellar hole if it had a cellar hole. It could sink. I just mentioned that in that I know we'd all like to see a brand new building there, that's probably not going to happen in the short term and too many demands on the architectural are going to queer the entire deal and I'm not usually one to worry about paint colors but this might be one the nicest thing they could do and I'm thinking back to a number of these various brand name dollar stores to try to make their visibility the strangest paint combination you can imagine and I think this is one that a good move for them on the architectural design would be a paint scheme that isn't obtrusive. Johnson – That's noted and I agree with you in terms of there's only so much you can do and I also agree that something can be done to make this building look better and that's what we'll be coming in with but if you recall when Golden View had the brick building and they were encouraged to do a New England style addition for when they did the assisted living, it actually made it into the Town of Meredith Ordinances of what not to do as part of architectural design review so trying to make an existing brick building look like a Cape didn't work and trying to make this look like something it isn't won't work either but to make it look nicer is certainly doable. Vadney – Creative painting might be something that would help and the wrong creative painting would definitely hurt. Lapham – Is that going to be a lighted sign? Johnson – I would say yes. As I mentioned, I think the latest I got from the Family Dollar, what I did when I prepared the site plan to come in here tonight, I took what was allowed because I didn't have sufficient information from them. I said this is what's allowed by the ordinance in terms of signage square footage so you if you had the existing sign, you could have a 4' x 25' sign that would be permitted and I think its going to come in less than that because as I said I don't think they need 25' to spell out Family Dollar. That's how that square footage came about. Vadney – The applicant has recommended this hearing be continued to the next meeting.

Bayard moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE CONTINUE THIS HEARING UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2011, AT WHICH TIME WE WILL REVIEW THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AS WELL. Voted unanimously.

Vadney – The elevation might be a bit of a plowing problem, there's not much space there where the sidewalk comes through. Johnson – I think the Chairman hit the nail on the head when he said the elevation of the building is at grade so you don't want to go up and then down, you'd rather just go down. It's below the highway. The plans you have show the contour lines on there so you can see the difference in grade from the highway, it does go down so it is considerably lower than the edge of Route 3 so the trucks will be coming in and as you mentioned probably be loading off the back of the truck. Brothers – I'm assuming when the architectural review

1. **JAMES R. BLACKIE, JR.** – Pre-Application Conceptual Discussion of possible business usage at property located at 146 Daniel Webster Highway utilizing both interior of building structures and exterior lawn areas, Tax Map S18, Lot 49A, in the Commercial Route 3 South District.

LaBrecque – Mr. Chairman, it seems we don't have Mr. Blackie here this evening.

### TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

1. LaBrecque – I wanted to make the Board aware that the Sub-Watershed Plan for Lake Winnepesaukee that includes Paugus, Saunders and Meredith Bays has been completed and you can find that on-line at [www.winnigateway.org](http://www.winnigateway.org). It's not a written plan that goes on a shelf but it is a website. There's lots of good information and links to other things so I encourage you to check it out. We are the first sub-watershed of Winnepesaukee to have a management plan and it will continue around the lake until we finally have a management plan for the entire lake.
2. LaBrecque – John is working on a Notice of Voluntary Lot Merger form. Right now anybody can just come in, fill out a form and merge two lots. This is going into it with a little bit more detail. I think we have much too easy of a process, you can merge a couple of lots and then what happens if there's a mortgage on one, it gets foreclosed on and you're in the middle of building a house or a commercial building on the property line like if we required it to be merged as part of a site plan review so this is something that was brought to our attention by our attorney because of something that did occur in town, we required two lots to be merged and there was a new commercial building proposed to be built on Northview Drive, luckily it wasn't constructed and was easy to undo so John's working on that with Town Counsel and either he or I will bring it in because it is the Planning Board's form. I just wanted to let you know that's coming.

Lou Kahn – You know the Sports Illustrated jinx and I don't want to create a jinx here and its tough to lose an uncontested election but Jim Hughes did it a few years ago. If you really went out of your way to offend people, there's still time but I just wanted to observe that since we're only meeting once a month, this is likely to be your last meeting as our Chairman and I thought we ought to express our thanks and appreciation for your service so I so move, Bayard – I'll second it. Vadney – It's been an honor, thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 8:19 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 on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

A. William Bayard, Secretary