

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Brothers, Selectmen's Rep.; Dever, III; Kahn; Touhey; Lapham, Alternate; LaBrecque, Town Planner; Harvey, Adm. Asst.

Kahn moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2010, AS PRESENTED.

APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **NEW ENGLAND HERITAGE PROPERTIES** – Proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map U37, Lot 21, into 4 lots (3.81 ac., 5.46 ac., 6.33 ac. and 12.05 ac.), located on Powers Road in the Shoreline District. (ACCEPTANCE ONLY)

LaBrecque - This 4-lot subdivision (major) is located in the Shoreline District. Subdivision plan and abutters list are on file. Application fees have been paid. Because this is a major subdivision, it is recommended the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing on October 26, 2010.

Bayard moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF NEW ENGLAND HERITAGE PROPERTIES FOR A MAJOR 4-LOT SUBDIVISION. Voted unanimously.

2. **SHAREN J. FULLER AND WILLIAM L. AND REBECCA L. FULLER** – Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer 6,550 sq. ft. from Tax Map U25, Lot 31 to Tax Map U25, Lot 33, located at 59 and 49 Cummings Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

LaBrecque – The proposed BLA is to convey 6,550 sq. ft. of land from Lot 31 to Lot 33 for the purpose of having the driveway and well entirely contained within the lot it is serving. The BLA plan, checklist and abutters list are in file. Application fees have been paid. A waiver request has been made for topography and wetlands because both of the lots have residences on them and associated improvements so it's recommended the waiver be granted and the application be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding to a public hearing this evening.

Touhey moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF SHAREN FULLER AND WILLIAM & REBECCA FULLER AS COMPLETE AND PROCEED TO A PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

3. **TLF HOLDINGS, LLC** – (Rep. Dave Dobbins) Proposed Site Plan Amendment to replace an existing 1,625 sq. ft. structure with a 6,146 sq. ft., 3-story structure, Tax Map U07, Lot 135, located at 62 Main Street in the Central Business District.

4. **TLF HOLDINGS, LLC** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed commercial structure, Tax Map U07, Lot 135, located at 62 Main Street in the Central Business District

LaBrecque – This is for a new commercial building in place of the existing building on the corner of Dover and Main Streets. The site plan and architectural plan are on file. The checklist and abutters list are also on file. The application fees have been paid and it is recommended both applications be accepted for public hearing this evening.

Dever moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN APPLICATIONS OF TLF HOLDINGS, LLC AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

5. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS** (Rep. Rusty McLearn) - Proposed Site Plan Amendment to enclose the Carriage House @ Church Landing and review parking availability, Tax Map U06, Lot 147, located at 281 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

6. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS** – Architectural Design Review of the proposed changes to the Carriage House, Tax Map U06, Lot 147, located at 281 Daniel Webster Highway in the Central Business District.

LaBrecque – This is for the purpose of enclosing the Carriage House to make it interior space vs. existing parking area and the applicant has requested a waiver of a site plan be granted due to the limited scope of the project and the coverage, setbacks, etc. will not be affected, it's just enclosing a portion of the building. It is recommended the waiver for a site plan be granted. The architectural plan, site plan checklist and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid and it's recommended the applications be accepted and proceed to public hearing this evening.

Sorell moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS OF HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

7. **WILLIAM G. SHAW AND RICHARD & JEANNETTE FAUBERT** – Proposed Boundary Line Agreement between Tax Map S06, Lots 5 & 7, located on Western Lane and Meredith Neck Road in the Shoreline District.

LaBrecque – This is a Boundary Line Agreement because there are a couple of boundary lines that are not defined so the applicant has submitted the plan for the Board to review. The Boundary Line Agreement plan, application and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. A waiver has also been requested from environmental information, given its just agreeing to a line location and not the transfer of land and it's recommended the waiver be granted. It is also

recommended the applications be accepted for the purpose of proceeding to public hearing this evening.

Touhey moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS OF SHAW AND FAUBERT AND PROCEED TO PUBLIC HEARING THIS EVENING. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **JOHN E. MOULTON** (Rep. Carl Johnson, Jr.) – Proposed Major Subdivision of Tax Map S13, Lot 43, into two (2) lots (6.16 ac. and 10.61 ac.) located on Snell Road and NH Route 25 in the Residential District. Application accepted August 24, 2010.

Johnson – This piece of property is owned by John Moulton and was once a much larger piece which has been previously subdivided and approved by the Board. It is a major subdivision due to the fact that the lots are of sufficient size that if a field analysis were done, there's a remote possibility another lot could be created. With the wetland setbacks that are out here, driveway issues and so forth, this is probably going to be it for this larger piece of property. The lot is located at the intersection of NH Route 25 and Snell Road. The previous subdivision plan actually had this as a single lot and showed a test pit and the 4K area, a driveway and a dwelling site with an acceptable well location located up on the road. We've created Lot 1B which is a 10.6 acre lot showing a driveway location, an acceptable test pit and an acceptable house location. The parcels are large enough so State subdivision approval is not required. We did sufficient topo mapping and wetlands delineation to demonstrate we could meet the minimum requirements necessary to meet the worst case soils and slopes scenario and a chart has been added to the plan. NH Route 25 is a paved highway and there is no access off of that road. The access is off Snell Road for Lot 1B and that was previously approved by the previous subdivision and the new access is roughly in the center of the lot to meet the 75' setback from drainage and a 50' setback from a wetland on the southern portion of the lot. Snell Road is serviced by electric poles so there is no problem getting electricity to either one of these properties. We do meet the density and we demonstrate the lots exceed the soils and slopes and are residentially zoned. The wetland information is on the plan and delineated by Nicole Roseberry of Ames Associates. The lots will be served by septics, wells and the utilities that are on the road. We will provide written evidence that the pins have been set prior to recording the mylar. There is a condition that the approval will be valid for two years at which time if final approval has not been obtained, we will need to schedule a public hearing before the Board if additional time is needed. LaBrecque – Both lots have acceptable building envelopes, septic locations and wells. No zoning relief is necessary for any access so it's pretty straightforward. Dever – On the back lot, there are two setback lines there. Johnson – A 50' setback from the wetland which is the limit for development and the 75' setback is a septic system

setback so the house can be within the 75' as long as it's greater than 50'. Public hearing closed at 7:15 p.m.

Dever moved, Sorell seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE IN THE CASE OF JOHN MOULTON FOR A TWO-LOT MAJOR SUBDIVISION, TAX MAP S13, LOT 43, LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF SNELL ROAD AND NH ROUTE 25 IN THE RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT, WE APPROVE THE SUBDIVISION WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

(1) THE SURVEY OF RECORD SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT ALL PINS HAVE BEEN SET PRIOR TO RECORDING THE MYLAR.

(2) 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.

2. **SHAREN J. FULLER AND WILLIAM L. AND REBECCA L. FULLER:** (Rep. Dave Dolan)

This is a Boundary Line Adjustment with 6,550 sq. ft. being transferred between 49 Cummings Cove Road and 59 Cummings Cove Road. 49 Cummings Cove Road right now is about 30,000 sq. ft. and has about 100' of water frontage on Lake Winnepesaukee. The well for the house is located on the abutting property. The transfer of 6,500 sq. ft. and 30' of frontage will bring the overall frontage up to just over 150'. The remaining land at 59 Cummings Cove Road will be about 1.8 acres, it has an existing house and septic system on it and will have over 180' of water frontage after the transfer. We will provide documentation of all monuments being set if the Board approves this as well as documentation regarding a mortgage release, whether it's a mortgage release or there is no mortgage which I believe is the case on 59 Cummings Cove. LaBrecque – The transfer of the 6,550 sq. ft. will allow an entire driveway and well that serves Lot 33 to be entirely located on Lot 33. Lot 31 is conforming with respect to zoning setbacks, lot size and Lot 33 is a pre-existing non-conforming lot. It does become more conforming in a sense 40,000 sq. ft. is the required area and it will be 36,850 sq. ft. Setbacks are shown on the plan and the Boundary Line Adjustment does not create or compound any non-conformity with respect to zoning. As Dave mentioned there will be a requirement to provide either a mortgage release or documentation that no mortgage exists. The surveyor of record shall provide written evidence that all pins have been set prior to recording the mylar. Public Hearing closed at 7:24 p.m.

Bayard moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT FOR SHAREN J. FULLER AND WILLIAM L. AND REBECCA L. FULLER TO TRANSFER 6,550 FEET FROM TAX

MAP U25 – 31 TO TAX MAP U25 -33 LOCATED AT 59 AND 49 CUMMINGS COVE ROAD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

(1) THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A 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 31. IF THERE IS A MORTGAGE, THERE SHALL BE A SATISFACTORY RELEASE RECORDED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CONVEYANCE DEED.

(2) THE SURVEYOR 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.

3. TLF HOLDINGS, LLC. – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW: (Rep. Dave Dobbins & Sonya Misiaszek)

Dobbins – Sonya and I met with you a few times on a proposal that we had put forth and hoped to move forward on. Unfortunately, that first proposal did not work out. It turned out given certain conditions of the site and the size of that structure it wasn't economically feasible so we're here to attempt to present something to you that will make it from an economic point of view and will also keep true to our intent on being sensitive to the character of Main Street and keeping in mind the very special location that this building is going to be put in being right on the corner of Dover and Main Streets. We learned a couple of things on the first project that were very important and we have addressed them through this one. The first one was to be a lot more sensitive to how the building was positioned on the site as it is relative to the Penstock that runs through that property. The second one was to find a way to increase the square footage on the building so the economics of constructing on that site with the Penstock works out OK. It was very important to me and to Sonya as well to be able to do both of those things and still construct a building that really paid attention to the character of the village district and the Main Street of Meredith. This proposal is an amendment to our previous site plan and because it's an amendment, I'm going to try to focus most of the attention to things that are different on the site plan. We have not changed the number of businesses to be located in the building, it still remains somewhere between one and four, not to exceed four. The lot line adjustment approved by this Board last year has been finalized and recorded and represented by the dark line crossing which basically straightened that out and gave a little bit better positioning in the setback on the new structure. We are retaining this walkway from Dover Street to connect to a brick walkway that exists much further into Mills Falls. That aspect was very important to us and we still feel very strongly about it. It's going to be a big benefit to pedestrian safety. On this new site plan with the new building, the lot coverage post completion is 62.9% and the Central Business District allows up 65% coverage. The civil engineer that worked on this site plan indicated the runoff post

construction on this site will not exceed the runoff that exists right now and those calculations have been provided to the Town. That brings us to the differences from what we talked about last Fall. The building has changed in square footage and its positioning. The previous building had 4 or 5 significant jogs that crisscrossed a couple different times, actually maybe 3 or 4 times over the Penstock. The location of the new building which is structured with a smaller mass facing the Main Street intersecting with what is being constructed to replicate an early style mill building sits along the back side of the lot and the larger building just traverses or straddles over the Penstock in two locations. The increased footprint of the building has increased the parking requirements based on the 200 sq. ft. for either retail or office use. In the prior project, we had received a waiver for 15 parking spaces; in this project we're seeking a waiver of 12 spaces for a total waiver of 27 spaces. We used the most restrictive calculation, 1 space for every 200 sq. ft. of office/retail space. Vadney – Is this a totally different footprint? Dobbins – Yes. . Vadney – Will this building be totally demolished right? Dobbins – Yes. LaBrecque – The previous building was to be demolished and rebuilt. Dobbins - Yes, except we were following some of the footprint lines. The gain in square footage is all going to the full second level and the 3rd floor which is underneath the roof. LaBrecque – The design, flow of the site, parking and a lot of the landscaping features are staying similar to what was previously approved. The building is what's increasing. With respect to zoning, it conforms with coverage, setbacks are not becoming more non-conforming with respect to the side and rear, however, the front would require another special use permit that the Board previously granted. According to the architectural design review regulations or ordinance, the Board is able to grant a special use permit to allow for a building to encroach into a setback for a specific type of architectural feature or design. In this case, it would be the covered porch. That distance is less than was previously requested. The setback was 19', now they're requesting 22' from the road. The side of the building is an elevator shaft that is right next door to Emery and Garrett and that encroaches into the side setback but not any more than the current building does at a point. I ran it by the Zoning Administrator and he said that would not require any sort of zoning relief. Utilities currently servicing the building are town water and sewer and electrical. This site is on the corner of Main and Dover Streets and they would have to back out into Dover Street from the small parking area. It's not ideal but its parking and that is a commodity on Main Street. As Dave mentioned the pre and post stormwater runoff calculations do show there will be no increase in stormwater runoff and the walkways and parking areas are forest pavers so there will be some infiltration capacity from those. They have an attractive landscape design to enhance the building that will not change. Maximum sign area allowed is 32 sq. ft. per each building façade. No freestanding sign is proposed, however, there is a directional sign similar to the one at the end of Dover Street. Fuel supply is to be oil with tank in the basement. Trash disposal will be handled and removed by the owner. As part of your plans, you have the site plan that's prepared by the engineer but you also have the Misiaszek & Turpin plans for elevations. There are no floor plans but it won't exceed 4 businesses, either retail or office. In order for the Planning Board to approve the architectural design, the Board must find the

proposed design demonstrates substantial conformity with the ordinance. As you can see, for the special use permit there are 5 criteria for the reduction in the building setback must be found to fulfill the purpose and intent of the architectural design ordinance so that would be the articulation of the building and the front porch. LaBrecque – The building is 3 full stories and the maximum building height allowed is 45' and this building is 42'. Dobbins reviewed the building elevations with the Board. The building is made up of 2 masses facing Main Street. The porch on the front wraps around to the Dover Street side. The staircase goes up on the interior of the elevator. The walkway wraps around the building. The elevator tower needs to peak up above it in order to serve the 3rd floor. Bayard had no problems with the side facing Mill Falls parking lot but still expressed concerns about the elevator tower and wanted to know if there is some way for it to be softened. From the Main Street that jog is considerably back away from how you see it in a one dimensional view. Vadney – The way it is now, as you go by the red building and the Emery & Garrett building, you barely notice that path down through there because it sits back from the road. Bayard suggested some landscaping might help. Dever – One of the other issues is that's the back of the elevator shaft, putting a window in there would serve no useful purpose. Dobbins – We could try adding some landscaping there. Touhey – I want to go on record, I feel that this is very unkeeping and very unattractive looking to the Dover Street view. It seems the whole mass of the building is going to be very overwhelming on that lot. To me, it is unsuitable. I think you're trying to do too much here to have that elevator shaft outside. The frame of the building is unattractive and even if you try to put it into the alleyway, I don't think it does anything for Main Street. Dever – While I think the building is very nicely done, the only word that comes to my mind is looming. A structure of that mass seems overwhelming to put it there. Kahn – The east side of the building is simple. The sides facing Main Street and Dover Street are just too busy. There are too many angles and too many things jutting out all over the place. I would be a lot happier if you somehow stripped it down and got rid of a lot of the roof lines and made it simpler. You could knock a couple feet off the roof in terms of height, I think that would also be very helpful. Dobbins - I appreciate the comments but they do strike me to the heart. We took tremendous care with many varied rooflines to give it a very interesting and appealing look rather than just a big rectangle sitting on Main Street. Vadney – I think you've done a nice job with it as far as the looks of the building. I think some of the concerns would go away if they saw it in perspective standing in front of the building. After your last approval several months went by and with a call from staff, the talk was about just doing an architectural design review or not doing anything. I felt the change was too dramatic for me to waive it off and have the Board see it after it was constructed. I brought it to the Board at the last meeting and after seeing the size, massing and stuff, the Board voted to bring it back. I do support the project and I think the building would look very good. I checked a couple days ago going down there and I don't know what the Garrett Company is but the peak on that one has got to be at least 35' to 38', it's not a whole lot taller than this would be at 42'. There are some other pretty large buildings on Main Street. As you go down the hill, you see the Chase House which is a tall building well done. The original mill is certainly a large

building. I am concerned a little bit about what I call the intensity of it. The original building sitting there today is roughly 1,600 sq. ft., we little more than doubled that for your previous approval up to 3400-3500 sq. ft. and this one takes it up over 6400 sq. ft. It's pretty much quadrupling the existing building and from any calculation no matter how slyly you choose the parameters, its going to make quite a difference in the parking and parking is always an issue. This jump from a need of 4 or 5 spaces to 31 is a pretty heavy dose. Often times the business doesn't attract the level of intensity that the engineering calculations would suggest but to go from 4 available, 31 needed worries me a little bit. If we go forward with this, we would have to have some control on the level of intensity because of the size of the building and its going onto a small lot in a small village. I'm comfortable with the design, but I still think we need to look at the intensity. Brothers – I too look at the design and look at what else is on Main Street and think the design in many ways complements the different styles of the buildings that are there. They are all fairly large, massive buildings in terms of lot coverage. When they were built 100 years ago, parking issues, traffic and accessibility to the buildings wasn't of the same magnitude. I would ask the applicant if any consideration has been given to working with other merchants or figuring out some way to deal with the parking similar to a request we had last month where there was some off-site shuttling of employees or something to minimize the impact and provide both consideration for the rightful use of the property but also doing that in consortium with a few parking spaces available with abutting neighbors. I would like to hear some significant dialogue or solutions to that. This is a full 3-story building and office space in my mind would be different than retail. Its not for us to decide which one that is, but it does have an impact on the parking and movement of people and traffic in the downtown area. The parking issue is probably a larger concern than the design from my perspective. Rusty McLearn – I represent Hampshire Hospitality Holdings, a neighbor to this potential building. I did look at the plans this morning after last month's discussion and a little discussion with Angela. I was a little concerned about the size of the building; however, I think the look of the building is really quite good for the size of it. I would much prefer to see something this big with all of the peaked roofs and those kind of things than something smaller with a flat roof. I think they have worked hard to make it look attractive. Also, the fact it's encapsulated in very large trees, I also think brings the mass down on that building pretty substantially. One issue talked about was what kind of business is going to be in there; I would hope at least the first floor is retail. There is some discussion here about trying to get more retail back onto Main Street and I really did think that parking was going to be the biggest part of the discussion and I know its not the prevalent sentiment in town but I don't believe and have not believed for a long time that parking is the issue or even a major issue on Main Street. There's enough parking to support a quality building housing quality businesses. In the 70's and up to 1990 Main Street was very viable with a lot of very good businesses, Grad's, Samaha's, the Cupola, Anderson's Bakery, we had a sports store, pharmacy and we had less parking than we have now. I would like to know what's in the building, but I don't think parking is an issue to potentially stop this building. It really needs to be looked at and thought through but I do think it is good for the town. Jeannie

Borisso – I attended a meeting a long time ago about bringing the boat into town, I had said at the public meeting then, leave the boat where it is, the tourists go find the entertainment when they come to town. I have been here since 1969, I don't see that there's any more parking. We don't know what these businesses are going to be and we don't know how long they are going to stay and what's going to replace them. I've seen this town grow too much, too fast without any consideration for parking. Vadney – It's an up and down issue and in some periods it gets tough, most of the year it's not a problem at all. Bayard – I do have a little objection to the masses we often see a building that doesn't seem to work too well at a small size. I think the building for its size is probably about as nice as you can get. I think it's nice to have a fairly vibrant town, you don't want to have vacant buildings all over the place so I think putting the employee parking off-site like at the municipal lot in the back where it isn't too crowded normally might be the way to get around that. If they keep some of the landscaping and work with what they have as far as the trees and everything goes, I think that will help a lot to keep the mass of the building down. Vadney – I want us to guard against just approving a retail business with no limits and then the Code Enforcement Officer, when one business leaves and another one comes in, their business might be triple. When you go from a 1,600 sq. ft. building to 3,200 there was no room for a dumpster and we made an agreement last time that you would haul trash daily. If you jump to 6,400 sq. ft. assuming all this new space is getting the intensity you wish to have to turn a profit, would you still be able to maintain 3 dump runs a day or whatever? Those are the kinds of intensity issues we're concerned about with that much square footage because we did say no storage area for trash would be required and granted your request that you would haul regularly. I am willing to work with you on some minor modifications if they'd help you and help us. I understand you may be boxed in if you can't get a certain space there, you really can't afford to do much with the property and that's certainly a problem we regret.

It's probably unfortunate you brought in only the various side views and front views. Do you have a 3-dimensional sketch of any kind you could show us? Sonya – We do not have any 3-dimensional drawings at this point but we do have floor plans of the different levels with us this evening if the Board would like to see those. Vadney - You can put them up quickly but that is getting into a detail that I don't think will be your issue. Sonya – We worked very hard to try and blend this building into the fabric of the Main Street district and we feel we have done that in that this front element which is closest to Main Street has a smaller scale, relates to a person that has a porch for people to come and sit on. We're trying to invite people to the building and keeping that humanesque scale to it. At the back which is closer to the mill buildings, we have gone with the taller volume in the mill structure so it can complicate the neighborhood behind it. By wrapping the porch, we've also addressed Dover Street which we do not want to disregard. Liz Lapham – I remember from your other presentation to the Board, you were quite proud of the historical significance of the Penstock. Do you still plan to expose that to the public? Dobbins – On the earlier proposal, we had quite a bit of discussion about the Penstock because I had gone through so much intensive work on researching where it was and exploratory digging underneath the building to determine it. The

Penstock is down at a depth where making it viewable is really not feasible. We do not intend to do that. On this plan we're putting in an architectural feature at ground level outlining a portion of where the Penstock lies below. Lapham – I think a plaque or something to explain that would add even more historical significance to that. The building was to be called the Penstock. Dever – I'm not wedded to the building that's there and I just hate to lose that open space. I do like the design of the building. What's going to happen to the trees on the north side of the building that are there presently? It looks to me that at least one if not 3 trees outside the elevator shaft will have to be removed. Dobbins – On that site, the larger tree will have to go and the entire cluster of trees could end up going. I discussed that with Jamie next door and we're planning on finding a location to plant something else in its place. Dever requested the height of the ridge be shown on the elevation plan. Vadney – I personally support it and I would be willing to work with you in any way we can if we can tweak it a bit. I realize the building is bigger than we expected to be there. My real concern is not that it's bigger but could bring an intensity that would be tougher to manage. I would suggest we not bring it to a vote tonight and continue it to another meeting. Looking at supporting the business and having a core on Main Street I think is an important piece of where I see the community heading so I do support that. I think my point is trying to recognize how this would fit in with and complement the other Main Street businesses, incorporate plans or thoughts in terms of how the use of the parking could be more beneficial to everyone concerned. I'm not as hung up on the design as several other Board members, I think what I've seen coming into the area over the last 20 years is better than the old boxes and flat roofs that were once very predominant in the area. I would like to lend my support saying I'd like to work with you in terms of coming up with some solution to answer our questions based on what impacts that might have on parking and other businesses and I wish you well. Vadney – I would point out to the Board one thing I consider an advantage of this is you make the building a little higher to get enough economic use out of a piece of land. If someone were to crowd our setbacks, that would be much worse. Bayard – Could we get a rendering of what the front will look like in terms of a photographic simulation showing how it will look with some trees. Touhey – We get this thrown at us and in just a few minutes, we have not seen this, we have the staff review but we have not seen these plans so you have to understand that. I would love to see some kind of a 3-dimensional and then I can imagine what it would be like coming up Dover Street and seeing that building on the corner of Dover and Main. I would appreciate anything you can do to help me get a better feel for it. Dever – What plantings there are going to remain in perspective with the building might help to visualize the impact of the building in regards what it is. Kahn – I'm counting heads and I see the issue is parking so design is not going to be the issue. How are we going to come up with some sort of restrictions as to how this space is used so it doesn't create a greater parking issue for us? What kind of offices are we going to have that will have people who are sort of there all day long and won't have a lot of traffic. I think we need a little thought on who the tenants can be and that's going to have to be worked into the site plan. Vadney – Lou's point is a good one, if its retail, particularly tourist oriented retail, you could argue that the people that come

into your shop are already parking somewhere on Main Street and this is just another place they can visit. If it turned out to be something that draws people specifically, it could be a real problem. Do you have in the back of your mind any strong opinion of what you'd like to put in there, the kind of business you think would be most productive? Dobbins – I'm not at a point to do that but I appreciate the discussion. Vadney – Would you entertain the plan to work over the next month and see what we can come up with that would answer some of these concerns and come back? If that is agreeable to everybody, I'd welcome a motion to continue this to the next meeting and see what we can do. Public Hearing closed at 8:30 p.m.

Brothers moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THIS HEARING TO THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING, OCTOBER 26, 2010. Voted unanimously.

4. **HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS:** Site Plan Amendment and Architectural Design Review: (Rep. Rusty McLear)

Rusty - A major part of our business is corporate and association functions. These groups require vendor display and break-out spaces when you have a meeting and bring 100 people in and they want to break out into 4 smaller groups to talk so you need 4 rooms. We currently have a ballroom that has a 300-person capacity and we have 3 smaller break-out rooms. We have no dedicated vendor space and we have one lobby, the oval room on the main level of the Inn at Church Landing that doubles as meeting space. Due to these shortcomings we lose business and we're not as competitive as we could be and should be. Our proposal today is to enclose the existing Carriage House completely inside the existing footprint and create a 1750 sq. ft. vendor break-out space. This will also increase the lobby area for all groups and functions and make the drive-thru more attractive. In your plan you have a ceiling plan of the drive-thru which will really be quite impressive. By enclosing this it does result in the loss of 8 on-site parking spaces. The Carriage House has 11 spaces in it but we will build 3 new spaces that are shown on the existing site plan right in front of the Carriage House on the existing site plan is a small green area that on the approved site plan was allowed to stay green but could become 3 additional parking spaces. We would put those in. We have purchased a parking lot on Mill Street that can park approximately 32 cars and somewhere around 65-70 valet cars. Our current meeting room occupancy is 300. We are not asking for any increase and stipulate there will be no increase, it will remain at 300. This room will not add to our total capacity, it will help us to accommodate groups better and to be more competitive. To accommodate groups and all our guests better, we did a study of our 14 best competitors, 9 of them had group valet parking. We are going to require valet parking and will stipulate to the Board that we will have valet parking for every group over 100 so that should make our existing facility much more accessible and this new facility is not adding any people to the facility, its allowing us get the groups we can already accommodate and accommodate them better. We are enclosing a 1700 sq. ft. space to make vendor and break-out

space, our maximum capacity stays the same as it is, there are no site plan issues, we are replacing 8 reduced on-site spaces with 32-35 spaces off-site and we are requiring any group over 100 to have valet parking and since our last meeting in August, we have tentatively booked 7 groups to utilize the ballroom but utilize this space too for break-outs and 5 for exhibitors. The drive-thru will not change. The planting area can stay where it is. The one-way circle stays the same. We are enclosing the area where there's a carriage now, giving us more upper lobby space so when we have a group down here, you come down the stairs and there's a little table in front of the fireplace, it gets pretty crowded down there and now we'll be able to put that area in the upper lobby so it gives us more space to get people into the main part of the building and then this will be the vendor space and break-out space. We've coffered the ceiling of the drive-thru to make that look much more interesting, the main room obviously we're doing quite a bit with to make look attractive. We're taking the center aisle here and that will be a little bit vaulted and there will be either granite or brick as a walkway across there now to delineate that and also will be heated from below and above. Bayard – You're going to have about 32-35 spaces and you are also going to have valet parking for 80 something, is that additional parking? That's the same lot. If we were to do it as a defined parking lot, 10' spaces, 20' long, I think you can get 32 spaces on that site. If you do it as valet parking, we can get about 70. LaBrecque – If you were to pave, is that to the property line or 65%? McLear – No, that's not property line to property line, it's to the setback lines. If we decided to put that new UNH pavement... LaBrecque – The pervious asphalt doesn't support vegetation and Bill hasn't been looking at it like that because someone could come in and say its not pervious so we're going to do the whole thing. He's been looking at that as coverage even though it is pervious asphalt. It eliminates the need for stormwater management because it is a big infiltration area but I don't think it's in lieu of the coverage, the ratio of green space to built area. McLear – I would say the calculation I'm using is probably somewhere over 70%-75%. Kahn – Is that lot the one beyond Case n' Keg? I guess what troubles me about it, that's a good thousand feet from (900') and in terms of just ordinary valet parking, you're going to have to hire a lot of sprinters, either that or you'll have to run a shuttle for the valets. We hired a valet company this summer. We tested this out a couple of times last summer. It's a professional valet company and they will run 2 shuttles if it's busy enough. If everybody comes all at once, then we'll need it. If this is over a half hour, then kids would run it, but the way I see it, it's mostly being driven. Kahn – It works at the other end as well. When it lets out, you've got to have somebody getting those kids back. Has Kevin said anything about adding traffic to that intersection of Mill Street and Route 3. LaBrecque – He hasn't mentioned traffic, he did mention a concern for employee parking because I think he thought that perhaps that would also be parking for employees or could be parking for employees when there isn't a function and valet would be needed because of the concern of parking on side streets or whatnot but I know you don't formally allow employees to park on side streets but you can't check every license plate. McLear – Actually, we do try and do that and we don't tell people where they can't park, we tell them where they are supposed to park but we have now told all of the Church Landing employees to park on this site

and we have just bought a van for shuttling employees back and forth also. Brothers – Again, the concept of taking some spaces away, adding some viability to his business and yet come up with a solution even though it may not be ideal, it is probably as close to it as you can get in terms of what the Mill Street lot can provide. Obviously, there will be safety in terms of pedestrians crossing there and I guess my question is, does it require the state or anything else, is there any possibility of a crosswalk or anything else to help alleviate some of the traffic in what I call the dockside area as well? McLear – We’ve talked with the state about a crosswalk and they don’t want to have any more crosswalks anywhere on Route 3 until they redo the whole road issue and I think crosswalks will get built into that. Vadney – There’s another issue I suspect the state would be very hesitant to put a crosswalk at Church Landing is its not particularly hilly right there but its hilly before and after it and the slow down of trucks would really impede traffic. The state’s very strict on that. McLear – This parking lot isn’t meant to be a parking lot for guests to drive their car back and forth, they are not going to be told where the parking lot is. This is purely either employees or valet and the valet will be driven. The employees that use that are mostly nighttime employees and they want to be driven, they don’t like to walk. As a matter of fact, that’s the issue of why a lot of them are parking over by the Fire Station because they can park there and it’s close and lit up. I think it’s a great idea. LaBrecque – Rusty did want to note that this parking lot would be used for any event over 100 people and you have 160+/- spaces on-site already so I think that would be great. There is a capacity of 300 so just for 100 folks using that off-site parking lot would free up a lot of the parking spaces on-site. There was a concern about the loss of parking and the use of the Mill Street parking lot and I think some of those concerns specifically were paving and how people were going to be getting to and from the lot and I think that’s something we could work out administratively and certainly that would be tied to this site perpetually because you wouldn’t want to say, for instance, Church Landing gets sold and we have this parking lot that’s supposed to be going with it. McLear – I did see that on your notes and that lot was purchased under Hampshire Hospitality, some of our other holdings are different entities and that was purchased for that reason. I assumed you were going to make it go with the property. LaBrecque – I think that’s something we could review administratively. I think Mike had a concern about drainage and said it would be really easy to tie it into the catch basin at the curb. I think those issues are easily resolved. Bayard – Are we going to see something separate on the parking on that lot or are we sort of approving that lot with this change? Vadney – You mean paving and striping or something. Bayard – The fact that the lot coverage may exceed what we require. LaBrecque–It would fit what it would fit and would have to be within zoning or else he would have to go to the Zoning Board for some sort of zoning relief. Bayard – So that would be taken care of by the zoning officer. LaBrecque – There’s ample room for stacking of cars. When you talk about valet, the parking demand itself is 210 and about 160 were built so that makes up for the difference even if it is 100% stacking cars. McLear – It’s 108’ wide and 163.9’ long. LaBrecque – Even at 65% there would be enough room to make up those 40 spaces easily with stacked cars. Sorell - What’s going to happen in the winter when cars go down that knoll? McLear – The

circulation stays exactly the same as it is now. Vadney – You still drive through that portion. Sorell – But you are putting people back and forth across there and that would be my concern. McLear – We still put people across there now with people parking on one side. That's where everybody goes but it's an interesting question because we did get ice buildup on there. You can see we have a new drain now and we've heated that so we're not getting that ice buildup. I didn't think it was a safety issue, but it was raising the height and I was afraid if it got 6 inches higher and because we only have a foot of clearance and on a couple storms, it was getting up there so we've got an entirely new drain system and its heated. Public Hearing closed at 8:53 p.m.

Touhey moved, Dever seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE WE GRANT CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT PRESENTED BY HAMPSHIRE HOSPITALITY HOLDINGS TO ENCLOSE THE CARRIAGE HOUSE @ CHURCH LANDING AND REVIEW RELATED PARKING, TAX MAP U06, LOT 147, LOCATED AT 281 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

(1) THE ENCLOSURE OF THE CARRIAGE HOUSE AND LOSS OF PARKING SPACES SHALL BE DEPENDENT ON THE USE OF THE OFF-SITE VALET PARKING LOT. THE OFF-SITE PARKING AREA ON MILL STREET SHALL BE TIED TO CHURCH LANDING AND CONSIDERED A PART OF CHURCH LANDING UNTIL SUCH TIME EQUIVALENT PARKING CAN BE OBTAINED IN ANOTHER WAY.

(2) TO MAXIMIZE THE USE OF THE MILL STREET LOT TO ITS FULL POTENTIAL, IT SHOULD BE PAVED AND STRIPED.

(3) A FORMAL PLAN AND DETAILS CONCERNING THE PARKING LOT ON MILL STREET SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF TO REVIEW.

(4) THE PLANNING BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND ANY APPROVAL AS PROVIDED FOR IN SITE PLAN REVIEW REGULATION NOS. 7 & 17.

Voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

McLear – What we have is novelty siding which is the green siding we already have and that will be around the base of it and we have large windows with arch tops. It's going to look almost exactly the way it is now. We have the arch doorways and windows. LaBrecque – To approve the architectural design that the Board must find the design demonstrates substantial conformity with the general and specific criteria set forth in the ordinance.

Dever moved, Kahn seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN HAVING FOUND THE DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE. Voted unanimously.

5. **WILLIAM G. SHAW AND RICHARD & JEANNETTE FAUBERT:** Boundary Line Agreement (Rep. Harry Wood)

Wood: Starting back in early 1980 or thereabouts, I surveyed Mr. Shaw's property. At that time, he had about 24 acres of land and has some parcels in this westerly area which came out of the overall parcel. The deeds for those parcels are extremely poor. They have directions 180 degrees out, they call for lines to be even but the lengths are different. There's a number of issues that we left this area undefined. This lot is well defined, the roadway is defined and there is a stonewall on one side. I have talked with Mr. Taylor, who is present this evening, the lot in the middle was previously owned by the Harveys and now owned by Mr. Shaw and what we are proposing to do is establish a boundary line along the back of the Faubert lot and along the southerly side. In order to do that we had to take into account the two abutting parcels and they have a width there according to the deeds of 125' wide, 150' on one side, 225' on the other and even that doesn't come out exactly so I created a space that is large enough to meet the deed, then Mr. Shaw's property is fit in there using what little information there is for his and since he is the owner there and here, he's a little bit flexible and he has agreed to establish the line as we have shown it. There was another surveyor from Laconia that worked on this project and finally threw his hands up. I consulted with him about it and told him I had some prior experience in this area and thought I might be able to come up with a reasonable solution. The two owners agreed with that and have agreed to take these two lines that are intensified a little bit and you'll see a note there that says, "Lines to be agreed upon" and that is what they plan to do. It's pretty simple and does not affect anybody except Mr. Faubert and Mr. Shaw. I talked with Mr. Taylor years ago and also his son with regard to defining this lot and I think this will open the door for that also. LaBrecque – A Boundary Line Agreement is basically a survey that is defining boundary lines that are unknown and undefined so this is the case here. There's no exchange of land per se, they are just agreeing to where their property ends and begins so to speak and zoning isn't an issue but I'll go through that so you know. It's in the Shoreline District, both lots 5 and 7 are conforming with respect to the minimum lot size of 40,000 sq. ft. Lot 21 does not indicate the size though the Assessor's records show it's a pre-existing, non-conforming lot and is not part of the Agreement but does share a line with a line to be agreed upon. Typically, the Board reviews a Boundary Line Adjustment to ensure it does not create or compound a non-conformity with respect to zoning but in this case, there really isn't an adjustment per se, it is slightly different than the Assessor's records but the Assessor's records are just based on whatever survey we had historically to go on so after talking to Jim Commerford, our Town Assessor, he says he's seen these before. They come in and amend the tax map the way the survey shows the lines to be agreed upon are drawn up and

he'll have his plan changed. Basically, the only comment I had was the surveyor of record should provide evidence the pins have been set prior to recording the mylar. Wood – I will certify that. I don't know if state statute requires the PLB to review it but we're playing it safe by bringing it here because it is a plat to be recorded. Brothers - Is it going to have any kind of significant impact on the tax assessed values of either Mr. Shaw's Lot 21 or Lot 7? LaBrecque – Not any significance according to Jim. It appears that Lot 7 is a little smaller here than shows on our Assessor's records, but then again, the configuration of some of these other abutting lots are slightly different as well. Wood – The Assessor's plan shows the line in a different location and we know from the deeds that is not the case. Dever – This is it, this sets the deed and from hence forward, this is the way it is. Wood – That will be the line in the future and if the property is transferred in the future, what they typically do is give the old description and then they say, however, subject to Boundary Line Agreement as signed and recorded, book and page and there will be a recorded deed. It is required under state law and it will, in effect, replace a portion of the old description. Dever – Its encouraging to see neighbors agreeing on a boundary line, I rarely see that. Touhey – Since we're talking about Mr. White and its White Road so-called, does that road exist? Wood – In essence, it is basically a grass strip where it turns off here, its not heavily traveled. There are lots here and a few up in back which are lots of record but if it were me and I were going down there, I'd drive up Western Lane and up a little connecting loop over here. Linda Harding - At the tax office I was told what we call Western Lane isn't Western Lane and what is written up there as being White Road is Western Lane. Wood – Just for the record, the tax map is incorrect the way its labeled. The subdivision plan for this area clearly shows Western Lane as being a strip of land running across the back of the lots that run from this boundary to the water so it's a private way on private property and each of the lots share a strip on the back of their property that allows the road to exist. Paul Taylor – My son owns Lot 22 on this sketch and I am here in his place. I have no issues with the lot line adjustment between the parties. I'd like to be sure that Lot 22 is unaffected by tonight's action and any rights we have on that lot are preserved as they were before the meeting should the Board decide to grant the variance which I hope they do. I'm a little concerned about this Western Lane/White Road stuff and where the roads really are. This might not be the venue for it, does anybody have any idea what that street is? The Town map shows that Western Lane that Harry's referring to is a 25' easement going down the back of those properties and Western Lane being the one that's being referred to here tonight as White Road. Wood – that's what the deeds call it. LaBrecque – Two comments, with respect to roads, road names, their history, there's a lot of it in Meredith and you can go to the Town Clerk's office and there are historical records there on our roads so there may be something on Western Lane and there may be something on White Road so-called. As far as a private way, I would say if you owned any of these lots and your deed had an easement on it, then your lot is subject to an easement for others to cross. There are also prescriptive easements and that's not really the issue tonight, however, there are files in the Town Clerk's office on most of the roads in the Town of Meredith. Vadney – Lot 22 should have no bearing on this whatsoever. Taylor –

It's kind of what Harry told me out in the hall, but I wanted to hear it from you. Wood – All we did was to show the rough dimensions on those 2 lots beside it so if the question came up we could show both Mr. Taylor and anyone else interested that we were aware of the dimensions on their lot and we set this up so if anybody loses anything, it will be Mr. Shaw and he will maybe merge all of his stuff together in the end. The only improvement on that lot at the present time is a well that the Harvey's put in when they bought it, no structure. Public Hearing closed at 9:15 p.m.

Dever moved, Kahn seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, IN THE CASE OF WILLIAM G. SHAW AND RICHARD AND JEANNETTE FAUBERT FOR A BOUNDARY LINE AGREEMENT AT TAX MAP S06, LOTS 5, 7 AND 21 ON WESTERN LANE AND MEREDITH NECK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT, I MOVE WE APPROVE THE BOUNDARY LINE AGREEMENT AS PRESENTED AND THE SURVEYOR 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.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Plan Signatures: Bruce Vaal Subdivision

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 _____.

s/A. William Bayard
A. William Bayard, Secretary