

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

Call to Order: by Jeremy Dube-Chairman at 7:05 p.m.

Members: Present: Jeremy Dube-Chairman, Cris Blackstone-Selectman Representative, Bruce Holmes, Cynthia Balcius, Jim Bureau-Alternate, Monica Jerkins-Planning Assistant and Carolyn Schaeffner-Recording Secretary.

Appointment of Alternates: Jim Bureau is appointed for the evening.

Approval of Agenda:

Case P06-42 moved before P07-03

The following applicants have requested to be continued to the March 20, 2007 hearing:

Case #P06-102	Map 9 Lot 53	21-Lot Subdivision
Alton Bay Camp Meeting Association		New Durham Road
Prospect Mountain Builders		
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing		

Case#P06-70	Map 14 Lot 20	8-Lot Subdivision
Daniel A. Weldon, Trustee, C&D Realty Trust		East Side Drive (Route 28A)
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing		

Case #P06-110	Map 3 Lots 24-1 & 23	14-Lot Subdivision
Brian & Heather Welch		Prospect Mountain Road
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing		

Case P06-70	Map 14, Lot 20	8 Lot Subdivision
Daniel A. Weldon, Trustee, C & D Realty Trust		East Side Drive (Route 28A)
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing.		

Case P06-110	Map 3, Lot 24-1 and 23	14 Lot Subdivision
Brian and Heather Welch		Prospect Mountain Road
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing.		

Case P07-01	May 57, Lot 9	2 Lot subdivision
Gerald and Linda Paxton		Woodlands Road and Run Point Road
Application submitted by Brown Engineering on behalf of the property owners, Gerald and Linda Paxton for a proposed 2-lot subdivision of their property located within the Lakeshore Residential Zone.		

Motion made by B. Holmes to approve the agenda as amended, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.

Public Input: Paula Brooks – question as to when public input will be for a specific case.
J. Dube – When that case is before the board at some point I will open it up to public while discussing that case.
No further seen or heard, public input closed.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

Applications for Public Hearing:

Case #P07-08

Map 29, Lot 76

Site Plan Review

Nancy D. McFarlane

Monument Square

Application submitted by Arthur W. Hoover, Esquire on behalf of Nancy D. McFarlane for a Site Plan Review to operate a Curves exercise facility in an existing building. The property is located within the Residential Commercial Zone.

J. Bureau recused himself for this case.

M. Jerkins noted applicant requesting blanket waiver.

Motion made by B. Holmes to accept Case #P07-08 and grant the blanket waiver, seconded by C. Balcus. Motion passed with all in favor.

Art Hoover – The property owner is Nancy McFarlane but I was actually retained by the Julie Higgins, who is leasing the property. Some of the concerns that are expressed by the Department Heads, I will try to address but I don't represent the other tenants in the building or Nancy McFarlane. The property is the former American Legion property and there were many activities then with the same parking situation as it is now. The property has 1 or 2 apartment houses up stairs. This application is for the use of the basement area for Curves. The Code Officer informs us that no variances are required but we do need site plan approval. There will be no changes required to the building neither inside nor outside. The estimated hours of operation will be Mon-Thu 7-7, Fri 7-6, Sat 8-1, no Sunday openings. She estimates one possible two employees but no more than two at one time. The estimated peak hours of operation would be 7-10:30 a.m. and 4-7 pm in the evening. The peak is based on experience is 10-12 cars on an average between 10:30-3:30. I would like to address the issues raised by the Fire Department. There is an electrician addressing the issues with the smoke alarms, fire alarms, bathroom issues and all of the things that we raised and we anticipate that will be done in the next day or two. The parking issue was raised by the acting Police Chief and that is we can accommodate and do what is required or requested. I am going to make a suggestion and I need to point out why because there is some confusion as to who owns what in that area and who has what rights and before we devise a parking plan there should be some understanding of what the various interests are. Parking issues were raised by Acting Police Chief and there is confusion on who owns what area. (Showed display of parking with three different situations.) Willing to comply with all requirements and they will do what they can with the parking. What I suggested and would like the Board to do is grant site plan with condition of electrical work done and approved by Fire Chief and parking issue be deferred until property line issues can be resolved.

B. Holmes – I think we should follow the suggestions from Fire chief, there are 7 items that need to be dealt with and then there is a note in here to Nancy McFarlane on other things in that building that I don't think pertains to this application at all and to me should be separated out. Are there parking requirements downtown?

M. Jerkins – Every individual business needs a certain number of spaces and it is difficult in the downtown area because all of the businesses share the parking that is available on Main Street.

C. Blackstone – I don't believe policing the parking is realistic

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

J. Higgins – there is a sign there that says tenant parking

A. Hoover – But that is for the tenants in that building, Mrs. Brooks is concerned about her tenants in that alleyway.

C. Blackstone – What would be happening in the basement?

J. Higgins - Curves fitness facility

C. Blackstone – You would be curving underneath Cranberries?

C. Balcius – The parking thing is bothering me.

J. Dube – Was there a business there before or is this a new area being made

J. Wiggins – It was the American Legion

Open to public input:

Paulette Alden Brooks – I own 4 Monument Square it is the large white building to the left of the hardware store. There is a marker in middle of the road to mark the property line. Five parking places in front. Parking covers tenants needs for 2 per apartment. I think parking addressed before any decisions are made.

J. Dube – You said you had a sign?

P. Brooks – I had someone paint parking spaces before and it helped a little.

C. Blackstone – Does your lease state that with the apartment comes parking spaces?

P. Brooks – I don't specify in the lease but we provide parking for the tenants.

C. Balcius – What are the peak hours and how many patrons do you expect in that peak hour if all goes well?

J. Higgins – Peak is 7-10:30 in Gilford and generally I have between 8-10 cars at that time. Mondays are higher than the other days.

J. Dube – Has anyone checked the road inventory?

M. Jerkins – They are private.

J. Dube - Since the road is private it is not the town's responsibility to determine who the owner of record is.

J. Dube - Public input closed.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

J. Dube – When would you like to open?

J. Higgins – I would like to open by April 2

Motion made by B. Holmes to approve Case #P07-08 with the following conditions:

- 1. All areas of the building are to be included in the fire alarm system**
- 2. Smoke detectors with emergency battery backup will need to be installed instead of heat detectors**
- 3. Bathrooms must have gfcı outlets installed**
- 4. Code Enforcement Officer to do an electrical inspection before opening**

Motion seconded by C. Blackstone. Motion passed with all in favor

Motion made by B. Holmes to have Peer do more research for owner of record, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.

C. Balcius recused herself from the following case.

J. Bureau resumed his seat on the Board.

**Case #P07-05
NH Electric Coop**

Map 9, Lot 3

**Design Review
Suncook Valley Road**

Owner of Record: Keith & Stephanie Robinson

Request submitted by Ames MSC on behalf of New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, for a pre-application discussion on a proposed utility facility. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

J. Dube – The design review limited to 20 minutes.

D. Bolton – 16-acre site NH Elect Coop would like to build a maintenance building on this site. The proposed building would be 8400 sq. ft with 1400sq. ft. as office and a 7000sq. ft. as a garage. All proposed work to be done outside of the 50ft wetlands buffer. In addition to the building there will be a storage area for utility poles and three dumpsters for separated waste and 13 parking spaces including 1 handi-cap space for the site.

J. Dube – I have the review from the Conservation Commission and there is a concern. The access way crosses a wetlands already and any upgrade to that access way would need a permit.

D. Bolton – The changes being made are outside that road the crossing will remain the same.

J. Dube – So any upgrade would be a surface upgrade not a widening?

D. Bolton – Yes just a surface upgrade.

J. Dube – Are catch basins going to be proposed? They also recommend oil/water separators included in the catch basins catch basins and well water separators.

D. Bolton – At this time we don't propose any catch basins, all flows will be sheet flow off he pavement.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

B. Holmes – You are increasing the level? Are you bringing the pad level where the building is going to be raised up some?

D. Bolton – I believe some of it is on ledge so we will be going the other way.

J. Dube - Label parking spaces. Is there a snow storage area? Is there a dumpster area?

D. Bolton – I will note the snow storage area and there are 3 dumpster areas noted on plans but we will make them more visible.

J. Dube – What are the plans for the site on Main Street?

D. Horton – If we relocate the facility that will probably be sold with parking but site out back remains.

J. Bureau – What about the terrain and neighboring houses?

D. Horton – There are no houses visible where we want to change the road to.

J. Dube – I don't think that would affect you to leave that as a buffer, what is there?

D. Horton – The road is getting relocated to the north so we do have a little bit of space between the proposed road and the property line. There is a stonewall along the property line.

B. Holmes – How far is the proposed building going to be off of Route 28?

D. Horton –800'-900'

Motion made by B. Holmes to open up to public, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

J. Dube - None seen or heard, public input closed

Case P07-02

Map 12, Lot 97

**2 Lot Subdivision
Powder Mill Road**

Van E. Hertel

Application submitted by the property owner, Van E. Hertel, for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

Case P07-09

Map 12, Lot 97 & Map 15, Lot 66-1

**Voluntary Lot Merger
Powder Mill Road**

Van E. Hertel

Application submitted by the property owner to voluntarily merge his abutting parcels. The applicant proposed this merger in conjunction with his application for subdivision. The properties are located within the Rural Zone.

M. Jerkins – The applicant does request the following waivers 7.2.1-sheet size, 7.2.2 margins, 7.2.27 scale, and 7.2.27 elevations.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

J. Dube – Generally we require the topo just for the area that shows the 4K areas and the area where the buildings are going to be.

C. Balcius – I noticed that the old soils data on checklist is there any way on the checklist we can put the newly updates Belknap County Soil Survey?

M. Jerkins – Not without changing the subdivision regulation. The checklist is based on Chapter 7 in the subdivision regulations and there is an update we should be looking at within the next month or so. Justine Gengras from the Conservation Commission had some comments regarding the wetlands mapping. She wasn't sure that the entire parcel had been wetlands mapped and it does seem like possibly just the front portion has been done and she wanted that clarified and the board may want that clarified as well.

C. Balcius – They should have submitted for a waiver to not have to map the wetlands on the remainder of the parcel.

J. Dube – It looks like we are missing the elevations on the remainder lot to show if it is buildable, lot calculations for steep slopes and wetlands, wetlands mapped, 25 ft wetlands buffer (which is now in zoning). We are actually missing quite a bit of information.

M. Jerkins I did meet with the applicant and inform him that the board may request to be put on separate sheets.

Motion made by C. Balcius to deny the acceptance of the application pending the above list that was just developed, in addition to, suggestions made by the Planner that it be put on to two sheets, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

Case #P06-42 Map 19, Lot 8-2 Site Plan Review
Industrial Communications & Electronics 1439 Wolfeboro Highway (NH 28)
Co-applicant: RCC Atlantic, Inc. d/b/a/ Unicel
Owners of Record: Roberts Knoll Campground, LLC
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing.

M. Jerkins - The applicant has revised prints to submit tonight.

J. Dube – The Board cannot accept plans the night of the meeting, we have a 7 days policy for the staff to review.

J. Dube – I do apologize for not having a quorum on site walk. Have you had a chance to review Peer's comments? The woods road wasn't located correctly on the plan.

Don Cote – It was an extension of the woods road so we have adjusted that on the plan, you will see that it does show that the woods roads is going off to the west side of the compound now.

J. Dube – Last month where we left off was that we deferred a bunch of waivers to do the site walk and we don't have Peer's comments specifically to those items and all we have is the woods road wasn't correctly marked.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

C. Balcius – How did you make the adjustments, just move it on the plan or go out and survey it and locate it in the proper position? Part of the concern at the last meeting was there wasn't survey work done out here and what our concern was what was shown on the plan wasn't accurate and based on the Town Planner's comments, the road was already shown not in the correct position. You said you made adjustments, have they been surveyed or are they adjustments where you went into CAD and just went bing.

Thomas Voltaro – These plans have actually been stamped by a New Hampshire Land Surveyor, who did the original plans for the campground. We have also made several adjustments to the plans such as scale, locust, legend, USGS, flight plane data.

J. Dube – Is there a list of outstanding waivers. I am looking for a revised copy that shows the ones that are still outstanding.

15 minute break at 8:35 p.m.
resumed meeting at 8:50 p.m.

J. Dube – We are in a bind with the fact that we have new plans that will take care of most of the waiver requests. What we would like to do is to have these new plans gone over and set another scheduled meeting to go over and view new plans and go over waivers.

D. Cody – I would like to propose for a date final. We are two years in the making of this process and we have complied with requests. We feel the Board has an obligation to expedite these types of projects.

T. Voltaro – There shouldn't be any revisions to the plans. The only outstanding waivers would be studies. If we were to reconvene it would only to determine if we need these studies.

C. Balcius – No, if we were to reconvene it would be for time to review the new plans that weren't put in n time. I think we are offering a pretty fair compromise here.

J. Dube - The board has 65 days to act on the application. Would like to make a time to get in within the 65 days.

K. Delaney – We did discuss at the site walk with the planner all of these different waivers.

J. Dube – I did request it and it is not here tonight.

D. Cody – Is there any outstanding issue outside of this plan that you would like to talk about?

J. Dube – We need the information on the waivers and the rest is pretty straightforward.

D. Cody – We are down to one waiver, and I believe we have complied with details to abutting properties to the best of our ability to do so. The environmental Impact studies we feel is not pertinent to this size project because it is only 10Ksq. Ft. and if the board will address that we will know which way we are going to go on that.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

Wednesday, February 28, 2007 6:00 p.m. was chosen for a date.

Motion made by C. Blackstone to continue Case #P06-42 until Wednesday, February 28, 2007 at 6:00 p.m., seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Case #P07-03

Map 4, Lot 3

3-Lot Subdivision

Earl and Judith Bagley

Halls Hill Road

Application submitted by Lindon Design Associates on behalf of the property owners, Earl and Judith Bagley, for a proposed 3-lot subdivision. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

C. Balcius recused herself from this case.

M. Jerkins – There are no waivers requested and none required.

M. Jerkins - In planner's report there is question regarding the parcel size ratio. There is also a letter from Lindon Design Assoc. that addresses that question.

Motion made by C. Blackstone to accept the application for Case #P07-03, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor

G. Vachon – We are proposing to subdivide this into three lots and they all meet the length to width ratio. We have received DES approval. There are some wetlands on lot and there is a stream on back portion of the lot. The buffers are shown on the plan. On lot 3-3 there was enough left room to access the back uplands? The wetlands were flagged by certified wetland scientists and all driveways have at least 300' of view.

J. Dube – We need to see the proposed driveways on the plan.

J. Dube - Open to the public, seeing none I will close public input

M. Jerkins –I think the driveways permits that are issued tend to be for a certain standard of driveway.

E. Bagley – I talked with Fran from Highway Department about the driveways and she said once the plan is approved and everything that I have to meet with her and Kenny and at that time that is where they will decide the best place for the driveways.

C. Blackstone – You mean the driveway cut where it comes out in the road?

E. Bagley – Yes where it goes onto Halls' Hill.

**Motion made by B. Holmes to approved Case #P0-7-03 with following standard conditions:
Trees along the boundary of the 25' of wetlands buffer to be flagged on the plat and in the field on trees approximately every 25' with permanent markers identifying them as the wetlands buffer, all proposed signage to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board this is to be completed prior to the plan recording and shall be certified as complete by the surveyor who stamps the plan, a note to be added to the plat stating erosion control will be in place prior to excavation of timber cutting, a note to be added to the plat stating the total acreage of each current use category for each lot**

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

number if applicable, all necessary state, local, and federal permits to be obtained prior to the beginning of excavation or timber cutting and copies to be provided to the Planning Department, show proposed driveways on the plan, second by C. Blackstone. Motion passed with all in favor.

Case #P06-88 **Map 10, Lot 26** **10-Lot Subdivision**
Estate of Winona Houle, **Alton Mountain Rd, Alton Shores Rd & Frohock Brook Rd**
Continued from the January 16, 2007 hearing.

C. Balcus recused herself.

M. Guldbrandsen – There were several outstanding issues from the last meeting and I think we have addressed all of them. There were two issues that I focused on and one was a question about a possible road that bisected the property and I did a lot of research. The other outstanding issues are the status of Frohock Brook Road and I believe in prior meetings there was discussion about having the applicant improve Frohock Brook Road and there was also a discussion about if we were going to have to improve Frohock Brook Road, perhaps there should be an additional lot but we have made a lot of progress on that issue and I would like to address that also, and the third outstanding issue was drainage and we have some drainage plans that have been submitted. Do you have any other issues or questions before we start?

J. Dube – Does the staff have any comments after reviewing this latest submittal?

M. Jerkins - There is a memo from Peer.

J Dube – Peer’s major concern is with the drainage, basically access for the maintenance of the there should be an easement.

M. Jerkins – The board should probably consider whether or not they would like given the concern of the drainage, whether or not they would like to have an independent review of the drainage report. That has not been reviewed by any of our professionals.

B. Holmes – How did they find out the road was resolved?

M. Guldbrandsen – I did a lot of research and I have pieces of evidence which taken together would support the conclusion that the road was actually terminated. There is a vote from a Selectmen’s meeting from 1957 to discontinue Old Range Road by Elmer Blake’s. The Blake property is now Alton Shores including a piece of land on the other side of Frohock Brook Road. Col. Clough’s road inventory there is a little sketch, which shows a piece of discontinued roadway.

J. Dube – It seems like the drainage is a big issue and from Peer’s comments he is concerned about it so I think we should have it reviewed.

M. Jerkins This subdivision doesn’t have a proposed interior road but we could send it to our town engineer’s and do the review process much the same as we would a subdivision with a road except have them focus on the drainage.

Nowacki – There are three ponds that will function to detain water that is running out towards Frohock Brook Road. They will collect run-off from smaller portions of the overall watershed and detain that

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

water and that will when combined with the remainder of the water shed that will result in a lower peak flow to the culvert down on Alton Shores Road with very minimal disturbance required to create those. Those will be constructed on lots 6 & 7 and there are three of them. I show in the drainage report it reduces the flow quite significantly by 10% from the pre-development.

B. Holmes – All three of those are on private lots so who is going to maintain and make sure they stay working?

M. Guldbrandsen – It sounds like Peer's suggestion is an association that would have that obligation and it is not uncommon when you have an interior road to have an association in place for both drainage and road maintenance until the road is taken over by the town.

B. Holmes – Lot 6 there are two of them, is there still building room?

Nowacki – Each one is approximately 100 feet long. The vegetative line detention swale shows the basic set-up of each one of those 2' wide base 3' depth. Detain the flow, release it through a riprap flow area at a reduced rate and will not affect current drainage on Frohock Brook Road.

B. Holmes - What happens to the septic area in the event you get the 100-year storm or the major run-off. Also where is the house going to sit?

J. Dube –I will open this to the public

Charles Weston – Alton Mountain Road

I have some concerns about the assumptions made in the report, on page 5 assumption #2 ground contours in the building is there going to be any change in the ground contours because this is predicated on the existing ground contours. If building goes in and they strip away the assumption that is made is that there is only a 1200' print plus a driveway and ¼-acre of grass, rest of the trees will be left, there will be no swimming pools, there will be no tennis courts or anything else built in there since that is the rural area you can have almost anything in that area with the size lots according to our current plan so is the assumption flawed if any of these other things are going to be allowed, that would mean then the drainage could be increased and the problem we have already with Hills Pond is the accelerated building that is going on existing lots in Alton Shores is contributing to the down fall of the pond so I have a concern with that. Another concern I have is if lot 10 is going to be developed at all. If that is going to be developed than will there be requirements for retention ponds or basins on lots 1, 2, & 3 in order to facilitate the sheet flow off of the other area if that is developed? I don't think that was taken into consideration in the assumptions. I think the assumptions are correct if everything is followed the way it says and if the contours are not changed and the building size is not changed, the driveway size is not changed, and the grass area is not changed and the trees are allowed to be there. Are the assumptions flawed if something else is going to have or can it legally be written so that nothing can be changed on it and also if in fact the association is going to be required to maintain the swales in order to take care of the run-off, who will check on it? I have a concern with sheet flow on the assumptions.

Nowacki – The watersheds are of such a sheer size that there is very little impact at all. The wooded area is the largest determining factor. There is not enough imposed impervious area to really make much of a difference when you are comparing it to the overall watershed itself. With the assumptions made I feel it is fairly accurate.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

C. Weston – I am concerned about future development. Can wording be legally added so that there is no more future development?

M. Guldbrandsen – There is a percentage of impervious surfaces on each lot. Standard

C. Weston – I don't think his assumptions were based on that percentage of each lot, if they were it was not specifically stated in the report and it should be stated in the report if it is based on the 20% factor than his assumptions are based on that it is fine, if they are not based on that and not stated in the report than it is a false assumption and everything is thrown out.

M. Guldbrandsen – the town is going to have somebody else look at that and that may be one of the things they look at.

J. Dube – In that zone there isn't 20% anyway

Nora LaRue – I am unable to find where the town has the authority for water to flow on to her property.

B. Holmes – You should go to the Highway Department.

C. Balcius – Are you referring to the culvert? That wetland drains that way so there wouldn't necessarily be an easement. My guess is that the wetland has already flowed down that way so it wouldn't need an easement and that is where it has always been.

M Guldbrandsen – We cannot increase the water flow onto your property and that is the goal of the drainage swales that we would be putting in is to prevent there from being an increase in water flow onto your property.

J. Dube - The plans show a decreased in flow.

J. Dube – I will close public input.

J. Dube - We need to send this on for review

M. Guldbrandsen – There is a mistake on plan, it shows Frohock Brook Road as being 1585' and there is a line at 1585', in looking through the road inventories the information of 1585' came from Col. Clough's inventory but it became clear ingoing over that he was measuring from the other end of Frohock Brook Road, which would put the 1585' not where it is shown on the plan but actually where you seen the little turnout from the Highway Department and it makes sense once that kind of fell into place that was indeed where the town was maintaining the road, so the Class V section is a little bit shorter and it will have to be fixed on the plan. When we had initially talked about improving Frohock Brook Road the initial assumption was that we would improve it all the way up to the point shown on the plan is, which would potentially give us additional frontage and potentially another lot. Finding out that the portion is a Class VI gives it a much more complicated process and so the applicant has decided to simplify this and we would only be improving Frohock Brook Road up to the point where the turn around is, which is basically 1585' from the other end. The other issue that has been going around is whether the applicant would do the upgrades or the applicant would pay the town to do the upgrades and I did speak with Russ Bailey

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

Case #P07-07

Map 6, Lots 36, 37

15-Lot Subdivision

Benjamin Finnegan

Valley Road

Application submitted by Lindon Design Associates on behalf of the property owner, Benjamin Finnegan, for a proposed 15-lot subdivision with a proposed interior road. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

Motion made by B. Holmes to accept the application for Case #P07-07 and grant the waivers 7.2.6 and 7.2.12, second by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

G. Vachon – We are proposing 15 new building lots and a lot line adjustment and the lots range from 2 - 24 acres and the proposal is for an interior road called Dobbins Way and that is 1836' long. All of the lots meet the ratios. The test pits have been done on every lot and DES has been out there and inspected the property and is pending approval of permits.

C. Balcius – We performed wetlands delineation a few years ago when the original subdivision came to the board. At this point the current proposal we are working on the wetlands application and I just read the comments from the Conservation Commission, currently we are hovering around 9500 square feet of proposed impact. This proposed impact is all for access on all of these lots. The majority of the streams are at the bottom of Prospect Mountain and does receive a lot of drainage. We have worked to minimize drainage. There is a culvert that is too small for flow and we want to restore it to the original stream and place a bottom box culvert, there by improving the situation environmentally as well as hydrology wise. The wetlands application is in process.

B. Holmes – What about the a cistern

A. Hoover - It is located on lot 15.

B. Holmes – That has to be on the plan.

G. Vachon – The road has been flagged.

J. Dube – Do we want to schedule a date for a site walk.

Motion made by B. Holmes for the board to do a site walk on March 5 at 4:15pm with the front two corners marked, second by C. Blackstone. Motion passed with all in favor.

J. Bureau – What is the reason for lot 7 and 8 and that particular configuration around the cul-de-sac?

G. Vachon – The building site for lot 7 is so far in the back we tried to minimize the frontage on the road to gain the frontage for lot 8.

B. Holmes – How long is the driveway on lot 7?

G. Vachon – I don't know the exact distance on that.

J. Dube – How long is the road?

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

G. Vachon – 1836' to the center of the cul-de-sac.

A. Hoover – There are a couple of old utility easements that one runs through lot 1 and that will be eliminated and we have had a discussion with the utility companies and that will be eliminated once we have installed the new power lines along the road. There is also a utility easement that goes back to the Councilman property that crosses lots 3 and 4 will be eliminated and they will actually have power along the driveway so those will ultimately be released.

A. Nowacki – The proposed alignment of the roadway, we did our best to utilize the existing location of the gravel driveway, which results in about 40%-50% less newly developed area. We are on top of the gravel driveway for quite a ways. We are proposing to put in a concrete 3 sided culvert about 8' wide and 4' high that would cross over the major wetland crossing. The overall site is in two different watersheds. We have proposed several structural measures and stabilization measures for roadway run-off to be treated by level spreaders and we are not proposing any detention pond measures.

J. Dube – I will open it up to public.

Julie Councilman – I am concerned about the water issues, but it sounds like it might be improved if it is a bigger culvert in the road there. Our driveway will change so I was wondering about our address changing. The reason they bought this property was because it was so isolated. I am also wondering how close the houses are going to be and if they are going to be visible to us.

J. Dube – For lots 4 and 5 would it be possible to have a buffer on the plan.

G. Vachon – It is possible yes, but you can see quite a ways through the trees.

B. Holmes - Her driveway will dissect lot 5.

J. Councilman – Does that mean we will need another easement?

G. Vachon – Art said you would.

C. Blackstone – We will have Monica ask Sheri Emerson what the Councilman's address will be.

J. Dube – It will be different during construction as far as getting in and out.

J. Dube – Is the road proposed to be taken over by the town?

A. Hoover – At some point we hope so, yes.

M. Jerkins – This is regarding the utility easement, you said you are going to be abandoning the current easement that goes to the Councilman property and you will be creating a new easement going along the roadway, so will she be responsible for relocating anything?

A. Hoover – No, there is no expense or cost for them.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

J. Dube – Maybe for next month you could fit in some sort of buffer and see what you could work out for that.

J. Dube – I will close public input.

Motion made by C. Blackstone to send the application for review to the town engineer, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Motion made by B. Holmes to continue Case #P07-07 until the March meeting, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

C Balcius recused herself from the case.

**Case #P07-04
Bradford J. Jones**

Map 11, Lots 13, 14, 13A

**17-Lot Subdivision
Alton Mountain Road**

Application submitted by the property owner, Bradford Jones, for a proposed 17-lot subdivision with a proposed interior Road. The property is located within the Residential Rural Zone.

M. Jerkins – There were no waivers requested and none needed.

Motion made by B. Holmes to accept Case #P07-04, seconded by C. Blackstone. Motion passed with all in favor.

Arthur Hoover – There were a few things mentioned in Peer's report that I will discuss briefly. The 25' recreational easement, we are inclined to leave as is for right now subject to further discussion with the board. In the previous plans for Alton Mountain Estates there is a 50 ft ROW access easement that provides access to the rear lots and that is no longer necessary and Peer has recommended we remove that. The Range Road issue has been resolved.

B. Jones – I spoke with the surveyor of record and Mike Bemis found in 1890 the town voted to relocate the Range Road and it was approved in the town meeting minutes and it is under Article 6. Town drafted the road layout in 1889.

Jonathan Ring – The property is 80.67 acres mostly wooded. The proposal includes 17 residential lots with 1800 feet of roadway to the beginning of the bubble. There are three state permits required from NH DES, we need subdivision, site specific and wetlands. There is a total of about 2475 sq. ft. of wetlands affected by the property. NH Soils is working with us. There is an existing barn apartment that would remain and a small horse stall barn and pasture that will remain also. The drainage will be channeled into a drainage swale and a catch basin. There will be on-site leech fields and wells. The center of plan between lots 4 and 6 is a 20,000 gal fire cistern, which will provide fire protection for the property. We have checked all lots to make sure they meet the zoning requirements and all of the lots meet the length to width ratio as well. The road has been staked also.

B. Jones – The property lines are flagged.

J Bureau - What about the 30' ROW?

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

B. Jones – There was a ROW for lots E & F, which was put in place until they had a proper driveway permit and both of those lots actually have driveways and driveway permits, so that is no longer needed.

J. Dube – What about the wetlands? I am having a hard time seeing where they are.

J. Ring - There are very few wetlands and some are manmade.

J. Dube – I will open it to public input.

Cynthia Cross Bohy, George and Laura Gass, Alton Mountain Road.

C. Bohy – My concern is about the water drainage. What will happen with the other 32-acres?

B. Jones – We made the decision to stop the Cul-de-Sac at 1800' instead of the 2400'. There will be a large 32-acre lot. The driveway access will be off the frontage on the new road and it would run up the hill.

J. Dube drainage will not get worse and will hopefully improve that is a requirement.

L. Gass – I am also concerned about the water comes down

G. Gass – There is a brook that runs across my property.

L. Gass – Our property always gets flooded.

J. Dube – It runs behind lots 6, 7, & 8, is that correct?

J. Ring – Our drainage analysis will be reviewed by CMA and what we have done is proposed a detention basin up toward to top of the hill to control our storm water so that there is no increase in flow down stream.

J. Dube- The town engineers will review that

G. Gass – What are the town requirements for the width of the road?

J. Dube – Is it 20' of the paved way with 2' shoulders.

C. Bohy - Why the lots are so small?

B. Jones - They are all within town zoning.

J. Ring - There is no proposed activity to be done in that area.

J. Dube – The drainage studies will help protect their property.

J. Dube - Public input closed.

Approved by the Board 9-20-07

B. Jones – The proposed road will be plowed

Motion made by Bruce Holmes for a site walk on Monday, March 12, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. and to meet at the barn apartment, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

Motion made by B. Holmes to send the Case #P07-04 for engineering review, second by C. Blackstone. Motion passed with all in favor.

Motion made by B. Holmes to continue to the March 20, 2007 hearing, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.

M. Jerkins – there is still the matter of Prospect Mountain Builders request.

J. Dube – Prospect Mountain Builder couldn't come tonight because they still wouldn't have had a quorum.

J. Dube – Maybe we should have a vote to have the meeting on the 28th of Feb at 6:00 p.m.

M. Jerkins – We need to set a work session date to discuss other business

J. Dube – Let's do it next Wednesday the 28th after the other meeting.

J. Dube asked about Valley Road and noticing in New Durham of a new road and subdivision.

M. Jerkins – I will let New Durham know but they make an issue over regional impact.

Motion made by B. Holmes to adjourn, seconded by J. Bureau. Motion passed with all in favor.