

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

**Members Present:** Jeremy Dube, Cindy Balcius, Bruce Holmes, Scott Williams, T. Hoopes, Bonnie Dunbar, Bill Curtin –As Selectmen’s Representative, and Robert Bystrack

**Others Present:** Monica Jerkins – Planning Assistant, Peer Kraft-Lund – Interim Planner, and Jennifer Fortin – Recording Secretary, Sharon Penney – Planner and others as mentioned below

**Call to Order:** at 7:05 p.m. by T. Hoopes, Chairman

I would like to introduce Sharon Penney, the new Planner. Robert Bystrack is the new alternate.

**Signing of Appointments Forms/Swearing in of Appointments:** Bonnie Dunbar and Robert Bystrack – Bill Curtin – Selectmen’s Representative did before the meeting.

**Appointment of Alternates:** None needed

**Approval of Minutes:**

**Motion made by B. Curtin to approve the minutes later on in the evening, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

May 30, 2007 - **Motion made by B. Curtin to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by J. Dube. Motion passed with all in favor.**

June 20, 2007 (Houle) – **Motion made by B. Curtin to approve as amended, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Approval of Agenda:**

**Public Input:**

Attorney Jack McCormick has requested the opportunity to speak. I am here on behalf of Jill & Bill Duca, who own and operate the Bay Hill Camp Ground, Tax Map 33 Lot 31-1. The reason I am here is by way of informational input. I think in a small town and I find that there is a lot of mi-information and if you plan to do something I think it is best to get it on the record before the Planning Board so everyone knows what is going on. Jill & Bill have owned and operated that place for about 5-years now and historically it had 20 RV sites, 8 tent sites, a shower room and 4 cottages, all of that is not being used at the present time. In fact there are 4 cottages and 3 RV sites being used actively now. What is happening is, is that 1.5-acre site they are proposing to sell to a corporation and they will be part of that corporation. There will be about 7 buyers and what they want to do is to keep it seasonal occupancy and use it themselves. This is not a subdivision and there is no site plan review, it is simply a corporation buying it for themselves. At this point historically I have been involved in 6 of those and one we did 22-years ago in Holderness. The reason for me coming in here is to advise you of that. It will probably happen in the next 6-8 months.

T. Hoopes – It is a seasonal campground so if it were to go year around you would have to come back.

J. McCormick – I couldn’t agree more.

Approved by the Board 8-23-07

T. Hoopes – Is it not a form of condo minimizing to a certain degree?

J. McCormick – No, the closest parallel would be a cooperative.

S. Williams – How would the maintenance of the property be apportioned to different people?

J. McCormick – The corporation like any corporation, you have income and out flow. Basically in any corporation I have been involved in if you are short you put the buck in yourself.

B. Curtin – Now they would have to set a value on it because the corporation would be the one actually purchasing it?

J. McCormick – Yes, the corporation buys from them for dollar value funded by the people buying into it.

B. Curtin – Will they be paying for transfer stamps?

J. McCormick – Absolutely.

T. Hoopes – There is no action needed on our part.

**Applications for Public Hearing:**

**Case #P07-33**

**Map 1 Lot 12-2**

**Conceptual Hearing  
Lockes Corner Road**

**Robert Tiffany**

Request submitted by Robert Tiffany for a pre-application conceptual discussion on a proposed 2-lot subdivision of his property on Lockes Corner Road located within the Rural Zone.

Application was a no-show

**Case #P07-34**

**Map 11, Lot 9**

**Conceptual Hearing  
Rand Hill Road**

**Roger Sample**

Request submitted by Roger Sample for a pre-application conceptual discussion on a proposed expansion of use to allow an existing 3-unit rental building to become a 4-unit. The property is located within the Rural Residential Zone.

T. Hoopes – you are limited to 15 minutes and we try to avoid getting into specifics.

Roger Sample – I have an existing 3-unit building on the corner of Rand Hill Road and Alton Mountain Road and I am going to put a 24'x30' additional unit on that building. There is an existing driveway, existing septic, existing water. The site is pretty much done it is just adding the unit.

M. Jerkins – I did some quick preliminary, Mr. Sample's land is 9.95-acres in the Residential Rural Zone where multi-family structures are an allowable use with 1-acre per unit. He is proposing a 4-unit which is our maximum allowable, so as far as preliminary zoning requirements go it appears that his site is appropriate.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

T. Hoopes – I do recall that that lot has a substantial amount of wetland to it, does it not?

R. Sample – In the back.

T. Hoopes – So what you are looking for is input on an addition onto the existing building?

R. Sample – Yes, it would be a 24'x30' stuck onto that building and then it would max out that building there.

C. Balcius – Your septic, would you be altering the present septic system to meet the requirements?

R. Sample – Yes that has already been designed.

B. Dunbar – You know you will have to address the usual of parking, snow storage for the parking areas.

M. Jerkins – He will have to come back for site plan review. Do you have any specific questions as to what is going to be required of you at the site plan review?

R. Sample – I have read the application forms and it seems as though they are one application form for many different things and it is quite confusing as to whether or not I need to have the five plats and other things, especially where most of my site was done.

Peer Kraft-Lund – This is a building inspector situation. It really shouldn't be for the board to talk about, this is not a conceptual. You should go to the building inspector and he will say if you have to go the Planning Department and they will walk you through all of the steps.

T. Hoopes – One of the things we like to see is the planning and screening of the structure from the road.

B. Dunbar – There is a checklist you will go through to which will also contain drainage and because you are putting up another building, all of that water is going to be shed and it will go off the property or onto your property at a different rate than normally falling so you would have to deal with drainage. I think what the board is telling you is that you have enough room as far as square footage on your property.

C. Balcius – I think if you have any other questions just come into the Planning Department and they can help you.

B. Curtin – Brian would be able to help you out quite a bit.

M. Jerkins – When I was doing my research I noticed that some of the land is in current use, is that correct?

R. Sample – Yes

M. Jerkins – I just want to make you aware that when you do this project you are going to need sure that 4-acres are taken out of current use because you need an acre for each unit.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

R. Sample – There is already 3 out so it would just be an additional 1.

T. Hoopes – You have to have a figure on the calculations of what is remaining in current use, it is not up to him to do the calculations.

**Case #P07-32  
Richard & Arlene Fiore**

**Map 32, Lot 54**

**Site Plan Review  
Main Street**

Application submitted by property owners Richard & Arlene Fiore for a proposed change of use site plan review to change an existing residential mobile home to a commercial use or professional office space. The property is located on Main Street within the Residential Commercial Zone.

S. Williams stepped down because he is an abutter to the property and R. Bystrack appointed to take Scott's place for this case.

R. Fiore – I request that Scott Williams stay, please.

T. Hoopes – As an abutter he has to.

B. Dunbar – On Map 32 Lot 54, I do not see it as part of this original site plan, it wasn't included in the acreage at the time.

R. Fiore – 344 Main Street Alton

B. Dunbar – Just please answer the question because we have not accepted the plat. I just want an answer to the question.

R. Fiore – I had a cold a little while ago and I can't hear well.

B. Dunbar – I need to know if this site plan was for Map 32 Lot 55?

R. Fiore – Yes it was.

B. Dunbar – It was not really for Map 32 Lot 54?

R. Fiore – All of the surveying and all of the work was done for both.

B. Dunbar – Correct but the site plan was just for the other lot and its ability to come before site plan and be approved.

R. Fiore – What I am requesting now is this site plan is more than adequate because it shows everything.

B. Dunbar – I would like to know where the square footage for the lot came from? Is there a notation on here of where that came from?

R. Fiore – Well he surveyed it.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

B. Dunbar – I see he surveyed it but it is not written on here for that site plan for the new lot you want a site plan for. I do not see it on here, unless I have missed it.

J. Dube – If you look under title and read the title block it says for auto and marine mechanical sales, service, and storage. From how it is titled it seems like it is referring to lot 55.

M. Jerkins – This is a previously approved site plan, the applicant wanted to be able to use it simply because the lot in question is also shown it and this is a change of use application only, so he is requesting a blanket waiver as we have done in the past for changes of use.

B. Dunbar – This isn't a change of use of the lot that was approved, it is a change of use of another adjacent lot that does not have full information on it, which includes how much square footage there is. I am going through the checklist and trying to stick to the requirements that we require.

J. Dube – This is a question for the board, usually when we have a change of use we have taken like the candy shop and turning it into part of the flower shop and taken some sort of business and that is how we came up with this whole blanket waiver. I am a little confused as to how it would apply to something residential. I think we are treading a fine line on this.

B. Dunbar – I think so too. This is a residential use that is going commercial. This was a previously approved based upon this being a residential home. We need all of the information that we would normally have for a site plan.

R. Fiore – The boundary lines are there what so hard about 146'x90', it is 1/2-acre.

B. Dunbar – It has to do with the square footage, minimums being maintained, it is following our zoning laws, and I just need the information in order to make a correct decision.

C. Balcius – It would seem to me that this is a new application for a commercial site plan and as such we should get a new site plan.

T. Hoopes – Back December 30, 2003 for the Technical Review when the application was for the steel building and part of the narrative here is “the applicant is seeking a voluntary merger to merge tax maps 32 lots 54&55, I have visited the site and researched the record and have no objection to the merger of the two lots, Peer Kraft-Lund”. Were they merged or are they two separate lots?

R. Fiore – At that point in time you didn't want me to merge them.

M. Jerkins – They can't merge them because it would be creating a new non-conforming lot and we can't do that.

T. Hoopes – Was it ever completed?

M. Jerkins – No it wasn't.

Approved by the Board 8-23-07

**Motion made by J. Dube to deny the acceptance of Case #P07-32, seconded by C. Balcius.**

T. Hoopes – What conditions do we need satisfied?

J. Dube – He doesn't meet the checklist requirement for a site plan.

R. Fiore – I put it in the letter that I was requesting the checklist be waived because of the fact that everything is on the map and it has all been surveyed and there isn't anything else you can add to it.

J. Dube – There is a lot of information that needs to be added to it.

T. Hoopes- What are we looking for, for his benefit, septic, square footage?

J. Dube – Everything you would have on the site plan

C. Balcius – Not the site plan for his previous business but a site plan for the new proposed commercial site plan.

B. Dunbar – Map 32 Lot 54

R. Fiore – So what is it that you want on the site plan?

T. Hoopes – What is required on a standard site plan, so it would be dealing with Map 32 Lot 54.

C. Balcius – If you come in and meet with our new town planner she will go over the checklist.

R. Fiore – I am not changing anything.

C. Balcius –We need to see it.

T. Hoopes – We need the information to make a decision on behalf of the town.

C. Balcius – I noticed on the comments that the planner suggested traffic might be an issue there, I don't see any comments from Ken.

T. Hoopes – The old reports is the police chiefs comments were “the home's driveway is setting on the crest of a hill on the roadway, no public safety issues if only building is being added. If new driveway is to be added then there is an issue concerning the site visibility on traffic coming and going”.

B. Dunbar – What we need is a site plan specifically for Map 32 Lot 54 with all of those things delineated. I think the board needs to be reminded that a site plan runs with the land. There is a motion on the floor.

T. Hoopes – Motion made by Jeremy and seconded by C. Balcius. **Motion passed with all in favor.**

Scott Williams returns to his seat and Robert Bystrack steps down as fill in.

**Case P07-23**  
**Catherine & Mark Blanchette**

**Map 1, Lot 16**

**2-Lot Subdivision**  
**Lockes Corner Road**

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

Application submitted by the property owners Catherine & Mark Blanchette for a proposed 2-Lot subdivision. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

M. Jerkins – The Blachette’s have had a little bit of an issue with their surveyor, unfortunately their first surveyor passed away in mid project so they have had to hire somebody else to try and help them out, who is unable to be here tonight.

T. Hoopes – Do we have enough information to accept the application? The only waiver I see is for the 2-inch margin.

B. Dunbar – And for the 2’ contours, they have 5’ but to me they are adequate.

**Motion made by B. Dunbar to grant the waivers for the margins, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Motion made by B. Dunbar to accept the application as complete for Catherine Blanchette, seconded by B. Curtin. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Mark Blanchette – We would like to subdivide 2-acres off of our current 12-acre lot. It has the 200’ of frontage, which complies with the minimum road frontage. The property has been surveyed and the only thing that is left is the approval and setting two pins to make it final. We have had the wetlands scientist look at it to make sure there are no wetlands on there. We originally had this whole area surveyed and we were originally going to subdivide two lots several years ago and we opted not to do that. We also took out the house that is currently on here that was on a non-conforming 1-acre lot to put it on a conforming lot to meet the needs of the town.

M. Jerkins - There are a couple of things in the memo written by Sharon Penney that you are going to want to pay some attention to.

T. Hoopes – That is the house locust and the question about the location of the septic.

M. Jerkins – Yes we are talking about Map 1 Lot 16-5 is the abutting property where when we did field inspection it seems appropriate to have them on the plan.

T. Hoopes – Where is lot 16-5 structures. If their well happens to be opposite where your septic is being proposed that is not compatible.

J. Dube – That would be the abutters responsibility to not have their radius go over their property line.

C. Balcius – We commonly ask to see that.

S. Penney – It is just a little information that we need to make good decisions and there was the notation on the utility pole.

M. Blanchette – With locating the structures on this plan you are asking for it to be re-drawn to show it on there.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

T. Hoopes – On this map it has to be drawn to scale where these structures are.

M. Blanchette – I do know it is towards to back part of the lot, I don't want to over state where it is.

M. Jerkins – You need your surveyor to locate it.

T. Hoopes – And that will be a condition of approval

M. Jerkins – This project is located along the Alton/Barnstead town line and according to RSA674:53 you have to notify the town if you have a subdivision going on that is located on a boundary. It is less than a regional impact but it is a requirement, so our suggestion to the board would be to continue the and determine any other additional items that you would like to see, continue for one month and allow the planner to have the opportunity to address a letter to the Town of Barnstead and pending any resistance from them at the next hearing is when you could approve the project.

T. Hoopes – The town will send a letter to Barnstead.

M. Blanchette – Was the Town of Barnstead not notified on that list?

M. Jerkins – No

M. Blanchette – My challenge now that my surveyor has passed away is that I have to deal with Bill Carpenter because he has records and I have to get those from him and get another surveyor.

C. Blanchette – To get another map done with that information on it would be a hardship for use where our surveyor has passed away.

M. Blanchette – Mr. Carpenter has the files and disks that contains the CAD drawings, he is pretty much out of the business and a challenge to work with in getting things accomplished. He doesn't have the actual computer software and his computer has crashed, so I need to get the CD and information from him and find another surveyor that has that software to actually create a new one.

B. Curtin – The information provided on lot 16-5 showed all of the information we are looking for, could he go with that due to the circumstances that he is with?

They should probably be able to go with that septic design that would probably satisfy the need and may have to record it with this so it would be noticed.

M. Jerkins – If it satisfies the board the staff can certainly investigate if there exists a plan for 16-5 and if we can verify that in fact that the septic and the well are completely contained within the bounds of the lot than it really shouldn't be an issue.

C. Balcus – Yeah but we can't do this for everyone, just like the applicant before. Consistency that is what I am looking for.



**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

T. Hoopes – Open to public, seeing none I will close public.

**Motion made by C. Balcius to continue Case #P07-23 until the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, seconded by B. Curtin. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Case #P07-21  
Freese Trust

Map 10, Lot 5

3-Lot Subdivision  
Avery Hill Road

**Application submitted by Paul Darbyshire on behalf of the Freese Trust for a proposed 3-Lot subdivision. The property is located within the Rural Zone.**

T. Hoopes – I do notice one thing on the planner’s review here, Peer does recommend an on-site. There does seem to be some challenging elevation here.

C. Balcius – I think the waiver was for length to width ratio.

**Motion made by C. Balcius to accept the application for Case #P07-21 as complete but still needs to show the wetland buffers on the next plan not to act on the waiver for the length to width ratio until we do a site walk, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Paul Daryshire – The proposal before you is for a 3-lot subdivision, 21.924-acres total. Lot has 7.834-acres and 289.64’ frontage on Avery Hill Road. Lot 5-7 has 6.294-acres and 208.7’ frontage. Lot 5-8 has 7.795-acres and 224’ frontage. We did do a topographic mapping on the entire parcel these are 5’ contours. We also show the wetlands soils that were delineated by Shauer Environmental and those are shown on the plan. Each lot has well over the minimum building area. There are some steep slopes. There are areas for the driveways.

T. Hoopes – I am looking at the wetland on lot 5, there seems to be in the topography a drainage swale that comes down towards where the driveway is going to be, is that the outlet for the, no it is the opposite.

P. Darbyshire – It is actually a big wetland on the abutting property.

J. Dube – There are no wetland stamps on the plan that I have and I didn’t know if the other board members have one.

T. Hoopes –There is one on mine.

C. Balcius – I would like to do a site walk, I am familiar with the piece of property and the slopes and I think it would be good to take a peek.

B. Dunbar – I would like to hear the rationale for not meeting the width to length ratios.

P. Darbyshire – I could have drawn the line from lot 5 directly across the back of those lots just to shorten them up and added that land to lot 5, I didn’t see any sense to do that.

B. Dunbar – That needs to be on the record.

P. Darbyshire – These are pretty large lots.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

S. Williams – Can the driveway regulations be met, with no greater than 15%?

P. Darbyshire – I believe they can, yes.

T. Hoopes- I will open this to public, seeing none I will close public.

**Motion made by C. Balcius to do a site walk on Tuesday, July 24<sup>th</sup> @ 5:30pm, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Motion made by C. Balcius to continue Case #P07-21 Map 10 Lot 5 a 3-lot subdivision to August 21<sup>st</sup>, seconded by S. Williams.**

J. Dube – If the plan in front of us has slopes of 30 we need the resubmission to have them at 25 for the actual subdivision plan.

**Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Case #P07-28  
Sally Castleman**

**Map 9 Lot 16**

**2-Lot Subdivision  
New Durham Road**

Application submitted by Randy Tetreault, LLS of Norway Plains, Inc. on behalf of the property owner, Sally Castleman for a proposed 2-Lot subdivision of a 23+/- acre parcel located along the New Durham town line on New Durham Road within the Rural Zone.

M. Jerkins – We also have the same situation in regards to Blanchette with notifying the other town in this particular project. I also have a color aerial to pass around.

T. Hoopes – I am looking at the waivers and there is one here that we cannot grant or should not grant and that is 7.2.1, which is sheet size, it won't fit in the files, that is why we have the size limitation.

**Motion made by S. Williams to grant the following waivers: 7.2.2 – left margins 2", 7.2.21 – meets and bounds, 7.2.23 – natural and cultural features, 7.2.24 – soil types, 7.2.27 – elevations 2'-5' contours, 7.2.33 – wetlands, all wetlands boundaries.**

**C. Balcius – I would like to amend that just to make sure it is noted on the remaining parcel**

M. Jerkins – Staff also indicated that there are no numerical designations on the utility poles, which makes field identification or location hard.

C. Balcius – It shows on the plan.

P. Kraft-Lund – If you don't waiver the sheet size you can't accept the application, waiver the sheet size with the consideration that you will ask as a condition of approval the proper sheet size.

**S. Williams – I will add 7.2.1 – sheet size, seconded by B. Curtin. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Approved by the Board 8-23-07

**Motion made by C. Balcius to accept the application as complete, except for one thing, for Case #P07-28 Map 9 Lot 16 for a 2-Lot subdivision for Castleman on New Durham Road and that is the wetlands scientist will add a note to the plat saying that within the first 200' of frontage on the remainder lot there are no wetlands, seconded by B. Curtin.**

J. Dube – There is no driveway shown on the proposed lot and there are no abutting features shown and the board had an issue with that a few cases back.

T. Hoopes –Is the proposed driveway where the gateway is?

R. Tetreault – There is an existing by-way there being used, they haven't represented where they want it and if that is what the board wants than we will get with Ken and make sure and pick out a spot, right now it is in limbo.

S. Williams – What about showing the structures on Map 9 Lot 19?

T. Hoopes – Are there any structures within 200' of the wall?

R. Tetreault – Not within 200', I don't believe so but if the board wants to see it I can add it to the plan.

**Motion passed with all in favor.**

R. Tetreault – Norway Plains Associate, Surveyor representing Sally Castleman. On her property that lies in Alton and New Durham. This lot is being proposed as 1 ½-acre lot out of the northerly corner of the property with 150' frontage. We have received state subdivision approval.

S. Williams – What zone is this in?

R. Tetreault – Rural Residential Zone. We did survey down to the town line and as far back as that interior stonewall shows. There is a plan of the property from 1968. It is not recorded but it is a compass and tape survey of her whole property. There is a small discrepancy in it and the tax maps.

T. Hoopes – Has New Durham been notified as an abutter?

M. Jerkins –They weren't on the abutter list.

R. Tetreault – We had talked about notifying them but they weren't on the abutters list because we were wondering whether or not we needed to do that for regional impact on a 1-Lot subdivision.

T. Hoopes – Not for regional impact but for simply for courtesy.

M. Jerkins – We had also talked about whether or not because it is a county boundary as well if it needs to be a regional, which I think we determined would not need to be regional. What we are going to do is draft up a letter to New Durham.

R. Tetreault – This does meet the 2:1 ratio.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

C. Balcius – The wetland buffer isn't shown on the plan. It sounds like there is a short list of things that need to be cleared up for the next meeting including the notification.

M. Jerkins – Just for clarity did you just say that you want to do a work session?

R. Tetreault – The 25' buffer, does that mean you want the wetlands shown on the recorded plan.

J. Dube – Where is the calculation for the square footage for the wetland?

C. Balcius – There is no calculation on this or any plan we have seen tonight.

T. Hoopes – We have to notify New Durham and we have to continue this until next month.

T. Hoopes – I will open this to public, seeing none I will close public.

T. Hoopes – We need to see the driveway location, wetlands within 200', structures within 200' including wells, septic, and leach fields, lot calculation, and wetlands buffer.

**Motion made by B. Curtin to Case #P07-28 until the August 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor.**

<b>Case #P07-29</b>	<b>Map 15 Lot 31-1</b>	<b>2-Lot Subdivision</b>
<b>Betsy Kretschmer &amp; Sylvia Leggett</b>		<b>Gilmans Corner Road</b>

Application submitted by George Chrisenton on behalf of the property owners Betsy Kretschmer & Sylvia Leggett for a proposed 2-lot subdivision of an 8.9+/- acre parcel located on Gilmans Corner Road within the Rural Zone.

T. Hoopes – There are three waiver requests natural and cultural features, elevations and wetland.

Sylvia Leggett – That is only on the remaining parcel.

**Motion made by S. Williams for Case #P07-29 Map 15 Lot 31-1 to grant the waivers 7.2.23 - natural and cultural features, 7.2.27 – elevations, and 7.2.33 – wetlands, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Motion made by S. Williams to accept Case #P07-29 Map 15 Lot 31-1 with waivers and the application is complete, seconded by B. Dunbar. Motion passed with all in favor**

S. Leggett – It is 8.9-acres and we want to subdivide of just the maximum that we have to, which is the 2-acres to create a nice lot for friends. It is a simply 2-acres with the required amount of frontage and we do have a rough driveway into the area, we did some preliminary clearing and the other thing I would like to point out that there is a note on the bottom of the plan that this is our property can only be subdivided once by way of our agreement and in our deed.

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

T. Hoopes – Technically the driveway should not have been constructed yet. I went to the road crew and they should not have issued a permit until the subdivision is completed. I don't think it is a big problem it is the only logical place to put it. How close is Shea?

George Chisenton – Shea is not an abutter we just did it as a courtesy. The town owns the land between Shea and the lot we are subdividing.

T. Hoopes – I will open it to public, seeing none I will close public.

**Motion made by C. Balcius to approve Case #P07-29 with the waivers that were granted, seconded by B. Curtin. Motion passed with all in favor.**

<b>Case #P07-31</b>	<b>Map 4 Lot 27 &amp; 27-1</b>	<b>Boundary Line Adjustment</b>
<b>John &amp; Joan Watson</b>		<b>351 Dudley Road</b>
<b>Linda McKenney</b>		<b>369 Dudley Road</b>

Application submitted by Lepene Engineering and Surveying on behalf of the property owners John and Joan Watson and Linda McKenney to adjust the property boundaries of two parcels located on Dudley Road within the Rural Zone.

**Motion made by B. Curtin to accept Case #P07-31 with the following conditions for waivers: 7.2.23 – partial portion of the entire lots, 7.2.26 – partial portion of the entire lots at this time there is no plan for further development, 7.2.27 – contours on the entire site (have shown contours in the area that is being subdivided, elevations are shown to assume benchmark is shown on the plan, 7.2.29 – sketch any future development as there are no plans at this time for any further development, 7.2.33 – delineate all of the wetlands on the site, the wetlands have been delineated in the area of the subdivision, seconded by S. Williams.**

T. Hoopes – under the comments from the Conservation Commission there was a question here: Are wetland buffers needed on the two proposed larger lots? How much of a wetland is the peat soil?

C. Balcius – Very wet

T. Hoopes – Are they over 10,000 sq. ft. and do we need to have buffers on them?

C. Balcius – Based on the map here they are well over 10,000 sq. ft. but we haven't really dealt with that before.

Lepene Engineering – Most of wetlands is going to be on lot 27-1 which is the BLA.

C. Balcius – The question is on all newly created lots there is a 25' not-cut wetland buffer and with the BLA you are creating a new different size lot and that is the question, should the buffer be applied to this lot?

S. Williams – Most of these lots are already improved so I don't think they would go out back there. Is lot 27-1-2 that is still a vacant lot?

Approved by the Board 8-23-07

Lepene Engineering – That is an abutter.

T. Hoopes – If you change a boundary you have created a new lot.

Lepene Engineering – Increasing the size of an existing lot.

T. Hoopes – But with the ongoing zoning ordinance that we have requiring a wetlands buffer, the idea was to protect the wetlands by having a buffered area so in this particular case the larger wetlands would need to have a buffer at least on the plat.

J. Dube – We need to know either the total square footage and that needs to come under 10,000 sq. ft. or we need a wetland buffer on the plan.

Lepene Engineering – Then we need to delineate the whole wetland, I can't put a 25' buffer on something I don't know where it is.

M. Jerkins – It is our zoning ordinance, it is not even a subdivision requirement so that is something the board can't even waive. You are not required to flag it but you will have to locate it.

Lepene Engineering – I can't locate something I can't delineate.

C. Balcius – Just the back line. It will take a few hours tops.

Lepene Engineering – Well it will take me a whole day.

**Amending the motion for partial waiver for the wetlands on Map 4 Lot 27-1, that the wetlands be delineated only on the line in the most northeastern section of the property, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Motion by S. Williams to accept Case #P07-31 Map 4 Lot 27 & 27-1 as the application being complete with waivers, seconded by B. Curtin. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Paul Zusko – We want to take the one line behind lot 27-1 and extend the stonewall all of the way back to the property and convey all that from lot 27 to lot 27-1.

T. Hoopes – I will open it to public seeing none I will close public.

**Motion made by B. Curtin to approve the Boundary Line Adjustment for Case #P07-31 Map 4 Lot 27 & 27-1 with the waivers and the addition I delineation and buffers shown, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Case #P07-30  
John & Joan Watson**

**Map 4 Lot 2**

**2-Lot Subdivision  
351 Dudley Road**

Application submitted by Lepene Engineering and Surveying on behalf of the property owners John & Joan Watson for a proposed 20lot subdivision of a 19.25+/- acre parcel located on Dudley Road within the Rural Zone.

Approved by the Board 8-23-07

J. Dube – We are missing a driveway location.

P. Zusko – It is where the break in the wall is, I will make a note on the plan saying proposed driveway.

**Motion made by C. Balcius to grant the following waivers for Case #P07-30: 7.2.23 – natural and cultural features, 7.2.26 – existing a future improvements, 7.2.27 – elevations, 7.2.29 – future development, 7.2.33 – balance of the wetlands on the site, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor**

**Motion made by C. Balcius to accept the application for Case #P07-30 Map 4 Lot 27 for a 2-lot subdivision for John and Joan Watson as complete pending the following items: the driveway location be shown on the plan, structures, septic and well locations within 200' of the proposed property boundary be shown on the plan and the 25' wetland buffer be shown on the plan and the calculation for the 25% slopes also needs to be shown on the plan.**

P. Zusko – I do show the 25% as 0 because there are none.

C. Balcius – Where do you have that on the plan?

P. Zusko – Note 6

B. Dunbar – It would be nice to have the word slopes written on there.

**Motion seconded by B. Dunbar. Motion passed with all in favor.**

P. Zusko – We will be taking the remaining 19.2-acres and taking of 2.01-acre lot off the south side, it will have a remaining lot of 19.2 with the existing house. The septic system has been designed.

T. Hoopes – Is this in current use?

S. Williams – They are saying no outback.

T. Hoopes- I will open it to public, seeing none I will close public.

**Motion made by S. Williams to approve Case #P07-30 with previous conditions set and the following: federal, state, and local permits, erosion control note on the plat, TBS notes removed, trees flagged, where trees are not shown the wetlands buffer shall be flagged with metal posts displaying the markers that should affixed to the posts with bolts this is to be completed prior to the plan signing and certified as complete by the surveyor who will stamp the plat, and 2 sheets for recording, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.**

**Old Business:**

Ridgewood Engineering

Rick Lundy is here to talk the board regarding engineering services on the Ridgewood Project.

C. Balcius – Recused herself

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

T. Hoopes – R. Bystrack appointed to take Cindy’s place.

T. Hoopes – There was a meeting last Friday With Carl Norby, Rick Lundy, Sharon, Russ, and myself and Norby/Lundy felt the engineering expenses were too great and they had the right to have another engineer to choose from. Our problem is that our list is empty. Our engineering subcommittee needs to get back together and review other applicants for engineering purposes, so the applicants have somebody else they can choose from. In the mean time these applicants have an approved subdivision and they have met all of the requirements, they have a \$25,000 deposit at this moment for an escrow account but since there is no approved engineer to appoint to oversee things, I believe what we need to do if nothing else come up with an interim person who can do some of the inspections. Rick is ready for an inspection right now, so he can move forward while the weather is good.

S. Williams – Where does this stand as far as the road bond amount?

R. Lundy – That is all in place.

M. Jerkins – We have a letter of credit in the Planning Office and draw downs can be requested as soon as work is completed.

C. Balcius – An alternative in the interim while and RFP is sent out for engineers is Belknap County has a review process where they have a review engineer at the disposal and it might be worth the time of the board to ask them to review the plans and do the inspections interim while a couple more engineer firms are picked.

S. Williams – How do the costs compare?

C. Balcius – I don’t know but I think it is comparable.

T. Hoopes – Rick had asked if they could use Tom Selling, who use to be approved and I told him it was up to the board and it had to be somebody approved by the board.

S. Williams – if he was approved by the board before, how did he get unapproved?

T. Hoopes – I don’t know.

M. Jerkins – Mr. Selling was approved on a one-project basis, he wasn’t approved for and didn’t want to at the time be a town engineer.

R. Lundy – We have 3 different prices, Norway Plains, Tom and the other guy that was at the meeting here and they are all within \$8K-\$12K. I don’t care which one but it is definitely cheaper than \$48K.

T. Hoopes – At this instance, until the board approves somebody the feeling is we need to have somebody in the interim so you can work tomorrow.

J. Dube – I like Cindy’s idea. I think that makes sense.



**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

B. Curtin – How fast does it take to get a quote from one of your engineers?

R. Lundy – I called Tom and met him the same day and the next day he had a proposal and the other guy had one within a couple days.

T. Hoopes – I would like for the engineer subcommittee put out RFP's for new engineers and I propose that I step down from the engineering committee and **I suggest Scott Williams as my replacement. He knows the field, seconded by B. Dunbar. Motion passed with all in favor.**

J. Dube – I also want to resign off the engineering committee.

T. Hoopes –Is there anyone interested in serving as Jeremy's replacement?  
**Motion made by T. Hoopes to nominate Robert Bystrack to replace Jeremy Dube, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor.**

C. Balcius – Sits back in on the meeting

Merry Meeting Estates letter for clarification on condition of approval – M. Jerkins – One of the conditions of approval for this subdivision was that the conservation they had as part of the overall subdivision be given to certain entities and nobody wants it so they are coming to the board and asking what to do and they would basically like the homeowners association to take to total conservation easement.

T. Hoopes – They are proposing an alternative to deed the open space to the homeowners association with conservation restrictions, which give the town the right not the obligation. Will they all take a partial share in the ownership?

M. Jerkins – I don't know. It is going to require some legal analysis.

S. Williams – Why don't we have the Town Attorney come up with a solution?

**Motion made by B. Dunbar to send this correspondence to Town Attorney for review and comment as to a solution to this issue, seconded by S. Williams. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Boundary Line Survey for Map 40 Lot 52 dated 7/10/07.

M. Jerkins – Sitting in the audience here is Tim Roy, he is one of the persons who submitted an interest letter for the alternate positions that are available. Tim has now exceeded his requirements for attendance at the meetings so I am going to go ahead and get his form set up and get the signatures, if you are all here Tuesday we should be able to take care of it then.

M. Jerkins – A resignation letter was received from Jim Bureau.  
**Motion made by B. Curtin to accept the Jim Bureau's letter of resignation with regret and many thanks, seconded by T. Hoopes. Motion passed with all in favor**

Save the Date – OEP Fall Conference – **No action taken by the board**

**Approved by the Board 8-23-07**

LGC Municipal Volunteer Awards – **No action taken by the board**

Impact Fees information from Tom – **No action taken by the board**

Letter from Dennis & Jacqi Gough – **No action taken by the board**

CMA Letter RE: engineering services – **No action taken by the board**

Environmental News – **No action taken by the board**

Pre-Construction meeting minutes from CMA RE: RACO Development – **No action taken by the board**

**Motion made by C. Balcius to adjourn at 10:24pm, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Fortin  
Secretary Pro Temp