

Members Present: Chairman, Thomas Hoopes; Thomas Varney; Ex-Officio, Alan Sherwood, Jeremy Dube, Bruce Holmes, Jeanne Crouse.

Alternate: Bonnie Dunbar

Member(s) absent: Vice-Chairman, Cynthia Balcius and Alternate Donn Brock

Others Present: Town Planner, Kathy Menici and Planning Department Secretary, Stephanie Verdile and others as identified below.

Call to Order: Chairman, T. Hoopes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Appointment of Alternates: T. Hoopes appointed D. Brock to replace C. Balcius.

Approval of Agenda:

K. Menici explained the changes in the agenda and that the changes and the notice for the meeting to be continued to August 18, 2005 had been posted and agents were notified.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by J. Dube to accept the amended agenda, motion carried with all in favor.

Public Input: T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for general Public Input, being none; he closed that portion of the hearing.

Applications for Public Hearing:

K. Menici reminded the Board that the Conceptual applications have a limit of 15 minutes for their presentation and read into the record the purpose of the first case.

**Case#PO5-59 Map 6, Lot 18
Donald Roberts**

**Conceptual Review
Suncook Valley Road**

Application submitted by Alton Law Offices on behalf of property owner Donald Roberts for conceptual design and scoping input for a future 3-Lot subdivision.

Melissa Guldbrandsen, attorney for Donald Roberts were in attendance to represent the application.

M. Guldbrandsen gave a brief history of the application and described the solution about the road frontage on Rte 28S. She said D. Roberts and his abutter are planning on doing a Boundary Line Adjustment in order to accommodate both frontage requirements and that the applications will be a Boundary Line Adjustment and then a subdivision application once they receive scoping and design input from the Board.

A. Sherwood and B. Dunbar liked the conceptual design and considered it an improvement from the previous applications submitted.

T. Hoopes spoke about the safety concerns he has at that intersection. He said that intersection is known to have many accidents and advised the applicant to have a shared access because of the dangerous intersection in that area.

Some Board members discussed that they would rather see a shared access to lessen the amount of driveway cuts and if each property owner maintained their own frontage and if it were to be safer then 2 cuts. The Board members did discuss the opinion of R. Talon of NHDOT and the shared access when safety issues are a concern

D. Roberts said the driveways are on the outside of the curve and that the NHDOT recommended some cutting of trees to help visibility.

T. Varney spoke about the Town of Alton being made aware of the safety issues and not rely on

the NHDOT.

M. Guldbrandsen asked about how many applications and the Board said it would be 2, first the BLA and then the subdivision.

The applicants thanked the Board for their time.

J. Dube stepped down from the Case#PO5-58 therefore D. Brock and B. Dunbar remained as active Board members.

B. Dunbar disclosed to the Board that Tim Morgan is a member of the Vision Committee for the Master Plan re-write as well as she. She said at a recent committee meeting, T. Morgan was asked by other people what was going on with the water extraction and T. Morgan said he was doing testing and that was the extent of the conversation. T. Hoopes said he did not think that pertains the application before them and he appreciated the disclosure.

K. Menici reminded the Board that the Design Review applications have a limit of 20 minutes for their presentation and read into the record the purpose of the next case.

Case#PO5-58 Map 12, Lot 57

Design Review

Deanna O'Shaughnessy

Old Wolfeboro Rd

Fae Kontje-Gibbs

Application submitted by property owners Deanna O'Shaughnessy & Fae Kontje-Gibbs for a Design Review session from the Planning Board for a Groundwater Withdrawal Plan Site Plan Review. The property is located on Old Wolfeboro Rd and in the Rural Residential Zone.

Tim Morgan, property owner's husband, spoke to the Board. He spoke about the first issue K. Menici points out is the discrepancy in the minutes. He said the accuracy minutes, or more properly in this instance, the destruction of tapes of these minutes he said is a very serious issue for this Board. He said it is not however, the issue they want to discuss tonight. He said let's assume for the evening, arguendo, that the Planning Board's minutes are the correct minutes. He said with that being said, Section 7.5 of the Alton Planning Board regulations says "additional information may be required. He said the various reports under 7.5 are not mandated. He said they appeared before this Board earlier this year and last year they appeared before the ZBA to get the proper exemption for the large Groundwater Extraction project they are working on. He said their Notice of Decision dated October 7, 2004 they found under Section 5 "There is no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking. He said they based their opinion on information and research from the applicant, Town Highway Agent, and Board members agreed to that. He spoke about the letters submitted in the application written by the applicant and one from the NHDOT driveway permit and the NHDOT considers traffic impact as well as safety issues when they issue a driveway permit including a permit request for access to Route 28. He said that NHDOT permit was issued for 30 truck trips a day. He spoke about the letter from Jack Cilley, NHDOT District 3 Engineer outlining additional safety study of the intersection and T. Morgan said that Jack Cilley visited the intersection. T. Morgan spoke about the intersection of Old Wolfeboro Rd and Route 28 being rebuilt within the past year. T. Morgan said J. Cilley reviewed the as-built plans for the rebuilding of Route 28 and Old Wolfeboro Rd and he went out to the site to measure the site distances. T. Morgan also spoke about the letter that was submitted in the application to the Planning Board, J. Cilley wrote to Police Chief Iwans and that J. Cilley talks about the site distances for automobile and truck traffic and the site distances for both types of vehicles relative to the speed limits on Route 28. T. Morgan spoke about the letter from Police Chief Iwans that

was submitted in the application to the Planning Board and he said Chief Iwans wrote in his opinion that based on the NHDOT studies the intersection is safe and should no longer be an issue for the Planning Board. T. Morgan spoke about a letter submitted in the application written by Ken Roberts the Town of Alton Highway Agent, stating based on his studies the proposed truck traffic is safe and the NHDOT is the best authority upon which to rely on this matter. T. Morgan referred to an email from Tim Golde, the engineer whom performed the traffic study for the Hannaford Supermarket. T. Morgan said they requested T. Golde conduct a traffic study on the intersection of Route 28 and Old Wolfeboro Rd, the area to be impacted by the proposed water withdrawal plant. T. Morgan said in T. Golde's opinion since they studied the intersection of Old Wolfeboro Rd and Route 28 in conjunction with the Hannaford traffic study; he has no concerns about the traffic impact of 30 truck trips a day or the safety issues. T. Morgan said T. Golde also stated that there would not be anything added by completing another traffic study. T. Morgan asked the Planning Board what other information the Board would hope to gain from another study and he feels very strongly that they can satisfy what the Board feels is required regarding the traffic study in light of the professional studies already completed, as well as the letters from the NHDOT, Chief of Police and the Alton Highway Agent and T. Golde. He said based on all that information they would be asking for a waiver when the formal application is submitted for subdivision and site plan approval. He asked the Board for advice for what other types of things the Board will be looking for to be included in their application.

T. Hoopes spoke about the NHDOT issue and even quoted the applicant's version of the minutes, on page 2, based on the questions that A. Sherwood asked. T. Hoopes spoke about question 2 that A. Sherwood asked that really captures the concern of the Board. He read from the application what A. Sherwood's question 2 was to the applicant, "then the pulling out on 28, those trucks are slow to accelerate so is there anything reasonable to make sure that the intersection would be safer. I do not know what the rules are as far as NHDOT is concerned, but it should be pursued to see what can be done".

T. Hoopes said that is the ultimate point of the intersection as far as he is concerned. T. Hoopes said if the applicant can find a way to have that addressed, he said the point is, there was a pull out lane made to turn down Old Wolfeboro Rd, there is no pull out lane to pull onto Old Wolfeboro Rd. He said everyone has pulled out onto Rte 28 from Old Wolfeboro and found a car bearing down on them and there is no place to pull over. He said his concern is there needs to be widening on the right hand side of the shoulder of Rte28 for the trucks to begin to accelerate. T. Morgan said in the letter to Chief Iwans, the NHDOT has studied that issue and found the sight line is sufficient for the trucks to pull out and their acceleration.

T. Hoopes said the letter talked about site line, they did not acceleration of the trucks. T. Morgan said they talked about the speed of the on coming traffic. T. Hoopes said yes they talked about the speed of the oncoming traffic not of the speed of the trucks. T. Morgan said that is the reason you would need to accelerate because of the speed of the oncoming traffic southbound toward the circle. T. Hoopes said the trucks would be hauling 8,000 gallons of water at 8.6 pounds per square foot and that is a lot of weight and he said the need for some concern has to be addressed. D. O'Shaughnessy said it has been addressed, not only by the NHDOT by doing their study and the Police Chief expressed his concerns and the NHDOT went out again and then they asked T. Golde to review the intersection and he has already looked at this intersection and has said specifically, he could not see what additional information can be provided usually the study is a requirement of the NHDOT in order for them to have sufficient information to approve the permit; given that the permit has been issued, they apparently have the information they need. D. O'Shaughnessy refers to the trip generation, turning movement counts, capacity analysis and the

measurement of site distances. She said the NHDOT does have more stringent requirements before they issue a permit. She said the Town Road Agent has said this is not an issue for safety and this should be accepted based on the NHDOT's requirements.

T. Hoopes spoke about C. Balcius' comments from the previous hearing, stating the Board wants a traffic study done and a meeting with direct consultation with the NHDOT and their engineer.

D. O'Shaughnessy said according to their minutes, C. Balcius asked if they would be willing to consult with the NHDOT about a traffic study and they have complied and went beyond after they got their permit and went to the Police Chief and addressed his concerns.

K. Menici said the Board has begun talking about merits of the case outside the scope of Design Review. She said the only thing the Planning Board has to look at from NHDOT is the letter from J. Cilley. She said the Board could not make a decision tonight and waive a requirement. She said that when the applicant's come forward with their formal application that a more detailed analysis provided by NHDOT so the Board knows exactly what NHDOT took into consideration when they conducted their site visits and made their decision.

T. Hoopes said they have a responsibility to the Town of Alton to investigate all safety issues and that the Town of Alton is represented properly. It is not meant to put extra burden on applicants.

T. Morgan said that the NHDOT has jurisdiction over the state highway and that is something the Board has to consider.

T. Hoopes agreed and said the Planning Board has jurisdiction over the site plan review process and where it gains access to something it represents a part of action going on within the Town of Alton.

T. Hoopes reminded the applicants that they are talking about Design Review, the concept of what is going to take place on the property and how it is going to be done.

D. O' Shaughnessy said they wanted clarification on this issue and Russell Bailey suggested they come to the Planning Board for clarification because of the discrepancy between the minutes because they felt they had complied with what the Board had asked them to do and they went beyond and got more information. She said they have provided extra information and that the NHDOT permit is a part of the packet and the letter from Jack Cilley that explained further what the NHDOT did when they went out the second time to check the intersection. She said when they wanted to submit the documents they were told to come before the Board in the Design Review process therefore they are coming in front of the Board for clarification.

T. Varney asked about the applicants using another entrance and pipe it to Range Rd. or drive the trucks up Old Wolfeboro Rd and then to Bay Hill Rd.

D. O' Shaughnessy said that any other entrance or piping it to Range Rd is an enormous financial consideration that they are not interested in pursuing because they would only be making \$80.00 per tanker. She said that they would be impacting more neighbors by using the Bay Hill Rd suggested entrance and they are trying to accommodate the neighbors in the area now. She said they donated money to upgrade that section of Old Wolfeboro Rd that they will be impacting and they were told by the Road Agent and the Town Engineers that was the proper thing to do so that there would be Geo-tech fabric in so that it would help support the weight of the trucks. She said they would have to dig up all of Old Wolfeboro Rd and Bay Hill Rd to place Geo-tech fabric in order to have them safe for truck traffic and that would be an incredibly unreasonable financial issue to complete.

T. Varney said he thinks the applicants have a problem with that intersection.

D. O'Shaughnessy said the site plan regulations require that the all the professionals address this issue and she said they have completed that. She said the professional that did the traffic study for the Hannaford supermarket, said the work that has been done by the NHDOT is professionally

appropriate and there is nothing more that would be required and spending more money and drawing out this issue it would be going past what a professional would consider reasonable.

T. Hoopes said his and A. Sherwood's questions and concerns about the trucks entering Route 28 have not been addressed. He said the information provided did not talk about a truck fully loaded, pulling out into traffic and gaining speed. He said it has not been addressed at all to his satisfaction in the writing that was submitted by the applicant. He wants that specific concern to be addressed by the professionals.

K. Menici spoke that the letter the Chief Iwans wrote and makes a reference to reviewing a copy of the traffic report or study that was completed by NHDOT and that the applicants obtain a copy of that report and submit it to the Board as part of the formal application.

A. Sherwood spoke about his experience with trucks acceleration being fully loaded and how slow the trucks drive when accelerating, even down hill, and he said that he wants to know if it is a safe intersection. He said that intersection of Route 28 is posted at 55mph and most people and trucks travel that road going 60-65mph and it is a slight downhill grade. His said his question is, given the realities as opposed to the posted speed limit of the speed people drive and the site distance is, that a safe situation with a very slow moving truck.

D. O'Shaughnessy said that it has been addressed by the NHDOT and the Chief of Police and that it is a safe intersection and it wouldn't matter if it were a truck or a car traveling or speeding on that road. She said there are other trucks that pull in and out of Old Wolfeboro Rd. and they pull out very slowly and this is not the only truck traffic that uses that intersection.

T. Hoopes said this situation is calling for 30 trips out every day and D. O' Shaughnessy said not necessarily.

A. Sherwood said he read the information and it still did not specifically answer the question that he originally had and that based on the Planner's suggestion that the applicants obtain a copy of the NHDOT study done and provide that to the Board within their formal application. He said his issue is the safety at the intersection, not the traffic study in the usual way that includes traffic counts. T. Hoopes agrees that the issue is the safety of the intersection and he knows it has been rebuilt but it was not rebuilt with the concept of trucks pulling out.

D. O' Shaughnessy said actually she is not sure that they didn't.

T. Hoopes said they only changed the design relating to the Geo-tech and not to the design of the intersection.

D. O'Shaughnessy said that they took into consideration that there is more truck traffic at the intersection currently.

D. Brock asked if the NHDOT would consider a slower speed limit for that area.

D. O'Shaughnessy said they asked the Police Chief about signs for truck traffic entering and the applicants said that the NHDOT said it would not be necessary and they consider it a safe intersection. D. Brock said the speed factor problem is coming south rather than going north and that is the problem coming out of the intersection.

T. Hoopes spoke about the reconstruction on Route 28 when the NHDOT created a turn off lane to go down into Town and T. Hoopes said that the NHDOT originally said it was not necessary. He said he went to the police department and had them research the number of accidents at the intersection and if they would make a recommendation to NHDOT and a police representative went to the hearings and spoke in favor of adding the pull out lane.

D. O'Shaughnessy said that shows you that if they had to beg for the turn out for that, but yet the Police Chief feels confident enough with what he has received for information to say that this should not be an issue for the Board anymore.

T. Hoopes said the main concern is the safety of the intersection and that issue should be addressed when the make the formal application.

T. Varney asked if anyone does not feel it is a concern and no other Board members responded.

D. O' Shaughnessy said there is no other way to go around it to use any other entrance and to have the least impact on the community, neighborhood and safety.

The applicants thanked the Board for their time.

D. O' Shaughnessy asked if she could read something into the record and K. Menici said it is not a public hearing and T. Hoopes said it is not a public participation meeting.

B. Dunbar stepped down as an alternate and D. Brock remains, J. Dube took his seat back on the Board.

K. Menici read into the record the next case.

**Case#PO5-49 Map 12, Lot 54 and 54-1 Boundary Line Adjustment
Carl Norby & David Reynolds Old Wolfeboro Rd**

Application submitted by Fox Survey Company on behalf of the property owners Carl Norby and David Reynolds for a Boundary Line Adjustment. The property is located on Old Wolfeboro Rd and within the Rural Residential Zone.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows and said there are no waiver requests.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by B. Holmes to accept Case#PO5-49, motion carried with all in favor.

Kerry Fox, Fox Survey Company was present to represent the application. He gave a brief presentation to the Board about the BLA. He said there would not be any change to road frontage and the adjustment will affect lot 12-54-1 in the rear of the property and that the lot assizes will match the house sizes after the adjustment.

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application, being none he closed the public input portion of the hearing.

The Board asked about the septic locations for the lot 12-54-1.

K. Menici spoke about the notes that were on the plan that showed the well and septic locations and that the agent did provide new plans that shows the locations of the septic location.

She said it should be noted as a condition of approval

Motion made by J. Dube, seconded by A. Sherwood to approve Case#PO5-49, with the following conditions

- 1) That the Final plans include the limit of the 4k area and the well location for lot 12-54-1
- 2) And all state, local and federal permits be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Department.

Discussion on the motion T. Varney said that the NHDES State subdivision approval has to be amended. T. Hoopes called for the vote, motion carried with all in favor.

K. Menici read into the record the purpose of the next case.

**Case#PO5-54 Map 21, Lot 5-6 & 5-7 Boundary Line Adjustment
Robert & Sandra Bahre Hopewell Road**

Application submitted by Richard Bartlett and Associates on behalf of the property owners for Boundary Line Adjustment. The property is located on Hopewell road in the: Lakeshore Residential Zone, Town of Alton Shoreland Protection Overlay District, the NHDES Shoreland

Protection Overlay District.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows: she said no waivers were requested and none are necessary.

Motion to accept Case#PO5-54 as complete made by A. Sherwood seconded by D. Brock, motion carried with all in favor.

Mark Sargent, Richard Bartlett and Associates was present to represent the application He gave a brief presentation to the Board about the proposal. He said both lots are currently undeveloped.

The Board did not express any concerns and that the application seems complete and no real issues were discussed.

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application, there being none, he closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Motion made by D. Brock, seconded by, B. Holmes to approve Case#PO5-54, with the following conditions

1. All state, federal and local permits be obtained and copies provided to the Planning Department.

Discussion on the motion- J. Crouse asked about K. Menici's suggested conditions of approval as outlined in the Planner's report. K. Menici said they did not need to be added and she would take them up with the agent. T. Hoopes called for a vote, the Motion carried with all in favor.

K. Menici read into the record in the next case.

Case#PO5-57 Map 80, Lot 39 & 40

Dean & Diane Morrison

Walter Tingle & Diane Morrison

Boundary Line Adjustment

Big Barndoor Island

Application submitted by David Dolan & Associates on behalf of the property owners for a Boundary Line Adjustment. The property is located in the Lakeshore Residential Zone, The Town of Alton Shoreland Protection Overlay District and the NHDES Shoreland Protection Overlay District.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows. She said the applicants jointly own M/L 80/40 and through the Boundary Line Adjustment want to divide M/L 80/41 between M/L 80/39 and 80/41. As a result of the BLA, M/L 80-40 will be eliminated and M/L 80/39 and 80/41 will increase in size. She said both lots M/L 40/39 and 80/41 have existing dwellings on them; M/L 80/40 is undeveloped and no further development of the subject parcels is proposed.

She read the waiver requests into the record as follows: Section 7.2.24 – Soils, Section 7.2.27 – Elevations, Section 7.2.33 – Wetlands and advised the Board that the waiver requests are reasonable.

The Board discussed some of the waiver requests and T. Varney questioned the possibility of not requiring one applicant to provide what the 2 previous applicants had to provide on their plans.

T. Hoopes said this case is flexible enough to not require the information.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by D. Brock to grant the waiver requests and accept Case#PO5-57 as complete, motion carried with all in favor.

D. Dolan was present to represent the application and gave his presentation to the Board. He said

the proposal is to split the lot owned by both parties, increase the size of the existing lots and eliminate a non-conforming lot. He said there are no wetlands on site.

The Board discussed that the two individual lots have their own septic systems.

T. Varney said the setbacks will now be 50' from the water and T. Hoopes said the association has their own setback of 40'. They discussed any future development of the non-conforming lot will be possibly because the lot will no longer exist.

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application, there being none he closed the public input portion of the hearing.

They discussed the setback issue and K. Menici said that the BLA is a subdivision and the lots will be subject to the 50' setback since new lots are created.

Motion made by B. Holmes, seconded by A. Sherwood to approve Case#PO5-57, motion carried with all in favor.

K. Menici read into the record the next case.

**Case #PO5-13
Robert Henderson**

Map 10, Lot 27

**3-Lot Subdivision
Alton Mountain Rd.**

Application submitted by Roseen Survey PLLC on behalf of the owner, Robert Henderson for a 3-Lot Subdivision. The application was accepted at the February 15, 2005 meeting and continued from the March 15 and April 19, 2005, May 17, 2005, June 21, 2005 meetings. The property is located in the Rural Zone.

Eric Roseen, agent and Robert Henderson, property owner were in attendance to represent the application.

A. Sherwood spoke about the meeting with the Town Attorney, James Sessler and this case was used as an example of a subdivision proposed on a Class V road as opposed to a subdivision with an internal road. He spoke about the Board's authority over the road and improvements or impact fees that may be levied. He said the Board can request that money be put into escrow for future improvements but they cannot put the burden on the applicant to bring the road up to town road standards. He said the Highway Agent came to a deal with the applicant to upgrade the road and do some ditch line work and widen it to 18' gravel travel way. He spoke about the fact that the previous request from the Board to make engineering improvements was unreasonable and he would like to find a solution.

R. Henderson spoke about his engineering costs being about \$6,500.00 to date. He said he is still willing to make some improvements to the right hand side of the road. He told the Board he did a site walk with the neighbors and he spoke about his desire to make 2 more lots after the IGMO expires and he knows they will need a cistern. He said he is still willing to agree to the original agreement and he is still willing to do the work previously requested by the Highway agent. He said he would like to meet one more time with the Highway Agent to confirm previous agreements. He is very concerned about the people that have to live there and does not want to ruin the character of the road.

A. Sherwood asked if the applicant is willing to wait until next month for approval and in the meantime submit engineered plans to the road agent and R. Henderson said K. Roberts has the latest engineered plans and he would be willing to do that.

The Board discussed the applicant putting money into escrow, including engineering expenses, and there would have to be some improvements to the road. R. Henderson said the road would be widened to 18' and clear some ditch lines, possibly on both sides of the road. R. Henderson said the road is now 14'-16' feet wide and they plan on having it be 18'.

A. Sherwood said that the escrow has to be secured up front and in the form of cash or a letter of credit and that would be a condition of approval

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application, there being none he closed the public input portion of the hearing

The Board discussed that access to the cemetery be a walking trail and the applicant plans on doing that.

Board discussion about the IGMO and the number of lots originally proposed and the Board has been made aware that there will be 2 more lots and that this plan does not include the 2 additional lots because they have been submitted under another application. The 2 future lots cannot be shown in this application because the proposed 3-lot subdivision is to be recorded and you cannot record future lots on the plan.

B. Holmes requested that the application be heard first on the next month's agenda, the Board agreed.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by D. Brock to continue Case#PO5-13 until September 20, 2005 at 7pm and that the applicants waive the time requirements for the Board to act upon the application, motion carried with all in favor.

T. Hoopes called for a 10-minute break at 8:40pm

T. Hoopes called the meeting back to order at 8:50 pm

K. Menici read the next case into the record.

Case#PO5-48 Map 58, Lot 5

3-Lot Subdivision

NSTS Development

Timber Ridge Rd

Application submitted by Benchmark Engineering on behalf of the property owner NSTS Development. The proposed subdivision is located on Timber Ridge Rd and is located in the Lakeshore Residential Zone, The Town of Alton Shoreland Protection Overlay District and the NHDES Shoreland Protection District.

T. Hoopes appointed B. Dunbar to replace C. Balcius.

T. Hoopes spoke about the site walk and how steep the site is and the access is difficult.

J. Dube spoke about the area being difficult to access and can understand why they are doing it but he does not like the proposal.

J. Crouse spoke about the intermittent stream and asked about a wetlands review.

Jack Szemplinski, Benchmark Engineering was in attendance to represent the applicant, NSTS Development and gave his presentation to the Board as follows. He said it was treatment swale there it is not a stream. He said they do not plan to alter it in any way and they want to be able to slow down the water from the site and that is what the treatment swale is for.

A. Sherwood said he was involved in the original subdivision and he asked about the steepness of the proposed driveways versus the approved driveways that exist today.

The Board discussed the proposed driveway that goes across another lot and the possibility of

sharing a driveway and there would be a very tight turn if they shared the driveway.

J. Dube said the proposed driveways would not be as difficult to access as previously approved.

J. Szemplinski said the homes serviced by the driveways will be built with self-sprinkled fire suppression systems.

The Board discussed an engineering review for the driveways and the Board talked about shared access driveways. J. Szemplinski said there was no regulation that requires them to have a shared driveway and he said the terrain may not allow that.

The Board discusses a driveway going through another person's land is not a good idea and there are liability issues that are attached.

J. Szemplinski said that is why they have legal descriptions in the deeds.

A. Sherwood spoke about lot #5-26 and it having its own driveway in its own lot and wanted to know the types of grade it would have under that situation.

J. Szemplinski said probably 2-3% steeper and they have researched other options and this is the least impacting.

T. Hoopes spoke about finding the most reasonable and logical solution and the Board has to act on the behalf of the Town, future owners of the property and future regulations and subdivision applications.

J. Dube spoke about the issue not being one driveway cut, it is the fact the driveway goes over another lot. He spoke about the fact that one owner would have to dig up the other's driveway in order to install the septic system and he has a problem with that. He said he agrees with the engineering but not with the way the driveways are proposed. He would rather see each lot have its own driveway.

T. Hoopes said the Board has to have a review done by a Town Engineer.

The Board discussed that each lot has to have its access from its own frontage.

A. Sherwood said he realizes from an engineering point of view this proposal is probably adequate but from the Board's point of view, it is not adequate to have a driveway go through someone else's land.

J. Crouse said maybe it is not a good idea to subdivide the lot because of access and asked if it is in the best interest of the community.

J. Szemplinski said the lots can be developed and the lots are good for the community because of the tax base they generate with the homes.

The Board discussed the proposed driveways in relation to the layout and they are not happy with the previously approved driveways in the subdivision and they do not want to repeat that approval. The Board also discussed the applicant would have to go to the ZBA for a variance because of the frontage/access issue.

J. Szemplinski wants the Board to get an opinion from the Town Attorney on liability issues.

A. Sherwood wants the driveway for lot 26 be split from the lot and he wants to see the consequences of that lot having its own driveway and wants the revised plans to show that.

T. Hoopes wants to know if the length of the driveway for lot 25 if it served only one lot would be changed.

T. Varney wants the Fire Chief to review the driveways.

The Board reviewed the driveway proposals and spoke about the driveway standards that are being proposed with the assistance of the Fire Chief and the Highway Agent and the changes that are being proposed.

J. Szemplinski said he would have no idea to what to ask for a variance from.

A. Sherwood suggested a legal opinion be obtained before any escrow be established for an engineering review.

J. Crouse spoke about the regulations and suggested that the Board members that did not go on the site walk go on a site walk.

T. Hoopes wants a legal opinion and A. Sherwood wants to see plans that show the consequences of separating the driveways.

A. Sherwood wants to see that the driveways can be built on the Fire Chief's requirements and that in the future the proposed lots can have their own driveways.

J. Dube wants to know about the liability of the Town and if it has to go to the zoning board for a variance.

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application, there being none; he closed the public input portion of the hearing.

T. Hoopes asked K. Menici to contact J. Sessler for a legal opinion regarding the liability issue.

Motion made by J. Dube , seconded by J. Crouse to continue Case#PO5-48 until the September 20, 2005 meeting at 7pm, motion carried with all in favor

**Case#PO5-51 Map 14, Lot 1
Sandra Wyatt & Elaine MacDonald**

**3-Lot Subdivision
Jesus Valley Road**

Application submitted by Anderson Livingston Engineers on behalf of the property owners for a 3-lot subdivision. The property is located on Jesus Valley Road and in the Rural Zone

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows the applicants are proposing a 3-lot subdivision to divide the estate of the parents of the applicants and there is an existing dwelling on one lot.

She explained the waiver requests as follows: Section 7.2.6 – Scale, Section 7.2.23 – Natural and Cultural Resources, Section 7.2.27 – Elevations, Section 7.2.29 – Future Development, Section 7.2.33 – Wetlands. She also explained Waivers were also requested from the following; these items are not applicable to this application: Section 7.2.25 – Substandard Lot (not applicable to this application), Section 7.2.31 – Descriptions (not applicable to this application), Section 7.2.32 – Reserved Areas (not applicable to this application), Section 7.3.2 – Timing (not applicable to this application), Section 7.3.3 – Significant Features (not applicable to this application) In addition to the requested waivers, applicants will also need a waiver from Section 7.2.26 – Existing and Future Improvements or the Board should require that to be added to the final plat.

K. Menici said the Board's policy on the large lot developments have been to require checklist items to be completed on the front portion of the property.

A. Sherwood said he would not look for the entire 50 acres to be identified and mapped but the

areas in the front have to be in order to show the Board what they are approving and every lot they create the Board needs to know it is conforming and buildable.

The Board wants the 2 new lots to have all the proper information shown on the plan and they want to see: the proposed well and septic areas, the topography, wetlands, elevations at least a few hundred feet into the lot to show the board the lot is buildable and viable.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by B. Holmes to continue the discussion on the acceptance of Case#PO5-51, until September 20, 2005 at 7pm, motion carried with all in favor.

Other Business:

K. Menici presented CMA Engineering reviews for Gillan Marine and Wentworth Cove

A. Sherwood asked about the CMA contract that did not include recharge and drainage issues and the Board wants to know and what the compliance issues are and that was the main reason for the engineering review for Gillan Marine.

Scott Williams also wants CMA Engineering to continue with the Ingalls' Woods

Motion made by T. Varney, seconded by J. Dube to approve the CMA Estimate for the initial review of the current site plan for Gillan application and current subdivision Ingall's Woods application, motion carried with all in favor

Adjournment

Motion made by J. Crouse, seconded by B. Holmes to adjourn at 10:00pm, motion carried with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephanie N. Verdile
Alton Planning Department Secretary

**THE FOLLOWING IS A CONTINUATION OF THE AUGUST 16, 2005
ALTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD ON AUGUST 18, 2005 AT
7PM.**

Members Present: Chairman, Thomas Hoopes; Ex-Officio, Alan Sherwood, Thomas Varney; Alternate Ex-Officio, Cris Blackstone; Bruce Holmes; Jeanne Crouse, Jeremy Dube and Alternate Bonnie Dunbar, Alternate: Donn Brock, Cynthia Balcus

Member(s) absent:

Others Present: Town Planner, Kathy Menici; Secretary, Jennifer McCullough and others as identified below.

Call to Order: Chairman, T. Hoopes called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Appointment of Alternates:

No Alternates needs. Full Board.

Approval of Agenda:

Agenda has changed. RCC Corp. has asked to continue. US Cellular needs to bring their installation in compliance with town regulations before approval can be obtained for other installations on that tower. Motion made to continue case #PO5-36. Motion made by, T. Hoopes, seconded by A. Sherwood to approve the agenda as presented, motion carried with all in favor.

Public Input: T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for general Public Input, being none; he closed that portion of the hearing.

K. Menici read the first case into the record, Cynthia Balcius reclused herself from this case. Donn Brock will sit in for Cindy.

**Case#PO5-52 Map 1, Lot 9
Robert & Kristen Ramey**

**2-Lot Subdivision
261 Muchado Hill Rd**

Application submitted by Lindon Design and Associates on behalf of the property owners for a 2-Lot subdivision. The property is located at 261 Muchado Hill Rd in the Rural Zone.

She explained the waivers Requested: Section 7.2.23 – Natural and Cultural Features, Section 7.2.27 – Topography, Section 7.2.29 – Future Development, Section 7.2.33 – Wetlands. Agent came before planning board to discuss mapping requirements for application. Proposing to subdivide a 12-acre parcel off of an existing 40-acre parcel and requested input from the board that would be acceptable if they required features for the proposed new lot and areas immediately adjacent lot.

T. Hoopes asked for confirmation on planners report. K. Menici stated that after reviewing the plat for completeness and reviewing various features of the parcel, she found that about ¾ of the way up on plat, it is extremely difficult to make out details, T. Hoopes stated he did see coloration, but from small map you don't see all brooks, question is that there is obviously no wetlands, long time ago filled in. Applicant stated the wood road was put in quite a while ago. Discussion around stream and flow. Applicant stated does have significant flow. Applicant stated they have application with Wetlands for culverts. Confirmation that there was no future subdivision planned. Alan Sherwood had question regarding no new wetlands. When Wetlands application comes in will be in more detail.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by C. Balcius to grant the waiver requests and accept Case#PO5-52 as complete, motion carried with all in favor.

Don Voltz, Lindon Design & Associates was in attendance to represent the application and gave his presentation to the Board. As noted we did come to board in November and requested several waivers because of size of lots. Ramey Farm is more than 40 acres and carries over to Barnstead. Purpose of subdivision is to provide retirement lot for Mrs. Ramey's brother. Shown topography, wetlands, soils for entire lot. County soils shown on new draft approved soils from 2000. Did test pit where house is going and good soil. No water observed for depth of pit 6 feet. Loamy sand. House site is served by old farm road, fill was put in when road was put in. Trees in road were cut down. Driveway will go along with that old road to minimize wetlands disturbance. Two brooks, one seasonal, and brook closer to the house. Lot gently slopping away from Muchado Road and travels towards southeast. Lot is a little over 12 acres. Two large lots for foreseeable future. Have

proposed 25-foot wetland buffers. Opened up questions from board.

A Sherwood questioned if there is a note on plan relative to buffers? This was confirmed. Planner stated not on their copies of plan. Don Voltz stated that wetlands buffers were on his copy, passed around for Board to view. Board discussed need to see no cut buffer around all of it. Question as to status of Wetlands application, was noted it was in progress and would be done tomorrow. In any case would be available for next meeting. Subdivision is 12-acre parcel in 100-acre plot. 29 acres in Alton because portion in Barnstead. Did notify all abutters around Barnstead parcel.

T. Hoopes opened up the hearing for public input to discuss the application.

Angie Bystra of Alton spoke on behalf of the Ramey's. Have about 160 acres total and are looking to keep farm as farm all they want to do is bring brother up for their retirement. Not looking to plug in a bunch of houses. Small wetlands area growing up. Not clear pond. Most of it is from road runoff goes into pond. I would like to speak in favor of approving subdivision of 12 acres, especially because it is a large parcel and will be kept in current use.

T. Hoopes closed the public input portion of the hearing and moved on to deliberations.

Since contingent on what DES says. Tom Varney stated acreage on map could be misleading. Agreed could write somewhere on plan total acreage in Alton and Barnstead.

Motion made by T. Hoopes, seconded by T. Varney to approve Case#PO5-52, motion carried with all in favor with following three conditions: #1 all federal, state, and local permits be obtained, #2, that the plan be updated to show a 25-foot no cut wetlands buffer for all wetlands on lot 1-9-6, and #3 that a note be added to plan showing approximate overall acreage of lot in Alton and Barnstead.

Noted that C. Balcius resuming her chair.

K. Menici read into the record the next case.

**Case#PO5-03 Map12, Lot 43
William McQuade/ Nextel Communications**

**Site Plan Review
Old Wolfeboro Rd.**

Application submitted by William McQuade on behalf of the property owner Michael Letourneau, Nextel Communications and Tower Venture for Site Plan Review to construct a new 120' monopole telecommunication tower. The property is located on Old Wolfeboro Rd in the Rural Zone. The application was accepted by the Board at the May 17, 2005 meeting and continued.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows and said the engineering review was completed by CMA Engineering and submitted to the Planning Department by fax on August 11, 2005. A copy of that report is included with this packet. Staff's preliminary review of this letter indicates that the applicant needs to provide additional detail is required for the construction of the road and associated drainage. Staff's preliminary review of CMA's report indicates that a second review by CMA will be necessary to address outstanding details before the Board can approve the application. Staff will review the review the report more closely and comment further to the Board during the public hearing.

T. Hoopes wanted confirmation that stone wall has been surveyed, but not survey of entire

property, and also concerns over road closure. Waiver allowed them to not survey whole property, but just survey one boundary.

T. Varney voiced concern over confusion on plan and fact that road was never discontinued. Confirmed that there was a motion made to survey boundary by stone wall. Questioned what arrow +- 15B was on plan. Engineer stated that it was the average distance between stone wall and access road. T. Varney stated still had concern on survey. K. Menici stated she had copy of approved minutes May 17. She read motion from those minutes which confirmed waiver approval if Survey of just parcel near rock and stone wall, not whole property.

T. Varney stated that the tax map shows road, and land and shows two separate parcels divided by road. Survey would clear that up. Not measure wall, but find out where boundary is. Could be corrected easily if surveyor did work that showed that they own property, that is boundary, that is where road is cleared up. Should be required by planning board.

T. Hoopes stated that that is not what was decided at the last meeting.

B. Balcius noted that note from surveyor confirms that this is the northern end of property of Laterno. Certifies Northerly boundary of property is defined by stone wall.

T. Varney stated he thinks this is a misrepresentation to planning board. Land has not been surveyed at all, no delineation of property lines.

T. Hoopes stated they are certifying that the northern boundary of Laterno property is defined by stone wall and wetlands are located correctly.

Much argument over what was requested at previous meeting. Discussion as to who was comfortable with the survey and who was not: J. Krouse stated, she personally doesn't have enough information. B. Dunbar stated she doesn't have problem with this. D. Brock doesn't have problem. T. Hoopes stated he is comfortable with survey. B. Homes stated doesn't have problem with it. C. Balcius questioned if he went out and surveyed would have expected to see lot corners, or did he just survey from a benchmark physical location of stone wall and say that was a boundary. Engineer was not sure, but stated he could get information from their files as to what was actually done at survey.

T. Varney wants to go on record saying no survey of property has been done in his opinion.

C. Balcius noted that the surveyor in order to put stamp on has to have done what he said.

Motion made to proceed by T. Hoopes. Can look up Misty Lane and know exactly when it was opened and closed. K. Menici stated that there was discussion on that at last months meeting.

A. Sherwood has question concerning engineer review. Maybe as part of that you can ask CMA if this boundary was adequately located. Noticed on review no structural analysis. CMA does not have in house capability to do structural review, but use another firm. Also question as to site walk, whether there was any observations or feedback at site walk.

T. Hoopes described wetland impact. Not a site where you are going to be driving up every day.

Imagine monthly or twice a month trips at the most, so doesn't see 20% slope in a couple of places as a problem; this is not a residence.

Site is good, concern that there will be a strobe light on top of tower, red during day, white at night. Three other lights in fixed position 75 feet up, so yes there is going to be some impact visually, but those are required by FAA.

T. Varney stated he thought CMA would be here. K. Menici stated that once other issues were addressed they would come to meeting.

T. Varney stated he has problem with Zoning of land. Purpose of this regulation is to preserve the view of the skyline from the following areas. Preservation of historic areas. Construction of new access roads on steep slopes and suitable soils. Would like planning board to decide that this does not meet Zoning ordinances.

T. Hoopes stated that this is an approved, designated area, and applicant has right to put tower here. Tom reading specific requirements made for cell towers and accept ions by state statue. This board made overlay district for cell tower use and was voted on. This is not a debate as to the zoning. These people have come and put forth a viable application to a piece of land we have designated for this use. You cannot put a cell tower on a flat spot. Board looked at wetlands and area and determined this area is where it should go.

Motion made to open to public. No public input closed this portion of meeting.

W. McQuade, representing the Nextel Communications and Engineer, Emon Kernan, representing Nextel was in attendance for the application gave their presentation to the Board. Would like to review letter from CMA. Believe CMA is going to sub out structural.

In review of Mr. Riders comments from CMA and discussions today. We can give him detail in order to satisfy his review. We will get him what he needs and CMA will do review of structural and at that point answer any questions at this point.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by C. Balcius to continue Case# PO5-03 September 20, 2005, motion carried with all in favor.

K. Menici read into the record the purpose of the next case.

**Case#PO5-45 Map 27, Lot 24
Helane Shields**

**Amended Site Plan
91 Main Street**

Application submitted by Helane Shields for an expansion of an existing auto repair business and gas station. The applicant proposed to add a 30'x41' 2-bay metal building to the existing auto repair business, gas station, retail sales and 5-unit apartment building. The property is located in the Residential Commercial Zone.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows and said the applicant proposes to construct a 2-bay service garage as an expansion of an existing service station/ automobile repair facility. A pre-existing non-conforming lot, the applicant was granted a Special Exception at the July 2005 ZBA meeting to allow the construction of the proposed building. The agent has requested the three waivers listed above. With the exception of the proposed building, all improvements lot are

existing. The agent also states there is no wetland or drainage issues on the site.

K. Menici explained the waiver requests as follows: Section 7.2.27 – Elevations, Section 7.2.33 – Wetlands, Section 7.4.5.1 – Drainage Plan

T. Hoopes question, what is existing and what is new. Metal repair building is only new structure whatsoever. So office will stay exactly the same. Confirmed by applicant. Only questioning what was asked by Earl Bagley and since road agent asked about drainage, something I don't know enough about we should leave that open-ended and give waiver to elevations and wetlands, don't have problem.

T. Varney question as to lot size coverage and if this was in aquifer protection zone as Earl Bagley stated that it was.

G. Chrisenton stated that only change is that one building and adding driveway off of School Street. They have a driveway permit for that location. Not the primary, used for occasional access.

A. Sherwood confirmed that if this is in Aquifer protection zone and that only 20% of property can be covered. The site plan needs to have firm numbers as to the amount that will be covered. Square footage of roof. What is physically covered on lot? Engineer stated that they can add that to plan very easily.

B. Dunbar read the rules of Aquifer zone. It had been amended in 1998.

Need to know answer to this before we can approve this. A. Sherwood asked what board wants to do.

T. Hoopes stated that if the percentage of coverage is above 20% then it would have to be some kind of drainage engineering that would resolve the purification. We are required by law that if there is more of 20% covered by permeable surface, which prevents the absorption of the Aquifer, than you need to be able to find a way to get more moisture into the ground. So that it doesn't run off. And in a case like this it is an existing gas station, we simply need to be aware of what is being done to protect the groundwater.

Motion made by A. Sherwood for Case #P05-45 to approve waiver for and defer waiver of drainage plan until we have ratio of impervious surfaces and accept the plan for review. T. Varney stated that a plan like this should have a drainage plan. If you are in Aquifer zone, all had to go through engineering review and still have to do it here. Zoning requires it anyway. Most likely over 20%, so you are violating zoning. If we defer this, why not just not accept the plan. We need to be consistent. Suggest we not accept the plan and come back next month.

C. Balcius asked if there were any treatment areas. Grass in back of property and all water ponds near gas pumps. Is there any contingency treatment available? C. Balcius stated that when you have runoff from pavement, sometimes have catch basins with oil, things of that nature. Drainage study needed. Just because it is existing doesn't mean it is a good situation.

H. Shields stated that drainage from gas station goes into the town culvert. Very little runoff, water absorbed by lawns and trees.

A. Sherwood said lot was flat as a pancake. But that this is still not going to make a difference if we need a drainage study.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded by C. Balcius, to grant the waiver request for Wetlands 7.2.33 and defer the waiver request for elevations 7.2.27 and 7.4.5.1 pending receipt of information on the percentage of impervious surface on this site and that we accept Case#PO5-45 for discussion.

T. Varney said what is purpose to have discussion tonight because we don't have information. J. Krouse also stated that since this has direct impact on case, we need to wait.

Helane Shields asked if she only needs the drainage plan if over 20% is impervious. T. Hoopes stated validity in your argument, but other issues we can discuss tonight until we have that information at next meeting. B. Dunbar stated does not think that if there is not more than 20% coverage that the drain is not going to be looked at. If there is more than 20% coverage, not prerogative of board to allow more than 20% coverage. Possibility that building will not be allowed and discussion that follows today would be pointless. Decision by board, you can allow someone to cover more if they can guarantee that they can protect the aquifer and recharge it. That is the only reason board could approve.

Engineer G. Chrisenton stated make suggestion to continue discussion tonight so that he could have an idea of the other issues and take care of them all at once. T. Varney stated, if you accept plan as complete, you are violating zoning. We don't have the power to do that. Have another site plan very similar to this and they are required to follow every single rule. Bothers me when Board is not consistent.

Discussion as to if Board wants to continue case. T. Hoopes asked if anyone else uncomfortable with this? I don't see any problem moving ahead with deferment.

All in favor of motion 3, not in favor 4. Motion failed, application is not accepted.

T. Hoopes stated that we cannot have discussion tonight because we do not have enough information to accept the application.

Applicant stated thinks it is unfair that when they come to meeting this stuff comes out. If we had known this up front, we would have taken care of this issue. C. Balcius stated that is was pretty clear what is required. T. Hoopes is thinking of having preapplication discussion so people aren't put on spot like this. Unfortunately we don't have this requirement at this time. K. Menici stated not requirement, but it is an option that is available and is stated in regulations.

Motion made by T. Hoopes to continue this discussion to the September 20, 2005 meeting, seconded by A. Sherwood, the following items need to be addressed prior to the September meeting: the ratios for impervious surface including buildings and pavement; spot elevations; as well percentages of grass and gravel on property. All in favor.

Motion made to take 5 minute break, all in favor.

T. Hoopes called the meeting back to order at 8:54 p.m.

Case# PO5-53
Foulkes Corporation
Midwest Tower

Map 3, Lot 18

Amended Site Plan
Prospect Mountain Rd

Application submitted by Verizon Wireless for the property owners Foulkes Corporation and Midwest Tower for an Amended Site Plan to add three 6-foot dish antennas to existing tower. Site is located in the Telecommunications Tower Overlay District and in the Rural Zone.

K. Menici gave her report to the Board as follows; she said the applicant seeks approval to add 3 dish antennae to the existing tower on Prospect Mountain. No additional structures will be required in the equipment compound at the base of the tower. She reminded the Board that last month they granted conditional acceptance to another carrier for the installation of additional antennae on that tower. The condition of that acceptance was that another carrier, US Cellular, come before the Board with an application to bring their most recent installation into compliance through an Amended Site Plan Review. This condition remains outstanding. If the Board grants the waiver requests, the Board may again consider conditional acceptance and allow the engineering review to be undertaken while US Cellular brings their installation into compliance. Had a call from Michael Brennar that US Cellular has just completed their engineering review that they need to file their application. They will be filing application next week What the board finally decided to do was to give conditional acceptance of application and assigned application for engineering review.

She explained the waiver requests: Section 7.2.20 – Details on Abutting Properties, Section 7.2.21 – Metes and Bounds, Section 7.2.23 – Natural and Cultural Features, Section 7.2.24 – Soils, Section 7.2.25 – Substandard Lot, Section 7.2.27 – Elevations, Section 9.14 – Parcel Size Ratio, Section 7.4.5.1 – Drainage Plan (notes on plat only), Section 7.4.5.2 – Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan, Section 7.5.1.1 – Fiscal Impact Study, Section 7.5.1.3 – Traffic Study

Waivers are not needed for 7.2.27 and also 7.4.5.1. This is an amended site plan review so that most of these would have been provided in the existing plan. No additional equipment buildings. No need for these waivers. We don't need to see new graphic studies, because nothing is changing.

Motion made by T. Hoopes to accept requested waivers for Case #PO5-53, seconded by J. Krouse, motion carried with all in favor.

Motion made by A. Sherwood, seconded J. Dube to accept Case# PO5-53, on condition there be no final approval of this plan until the existing US Cellular gets successful site plan review. J. Dube seconded, motion carried with all in favor.

C. Balcius had question concerning limit of number of antennas on one tower, she thought it was 12. K. Menici stated this was a limit per carrier, not per tower.

Tom Hildreth from Verizon Wireless took floor. Stating equipment is a straightforward addition to this tower. Third page of plan shows new dishes made dark on plan. With the addition of the dishes, will be additional cable lines. No additional work done on ground. Stated that it seems little bit unfair from his perspective that US Cellular has the benefit of their services today and did not come before the board and that they are going through all the necessary channels and do not have services at this time. T. Hoopes stated it is the only way we can get the owner to comply.

T. Hoopes asked question as to what the additional dishes do. Was stated that it brings signal into switch site, each of these dishes are connected to other specific sites, microwave dishes are point-to-point communication, not a broadcast signal. This is bundling up frequency and beaming it to and receiving it from another specific site. Each path gets approval from government. This site beams back towards Hooksett and gets sent back out. Peter Cook from Weldon Associates stated it is essential backhaul.

A. Sherwood asked question if you are supporting other carriers. Stated specific to Verizon Wireless. For wireless based technology depending on wires more than anything else. Goes from handset to that tower, tower goes to shelter, within that is interface into the land line and land line goes back to switch. Almost all of existing network is land-lined based. A. Sherwood was just wondering if this tower was getting near to capacity. Having seen other carriers to microwave. Haven't seen anyone have commitment. T. Hoopes asked what is the next phase of expansion? Do other knolls in area work? P. Cook stated that what you are seeing in the industry as a whole is capacity issues. Couple usage with other features, video screening, Internet, you will end up infilling. You are buying a band of frequencies and reusing these frequencies. Verizon has bought PCS frequencies. A. Sherwood stated eventually they are going to be looking for more towers closer together, but lower. T. Hoopes stated we currently have four zones for this, we will be outgrowing this. P. Cooke Cingular and AT&T have additional frequency bands. Antennas are not changing, but a couple of those have PCS frequencies, have some efficiencies with regard to equipment themselves. This particular site is nearing its capacity. I seem to recall that there was some requirement that this site have capacity to be heightened. You can also replace tower. You could replace with a different style of tower. Last choice might be another tower. Right now zoning only allows one tower on each of these sites. Down the road, you may see on church steeple, or buildings.

A. Sherwood going back to structural analysis, already have one company undergoing engineering review. Probably doesn't make sense to have another structural review. Out of fairness to other applicants should split cost. Three applicants here. Dufresne Henry should only need to do one review. Should have U.S. Cellular subject to the engineering review. K. Menici stated that if US cellular does not come into compliance, that the owners may be required to remove antennas.

Motion made by T. Hoopes to share engineering fees review between RCC and Verizon. Should US Cellular come in, they would also be required to share in fees. Motion seconded by C. Balcius, all in favor.

Motion made to continue case #PO5-53 by T. Hoopes, seconded by A. Sherwood, all in favor.

Motion made by B. Holmes to continue Case #PO4-49 Wentworth Cove Realty, Seconded by J. Krouse, all in favor.

T. Varney stepped down from Wentworth Cove as well as J. Dube.

Motion made by B. Holmes to continue Case #P05-36 RCC, Seconded by J. Krouse, all in favor.

Other Business:

1. Approval of Minutes from the July 19 and July 21, 2005 Planning Board meetings and July 7, 2005 Workshop meeting.

Motion made by to postpone approval of minutes to September 20, meeting, all in favor.

2. Old Business-

1. Hussey Conservation Easement Update, presented to board in October. Worked through winter to get approval. Final easement area is 1-1/2 less than what is originally proposed. The easement area as it appears. Reduction does not affect public access to the property. During this process Brownie was the person who was in charge of shepparding this through the process. Brownie and Mr. Hussey discussed uses of conservation area, Mr. Hussey has agreed to assist in making walking path through conservation area. T. Hoopes stated that this is beyond due diligence.

No motion needed will send to assessors office to get updated.

3. New Business-

1. Hilltop Estates, Map 12, Lot 17

K. Menici said this item was for informational purposes only. Just a pending issue. Site specific permit for 9-lot subdivision. Off of 28. Not been approved.

2. June A. Rich Trust- Voluntary Lot Merger

K. Menici spoke about

Both parcels are on Tranquility Lane. Prior to lot merger, first parcel, second is for ¾ of an acre 32, 647 square feet. Minimum lot area is 30,000 square feet. No issue to lot area. Lot area is going to be increased along with shoreline. By doing this lot merger, the new lot will be in total compliance.

T. Hoopes has concern over one lot having no dwelling and one has breakwater and docking structure. No building on either parcel. Concern from plan that two breakwaters exist. If there is only one breakwater and dock. Combining should say that there should only be one breakwater on one lot. I don't see a problem as well as there is a restriction on the number of breakwaters on one lot.

Motion made by B. Holmes, made motion to approve the Voluntary Lot Merger for Map 18, Lot 39-8 and Lot 38-9 on conditions that we notify DES of the merger and second that we inform the applicants that they will be restricted to the one existing breakwater, may have more than one dock. Motion seconded by J. Dube, all in favor.

4. Survey prepared by George Christianson 225 Trask Side Road. Mr. And Mrs. Irving had some questions concerning property lines. Issues with Abutter, so decided to have survey done to property and are just conveying this as required by RSA #676-18 IV.
5. Letter from Tylor Young who is a graduate of Plymouth State College and was a topology major. He has volunteered his time to take on any of the mapping projects that the town may have and also to teach us how to use the mapping

program that the town has that nobody knows how to use.

We have version 3.2 and they have just released version 9. A. Sherwood suggested if he could give us some advice as to what it would cost and what we would need to update.

T. Hoopes stated that in doing the work on the master plan we will need to have ability to have maps overlaid. Problem is we have nothing on same scale. C. Balcius stated that part of the package was that we were paying extra to have tax map overlay done. Would show where subdivisions are. Topic came up 6 or 7 months ago and did e-mail. Things have gotten dropped in last phase. Conservation had funds for that, but not sure if we ever paid for it.

K. Menici asked if anyone would be interested in seeing reports on drainage issues at St. Katherine's. Road washing out is big issue. On that regard B. Dunbar would like to make note of area that has been opened on either side of Route 28. Has created sediment in our lake. Don't know what can be done, but our lake is filling up with a lot of sediment. C. Balcius stated that that would make them not in compliance and it just needs to be reported to Wetlands committee. B. Dunbar stated that she is referring to the state's work. This is the equivalent of 100s and 100s of home sites exposed. K. Menici suggested talking to the town administrator.

Adjournment

Motion made by T. Varney, seconded by B. Dunbar, to adjourn at 9:50 pm motion carried with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jennifer McCullough
Secretary