

**TOWN OF ALTON
ALTON PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting**

**December 15, 2009
APPROVED 12-29-09**

Members Present: William Curtin, Chair
Timothy Roy, Vice Chair
Scott Williams, Clerk
Thomas Hoopes
David Hussey (joined the Board at 6:30 p.m.)
David Collier, Alternate

Others Present: Sharon Penney, Town Planner
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

W. Curtin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p. m.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

W. Curtin appointed David Collier as a member for this meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Case P09-23 was withdrawn from the agenda.

S. Williams made a motion to accept the agenda as amended. T. Roy seconded the motion, which passed with five votes in favor, no opposed.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

W. Curtin opened the floor for case non-specific public input. Hearing none, he closed public input.

V. CONCEPTUAL

Case P09-25 Alton Bay Campmeeting Association	Map 34, Lot 33	Conceptual Mount Major Highway
--------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------------

Jeff Greene from J. L. Greene Enterprises, Joe Spain from J. H. Spain, and Richard Smith serving as the Interim Director of the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center and also serving on the Board of Directors, came to the table. Mr. Smith explained that they are going through some management changes at the Conference Center, and the Board asked if he would act as director. Of course, he didn't know they would be dealing with the

matter of losing forty-two cottages in a fire, but so be it. The good Lord has His intents and His ways. They are in for a conceptual re-do; he would like to bring the Board up to date on a few things and perhaps address a few concerns.

They lost forty-two cottages, and it has been asked, as far as the number rebuilding, so they did some surveys and asked some questions. There are seventeen people who want to rebuild right away and there are seventeen who said maybe but they want to wait and see what they come up with and what they were going to build and exactly what was going to happen. Four cottages were for sale at the time of the fire; those people got their insurance and moved on. There are two people who were uninsured, and they're not sure they can come up with the funds to build. There are three people who called and asked to be added to the list to be considered, and there are two present cottage owners who have indicated they would like to sell the cottage they presently have and move into a new one.

He knows the question has come up about density. They are not asking to grow any of the density. They are only asking to maintain what they had, and that probably is not enough for the people who would like to be there, but they do understand density, and they just want to maintain. They also had some questions concerning year-round. No one has expressed an interest in year-round at this point. Some folks have offered to allow them to use their cottages during the winter for retreats while they go to their winter homes in warmer climates. Others would like to close them up and drain them, and turn off the heat for the winter. Right now there are four cottages that are occupied year-round that have residents in them. There are another nineteen that could be made year-round, and in fact some of them can handle year-round, but nobody is rushing to do that. He is not sure the year-round or the permanent residency is or should be a concern.

There has also been some concern about the parking in the area. The Campground allows one vehicle per cottage. If there is more than one vehicle, they need to park it in a common area. He can count on both hands the number of people who would be there with two vehicles. Most people come with one vehicle. Somebody drives up from Florida, they don't drive two vehicles; they drive one. He is not sure that parking is of a major concern. They do not allow parking on the roadway. These are enforced. They have rules and regulations; the Board might call them covenants, they call them rules and procedures. For instance, they don't allow boats or trailers to be parked on the Campground. They have to find someplace else for them, or they have to rent a place to keep their trailer if they have a boat at one of their boat docks. They have the power to enforce because they have the right of tenancy that all cottage owners have to submit to. They have to go through a five panel assessment to be allowed to have a cottage on the Campground. That is because the Campground has been serving the Christian community since 1863. That is what they do and what they want to continue to do. They are not there to be a vacation or a resort area. They are there to serve the needs of their Christian followers.

Safety and fire concerns are their big concerns as well. He has met many of the Board members at different times and he has expressed that they want to do this right. They want to do this safely. They operate on limited funds as they rebuild. They have made it

a requirement on the Campground that they use fire retardant siding. They have also said that they may need fire suppression equipment in the buildings. They do want people to be safe. He doesn't want to ever face the problem where someone is injured or killed on the Campground. He doesn't think anybody would want to face that.

There were concerns on the roadways; they want to have the proper roadways. One of the radii on the original plan caused concern. That has been or can be fixed. They also had a concern about the grade coming up onto Circle Drive; he doesn't see a problem with that being fixed. They have made that a one-way so it doesn't come out onto Rand Hill Road at that point; even though it is back 100 or more feet from the corner, they just didn't think it would be good coming out at that point, and they moved a main entrance down further. They also talked about the triangle at the top of Winni Ave.; it's a landscaped triangle that was put in some years ago. That can easily be removed; he thinks the pavement is still underneath. They really don't have nay problem with that.

The thing that he really wants to stress is that when he took over at the Conference Center, it is his intent that they do things correctly. They do things right, they do things that are reasonable, and that they work together. The only concern he has is that they have an open dialogue, and that they work with the Board and the Board works with them so that they can come up with the best solution for the Campground, and the best situation for the Town of Alton and Alton Bay. When they work together, he thinks they all win. He would just ask that they do that as they move along.

They gave the builder several challenges; Joe Spain is sitting to his left. Naturally, they had to be built within code. They had to be safe and meet the fire requirements. They didn't want it oversized because they are not looking for families, they are looking for cottages. They asked that he keep the character of the Campground and keep the cottages in the vintage of the Campground. They asked that they keep the price down and carry most of the upfront expense.

They have a couple of new plans they would like to present as a conceptual. He turned it over to Jeff Greene and offered to answer any questions as they go along.

Jeff Greene gave S. Penney paperwork, stating that he had meant to get it in sooner but had been working on it right up to 3:00 that afternoon. Everybody keeps coming up with ideas. Copies of the conceptual drawings were passed to the Board; these were marked Concept I and Concept J. He is going to speak about Concept I first.

They have tried to take into consideration some of the stuff that was asked of them by the Board. They have also gone before the Zoning Board, and because of the results of the Zoning Board, they have had to step back and start over again. What they are trying to accomplish is to get as many single units back on the Campground as they can. Beyond that, they will put duplexes on. In this concept he has fifteen single units and the rest will be all duplexes; this will give him forty one units. It is still using the circle in the middle with a gazebo. He went out and did some preliminary grading on Circle Drive, and found that the road is higher than the cabins that are still there so he is looking at probably

taking three or four feet off the top of that and then regarded. The problem they have is that they have cabins on one side that are low and one on the other side that is high; they will work that out. With any units or any parking they do in there they will step that up if they need to. Circle Road will not be an issue to bring that grade down to what the fire department was looking for.

Over in the area where #30 and #44 are, there was concern of widening the road there, but he only has twenty feet between the two cabins. They are turning it into one-way traffic where it was two-way. When they say two-way back then, your car would come in, drop off your stuff, and leave. There was never really a flow of traffic there and hopefully it won't be much more than that now. They can widen that out and get a sidewalk on one side and end up with something wide enough for one-way traffic, which is better than what it is now, which is not quite 8 feet. They will be a little closer to the decks and porches that are there, but he thinks there is room to work.

There was also concern over where the triangle is and the sign; there is also a big spruce tree there. Now he has found out that the asphalt is still under there, so it's not as big a problem as it could have been. That is another area that was discussed and can be eliminated to allow the traffic to flow through a lot better. When he first looked at it he thought it was a good way to keep from having a pass through to Route 11 or Rand Hill, but if the fire trucks can't get around there it is really not as good to prevent the pass through; they can put a speed bump there.

There were concerns about the drainage; that will all be picked up when they start to do the actual engineered drawings. They are going to have to look at the entrance and at any of the drainage that is coming there and at Circle Road. Being conceptual, they haven't looked at any of that yet, but it certainly will be looked at through the engineering process.

Parking has come up a couple of different times; he knows it requires two parking spaces per unit but like Richard had said earlier, they are allowing one vehicle per unit. They are trying to keep this a community-type environment and not make a big parking lot in front of every unit. If there are two in front of every single and four in front of every duplex, it starts blocking off what was aesthetically pleasing. He would like to stay with the one parking space for each unit. The units that are in gray up by Circle Road, the parking there is where cabin 12 is going now and all they would like to do is move the parking over a little bit and still maintain the spots for the seven cabins. They still have more than enough spaces to give each unit two spaces but they would like to use that and the overflow parking here (indicated area on the plan). A lot of the parking was here to begin with, but it has never been painted, striped or paved. It has not been utilized in a manner where you can maximize the use, so they are looking at straightening out all the parking and adding in. Over here (again indicating the plan) would be the areas where they will pick up for the other duplexes and any overflow. At this point he has ended up with six extra spaces over what is needed for new parking without taking away from what was already there for parking. Existing parking was not counted, so they do have enough

area to do what they are trying to do and maintain what they had and add this parking and make things a little bit more usable.

He asked for questions or thoughts from the Board. S. Williams asked him to touch on what they are planning behind the Clam Shell; are those units down over the hill or are they at the upper level. Mr. Greene answered that on Concept I they are on top of the bank just before it drops down; they have talked about moving them closer to Route 11 and setting them down into the bank so you don't see as much of them from up here. They were just kind of placing them; it's conceptual so they were just kind of placing them in the general area but they have in the last few days been talking about how they are going to place those. They are getting a little more serious now, and they would like to set those down into the bank so that you are walking out and it is nothing more than a one story with a walk out along this ridge.

W. Curtin asked about the parking for that; would it be off of Route 11. Mr. Greene answered no; all the parking is up here (indicated on the plan). There are two spaces per unit there, plus the overflow.

T. Hoopes asked how many pines they would be losing in the section behind Pop's. Mr. Greene answered that he does not know; his job next week is to locate all of those and try to place those in there. It depends on which concept they go with; there is still some area, and it depends on how far down the bank they put it. Mr. Spain added that there is an intention to landscape at the end and to make it aesthetically... T. Hoopes stated that he realized that, but there is a long history in the town with the Campground. He is only one resident, but there are a lot of other residents over on the east side and other parts of the bay, and they also have to consider them. The appearance is important. Mr. Spain indicated that it is important to them also. The main emphasis is the aesthetic value and landscape and terracing it down properly so it has a good view from the Bay and from Route 11. T. Hoopes indicated that would have been a big problem with the nine unit buildings; they would have been monstrosities. Mr. Greene voiced agreement with that but went on to say that they were looking at different options and so many different people and boards were giving input. They are going to start working on it and it will show up what trees are there and what ones they think they will have to remove. These are big tall pines and if they are going to put buildings in near them, they are going to have to do something different. It may be that they replant with different types of landscaping to make it pleasing to the eye, maybe even more so than it is now.

S. Williams asked what type of swing they have in the circle area for fire apparatus to be able to get around there. Mr. Greene answered that when it gets to the engineering it will be different than what he has on the plan, to a point. He has 25 foot radii on there now. S. Williams stated that he likes Concept I better than Concept J, mainly for fire protection purposes because the ones on the lake side, on the second tier would be very difficult to access if another fire occurred.

Mr. Greene moved forward to discussion of Concept J. What was there originally was a walk-in community; that is what a lot of people still want to see. The second option is to

get rid of the circle in the middle and add a few more single units versus duplexes, and putting them in a double tier, staggered so that each one would have a view between the others. There would be little walkways around them. He realizes that S. Williams mentioned the fire department; they are still looking at a one-way road through and two-way traffic in and out. It eliminates the circle and gives them a little more of a walk-in community and they can put little walkways in between them. The only thing he doesn't like about it is putting parking places across here (indicated on the plan); he would like to landscape there and put the parking over here someplace. He did that because he is trying to satisfy what the Board is looking for, which is one space near a unit at a minimum. All the same areas of concern like Circle Road are still being handled; the difference is that there isn't a big circle in the middle. The radius is tight so this could eliminate that. It also took away, over where the restaurant is; there would be fewer units up there. As for the concern with the pines, a lot of them were in the area where the last few units would be. They be getting into those much, but they would be more in where the open area is at this point. They were trying to see if there was a second option they could work with, so now S. Williams was talking about how he liked one better than the other. S. Williams said that the accessibility of Plan J is better.

J. Greene asked if, other than that, there are any other questions or concerns. T. Hoopes said that he would like to go back to the concept of density. He doesn't think it is realistic to get back what was lost. They have precedents that they set constantly in town. The development at the Campground was so much denser than anything else conceivable in town. He is not picking any kind of a number, but he thinks realistically they need to look at something that is less than what was there. They have to make some room to get around something, then they have to drop something.

David Hussey joined the meeting.

J. Greene stated that they all understand that, but from his perspective and from where he is, he has to give them everything he's got. Then, when they tell him there's a problem, then they will drop a unit here and make this correction, and do that type of thing. He agrees 100% with that concept. When he looks at density, and it depends on how you look at density, when you look at how it was before, it was also compacted. Now they are spreading them; they are making them meet the twenty foot standard, and they are making the fire hazard less than it was before and trying to meet all the little standards. By doing that and showing that the number of units can still be there hopefully, the overall concept is going to be safe. He's hoping they can conclude that what they do is safe; not safer, but safe. He agrees they may lose a few units in the long run; part of that may be that when he engineers this section of the road (indicated on the plan) he may lose some. He needs to try to do as much as he can do and as they go through the process they will be looking at considering that.

T. Hoopes said that he realizes there is a financial phase on their side, but the Board also has a precedent phase that they have to consider as well.

Mr. Greene made the point that when you are setting a precedent, it has to be set on something that can be duplicated. He does not believe this can be duplicated in the town of Alton. Being new, they wouldn't allow it anyway, and he doesn't believe there is anything else that looks like it. T. Hoopes said there are a few camps. J. Greene agreed that there are a few on individual lots, and that they do have to work on that.

S. Williams stated that with this density, he knows that when those pits were put in, he thought part of it was on a seasonal usage. He knows they are building these so they could be year-round, so they are going to have to consider them all year-round, whether they use them that way or not. They will have to see if the loading is still correct. Mr. Greene answered that he has worked with a septic designer who has looked at it preliminarily and done checks and different things to see if they are even close to being able to handle this, and he is saying that they can.

Mr. Greene explained that the other day he took a tour to see what is on the site; he does know presently what is out there. There are some concerns. The problem is if they go to the state now, they are going to tell them that they have to do it for year-round anyway; they don't have a seasonal. Because of what is going on there, they do have to look at the whole site, so there will definitely be some things taken care of there.

S. Williams said that there was seasonal usage that they dealt with back when that was done. J. Greene said they don't do them anymore; S. Williams agreed. J. Spain added that the question is how many of these cottages will be brought up with the new construction. T. Hoopes referred to their opening comments; only four are currently used as year-round, but nineteen could be. Mr. Spain said that they are looking at underground utilities, upgraded sewage systems, tank farms that will be buried; there are a lot of improvements that will be brought in. They have to make a determination as to how many are going to be affected.

J. Greene stated that they are hoping to get a consensus from the Board that they are heading in the right direction, and that they will be able to work with the Board on what they have presented here. S. Williams feels that both concepts presented have some pluses. The biggest minus in his eyes is the tiered system off the roadway. He is also concerned about getting radii in there so they can maneuver around with their equipment. Luckily they are all pretty short wheel based, so they can get around. As for losing the trees over there on the other side, that's too bad, but it is what it is.

Mr. Smith addressed the intent for the trees. He doesn't like to take down trees at all. Sometimes it's necessary; you don't have a choice. In walking this the other day, it does not eliminate the trees that are in front on Route 11. There are two up on the bank itself that might possibly be eliminated. Over in the section back toward the other existing cottages and beyond the Clam Shell, that's pretty much open and those would not encroach on the septic field or the leech field that is down near Route 11. They would be at a one elevation level on the campground, so they wouldn't create a height looking from the other side. There would be two levels; part of that level would be below the upper grade of the Conference Center.

They don't want to take out trees. They don't want to change the view or the look. They have a unique campground there; he has been coming for about thirty-five years and he did buy a cottage there. One of his dreams was to retire in Alton because he likes the town. He was fortunate enough to buy a house up on the other side of Avery Hill. He likes the look of the campground, he likes the setting, and he likes the view from the other side of the lake or even when you're driving down Route 11. He really doesn't want to see that change a lot. That drives him when he says they want to do things right, not only from what they need but also from the aesthetics and the reasonable standpoint. S. Williams stated that in time those large pines would become a safety hazard. T. Hoopes said that if they are nestled down in, they are even more fitting into the terrain.

Mr. Smith continued, saying that the basic intent is to keep the image of the Campground. One of the concerns has been changing the image or becoming too modern. It's a pretty campground; they use it for retreats; they probably have about 40,000 people a year who come to retreats on the Campground, and they don't want to destroy that image. That's what they're about. They want to keep it in that type of image, but they also want to work with the restraints the Board has; they understand those and he is sure they understand his. It's just a matter of where they can meet on good ground, and how they can accomplish it.

S. Williams and W. Curtin both stated that they like Plan I better. S. Penney asked if they wanted to recommend a design review. S. Williams said there is still a lot of work to do. At this point it is just pencil and paper drawings; they have to engineer this whole thing.

Mr. Smith said that they have to go through the engineering, the septic, the State and all of those things. Conceptual on paper is one thing, but space, room, size, all of that has to fit in properly. They understand that and they know that somewhere within that they may not be able to have the same number they are looking at. It may work out on paper but not work out in reality.

Mr. Spain asked if the Board has an issue with the density of what he will call Phase I; with this one area. D. Collier asked what the phases are. Mr. Spain answered that in concept I it is on the right as you are facing the gazebo. Does the Board feel that it flows from traffic and setbacks? S. Williams said that he personally likes the idea of traffic going out on Rand Hill Road across from Sample's house much better than putting more traffic into the Winni Ave. area which is where the pedestrian traffic would be. He knows they are going to come in that way, but it would be better to have them going out on Rand Hill Road. The correction of the Circle Road incline is certainly something that will have to be done ahead of time, but it is what it is.

W. Curtin stated that on the last plan they had, there was a gymnasium. He asked if that was going to come into play later on. Mr. Smith answered that would be later on; they still desire to do something. Spacewise, one of the concerns expressed was that the size of it out on the front might not be conducive. They kind of backed off on that at the moment. S. Penney added that they would need a special exception for that anyway.

T. Roy asked if they were looking at twenty five units in Phase I and asked how they were going to phase it. Mr. Smith answered that it is really going to be built as people commit to them; they are not going to build on spec that somebody might want them. It's going to be a commitment when they are built no matter when they do it, even in Phase I. Phase I may be the first nine and Phase II might be the next ten or whatever, but they are going to need the commitment of the person making the purchase before they actually build anything. T. Roy asked if they only have seventeen commitments now. Mr. Smith answered that they have not gone into commitments until they have some kind of a concept and they start engineering then they can say okay, give me your deposit, then they will know for sure. Nineteen have said maybe, but they want to wait and see.

Mr. Spain remarked that it is really difficult to get people to buy into this concept; look how much it has changed over the past forty-five days. You have to get the concept developed, build a few, and people will come. W. Curtin asked if there was a possibility that they could do all the lake side ones first. Mr. Spain answered that he would very much like to focus on that one area because it is close-quarters and you're going to have kids running around and residents walking so it would be wonderful to get that one phase done in its entirety; all the roadways, walkways, the gazebo established. Then they can go in and if they don't have all the twenty-four or twenty-five sold, they can leave them out and come back to them, but this would be done in it's entirety.

S. Williams asked if they plan on having sprinklers in all the buildings because of the 2012 ruling. J. Spain said that is the expectation. The discussion has been hardy pine siding, full sprinkler system within; that's what they are working on. S. Williams said that would help their density. T. Roy asked if they would have to go to the ZBA on the parking issue. Mr. Greene does not believe they are going to have to because they have all the parking they need on the property. S. Penney said it is the Board's call; because of the nature of the encampment whether those spaces they are supposed to have need to be directly adjacent or not. T. Hoopes said he personally doesn't have a problem with having a single car by the houses. S. Williams said that from the fire department point of view that is better also; there is less hindrance. Mr. Greene said they had looked at it from all those same points; he is the stubborn one who doesn't want to change it. He is looking at aesthetics and accessibility and that they don't want to have a big huge parking lot out in that area. He would like to stay with the one space per unit and using the overflow if needed. They have no problem with supplying the number of spaces that are required, but they would like a little input as to where they put them.

Mr. Smith stated that elsewhere on the Campground they have other areas like Mitchell Avenue that is very tight. They only allow one car up in there too, in various places for parking, but not along the road because they want to be able to get emergency vehicles up in there at any time. They do enforce that; they are pretty strict about their rules and regulations and how people conduct themselves on the Campground.

W. Curtin asked D. Hussey if he had any questions; D. Hussey asked if anything had been said about the septic. T. Hoopes told him they are being reviewed. S. Williams added that the State will make sure if they are seasonal rather than year-round.

D. Collier stated that on the other concept, the further they push those Phase II cottages down the hill they will run into a fire issue as well. J. Greene stated that with the I Concept they are trying to hold those back a little bit.

S. Williams asked which concept they liked best. They are divided. Mr. Spain likes the I Concept because it is aesthetically pleasing; you've got the gazebo and the green space.

J. Greene stated that almost everybody has seen that concept right from the beginning because it is very similar to what was there. He indicated the roads that had been there on the plan. Beacon Ave came up and did a loop and came back out. The loop thing was there to the circle and then it became a walking path. The idea is to have something like what was there, except that they can't put forty-three units back in there.

T. Hoopes asked S. Williams how he wanted to see the exit; S. Williams used the plan to indicate. There is better visibility and it is not dumping as much out onto Route 11. S. Williams stated that they are going to have to put some drainage in there (at the Rand Hill Road exit area) because it fills up as a pond. J. Greene said they know that; it would all be part of the engineering. Mr. Smith mentioned that when they talked with the engineers, and that is one of the things they were going to have to overcome; the water has to be able to go somewhere, be diverted, or whether they put in some kind of a tank or leeching system to take care of that low spot. It has been a problem for as many years as he can remember. S. Williams recalled that there is a drywell system in there now; there is a concrete culvert that is perforated and it is buried with stone. It doesn't go anywhere; the water goes into it and then it will perk out. Mr. Smith said that the other thing they had looked at was coming straight across the Campground to the Route 11 side. S. Williams said they would have to put a velocity reducer in, too.

W. Curtin asked if the roads were going to be paved. Mr. Greene answered that all of the roadways would be paved. W. Curtin said they would have more runoff with that, so it would tie in for drainage.

W. Curtin thanked the presenters for coming in.

VI. CONTINUED

Case P09-19 Paul Beckett	Map 12, Lot 17	Subdivision Route 28 North
-------------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Application submitted by Tom Varney of Varney Engineering LLC on behalf of applicant Paul Beckett for a proposed eight lot subdivision with frontage on Route 28 and a new road, "Hilltop Drive". This parcel is located in the Rural Residential zone.

Tom Varney is representing Paul Beckett, the owner, and Paul Zesgrow, the land surveyor. He has the letter from Farmhouse in which Peter Julia gives his blessing to this

project. There were a few minor corrections here and there, which Mr. Varney can easily make. Mr. Julia questioned the cost estimate for the road, which can be discussed. Mr. Varney got his numbers from NH-DOT website for construction costs. When he went through the cost for the construction items, he came up with a number that is double the bottom line on the spreadsheet. When he gave the figures to Mr. Beckett, he went out and got estimates from three local contractors. Mr. Varney reduced his estimate to get it down to what Mr. Beckett's figures from the three contractors. The number he has is based on the actual estimates from three different contractors in the area. Copies of the referenced spreadsheet were made for the Board members.

T. Varney told the Board that Mr. Beckett plans to build the road and have it completely done and inspected by the Road Agent, and then there won't be a bond anyway. Normally the cost is determined and taken to the Selectmen and then they come up with a bond amount everyone agrees with. Mr. Beckett indicated to Mr. Varney that he would build the road and be done with it, and then he would sell the first lot. Mr. Varney is not overly concerned with the numbers at this point.

T. Hoopes stated that he did not understand this; he is planning to build it, but he is saying he can build it for \$115 per foot. T. Varney said he doesn't think that matters; the road will be done and finished and inspected and completed. T. Hoopes said there would still have to be a bond on it. Mr. Varney replied that he does not think so. Somebody can build a subdivision and have it done, and they don't need a bond. T. Hoopes answered that they have never done it. Mr. Varney agreed that they probably haven't. T. Hoopes asked how it is dealt with if the development is stopped in the middle of it; the concept of having the bond or a letter of credit is to protect the town. T. Varney said it is for the homeowner; if somebody buys a lot there and then it never gets finished, that is their problem. There wouldn't be anything sold there; it would be an unfinished development.

T. Roy asked what if it gets half done, and silt fences wash away, then whose problem is it? T. Varney answered that it would be his (Mr. Beckett's) problem. T. Roy said he would feel better covering something. T. Varney said they could run it through the Selectmen or the town attorney; they can deal with that anyway. T. Hoopes pointed out that in this case it is not going through the Selectmen; it is going through the Planning Board.

S. Penney asked if the figures on the spreadsheet were an average of the cost given by the three estimates. T. Varney answered that this is his estimate that he went through item by item using the numbers that are the average prices in the state from the DOT specs. D. Hussey asked if his (Mr. Beckett's) numbers are lower than this; T. Varney said they are a lot lower. It's not in the same category, and you really have to make some major reductions to get it down to the local cost because it's not a state or federal road project. He has to go with the local estimates and work his way up. If the Board wants to increase the numbers, that's fine.

S. Williams asked if the numbers on the spreadsheet had come from the DOT website. T. Varney answered that they originally did, but then they got cut in half. There are some

things that aren't going to change; they know the price of a culvert per foot doesn't change. Gravel and excavation and fill; some of those things including swales and ditches are subject to numbers that are quite varied. Catch basins he can't change, guardrails, and pavement they know the cost. The numbers that a local contractor uses are not the same as what you are going to get on the DOT website.

T. Hoopes referenced a comment from Peter Julia's correspondence, stating that he feels the road would be substantially more, and that the Board should require three estimates. He went on to say that if it is going to be done as inexpensively as possible, that is all the more reason for requiring a bond. S. Williams added that Peter should review the estimates. T. Varney said that would not be a problem; he can get the three estimates. It comes down to so much a foot. He asked who had the authority, whether it is the Selectmen or the Planning Board. T. Hoopes answered that the Selectmen deal with approved roads, and the Planning Board deals with designed roads, and if they are going to lay out a road, that's a different case. W. Curtin stated that the Board of Selectmen, once the road is complete and it's 50% developed, will opt to take the road over. T. Hoopes added that it has to be built to the right standard; that is the key that has to be governed. He cited a case on Batchelder Road where purchasers thought it was going to be a town adoptable road, but it wasn't built to the town standards, so it was never adopted.

S. Williams pointed out that on Line 18 T. Varney shows an under drain flushing basin, but nowhere does he see the under drains listed on the spreadsheet. He also questioned ledge excavation; T. Varney shows \$8 per yard, but there is nothing provided for the drilling and blasting portion. T. Varney answered that under drains are item #16. Ledge excavation is a big deal, and it is item 4. S. Williams acknowledged that, but asked where the blasting part of it is. T. Varney answered that is what it is – it is ledge excavation. T. Hoopes asked if the excavation was going to be the source of the gravel and everything; T. Varney answered that the gravel would be brought on to the site, as there is no gravel onsite. The excavation involves blasting and hauling away; that's a per cubic yard price. The fill is placing and moving the fill to different sections of the road; that is done by the cubic yard. The excavation is also done by the cubic yard.

S. Williams remarked that there is \$3,000 for the excavation; that won't have an excavator on the site for even a week. He asked T. Varney if it would take more than a week to build the road; T. Varney answered that it would. S. Williams stated that he feels that the cost estimate is far from complete.

W. Curtin asked what the high and low were of the three estimates. T. Varney answered that the highest was \$125,000; he has the spreadsheet at \$144,000, then he added 10% so he is up to \$159,000. S. Penney asked what the length of the road is; T. Varney answered that it is 1,200 feet.

T. Varney offered that he could give them a lot higher estimate if they would like. He can go back to the DOT and go right off that. He'll say forget the local prices; he thinks that would be fine with Paul Beckett. T. Hoopes remarked that he is not a dirt man, but he respects Peter Julia.

D. Hussey asked how old the site was that T. Varney got the numbers from, because some of them are ridiculous. T. Varney answered that he had done a chopping job; he used to work on road construction for the state so he thought he had come up with some real nice numbers. He had to deal with what Mr. Beckett told him he got prices for. There is kind of a set average if you go around town; you can come up with a number per foot for a subdivision road, and that is in line with the spreadsheet. He tried to make his balance with what the reality would be as opposed to going with the state highway numbers. He can work this out with Mr. Beckett; they can both give input and more information, and he will come up with an acceptable number.

W. Curtin asked if all the other permits had been obtained. T. Varney answered that they have everything except the SWIP, which is erosion control, and the alteration of terrain. The soil work has been done, the soil scientist has done the work, but he does not have the report yet. He is ready to submit. Paul would like to start working on this next week if he can. W. Curtin asked S. Penney if she had any questions; she stated that she does not, but she thinks it is important to get on board with the numbers.

T. Hoopes stated that once the numbers are established they could have a preconstruction meeting. S. Penney agreed and said that then they can talk about bonds and other things. T. Varney asked how it is decided who is delegated to inspect the site. S. Penney answered that it is Peter Julia; he is the town's consulting engineer. He inspects it on behalf of the town. S. Williams added that Peter would come up with an estimate of what he feels it will take to inspect it; he will lay out a certain number of inspections. T. Hoopes added that they should let him know when certain things are ready. S. Williams went on to say that this would have to be escrowed for him.

W. Curtin recalled that when they walked this property there is a fair amount of gravel out there left by the state when they were doing Route 28. T. Varney answered that it is not really gravel, it is crushed ledge and that it is usable.

T. Hoopes asked what the status is; S. Penney stated that they are at the end of the continuances, but it would be at the Board's discretion to allow another continuance, as it can't go forward without one. T. Hoopes feels that there needs to be a conference between Mr. Varney and Mr. Julia. S. Penney agreed that Mr. Varney and Mr. Julia need to talk, and then come back and tell the Board what the scoop is, and then the preconstruction meeting. D. Hussey asked that he go over the cost estimate to see if they could come up with some common ground. He also asked Mr. Varney to check with S. Penney on the bonding. S. Penney said that they can't discuss the bonding until Peter signs off on the estimate.

D. Collier asked if the permits were also part of the Board's approval process. T. Hoopes answered that it would be a conditional affect, and it wouldn't be valid until those were in place. D. Collier also asked that the minor revisions Peter asked for should be taken care of as well. There is one dealing with the geometry; on the second page there is mention of not meeting the lot ratio. D. Collier asked if Lot 6 is the one with the vernal pool. A

copy of the plans was referred to. D. Hussey asked how they were doing with getting everything on one sheet; T. Varney answered that it is all on Sheet 14. D. Collier noted that Lot 6 is shaped as it is because they are trying to avoid the vernal pool; there is nothing that can be done about it. The remainder parcel, Lot 00, can't have anything done with it. T. Hoopes asked if this is designed so that the road can be transferred to the town; Mr. Varney answered that it is. He also explained that Lot 00 includes the drainage area; if he chops that off it would be a separate lot that would be sold or transferred to somebody, then you would lose control over the drainage easement. S. Williams verified that the existing building would not be used as a multi-family building; T. Varney pointed out the note that says it would be single family.

T. Hoopes asked if it is necessary to request a waiver if there is a variance from the lot size; he would not have a problem with granting that, mainly because he would rather see the vernal pool protected. T. Varney said that he had not requested a variance because he thought it met the requirement at the beginning, and he thinks it still does. He did push the road out to avoid the vernal pool. T. Hoopes remarked that all he was saying was that if a variance was needed, he is willing to say yes. The mathematics would have to be discussed with Peter because that is not his forte.

There was discussion concerning when Mr. Varney could come back in for another session; there is a workshop on Thursday, December 17. The next meeting after that is December 28, which is set aside for going over the zoning.

T. Hoopes made a motion to continue Case P09-19 until December 17, 2009 or if they can't get it done by then, the following month which would be the meeting on January 19, 2010. T. Roy seconded the motion.

Mr. Varney said that he wanted to discuss this. He can give a waiver right now for the lot size ratio; the rest of it is the engineering estimate which he can take care of with Mr. Julia. He is not going to change any plans; he is just going to change numbers on a spreadsheet. He has a big meeting on Thursday night. They can approve this with the conditions that he works this out with Peter Julia. W. Curtin said if that was the case, they could have approved it last month with the same conditions and gotten it off the table. This was continued last month at the request of Mr. Varney. T. Hoopes added that the reason they had continued it was because they had not received the comments from Peter Julia. T. Varney answered that he was still submitting work to him to get his comments, and he still had work to do at that point, so he needed the time to answer all his questions. He has done a lot of work; there have been a lot of changes to the plan. Mr. Beckett wants to get this done; Mr. Varney is conveying his thoughts. W. Curtin answered that he appreciates that, but there have been other people before the Board who were in a rush and needed to get stuff done, and the Board jumped the gun on some of it, and they don't want to do that again. T. Hoopes stated that at this point he would have trouble trying to figure out how to write the conditions.

Mr. Varney asked if the Board would act on the waivers. W. Curtin answered that they still have to wait for Peter on the other things; if he gets them straightened out with Peter, it can all be taken care of on Thursday. Mr. Varney said he would try to do that.

The above motion made by T. Hoopes and seconded by T. Roy carried by unanimous vote.

The Board took a short break at 7:20 p.m.; D. Collier was recused from the next case.

The Board reconvened at 7:25 p.m.

VII. NEW APPLICATIONS

Case P09-24 Bahre Alton Properties LLC	Map 26, Lot 10-1	Design Review Route 28/Homestead Place
-------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

Application submitted by Richard Bartlett Associates LLC on behalf of applicant Bahre Alton Properties LLC to present a Site Plan Design Review to propose two buildings by the Route 28 access drive. This parcel is located in the Residential Commercial zone.

Mark Sargent, representing Bahre Alton Properties, came to the table and introduced Bob and Sandy Bahre, and Cindy Balcius. He thinks everyone is familiar with the site; it is identified as Map 26, Lot 10-1 and has a total area of 12.75 acres. The property does have frontage on Route 28, Homestead Place, and Range Road, and there is access from Route 28 and Homestead Place and emergency access from Range Road. The site is currently occupied by Hannaford and Meredith Village Savings Bank.

When they were before the Board back in 2004, they had received approval for a pad site located closer toward Homestead Place. That pad site was designated as a restaurant and at the time they did not have a tenant, but left it with the proviso that when they had a tenant they would come in for architectural design review for that portion of the project. Earlier this year they came back before the Board and at that time they were proposing a 10,000 square foot building for that same site. They have since retreated from that design and are taking a different approach.

What they are proposing now is to utilize that existing pad for overflow parking for the Hannaford building, and construct two retail buildings on either side of the access road coming from Route 28. On the north side the retail building would be 2,460 square feet and have the requisite parking. On the south side of the access road they are looking at a 6,000 square foot retail building and associated parking.

As they had proposed when they were here earlier in the year, they will be using the same drainage technology, that being pervious pavement, rain guards, and infiltration basins as they were proposing on the 10,000 square foot building. There are some wetlands impacts involved with the property and Cindy is here to speak more on that.

C. Balcius, wetland scientist from Stony Ridge Environmental, stated that the new design concept they are looking at would propose approximately 33,360 square feet of additional wetland impact. That additional wetland impact would be located to the front portion in front of the existing Hannaford building. Approximately 14,000 square feet would be for the approximately 2,500 square foot retail pad, and another 18,000 square feet would be for the 6,000 square foot building with associated parking. (C. Balcius used a site plan to indicate the locations she is referring to.)

They have had preliminary meetings with both the Federal regulators and the State regulators. Obviously, this was a permanent site before and before they even started this process they went to the Feds and the State to see if this was even a possibility. They had a site walk with the EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and NH Fish and Game back in November. The State couldn't make that site walk; he came a week later. They had very favorable results from the Federal people, and they are still in the process with the State people on looking and seeing if they can minimize and avoid any more, and they have a meeting set up with them. The possibility of additional impact is definitely looked upon favorably right now. The key is to avoid and minimize where possible and mitigation.

Mr. Sargent stated that they are early in the process now, but they wanted to come before the Board to present this plan and get some input as to the direction they should be heading in, or if they are heading in the right direction. He invited Mr. Bahre to add his comments.

Mr. Bahre stated that basically what they want to do, and this is not official yet as they are just talking, is that Hannaford would like to make a deal with Meredith Savings Bank to have them come out on one of the pieces out front, then come back to the Board and make the store bigger than what they have there. They haven't talked yet with Meredith Savings Bank; they want to see what will work. He thinks Meredith would be better off going out front anyway. The other pad (the one they were going to use before) would be parking for the help in the summer, and in the winter they can put their snow there. They are gaining one more spot, really. They're not trying to cram a lot of stuff in.

W. Curtin asked about the septic system that is in the ground; everything was going to be piped up from the pad down by Homestead to just the other side of Meredith Savings Bank. He asked if that would be the same for these two sites; Mr. Sargent said it would be the same.

Mr. Bahre continued, saying that where it goes over to the state property, they will get the septic in there and, with Board approval, get some more parking in there because it is really tight in the summer time. They are in trouble with that. S. Williams remarked that Hannaford outgrew that store the first day they opened.

T. Roy asked if, on the original approval, anything was said about screening; obviously a lot of trees are going to have to go. If it was on the original approval, the Board would have to deal with that some how. Mr. Bahre answered that there would be some trees that would have to go, but not a lot. Mr. Sargent mentioned that there had been

discussion about that screen being there; obviously when they construct this thing they will take landscaping into consideration. W. Curtin said that originally when the Hannaford building was going in they (the Board) didn't want it to be visible from the Traffic Circle or Route 28. Mr. Sargent stated that Hannaford wanted to clear the entire site out; they wanted to be seen.

T. Hoopes stated that he worked with the designer from Hannaford, and he has since continued to do the selective cutting at new sites. They went up to the church site and looked at a bunch of different things. He remembers specifically that what they were trying to do was not limit his total visibility, but just to have some screening. You didn't need to be able to see Hannaford at all; you would have found it. That's not the problem. People would find it if they needed to find it. As far as he is concerned with the system here, they are basically going to clear cut the lots. M. Sargent said they were not going to clear cut it. T. Hoopes interrupted to say that he was embarrassed when he looked at this application; he was shocked at the percent development that is going to be used on the whole thing. It's a twelve or thirteen acre lot; how much of it is wetland? He can't believe this. Mr. Sargent said that about four acres of it is wetland. T. Hoopes said they are talking about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre impact of wetlands. He has slogged this area as well; this doesn't make sense to him. He doesn't care if the Feds say this is okay; the water that comes through here in the ground...

C. Balcius answered that this was actually part of the planning process when they met with the Feds. Back when they first did the original Hannaford design, low impact development designs, in other words, greener technologies, were not well used. Since then, they've come a long way. By using such things as permeable pavers and permeable concrete and things of that nature as well as a lot of the infiltration techniques, his concerns can be almost nullified, as opposed to traditional development that has been taking place around.

T. Hoopes guessed that when they came in with the original site plan, he thought that was the maximum development on this site, and he felt comfortable with that. This, he thinks, is going too far.

Mr. Bahre addressed T. Hoopes saying that he may think it's going too far, but they are doing very, very well. T. Hoopes said he had done his own coloring; they are dealing with wetlands that are substantial. He indicated the site plan and said that there is no indication of wetlands in the legend and yet there is reference to it. He can read a map fairly well, but it took him a while to figure out how to map the wetlands. He hopes it wasn't intentional, but it was very difficult to determine what was wet and what wasn't; where the culverts were...

C. Balcius thought that mostly they were trying to come in for conceptual review, but the requirements for conceptual review are basically a sketch on a napkin, so they came under the design review. What they are seeing is not the final plan but more in line of what she would call a conceptual.

Mr. Bahre asked T. Hoopes if he was saying that he didn't want to see any of the trees cut. T. Hoopes answered that what it would mean is that there would be a clear view of the parking area from Route 28 with Dunkin Donuts behind you, so you'll see it completely from the Circle all the way around. There won't be any trees screening any of the area. Mr. Sargent commented that the commercial zone in Alton is very limited, especially in that area. Essentially, that is all they have. They might recall that early on they had looked at a few other sites at the Circle and knocked those out just because of wetland issues. T. Hoopes commented that 15.8% of Alton is wetland.

Mr. Bahre spoke about Hannaford; they hire a lot of people. If this goes through, there are going to be more people who have jobs. If he (T. Hoopes) doesn't think they should have them, Mr. Bahre is not going to fight with him. T. Hoopes said he was not looking at jobs; he is simply looking at it from the point of view of the Planning Board. Mr. Bahre said he knows that, but if he doesn't want it, he can just vote against it. T. Hoopes pointed out that he is one member of a board. Mr. Bahre asked if he didn't think it would be nice if they hire more people at those other two places; that there are people getting jobs. T. Hoopes recalled that two lots away, there was a proposal to have a new medical section. When he said that the state would never issue a permit on that wet area, he was looked at as a pariah because he said you can't have that. Yes, it would be nice to have a medical center in town, but not where that site is. It all depends on what the sites are. Not all land is equal.

C. Balcius said that is why they went for a site walk with both the Federal agencies and the State agencies. D. Hussey asked if all the trees would in fact be taken down between the road and the building itself. Mr. Bahre said they would not all be taken down. D. Hussey asked if they would have a buffer between the highway and the front of the building. Mr. Sargent answered that if he looked at the plan, he could see that there is a substantial width of ROW in there; their property doesn't start until quite a ways in. That area they can't touch at all.

Mr. Bahre thinks it is going to look nice to have the two outparcels; just say there is a bank on one side and something on the other. It's all business zoned anyway, so he is not going to argue with the Board. If they want to turn it down...

S. Williams told Mr. Bahre that he should not be looking at it that way at all. He thinks that in this day and time, they can plant very nicely and very attractively. Mr. Bahre said he was not faulting anybody, but Tom doesn't seem like he wants to have it. S. Williams stated that he personally would like to thank Mr. Bahre for his willingness to invest in our community and provide jobs for the people who live here. He thinks this can be done, and done very nicely. They will mitigate the wetlands as is part of the law. He thinks it is a commercial area; he wouldn't want to live in the Circle and he doesn't think anybody else would. He thinks they should use it to their greatest advantage and commercial activity is the best. He looks forward to presentation of a formal plan. D. Hussey agreed with S. Williams. T. Roy also agreed, but added that he would like to review what was originally mentioned about screening. If that has to be mitigated in some way to stay in line with what was originally done; that has to be reviewed.

D. Hussey asked if there was a possibility of moving the parking to the other side of the building. Mr. Sargent said he thought that was possible; they had just quickly thrown something together for this evening. S. Penney said that if you put it behind, then you are not losing your trees at the front. Mr. Sargent answered that unfortunately, the upland is closer toward the road. C. Balcius said they were dealing with minimization and avoidance at the same time, but working with the screening is definitely a possibility.

S. Penney said that careful cutting is troublesome, but this is a situation where they could perhaps be careful with the cutting. M. Sargent said they would take that into consideration. T. Hoopes said they were going to have to change grades, and all sorts of things, so what would happen is that all the trees would come out for convenience. S. Williams said they could replant. D. Hussey said that knowing what is going to be done; he knows it is going to be done properly.

W. Curtin asked about the architecture of the building; would it conform. M. Sargent said it would conform to what is already out there. There is some uniformity to what they have already constructed at the site. W. Curtin said he does go along with what Tim was saying; depending on what the conditions were the last time, they are going to have to take a look at those. D. Hussey stated that he thinks once they work through the issues, they can come up with something they can all live with.

W. Curtin asked if they were going to have to find another property to mitigate with the wetlands there. C. Balcius answered that that conversation had come up. They still have to step through the process of creation and preservation first, but because it is roughly 30,000 square feet of impact, the chances of preserving a piece of property with proper buffer widths and everything is pretty nil, so they are probably going to lean toward in lieu fees in this case. Before, where there was a lot more impact, it made sense to do preservation. S. Penney asked if everyone know what Cindy was talking about. T. Hoopes said that the laws have been changed so that you simply pay for your damage to wetlands. C. Balcius said you still have to go through the process of looking at everything else. T. Hoopes said it is basically buying off wetlands, as far as he is concerned. D. Hussey asked if the cash actually goes to conservation. C. Balcius answered that there is an in lieu committee for the state. They pool the money and look at the different watersheds, then go out and buy larger tracts of land. It especially works out great for the smaller projects under an acre of impact because you really just can't purchase land. D. Hussey said that it is not just throwing it away; it is going to go to something. T. Hoopes said it would be used in the same watershed; they define in by watershed. C. Balcius said that is the focus. Board members agreed that this is a great concept.

S. Penney asked about traffic. The access to these two buildings will be off the access road to the left and right. Mr. Sargent agreed. She asked if they anticipated a substantial increase in traffic. M. Sargent stated that they did an initial traffic study; they would probably have their traffic engineer update the study. W. Curtin asked where they would have the traffic study; would it be on Route 28, or would it be on Route 28 and going into

Hannaford. M. Sargent recalled that when they did the original traffic study, it involved the three roads; Route 28 and the Circle, Homestead Place, and Range Road. Under this concept, they would not anticipate much of the traffic coming from Homestead Place. Typically people are probably going to be going up Route 28 to the lights and turning in if they are going to be accessing one of these points. Traffic that is already generated at Hannaford would be coming down to these stores. He is not a traffic engineer, so he doesn't know. W. Curtin asked what the head count is at Hannaford per day; neither Mr. Sargent nor Mr. Bahre knew. S. Penney thought the DOT would probably have some of those numbers. She also wanted to mention that with the anticipated upgrade to the traffic circle this is a really important time to be coordinating with the town and with DOT. They've got some potential transportation enhancement projects with sidewalk continuity; there are all kinds of pieces to it. The circle upgrade itself will include the addition of sidewalks, that whole area is undergoing some positive change; this is another facet of it. In those terms, she hopes that this could be considered within the whole picture there because it is going to impact; hopefully it will be a positive impact, but traffic needs to be coordinated at the beginning rather than after the fact.

Mr. Sargent said they have worked closely with the state from day one on this project in terms of traffic. One of the issues they knew was that at some point pedestrian access might come to the area, which is why they have sidewalks that really go nowhere. S. Williams suggested that it would be great if they could talk to the Downtown Revitalization Committee; they're working on a pathway that will come out roughly around the Hannaford entrance; if something can be worked out to tie this whole thing together, that would be great. S. Penney said they have put in an application to DOT for transportation enhancement. The town owns a portion of the old B & M corridor; that's definitely what they were thinking about, with some connectivity down to the circle area. D. Hussey added that they have been walking that, and it is a plan in motion right now.

Mr. Bahre said they want to do whatever the people really want; they want to please everyone and look decent and everything. They're doing well, it is jobs. W. Curtin asked if they had any idea what would be going into the 6,000 square foot site. Mr. Bahre said they were not sure right now.

W. Curtin asked if they had any questions for the Board. Mr. Bahre said they just wanted to get a feel for what the Board wanted and to work together going forward.

S. Penney will get the notice of decision for the original site; there will be review of the minutes and the notice of decision regarding the screening.

D. Collier rejoined the Board at this time.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Kenny, the highway agent, called Sharon a few days ago; for the past sixteen or eighteen years, he and his department have been issuing driveway permits. The RSA provides for the highway department, the selectmen, or whoever is designated to do it. The rule of

thumb in Alton has been the highway agent, but he does not remember, in his tenure, that the highway department has ever been authorized to do it. He is requesting that the Board look at the RSA at V, which says ...the commissioner of transportation and shall be conferred upon the Planning Board which in those places where the Planning Board has been granted the power to regulate subdivision, and they shall adopt such regulations as necessary and such regulations may delegate administrative duties, including actual issuing of permits to a highway agent, Board of Selectmen, or other qualified official or body. This is a pro forma thing to get some paperwork on the record, if the Board agrees.

T. Roy made a motion to have the Highway Agent be responsible for issuing driveway permits to adhere to current State RSA 236:13 V, and design guidelines for driveways. S. Williams seconded the motion.

T. Hoopes asked if they wanted to add any caveats, the idea being to limit the number of cuts. He usually will not give somebody a "U" shaped driveway, which has two accesses on it. S. Penney said they would reference existing highway regulations and driveway regulations. T. Hoopes said he was curious as to whether this opened anything up or not. At one point DOT division 3 came down and they were talked to as to limit the number of cuts on the highways, then they go and issue three cuts on a place that should only have one. There should be some prerogative whether an applicant goes to the Planning Board or to the State first because sometimes there is a difference. D. Hussey said that on state roads, they have nothing to say. S. Penney stated that they do have something to say, but they have to go through the state; the state has to consider town input. T. Hoopes recalled that they had been told to try to limit the number of cuts. There is a subdivision right up near Stockbridge Corner Road; the Planning Board recommended one cut and then having the driveways come off of that, but they got three cuts from the state. S. Williams said that if the state doesn't mind the idea, you're going to get the permit. D. Hussey said he had just gone through that on a 139 acre parcel; they researched all the way back to 1960 and took the whole big piece of property, which is over 400 acres, and they only allowed three cuts off of that. There were two already, so they gave him the third cut on his piece of land. S. Williams said he has the same problem on his Route 140 property; he has 100 acres that technically has no access. D. Collier said it used to be five cuts they would give you, depending on your frontage. As long as it is a safe distance, they will give you your cut, as long as it is within those original five cuts. It makes sense to him what D. Hussey had said; where they were giving three cuts and two of them were used so they gave him another one. There were probably two other ones back even before that. T. Hoopes said they are talking about 100 or more acre plots; he is talking about a place that had 400 feet on Route 28, and the question becomes on of the more cuts you put on any road, the more traffic is going to get fouled up. S. Penney said it is idiosyncratic to the different districts; some districts are more conservative than others. D. Collier said it depends on the use, and it depends on safety issues with the state. D. Hussey said he has had to deal with the 400 foot rule; you have to be 3.75 feet up and 13 feet back and the 3.75 is where you can see it and where you're set up. They've got a good regulation; he thinks it should be part of the approval process in the first place; if they approve lots, and you can't get a good driveway cut in there, they've approved a lot that is just sitting there. He said that it should be approved by the highway

department before it ever comes to them. S. Williams asked if Kenney has access to the plans; S. Penney answered that he is a department head. He looks at everything and applies his criteria and the state criteria.

There was discussion of having it a requirement for subdivision applicants to go to the highway department before they come to the Planning Board. S. Williams said that on one subdivision he wanted to do the driveway crossings at the time they were doing the ditch line so they don't have to hack it up later on. There was more discussion about making this a part of the approval process. S. Williams suggested adding another layer to the approval process; once the application is here and they get done making changes, the plan should go back to the department head so Kenny can see them for final approval.

S. Penney said it could perhaps create a delay at the front end. T. Roy said he is not intending to make Kenny a surveyor either, but every time a driveway goes in, he has to go out and verify that it is where it is on the plan. D. Collier suggested putting the burden on the individual submitting the plan. He has had to do it. Get Kenney to sign off on it, and get a letter as well, just making sure that everything is in order.

T. Hoopes asked what would happen if Kenny authorizes a road cut and the applicant comes to the Planning Board, and the Planning Board doesn't like where it is. Those details would have to be worked out.

The above motion made by T. Roy and seconded by S. Williams passed by unanimous vote.

No minutes were approved at this meeting.

S. Williams asked to be listed as clerk on the members list for future minutes.

The next meeting is a workshop on Thursday, December 17.

S. Penney will call Peter Julia concerning the issues with T. Varney. Peter will call W. Curtin to let him know what discussion went on between him and Mr. Varney.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

T. Roy made a motion to adjourn seconded by S. Williams and passed with 5 votes in favor and no opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary L. Tetreau
Recorder, Regular Meeting