

**TOWN OF ALTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Minutes
January 26, 2011
Approved as amended 3/15/11**

Members Present: Timothy Roy, Chair
William Curtin, Member
David Collier, Member
Scott Williams, Member

Others Present: Ken McWilliams, Alton Town Planner
Mike Garrepy, Interim Planner
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Roy, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

There are none to appoint.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

S. Williams made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor, none opposed.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

There was none at this time.

V. REVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MINOR ITEMS

None.

VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case #P10-23 Industrial Communications and Electronics Inc.	Map 14 Lot 21	Final Site Plan 486 East Side Drive
--	----------------------	--

Application submitted by Industrial Communications, Inc. to propose to construct and maintain a 100 foot monopole wireless facility and six accessory equipment shelters. This parcel is located in the Lakeshore Residential Zone.

A continuance is being requested in this case. The applicant has is evaluating whether they need an AOT permit for the construction of their access way. Due to issues with their engineer, the applicant has switched engineers; they are currently working with the new engineer to redesign the access for the project. Plan revisions and consultation with DES concerning the AOT permit are ongoing. The applicant would like to come back before the Board in February with final plans.

S. Williams made a motion to grant the requested extension to February 15, 2011. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

S. Williams commented that there has been some heat from the media that the Planning Board is dragging their feet on this project. He is hopeful that the newspapers will accurately print that the Planning Board is not dragging their feet on this project; it is Industrial Communications that is doing that.

Case #P10-35 Roberts Cove Inc.	Map 48 Lots 4 and 8 and Map 18 Lot 27	Lot Merger and Lot Line Adjustment Basin Road (Roberts Cove)
---	--	---

Application submitted by Roseen Survey PLLC on behalf of applicant Roberts Cove Inc. to consider a lot merger of existing lots Tax Map 48-4 and 48-8 and subsequent lot line adjustment of the newly merged lot with Tax Map 18-27.

T. Roy read the case into the record.

This applicant has submitted a request for continuance via e-mail. They are working with DES for Shore Land Permits and State Subdivision approval.

W. Curtin made a motion to continue Case #P10-35 to the meeting on February 15, 2011. S. Williams seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Case #P10-33 Kathleen and Michael Currier Sr.	Map 2 Lot 19	Final Site Plan 55 Prospect Mountain Road
--	---------------------	--

Application submitted by Kathy Currier on behalf of Kathy and Mike Currier to request Site Plan Approval for on site functions and a corn maze. This parcel is located in the Rural Zone.

T. Roy read this case into the record; M. Garrepy stated that due to ZBA rehearing of the Variance previously granted, the only part of this application to be considered this evening is that which concerns the corn maze.

Kathleen and Michael Currier and Tom Varney of Varney Engineering came forward to speak to this application.

The Board members have received significantly updated plans prepared by Mr. Varney. There are four pages to the new plans; existing conditions plan is on page 2, the site is on page 3, and sheet four is a boundary plan.

At the October 19, 2010 meeting this application was accepted as complete, subject to the granting of waivers; those waivers have not yet been acted on. After the site walk held in November, the Board encouraged the applicant to hire a professional engineer to put together a plan. M. Garrepy suggested that the Board should hear from the applicant as to what they have done; he has done a review of the new submittal, which does require some waivers and discussion of a few issues. The applicant has been made aware of the issues.

Tom Varney read a prepared narrative. Mike and Kathleen Currier are submitting a site plan for Lake Knoll Farm to hold weddings, social events, a corn maze, and other social activities. The property is 107 acres with a house, farm buildings, and open space. The proposed use is seasonal.

A tent area is available for weddings and social events. The railroad caboos has a deck attached for small gatherings. The parking lot provides spaces for 100 cars with five additional spaces provided for handicapped parking. Pedestrian walkways connect the parking areas to the social area. Portable toilets are brought to the site for each event. The service area for caterers to bring food to the event is located behind the barn. Three 100-watt lights are on the barn and caboose.

The house is off limits to the events, other than the location of handicapped parking and the side entrance for the bride.

The music platform is located adjacent to the tent area and a limit of 90 dB average is placed on music vendors.

The site is accessed by three entrances; an access in, an access out, and the house driveway for handicapped parking and the bride. All three entrances have adequate sight distances on Prospect Mountain Road. A sign is to be erected at the entrance to the parking lot. The parking area is to be roped off to delineate parking and traffic flow during events will be directed by vested personnel. The second entrance to the barn area is designated as the emergency exit.

The corn maze is used during the fall. The ticket booth is located in the parking area and visitors are transported to the maze by the farm wagon. A corn cannon fires apples and corn at a target across the pond.

Mr. Varney used the plans to show the site. There is ½ mile of frontage on Suncook Valley Road and nearly as much frontage on Prospect Mountain Road. He pointed out wooded areas and open spaces, and the field as well as the location of the abutters' houses. He showed the sight distance lines from the access in location and explained the calculations for the sight distances based on a 35 mile per hour speed limit. He showed the location of the parking area and walkways to the event area, as well as the location of the handicapped parking. There is also a traffic flow diagram; there would be attendants to maintain traffic. He also showed the location of the caterer's area and the tent area, as well as the location of the emergency access. The house access would not be used except for handicapped access or arrival of the bride. He pointed out the location of the outdoor lighting and the location of the portable toilets, which are handled by a service.

The location of the trail to the corn maze as well as the location of the corn cannon was pointed out on the plan. There is a note on the plan to deal with storm water management; they will keep the grass at a four inch height to mitigate storm water runoff. There is also a note indicating that the noise level will be at an average of 90 dB; this level is suitable for dancing and for conversation.

M. Garrepy again pointed out that this meeting is to focus on the corn maze aspect of the plan, not on the event component.

T. Roy asked about the size of the parking area; it is roughly 33,000 square feet, which is about ¾ of an acre.

The portable toilets will be available during the corn maze event.

M. Garrepy questioned the sight distances for the access in; the analysis that was done was for vehicles coming to an event. M. Garrepy advised Mr. Varney that there also needs to be analysis for the other two access points as well; when vehicles are exiting the site they need to make sure they can see in both directions. He suggested further analysis of all three points for proper turning movements at all three; the ADA accessible and commercial points will also need analysis for all movements. T. Varney stated that he could do that.

S. Williams referred to the site walk; he commented that the line of site for traffic coming from Route 28 would be the worst. He asked if there could be traffic restriction to right turn only coming back toward Route 28 from the access out. The line of sight may be better heading toward Hamwoods Road and the sight distance would be unrestricted as it is down hill. There was further discussion; there is only 60 feet between access in and access out. M. Garrepy commented that further analysis could demonstrate that the access in and access out may need to be switched. T. Varney stated that he has done the analysis, it just is not shown on the plan. The access out is fine and the driveway is fine. M. Garrepy commented that one of his great

concerns on the site walk had been the ability to make all those traffic movements; if that can be shown on the plan, he will be satisfied.

M. Garrepy stated that the plans have been accepted as complete; the review of completeness of the application indicates that there are a couple of waivers required. A waiver for Section 3.04 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been requested by the applicant. There is also a waiver under general requirements; this is for Storm Water and Erosion Control, which is Section 4.03. A waiver for that section has also been requested by the applicant. These two waivers would be required. The reference in his memo to Section 4.12 is incorrect. There is no site disturbance and the grass is going to be maintained in all areas, so everything is going to do exactly as it does now in regard to run off and drainage.

T. Roy asked the members if there are any issues with the storm water and erosion control in regard to the corn maze, which runs approximately 7 weeks a year. S. Williams does not feel that as this is going to stay a grassy surface and recover between uses, there is not going to be an issue. Mr. Currier produced photos of the site taken during a heavy rain; his photos show that there was no runoff at that area.

S. Williams made a motion to grant waivers for Section 3.04 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Section 4.03 Storm Water Drainage and Erosion Control. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Kathy Currier addressed the Board stating that they are also requesting a waiver of the application fees. The Board of Selectmen is recommending this request, as the Curriers paid fees when they went for their initial minor site plan review. The applicant did pay all noticing and abutter fees. This waiver request is for the application fee itself. This waiver would be for Section 2.05.

W. Curtin made a motion to grant the waiver for Section 2.05 and 2.06a in reference to Application Fees as it was previously paid. S. Williams seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

M. Garrepy stated that his only issues with this application have been in regard to sight distance and parking; he feels that the applicant has done a good job addressing those concerns. There were no department head concerns in regard to this project; there is also no engineering review as none was requested. The sight distance was again discussed; T. Varney has indicated that sight distance from all three access points is adequate. M. Garrepy requested that the plan be revised to show the line of sight at all three accesses instead of just the access in. T. Varney stated that he would put that on the plan. M. Garrepy added that it could be a condition of approval, or they could ask the applicant to come back after the plan revisions are made.

T. Roy opened the floor to public input.

Carol Locke came forward and asked if the waiver for the parking is just for the corn maze; if the event goes forward, will there be another waiver required for that parking?

M. Garrepy explained that the issue addressed right now is based on the frequency of use. At this point it is only 7 weeks out of the year. Mrs. Locke voiced understanding but added that if the event business goes forward their plan is to have an event once a week with 200 people and 100 cars every week for the whole summer. T. Roy stated that is an issue that would be looked at. S. Williams added that everything being talked about tonight is for the corn maze and that it would absolutely be addressed again. Mrs. Locke referred to a DES letter that has been given to the Board members; they are concerned about erosion. Her concern is beyond the first season; if you keep putting cars on a field, the pasture is eventually going to wear down. With the corn maze, this probably won't happen, but she worries that it will happen over time. S. Williams pointed out that the DES letter does not say they are concerned about this issue; they are simply asking the Board to look into it. M. Garrepy explained that there is no trigger for DES involvement in this application;

they have responded to citizen concerns and made staff aware of concerns that have been voiced. DES has no jurisdiction over this application at all. Mrs. Locke asked where she would go with a problem if one were to develop five years down the road; she does not think it is going to be an issue with the corn maze. T. Roy answered that she would make a complaint to the Building Department. There is a note on the plan that they will keep the grass at a minimum of 4". K. McWilliams suggested a note on the plan stating that if there is an issue with erosion down the road that they are not in conformance with the approval and would have to come back to the Planning Board to address that. This was discussed further and staff, members, and Mrs. Locke voiced approval of that. Mrs. Locke went on to say that she trusts the information she has seen from Mr. Varney regarding the sight lines; she also trusts the Board to do what is right in accordance with regulations. She wants to make sure that if they do come back with a site plan for the events that this issue will be revisited, as it is a different type of parking than the corn maze. She was assured that this would be the case.

There was no further public input; public input was closed.

M. Garrepy explained to the members that he incorporates some standard language showing that all representations both written and oral by the applicant are part of the approval. What has just been discussed about erosion control is incorporated in the decision by reference. He has checked the department head concerns in the file; there were no concerns. Showing the sight lines for all three access points will address the traffic concerns.

Conditions of approval were discussed; M. Garrepy does not have a prepared list of conditions of approval. There was discussion of how this application is being bifurcated; part of it has been heard this evening. The other part of the application is pending ZBA decision at their February meeting; if their decision is favorable the applicant will be back on February 15, 2011 for possible approval. There was discussion of continuing the corn maze approval until the February 15 meeting. There are no red flags on this application so the conditions of approval (for the corn maze only) would be very straightforward. If the ZBA does not re-grant the waiver, all references not directly related to the corn maze will have to be removed from the plan.

It was decided that this application would be recessed at this time; M. Garrepy will draft Conditions of Approval while the Board continues to hear cases. Additionally, an extension of the time clock is needed regarding the other component of the application.

VII. COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF NEW FINAL APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS (If applications are accepted as complete)

Case #P11-03 Roberts Cove Inc.	Map 15 Lot 77A	Final Minor Subdivision Drew Hill Rd. and Chesley Rd.
---	-----------------------	--

Application submitted by Sylvia Leggett on behalf of Roberts Cove Inc. for a proposed three lot minor subdivision in the Rural Zone.

T. Roy read the case into the record.

Christopher Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering came forward to present this case. He is representing Roberts Cove, Inc. in an effort to subdivide a parcel into three distinct parcels of 5 acres plus each.

K. McWilliams stated that after meeting with the applicant and review of the application he has determined that the application is complete and recommends that the Board accept it as such.

S. Williams made a motion to accept the application for Case #P11-03, Map 15 Lot 77A, Roberts Cove, Inc., as complete. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Mr. Berry explained that this application contains a parent parcel of 16+ acres on the corner of Drew Hill and Chesley Roads. The applicant is proposing 3 lots each to be over 5 acres in size. Given the lot size and road frontage, this is a fairly benign use. Because each lot is over 5 acres there is no requirement for review by NH-DES Subsurface Bureau.

Marc Jacobs is a wetlands consultant and certified soil scientist; he was hired to conduct wetlands mapping of the parcel. The plan indicates that there is quite a bit of wetlands that moves down the hill in channelized form; there is also a moderately sized standing wetland. All of the wetlands are poorly drained but there are no very poorly drained soils. Additionally, there are some areas of small depressions; a vernal pool study was done, and no vernal pools were evidenced.

As part of this application, Mr. Berry is proposing three driveway cuts. Beginning on Chesley Road, the proposed driveway cut has good sight distance and is on a very flat road with benign curvature. There are no grade issues; that driveway is easy to develop.

Moving up Drew Hill Road, there is an old mining pit adjacent to the roadway. Driveway cuts are shown on pages 4 and 5 of the application. The first driveway discussed is shown on page 5; the next two are on page 4 of the application. On proposed lot 2, the driveway cut will go through the old mining area. There are hard, restrictive soils at about two feet and some areas have been mined in the past for brick and clay products. They are proposing a small amount of wetlands impact for this driveway; the majority of the contour for the driveway already exists. If they were to place the driveway anywhere else, they would either be disturbing more wetlands or disturbing slopes that are very steep and hard to manage and where there would be sediment and erosion control issues. They are proposing a small amount of impact on that lot.

Also shown on page 4 of 5, they are proposing a driveway cut just south of the utility pole; this is in an area where there will be some impact on the wetlands buffer. If they were to move the driveway out of the buffer, that would necessitate large cuts into the hillside. If the Board objects to impacting the wetlands buffer, cutting into the hillside is an option, though not an ideal one. The driveway is partially existing in the form of a woods road, so development would be fairly easy.

Profiles and cross sections show the grading for those two driveways; there are sections of the lots that are steeper. On lot two, they have to make an application to DES for the Wetlands Bureau, and they would require the profiles anyway. Board members were provided with copies of the profiles and cross sections.

Mr. Berry used copies of the plans to show the grades; on lot 1 the grade would be about 12.5%. There is 738 square feet of buffer impact. Planting enhancements could be done within the buffer; this is simply a graded area so there will not be a lot of opportunity for planting. They are proposing instead to stabilize with red top and switch grass. On lot 2 the driveway grade is 15%, which is the maximum. Grading and swales are shown. The plan view indicates the impact area. The total area of impact is 671 square feet, which is a minimum impact application, assuming the Conservation Commission agrees with the plans.

From a land planning standpoint, the driveways are the greatest challenge. The site grades from top to bottom and left to right on the plan sites. The plans show proposed home sites and 4,000 square feet of leeching beds. Mark Jacobs performed test pits on the sites and found that there are hard pan soils within 2 – 3 feet of the surface. There is an area of slope on Lot 1, but there is no development proposed there. Test pit data was included as part of the application. There are no cemeteries or foundation holes on this site. There are abutting properties that are close; the most immediate is on Chesley Road. The house site, well, and septic have been located; they are within 200' of the site and should be considered by the Board. Other parcels have home structures not within 200' so they are not shown on the plan.

There is drainage down Drew Hill Road; the town has installed 2 cross culverts – one is on Drew Hill Road and the other is on Chesley Road. The ditch at the bottom of the hill has been regarded. Drainage is onto a large wetland on the Ely piece.

T. Roy asked about the rear boundary; it is a stone wall.

Mr. Berry explained that because they are a mixed survey and engineering firm, they often look at things in a different way. The cross culverts mentioned in his presentation are restricted by the road's right of way. He has suggested that Roberts Cove, Inc., provide easements around the interior of each of the inlets so the town can do any necessary repairs. This has been marked on the plans. Bearings and distances are marked on the plan. S. Williams asked if the Highway Department has reviewed this aspect to make sure it will meet their needs. K. McWilliams answered that the Conservation Commission has submitted that any wetland over 10,000 square feet requires a 25 foot buffer; those buffers are shown on the plan. The Highway Department comment is that all driveways will require culvert work in this area; there were no comments about the easement. Police and Fire Departments had no concerns.

Mr. Berry explained that pages 1, 2, and 3 of the five page plan set will be submitted for recording; all conditions the Board has would be placed on Page 1. The bounds have not been set yet, but they will set all four bounds that are required. The existing corners are marked. S. Williams complimented Mr. Berry on the clarity of the plans submitted.

Mr. Berry's technician will meet with the Conservation Commission tomorrow evening.

There are no waivers being requested.

K. McWilliams informed the Board that he has been contacted by abutters who voiced concern about drainage; he passed those concerns on to Mr. Berry who responded with a letter dated January 25, 2011.

T. Roy opened the floor to public input.

Lois Smedley came forward; she is next to lot 1 on the plan. She is concerned about the water issue; they are very wet in the spring and into the summer. The Highway Department is up there every other week repairing the road because of the runoff from that end of Drew Hill Road. She is concerned what will happen when they start digging up the ground. She is also concerned that, due to the wetlands, the house on that lot is going to be right on her property line; the same is true of lot 3. S. Williams pointed out that as long as the setbacks are met, there is nothing else for the Board to deal with. Mrs. Smedley did say that they could probably go for a variance, but if the variance is not granted, the house is still going to go up. She reiterated her main concern, which is the standing water that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Berry explained that the two abutters who voiced concern reside uphill from these proposed lots, so no water will be passed to them. There is water that comes down through the site; there are four seeps that come down and form the wetland channels as described in his response to the Planner's comments. If a full drainage study were to be done for the project, it would most likely show that there is a large catchment area that drains down through this site. Along with the fact that there are hardpan soils in this area, there is no doubt water that comes down through those areas. The Board acknowledges the purpose and value of wetlands and protect them with buffers which are shown on the plan. The lots are constructed in accordance with town standards; this will be monitored again through the building process. These are not lots being developed by a builder, and there are no pocket buyers; he does not know where somebody will want to build on these lots so they are not proposing additional wetlands impacts to cross these streams. Somebody may want to live closer to the road than to the middle of a five acre lot; the Board determines the location with the setbacks. S. Williams commented that it looks like the sheet flow will be going away from any abutters; Mr. Berry concurred.

Part of the issue Mrs. Smedley spoke of is because the ditches are perpetually filled with gravel; water probably breaches the road bed frequently. T. Roy stated that this project will not change the way the water comes off the site; S. Williams added that there will be a little more sheet flow due to increases in impervious areas.

T. Roy invited further input; there was none. Public input was closed.

S. Williams suggested that whoever does the site work should try to get any concentrated water on a level spreader to get it out so it can meander over the soils. Mr. Berry suggested adding an additional note to the cover sheet to say that future developers of these lots should keep in mind State of NH Best Management Practices for Development. Board members voiced approval of this plan.

There are no waivers requested on this project. Conditions were discussed; the meeting with the Conservation Commission, the culvert easements, and the additional note mentioned above were discussed. K. McWilliams also mentioned that there will be wetlands impacts that could require state permits; he suggested that the Board should wait until next month to grant approval, after the applicant has met with the Conservation Commission and heard from DES.

S. Williams made a motion to continue Case #P11-03 to the meeting on February 15, 2011. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

The Board reconvened Case #P10-33; M. Garrepy has drafted conditions of approval for the corn maze aspect of the application only. He went over the proposed conditions with the Board.

S. Williams made a motion to approve Case #P10-33 as follows, noting that this decision is concerning the corn maze aspect of the plan only:

Conditions Precedent: The following conditions must be satisfied prior to the signing of the plans.

- 1. Site Distance analysis for all turning movements shall be shown on the plans in compliance with Town driveway regulations.**
- 2. Note all waivers granted on the plan.**
- 3. If the variance is not granted for the event component of the application all event related notes and improvements shall be removed from the plan.**

Conditions subsequent:

- 1. This approval is based upon the plans submitted and the written and oral testimony provided by the applicant all of which is hereby incorporated into this decision by reference.**

Per Section 2.16 of the Site Plan Review Regulations, this conditional approval shall be valid for one year from date of original approval unless extended by the authority of the Planning Board after petition by the applicant.

D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

S. Williams made a motion to continue the balance of this application to the meeting on February 15, 2011 and to request that the applicant grant an extension to the 65 day clock. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Mrs. Currier stated that she would provide the extension of the 65 day clock in writing.

Case #P11-01 GTP Acquisitions Partners	Map 3 Lot 18	Amended Final Site Plan Prospect Mountain Road
---	---------------------	---

Application for an amended Final Site Plan Review submitted by Jennifer McCourt on behalf of GTP Acquisitions Partners to replace one microwave dish and add a new microwave dish in the Rural Zone.

T. Roy read this case into the record. Jennifer McCourt of McCourt Engineering Associates came forward to present the application.

K. McWilliams stated that the application falls under the Telecommunication Tower section of the regulations; there is a section that deals with existing tower structures and what you have to do to amend those before getting a building permit. This need Planning Board review, so this has been set up as an amended site plan review; abutters have been notified. In terms of the section of the ordinance that applies to this application, the applicant has provided all necessary information to make this a complete application and he recommended that the application should be accepted as complete. There are no waivers requested or needed.

S. Williams made a motion to accept the application for Case #P11-01, Map 3 Lot 18, GTP Acquisition Partners as complete. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

This is a very simple application; there is an existing shelter with a microwave dish on either side of it. The existing 6 foot dish will be replaced with a 4 foot dish. On the other side of the shelter, there will be a 2 foot dish on a 15 foot pole. Ms. McCourt offered to go through the criteria; the Board members felt that this is a very simple application and does not require a lot more explanation. This is an existing utility that is for the good of all; the microwave dishes are not visible from the road.

T. Roy opened this case to public input; there was none.

S. Williams made a motion to approve the plan for Case #P11-01, Map 3 Lot 18, GTP Acquisition Partners as presented. W. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Case #P11-02 Brad Bissell	Map 49 Lot 4	Amended Final Site Plan Route 28
--------------------------------------	---------------------	---

Application for an amended Final Site Plan Review submitted by Brad Bissell to enclose an open carport for an additional auto repair bay in the Residential Commercial Zone.

T. Roy read the case into the record; Brad Bissell came forward to present.

K. McWilliams stated that the application provides the level of information requested for this site plan; he suggested that the Board accept the application as complete.

S. Williams made a motion to accept the application for Case #P11-02, Map 49 Lot 4, Brad Bissell, as complete. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Mr. Bissell explained that he would like to enclose the existing outdoor carport area; there will be two overhead doors and a side door as well as two small windows and a bay window on the front. The enclosure will match the existing building identically.

T. Roy opened public input; there was none.

K. McWilliams suggested a small landscaped island along the frontage to help control access. There was discussion about this with Mr. Bissell and members voicing concern about an island restricting ability to turn trailers and large vehicles around safely without blocking Route 28. He will do landscaping in front of the bay and at the corner; he is making an effort to clean up the site. The issue of outside storage was discussed; the property currently has a fenced in area. It is an auto repair business and Mr. Bissell does sell from there; he is trying to clean up the property and the fences are coming down. Vehicles waiting for repair or pick up are an integral part of the business. There was further discussion on this issue with the decision made to not address outside storage.

S. Williams made a motion to approve the application for Case #P11-02, Map 49 Lot 4, Brad Bissell concerning his plan to enclose the building, with all oral presentations included and also to include the recommendation of the Fire Department to comply with lighting and signage and fire extinguisher requirements. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Old Business

There was none.

2. New Business

Loon Cove will be coming in for amended approval.

K. McWilliams informed the Board that two of the zoning amendments, the one related to function facilities and the one related for nonconforming structures and nonconforming use. Before the January 11 meeting a conversation with Attorney Sessler indicated that because those amendments had not been properly noticed for the January 11 meeting, it was permissible to revert back to the original text of December 20. After the January 11 meeting and the decision to put the language from December 20 on the ballot, the Planning Department received a letter from an attorney contesting how that process was handled for the function facility. After further review, Attorney Sessler realized he had made a mistake and is advising strongly against placing those amendments on the ballot as they are now illegal. The Board of Selectmen has decided to pull those two amendments from the ballot.

W. Curtin made a motion to have those two amendments reposted next month for the 2012 ballot.

K. McWilliams advised against changing the schedule of public hearings if the amendments are going to be held in abeyance for a year. He would like to talk to Attorney Sessler further before the Board does anything out of the norm. There was discussion of the procedures and schedule for zoning amendments to be worked on for the 2012 ballot.

W. Curtin withdrew his motion above.

S. Williams would like to see work begin with an aim toward redistricting the town; most of the Board members feel the same way. There was general discussion concerning the involvement and the amount of time, effort, and work that goes into redistricting and changing the zoning ordinances.

K. McWilliams spoke about the difficulty for the applicants because the checklist does not match the site plan review regulations; the applicants often do not understand what is required for their application. There was discussion concerning the process of rewriting the regulations. S. Williams spoke about the need to have jobs in the town and also to keep the residential base intact.

A tentative timeframe for bringing forth zoning amendments for 2012 was discussed. K. McWilliams would like to work on the site plan regulations first; he could have a draft before the Board by mid-spring. Sub-division regulations also need to be overhauled; those could be drafted by fall. Zoning amendments would be on the slate for late fall. The process of redistricting could begin in January of next year; K. McWilliams strongly feels that this is a two or three year process, most of which will be keeping the public informed and getting them on board.

3. Approval of Minutes

Members discussed the minutes of November 17, 2010, which were in the board packets for approval. Those minutes were actually approved at the meeting on December 21, 2011.

The approval of minutes for the public hearing on January 11, 2011, was moved to the next meeting.

4. Correspondence

There was none.

5. Any other business that may come before the Board

Wentworth Cove is on the agenda for the February 15, 2011 meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

S. Williams made a motion to adjourn. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with all in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m. The next regular Planning Board meeting will be on Tuesday, February 15, 2011 at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary L. Tetreau
Recorder, Regular Meeting