

**TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
Public Hearing Minutes
April 19, 2011
Approved as amended 5/16/11**

Members Present: Tim Roy, Chair
Scott Williams, Vice-Chair
Bill Curtin, Member
David Collier, Member
Cindy Balcius, Alternate
Dave Hussey, Selectmen Rep

Others Present: Ken McWilliams, Town of Alton Planner
Randy Sanborn, Secretary, Planning Department
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Roy, Chair, called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the Agenda.

S. Williams moved to accept the agenda as presented. D. Hussey seconded the motion which passed with 5 votes in favor and none opposed.

III. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

S. Williams moved to appoint C. Balcius as an alternate for tonight's meeting. D. Hussey seconded the motion which passed with all in favor and none opposed.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input at this time.

V. REVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MINOR ITEMS

Case #P10-11 NH Electric Cooperative	Map 9, Lots 3	Time Extension for Site Plan 1 Suncook Valley Road
---	----------------------	---

The NH Electric Cooperative received conditional approval of a site plan for an emergency communications tower from the Planning Board on May 3, 2010. The conditions of approval were satisfied and the site plan was signed on June 3, 2010. A building permit has been approved for installation of an emergency communications tower. They are anticipating construction to begin in late summer and are requesting a time extension of the requirement for active and substantial development to begin within one year of final approval.

K. McWilliams made note that it is not an emergency communications tower as reflected in his Planner's Review. It is termed as an essential services communications tower.

T. Roy opened it to the Public. Seeing none he closed public input.

S. Williams moved for Case P10-11 Map 9, Lot 3 time extension of site plan for New Hampshire Electric Cooperative for a period of one year from tonight's date. D. Collier seconded the motion.

B. Curtin asked about their date of decision was from May 3, 2010 and today is April 19, 2011. Do they want to go to May 3, 2011?

S. Williams stated that it was good until May 3, 2011 already and if they did it from tonight's date it would be the 19th of April 2012. He asked them if that is enough and they stated yes.

The motion passed with all in favor of the vote and none opposed.

Case #P10-12 Jobean, LLC	Map 26, Lots 10	Concept Site Plan Review Homestead Place
-----------------------------	-----------------	---

Dean Puzzo wants to discuss several minor changes to the site plan approved by the Planning Board on December 21, 2010 to determine if any of the proposed changes need an amended site plan approval.

C. Balcius and D. Collier recused themselves from this case.

K. McWilliams reviewed the reason for this case. An e-mail from D. Puzzo is in the Planning Board's packet that details the proposed changes which include less building square footage, the lower building height, more consistent architectural style using the New England cape architectural style, improved handicap access, improved pedestrian safety and improved sight safety. He feels these changes are minor in nature and represent improvements in the site design and he doesn't feel these changes need a full site plan review. He feels as it was required in the original Notice of Decision, that these changes could be captured and detailed in the required as built plans following construction.

T. Roy expressed that he doesn't see it as an issue.

D. Hussey asked if K. McWilliams saw it as minor and he stated that he does.

D. Puzzo stated that he did a site walk with K. McWilliams and J. Dever and they were supportive.

T. Roy felt that some of the minor things could be done administratively.

D. Hussey agreed.

S. Williams stated that being an ADA issue there was not much they could do about it.

D. Puzzo stated that there was no ADA access now and they were originally going to put it in the front of the building but couldn't figure out how they were going to do it so they decided to put it in the back of the building and adding the two handicap spaces in the back.

D. Hussey felt that in order to facilitate things faster that if they met with the Planner and Code Enforcement Officer they did not need to come before the Planning Board.

T. Roy opened it up to the public. Seeing none he closed public input.

S. Williams made a motion on Case P11-12, Jobean, LLC Commercial Site Plan, Map 26, Lot 10, to approve the minor changes to the site plan. D. Hussey seconded the motion with all in favor.

K. McWilliams spoke in regards to a discussion with D. Puzzo. He started to go through some of the conditions subsequent and one he came across was a conditions of the December 21, 2010 Notice of Decision that stated that “A preconstruction meeting shall be held with Department Heads, Town Engineer and the Applicant prior to any site construction.” His interpretation of this was since the Town Engineer was involved in the Preconstruction Meeting he was being retained to do construction inspections of the site plan development. D. Puzzo felt that was not a requirement of the Planning Board and wanted to discuss that this evening. K. McWilliams noted that since he had a conversation with D. Puzzo he went back and looked at the Site Plan Regulations. In Section 3.09 in the Site Plan Review Regulations that deal with Performance and Maintenance Security, the only time it talks about construction inspections is when the Planning Board asks for security on the project. To the best of his knowledge the Planning Board has not asked for security on this project. Because of that section he believed that inspections were not needed for this project. He finds a condition in the Notice that references the Town Engineer being involved in the pre-construction meeting but now as he goes back to the regulations he is having a hard time finding where that link is being made so it may be simply a standard condition of approval that was put in there without realizing what was there.

T. Roy stated that the Town Engineer reviewed the plan and made comments and D. Puzzo has satisfied those and he doesn't see any reason for an Engineer to go onsite.

S. Williams stated that he feels that if they didn't make that a condition at the time of the approval they cannot inflict it on him at this point.

W. Curtin made a motion that they remove Condition Subsequent #3 that reads “A pre-construction meeting shall be held with Department Heads, Town Engineer and the Applicant prior to any site construction dated December 21, 2010. S. Williams seconded the motion. All were in favor of the motion.

Case # P11-11 Lisa Boudrow	Map 27, Lots 52	Concept Site Plan Review 44 Main Street
---------------------------------------	------------------------	--

Lisa Boudrow wants to discuss whether there is a need for a site plan review to reuse the former NH Electric Cooperative office at 44 Main Street for a gift/flower shop business.

Rob Boudrow spoke on behalf of this application stating that there is a letter from the NH Electric Cooperative allowing them to speak on their behalf. They are interested in purchasing the NH Electric Company building. Lisa has an existing gift shop and garden center in West Alton that they would like to move to the Electric Company building and he would like to use the building for storage. They are here to find out if there is any additional work needed in order for that to be a permitted use at that facility.

T. Roy asked where the place stands because he has not reviewed the building.

K. McWilliams stated that by looking at the parking requirements that the new use would be either comparable or a less intensive use than what had been there so he doesn't see that they would need for additional parking so as a result he doesn't see the need for exterior site changes to the site. She is talking about putting some brick on the sides of the building to dress it up but it doesn't appear there is a need for site changes so he does not see the need for her to go through a full site plan review for this change of use.

D. Hussey asked about the outside of the building if there is going to be anything outside such as displaying plants, furniture, etc.

T. Roy asked if the things are going to be taken in at night.

L. Boudrow stated that if there are any items outside, they would take them in at closing.

S. Williams asked if they could have a parking scheme on file to show how they will have their parking handled and the flow of traffic.

K. McWilliams asked the Board if they were comfortable with just having a parking sketch and a sketch of sales of landscaping materials out front of the building and have that on file. The Board indicated they were.

B. Curtin asked what size delivery trucks would be coming in.

R. Boudrow stated that there was room for trucks out back to turn around.

L. Boudrow stated that the trucks would be fairly small unless there is a larger delivery.

D. Hussey made a motion to not require a full site plan for this change of use. S. Williams seconded it. All were in favor.

VI. COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF NEW FINAL APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS.

Case #P11-10 & P11-09 Robert H. Carleton	Map 8 Lot 49 & Map 25, Lot 6 & Map 8, Lot 50-1	Preliminary Major Site Plan and Lot Line Adjustment Route 28 West of Traffic Circle
---	---	--

C. Balcius recused herself from this case.

T. Roy called both the Site Plan and Lot Line Adjustment cases because they are basically the same because the Lot Line Adjustment will not go forward without the approval of the Site Plan.

D. Collier felt he needed to recuse himself from this case but the Board and the Public did not feel it was necessary so D. Collier remained on the Board for the cases.

Mr. Carleton is applying for a preliminary site plan for a 150 unit Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park. The RV Park is proposed in the Rural (RU) Zone. The access road connecting to Route 28 passes through the Residential-Commercial (RC) Zone. Proposed utilities include on-site wastewater disposal and the extension of Town water from Pine Street and boring under the river to the site. Mr. Carleton is also

proposing a lot line adjustment that would increase the lot size of Map 25, Lot 6 from 4.50 acres to 5.30 acres and reduce the lot size of Map 8, Lot 50-1 from 16 + or – acres to 15.3 + or – acres. The area added to Map 8, Lot 50-1 includes 158.39 feet of frontage on Route 28 and the area for the road that would provide access to the RV campground. The reconfigured Map 8, Lot 50-1 would then be merged with Map 8, Lot 49 where the RV campground is proposed.

K. McWilliams explained the steps to be taken during the course of this application. This is the first step of three that they will need to go through. Beyond the preliminary site plan they need to apply to the Board of Adjustment for Special Exception for the use. The RV Park in a Rural Zone is allowed by Special Exception. They have filed their application and will be coming before the Zoning Board next month. If they get the approval for the Special Exception they will be back before the Planning Board for the final site plan review.

Tyler Phillips with Horizons Engineering out of Littleton, New Hampshire and Justin Daigneault spoke in regards to the application. They brought a colored plan for viewing by the Board and the Public. There are three parcels involved. There is the original parcel with 169 acres where the campground is going. There is another parcel with 33 feet of frontage on Route 28 South. There is not sufficient frontage on Route 28 so that is why they may need the Lot Line Adjustment. They are trying to get frontage of 75 feet in the RC Zone where the campground is going. The RV Park lot has no frontage and is a nonconforming lot. Section 320 C.2. provides that any use of a nonconforming lot other than a single family residence requires approval of a special exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The zoning ordinance states that if you have a non-conforming lot and you have abutting parcels you are to merge those parcels if you can make it more conforming. The owner owns the large parcel and the two other parcels. They had two choices to get frontage and access to the site. They could create on Route 28 frontage for this back lot and by doing a lot line adjustment which would take frontage from the Water Industries' lot, give that strip to the middle lot and then merge the middle lot to the larger lot to get the frontage. The alternative is to construct a road designed and built to Town road standards into the RV Park property to create the required frontage.

T. Roy asked K. McWilliams if he concurs that merging those two lots would get him enough frontage.

K. McWilliams stated that he didn't know if the 158 feet is enough to meet the Zoning Ordinance but they are trying to get as close as they can and the lot is now land locked entirely.

S. Williams stated that prior to the zoning change in 2004 the frontage requirement in the Rural Zone was 150 feet and all pre-existing lots at that time still remain 150 feet. He feels this lot predates that and still may be able to enjoy the 150 feet frontage standard.

K. McWilliams says he does not see that in the ordinance.

S. Williams said that it was about 7 or 8 years ago they changed the frontage requirement in the Rural Zone.

T. Phillips found the original land owner owned land on both sides of Route 28 but in the 1930's there was a town road that came through. The State wanted to move Route 28 and when they moved the road over they purchased the land from Mr. Rollins. Mr. Rollins deeded himself a right of way of 50 feet that goes through two lots from Route 28. Route 28 was moved and Mr. Carleton purchased this land about 30 years ago but it was never indicated that there was a strip of land between the old town road and Route 28 which means that the Water Industries lot has next to no frontage on Route 28. They are still researching this because it is very difficult to find the deeds that long ago and they don't know who owns that strip of land. They want to use the 50 foot right of way and construct a road to town standards back through to the middle lot and then

merge the lots. The road constructed to Town standards would provide the required road frontage. To do that they would need to go back and get a special exception from the Zoning Board to allow a use other than a single family residence on that lot.

S. Williams asked if they tried to find any heirs of the Rollins family. They had not. S. Williams noted one of them is in the audience.

T. Phillips felt that trying to do the Lot Line Adjustment would be very time consuming and so they will probably choose the use the 50 foot right of way and build a road to Town standards with an asterisk. He wanted to know how the Board felt.

T. Roy asked what the asterisk was that they were talking about.

T. Phillips stated the campground is only required to build an 18 foot wide road and it is not required to be paved. For the portion built to Town standards they are trying to minimize the impact to wet lands so they are proposing to tilt the road to one side which will keep the water to one side. So they would construct it to town standards but with two asterisks. They would ask the Board of Selectmen to build this road with a super elevated cross section rather than a crown in the middle and not pave it until such time as some other use other than the campground would use the road.

S. Williams stated that he felt that they would want a portion of the access road off of Route 28 paved in 100 feet or so to keep the dust down.

T. Roy asked if it was the Board of Selectmen or the ZBA that he would need to get permission from to change the road standards.

K. McWilliams stated that it would be the Board of Selectmen. He wanted to make note that T. Phillips has talked about building that section of road to town standards to serve potential development on the remainder of the large parcel. Mr. Carleton owns about another 140 acres that may be developed in the future.

D. Hussey asked if DOT would have an issue with that not being a single family residence now that the access would serve the RV Park.

K. McWilliams stated that they would need to get another access permit from DOT.

T. Phillips stated that they have applied for a driveway permit and they are doing their field review in the next week or so. They have adequate site distance there, there is 400 feet.

S. Williams asked how many acres they are using for this project. T. Phillips noted forty six will be used.

T. Roy asked about the yellow dotted lines.

T. Phillips explained that they define the Park limits. The ordinance relates to density. Where someone has a smaller lot and develop the whole lot for a campground they just use the property boundary. Here they had to define some park limits so they took as straight a line as they could to define the park limits, the Park consisting of about 46 acres is only part of Mr. Carleton's ownership.

T. Roy asked how far does the right of way easement go back and is it to service land other than the Carleton properties.

T. Phillips stated that it was to service three lots. It is mostly on Carleton's land except that piece that they do not know who owns it.

S. Williams asked if there were any restrictions on that right of way.

T. Phillips stated it was for vehicle travel. It is a 50 foot right of way but does not have meets and bounds so follows the center line. It says if someone was ever to build a house there they would have to provide a way around. He is concerned about whether or not if they do a lot line adjustment the lands of record would lose their lots of record that were created after the wetland setbacks were established. These lots predate that so they do not have the wetland setbacks.

D. Hussey stated that they would probably be asked about the buffers for the noise issues.

S. Williams stated that he feels they should have their bylaws for the campground available to present with the final Site Plan Review to be recorded with this project.

T. Phillips stated that they did have buffers.

D. Hussey asked if there was anything saying they could not build a road on their property. The answer was no.

B. Curtin would question the road access point coming off of Route 28 but the State will determine what is needed for that.

S. Williams was concerned with the leaching field and he believes this is going to require 1500 gallons a day septic loading and they would have to make sure they are loading this properly.

T. Phillips stated that 60 gallons per day is standard for RV Park hookups but there are two proposed leach fields so there is 9300 gallon capacity. Anything over 2500 you need two fields separated by 20 feet so those fields are sized for RVs. The owner is suggesting interest in accommodating park models. They will be accommodating pop-up campers, tow behinds, etc. Park models will roll in but will stay. They know that no one can stay more than 180 days. They would show up and then leave and could not stay more than 180 days. Park models are not in the regulations but they would like to have approval for them. They have defined the park limits to show that they can meet the setbacks. The requirements in Section 355 state that they need a 75 foot landscape buffer all the way around. That buffer needs to be provided on the rear lines and side lines. They have provided a 75 foot buffer along the Merrymeeting River. The Shoreland Protection Act requires a 50 foot buffer. Where there is less than 50 feet they will plant to provide a uniform 50 feet. They have mapped the wetlands where they are proposing to do work. They have a two way road that goes down the center and a one way road that goes around the outside. They are proposing 150 units but have shaved them down by three. The park area of 46 acres is about 2 million square feet and the ordinance says they need to supply a common area of a minimum of 15 percent of the park area as common space. They have provided 18 ½ percent of the Park area as a common space. The minimum landscape area required is 35 percent and they are providing 78 percent. Each site will handle its own drainage. The drainage requirements are no increase in peak flow or volume on offsite properties for storm water. They will retain the whole 50 year storm on site. Because they are in an Aquifer zone there was a question about increased impact but they don't feel there will be.

D. Hussey asked how deep the water table level was right now.

T. Phillips stated that they know the elevation. It may be 15 feet in some high points down to a shallow 36 inches in the pit itself. The plan is to grade the site so that the seasonal high water table is no closer than 5 feet to the finished grade. That works for drainage. The pump system leach fields will meet the standards as far as separation.

T. Roy asked about the man made pond.

T. Phillips stated that the owner had a permit from the state to excavate the six acres of wetlands adjacent to the pond which he did not pursue but created a pond which is not within the park confines. They will not stop people from going over to it and fishing but did not want to include that in the park. They did not want to include this in the park in case they wanted to do further development in that area.

T. Roy suggested that there be a no fishing or swimming posted if it is not included in the park.

S. Williams asked what months of operation they were looking at.

T. Phillips stated May 1st through the end of October.

T. Roy asked if the water supply would be turned on and shut off.

T. Phillips stated that yes and as far as water supply they are proposing to connect into the town water supply on Pine Street. The proposal is to directionally drill from Pine Street under the river not disturbing the trees or the wetlands. The wetlands permit is not required if they are outside the jurisdiction where they start their directional drill. The water will come in and continue with a six inch line to go through the campground and put a hydrant by the bath house and rec area and would continue all the way to Route 28 and put another hydrant on Route 28. The loops would remain seasonal and the main route would be charged all winter. They think that is the best place to come across but nothing is set in stone.

S. Williams asked about another building shown on the plan and whether that might be a store.

T. Phillips stated they would like to have a placeholder for future expansion and would show that on the plans so they do not know yet and would come back in for a site plan if they decided to put in a laundry room, etc.

S. Williams asked if they were not going to have tent sites do they need a bath house.

T. Phillips explained that they have to provide showers per the regulations. Code requires one bathroom for the first 25 sites. They will be putting in 10 showers, toilets and lavatories which exceed the code.

T. Roy stated that he would like to see a definitive phase I, phase II, and phase III.

T. Phillips stated that the owner would like to be allowed to go forward and have it approved all at once as long as there is a reasonable coordination between the Board as far as what they would require in the first year to be done.

D. Hussey asked where they would be putting the main water line in immediately. Would they be putting it in the further part of the camp?

T. Phillips stated that they would be bringing it all the way through. He stated that the intention was to bring the water line all the way through in the first year.

D. Hussey asked B. Curtin about the ownership of the water pipe coming out to Route 28.

B. Curtin stated that that would have to be discussed and the town would need an easement. It is understood that the Town would have it available for future use going down Suncook Valley Road.

K. McWilliams stated that in regards to the phasing and timing of the improvements that in a lot of cases the Planning Board does conditional approvals with conditions precedent that need to be met before the plan is signed. The one year time frame starts after the conditions precedent are met and the Site Plan is signed by the Planning Board Chair. The clock starts for vesting after the conditions precedent are met and not when they give him a conditional approval.

T. Roy was concerned with security being required because it may be needed to be reclaimed.

T. Phillip stated that there is an active pit permit right now so there are no time limits on that unless there was a threat to water quality.

S. Williams asked him to explain the bioretention system.

T. Phillips explained the idea is not to route all the water to one location and put some sort of retention or detention and treatment to remove potential pollutants in the storm water. When you do that in one concentrated area the soils that remove nitrogen will wash off and get into the surface water. The Alteration of Terrain Permit program says they need to slow up the water coming into the site they want you to treat the water and remove the pollutants. Rather than routing it into a pond where the soils are over worked their proposal disperses it. Water comes off an individual site and will be graded to this landscaped area which is a shallow depression. That shallow depression will have soils with compost and moss, etc that provides carbon and a habitat for microorganizms that help break down fertilizer and metals, etc. The shallow depression is landscaped and meets States standards. It is designed to capture a full 50 year storm.

S. Williams asked if the individual sites will have landscaping separation.

T. Phillips stated that they would have landscaping as pictured on the plans, but not separating sites.

T. Roy opened it up to the public.

Dan Lacroix is not an abutter but has a vested interest in one of the pieces that the right-of-way off Route 28 would serve. He is not speaking on behalf of Maurice and Mildred LaCroix who owned one of those pieces which are a descendant of the Rollins family. He understands that the intent of the deed was for the property owners to gain access to those pieces of property not specifically for his project. He is disappointed that Mr. Carleton didn't approach Mr. Lacroix to discuss this plan ahead of time so they could digest some of the things being presented tonight. He asked where the electrical would be coming from.

T. Phillips stated that it would be most likely come off of Route 28 but they have not discussed it with NH Electric Cooperative yet. It would be underground but they are not sure exactly where.

D. Lacroix asked about the crowned road versus the pitched road.

T. Phillips stated they did not want a crowned road but preferred to pitch the road to one side, keep the water in their site and be able to handle it with a ditch on one side.

D. Lacroix asked about the access road coming off Route 28, the campsite lot and a larger chunk of land for future development. He felt along with the entry road the Planning Board needs to take a closer look at the way that road is built.

T. Roy asked if the access road services any other land than Mr. Carleton's. He feels if it is going to be servicing anything else he will need to build the road to town standards right up front.

K. McWilliams stated that the starting point is that it has to be built to town standards and anything less than that he has to talk to the Selectmen and get waivers.

T. Phillips asked for clarification that if this road is to serve any other lot than those two that they would be required to build the road to town standards to that other abutter's lot.

S. Williams stated that what they are using now it could be satisfactory if approved by the Selectmen. If they wanted to come and develop other parcels the Board may say they want a crowned road with ditches on both sides.

T. Roy asked where the road way is up to the bend how many lots they were exposing to future development.

B. Curtin stated that if that road way goes past anybody but Mr. Carleton it should be brought up to town standards.

T. Roy stated that they needed to hold them to the same standards they hold every other development to.

K. McWilliams stated that this right of way serves three lots one of which is Mr. Carleton's. Mr. Carleton will need to extend a right of way to the other properties off this road that he is building to Town standards.

D. Hussey asked if it was their responsibility to bring this road up to town standards for someone else's subdivision. He did not feel that as a Selectman they would waive the Town standards. In the past they have had to take over roads because of bankruptcy and they are not looking to do that so in the future if they are going to accept the road they are not going to do that.

D. Hussey asked C. Balcius if she concurred with what they said as far as wet lands and pitching the road.

C. Balcius stated that anything they can do to relieve impact on the wetlands will be well accepted.

June Sanborn spoke as an abutter directly across the Merrymeeting River from the campground. She asked if Mr. Carleton or the management of the campground has any experience in managing campgrounds.

T. Phillips stated that Mr. Carleton has never run a campground but has visited several.

J. Sanborn asked about the area for boats.

T. Phillips stated that there is a rack for kayaks and canoes.

J. Sanborn asked if there would be a limit on what kind of boats, just canoes and kayaks.

S. Williams stated that it is controlled by the State because it is a river.

Sandra Esposito spoke as an abutter on Pine Street and stated that her property would be impacted by this project. The town water supply going down Pine Street is proposed to cross her property. She felt that she should have been approached by someone that represents Mr. Carleton before she discovered this by accident on the engineering plans that were drawn. She is very concerned that she does not want her property being disturbed as far as bringing the water lines down and bringing equipment on her property and boring under the river. She wants to make sure that her property stays her property and the Town can't say that they own so much of the road and if they do she wants a survey done. She asked why they are not going in on the Route 28 side.

T. Phillips indicated the water line is going on Pine Street because if they did not they would have to go over the river underneath the bridge or hang an water line off the Route 28 bridge which the DOT did not want. This was a logical place to go from because there was close proximity to existing water. At the head of Pine Street there is a hydrant and the line runs down Pine Street so it would be ideal to connect into it. They would need an easement from her if she would grant them one after they spoke to her. He understood that that was the only way they could get Town water to this area. He also understood that there would be some benefit to the community to get water up there.

S. Esposito asked if he could drill wells instead of using town water.

T. Phillips stated that they could drill wells but they felt it would be easier to use town water.

S. Williams stated that once this boring is done it will look as it does today and that she wouldn't even notice it.

S. Esposito stated that she is worried about during and after.

S. Williams stated that the boring is very minimally invasive.

T. Phillips stated that he was available to listen to concerns and if she had an alternative idea. He thought she had been contacted.

S. Esposito stated she had not been contacted. She had to find out from someone calling her asking if she had seen the plans. She came to the meeting because she got the letter. She asked if anyone had thought about emergency services taking care of a campground this large.

T. Roy assured her that they would get a report from the Assistant Fire Chief regarding these issues.

S. Williams stated that that report was already there and anyone can view it in the Planning Department. He stated he would speak for the Fire Department. Any one of these campers could be put out with one truck load of water from any one of their trucks. Ambulance service is what it is. People are charged for the service. None comes out of tax payer's money except \$1.00.

S. Esposito is not so concerned about the cost but is worried if the tax payer would be rescued in time.

S. Williams stated that they are all tax payers and would be treated equally.

T. Phillips asked what her specific problems are and he would like to address her concerns. He wants to know if she feels if the response time might be too long.

S. Esposito feels that if their services are in the campground, not knowing how big the services are, is there going to be enough services in the town to help other areas of town at the same time.

S. Williams stated that they had approximately 35 men and women on the Fire Department serving 4 fire stations throughout town. Approximately 15-20 of those are medically certified. They have two ambulances. They have four engines with a ladder truck and rescue truck. They also have mutual aid from Barnstead and New Durham.

T. Phillips asked if her concern of this usage rises above that given the land area.

S. Esposito stated that her main concern is that she lives here for the peace and quiet and the rural atmosphere and the natural environment of her property and having a campground across from her parcel is going to be a direct impact on her property and her way of life.

T. Phillips asked if she felt that the activity is over and above what would be expected on property of this size.

S. Esposito answered yes. She asked if they are going to the Zoning Board for a special exception. Is it an exception they would get for hardship?

S. Williams told her that no it was not a variance but a special exception for permitted use which is allowable but only by special exception.

S. Esposito asked if it was a Residential Commercial Zone.

K. McWilliams stated that the campground is in the Rural Zone and the entrance way is in the Residential Commercial Zone. He explained the difference between a Special Exception use and permitted use in zoning. Uses permitted by Special Exception are uses that may be appropriate on certain parcels of land and may not be appropriate on others and that are what the Zoning Board looks at. Is this particular use, the RV Campground, appropriate on that piece of property?

S. Esposito asked about the leach fields if there was a back up plan if they fail.

T. Phillips explained about leach fields and how the RV works with it. They will need to meet State standards. He stated that this site is very well suited to have little or no impact on the river.

S. Esposito asked who would be policing the quiet hours and making sure that the rules are being followed.

T. Phillips stated that the owner would be unless the police needed to be called.

T. Roy stated that would be specifically addressed in the rules and regulations that the Board would require to have and it will be available for review as they submit them with their final site plan application.

D. Hussey explained that this is the first meeting and a lot of these things will be addressed at the meetings coming up. They do not have all the answers yet but will have them as the meeting progress.

S. Esposito asked if she would be notified of the next meeting.

D. Hussey stated that she would be notified of all meetings including the ZBA except for continued meetings.

S. Esposito asked if they need an easement from her when it would be discussed.

B. Curtin stated he assumed it would be very soon.

T. Phillips stated that they needed to show where they could get water from and he apologized that she was not notified.

D. Hussey explained that they needed to show the Board first what would or might happen before they made any notices because they may not have accepted any of the ideas.

S. Esposito let the Board know that the oldest white oak tree is at the end of Pine Street.

Herb Jackson spoke to represent Ben Kane, his son in law and Michael Kane who owns 212 acres on Youngtown Road and he asked him to come. They are for the campground and think it will be good for the community.

T. Roy asked about the right of way. In the Town Highway Policies and Standards there is an Ordinance that says 2500 foot maximum length of a dead-end road unless there is an auxiliary access and that may or may not be satisfied by the access that may be gated. His concern is if they are using all that footage up and may be limiting severely the right of way access to the lot further up under separate ownership.

K. McWilliams stated from his stand point as outlined in his memo they need to address that with the campground. If they measure from Route 28 to back of the loop in the campground it is about 4800 feet.

S. Williams felt that the 2500 feet is measured to the point where there is a loop. Once there is a loop it is not dead ended anymore. He is saying that the measuring point is where the loop starts to divide.

D. Hussey asked if they were going to have the road providing access to the gravel pit be a secondary emergency vehicle access.

S. Williams stated that the Fire Department report requested that they have a gated access locked with a Knox box so they have a second ingress/egress.

D. Hussey stated that if they made that road from one end to the other they would not have a loop.

Jim O'Neil lives on Pine Street. He was concerned with the impact on his neighborhood. He was also concerned about water pressure if they add more lines on the water line. He has experienced water pressure problems at his house.

B. Curtin, who spoke for the Water Department, stated he did not know about the problem and stated that it could be an issue inside the house. He stated that extending the water line it would not change anyone's water pressure.

J. O'Neil asked about the map showing the upper loop showing the water coming in but the septic system is emptying into the same area.

T. Phillips showed where the water line was coming in and stated that there were State standards about separation. The closest point is 100 feet from the leach field.

Vicky Howard, who owns the deli around the corner, spoke and asked why they couldn't do wells instead of town water. She spoke that the businesses needed the campground but sympathized with S. Esposito. She suggested that they make it so Pine Street residences don't see the campground.

T. Phillips showed how they were going to block the view from Pine Street. To have wells dug would be a lot more expensive and a lot more work than town water.

D. Hussey expressed that this is a recreational town and this is a way to support that without adding to the school system but understands that nobody wants it in their back yard.

Mary White asked how many people would be using the river. She is concerned about the trash and was wondering how many boats would be used.

T. Phillips has not calculated that as of yet but does not expect a lot of usage. They will only have canoes and kayaks that people bring on their own. They will not be renting them. The owner wants things to be clean.

Sylvia Leggett is the owner of Roberts Knoll on Route 28. She spoke on behalf of her campground and what they experienced on trying to get her campground in town and how the campground has been since it has been established. They have three pages of park rules and guidelines that people have to follow. If they don't follow their rules they are not permitted to return. Her concern is the access point. She feels that if they are looking to get their 200 feet of frontage which changed in 2004 from 150 to 200, the road needs to be built to town standards for subdivision and not town standards to campground.

S. Williams asked Sylvia to furnish a copy of her rules and regulations. She said she would.

D. Collier spoke of his concerns regarding the access road and the need for a secondary emergency access with the Knox box. His other concern was the underlying aquifer that they could be effecting and the possibility of it being a regional impact because the Merrymeeting extends into New Durham. He felt they need to talk about that as a Board and if the Regional Commission and Town needs notification they need to give them heads up on that.

K. McWilliams stated that it would be if the Planning Board determined it to be a project of potential regional impact. They would need to identify which communities would be impacted and the Regional Planning Commission serving those communities would need to be notified and that would all take place as part of the final site plan review process. What needs to be addressed in the preliminary step is whether the Planning Board determines it is a project of potential regional impact and what communities would be involved.

S. Williams asked what level of scrutiny would the State put on this with its proximity to where it is.

T. Phillips does not feel there will be any impact to New Durham because they are upstream.

T. Roy asked if it was limited to water quality.

K. McWilliams stated that it definitely was not. In the State RSA's it talks about relative size or number of dwelling units compared to existing housing stock proximity to the borders of a neighboring community, transportation networks, anticipating emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors or particles, proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries, shared facilities such as schools or solid waste disposal facilities. Those are the criteria outlined in the State Statutes.

The Board does not feel it is going to affect New Durham.

D. Collier felt the only other thing he had that fell under that category is the transportation network. They are three miles from the town line and it may have an impact on the traffic circle and a traffic study would help that rather than a regional impact.

The Board does not see that there is a regional impact. D. Collier simply wanted to talk about it ahead of time.

T. Roy feels that a traffic study needs to happen.

S. Williams feels that the State will deal with it. All agree.

T. Roy asked if T. Phillips has a copy of the Planners Review and asked if he wanted to address the issues.

Zana Richards asked about the impact where the end of Pine Street and where Barns Ave comes in.

T. Phillips showed on the map where they are.

Z. Richards felt that the boating area would be near the Pine Street and Barns Ave.

T. Phillips showed where the boating access would be and that there would not be much activity.

Z. Richards asked about lighting from the vehicles coming in and suggested more of a berm to hide the car lighting from that area. She also asked if they are bringing in a water line and going out to Route 28 where does the town line end closest to that.

B. Curtin stated at the traffic circle. Riverview is the last property served on the line.

Z. Richards stated that they were 169 acres and the campground covers only 46 acres and asked if they had a vision for expansion of this campground.

T. Phillips stated that he didn't and doesn't believe that the owner does either.

Z. Richard asked where the buffer zone was located relative to where the pads are for the motor vehicles. Would the water line or side walks be located in the buffer zone?

T. Phillips stated that they are not going to cut any trees or do any ground disturbance in that 75 foot buffer zone. He will not rule out that they may put a path down to the water.

T. Roy expressed that he would like to see the whole plan as it is and then phase it.

T. Phillips preferred not to have a time line that is not realistic. He asked what he had to do to phase it.

The Board explained to him how it worked.

T. Phillips is concerned about them being able to change their minds on which area they will be building on in each phase.

T. Roy closed the public part.

K. McWilliams went through the list of issues from the Planner Memo and T. Phillips and the Board responded. Most of the issues had already been addressed. The Board determined sidewalks were not needed.

T. Roy suggested scheduling a site walk. They will set a date at the next meeting for the site walk and notify the public then. This meeting will be continued until May 17th and then they will schedule a site walk.

B. Curtin made a motion to continue the meeting until May 17th at which time a site walk schedule will be determined. S. Williams seconded the motion. All were in favor.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Old Business

K. McWilliams explained that when the Ridgewood Subdivision was approved some of the survey boundary markers were not put in. Mr. Richard Macduff has one of those properties and he is requesting the survey markers be put in.

R. Macduff stated that he is here because he has been trying for four years to get the boundary markers set in place. The town has been trying for over two and a half years. He took a walk out there today and there are still no markers in place. His biggest concern is the back line of lot 15/56. There is a 2200 foot property line and there is only one marker referenced on the plan and that is actually 67 feet out and can't be classified as a property marker. The developer is planning on coming back to rephase the road and he is asking the Board to have them follow up on their prior obligation before they are allowed to continue on with any of their modifications.

T. Roy agrees except he understands that they said he did not need to put the markers near the road.

S. Williams suggested K. McWilliams contact Attorney Sessler and find out what course of action they can take to facilitate this and ask if they can withhold a building permit.

K. McWilliams stated that it should have been done before the plat was signed and recorded. He will talk to Attorney Sessler to see if they can take some of the security to complete the pinning.

B. New Business:

There was none at this time.

C. Approval of Minutes

February 15, 2011 –

W. Curtin made a motion to accept the February 15, 2011 minutes as presented. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with five in favor and none opposed. S. Williams abstained.

March 15, 2011 –

Page 2 – Half way down “T. Roy asked if they have to approve the amended application”; should say accept
Towards the bottom it states that “there is a 365 start time”; should be 365 day start time

Page 6 – Says that “T. Roy closed public input” but no where does it say T. Roy opened public input.
Will listen to the tape again to verify where it was stated that it was opened.
These were postponed to May 17th.

VIII. CONTINUED ANY OTHER BUSINESS

K. McWilliams mentioned to the Board about the OEP Conference on June 11th. The Agenda was in their packets. Contact Randy Sanborn to get registered.

S. Williams mentioned it is time for them to think about redistricting.

D. Hussey mentioned that one of their objectives this year is to look at outdated laws, zoning laws, planning laws, etc.

T. Roy suggested setting up workshops for these issues.

K. McWilliams mentioned that his agenda is that he is starting with the Site Plan Review Regulations. He has completed a draft and has given it to the staff for review and would be bringing that to them to work on. He is now rewriting the Subdivision Regulations which he is part way through. He feels that if they can get these two regulations in order that day to day things will go much smoother. The zoning project is a long term project which could take two to three years to complete.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

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

The public hearing adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy Sanborn
Recorder