

TOWN OF ALTON
ALTON PLANNING BOARD
October 6, 2009
APPROVED 11-09-2009

Members Present: William Curtin, Chair
Timothy Roy
Scott Williams
Thomas Hoopes
David Collier, Alternate

Others Present: Sharon Penney, Town Planner
Randy Sanborn, Planning Secretary
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

William Curtin, Chair, 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

S. Penney made the Board aware of an addition to the agenda. This is a Board review of an outstanding condition for final approval. She asked that this case for Deanna O'Shaughnessy, Case # P09-05, be moved ahead of the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center.

T. Hoopes made a motion to accept the agenda as amended; motion seconded by D. Collier and passed by unanimous vote.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT

W. Curtin opened the floor to case non-specific public input. Hearing none, he closed this session of public input.

V. FINAL APPROVAL

Case # P09-05 Deanna O'Shaughnessy	Map 12, Lot 57-1	Site Plan 118 Old Wolfeboro Road
---------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

Application submitted by Deanna O'Shaughnessy for a proposed Site Plan for a water bottling plant. This parcel is located in the Residential Rural zone.

Tim Morgan introduced himself and stated that he is representing Deanna O'Shaughnessy, who is unable to attend due to medical appointments. He has a letter from her authorizing him to sit in; a notarized copy of the letter has been given to the Town Planner.

As the Board may recall, they had been in previously to outline the plan for a water bottling facility at 118 Old Wolfeboro Road; to put the bottling equipment in the barn. There were a couple of things the Board asked for. The first is that the barn is subject to an historic easement, and there was a contract between Deanna and her sister, and the Selectmen. The Board asked that the contract be revisited and adjusted to reflect the change in the use of the structure. That is done and executed by both Deanna and her sister as owners of the property, and the Board of Selectmen during a meeting with them.

The second item the Board had asked for were Mylar's of the final plan, and he understands they have been submitted to the Town Planner.

D. Collier asked to be recused, as his company is involved. W. Curtin granted recusal.

T. Morgan stated that he thought those two sets of documents – the contract and the Mylar's – were the only things that were needed. He offered to address any questions the Board might have.

W. Curtin asked if those were the only things needed.

S. Penney said that was right, and that, traditionally, Tim or Deanna would bring in the Mylar's before sign-off and they would give it a once over to cross all the T's and dot the I's. They have the notes of decision before them, and the reason Mr. Morgan is here tonight is to show the tax assessment change on the preservation easement, and that has been accomplished. This is just pro forma, so it is pretty straight forward.

W. Curtin recalled that with the preservation easement, they thought it was interpreted one way, then the State got involved and it was interpreted a different way.

T. Morgan answered that representatives of the State and one of the Selectmen came to visit with them and with the Town tax assessor, and also with the Town Manager. They all finally came to an agreement as to what the statute really says, and the contract reflects that decision.

W. Curtin stated that he did not have a problem with it.

T. Hoopes made a motion that the Board have a final approval on Case # P09-05. Motion seconded by T. Roy and passed with four votes in favor and none against.

D. Collier rejoined the Board.

VI. CONCEPTUAL

Case # P09-21 Alton Bay Christian Conference Center	Map 34, Lot 33	Site Plan Conceptual Mount Major Highway
---	----------------	---

Request submitted by Jeff Green of J. L. Green Enterprises on behalf of the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center for a Conceptual of Site Plan for the rebuild of the site. This is located in the Residential zone.

S. Penney stated for the record that she and Mr. Green, the surveyor, have met informally to get the process rolling and facilitate conversation. She knew that way back some of the department heads met after the fire, very preliminarily, just to glean some information. They are here tonight for a conceptual, and hopefully it is the beginning of a really good, in-depth conversation to do a good rebuild on this project.

Jeff Green and Melissa Gulbrandsen came to the table. Information packets/plans were given to the Board members.

Jeff Green introduced himself as a licensed land surveyor working on the project. He also introduced Melissa Gulbrandsen from the Alton Law Office. Behind them, seated in the public area, were several of the architects and engineers, as well as members of Alton Bay Christian Conference Center.

They are here tonight to put a conceptual plan in front of the Board and get some ideas of what the Board is thinking, as well as to let the Board know what they are thinking.

Mr. Green pointed out the overall property using the boundary plan prior to the burned units; this gave an overall idea of where the whole property is and showed that the most congested area is now vacant. They are looking at trying to recreate/replace the forty-two units that were destroyed. In doing so, they are trying to figure how to meet all the regulations that are going to be put before them regarding setbacks, fire, the roads, etc. They lost infrastructure; sewer, water, everything is gone. They are looking at this as coming in as a new project replacing what was there, but at the same time it is a replacement project.

The conceptual plan includes:

- Seventeen single units in the burn area
- Four two-unit duplexes, also in the burn area
- Upgrade for the road system
- New entrance to make it easier to get in and out off Rand Hill Road
- Converting roads to one-way traffic from Beacon to Circle so that it alleviates some congestion.

Before, people would come in and leave and park someplace else. They are going to encompass some parking in there so some of the units will have a place to park

The whole concept will replace 43 units; in this area there would be seventeen singles and eight in duplexes.

The second part of the development, because they can't fit all of them into this area and still meet 20' setbacks, fire requirements, roads, and other things they want to do they are looking at developing an area off of Winni Avenue. This area is right behind that little clam shack restaurant on Route 11, where the basketball court is. This would entail an eighteen unit building plus a gymnasium and auditorium. It is broken down so there are upper level and lower level units; nine on each side. In doing this they will be adding and correcting some of the parking issues that were over here so each unit would have a place to park. It would take the congestion from this area and spread it out a little bit more.

All the development would have underground utilities to get rid of some of that mess from the wires. Same thing with the leech field areas; most of the pipes are gone so they are looking at that. They are looking at all the areas where the leech field areas are currently and they are going to expand on that using some of it and putting in some new areas within this that would take care of some of the new units, and possibly tying some of the old units into a closer place so they wouldn't be spread out as much. Most of the facilities would be upgraded to be used year round; whether they do or not is beside the point. The water would be underground instead of on top of the ground, the sewer will be underground, and so a lot of that will be upgraded to the new standards.

M. Guldbrandsen invited feedback from the Board, based on the conceptual. There is a deadline tomorrow for the next Zoning Board meeting and they understand that the next step would be to go before the Zoning Board. Any comments or thoughts would be appreciated.

W. Curtin asked if they would have to ask the Zoning Board for the multi-units.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that her take was that they are in the residential zone, which does not permit multi-family at all, so they would need a variance even to do the duplexes. Then, what is in front of them is showing nine units per building, which is over the five. She is thinking they need two variances. Again, they really want to hear from this Board before they take the next step; the overall goal is to replace the total number of units. From an engineering perspective, they really had to roll up their sleeves and say "How do we get forty-three units back in here?" Of course, that forty-three translates to forty-three homeowners who are saying they each want to rebuild their homes. They are trying to do this with a comprehensive plan that makes sense for everybody. To meet the setback requirements and make the roads more passable, they can only get the seventeen single family plus the duplexes on the hillside. What they are proposing is to do this nine-unit condominium on either side of the community gymnasium. That is another topic. They would need to have at least a sense from the Planning Board that putting condominium units in there is something they would at least be receptive to. Obviously, it is going to be up to the Zoning Board whether they are going to permit that kind of density.

W. Curtin mentioned a previous case where there is a single large parcel and they want to have eleven five-unit buildings. The way the zoning ordinance is, you can only have one multi-family building.

M. Gulbrandsen answered that the difference with this is that it is a pre-existing, non-conforming use. The zoning ordinance allows you to continue, as long as it's not a change of use. They can continue the pre-existing non-conforming use, so that's the take they have on that.

W. Curtin stated that he just wanted to get that on the table. M. Gulbrandsen said she had the same question. W. Curtin continued, saying that people watching this are going to be asking why this guy can do it this way and that guy couldn't? M. Gulbrandsen reiterated that the distinction is that this is a pre-existing, non-conforming use and it's grandfathered.

T. Roy asked about parking; they are only showing one space per unit. M. Gulbrandsen said she had counted the parking while Jeff was speaking and came up with fifty-four; she deferred to J. Green to answer. Jeff stated that this is conceptual, so they haven't done an actual number per unit type thing. What he had done, for the seventeen units and the duplexes, was to put in one space per building. Over at the other area he had taken some general area that is being used for parking and squared it off and made it look like real parking versus the gravel park anyplace type of thing. They haven't done actual numbers; they haven't done anything to try to figure out exactly how many.

T. Roy stated that the zoning is two per unit; they might want to address that with the ZBA as well. J. Green explained that what they were looking at, there was no parking before, so they are adding one parking per unit that wasn't there before. W. Curtin pointed out that they are all going to be year-round properties. J. Green answered that there is a potential for year-round so that's why they are looking for the Board to look at them. They want to do the minimum; they want to do it right, but they also want to keep it down. They don't want to put great big parking areas in because before, it was a walk-in community. They're still trying to keep that type of thing, so it may be that they have to go to another section and put in general parking, which is kind of what this is showing, and still keeping it so that only one car parks at each unit so they don't overcrowd that area again. If need be they can create or show parking areas.

W. Curtin asked if this was going to be phased, or would it be forty-three units right off the get go. J. Green stated that they want to get approval for forty-three units because they want to go in as one thing with forty-three units, and that's what they are looking for approval on. The building part of it is probably going to be phased.

M. Gulbrandsen explained that the catch-22 they are in is that the applicant is an association on behalf of the members of the association, including the forty-three people who want to rebuild. Even though physically the development is going to happen in a phased manner, they couldn't go forward with only Phase 1 being approved without knowing that the whole project is approved. They have the obligation back to the whole association to have forty-three units. W. Curtin asked if the conference center was going to build everything; it would not be left up to the people.

M. Guldbrandsen said that was right, and to her that was a big benefit to the town and from a planning perspective. What's being proposed is a really cute cottage community with a green space in the middle. The builder is here; one builder will have the exclusive right to build the entire development, so it will have a cohesive development and it will fit into the existing cottage look of that neighborhood.

S. Williams stated that this had been seasonal use before and he thinks the potential for year-round use would pose a set of problems to the school system and things of that nature. They are expanding their non-conforming use to year-round usability. Then you need to worry about snow storage and things of that nature in that still relatively congested circle area/ triangle. He asked if the units would be two story or single story. J. Green stated they would be two and three story units with walk-out basements on some of them, depending on where they are located on the property.

S. Williams also mentioned the area coming off Circle Road and asked if they would be modifying the access on Circle Drive because the beavertail on the backs of the fire trucks will drag and hang up. At present, they can't get all of their equipment up in there.

J. Green answered that Circle Road is going to be very difficult to upgrade because it is right next to the cottages that exist already. It's going to make it a little tough, but it's something they can look at. That's part of why they were looking at putting a two-way entrance off of Rand Hill. S. Williams stated that his concern is that, if they need to come in either from Circle Drive or the new entrance across from Sample's house, they cannot turn right and then turn left to come around that triangle. They cannot negotiate that corner with equipment. Another thing he sees is the Sylvester property; he sees a line drawn through the building now for access to that property. He thinks they could modify Circle Drive if they brought the road more toward the west. That way they could do a proper ramp into the property and achieve that access.

J. Green said they could look at that; it was one of the things they were trying not to get into recreating that down there with the existing cottages. They were just going to take it from there and widen it so that it would become a through road versus right now it dead ends. S. Williams said it could not be a through road in the way it is constructed because of the beavertail on the backs of the fire trucks and it hangs down low. As they come up, they have had the trucks hang up before.

T. Hoopes is questioning density. The density here is something that supersedes anything within the town. Trying to get back all forty-three units seems a bit high to him. He will leave it at that; his next question is back to ownership. The land is owned by the campground and previously individuals owned their own house on the campground, and yet they were bypassing the campground and going to the building inspector to get permits to put in foundations and other things. That happened in about fifteen different cases he knows of, and they kicked a bunch of them back from the Conservation Commission back to the Conference Center so they knew what was happening. In some cases a lot of people didn't know where the ownership was. The point he wants to make is that they are going to be built by the campground, but are they going to be owned by the campground.

J. Green said no, it's going to be the same as it was before. Each individual unit is going to be owned by the individual who pays to have it put there. The campground still owns the land.

W. Curtin recalled a comment made by Mr. Smith that anybody that is going to do anything at the campground is going to have to get approval from the campground. J. Green thinks it might have gotten out of control at one point, but it is definitely back under control now.

T. Hoopes asked, in regard to the nine-unit buildings, if they had considered having one as a motel instead of as condos. J. Green did not think that had been discussed because they are trying to make each unit available to people the same as it was before. They've got a motel right across the street from that multi-unit building, so they've already got that on their property. T. Hoopes said that one of the things applied for before (Building 19), was to have a duplex there as there was a need for a place for visiting pastors so he would think this is a shot where you cash in your chips and they are getting something different.

J. Green said that would have to be discussed because they are dealing with building committees, the campground committees, engineers, surveyors, architects – they're trying to get everybody's ideas, plus homeowners are involved in this too. They're trying to put everything together, and now they are looking to the Board for their opinions. At this point everything has already gone through from the homeowners and the building committees. He thought this was the eighth concept they have come up with, and the one that finally everybody started to agree on. This is what they are trying to bring forward to the Board. When you look at Building 19, they were looking at that at one time; they were taking down one unit and replacing one that burned forty years ago. They were trying to sneak a duplex in there. It didn't work, but the idea was not to just stick somebody in a hotel room, but to have a place where, if it was a guest pastor or something he could have more space to be able to have meetings and things like that. That was the idea of that building; it was not just to bring nineteen people up and stick them in hotel rooms. They've got forty-three units that burned that were individually owned that they are hoping to replace with individual ownership again.

T. Hoopes mentioned that years back, either in the building codes or somewhere else, they had a situation where if something burned to 50% you could rebuild. If it went to 75%, you had to start over again with the new regulations. He doesn't know where this is; he needs to talk to Brian Boyers to find out where that came from. Originally it started with what happened down at Bayview during the Mohamed Kushru and John Downing's Design. It got to a point where if you wanted to tear something down you had to leave one wall up; it was sort of hokey. He doesn't know where this information is and it was information the ZBA used to use when somebody was replacing something that was destroyed. He knows the information is out there someplace; he has been looking and he can't find it. The concept is that when you lose forty-three units that are tightly packed in here, should you put forty-three back? From a financial point of view, it makes sense from their point, but from the Board's point of view of dealing with zoning in Alton, they're trying to make things less non-conforming. He would want to see something that is under forty-three units, but he is one person.

W. Curtin asked, out of the forty-three units lost and the forty-three homeowners, do all forty-three of those homeowners want to come back in there? Rumors are that some of them don't.

J. Green answered that he is sure not all of them are going to. Right now a lot of it has to do with looking at what is going back in there, what the cost is of going back in there. It's going to change daily depending on what happens through the whole process as to how many are actually going to finally be there. A lot of them had a type of view from before, and they may not have that now because they are moving buildings away from where they were tightly packed before. Now they are spreading out so they are losing some of those areas. A lot of them were talking about wanting to build exactly where the other one was. That isn't going to happen; there are going to be maybe six, eight, or ten that might be potentially pretty close to that, out of forty-three that isn't very many. The talks are going on about where their location is, what kind of cost is going to be involved to put it back, and whether they want to. At this point not all forty-three are in cahoots to go forward, but there are quite a few still interested.

T. Hoopes asked if they would be re-grading. He parked and walked up the hill; it would seem that this is a great opportunity to get rid of some of that slope. J. Green said that is exactly what the engineers are going to be looking at. From the concept idea they have in front of them, he took into consideration, because he has gone out since the fire and topo'd that, so he is using some existing grades. Not all of this is based on what is there, but what they think they can do with it. There is definitely going to be some re-grading and redesigning; the whole idea is to try not to lose the view, but to set things down level it out a little bit. Make sure there are plenty of walks to get from the lower to the upper decks. There is going to be a lot involved in the plans as they go forward.

W. Curtin said he would like to see a drawing of what the actual building is going to look like; are they all going to be the same?

J. Green answered that there are at least six buildings; there are going to be some choices and people are going to be able to design them a little bit on their own. There are going to be several different buildings that can be an option to be built.

W. Curtin asked if they were going to pre-sell them. J. Green said that is what is going to have to happen because the forty-three people want what they had before. They don't want cookie cutter buildings put in there. The whole concept of what they are doing is to work with the owners and the campground; the campground has the land and the owners will come in and look at what is going to be built. They are going to purchase their site, so to speak; at that point the building will be designed around the specifications that are being put forward by the campground. T. Hoopes clarified that they would be able to choose among the models; J. Green confirmed this.

M. Guldbrandsen passed around the preliminary draft for the different cottages; even the sizes are not what they will end up to be; some of these footprints are larger than what they have space for. This is just to provide an image of the idea.

T. Hoopes stated that he is not even going to argue the fact that it is going to come, but dealing with large buildings like the gymnasium and the multi-units, he is hoping they had a New England style structure in mind. J. Green answered that is part of the whole idea; the way it is being proposed and presented is that they are trying to use what was there and try to encompass

as much of that as possible into what they are going to do. Cottage style buildings; the multi-unit and the gymnasium buildings are also looking at that same type of concept, and at the same time trying to move forward a little bit with it. They are trying to make everything better, but at the same time taking some of the old and bringing it forward.

W. Curtin asked about the multi-family ones. He thought the two family one's would probably look similar, but what about the nine unit? J. Green does not have a drawing of that; they've had some going around, but that is still in a preliminary stage, but the idea is to have some open porches, enclosed porches, decks, and that type of thing on the building overlooking the lake. They're going to be basically the same idea as what they see on the duplex. Going forward the Board will see a lot more of that; a lot of it has to do with what they hear tonight as to going forward.

T. Hoopes asked about the concept of the condos. Would they be year-round permanent ownership, or would they be revolving? It would seem likely that someone would want to rent at some point for a month or two to see if this is where they want to be. M. Guldbrandsen answered that the conference center has tenancy rules and regulations, so not everybody can just go there; it's limited. There is an approval process for going there. Any time anyone even wants to rent out their individual cottage the conference center basically takes control of that and selects the tenants. The concept of the condo is that people want to own their unit, which isn't to say that they might rent it to a friend for a month, but all the rental happens through the conference center, and it's all regulated.

T. Hoopes explained that his concern was uncontrolled, just anybody coming in, but as long as it is controlled, that's fine.

W. Curtin invited Assistant Chief Consentino to come up with input.

D. Collier pointed out that on the design, they are all pretty much standard boxes. While looking through the plans for cottages, he noticed that porches and decks are on there as well. One of the things they had talked about originally was a twenty foot separation; will that take into account? It is something to consider during the design process. J. Green answered that for him to put the plan together they took a certain square footage, and that is what the boxes represent. Within that will be the unit; it can vary in size, depending on what unit is picked, but it will not be any bigger than that box. All the porches and decks will be inside the line and meet the setback requirements that they were looking at. That is why they look kind of boxy now, but it's because they don't know if building #1 is going to be unit one or unit six or whatever. Even if they get that, they may want an open porch, or a deck, or something like that. They have to leave that a little bit open in order to work with the people who are going to own the unit. The campground chose somebody to come in and oversee that, and make sure they are the design builders. They are going to make sure all the units are being done to be all the same, instead of having everybody come in and do their own unit. The boxes are, at this point, showing that they can put this many units in of this size, with 20' setbacks, and with 18' wide roads, and that is what they are trying to show.

Assistant Chief Consentino asked about the different cottages and confirmed that there would be no decks or porches in the setbacks; J. Green answered that if the Planning Board doesn't allow that, then no. Chief Consentino explained that 20' is not a lot for fire exposure, but there are ways to minimize the exposure problems. He went on to ask about the roof overhangs; would those also be within the 20 feet? J. Green answered that it was not considered. They were looking at the floor plans, the size of the buildings, decks and porches, but he does not believe he took overhangs into consideration. He does know that the campground has set up rules that they want to also follow as far as the type of siding between them, and things like that for fireproofing. He doesn't know if the regulations stated that an overhang cannot be within the setback, so he doesn't remember. Assistant Chief Consentino said he would have to do some research, and Brian would have to do some.

The assistant chief asked about the two bigger units and the gymnasium; he imagines they would have the two nine-unit buildings and the gymnasium sprinkled. His concern there is whether the current water system is going to be able to support the required flows as it is set now. M. Gulbrandsen pointed out that it is on town water; the assistant chief agreed, but stated that it is very inadequate in that area at this point. J. Green said that was something they are definitely going to have to look at and they will take a look at what the water mains are and hopefully make it work.

Assistant Chief Consentino reiterated S. Williams' concern about Circle drive and stated that the concern there is going to be that the radius of the island is not going to be able to be turned by the trucks. He asked if they were going to be subject to the driveway ordinance on this stuff; on the driveway ordinance the radii have to be no smaller than 45 feet. That is a concern.

J. Green answered that, to be honest, this is a concept done by a land surveyor, and what hasn't been done is to have it picked apart by the engineers. He is trying to make a pretty picture, and trying the best he can in a short manner what they think would work there. Most definitely, if that radius can be changed fairly easily, and they know they can meet it with whatever the fire department needs to make that corner. This looks nice; they are trying to maximize the gazebo area and they want to keep the center looking pretty. One of the ideas he came up with was to also have walkways with the 18 foot roads. What they are trying to do is 18 feet wide of pavement, with a three foot walkway on either side. That leaves one width of travel lane, but there won't be any curbing or anything, so if the fire trucks do come through there, they have 18 feet of pavement to work within. The walkways would be painted; it would allow people, if they did pull over to unload, they can still get by.

Down on the other side, there are 22 feet of pavement, three feet on either side for walkways. It would still be encompassing plenty, but they don't want to put a lot of curbing in. That way they could utilize more area for fire and still allow them to get their units and driveways in. S. Williams pointed out that there may be people who just think of it as a great parking spot. J. Green is thinking they are going to paint it with a red-brick paint or something so that it becomes a walkway and that people will use that. The campground will hopefully make sure. They are trying to create a walk-in community but at the same time without getting super wide; they want to keep the tight-knit community as much as possible, at the same time meeting the needs of the fire and police and anybody else who has a concern. W. Curtin asked if, while they are painting

them red, why don't they make them all fire lanes? J. Green said that was possible as long as people could walk in fire lanes. They are trying to keep it a close-knit community area and they don't want to put "fire lane" there.

S. Williams pointed out that this piece of property gives the Fire Department night sweats; they don't want to have this performance happen again. J. Green understood; he has spent the whole summer locating all those units. When he was surveying, he lost two units and then found them behind others. He understands where they are coming from, and that is why they are trying to do something a little bit different.

Assistant Chief Consentino asked about Glen Ave.; he doesn't see it in the plan. J. Green said that Glen Ave. is still there and it hasn't changed. It is not on the map because there is nothing really definitive; it is gravel and grass. It's there but it isn't there. That particular area really didn't get disturbed, so they haven't any plans to do anything different with that. What was there will still be there; he didn't show it because it isn't really definitive down there what exactly it is.

The assistant chief talked about window placement being determined by the fire load; he thinks it is either 20 or 25% of the exposed area. He suggested that they might want to consult the fire marshal on some of this work.

W. Curtin asked if there was going to be street lighting. Before they had the trees up there that would block a lot of the different cottages, but now you can see everything. J. Green asked if the concern is that they would like to have them, or not like to have them. T. Hoopes explained that, if they are going to have them, they need to make sure it doesn't shine off the property and so it doesn't affect other people. J. Green explained that at this point they haven't discussed putting any in, and he knows that is one of the things that will be discussed. He doesn't know if a lot of people are going to want those; they didn't have them before. Then again, it might be worth putting a couple of them in. T. Hoopes said that today with LED's, you can do anything.

Referring again to Building #19, T. Hoopes questioned how that would affect people behind or uphill from a two story building. If somebody has had a long term view that is going to be impinged, they need to take that into account to some degree. S. Williams mentioned a couple of homes going up Rand Hill Road; the Desrochers and the Fannins. J. Green explained that a lot of the units were already two story buildings and what they are doing is bringing the grade of the area down some. Even if they do put them up, the majority of the buildings are going to be lower than what they were. T. Hoopes asked that they keep that in the back of their minds.

W. Curtin spoke about the stone wall at the end of Beacon Avenue. He thinks that should be eliminated to make it easier for any apparatus to get in there. T. Hoopes commented that it slows people down. S. Williams said that had been put in within the last ten years; when Russ Sample was chief, he was very much against that being there because it does hamper access. He asked if they could come into the ball field a little bit to achieve a bit more of a travelled way between units 44 and 30. People park close there, and he is worried about something like 4th of July if something is going on in there, it will be really tight for an ambulance or anything.

J. Green pointed out that on the side with 30 and 36, he has added a sidewalk and three more feet of pavement. On the other side it is a little bit tighter, and he doesn't know if they can do anything. S. Williams said that if they wanted to go a little diagonally at the ball field, they could squeeze out a few more feet. J. Green pointed out that there is also a utility pole on that side; when they looked at that before they were trying not to get too close to that. When they did Building #19, they were supposed to have widened Beacon Ave. a little bit in front of that. The utility pole goes in five different directions, so it would be a lot to relocate it. They can try to get closer to it. S. Williams spoke about the Laconia Company; they came in Beacon Avenue and that was one of the stances they took. They did have a hard time navigating through this area. He understands it is to keep joy riders from going up through there to Rand Hill Road, but it doesn't work well with that triangle there.

Assistant Chief Consentino confirmed that the utilities were going to be underground and asked whether propane was going to be the fuel for these buildings and where they are going to locate the tanks. S. Williams stated that he would like to see them not use propane in there; he thinks it is possible the way things are these days. Everyone who was there has a new respect for propane. J. Green felt that a lot of that had to do with the little individual tanks hooked to the back of the buildings. S. Williams asked if they could do something buried; J. Green said that they had talked about burying them also because it looks better. He hasn't seen any concepts that have the two tanks hooked to the side of the building. S. Williams said some of the fuel companies will do a large underground tank system and run underground and meter every building. J. Green said they have talked and that is one of the things that will be discussed when it comes time for the heating is what they will do. They are looking at more community, so there is a very good possibility of that.

Joe Spain spoke from the audience. They do intend to put a tank farm in; they will strategically place a number of tank farms to service the buildings. He said they are looking at propane because it is a cleaner burning fuel. He also commented on the cottages; they are all going to be aesthetically pleasing to the eye. They want to mimic the 1920's and 1930's motif. There will be nice farmer porch posts and gingerbread to give it a nice appeal. That same theme will be brought forward to the larger buildings. A lot of emphasis is being placed on the aesthetics.

D. Collier voiced a quick idea about the Circle Road access. He has seen that road and how steep it is going up to the existing buildings. An idea to look at as far as the engineering is to possibly move that road just a little so they can terrace it if they have to. Otherwise, they are going to end up digging out that road to keep the truck from hanging. S. Williams mentioned that they could also ramp it; he said that getting their equipment up in there is a major stumbling point for the fire department. You can't get there any other way but Circle Drive for some of the accesses. D. Collier mentioned they could slide it just a little to the west to give it more room for the existing buildings. It would tighten things up some on that west side. J. Green said that is one of the issues they are looking at; are they going to lose three units doing that. His mission was to come up with forty-three units to replace forty-three units. If he goes back and says he can only do forty, then he is not doing what he is supposed to be doing. As much as he would like to say he will fix Circle Drive and they can keep four of the units, he can't do that. What he can say is that he will do everything he can to fix Circle Drive, but he still wants his forty-three units.

W. Curtin asked about eliminating #10 and #11, and doubling up on #12 and #13, putting two more two families in. J. Green said that is a potential, it's all a matter of going through the committees and the process and getting them to go along with that. If that is the only way they can do it, then they go backwards and they do that. S. Williams asked if they had given any consideration as with the nine unit buildings (voiced approval of the 1930's motif with the gingerbread) to sistering some of the other units together down in the overlook area. J. Green clarified that he is referring to where units #1 – 9 are shown; they definitely will not be doing that. The people who definitely want to replace are looking for single units with front row seats. He doesn't get any advantage by making those double units; he actually loses. For every double, he loses one in between to keep the setbacks because of the unit sizes. He doesn't gain anything. He has concepts showing all multi-units, and it is very hard.

S. Williams asked if they would consider putting residential sprinklers in all the units; J. Green said that is on the table. S. Williams said that given the close proximity, they would feel better about having sprinklers in them. W. Curtin mentioned that the code is going to be changing to require them; S. Williams said that is not cast in stone yet. W. Curtin said they could make that a requirement because it is a fact of safety. J. Green said he had spoken to the fire department a month or two ago when they were first starting the process and one of the things was the siding between them, and because they know the 20 feet is still pretty close, sprinklers are on the table if necessary. Chances are it is probably going to be a necessity.

T. Hoopes asked where they are planning to add extra septic. He is somewhat familiar with where septic are and the turntable and other things. Are they going to be under parking lots? J. Green said he is working with a septic designer and engineers, but there is no guarantee right now that he is even have to put in new systems. Chances are they are going to have to. The units were there before, and the State had approved systems there before, so they are looking at what is there, and what units are there and how many bedrooms. The Board looks at units and the State looks at bedrooms. They have figured out that where the gazebo area is would be a prime location because of the types of soils; they are pretty sure they can keep it in the ground. They have the whole ball field; they might be able to keep it in one end. Where the new two-way entrance is by units 21 – 25, there is an area behind them that might be able to be used. Depending on what is going on down where Glen Avenue is, with some units down at the lower side, there is also an area there without disturbing the Glen Avenue area but where the old houses were. The advantage they have is that the soil type is conducive to what they are doing.

If they can do a lot there, where the parking is for the multi units is where some of the newer ones are anyway so they may be able to expand on those or because they are taking some away they might be able to utilize those better. S. Williams confirmed that he is talking about the pits that were put in twenty-five years ago.

T. Hoopes said that if they are going from seasonal to year-round, there might be more need. J. Green said there might be, but the State doesn't do that. The State looks at year-round, regardless. That's why he is saying they are looking into it and making sure that there wasn't a clause twenty-five years ago that allowed it to be considered seasonal. T. Hoopes pointed out that the holding systems get a chance to recuperate over the winter in seasonal. When you are

using something year round, there will be a different impact. J. Green explained that any of the ones that were approved by the State would have been approved for year-round use. Even though it gets a chance to recoup, it shouldn't have had to, according to State regulations.

S. Williams asked if the big pit on Winni Drive was still there and in operation; J. Green answered that it is. The turntable is still there and there is a pit; S. Williams said the reason they discontinued the road is because something was in it and a car went over it and it didn't look good. J. Green said they have several areas they hope to utilize, not so much for the use, but because of the infrastructure and getting from one location to another. It is probably going to be cheaper to put a small system in behind these units and gravity feed it than to bring everything together and pump it. They are looking at different areas that will take smaller ones and work within that.

W. Curtin opened discussion to the public.

Mr. Richard Smith, Director of the campground, came forward and stated that even though they have talked about year-round, a lot of the cottage owners have places in Florida and don't intend to be here for the winter. He doesn't think they will see a huge expansion to the year-round residency. S. Williams asked if they would be willing to restrict year-round residency so it would carry with the property no matter which owner there was. Mr. Smith answered that they were not intending to do restriction at this point.

W. Curtin invited further public input. Hearing none, he closed public input.

T. Hoopes voiced a concern about the density; this is something they are going to have to address. He is going to check with Brian Boyers and with whatever other regs that are out there; when you have something that is non-conforming and you lose a lot of the units, how much can go back in. He doesn't know, but it seems hard to anticipate that you can put back everything that was there because nobody else can do the same thing.

J. Green said he had looked at that himself; he has looked at regulations and tried to figure some of that out because he know that question was going to come up. He's not sure how to address it other than the fact that, if you own a property with a house on it and it burns, can you replace it with what's there? If you own a unit and it burns to the ground, you can replace it. They have forty-three people that individually owned units. How can you tell six of them that they can't rebuild, without telling all of them they can't rebuild? S. Williams thinks that the tipping point on this is the type of ownership of the land. They do not own the land, and that's where the stumbling point would lie. He would defer that to Town Counsel for clarification.

T. Hoopes asked how many units were burned the last time, down by the water, and how many were put back. After clarifying the location, S. Williams stated that four were burned and four went back in. One of the audience members verified that and went on to say that he and Mr. Smith had met with Brian and the Town Attorney and they were of the mode that if they lost forty-three, they can put them back, even if it had to be multiples.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that she did a search for the word fire in the zoning ordinance because she knows there is a state statute that addresses it from the perspective of if you are in a waterfront zone, which this technically is not. There is a section in the ordinance at page 33 dealing with impact fees, and it talks about and defines new development. It says “new development shall not include the replacement of an existing...or the reconstruction of a structure that has been destroyed by fire or natural disaster where there is no change in size, density, or type of use that would increase the demand on capital facilities.” That is dealing with impact fees, but she thinks it is at least relevant to the analysis.

S. Williams pointed out that there would be an impact on the school, which is a capital facility. If those go year-round, there would be an impact on the school, which is a capital facility. M. Guldbrandsen referred back to what Mr. Smith had said concerning the people who are living there, but she does understand that if there is no deed restriction, what happens typically is somewhat irrelevant. The expectation is not that this is going to turn into a different type of use than what it has been in the past, which is seasonal. Some of those structures are year-round now, and have been. The town shuts off water to most of them, but some stay hooked up and some are year-round. W. Curtin said that they have to look at ten and twenty years down the road and what is in there now. S. Williams pointed out that it could go gangbusters in there and they could end up with 100 kids in there attending the schools. He would hope that they would look at some kind of regulation in house that would be recorded that would address that issue.

Mr. Smith spoke from the audience, saying that if people are going to be there year-round, they are assessed a higher fee, and that keeps some of it down already. S. Williams said that when these are built, they are going to set value, and that is how they are going to be taxed.

W. Curtin wishes it could be pinned down a little better, but he thinks that the way they have it laid out on paper looks pretty good. T. Hoopes agreed, then went on to say that on the other hand they are also involved with precedent. Anybody who comes to them who is grandfathered wants to maintain something is going to say, “You let them do it!” The Board does have to look at this from a long term point of view. He is not trying to be punitive in any way; they just have to look at it from that perspective as well.

J. Green said they understand that 100%, but when the Board is looking at that, they have to look at what is here, what it does for the town now; tax base, tourism, and a lot of things. When they are saying “setting a precedent,” they have to look at what else in town looks like this. It doesn’t pertain to everything; they’re not asking for anything special. They are asking to be allowed to replace what was damaged for individuals who had a loss. They are also trying to look at making it better than it was; everything they are doing. When he looks at precedent, he is hoping will be better than what it was before, which is setting a precedent for what everyone else will have to follow. That’s what they are trying to do. They are looking at what was there and they are trying to work with the Board to set a precedent that says in a case like this, let’s make it better, not just I want to put forty-three units exactly like they were before. They are looking at how they can make everything better.

S. Williams brought the discussion back to the gymnasium and auditorium. How many seats? What are they proposing? Do they have enough parking for it?

M. Guldbrandsen answered that it is really very conceptual, at this point. It's an idea. She and Jeff were talking before the meeting about the fact that that, in and of itself, would require some Zoning Board approval even before they came back to the Planning Board. They are not in a position to seek that right now; their focus right now is the number of units. In terms of what they would be asking the Board to approve for a site plan, it's either going to have to come off of the site plan, or they're going to have to have a zoning approval for that specific use.

S. Williams said that he know the Alton Bay Improvement Committee has some plans for a parking lot on the west side of Route 11. He doesn't know if they would want to incorporate that additional parking so it would all flow together.

J. Green explained that what they are looking at here is creating a place for general assembly and basketball inside, and so they can have their conferences inside, no matter what the weather is. Whether it is summer, fall, or winter, it gives them more usability for what they are doing. They can have a grouping area; at the same time it's going to bring it into the community. It's almost a gate to the community, and one of the things that was discussed was having it usable by the community also. That is nothing that is set in stone, but it is something they have talked about. In doing that, one of the problems they had was with parking. If they are saying there is already talk about parking, what they were looking at is that it is a perfect place for parking, especially if it has lower doors and upper doors, to possibly open it to the community. If there is going to be parking there and that building is going to be out overlooking, then they are looking at what that can be used for. They don't know yet, but it is something they want to look at for the future. If everything else happens and there is a potential for that to happen; if nothing else happens, that isn't going to happen.

S. Williams stated that he would like to see them come back with a site plan that encompasses everything they plan on doing. As he had told Mr. Smith before, it is a tragedy that happened there, but it could be the best thing in the world that happened for them. It would behoove all of them if they planned the whole plan together, and moved it through. Whether they phase it or not is certainly up to them, but he would like to see the whole thing on the table, and let's make sure it is right.

J. Green said that is what they are looking for; that is what they are trying to do. They definitely want to go forward. He has people behind him that have people behind them who want it approved next month. They definitely want to bring it all forward; the Board is going to see everything at once because their mission is to get this approved. This is what the building committee wants. There are still some questions left in there, but they are all being answered. One of the areas, though, is how much do they open up? Do they want the community in, or do they keep it close-knit, or do they want to address involving people in it? There is that potential, and that is why that area is over here (referring to the plan) and what they are planning to do there.

S. Williams said that his biggest concern is life safety. He has explained those, and the Assistant Chief has as well. He thinks they can work with the rest of it.

S. Penney is hoping that they will have this very open and honest conversation, and perhaps the next step, when the parties are ready, would be design review. She would like to proceed through the building blocks on this.

S. Williams suggested they could get Mr. Bailey involved if they are thinking about any parking down in the lower side; they could get some dialogue going on what the town could do to work in conjunction with them to get something that is going to satisfy the whole area.

T. Hoopes asked S. Williams if there is a current Alton Bay Improvement Committee. S. Williams answered that there is not that he is aware of.

M. Guldbrandsen said that the point to the parking is to put it on the town land. S. Williams explained that the Alton Bay Improvement Committee was only figuring on what the town portion of the land was; he thinks there is enough land down there that they could put some more spaces down there. If they engineer something together, they're not banging heads all the time. J. Green said that one of their concerns had been, if they did put parking down there, where would the entrance be. They would be going across town land anyway. They had been hoping to be able to work with the town on something like that. That's exactly what they are looking for; what can they do?

W. Curtin stated that, not being a member of the Board of Selectmen, but he thinks they would be receptive to it. T. Hoopes said that working with is always a lot better. J. Green answered that is what they want to do; that's why they are here. T. Hoopes replied that that is the beauty of the conceptual idea and then the design review; there is nothing binding, and then you can work out different things. You get to see where the concerns are.

J. Green acknowledged that there is a lot going on; there are a lot of things that have to be worked out. He and Sharon had one meeting where he really just got her idea of where to pursue this and that was to come here tonight. This was to answer concerns the Board had so when they start looking at this now, they won't be coming in three times getting the same answers. They will already have them. He realizes they can change, because even with what they are told, they are still going to come up with ideas that may be changed a little bit from what the Board thought they were going to do. If they can work through the process together, he thinks they can come up with a solution that will be good for everybody.

S. Williams offered an opportunity for another conceptual, if they want it. S. Penney agreed, saying they did not have to be locked into design review. She really thinks this could be a real example of what positive planning is about in the face of a disaster.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

There was a short discussion concerning the serving of ice cream versus pizza at the mini golf.

S. Williams spoke about a situation at the Pavilion. This is happening in the northern unit that abuts the Spencer-Hughes property. He was there the other day because they wanted permission to move the enunciator for the alarm system. They're putting a kitchen in; it has its own

entrance, laminate flooring already in; they are also putting in a bathroom. He is thinking apartment. T. Hoopes said he thought that was one of the things they had said – they did not want any new structures downstairs. They have a permit; he understands it was issued by Cindy.

S. Penney asked if that was for the sandwich shop; S. Williams said no, it was for the work in the basement. S. Penney explained that they are kind of over a barrel because of a lack of staffing. S. Williams said the planning office is the one, and maybe they should turn it over to Russ. T. Hoopes recalled that during the discussion of the site plan one of his concerns was that they had a large downstairs area. After the fire the downstairs became larger. S. Penney asked if this was retail space. T. Hoopes said no, they were parts of the apartments, and they were told that there would be a bedroom, but there would never be another bathroom downstairs. S. Williams added that any pump-up would require that the septic tank be increased by 15% because it causes turbidity in the tank and sedimentation does not settle. The septic tank sizing will have to be changed if they put a pump-up toilet in the basement. T. Hoopes recalled that they were within twenty gallons of the loading of the system. S. Williams explained that with a pump-up toilet, the State wants the extra capacity so that the effluent can settle out.

There was further discussion about this issue. S. Penney requested that S. Williams get with her soon to get details concerning the permit and what is being done there. He agreed to do so.

S. Penney informed the Board that she had spoken to Town Counsel about Lavaasseur; he believes that for frontage to qualify, it has to be usable. Frontage that is controlled access must have some proof that an access point will be allowed or continue to be allowed. That is the access to Route 28, which Mr. Szemplinski is still trying to discern for them. S. Williams drove by there the other day, and there are saplings growing up through the driveway. S. Penney went on to explain that the same would apply to footage that is separated from the buildable portion of a piece of property by a steep grade or anything that impedes access. Then it is not frontage, because frontage is road access.

T. Hoopes made the argument that if you have frontage on a road, it is still frontage whether you have access or not. S. Williams agreed, stating that there would be an argument to the point of the Route 28 access; he could get someone like Scott himself to give an affidavit that it was there; he knows it was there because he drove on it as a kid. That does cut weight with DOT, because they can't keep their thumb on everything. T. Hoopes said that if there is a future subdivision, they are going to go there. S. Williams agreed. D. Collier stated that, from a survey standpoint, he would be looking at that as an existing access that was prior to the changeover from five driveways to three, off of state roads. S. Williams said that the only access the "mother lot" will have will be fronted on Route 28. S. Penney added that otherwise it is just a fifty foot ROW. S. Williams said that is access for something further down the road; he has to have 200 feet of frontage somewhere, and that's on Route 28. D. Collier said that is the way he would look at it, and he does have existing access. S. Williams said he could make the argument that he has the frontage, and he needs to have his access rekindled. T. Hoopes asked about Proctor Road; it seems very rinky-dink to him. S. Williams is amazed the town maintains that; it is really nothing more than a driveway.

S. Penney said that at some point they need to look at the Morrill Excavating issue because at some point they may be looking at a cease and desist. S. Williams said that he had received a call from him the other day asking what they wanted from him and inquiring as to whether he could just come in with a reclamation plan saying he would loam it and seed it and make the slopes X? S. Williams clarified that they are talking about Allen Morrill who is on Harley Lamper's property. S. Penney handed over her notes which give the chronology of what happened on this. Item G on Page 2 says the parties were instructed to contact the Planning Board by Cathy Currier, letters of May 28th and June 11th, to obtain an excavation permit. He was instructed to cease all excavation. That's where it's at. S. Williams said he wants to get it wrapped up. T. Hoopes asked if there is any gravel left. S. Williams said there is gravel left, but he just want to put this to bed. S. Penney asked if he wanted to close it for the winter; S. Williams answered that he just wants to close it, period. He explained that he wants to come in with a reclamation plan; four inches of loam – S. Williams told him to put Conservation Mix down, and things along those lines. T. Hoopes said that one of the problems is that all this work was being done in Shoreland Protection because they had adopted Shoreland Protection along the Merrymeeting Marsh in the early days. S. Williams said it is way more than 250 feet to the river; he doesn't think it falls under Shoreland Protection. S. Williams explained the exact location on George Lamper Drive. T. Hoopes said that if he is not going to take out more gravel, he has no problem as long as it is reclaimed. S. Penney asked if S. Williams would sit with her on this, as that is his area of expertise; he agreed to do so. S. Penney said she would check to see if he needed a performance bond on the reclamation, but it sounded like a field trip for her. S. Williams stated that Allen is a man of his word; when he tells you he'll do something, he'll do it. S. Penney stated that he would have to get all of his permits retroactive.

S. Penney passed a message from S. Ames – they need to get some zoning subcommittee workshops going. She had sent them an e-mail so they could pick what they are interested in. They have to do some serious triage on density. T. Hoopes mentioned setbacks and buffers to S. Williams and invited any others to join in.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

W. Curtin made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Williams and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Tetreau
Recorder, Special Meeting

