

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

Alternates: Bonnie Dunbar and Donn Brock

Member(s) absent: Vice-Chairman; Cynthia Balcius, Jean Crouse.

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

Call to Order: Chairman, T. Hoopes called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Appointment of Alternates: T. Hoopes appointed D. Brock to replace J. Crouse and B. Dunbar to replace C. Balcius.

Approval of Agenda: K. Menici stated request from attorney for case PO4-45 and PO4-61 to be continued to the November agenda. Case PO5-45, Helane Shields, 91 Main Street, requested to be continued. PO5-49 Gillan Marine requested to be continued with no date certain.

A. Sherwood asked how we handle continuing without a specific date and if we would need to re-notify abutters? K. Menici confirmed we would need to re-notice in this case.

T. Varney had question on PO5-45 Helane Shields and if it was approved? T. Hoopes confirmed that the discussion for acceptance was continued. T. Varney asked how long can they continue this? K. Menici stated it is up to the board to accept the request to continue or not. If Board is not comfortable can reject request to continue. K. Menici stated the engineer did not relay information from conversation she had with him to applicant. T. Varney would suggest that since it wasn't applicants fault, then that we allow them to continue.

D. Brock suggested that on application for towers, that the US Cellular application be put in order in front of two towers. Agreed that it makes sense.

A. Sherwood make move that we continue cases PO4-45, PO4-61, PO5-45 to our next regular meeting November 15, 2005 and that we continue case P04-09 to a date uncertain, can't say and will have to re-notice. Seconded by J. Dube. All in favor was unanimous.

A. Sherwood makes notice in terms of order or agenda that case PO5-78 be discussed prior to cases 05-36 and 05-53. Seconded by J. Dube, no discussion. All in favor was unanimous.

B. Dunbar made notion to add approval of minutes to end of agenda, seconded by J. Dube, all in favor, was unanimous.

T. Hoopes asked if any public input about any general topic. T. Hoopes closed public hearing and moves on to applications.

Applications for Public Hearing:

Case#PO5-76

Map 29, Lot 38-1

Conceptual Review

Profile Bank, LLC

31 Mooney Street

Application submitted by Wendy Cruz for design and scoping input for retail space to be located in an approved office building. The property is located in the Residential Commercial Zone.

B. Homes stepped down from application.

Wendy Cruz presented case to board. The brick building which used to be rectory building is now under site review for office space, I agreed to rent a spot in that building in April. Ken Norman, president of bank did not know difference between retail and office, was a separation. Rented on retail basis. Would like to put flower shop into the spot. Zoned for office, so I am looking to have that changed to retail.

B. Dunbar asked how much square footage. W. Cruz stated 600 sq. feet. Two more offices going in there. Attorney Hoover and engineering firm.

A. Sherwood asked if there would be signage. W. Cruz stated is approved for marquis which would be fine for now, that would just list the tenants. Not looking to do anything further.

T. Hoopes asked what was entailed in shop, such as coolers. W. Cruz stated would have two coolers, will be selling floral products, contracted with Teleflora, will have a lot of phone orders. Chose this spot because back door where she can move things in and out quickly. T. Hoopes asked if customers coming in, W. Cruz stated there would be some .

K. Menici stated reason for her coming here tonight was to find out from board how she should apply to board for site plan. T. Hoopes stated almost minor Site Plan. K. Menici asked if when she submits application do you want separate condition or one from file. T. Hoopes and A. Sherwood stated no need for new plan. T. Hoopes stated doesn't see it as a complicated factor.

K. Menici stated would just be site plan review. K. Menici stated that you do not need to fill out the checklist. Just the cover sheet, application fee schedule, and narrative. Describe it as predominantly mail-order/phone business. W. Cruz asked if she brings these things could she get final approval at November 15 meeting. A. Sherwood stated you do have to meet application deadline which is this Friday.

Case#PO5-79

Map 9, Lot 27-1

Conceptual Review

Addison Cate

New Durham Rd

Application submitted by New Hampshire Electric Cooperative for design and scoping input to construct their District Facility building. The property is located on New Durham Rd and in the Rural Residential Zone.

David Horton represented New Hampshire Electric Cooperative.

T. Hoopes stated that he thinks that they need to go to the Zoning Board because this is not a permitted use for the area. In essence we would like to have a summary of what you are proposing. As I understand it you would be putting dispatch and everything else on this site, and access would be off of Old New Durham Road.

A. Sherwood asked if office work would be done at this location. D. Horton stated basically minimal office work, no equipment repair. Would be dispatch station.

T. Hoopes stated as far as transformer, no storage of these or work done on these. D. Horton stated not a warehouse, in emergency might house there, but not generally. We have currently outgrown station and it is reaching an unsafe point. We are kind of forced to relocate and need site close to main customers. A. Sherwood stated there are two zones in town that allow this. D. Horton stated this has been a long process, the regulations that he was going by when he chose this site were from 2003 and have since changed.

T. Hoopes stated that difficulty is that people in Rural Residential are going to be affected from trucks coming and going. Also position of building would it be close to 11.

D. Horton stated that due to elevation of building it would not be seen from Route 11. Goal is to have minimal impact.

T. Varney stated that don't think it is utility. They are more of a facility and not a utility because not being used for public works. If you go by that approach, you would be allowed by acceptance. Utility would be sewage treatment plant, etc. You are using this for more of an office. K. Menici stated that if you look under notes, would be accessory use for residential for warehouse. K. Menici confirmed would require additional application to ZBA for use.

A. Sherwood asked if there were wetlands on property. I guess from my own point of view if you got a use variance, then I would be mostly concerned that it is a residential zoned area and would need to provide as much consideration to other residences.

T. Hoopes asked if from Old New Durham road difference in elevation changes minimally. Just concerned for winter access.

K. Menici stated will meet with Code Officer. D. Horton asked for confirmation that what he needs to do file for ZBA application. This was confirmed.

**Case#P05-80
C & D Interests**

Map 15, Lots 56 and 60

**Conceptual Review
Old Wolfeboro Road**

Application submitted by Carl Norby for design and scoping input for a proposed subdivision. The property is located on Old Wolfeboro Road and in the Rural Zone. Carl Norby just passed a note that since Cindy Balcius, Wetlands representative, is not available would like to continue. K. Menici stated would like to possibly move to next week.

B. Dunbar made motion to move to P05-80 be moved to next weeks meeting on Tuesday October 25, 2005. Seconded by T. Hoopes, all in favor, was unanimous.

Case#P05-71

Map 2, Lots 19 & 14

Boundary Line Adjustment

Carol & Richard Locke

Prospect Mountain Rd & Suncook Valley Rd

Kathleen & Michael Currier

Application submitted by Kathleen & Michael Currier & Carol & Richard Locke for a Boundary Line Adjustment. The properties are located on Prospect Mountain Rd & Suncook Valley Rd in the Rural Zone.

Waiver requests:

Chris Bofinger represented Currier and Locke's. Asking for two waivers, one is to not have to survey of C. Currier's lot due to the fact that the lot line adjustment would only make her lot larger and the subdivision would only affect the other acreage. Other waiver is for paper plan, 2" margin on left hand side and 1" remaining margin on plan. T. Hoopes confirmed that reason for size was just basically to fit in the drawer. K. Menici stated that 7.2.1.7 Utility Poles. Utility poles locations are noted, but pole numbers are not on plans, so a waiver would be required for that. C. Bofinger stated that they are on subdivision plat. In addition 7.2.24 soils the plat uses the 1968 soils designations and the town has been requiring that the recently approves soils designations be used on the plat and lastly the wetlands are delineated, but has not been dated and signed by wetlands scientist. With regard to utility, could feel comfortable. With regard to soils and wetlands. C. Bofinger stated would be willing to update soils. With regards to wetlands just forgot. Forgot to have him stamp these, but will do that.

A. Sherwood moved that for case PO5-71 we grant the requested waivers for 7.2.21, 7.2.17, but that we require sections 7.2.17, 7.2.24, and 7.2.23 be met in their entirety on their final plat. And that we accept application as complete. Seconded by B. Dunbar, all in favor was unanimous.

T. Hoopes stated for clarity, end result is subdivision. Basically what this is two pieces of land that all front on both Prospect Mountain Road and Route 28, both existing residences on these properties are on Prospect Mountain. Lot line Adjustment on route 28. Taking 1.58 acres of existing 6.8 acre lot and conveying it to an existing 107.38 acre lot resulting in 108.896 acre lot and a 5.30 acre lot. Remainder of smaller lot does still meet all zoning and subdivision regulations.

T. Varney asked if 107 acre lot has been surveyed, Chris stated he has a copy of this and it has been recorded.

T. Hoopes sees no problem with Boundary Line Adjustment. At this point open meeting up to public input. T. Hoopes closes public input and move to deliberations. B. Dunbar wanted to make request that larger parcel survey has never been recorded and should be included in file.

A. Sherwood moved to hear next case before approving.

Case#PO5-72

Map 2, Lot 19

2-Lot Subdivision

Kathleen & Michael Currier

Prospect Mountain Rd & Suncook Valley Rd

Application submitted by Kathleen & Michael Currier for a 2-lot subdivision. The property has frontage on Suncook Valley Rd and Prospect Mountain Rd and is located in the Rural Zone.

Waiver Requests:

7.2.2 Margin, 7.2.21 Metes and Bounds in addition staff review found that the 1968 soil designation should be revised to new soils to new designation. Also Wetland has not been stamped and signed, but was delineated on plat. Utility pole numbers were on this plat.

A. Sherwood made motion for PO5-72 that we grant requested waivers 7.2.2 and 7.2.21 and that we require section 7.2.24 and 7.2.33 to be completed in its entirety on final plat and that we then accept application as complete. Seconded by D. Brock, all in favor, was unanimous.

C. Bofinger stated basically if you look at big picture line we got ride of on boundary line adjustment. Took 1.5 from lot line adjustment and 2.02 from the 100 now 108 acre lot to create 3.6 acre lot that meets all the requirements of all town zoning and subdivision regulations. We have applied for and not yet received approval of state subdivision. T. Hoopes asked what line of site is for proposed driveway access? C. Bofinger stated it would be fine. From Northeast it opens up. A. Sherwood asked if they have applied for driveway permit? C. Bofinger stated they had applied, but not received yet. We would ask for conditional approval tonight based on receiving state and local permits and changing plat. What it comes down to is having to have a dry acre and ½.

A. Sherwood asked if Wetlands had discussion about 25 foot no cut buffer on wetlands, and if that is proposed on this plat. C. Bofinger stated up to land owners, and asked if this was a voluntary thing. C. Bofinger asked if they were going to go in that route, could we leave well in that area. A. Sherwood stated that we currently have. C. Bofinger asked if on the plan if it would it be in note form or a line. T. Hoopes would be comfortable with note on plan. K. Menici stated that it be depicted on plat as well as having markers placed in field. Important in case property conveyed to someone else in future. Applicant stated that was fine.

T. Hoopes opened up the meeting to public input. Seeing none will close public input.

B. Dunbar made motion to approve Case PO5-71 with the following conditions: That the requirements on the final plat of section 7.2.17 utility poles, 7.2.24 soils and 7.2.33 wetlands delineations be stamped on plat and submission of survey Map 2-19 of 107 acres be placed in the file. J. Dube Seconded, all in favor.

B. Dunbar made motion to approve Case PO5-72 with the following conditions. That the requirements on the final plat of section 7.2.24 soils and 7.2.33, the wetlands delineations be stamped on plat. Trees on the wetland buffer be identified on plat and permanent markers on land, also a note on erosion control be marked on plat. All necessary state, local and federal permits be obtained. The following notes are added to the mylar and final plat sheets for recording: This subdivision plan contains a total of two sheets, which in its entirety constitute the subdivision plan as approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. Sheet 1 is recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deeds; Sheet 2 is on file at the Town of Alton Planning Dept. J. Dube Seconded, All in favor.

J. Dube and T. Varney stepped down from Case PO4-59.

Case #P04-49

Map 12, Lot 2

19-Lot Subdivision

Wentworth Cove Realty LLC

Pearson Road &NH 28

Application submitted by Randy Orvis, Orvis & Drew, LLC on behalf of Wentworth Cove Realty, LLC for a nineteen-lot subdivision. The proposed subdivision will result in the creation of an extension of Pearson Road and 19 new lots. The property is located on NH 28 and Pearson Road in the Residential Rural Zone. The application was accepted at the November 8, 2004 meeting and has since been continued.

K. Menici stated plan is to provide board with update as to where the application stands with outstanding issues. Quite a bit has been completed since last meet.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that one of the biggest events was site walk on October 3 to address abutters concerns regarding drainage and water issues going down hillside. B. Moynihan was there, abutters were present, and applicant. We had a chance to physically see areas where issues were. B. Moynihan and R. LaBranche had a chance to put heads together on how to deal with drainage. Have letter from R. LaBranche indicating that after the site walk that he and B. Moynihan have an agreement on this issue. Have site-specific, the Wetlands application has been submitted as of today, bylaws are drafted and the Articles of Association have been drafted. Have made good progress.

R. Orvis stated as M. Guldbrandsen stated they have Wetlands application submitted today. Have made drainage revisions that B. Moynihan can go over. Plan and geometry of road has remained unchanged.

T. Hoopes asked if with the square footage of impact if there is proposal for mitigation on or off site. Don't have proposal worked out yet, said R. Orvis. Believe will have to be off site.

B. Moynihan stated in regards to drainage project does meet no-net increase rule, but we are concentrating it into two locations into two pipes to see what we can do to minimize impact to Mr. Birdsies land. Level spreaders which will be perpendicular to the pipe. Level Lift spreader which turns it to sheet flow conditions. Channel has V bottom, but no outlet, it backs up in the channel reaches edge of level lift and flows over that at a very slow rate.

T. Hoopes asked if there was any feedback as of the last week rains. B. Moynihan stated not.

T. Hoopes apologized for getting to the site walk late. He stated that he concentrated his search on the Old Wolfeboro side and was surprised at how much area and rivers that feed to the pipes and feed across, and all underdrains on 28, can't see this as being totally the applicants problem, more than his circumstances that affect drainage. R. Moynihan stated site only produces 1/3.

A. Sherwood stated that in R. Lebranche letter stated make initiative to make recommended meeting happen before next meeting. October 12 letter was mentioned that Planning Board should discuss some items 3, 10, 13, and 14, I am going to touch on quickly in the interest of seeing that things are doing to get this wrapped up. First, item 3. Recommend that all permit applications and proposed easements be submitted prior to conditional approval, permits should include site-specific, NHDOT, retaining walls, slope easements, driveway permits, etc.

Item 10 with regards to existing Pearson Drive cul-de-sac, property ownership of the cul-de-sac revert to ownership of abutters. Have we addressed that issue as a board. Will come back to that.

Item 13 previous waiver by board of selectmen, relative to road curves, waivers contingent on approval by highway agent. Just something on file from Ken Roberts. Item 14 revised drainage design shall be submitted for off-site drainage area along the Westerly property including the discharge approach identified on the site walk. I guess that is what has been addressed by the more recent memo.

B. Hunter stated spoke with K. Roberts and he doesn't want to issue driveway permits until building permits have been applied for on a case-by-case basis. Do we need that in writing.

A. Sherwood stated don't think so. Also Item 6 that the deeded easements wouldn't come from us it would come from utility company. Would sign easement request at that time. Did apply for permit from 28 by NH DOT and Randy Talon stated wouldn't be a problem. A. Sherwood stated that we are just trying to get all loose ends tied up.

A. Sherwood stated only item haven't discussed is cul-de-sac. T. Hoopes stated belong to town. K. Menici stated spoke to K. Roberts that if town property remains town property, even though this will be reconfigured. T. Hoopes stated doesn't know what circumstance is. A. Sherwood stated easiest thing is to leave ownership of cul-de-sac the way it is. Basically abutters will take over piece of it. T. Hoopes stated this would have to be done at town meeting. T. Hoopes stated what purpose would be to remove cul-de-sac and be straight line. No flower island middle.

T. Hoopes asked at this point what else is needed?

M. Guldbrandsen stated that B. Moynihan is finishing drainage design. K. Menici stated that she got e-mail from R. LeBranche stating that he wanted to be aware that agreement had been reached. K. Menici stated he called Mr. Birdsie and he was very pleased with the outcome and is happy to participate in meeting and also some other property owners whose property abuts Mr. Birdsies and he is going to meet other abutters know of meeting.

A. Sherwood some other administrative things. Paperwork that needs to be submitted to town attorney. Will need road construction cost estimates. Normally estimate and obtained by town, and escrow amounts are figured from that. Legal issue, applicant does not own fee interest in all proposed roadway, small section that applicant only has right of way. Would be legal question, should be thought about now, not a few years ago. K. Menici confirmed access on to 28. Does make complication if becomes town road. Draft easement for his review and I would imagine encompassed within that how transfer of Town would take place.

B. Hunter stated he does have a couple of estimates on road.

T. Hoopes stated will open up for public input.

Jim Bureau abutter on cul-de-sac circle. Reiterate wish board would reconsider not getting rid of cul-de-sac instead of making straight road. Has more benefit to force people to slow down. There is already kids on our section, most people slow down to go around circle. Besides that if road does go straight through. Three seconds on side of driveway, will it be paved, says all non-paved areas shall be loamed and reseeded. Will paved areas remain paved areas. T. Hoopes stated that the thing about the roads is that they are not planning board jurisdiction, they are the jurisdiction of Selectmen and Highway Department.

J. Bureau stated my driveway goes down and hooks left, area between my new driveway and the driveway to the right. Triangle to the left. Will remain paved, or grass section between my driveway and driveway to right, who will mow it?

A. Sherwood asked what plan was. B. Hunter stated will do whatever town asks to do. T. Hoopes stated has to take place between town and residence.

A. Sherwood suggested planner speak to K. Roberts about this. A. Sherwood stated that from abutter's point of view if you are going to remove cul-de-sac remove circle of pavement for aesthetics. Confirmed by R. Moynihan it is to loam and seed. If necessary coordinate with owner and town of Alton. A. Sherwood suggest run by K. Roberts.

T. Hoopes closed public input and open up for deliberations.

K. Menici stated that next month would be appropriate to do conditional approval after meetings takes place with abutter. Permits and letter from Attorney Sessler be condition of approval.

T. Hoopes asked that they look into litigation factor.

A. Sherwood makes motion to continue PO4-49 to next regular Meeting November 15, 2005. Seconded by D. Brock, all in favor, was unanimous.

Case#PO5-74

Map 5, Lot 50

2-Lot Subdivision

Beatrice, Albert & Karen Ciampoli

43 Coffin Brook Rd

Application submitted by Orvis & Drew on behalf of the property owners for a 2-Lot Subdivision. The property is located on Coffin Brook Rd in the Rural Zone.

K. Menici stated Waiver Requests: Plat overall: 7.2.4 subdivision name, not applicable because two-lot subdivision. 7.2.17 Locus instead of placing in upper right hand corner is located in title block instead because of changes of plat lot in upper right corner must be left vacant for registry of deeds, need to change in our regulations.

Partial Request: for 7.2.14 Building Lines, 7.2.17 Utility Poles, 7.2.20 Details on Abutting Properties, 7.2.21 Mepes and Bounds, 7.2.23 Natural Features, 7.2.24 Soils, 7.2.26 Existing and Future Improvements, 7.2.27 Elevations, 7.2.33 Wetlands. If the board recalls there was a conceptual discussion in September of 2004 at which time applicants were seeking input as to what survey requirements would be . Board approved partial submission.

T. Hoopes would like to hold off on 7.2.26, concerns about access to the remaining property, so that may be a condition of approval, otherwise can cope with these. Certainly don't want to see. K. Menici stated when they did conceptual were no plans for further sub-division, given the submission of future development assume change in plan since that. Was site on New Durham Road here is a case where you would be doing through massive wetlands to get to other parts of this lot. T. Hoopes don't want to grant full waiver on future improvements. K. Menici stated not necessary since they did submit schematics.

A. Sherwood stated that in discussion could specify access.

A. Sherwood moves case PO5-74 grant the two waivers for section 7.2.4 and 7.2.15 in their entirety, and for the following that they be granted only for the 7.2.14 Building Lines, 7.2.17 Utility Poles, 7.2.20 Details on Abutting Properties, 7.2.21 Metes and Bounds, 7.2.23 Natural Features, 7.2.24 Soils, 7.2.26 Existing and Future Improvements, 7.2.27 Elevations, 7.2.33 Wetlands, however that over the course of the discussion will be provided information on access to future development lots. B. Holmes seconded all in favor, was unanimous.

R. Orvis spoke for the application. 42 acre parcel it has split frontage on Coffin Brook Road. Proposing to subdivide a 5.82 acre building lot. Wetlands permits for crossing has been granted for driveway, Septic System approval, T. Varney did Wetlands crossing application and septic design. Have State Permits already.

A. Sherwood asked what total wetlands impact is? T. Varney stated 1,912 sq. ft. T. Hoopes stated his concern is that we define access for this road. When you get to further break-out of this parcel, how are you going to access Dry Island that there are. I would propose existing driveway or proposed to gain access to back land. If that is not designated someone is going to have a piece of land that they are going to have to go through 3 or 4 large wetland areas to. A. Sherwood stated can you verbalize again. Access to existing house one crossing, next house driveway has three crossings, if that road were to continue to back of land, potential future lot, further to other potential future lot. Question becomes is legitimate to state that we access back lots with proposed driveway rather than impact Wetlands many more times to access future roads. If it comes back to me to develop 3 additional lots, I would say these are undevelopable lots. They could build road to back of land. B. Dunbar stated they would have to bring up to standards at that point. 50 foot right-of-way be put in deed in order to state the future lots be granted right of way from this driveway. T. Hoopes from point of board do we want to approve subdivision that will have greater impact on Wetlands. B. Homes stated that could be done later. T. Hoopes stated yes could be done later, but needs to be made condition of approval.

R. Orvis stated that it does have access on route 140 with Logging Driveway Permit. What is amount of frontage of 140. Stated 40 feet. You need 200 feet of frontage. B. Dunbar stated wouldn't be enough. R. Orvis stated that we would have to jump that hurdle of that time. T. Hoopes stated his proposal was that just provide 50 foot right of way on that space then you are not ruling out something. R. Orvis stated if access has to on lot 1, but if it going to be on remaining parcel, don't need to show it because part of remaining parcel. B. Dunbar stated would be designated on lot 1 and not going by existing house. R. Orvis stated why couldn't it go by house. Would be least impact. There is room to go by house on either side.

A. Sherwood just stating Mr. Hoopes is trying to make you think ahead long term. What he is saying is that only practical way to develop back land is to have road going in and have you thought this through so you can get approval to subdivide future lots. B. Dunbar stated may not meet driveway standards. T. Varney stated submitted driveway plane June 04, revised to 10 foot driveway and highway rules, driveway rules approved September 6 and this was already in process.

A. Sherwood stated rules have been approved. You will have to update permit application. T. Varney stated when we did Wetlands Permit were going straight across with least impact, a lot of thought was put into this. Backland is nice land, but frontage is mostly Wetlands.

R. Orvis stated that he could put strip in. A. Sherwood stated that we can't make you do this, but just concerned over future subdivision. T. Hoopes simply making a point. We need to as a town consider how property in town is impacted. The only way to get into the land is Wetlands.

B. Dunbar stated that she would like to put note on plat that no future Wetlands Crossing be allowed. T. Hoopes stated also condition on Wetland Permit Condition 5, no further impact on the Wetlands. A. Sherwood just stated again you don't have enough frontage off of Route 140. If it is true you are abutted by Conservation easement, looks like only way to ever build back there is to put road where you are putting driveway.

J. Dube stated that just confirming on plat it states there is future development.

B. Dunbar stated that we will have restriction on rest of property.

T. Hoopes opened up meeting to public input. Closed public input.

A. Sherwood asked if they would be willing to have 25-foot no cut buffer around edge of Wetlands with exception as to where the driveway is. T. Hoopes stated is what we want to see is there will nothing happening within 25 feet of the Wetlands. Predominantly the low brush we are concerned about Applicant stated he has garden that goes around the Wetland. Applicant agrees to 25 foot buffer excluding Garden.

T. Varney stated that no future development concerns me because you need to do research and know land. When you have a large piece of land you don't want to say never. Not really fair if you say never on this size lot. So why do we have to put language in if state already has.

B. Dunbar made motion that note be put on plat that no future crossing of the Wetlands to access future subdivision other than upgrading what is already proposed to tax Map 5 lot 50.

J. Dube asked with the note that they put in there are they referring to just lot 1. T. Hoopes stated that this is a subdivision from mother lot. No further alterations of Wetlands for driveways, Lot 5

K. Menici stated that the Wetlands Permit that is in here is for another piece of property. It is for another piece of property. T. Hoopes stated either numbers are wrong and have to be amended. T. Varney stated, they know what they approved in Concord, but have to correct Wetlands Permit.

T. Hoopes stated that we can put requirements to obtaining another piece of property, falls in under our subdivision. We can't give permit across wetlands.

B. Dunbar confirmed that no further wetlands crossings or impact remaining Tax Map 5 Lot 50, interpreted that if they want to put a wider Road in still ok.

T. Hoopes still would be additional crossings to get from one lot to the next.

B. Holmes stated would be up to state to change to Lot 50.

T. Hoopes stated we need to rephrase it to say Wetlands along Coffin Brook should not be crossed, so access could be through one of existing roads.

A. Sherwood stated that if you word it that way you would not be able to get to future lots. What we really want to do is to restrict them to that access point.

B. Dunbar stated that no further wetlands access be implemented from Coffin Brook Road for any further development of further lot Tax Map 5 Lot 50.

B. Dunbar makes a motion to approve Case PO5-74 with following conditions. That a note be added to the plat stating that no further wetlands access be implemented from Coffin Brook Road for any further development of the remaining lot Tax Map 5 Lot 50. To modify and reapply for the Wetlands permit for the current driveway standards. A 25 no-cut buffer zone be implemented along the Wetlands on lot 1 and that the trees be marked every 25 feet identifying this as Wetlands buffer with exception of the driveway crossings and existing gardens and well. All state and local federal permits be obtained and that the Wetlands permit be correctly obtained for the correct tax and lot number. Tax Map 5 lot 50. Seconded by A. Sherwood with all in favor, it was unanimous.

T. Hoopes made motion for 10 minute break 9:30

T. Hoopes called meeting called back to order 9:40.

**Case PO4-33 Map 19, Lot 8-2
Robert's Knoll Campground, LLC**

**Compliance Hearing
1439 Wolfeboro Highway**

Application submitted by Sylvia Leggett and Betsy Kretschmer to amend Conditions of Approval for the June 28, 2004 approval of an Amended Site Plan for Robert's Knoll Campground. The property is located at 1439 Wolfeboro Highway and in the Rural Zone.

Issue in front of the board tonight is to amend the conditions of approval as they specifically relate to the requirement as an as-built plan.

T. Hoopes asked if you were able to find in the minutes prior approval. I am wondering why the request was made for the as-built. A. Sherwood stated he might have made that request. We typically for every major site review we have been asking for an as-built, did that for the new storage center on route 11, done for Hannaford, where there is likely to be changes made as they go along. K. Menici stated that you requested it and Stephanie included it in the motion she made.

Sylvia Leggett stated she has in her records checklist and there is nothing listed in there about an as-built. I received notification back in July notifying me of meeting, but and want to apologize, but I was out of town at a family emergency. After meeting I received notification. At this point in time I am respectfully requesting Condition 3 be deleted from the approval because the project was built on plan as 7.4 subdivision regulations any necessary engineering plans were site specific and Stormwater permit. The plans you are looking at tonight show all the approvals that were required and also submitted copies of all the approvals. Only minor change on plan, shifting of the pavilion and putting shuffleboard under pavilion which actually created less disturbance. Topography was much different that in Phase I. Basically flat just enough elevation. Basic layout easy to read. Stone walls are basically on both sides of the 23 sites. Secondly this is not a traditional subdivision and in eyes of state considered a one-lot subdivision. The state of NH has issued a certificate of compliance from state. Thirdly to the best of my knowledge a CO has never been issued to a campground in the Town of Alton. I believe that conditions 1 and 2 secure the objectives and standards of the site plan review and under section 16 you have the power to modify these conditions. If you require engineering will express undue hardship of Roberts Knoll Campground.

S. Leggett described changes on plan. Lots were all as on plan. Pavilion and Shuffleboard court only change.

A. Sherwood asked if short of surveying or engineering way to complete the record just indicating what the changes were. I would be very willing to have plan updated and have the one change changed on the plan and getting all approvals listed on Sheet 1 of the plan. Will have Eric Roseen do that.

A. Sherwood stated if there is some not too painful way to just complete the record without having surveyor involved. T. Hoopes stated point she has made stone walls limit any potential changes, no changes could have taken place that don't belong there. If you can have Roseen do the architectural difference there.

S. Leggett

Floor opened to public input.

Alice True abutter stated that my beach front where the boat house is has for years been one of the nicest spots on Winnepesaukee. Been there 40 years, but last few years have been having problems. T. Hoopes stated he went up last weekend. First thing I did was spoke to Irving Roberts. Green slime coming through culvert. Sedimentation on bottom. I. Roberts runs Roberts Cove Marina and his comment was that there was some runoff coming in. There is a big Wetland that you can see off of Route 128. There was sign of algae. Algae growth takes place when no flow of water. Algae grows in blooms.

Alice stated that the night that this happened was when it started to rain heavily. I heard two very large booms. Sounded like someone was breaking something up. T. Hoopes stated no sign of dynamite. What I. Roberts stated that people have been shooting up there. No sign of any tampering, no phosphorous, no growth. Wrong direction for flowage from campground.

B. Dunbar stated that this year state has been redoing road there. Have opened up side ditches numerous times. Wetland that you are speaking of has been filled with sediment several times because of state road. They have been the greatest contributed to sediment. B. Dunbar stated it all has to do with roadways that have been constructed and reconstructed.

T. Hoopes stated that Saturday was a day that it started to rain some more. Walked down and looked there was nothing in water, everything was washed away.

A. Sherwood stated that this is interesting but does not have anything to do with subject matter.

A. True stated that if it is caused by campground and if they are going to enlarge it, or if there is water backing up I would like it to stop it.

T. Hoopes everything from site flows away from Beaver Brook. No connection between this property and this big wetland. Septic systems that are here could no way possible flow over to wetlands. Hoopes stated land is at 630 feet where it touches the steepest part of campground and runs down toward your property and boundary is at 608 or 606, nothing that can come through there. When Campground came you were concerned with noise, and they put larger buffer than they needed to.

T. Varney stated that some of the runoff could come down and across her property and building can cause algae to grow, when you have development.

T. Hoopes stated the flow that is coming here, would cross her property and would not come down over that culvert.

A. Sherwood stated that we need to get back to the item at hand.

S. Leggett stated she would have Roseen update plan.

T. Varney stated that an as-built plan would just be a matter of taking a black marker.

A. Sherwood makes motion that simple update of existing plan that shows the changes in the building location and the shuffleboard court so that we have adequate plan on file. J. Dube seconded with all in favor, was unanimous.

J. Dube makes motion to continue with the cases on our Agenda tonight and go past 10:00 pm. Seconded by A. Sherwood. T. Varney not in favor, rest in favor.

Case#PO5-78

Map 3, Lot 18

Amended Site Plan Review

Foulkes Corporation/Midwest Tower

Prospect Mountain Rd

Application submitted by Liberty Tower and US Cellular on behalf of the property owners to comply with

previous installations of telecommunication equipment and to add an emergency generator and propane

tanks to the site. The site is located in the Telecommunications Tower Overlay District and in the Rural Zone.

K. Menici stated waiver 7.2.9 Details on Abutting Properties, 7.2.10 Subdivision Purpose, 7.2.11 Certification, 7.2.14 Building Lines, 7.2.21 Mepes and Bounds, 7.2.24 Soils, 7.2.25 Substandard Lots, 7.2.28 Public Use, 7.2.29 Future Development, 7.2.30 Flood Plain Data, 7.2.32 Reserve Areas, 7.2.33 Wetlands, 7.4.5.1 Drainage Plans, 7.4.5.2 Stormwater Management, 7.5.1.1 Fiscal Impact, 7.5.1.3 Traffic Study.

A. Sherwood moves for PO5-78 to make motion and to accept waivers and application and the case as complete. D. Brock seconds, all in favor unanimous.

Chris Blackiston from spoke for the Application Discuss our request to add proposed generator and 10 one gallon propane tanks to fuel that generator. Since implementation of 199 have made minor modifications to it. On Ground US Cellular has equipment shelter and you will see also directly to south is proposed generator location and direction 2003 applied for building permit from town and to add two additional antennas. Only new equipment is generator and propane tank.

T. Hoopes stated that this is for emergency service when power goes off. Confirmed. Is there some additional security for propane tanks? C. Blackiston stated over 100 in state and nobody has ever touched propane tanks.

A. Sherwood stated we had note that town engineer has renewed analysis which includes everything currently on tower and everything currently proposed. I guess our Building Inspector issued a building permit when he shouldn't have in June 2005.

T. Hoopes how do we figure out bill for engineering. K. Menici stated going to tower owner.

T. Hoopes opened meeting to public input. No input , close this portion of meeting.

Confirmed that the structural analysis has been done.

A. Sherwood makes motion to approve PO-78. J. Dube seconds, all in favor.

**Case#PO5-36 Map 3, Lot 18 Amended Site Plan Review
Midwest Towers LLC Prospect Mountain Rd**

Application submitted by Site Acquisitions Inc in conjunction with the property owner Midwest Towers, LLC to propose additional antennas and associated equipment and an expansion to the existing buildings on site. The property is located in the Rural Zone and within the Wireless Telecommunication Overlay District. The application was accepted with conditions on July 19, 2005 and has since been continued.

Only condition of approval was that U.S. Cellular bring their 2003 installation in compliance with town regulations. Other issue was the engineering review structural analysis and that has since come back with no issues.

T. Hoopes stated that the next two operations are clean whistles.

T. Hoopes opened to public. No public input close public input.

Applicant asked that any approval or conditional approval reflect RCC in site applications. Liberty and RCC wireless. Carrier on plans.

K. Menici stated when went back no need.

J. Dube moves to accept Case #P05-36. Bruce Homes seconded with all in favor.

**Case# PO5-53 Map 3, Lot 18 Amended Site Plan Review
Foulkes Corporation/ Midwest Tower Prospect Mountain Rd**

Application submitted by Verizon Wireless for the property owner for an Amended Site Plan to add three 6-foot dish antennas to existing tower. Site is located in the Telecommunications Tower Overlay District and in the Rural Zone. The application was accepted with conditions at the August 18, 2005 meeting and continued.

Only condition of approval was that U.S. Cellular bring their 2003 installation in compliance with town regulations and the engineering review structural analysis and that has since come back with no issues.

T. Hoopes opened meeting to public input. No public input. Close portion of hearing.

J. Dube moves to approve Case #PO5-53, Bruce Homes seconded all in favor, was unanimous

Approval of Minutes:

July 7, 2005 T. Hoopes recommended to approve as is. BH made motion to approve, J. Dube seconded. Was unanimous.

July 19 Minutes of Meeting:

Two Items, Page 4, R. Burlingame said there will be some servicing/preparation of a boat for sale....., it will strictly (**add the would be**) servicing.....

Page 25, the first motion on top of page made by J. Dube, seconded by to (**add word approve**).....

Page 13 says ask Kathy 3 lines up from bottom. James Bureau abutter asked about sheet 7....ask Kathy.... (**exclude this language**)

J. Dube makes motion to approve seconded by A. Sherwood, all in favor.

August 16:

Page 19 Motion made by **A. Sherwood**, seconded **J. Dube** blank, to **accept** case.

J. Dube made motion to accept August 16 minutes as amended, seconded by A. Sherwood, all in favor.

A. Sherwood made a suggestion that at beginning of every meeting we approve minutes of previous minutes. K. Menici stated we need to amend by-laws. A. Sherwood said he didn't think so.

A. Sherwood made motion as our standard procedure that at the beginning of each meeting we approve the minutes of previous meeting. B. Dunbar seconded. All in favor unanimous.

Sept 20 Meeting:

Page 6 **and instead of an**, page 11 what **slot percent should be what slope** percent, page 18, Melissa Guildbranson explained there had been should be **have** been.

J. Dube moves to approve September 20 meeting, B. Holmes seconds motion, all in favor.

Adjournment:

J. Dube moves to adjourn meeting, B. Holmes seconds, all in favor. Adjournment 10:35.

Respectfully submitted by,

Jennifer McCullough
Secretary, Alton Planning Department