Members Present:

Roger Sample, Chairman Scott Williams, Vice-Chairman Russ Wilder, Clerk Peter Bolster, Member Tom Hoopes, Member Dave Hussey, Member Virgil MacDonald, Selectmen's Rep. Bob Regan, Alternate

Others Present:

Nic Strong, Town Planner Jessica A. Call, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Roger Sample called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Roger Sample stated that he wanted to amend the agenda to hear Case #P18-26, Edward Peterson, Jr., before the public hearing on the CIP because it was a simple application and Mr. Peterson needed to get to work.

Scott Williams MOVED to forward Case #P18-26 to just after the approval of the agenda. Virgil MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Scott Williams MOVED to accept the November 20, 2018, agenda, as amended. Russ Wilder seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

1. <u>Completeness Review of Applications and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted as Complete</u>

Case #P18-26	Map 12 Lot 66-9	Final Minor Site Plan
Edward Peterson, Jr., Owner		Rural (RU) Zone
		224 Powder Mill Road

The Chairman read the case into the record.

Present was Edward Peterson, Jr., owner.

Scott Williams thought this application was similar to a sign permit. Edward Peterson, Jr., shared that what he was doing was not a trucking business. Virgil MacDonald stated that Mr. Peterson, Jr., had to do this application just for a sign. Scott Williams stated that Mr. Peterson, Jr., did not have a business

approved by the Board at his residence, which was why he had to go through this process. Virgil MacDonald asked if it was a home business. Edward Peterson, Jr., stated that he was just trying to get a transfer of his address for his dealer transport plates.

Scott Williams MOVED to accept the application for Case #P18-26, as complete. Dave Hussey seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Edward Peterson, Jr., stated that he and his wife purchased a home on Powder Mill Road and the Department of Transportation (DOT) required him to have a physical address for his dealer transport plates. He shared that he came to town hall and he was told that he had to go through the Site Plan process to obtain a sign. Roger Sample stated that Mr. Peterson, Jr., wanted to put up a sign for his business, but he did not have an approved business through the Board. Edward Peterson, Jr., stated that DOT required a sign in order for him to keep his dealer transport plates.

Russ Wilder asked if the place of business would be on Powder Mill Road; Mr. Peterson, Jr., stated, yes. Tom Hoopes asked what a transport dealer was. Edward Peterson, Jr., stated that he moved vehicles for dealers. Roger Sample stated that since he had a dealer transport plate, he needed to have a place of business. Virgil MacDonald asked if Mr. Peterson, Jr., had to go through a Site Plan Review just to have a sign in order to have a place of business; Scott Williams stated, yes. Dave Hussey stated that what the Board would be approving was a site plan for a sign because that was what the DOT required. Russ Wilder asked what the sign would say. Mr. Peterson, Jr., stated, "Bud's Transport". Dave Hussey asked if the sign had to be approved by the Code Officer. Scott Williams stated that once the Board approved the site plan application, Mr. Peterson would obtain his sign permit from the Building Department. Peter Bolster asked if this application would be approving a home business; Scott Williams stated, in essence, yes. Russ Wilder asked if the sign had to have his dealer # on it; Mr. Peterson, Jr., stated, no.

Russ Wilder pointed out that there was a letter from Patricia Daggett and Jeff Bates that gave permission to Mr. Peterson, Jr., to attend the Planning Board meeting on their behalf. Edward Peterson, Jr., stated that his girlfriend's daughter was Patricia Daggett.

Roger Sample opened public input. No public input. Roger Sample closed public input.

After due hearing, Dave Hussey MOVED that the Alton Planning Board hereby approved Case #P18-26 for Edward Peterson, Jr., for a Final Minor Site Plan Review on Map 12 Lot 66-9, to install a 24" x 34" sign on the corner of the garage at 224 Powder Mill Road for his transporter registration application with NHDOT, with the following conditions:

SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS

The following subsequent conditions shall be met during construction and on an on-going basis:

1. All site improvements are to be completed as per the approved site plans, prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy per this Notice of Decision and Section 1.22 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

- 2. The applicant shall comply with all of the Town of Alton's Site Plan Review Regulations.
- 3. The approval is based upon the plans, specifications and testimony submitted to the Planning Board. Any alterations, additions or changes to the plans are not authorized and require additional Planning Board approval.
- 4. A site plan which has been approved, conditionally or otherwise, may be revoked, in whole or in part, by the Planning Board when an applicant or successor in interest to the applicant has performed work, erected a structure or structures, or established a use of land, which fails to conform to the statements, plans, or specifications upon which the approval was based, or has materially violated any requirements or conditions of such approval.
- 5. Once any and all conditions of approval have been met and the Chairman of the Planning Board or his designee signs the site plan, the applicant has twelve (12) months from the date of signing to start construction.
- 6. If this site plan approval does not start construction within twelve (12) months it shall automatically expire, at which time no building permits shall be issued, unless an extension has been formally requested and granted by the Board. Normally the Board shall not grant more than one extension per project, shall only grant an extension for reasonable cause, and shall normally not grant an extension for more than six months.
- 7. No site may be occupied or used until a Conditional or Permanent Certificate of Occupancy Permit has been issued by the Code Official in accordance with Section 1.22 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Unless otherwise approved by the Board, the applicant shall have one (1) year from the date of the meeting at which the application was approved with conditions to complete any conditions that are required prior to signing the site plan. Failure to complete any conditions within the one (1) year timeframe shall invalidate the Board's approval, unless an extension is approved by the Board per Section 1.14 of the Town of Alton Site Plan Review Regulations.

Virgil MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Public Hearing on Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) of 2019-2023

Peter Bolster and Bob Regan left their seats and sat at the other side of the table to address their findings.

Peter Bolster stated that the CIP Committee met for four (4) meetings, and met with all of the department heads that were requesting items to be on the CIP. He shared that there were a number of items that were discussed, but they were not included in the plan because further research was needed. The Fire Department had some plans for a rescue vehicle and a ladder truck, but they were not finalized yet because the Fire Chief was new and he was still contemplating this because the ladder truck was turned

down last year by the voters. Scott Williams questioned the need for a rescue vehicle. Virgil MacDonald asked how many rescue vehicles did the town need. Peter Bolster shared that it was a combination rescue and ladder truck.

Peter Bolster then talked about the building improvement funds for the Highway, Fire, Police, and Buildings and Grounds Departments. He noted that there was nothing added to those funds, but there was money in there for a couple of the departments.

Virgil MacDonald noted that the Fire Department's rescue vehicle was a 2005, and with a 20-year lifespan, it would put it out to 2025. Scott Williams stated that when the town purchased the rescue vehicle, the town did not subscribe to a 20-year replacement because they were good for at least 25-30 years. There was a lifetime frame warranty on the E-1 trucks. Peter Bolster noted that was not part of the plan at this time, he was just explaining something that was discussed and would need to be addressed sometime in the future; no funds were put towards that at this time. Bob Regan stated that the Chief wanted to perform some research on it and then bring it up next year. Peter Bolster mentioned it because it was a big-ticket item that ideally would be good if the funds were put aside earlier than later. Scott Williams stated that they should be looking at used ladder trucks. Tom Hoopes thought that repairs should be taken in to consideration. Scott Williams stated at some point, all trucks would need repairs. He pointed out that the data on the spreadsheet the Board was given on the CIP items was not correct because Engine 4 truck was not a 2018 truck. Peter Bolster stated that everything in this plan was in last year's plan. Dave Hussey stated that Engine 4 was just approved last night by the Selectmen. Scott Williams agreed, but stated that the truck could not be purchased yet because they needed money from the town. Virgil MacDonald stated that purchase was one year out; it was just ordered now. Scott Williams asked when the voters voted on that; Virgil MacDonald stated, last year.

Peter Bolster referred to the spreadsheet and noted that the ambulance was paid out of the ambulance revenue account; therefore, no amounts were laid out for the CIP fund for that. What was being contemplated at this point was the Fire Department Annual Capital Reserve Fund. The amount to place into that account was dropped back because if it stayed at the current rate, it would end up having too much money in the fund before it was slated to be spent out for the items listed on the CIP. The amount was cut back to \$100,000, and would go up a little bit over the years by 2024 and would end up at \$200,000 to have adequate funds to meet the needs of replacing the items.

Peter Bolster stated that currently, there was \$412,783 in the Fire Department Building Improvement Capital Reserve Fund, but the Committee was not requested to add anything to that fund. The Committee was waiting for an indication from the Selectmen as to what kind of plan they had for future buildings with regard to public safety and other buildings. Before a plan was put together, it did not make sense to keep adding money to the fund. Virgil MacDonald, Scott Williams, and Dave Hussey disagreed because they did not want to see the town stuck with a large amount all at once. Scott Williams stated that the Town was putting \$50,000 a year away for the past eight (8) years. Peter Bolster stated that the CIP Committee wanted to know if the Selectmen wanted to fix up the existing Fire Department buildings, or build a new safety building. Virgil MacDonald stated that it did not make a difference whether the Selectmen wanted to fix it, add onto it, or put up a brand new building, there was always \$50,000 put in that fund for that reason. Virgil MacDonald pointed out that the State, the County, and the Town went up on taxes; he wanted to know if the Committee considered those. Peter Bolster stated that the Committee was presenting a plan to the Selectmen, and if the Selectmen wanted to cut back on some of the proposals to save the tax rate, then they could. The plan that was being presented was one that would help the Town

avoid the peaks and the difficulty was that the taxes would go up a little bit for the first few years, but things would level out after that. This was a tool for the Selectmen to make decisions.

Peter Bolster shared that there was some skepticism about doing a CIP again because in the past, plans were given to the Selectmen and they did nothing with them. Virgil MacDonald asked what he meant by that, because the Selectmen put the CIP in front of the people and everything was approved so the town was able to get their new trucks and everything else that was presented. Tom Hoopes stated he was previously Chairman for the Planning Board for nine (9) years and the Board did submit a report to the Selectmen. He noted that the CIP was not adopted by the Selectmen in the past. He shared that the first few years of putting funds aside for the CIP would be difficult, but it would set up the finances of the Town to be in a much better place. Peter Bolster stated that was why the Committee cut back some on the amount of money going into the Fire Department Annual Capital Reserve Fund. Scott Williams noted that it went from \$600,000 to \$100,000. Peter Bolster noted that the \$600,000 was what was in the account currently. Scott Williams wanted to know what the formula was for the gross capital costs. He noted that to do a CIP, all the costs of the equipment listed was divided by 25, and that would give the annual expenditure that needed to be put in the reserve; every year after that it would be increased by 3% to accommodate for a cost of living increase. Peter Bolster stated that the numbers were calculated correctly. The only items that were included were the items that would be expended. A set amount was put aside each year to continue to build up the fund. Scott Williams stated that each department had a number of what it should be to replace their equipment on a schedule, and that was not indicated on the spreadsheet. He thought that if money was being put away for all of the items listed, it would end up being more than \$100,000 that needed to be put aside.

Dave Hussey stated that at last night's Selectmen's meeting, \$499,995 was put aside for Engine 4, and he wanted to know if it came out of the Capital Reserve Fund; Virgil MacDonald stated, yes. Dave Hussey stated that now \$499,995 needed to be subtracted from that fund. Scott Williams stated that was a consumable item and he did not like borrowing money and having to pay interest for the big-ticket items. Peter Bolster stated that the figures were put together taking into consideration the bottom line would continue to fund the needs that were based upon..... Scott Williams asked how he knew that because he did not think that figures were being done the correct way. He thought that the Committee just grabbed the amount of \$100,000 and did not use a logically deducted method to arrive at the amount needed. He thought that the figures needed to be done again. Scott Williams stated that at some point long ago, the Town voted on the life expectancy of equipment and they came up with 25-30 years, and not the 20 years that the equipment was based on in the CIP. He thought that the boat could go out at least 40 years because the boat was built like a tank. Peter Bolster stated that the Committee was not given that information. Scott Williams thought that the whole system was flawed then. Virgil MacDonald stated that the Committee should "go back to the drawing board". Tom Hoopes thought that someone should speak to the new Fire Chief about the old plan and how the system was supposed to work. He thought that the Fire Chief might not have been familiar with it. Roger Sample stated that in Peter Bolster's opening statement, he stated that the Fire Chief was new and he was not ready to do this. Peter Bolster clarified things and stated that the Fire Chief was not ready to decide on the rescue/ladder truck.

Nic Strong stated that all the backup information was submitted and the Committee considered that information when they prepared the plan, but it was not indicated on the final table, which was what was going to end up in the Town Report that summarized all the work. Virgil MacDonald thought that the information should be on the table so the people could see how the Committee came to those figures. He thought that the people should get a chance to look at the information because they were going to get the

opportunity to see this at the Town's deliberative session. Nic Strong further shared that the department heads submitted the forms for the projects that they had in the 6 years of the CIP. The Fire Chief went along with the previous Fire Chief's plan from last year because he had not been there long enough to make any changes. The figures that were in the plan last year were running across the plan this year and the fact was that the spreadsheet the Planning Board had a copy of included the totals to prove that the totals would equal everything. The CIP Committee was working on the list of Capital Reserve Fund balances through a certain period of time. At the point in time the CIP Committee finished their plan, they had no idea that \$499,995 was coming out of the Fire Department's CRF; that made a difference to the bottom line. The spreadsheets that were given to the Board showed the number running through 2051 to replace each piece of equipment on the schedule that the CIP Committee had been given by each department. Nic Strong stated that Ken Roberts, Highway Department, did the same thing. Ken Roberts did not any longer add up the numbers and put in a specific bottom line number, he was requesting \$350,000 a year across the board, and then that was adjusted by the dates of the purchases of his vehicles; a spreadsheet was submitted to refer to those numbers. Nic Strong stated that all of the details that the Board did not think was there, were in fact shown on the spreadsheet; the department heads and CIP Committee did not just make stuff up or just pluck numbers out of the air and say this sounds good. Scott Williams thought that each department's budget should include what was requested and what was suggested. Nic Strong stated that the plan would have all of that back up documentation in the file. She thought that the problem was that the Fire Department and the Highway Department, once the cost of the vehicles broken down by years to get them to the year of replacement was added up, the Highway Department's did not equal \$350,000 a year. Nic Strong stated that the spreadsheet could not show the numbers for the costs per year for each vehicle when that did not equal the amount that was requested. The spreadsheet that showed the year of the purchase and what was in the fund at that time, clearly showed that the money was going to be there by putting \$350,000 in each year; that did not equal the cost of each specific vehicles' set amount for 25 years.

Dave Hussey noted that by the time 20 years went by, Engine 4 should be paid for. Peter Bolster stated that was the whole idea of the CIP. He stated he was not aware that the money for Engine 4 was coming out of the Capital Reserve Fund. Scott Williams stated that the Selectmen pretty much wiped out that fund with the purchase. Tom Hoopes noted that the money for the truck did not come out of the taxpayers. Virgil MacDonald noted that the Capital Reserve Fund for the Fire Department went from \$606,000 down to \$106,000 now that funds for Engine 4 were taken out. Peter Bolster stated that the CIP Committee could not do their job properly if they were not told what the Selectmen were doing. Virgil MacDonald asked if the Fire Chief was at the Selectmen's meeting. Scott Williams stated that the Committee needed to have a spreadsheet for each piece of equipment that included when it was purchased and what the life expectancy was. Peter Bolster stated that they did have spreadsheets with all the information. Virgil MacDonald asked again if the Fire Chief was present at the CIP meeting. Peter Bolster stated that he was there at one of the meetings. Virgil MacDonald asked if the Fire Chief mentioned that the truck was on order because the truck had been on order for about 8 months. Tom Hoopes asked if the Fire Chief knew that the truck was ordered. Virgil MacDonald stated that the Fire Chief okayed the order, but the bid specs had been in the works for about 8 months. Tom Hoopes asked if the new Fire Chief knew about the order; Virgil MacDonald stated, yes.

Peter Bolster stated that the purchase of Engine 4 now threw off the numbers. He stated that funds needed to be placed back into the account to make up for the purchase of Engine 4, and that was going to take some time. Virgil MacDonald asked if the CIP had a deadline date. Nic Strong stated it was supposed to go before the Selectmen on December 3. Peter Bolster stated that things could be adjusted. Nic Strong

stated that it was an Excel spreadsheet and it was easy to plug in a new number because the formulas would automatically recalculate. Virgil MacDonald pointed out that the CIP proposal need to come before the Planning Board again before it went to the Selectmen. Virgil MacDonald stated that there could be possible contingencies on the purchase of Engine 4 because the cost could end up being a little bit more, or a bit less. Peter Bolster thought going back to allotting \$300,000 instead of \$100,000 for the Fire Department equipment was needed in order for the funds to come out right in the end. Scott Williams stated that this system had fallen down over the years because he thought finding a way to collect \$300,000 out of the voters would be difficult; therefore, he thought that the CIP just went up in smoke.

Nic Strong pointed out that last year, the voters put in \$336,808 into the Fire Department's Equipment Capital Reserve Fund. Peter Bolster thought that amount should be recommended to the Selectmen again this year. Virgil MacDonald thought that the Selectmen were going to put in what the Committee recommended. Tom Hoopes stated that the CIP advised the Selectmen on what and when things should take place. Virgil MacDonald stated after the Selectmen okayed the CIP, then it was brought forward to the people and then they had a chance to decide. Peter Bolster wanted to know if the Board would accept an amendment from the 2019 line from \$100,000 to \$300,000, given the information that he received tonight. He thought that requesting \$300,000 for at least the next 2 years would work out, and then the amount could be decreased after that time. Virgil MacDonald asked if the \$300,000 could be dropped back a bit because the tax rate was at \$13.99 now, and if an additional \$1.00 was added onto that, then the tax rate would be \$15.00 or higher. Peter Bolster suggested going down to \$250,000. Roger Sample asked what the rationale was last year when the Fire Department asked for the \$300,000. Virgil MacDonald stated that a higher amount needed to be put in first, then after that it would level off. Peter Bolster stated it was explained that more money needed to be put in up front so the Town could be caught up with the equipment items that had been delayed. Scott Williams did not think that \$300,000 was going to do what the Committee was proposing to do.

Tom Hoopes pointed out that Scott Williams stated that the Town decided to make a 25-year equipment replacement plan. He thought that the department heads should be informed of that so they could reconfigure their figures. Peter Bolster stated that the figures that the Committee received were based on 20 years. Scott Williams thought that the Selectmen should advise the departments to determine the life expectancy of their vehicles. Russ Wilder thought that each vehicle should have a reasonable life expectancy. He thought it would be handy for the spreadsheet to be laid out so you could see the cost of something spread out until you got to the year that the piece of equipment needed to be purchased. Peter Bolster stated they had a breakdown last year.

Russ Wilder did not think the CIP was ready for the Board to consider. Roger Sample thought the Board should move on to the next item on the CIP.

Peter Bolster moved on to the Highway Department. The \$350,000 going into the Annual Equipment Capital Reserve Fund each year was not specified for a particular item. He pointed out that the items in red were when the items would be expended out. Scott Williams stated that all the life spans were listed for each piece of equipment. Virgil MacDonald had some issues with those life spans because it showed that an excavator had a 14-year life span and there was 12 years for a pickup truck. He noted that the Town had never gotten 12 years out of a pickup truck. Dave Hussey noted that those trucks were only used for half the year. Scott Williams pointed out that the grader had a 14-year life span; he thought that it should last much longer than 14 years. Roger Sample pointed out that the excavator was a lease

purchase. Scott Williams noted that usually there was a dollar amount buy out at the end of a lease. Tom Hoopes pointed out that the lease ended in February 2020. Virgil MacDonald stated that when the current \$40,000 lease had ended, another lease would only be half the cost at \$20,000 for a new excavator for another five years. Peter Bolster noted that was why the lease figures were not added to the CIP because they would be in the operating budget. He pointed out that was the same way with the Police cars. Virgil MacDonald stated the Police cars were not in their budget, the leases for the Police cars were now coming out of the revolving fund from the details that had been worked. Roger Sample thought that the Town needed to come up with the money to pay for the details that the Police worked in Town. Virgil MacDonald stated, no, it was whoever they were doing the detail for would be paying for their time. He pointed out that the revolving fund was separate from the Town's operating budget, and it was the people that voted on the Police car leases to be paid out of that account. Tom Hoopes asked if the revolving fund was like a general fund. Virgil MacDonald stated that the revolving fund covered the vehicles; before last year, the Selectmen were not able to touch that fund, but last year the people voted on changing that so the leases could be paid for the vehicles, motorcycles, and the boat. Peter Bolster noted that it was still part of the operating budget for the Town. Virgil MacDonald stated, no, it was not part of the operating budget. Peter Bolster stated it was not paid for by taxes, but it was part of the operating budget. Virgil MacDonald stated, no, it was not, it was separate just like the Capital Reserves. Peter Bolster thought it had to be.

Peter Bolster noted that the expectations of when items needed to be purchased were indicated in red. He noted that there would be \$628,000 in the fund by the year 2024. Virgil MacDonald questioned the life spans of the pickup trucks because one had 6 years and another one had 12 years. Tom Hoopes thought that the Selectmen needed to meet with the department heads to figure out realistic lifespans.

Peter Bolster moved onto road construction. Currently, the fund had \$567,000 and it was recommended that the \$950,000 each year that had been voted on stay at that amount.

Peter Bolster moved onto the rock crushing. He thought that was going to be a lease figure. The rock crusher would be used to crush the rocks at the cemetery and other places in town, which would provide material for the Town to use in road construction.

Scott Williams wanted to go to the previous line that had to do with road reconstruction and asked what the offset was from the State. Peter Bolster thought that the Town received about \$200,000 a year. Virgil MacDonald stated it was \$165,000 a year. Peter Bolster stated that there was a hope that amount would be higher, but because there was no increase in the gas tax, the offset was down to \$165,000. He thought that if that amount continued to go up to 24 cents a gallon, then there would have been more money available to the Towns to offset town roads. Tom Hoopes shared that the other issue was that other State departments have taken money from the gas tax. Peter Bolster stated that was not happening any more. Peter Bolster pointed out that if the roads were to be kept up to the standards that the Town wanted them to be, then the gas tax needed to go up. The other thing to take into consideration was that more people were driving hybrid and electric cars. One of the reasons why the gas tax was increasing was because fewer people were using as much gas.

Peter Bolster addressed the Highway sand shed. Only \$10,000 was going into the fund. Virgil MacDonald stated that the excuse of "good faith effort" had been thrown around for the last 20 years. Peter Bolster stated that the actual cost of the sand shed would be \$350,000 and currently there was only

\$39,000 in the fund. He thought that at some point, the State was going to inform the Town that the salt and sand needed to be covered; most towns had that under cover.

Russ Wilder stated that the issue was that the sand pile was sitting upstream from the Town well and it was possible for chloride to leach into the water supply. Roger Sample wanted to know why, if this was being discussed for the last 15 years or so, there was only \$39,000 in that fund. Virgil MacDonald stated that was because the Town had skipped some years and money had been taken out of it. Peter Bolster stated that the Selectmen had decided to put building the sand shed off and it was not up to the Board to decide when it was built. The Board's position was to say to the Selectmen that there was an indication at some point that the Town was going to need a sand shed. The CIP Committee needed to continue to place money into the sand shed fund and until the Selectmen came up a date when it was going to be completed, they were not going to increase the \$10,000.

Virgil MacDonald thought that the money going into the CIP funds needed to be stretched out somehow because if all the amounts were added up, the tax rate would go up \$3.00 per \$1,000, which was a huge hit. Peter Bolster stated that this year's amounts were not in addition to last year's amounts. Virgil MacDonald stated that if this CIP was voted in, and the amounts were added in, it came out to almost \$3.00. Peter Bolster stated that was not in addition to what it was last year; it was based on the same figures that were used last year. Virgil MacDonald asked again, if the Board voted to approve the CIP, would the tax rate go up an additional \$3.00; Peter Bolster stated, no. Virgil MacDonald thought that the whole spreadsheet was wrong because he thought that the spreadsheet indicated that the taxes would go up per \$1,000 assessed valuation. He thought that indicated how much taxes would rise if the Board voted to approve the CIP. Peter Bolster stated that was not what that meant. Russ Wilder thought that what Peter Bolster was saying was that change might already be in what was proposed last year; not all of it, but most of it. Peter Bolster stated that the Committee was trying to cut back a little bit by cutting back the amount for the Fire Department, but now that was not going to happen. Virgil MacDonald thought that there was a way to stretch things out a bit longer so the Town was not hit with an additional \$3.00 on the tax rate. Peter Bolster stated again that the Town was not going to be hit with an additional \$3.00.

Dave Hussey asked about rock crushing, and noticed that the fund went out to 2024. He wanted to know where the Town was going to get the material. Peter Bolster stated that Ken Roberts' plan was to continue to enter into the current lease because it was working well for the department. Virgil MacDonald stated it was not a lease; the Town bid out the rock crushing every year. Dave Hussey stated that was not going to work because there was too much material going out every year. Peter Bolster pointed out that a lot of CIP items were warrant articles. He asked if maybe this should be in the budget for the Highway Department. Virgil MacDonald asked if the rock crusher was on a warrant article, why was it on CIP? Peter Bolster stated that all of the items have warrant articles. The Fire and Highway Departments had warrant articles for their equipment. Virgil MacDonald stated that the CIP was submitted as a whole. When the Town purchased a truck, that was when it became a warrant article, the Town did not write a warrant article for everything on the spreadsheet. Peter Bolster stated that there was a Capital Reserve Fund article to put those items in. Virgil MacDonald stated that the Board would be voting on the CIP, they did not vote on individual items, and noted that the rock crusher should not be a CIP item. Scott Williams agreed with Virgil MacDonald because nothing was being purchased with it, a service was being provided. Scott Williams did not think that the rock crushing belonged under CIP. Virgil MacDonald thought that road reconstruction should not be in the CIP either. Peter Bolster stated that with road reconstruction, the Town was buying something new. Tom Hoopes stated to Virgil MacDonald that the CIP was intended strictly for the Selectmen to assist them in making their decisions.

Virgil MacDonald stated that the CIP should not have road reconstruction or a rock crusher in the plan. He thought that the plan was for equipment and capital items that were needed; road reconstruction was a separate warrant article that the people voted on. Peter Bolster stated that road reconstruction was a capital improvement. Virgil MacDonald stated that it might be a capital improvement, but it was voted on through a warrant article. Peter Bolster noted that the items on the CIP were \$10,000 or more and would last longer than 6 years. Dave Hussey did not consider sidewalks as a capital improvement item. Nic Strong clarified the CIP criteria; it was \$20,000 with a three-year life span. Peter Bolster noted that the sidewalks would last longer than three years and they were more than \$20,000; therefore, that was given to the Committee to add to the CIP. Virgil MacDonald stated that road reconstruction and sidewalks were separate from the CIP. Scott Williams noted that if Ken Roberts wanted to put a line item in his budget for sidewalk repair, then it would not go into the CIP. Virgil MacDonald stated that the CIP was designed for vehicles and equipment. Scott Williams stated that warrant articles stood on their own. Peter Bolster asked if buildings were supposed to go into the CIP and wondered if roads and sidewalks were considered "buildings". Virgil stated that buildings should be in the CIP, but not roads or sidewalks. Tom Hoopes stated that the CIP was not for the public, it was for the Selectmen only. Virgil MacDonald stated that when the Board put this before the deliberative session, did they not think that the people would not look at it. Tom Hoopes stated that when the voters voted on the CIP, they were not approving the CIP; it was a plan to look at and to decide what to put in each budget. Virgil MacDonald stated that the Selectmen had already completed their budget process. Peter Bolster asked if the Selectmen's budgets were done, then why did they ask the Planning Board to provide a CIP. Virgil MacDonald again stated that the CIP was for equipment replacement and everything else went onto a warrant article. Tom Hoopes thought he should look at the RSA that explained what a CIP should contain. He noted again that this was just a plan for the Selectmen and that the Town did not vote on this, only the Planning Board voted on it.

Peter Bolster stated all of the items in the CIP had to go on the ballot at some point. The CIP informed the Selectmen what was needed, and the Committee was following their mandate of an item having to cost more than \$20,000, and having a life expectancy of more than 3 years. He pointed out that most of the items were similar to what was proposed this year, that was why the impact on the tax rate was the same this year as it was last year. Russ Wilder noted, for example, the \$950,000 in the CIP for the Highway fund could be seen by the Selectmen and then they could put a warrant article in their budget saying that the Town wanted \$950,000 to put towards that fund. Russ Wilder stated that the CIP was a plan to support the Selectmen while they figured that out.

Peter Bolster shared that the operating budget was funded by several different things like, back taxes, car registrations, contracting out our police officers, and various other funds. When the tax rate was configured, the Town needed to show where the funds came from to fund the operating budget.

Russ Wilder wanted to know if the Board wanted to submit to the Selectmen a plan that suggested they needed to put aside \$950,000 a year for Highway road construction. He pointed out that the Town did not vote on the CIP; it went to the Selectmen to use to plan their budget. He wanted to know if the Board wanted the CIP to stay the way it was for the Highway Department and present that to the Selectmen. He also pointed out that the Fire Department's proposal was not correct.

Virgil MacDonald stated that at last year's deliberative sessions, the CIP spreadsheets were handed out for people to see what was going on. Russ Wilder stated that may be so, but the people did not vote on that document itself. Tom Hoopes asked when the Selectmen discussed their budget because they needed this information before they finalized it. Virgil MacDonald stated that their budget had already gone to the

Budget Committee; the Selectmen would do warrant articles for the items on the CIP. Tom Hoopes thought that the Board was too late now to submit the CIP. Nic Strong stated that the budgets that had gone through the Budget Committee were operating budgets; the CIP was always done with warrant articles. Each expenditure on the CIP would be a warrant article; therefore, it was not too late. The Board was going to meet with the Selectmen on December 3, but that might need to be changed because the Committee may need to meet one more time before that because of the changes that were discussed tonight. Russ Wilder thought that the only thing that was wrong with the CIP in order to get it to the Selectmen was to fix the Fire Department. Dave Hussey thought that the rock crusher was unknown and that needed to be taken out because the Town was not sure where they would get the gravel. Peter Bolster stated there was a discussion at a CIP meeting that Ken Roberts was thinking about purchasing a crusher, but it was decided that it was better to spend the \$50,000 each year to have a contract for someone to come in and crush rock for the Town. Russ Wilder thought for the Board's purposes that the rock crusher stay in the CIP and let the Selectmen consider what they want to do with it. Virgil MacDonald stated that he had a problem with the life spans that the departments had on their vehicles and equipment. Russ Wilder stated he was concerned about the timing to get the CIP in front of the Selectmen in a timely fashion. He thought that the Selectmen could state whether they thought the life spans were not correct and they could state whether the rock crusher should stay on the CIP also.

Scott Williams MOVED to table the CIP discussion. Dave Hussey seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Peter Bolster thought that what was discouraging was that the Committee put the same figures this year as they did last year, with a few exceptions. He stated that the items listed were made into warrant articles to fund the CIP. He shared that the Committee wanted to continue what they started last year.

Roger Sample opened up public input. No public input. Roger Sample closed public input.

Tom Hoopes thought that the Selectmen should sit with the department heads. Russ Wilder pointed out that there was a motion on the floor to table this discussion, and he recommended that the Board not do that. What he suggest was that the Committee should delete the rock crusher and correct the Fire Department's fund by deleting the \$499,995 for Engine 4 and then the Board could approve it and move it onto the Selectmen. Dave Hussey asked about the life spans. Russ Wilder stated that the Selectmen should discuss that.

Scott Williams MOVED to withdraw his motion to table the CIP discussion.

Russ Wilder MOVED to forward the 2019 CIP to the Selectmen on the conditions that the rock crusher be taken out of the Highway Department's CIP plan, the Fire Department's \$499,995 expenditure be corrected that was not shown under 2019, and to request that the Selectmen address the lifespan of the various pieces of equipment with department heads for the 2020 budget.

Tom Hoopes seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Peter Bolster stated that the Selectmen needed to establish a process of looking at the future need for a public safety complex. Virgil MacDonald stated that it was already being worked on. Peter Bolster stated that the CIP Committee was having a hard time with working on funding construction issues when there was no plan in place.

2. Continued from September 18, 2018

Case # P18-04	Map 26 Lot 10	Final Minor Site Plan Review
JOBEAN, LLC/Dean Puzzo,	_	Residential Commercial (RC) Zone
Manager		19 Homestead Place, Suite 5

The Chairman read the case into the record.

Nic Strong stated that Dean Puzzo sent in a letter requesting a continuance.

Russ Wilder MOVED to continue Case #P18-04, JOBEAN, LLC, Final Minor Site Plan Review, Homestead Place, Map 26 Lot 10 to the January 15, 2019, meeting and to extend the deadline for Board action on the application to January 15, 2019. Virgil MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

3. Continued from October 16, 2018

Case #18-24	Map 34 Lot 39	Final Minor Site Plan
Don E. Card, Jr. of Decard		Residential/Commercial (RC) Zone
Enterprises, LLC, d/b/a Alton Bay		404 Main Street/NH Route 11
Corner Store, Applicant and New		
State Realty Mgmt., LLC, Owner		

The Chairman read the case into the record.

Nic Strong explained that the Planner Review contained a list of emails with correspondence back and forth that explained that Mr. Card could not attend the meeting. Nic Strong stated that she checked with Town Counsel because there was a State Statute that stated after an application was submitted to the Board, it "shall" be accepted within 30 days. As a courtesy, at last month's meeting, the Board extended the application to this meeting. The Board was now beyond the 30 days and Town Counsel's advice was to deny the application without prejudice to reapply.

After due hearing, Russ Wilder MOVED that the Alton Planning Board hereby denies the application for Decard Enterprises, LLC, d/b/a Alton Bay Corner Store, Donald E. Card, Jr., Map 34 Lot 39, 404 Main Street, on the basis of the applicant's failure to appear before the Planning Board at the scheduled public hearings on the application, without prejudice to reapply.

Scott Williams seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

4. <u>Completeness Review of Applications and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted as Complete</u>

Case # P18-27	Map 61 Lot 1 and	Final Major Site Plan
Nicholas Loring, P.E., of Benchmark	Map 17 Lots 9, 11, 27, 29, & 30	Lakeshore Residential (LR)
Engineering, Inc., Agent for Brian		Recreational Service (RS) Zones
Fortier(1/3), Allyson Shea (1/3), and		West Alton Marina Road/
Deirdre Tibbetts (1/3) of West Alton		Mauhaut Shores Road
Marina, Owners		

The Chairman read the case into the record.

Present were Nicholas Loring, P.E., Robert Dietel, Esq., and Sheldon Pennoyer, architect; and Brian Fortier (1/3 owner).

Roger Sample noted that the Board had to accept the application as complete before they could proceed. Russ Wilder stated that there were some waiver requests that needed to be addressed before they accepted the application as complete. There were three (3) requests altogether, but two (2) of the waiver requests were acted upon at the Design Review application at last month's meeting. The third waiver request was not acted upon because DES was still working on the AoT permit and the Town Engineer had not yet seen the stormwater management plan. The waiver was for stormwater drainage and erosion control, Section 5.14 A. & M. Nic Strong informed the Board that the waiver did not have anything to do with completeness; they had to do with items on the plan itself. She noted that the Town Engineer submitted his report and acknowledged that the plan was to mitigate water quality and did not deal with the peak flow rates or volumes because DES would be the one to approve that.

Attorney Dietel thought he could update the Board with some items that had come in since the Design Review application, which might help them determine if the application was complete. He did not think he received any comments back from the Fire Department. He did receive the comments from the Town Engineer's review regarding drainage and runoff, but he only received them on Monday. He wanted to know if the Board wanted him to respond to the Engineer's remarks and make some final modifications to the submission, and then they could deem it complete at the next meeting. Roger Sample explained that the Board had to determine completeness before Attorney Dietel could even speak for the application. Russ Wilder pointed out that the Board was in possession of the Engineer's remarks, but Attorney Dietel had not had a chance to respond to those remarks yet because he just received them. Russ Wilder pointed out that he would have to respond to those remarks. Tom Hoopes asked if the Board could accept the application as complete, but not grant the waivers at the moment. Roger Sample thought that the Board could accept the application as complete, but they could not approve it because it was not done. Dave Hussey asked why the Board would do that if the Board could not accept it as complete.

Nic Strong stated that acceptance of a complete application meant that the Board had a physical pile of documents that their Regulations required for the Board to take jurisdiction of the application to make an informed decision. Once an application was submitted, the Board had to accept it as complete within 30 days, so if the Board continued the application, they would be outside of that regulation. She suggested that they accept the application as complete at tonight's meeting, and then they could discuss the outstanding issues. If the Board was not able to approve the application within 65 days, then a mutual agreement would have to take place in order to extend the deadline. Attorney Dietel stated that he had received additional information since he submitted the application and he wanted the opportunity to respond to that additional information and address any concerns that may arise. Tom Hoopes asked if it

made any substantial changes to the plans. Attorney Dietel stated, no. Roger Sample thought that he had all of the information that would allow the Board to accept the application as complete, and then they could move forward.

Tom Hoopes MOVED to accept application # P18-27 as complete, without yet approving the waiver for Section 5.14 A. & M., Stormwater Drainage and Erosion Control. Virgil MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Attorney Dietel expressed that he would like the opportunity to address the remarks from the Town Engineer before any discussions took place concerning stormwater and drainage.

Brian Fortier stated that he had received his AoT permit and received an approval from the Governor and Council. His State permits were in place. Russ Wilder noted that the documentation that the Board had was the permit from DES, an AoT permit, a driveway permit, and ZBA approvals, but he did not see the approval from the Executive Council. Attorney Dietel stated he could submit the minutes of the meeting from September.

Nicholas Loring, P.E., noted that were two (2) major changes since the Design Review. The first change had to do with the Planner Review comments. He responded to those issues in a letter dated October 29, 2018, and made those changes to the plans. The second change was that they submitted their plans and the drainage report to the Town's Engineer and yesterday they received a letter from him. He reviewed the letter and spoke briefly to the Engineer and he did not see any issues, but he would be writing a response and submitting revised plans. Russ Wilder inquired if Nicholas Loring, P.E., responded to all of the comments from the Planner Review. Nicholas Loring, P.E., stated that he submitted a response dated October 29, 2018, to the Design Review comments, and would respond to the final application comments as well.

Russ Wilder brought up phasing. He read Phase 1 and noted that the Board was going to need some information in order to determine when substantial construction was done and the time frame because it was part of the approval process. He referred the Board to Page 2A, plan notes, where there was a construction sequence and phasing. He pointed out that the note stated that before Phase 1, Brian Fortier was going to cut and clear trees, but they were not stumping. Brian Fortier stated that was covered under a logging permit and in fact, the logging was finished. He shared that the logging company was now down on the end of Minge Cove Road. Russ Wilder noted that Phase 1 was set up to work on some of the slips and to move the marine construction, but there was no mention of demolishing the current boat barn and office. Brian Fortier stated that the buildings would be removed prior to the area being dredged. Roger Sample asked what buildings he was referring to. Russ Wilder stated it was the existing boat storage that had a three (3) or four (4) bay high storage area, the offices, and the old gas pumps. Nicholas Loring, P.E., stated that portion of the project was listed in Phases 7-9. He pointed out that there were five (5) Phases that pertained to dredging the marina slips. Russ Wilder noted that Phase 7-9 might be built in any order any time after the completion of Phase 6. Attorney Dietel stated that the bigger picture of phasing was easy to describe. The roadway needed to be built on the other lot, Lot 61-1, which was near Mauhaut Shores Road. The boat storage needed to be set up and access to the basin needed to be done. Once there was a place for boat storage, they could then demolish the existing building and dredge out the slips that were going in the existing marina basin. Attorney Dietel stated that there were challenges in sequencing the phases around a running business. Russ Wilder asked how would the Board be able to calculate active and substantial development and building, and substantial completion of

improvements for the five (5)-year exemption, which would keep them from any changes within five (5) years from regulations changing, and also timeframes for start of construction, completion of construction, and the expiration of the approval. Russ Wilder was concerned with the comment, "Owner reserves the right to change the construction sequence at any time". He wondered how the Board was able to fulfill their obligations according to their regulations if that was allowed. Roger Sample pointed out that Mauhaut Shores Road was going to be used while everything else was being done. He noted that at the last meeting, he was told that Mauhaut Shores Road was just going to be used by the employees. Tom Hoopes noted that there was boat storage in that area off Mauhaut Shores Road.

Russ Wilder asked when Brian Fortier received his Variance from the ZBA, one of the stipulations would be that there would be a gate on the road off Mauhaut Shores Road, it would only be for employees, and the gate would be closed during the off-season. Attorney Dietel stated that he was not sure of the specific language in the Variance, but he thought that it was not that specific to state just employees. He shared that Lot 61-1 was not for customers; it was intended to be for boat storage, access for the marine construction facility, boat repair, and boat wash, but that did not mean that from time to time the public was never going to use that access. Brian Fortier shared that he had only four (4) boats come in on trailers that he winterized and shrink wrapped; therefore, it was not that busy. Russ Wilder pointed out that it appeared that the Marina only serviced the boats from people who rented their slips; Brian Fortier agreed. Peter Bolster asked if the gate would be locked at night. Brian Fortier stated that the gate would be locked at night during the summer and it would be locked all winter because they were not open during the winter season. Russ Wilder found the conditions of approval. The approval stated that the expansion area would be gated in the off-season; only employees and authorized personnel were to be allowed access. He was confused if that meant only during the off-season, or would it be all the time. Attorney Dietel stated that was intended to be off-season. He pointed out that an area of the marina would be customer focused on Map 17 and Map 61 would be focused on the services that the marina provided, like boat storage, boat repair, boat wash, and marine construction. Brian Fortier stated that the current conditions put his customers in an unsafe position because they would walk into the service shop and they would walk in front of where the fork truck drove; therefore, placing the boat storage up out of the way was the best layout possible. Peter Bolster noted that all the parking was located on the marina side. Attorney Dietel noted that there could be an occasional instance where a customer could be led out back to show some repairs that were being done to their boat. Tom Hoopes asked if the dredging would be phased. Brian Fortier stated it would be done in five (5) phases during the off-season.

Dave Hussey asked how many exits and entrances were proposed. Brian Fortier stated that there was one entrance into the marina basin and there was one entrance off Mauhaut Shores Road. Dave Hussey asked if the entrance on Mauhaut Shores Road would have a Knox box and a crash gate so the Fire Department could have access if needed. Brian Fortier stated he was waiting for comments back from the Fire Department. Dave Hussey stated if a place only had two (2) exists, a crash gate should be installed. He pointed out that if there was a fire at the main entrance, there needed to be another access area to exit the property. Brian Fortier noted that people would not be able to get from the marina basin to the exit at Mauhaut Shores Road if they were driving their vehicles, but they could if they walked the footbridge. Dave Hussey stated that for a project of this size, there should be more than one entrance/exit. He wanted to know if there was an area on the property that the two sections of the marina could be opened up to give vehicles access to the other entrance/exit. Brian Fortier stated, not now.

Peter Bolster asked where customers would come into the property. Brian Fortier stated it would be either the dock customers and/or it would be people coming in off the water. He stated that normally,

people did not come into his business like Irwin's Marina. Peter Bolster asked if a customer brought in a boat to be stored or placed into the water at the docks, would they come in off Mauhaut Shores Road. Brian Fortier stated, not necessarily. There was a ramp and there was public launching in the marina basin, but if someone was to drop their boat off for winter storage and they brought it in on a trailer, they would bring it in off Mauhaut Shores Road. The majority of boats stored in the boat storage came in directly off the water. Brian Fortier stated that the marina had two entrances in the past, but at that time, the Police Department asked his grandfather to close one of the entrances. He was not sure if the State would allow him to reopen that entrance because of the lack of line of sight. Dave Hussey asked if Brian Fortier could look into it. Attorney Dietel stated that road had been closed for decades. Dave Hussey asked how many people could occupy his property at one time. Peter Bolster noted that there were 562 parking spaces. Attorney Dietel stated that he really wanted to have the Fire Department's input in order to identify issues. He stated that this was a unique business because most people would be coming onto the property to get into their boat to go out on the water, and not staying mostly on the property.

Peter Bolster asked if the railroad right-of-way was open so a fire emergency vehicle could access it. Brian Fortier stated that the Town's 6-wheeler could go down it, but a regular car could not. Dave Hussey noted that someone could jump in the water if there was a fire at the entrance, but what if they could not swim. He suggested putting in another entrance/exit. Russ Wilder shared that half of the railroad right-of-way belonged to the Town's Conservation Commission. Dave Hussey asked why the Conservation Commission did not want that road fixed up. Russ Wilder noted that the road was cut off by a boundary line and from there the snowmobile club came in and took down a lot of trees, leaving a rough landscape.

Russ Wilder noted there was no design plan for the proposed 100,000-gallon cistern. Roger Sample thought that a dry hydrant in the lake would be sufficient. Russ Wilder stated that the cistern was shown on the plan. Brian Fortier stated that the 100,000 gallon cistern was indicated on the plan because their research showed using that cistern would be worst-case scenario. He stated he was still waiting to hear back from the Fire Department. Scott Williams stated that the Board of Selectmen had not adopted a cistern policy. Attorney Dietel thought that would be an absolute extreme case, and he was hoping to have a discussion with the Fire Department. Scott Williams suggested installing a dry hydrant system because it was more effective. Attorney Dietel was thinking of talking to the Fire Department about modifying the plan. Brian Fortier asked where the Board would propose a dry hydrant. Scott Williams stated that the dry hydrant could go through one of his retaining walls. Tom Hoopes stated that in Phase 9 a dry hydrant could be installed. Scott Williams stated that if there was a fire somewhere else in the Town, the Fire Department had a right to use that water.

Russ Wilder discussed the waivers, which were Section 4.02 F. 7. Boundary; Section 5.08 B. 2. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping, and Section 5.14 A. & M. Stormwater Drainage and Erosion Control. Attorney Dietel stated that he would like to continue discussion of the Stormwater Drainage and Erosion Control waiver so he could have some time to respond to the Town Engineer's review comments. Russ Wilder noted that the Boundary waiver was agreed to at the Design Review meeting. He further noted that he Board had agreed to minimize the parking lot landscaping at that meeting also. There were some plans to plant some arborvitae near the road to act as screening where the parking lots were. Brian Fortier thought that the plan was to still do some landscaping. Russ Wilder pointed out that the landscaping would be minimized. Nick Loring, P.E., stated that the waiver was specifically for the interior parking lot, which required 10% green space; he thought it was at about 5-6% green space. Russ Wilder pointed out that there were parking lots A, B, C, D, and E, which were all along the road by Route 11. Nick Loring, P.E.,

stated that there were two (2) more parking lots on the commercial side of the business, lots F and G, which were for employees or the occasional drop off. Attorney Dietel stated that only lots A and B could be seen from the road; those lots would have the arborvitaes.

Tom Hoopes MOVED to grant the waivers for Section 4.02 F. 7. Boundary and Section 5.08 B. 2. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping.

Dave Hussey seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Attorney Dietel wanted to address fire protection and stormwater drainage and erosion control at the next meeting.

Russ Wilder did not see any issues with smoke or dust. The next item on the Planner Review was Hazardous and Toxic Materials. In the current marine construction yard, there was a potential for contaminated soils, and Russ Wilder wanted to know what was going to be done with that. Brian Fortier stated that part of the closure report for the 1,000 gallon above-ground diesel tank, soil sampling was done around the gas tank and the gas dock. He stated that he needed a permit to close one tank, and then he needed to be re-permitted for his new one. Russ Wilder asked if anything was being done in regards to looking for metals in the soil, like copper, lead, and zinc. Attorney Dietel stated that they were not testing for anything beyond the closure report. He was not concerned with any metals regarding the marine construction company. Roger Sample asked if there should be any concerns about metal contaminating the soil. Russ Wilder stated that since it was a construction company where they used antifouling paints and performed some welding, it could be an issue. Attorney Dietel did not think that DES wanted to go beyond their scope of review. He noted that if the Board wanted a more expansive soils report, then he would entertain that at that time. Russ Wilder was concerned about materials being moved. Brian Fortier stated that the area where the construction site was now was not being excavated; they were building over it.

Russ Wilder wanted to know if Phase 2 had to do with parking. Nick Loring, P.E., stated that was where the marine construction company was currently and that area was not being dredged. Phase 1 was where the edge of the docks were, and anything beyond that was parking. Russ Wilder asked if they were taking any upland soils out to do the docking when that area was dredged. Brian Fortier stated that whole area was being dredged out. Russ Wilder asked if that area was in the marine construction area; Brian Fortier stated, no. Russ Wilder noted that the fuel tank was being removed and they would be obtaining a closing report. The area would then be regraded, paved, bulkheaded, and drained. Attorney Dietel stated it was not going to paved; it would have gravel but would be a plowable, drivable surface. Russ Wilder noted on the other side of where the plan indicated W. Alton and a wetland, he wanted to know if that area was going to stay undisturbed. He was concerned that materials from the marine construction area were going to be dragged through the site. Attorney Dietel stated that area was not going to be dredged out like the docking basin.

Russ Wilder noted that a new gas tank was being installed. Brian Fortier stated that he was going to recertify the one he had currently. Russ Wilder asked if there would be a buried fuel tank. Brian Fortier stated it would be above ground and would add a second dispenser. Russ Wilder asked what he foundation of the office/store would be. Brian Fortier stated, a slab foundation.

Russ Wilder noted that construction activity could be between the hours of 6:30 am - 9:00 pm. He informed Brian Fortier that the Board would let that stand unless there were complaints.

Russ Wilder noted that off Mauhaut Shores Road, the boat storage would be near Art Richardson's barn. He wanted to know if there were any woods left between the building and the barn. Russ Wilder noted that Map 61 Lot 62-37 was the lot he was referring to. Attorney Dietel stated that in one of the Variances that the marina received was a condition that that area would be kept as it existed around the boat storage building. All existing forests would remain. Attorney Dietel stated that the marina recognized that the area was a residential area and he did not want them to see any changes other than the gated entrance.

Peter Bolster noted that when he referred to the topographic map, there was a significant ridge that went around the property towards Mauhaut Shores Road and it appeared there was a basin. Attorney Dietel stated that when you drove down Mauhaut Shores Road, the ground sloped upwards on the right hand side. Brian Fortier stated there was a high point along the area of the non-existent cul-de-sac.

Russ Wilder asked if the electric and telephone utility easement ran along the property where the fire access road was; Brian Fortier stated, yes. Scott Williams stated that back in the early 1960's the Town did not want any power lines on the main streets.

Russ Wilder moved onto Filling and Excavation on the Planner Review. He noted that the Site Plan Regulations required a narrative of fill or excavation that was required for the project. There was no narrative submitted. He wanted to know if there was an intent to excavate. He pointed out that it appeared that material would be moved around to create parking lots or to construct boat storage building #1. There was some topography that needed to be excavated; therefore, a narrative needed to be included. Attorney Dietel stated he could provide more detail, but in his opinion, he did not think the marina would be subjected to RSA 155E. for excavation activities. Dave Hussey thought the same. Attorney Dietel believed that the requirement was looking at two things: was material being brought on site, which they were not; and were materials being taken off site, which they were not. Russ Wilder stated that was put in place even if the material would be used on site. Dave Hussey did not think so; as long as it was on the same contiguous land, the marina could move as much material as they needed to. Russ Wilder asked if there was a substantial amount of blasting, was that of interest to the Board. Dave Hussey stated that the Town had a blasting ordinance. Scott Williams said that the fire department handled blasting. Scott Williams stated that he knew if blasting was being done near a house, the blasting company would put seismographs in the ground to make sure they were not rattling the whole neighborhood. Nic Strong stated that if more than 1,000 cubic yards of material was being moved, an Intent to Excavate was needed. She pointed out that a recent site plan that went through the Planning Board was reported to the State for the amount of material they removed from their site, and they did in fact have to file an Intent to Excavate. If material was going to leave the site, she wanted Brian Fortier to know that there may be fees involved with the State. Russ Wilder noted that an Intent to Excavate was needed only if the marina was taking the material off site. Nic Strong stated that the Site Plan Regulations required the narrative about the movement so the Board could judge the noise, the trucking, and the kinds of things that are a part of a site plan review. She stated that was needed even if the material was staying on site; it needed to be documented. The only time they needed an Intent to Excavate was if they were taking the material off site.

Russ Wilder addressed Signs. He noted that there was a sign there currently, and wanted to know if that was staying in place. Brian Fortier stated that he was going to relocate it. There would be signage added on Mauhaut Shores Road. Russ Wilder asked what that sign would consist of. Nick Loring, P.E., stated that the sign would indicate the companies that did business on that property. He stated that there was a depiction of the sign on Page 19L of the plan. Scott Williams stated they did not have that page. Nic

Strong shared with everyone that the plans were so large that not all of the pages were copied, but she did note that the Planner Review indicated that if the Board had any questions on anything that they could come to the office to see the complete plan. Nick Loring, P.E., shared a large set of plans for the Board. Russ Wilder noted that there were two (2) granite posts holding up the sign.

Dave Hussey asked how the marine construction company employees would access the site. Attorney Dietel stated they were going to access the property via Mauhaut Shores Road. Attorney Dietel stated that there was a road called WAM Road #2 that had parking alongside of it. People could then walk across the footbridge to access the marine construction.

Russ Wilder addressed hours of operation. The Site Plan Review Regulations required days and hours of operation for each proposed use. The Executive Summary listed that the office would be open from 8:00 am to 8:00 pm, seven days a week from May through November; the marina would be open 24/7 May 1st through November 1st; the marine construction company would be open from 7:00 am to 8:00 pm, seven days a week; the repair garage would be open from 7:00 am to 8:00 pm, seven days a week; and the security apartment/clubhouse would be open 24/7. The plan indicated that the marina had 10 employees and the repair side of the property had 12 employees.

Russ Wilder addressed customer/business traffic. The ITE Trip Generation Manual was used to determine parking for cars. The marina had 20 trips currently for peak hour in the morning and 48 in the afternoon. The proposed trips were 36 in the morning and 86 in the afternoon. This included employees and customers and was based on the existing 250 slips and the proposed 450. The service repair business currently consisted of 8 trips in the morning and 6 at night, and the proposed trips would be 15 in the morning and 19 in the afternoon. Russ Wilder asked if the marine construction company employees were included in the numbers for the service repair business. Nick Loring, P.E., stated, yes. Russ Wilder asked if that included the occasional person dropping off their boat. Nick Loring, P.E., stated, no. Brian Fortier pointed out that there would be fewer valet slips, only 75, and that would reduce traffic.

Russ Wilder noted that the Police, Highway, and Water Departments had no concerns. He wanted to make sure that the Conservation Commission comments submitted at last month's Design Review stay as part of the record.

Russ Wilder addressed Active and Substantial Development and Building, and Substantial Completion of Improvements. He proposed that given the complexity of the phasing and that Brian Fortier wanted some flexibility, he wanted Brian Fortier to propose to the Board what the thresholds should be. Attorney Dietel stated that he would add the thresholds to his list of items needed for next month's meeting.

Tom Hoopes mentioned that there would be a preconstruction meeting that was required to take place before construction began. Russ Wilder brought up construction observation. Sheldon Pennoyer thought that was what the engineers and architects were responsible for. Scott Williams stated that the Town Engineer was put in place to verify that what was on the plans was what actually took place. Scott Williams asked how long would it take to complete the project. Brian Fortier was hoping to get it completed in five years.

Roger Sample opened up public input.

Richard Finethy came to the table. He had concerns about the access to Mauhaut Shores Road because people traveled 55 miles per hour on the main road, making it difficult to access Mauhaut Shores Road. He shared there were a few accidents in that area when waiting to turn. He was concerned because the entrance to the marina was supposed to be just for employees and the occasional customer. He was also concerned about the number of boats that the storage building could hold. He thought that since there was more room down the middle of the building that more boats could be stored than what the building was listed as holding. He thought that everything that was proposed was minimized. He shared that what he understood was that the boats needed to get access from Mauhaut Shores Road in order to be placed in the storage buildings because there was no way to get from the marina basin to the boat storage area. Tom Hoopes stated that the boats would come across the water and would be lifted out with a fork truck. Peter Bolster stated that would happen in the marine landing area. Attorney Dietel stated that the intent was that customers would be using these services for years, and they may bring in a boat through Mauhaut Shores, but they would be dropping it off to use it on the lake. Mr. Finethy wanted to know why a sign was needed off Mauhaut Shores Road if that entrance was only supposed to be used by employees. Peter Bolster stated that there may be people from the public that would drop off their boat from time to time. Mr. Finethy thought that "from time to time" would turn into more than that.

Brian Fortier addressed Mr. Finethy and stated that the way he ran his business and the way it was going to be operated was that he took care of the customers that rented docks from him. He proposed boat storage buildings for the same number of boats that he had slips in the water for. The boat storage would accommodate the 72 boats in the valet building and boat storage buildings 1 and 2 would accommodate the 450 slips in the water. He made no accommodations for people off the street, although he did take in about 10-15 people off the street, but they brought their boats in by water from Mauhaut Shores Road, Echo Shores, and Timber Ridge Road. He did not operate the way most marinas operated because they were not interested in taking a person off the lake who was only looking for the cheapest option or a quick fix. He took care of his customers who were paying a lot of money to be in a slip. Mr. Finethy agreed that was how Mr. Fortier was running his business, but he thought that there were buildings being constructed that could potentially hold more boats than what was being represented. Attorney Dietel stated that Mr. Fortier would be more than happy to sit down with Mr. Finethy to discuss any of the concerns or questions he may have about the project. Mr. Finethy wanted to see all of the proposed changes in writing. Tom Hoopes stated that everything would be in writing and it was part of the Notice of Decision process. Mr. Finethy wanted to see exactly what would be brought in through Mauhaut Shores Road; he wanted to see exactly how many boats would be stored; and he wanted to see only boats stored in those storage buildings, as part of the approval process. He thought that this property had a potential of being sold or becoming an industrial zone. Tom Hoopes shared that it could not change use without coming to the Planning Board for any public hearings. Mr. Finethy stated that property owners, per the Zoning Ordinance, were not allowed to have these types of businesses in that zone, but yet, Mr. Fortier was allowed to do business there. Tom Hoopes thought that the approval from the ZBA consisted of restrictions on how Mr. Fortier could conduct his business.

Richard Finethy was also concerned about blasting and any potential damage to the surrounding structures, but thought that was the blasting company's responsibility. Dave Hussey stated before and after blasting was done, they would go to the abutting properties and assess for any damage. Mr. Finethy stated that he did not directly abut the property. Dave Hussey stated that did not matter; the blasting company would go out a certain distance from the blasting site to look at foundations and take pictures, if necessary.

Russ Wilder pointed out that approval #4 from the ZBA back in July of 2016 indicated that the Northeastern-most seasonal boat storage building shall be reduced in size from 160' x 300' to 160' x 200'. Attorney Dietel confirmed that was correct. He shared that the valet area was for customers that came into the marina to park, then the business would take the boat out to the water and to the service area, if needed. Russ Wilder asked if the people who use the valet service stored their boat in the same building in the wintertime. Brian Fortier stated that was a requirement.

Peter Bolster asked how many employees the marine construction company currently had. Brian Fortier stated, eight or ten. Peter Bolster thought several of the employees would not even go to the marina and instead would report to the job site itself; therefore, not even entering onto the marina property. Brian Fortier stated that the marine construction company had their office on Glidden Road. Russ Wilder asked where The Dive was going to be parked. Brian Fortier stated it was parked in front of the covered slips.

Richard Finethy had one more concern and that had to do with beeping forklifts at 6:30 in the morning. Scott Williams asked when the valet service ended. Brian Fortier stated 5:00 pm. Peter Bolster asked how many valet slips there were. Brian Fortier stated there were 178 rack spots, but the most he had ever done was about 95. Peter Bolster noted that the proposed valet spots brought it down to 72, which was a reduction of over 50%. Brian Fortier stated that the valet would really only be used once the docks were full; it was for overflow.

Cynthia Finethy came to the table. She noted that she had some of the same concerns as Richard Finethy. She wanted the Board to know that she came to the table to express her concerns and she was not there to argue with anyone or to hear their opinion, this was her time to express her concerns. At the last meeting, she brought up Mauhaut Shores Road and she was told that was not going to be an entrance way for anyone but employees. She thought that the proposals kept changing and she was not sure what to believe. She urged the Board members to make the left coming from Gilford on Mauhaut Shores Road. She was concerned because you could not really see oncoming traffic; therefore, they could not see you. There were several accidents at that area of road as it was, and she was concerned with the extra traffic that this proposal was going to create, especially in the summertime. She wanted to know how the boats would be taken out of the water and be placed into the storage units that were located near Mauhaut Shores Road. Russ Wilder stated that there was a well where the boat would go; it would be lifted out of the water with a forklift, go to the wash area, and then to the storage area. Virgil MacDonald showed Mrs. Finethy the plan and discussed it with her. Scott Williams thought that the Board should perform a site walk. Attorney Dietel wanted to point out that there was a public access point in the marina, and as a condition of DES approval, historically and currently, that area had to be maintained. Russ Wilder stated that the public would use the main marina road, and they could leave their trailer in a parking lot. Brian Fortier stated that was correct, but they had to pay the fee.

Cynthia Finethy brought up that at the last meeting she spoke about the possibility of a fire hazard, and the fact that Brian Fortier stated he would be putting in fire hydrants. Tom Hoopes stated that Brian Fortier wanted to meet with the Fire Department first, before stating whether he was putting in a cistern or a dry hydrant. Cynthia Finethy had concerns about the large storage buildings. She did not think that the buildings would be screened in enough and would be seen from the road because even now, you could see the marina from the road without the proposed storage buildings. She was concerned about the hours of operation. She asked if the Board talked about the construction hours and forklift noises; construction hours were from 6:30 am through 9:00 pm, 7 days a week. Dave Hussey stated that she would get used to the noises. Cynthia Finethy stated it was so easy to deal with because it was not in his backyard. Dave

Hussey stated it was in his backyard. Cynthia Finethy stated she was here to state her concerns and instead she kept getting little bits of feedback and snips like the comment from Dave Hussey about "you'll get used to the noise". She stated no, she was not going to get used to the noise. She stated that the Board members should say those comments in their heads and that she taught her first graders that they could think things in their head, but comments did not have to come out of their mouths. Dave Hussey stated that he could make comments and that was part of why he was on the Board. Cynthia Finethy stated that the Board made comments during her time to speak at the last meeting and now it was happening again and she did not think that was fair. She wanted to know if lighting was going to be addressed because she wanted to be able to look at stars when she looked up into the sky. Scott Williams stated that dark sky lighting was required and it could not be more than 3,000k. She then asked about how the blasting company configured the distance for blasting. She wanted to know how she could get information on the blasting regulations. Scott Williams suggested that she go to the Fire Department and ask them what the regulations were and when the company came in to get their permit to blast, there should be some documentation included with that and possible some type of notification process. Dave Hussey shared that when he did some blasting that there was a homeowner that put in a claim that his blasting cracked his foundation even though he was 2 miles away from the blasting site. Mrs. Finethy wanted to know if she would get some kind of notice ahead of the blasting date. Dave Hussey stated that the blasting company usually went and knocked on everyone's door to let the neighbors know they were blasting.

Brian Fortier noted that Dave Hussey mentioned that someone claimed that his blasting caused their foundation to crack 2 miles away from the blasting site, so what assurance did he have that someone would not come and do the same thing to him. Scott Williams stated that at the homeowner's request, the blasting company would inspect their foundation. If cracked foundations were found, the blasting company would compare the damage to their seismograph readings and see if the blasting was at fault.

Roger Sample closed public input.

Brian Fortier stated that he was nervous about the blasting. Peter Bolster stated that he should not be nervous about anything because it would be the blasting company's responsibility.

Russ Wilder thought there should be a site walk. Brian Fortier stated he was going away, but was going to be back for the next Planning Board meeting on December 18, 2018; he suggested doing the site walk before the next meeting. The Board scheduled a site walk for December 17, 2018, at 11:00 am, and they would meet at Mr. Fortier's office on site.

Attorney Dietel confirmed that he would provide a narrative on the excavation, comments from the Fire Department and Town Engineer, and a phasing narrative. Dave Hussey stated that he realized there could not be a second entrance, but was there a way that an evacuation plan could be drawn up, just in case there was an emergency, for example, putting up a notice on the side of a building. Roger Sample thought that the old marina road could be used as an evacuation route.

Scott Williams MOVED to continue Case # P18-27 to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 18, 2018.

Russ Wilder seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

5. Conceptual Consultation

Case #P18-28	Map 51 Lot 9-2	Conceptual Consultation/Subdivision
Jonathan Bainbridge, Applicant		Lakeshore Residential (LR) Zone
and Bing Hou of King Birch		125 Route 11D
Properties, LLC, Owner		

The Chairman read the case into the record.

Present were Jonathan Bainbridge and his wife, Sharon Bainbridge, owners.

Jonathan & Sharon Bainbridge came to the table. Mr. Bainbridge stated that he and his wife had been coming to Alton for about 30 years and they wanted to retire here. For the last 10 years, they had been renting from King Birch and were able to have their boat out front. An opportunity came up to purchase property across the street. He shared that he had talked to a few surveyors about subdividing the property, but he wanted to speak to the Board so he was not missing any details like driveway permits because there could be a possibility of a shared driveway, there were easements on that property, and a well radius waiver might be needed because it would be near a wetland. Peter Bolster noted that the 75' radius waiver was put in place because if an abutter wanted to put in a septic system right on the property line and it was closer than 75' to the other owner's well, they could not complain. That owner would be waiving their right to have that 75' radius. Mr. Bainbridge passed out some information to the Board.

Russ Wilder noted that a driveway permit was probably needed. Mr. Bainbridge drew on the plan he passed out. He pointed out that there was currently 150' of frontage and thought that cutting that in half would give him the 75' minimum that was required in that zone. He pointed out that that the 75' mark was right where the line was between the existing parking in front of the house and the driveway that went up to the barn. He was hopeful that 75' would not get complicated because of the driveway. Russ Wilder shared that last year, the regulations were changed to require 75' of frontage instead of 150', so the driveway would either have to be on the property, or an easement for a driveway. Tom Hoopes thought that the driveway could be a shared entrance, but split off into two. Mr. Bainbridge stated that he measured the 75' from the pin that was surveyed in 2001, and it ended up in between the two existing paved areas.

Russ Wilder was concerned about the wetlands out back, and he noted that in Mr. Bainbridge's letter to the Board that he was aware of the percentage needed for buildable land. Mr. Bainbridge stated that the surveyors that he consulted with stated that the property looked buildable. Peter Bolster wanted Mr. Bainbridge to be aware of the 3:1 ratio and it might require a waiver. Scott Williams pointed out that there were also 20' side and rear setbacks for newly created lots. Mr. Bainbridge stated there was a driveway easement on the property next door and he wanted to know if that would affect the 150'. Scott Williams thought it did. Scott Williams asked where the well was located for the motel. Mr. Bainbridge stated that the well for the motel was across the road. Scott Williams stated there would be a larger protective radius for a commercial well application; he thought it was 250'. He suggested that Mr. Bainbridge talk to his engineer. Mr. Bainbridge thought that you could share a well with a neighbor.

Tom Hoopes suggested that Mr. Bainbridge submit an application soon because there could be a petition that was supposed to be coming to the Town to change the frontage back to 150'. Scott Williams stated

as soon as the time period opened, once the petition was submitted, the rules would apply as if it was enacted. Tom Hoopes stated that if their application was submitted before that time, they would be held by the current regulations. Nic Strong stated that as soon as the notice was posted that the petition would be heard at the Planning Board meeting that was when potentially it could go into effect. Nic Strong stated that the protection only worked when an application was noticed on the agenda; therefore, the subdivision would have to be on the agenda prior to the agenda that posted the notice for the hearing in order for it to be protected. Mr. Bainbridge asked if the survey needed to be done at the time of application submittal. Nic Strong stated that the petition period did not end until the middle of December. Peter Bolster pointed out that the application needed to be on the agenda before the middle of December. Mr. Bainbridge stated that he would not be able to do that without a completed survey. Nic Strong stated that the Bainbridge's would have to be at the December meeting because the petition hearing would be in January. Roger Sample suggested that Mr. Bainbridge sit back and wait to see what happened because it did not sound as if an application submittal could happen prior.

Other Business:

- 1. Old Business:
- 2. New Business:
- 3. **Approval of Minutes:** October 16, 2018, Planning Board Meeting

Virgil MacDonald MOVED to approve the minutes of October 16, 2018, as presented. Dave Hussey seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

- 4. Correspondence for the Board's review/discussion/action:
- 5. Correspondence for the Board's information:
- 6. Any Other Business that may come before the Board:

Public Input on Non-Case Specific Local Planning Issues

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:55 p.m., Virgil MacDonald MOVED to adjourn. Dave Hussey seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica A. Call Recording Secretary

Minutes approved as amended: December 18, 2018