

Minutes approved 5-5-08

**Call to Order:** by Chairman, Bruce Holmes 7:00 p.m.

**Moment of Silence** in remembrance of the Bystrack Family.

**Present:** Bruce Holmes-Vice Chairman, Bill Curtin-Selectmen Representative, Bonnie Dunbar, Timothy Roy-Alternate, David Hussey-Alternate, Sharon Penney-Town Planner, Stacey Ames-Planning Assistant, Jennifer Fortin-Planning Secretary, Carolyn Schaeffner-Recording Secretary

**Appointment of Alternates:** Timothy Roy for Cindy Balcius and David Hussey for Scott Williams.

**Approval of Minutes:** post-poned to a workshop.

**Approval of Agenda:** Two additions to the agenda for conceptual hearings. Case P08-09 David Hussey, conceptual on a liquor store on Route 28, and Case P08-10 Cataldo and Saulnier conceptual on a sign on Route 11.

**Motion** B. Curtin to approve the agenda as amended. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Public Input:**

None seen or heard. Public input closed.

**Conceptual:**

**Case #P08-09**

**Tax Map 26, Lot 10**

**Conceptual Consultation**

**David Hussey**

**Route 28**

Bonnie Dunbar recused herself from this case.

Present for this case: David Hussey, Randy Tetreault

Proposed building – 3000 square feet to be added on to the left side of a building (indicated on a sketch). Located in between remaining land of the Hannaford project. Surveying has been done in this area. Based on the use of current buildings (Yellow office building and white apartment building), the requirement would be 43 parking spaces. To add this building would add another 10 spaces. The engineers have indicated this parking arrangement on the south side of the drainage way (55 spaces). There are 25 additional spaces to the north of the drainage way with reciprocal easements with Hannaford for access ways that go through the property. Accessed by Homestead Place. Existing parking is gravel lot – no pavement or painted lines. Tonight’s processing process is to get feedback on any hurdles they may not have anticipated.

S. Penney questioned acreage.

R. Tetreault informed it was 2.63 acres. Building will be 2 story in keeping with architectural design standard of current buildings. Setback issues – Plans show 25-foot setback on two sides and a 10-foot setback on the other two sides.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

B. Holmes concern for three entrances near each other, concern for traffic flow.

D. Hussey also noted there was another entrance/exit on Route 28.

R. Tatum noted the liquor store is not definite, that is just one of the buyers interested.

B. Curtin noted there is also a round-table discussion that is being set up within the next few months by the NH-DOT to discuss the traffic circle again. This may change some of the access points.

R. Tetreault willing to work on making changes if necessary.

No further discussion.

B. Dunbar resumed her place on the Board.

**Case P08-10  
Cataldo/Saulnier**

**Map 34, Lot 37-1**

**Conceptual Consultation  
Route 11**

Present: Richard Saulnier and Harvey Cataldo.

Proposed signage out toward street. How does the town feel about signage in the Bay? Land owned by the State. Building is setback from the road. Does not get sight traffic.

B. Curtin noted if the sign goes on Town property it has to be voted on by the Town.

R. Saulnier noted they would like the sign to go to the right of the entrance.

D. Hussey suggested on a sign for all the businesses in the strip.

B. Curtin suggested check with R. Bailey.

R. Saulnier noted they are checking with the State to check on property lines.

B. Curtin suggested to talk to State to determine property lines. Talk to the owner of the Pavilion and try to get him on board.

R. Saulnier noted it will be soft lighting.

No further discussion.

**Applications for Public Hearing**

**Case #P08-04  
Alton Bay Campmeeting Association**

**Map 34, Lot 33**

**Site Plan  
Beacon Avenue**

Minutes approved 5-5-08

Application submitted by J.L. Green Enterprises on behalf of the applicant Alton Bay Campmeeting Association for Site Plan to raze a 2 bedroom cottage and replace it with a duplex complete with meeting rooms. This parcel is located in the Residential Zone.

Present for this case: Melissa Guldbrandsen and David Schaeffner

T. Roy recused himself from this case.

Present tonight to get the feedback from Town Counsel from last meeting. Emphasis on uniqueness of property. Land owned by Association and cottages privately owned. Association does own some other structures that are used publicly.

S. Penney noted they are still waiting on hearing from Town Counsel.

D. Schaeffner noted they are willing to work with the town.

M. Guldbrandsen noted replacing a structure that is unsafe and too close to an abutting cottage. Widening and shift of Beacon Avenue to improve area.

B. Dunbar noted concern on how large the proposed building is. Feels this is not a trade-off but significant alteration. Proposed building is very large in comparison to what is there. What are the meeting rooms for and how large

D. Schaeffner noted there are two meeting rooms in the basement of the building.

B. Dunbar noted not just a residence but function space as well.

D. Schaeffner noted drainage – pervious surfaces. Putting in dry well to hold soils. Scott Williams stated good soils for drainage. Meeting rooms getting good use of buildings. 28-40 (2 rooms divided by a firewall). In 1967 building was burned that was approximately 28x60.

B. Dunbar asked what is being swapped for additional residential space.

M. Guldbrandsen noted this is what they are waiting on to hear from Town Counsel. There has been discussion on the removal of another building on the grounds but this is not a possibility. Septic more than adequate.

B. Curtin feels this should go to the ZBA.

B. Dunbar feels that expansion is not grandfathered and that this is not unique. Need to come in good faith to come in with a building in trade.

D. Hussey concern for setting a precedent.

S. Penney suggested a workshop to discuss further.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

**Motion** by B. Curtin to continue Case P08-01 to a workshop session on Thursday, February 28, 2008 at 6 p.m. Second by D. Hussey. Discussion – Sharon to have a recommendation from Town Counsel and applicant to have recommendation from ABCA Board. No further discussion.

T. Roy resumed his seat on the Board.

This continuance is the public notice for next meeting.

<b>Case P08-01</b>	<b>Map 9, Lot 53-20</b>	<b>Site Plan</b>
<b>Prospect Mountain Builders</b>		<b>Marie Drive</b>

Application submitted by Jonathan Ring, PE of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. on behalf of applicant Prospect Mountain Builders for a Site Plan to construct 2 duplex residential units with on-site septic and well. This parcel is located in the Residential Rural Zone. Continued from January 15, 2008 meeting.

Present: Brad Jones, Joe Coronati.

This property has been approved for a 21-lot subdivision. They had agreed they would come before the Board anytime they were going to put more than one unit on any one of the lots. They are proposing 2 duplexes with a total of 4 units. Presented a site plan with grading and utilities and building locations. Common driveway with one well and one septic system. Driveway will split left and right. Access to units will be from inside the lot itself. Detention pond in the rear of the lot and access along the left side of the lot. The owner/application is planning construction to begin in Spring.

B. Dunbar asked if this application has been accepted as complete.

S. Penney noted this was continued from January. Planner notes: new application for subdivision which was accepted on November 21, 2006 and approved on March 2007 with conditions and Mylar was signed off by Tom Hoopes in November of 2007. This is a site plan review for the first development on that subdivision. No surety is in place for the roads. Phasing on roads is proposed.

B. Dunbar concern for roads and asked if this was originally proposed to be phased.

Discussion on whether the bond has been set on the roads and phasing of the roads.

Discussion on whether these are going to be condominiumized. Attorney General has to approve the 21 lots if these are going to be condominiumized. Mr. Coronati does not know if this has been done. Mr. Caley is not present tonight.

B. Holmes noted a letter Mr. Caley about the roads. That the current bond is set at \$570,000 for 3800 lineal feet of construction. He is asking the Board to consider bond of \$292,000 for the first 1950 lineal feet of construction. So he has phased the road with this request.

S. Penney added they have not seen any paper work as to any bonds or securities.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

J. Coronati noted the question on the bond does not effect the approval of a site plan on this lot in the sense that the Board can still go forward and review this application as it stands right now. Does not feel it has any bearing on the bond on the road or the surety.

**Motion** by B. Dunbar to accept the application for P08-01 as complete. Second by D. Hussey. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

J. Fortin noted in speaking with Jack, he wants to phase it up to where it "Y". His suggestion was 100 feet past the "Y". Kenny wants it reduced to 50 feet past the "Y" if he is going to phase it that way. That way he is not going too much further in saying, the road is up here and I can build on this lot. There is going to be a hammerhead.

B. Holmes asked about question from Town Counsel and there was a blank on one of the easements. There were a meets and bounds that was missing.

S. Penney is assuming that this has been filled in and she will check on this.

B. Dunbar stated the road bond needs to be in place prior to any building permits being issued.

S. Penney confirmed yes.

B. Dunbar asked about limited common area.

J. Coronati stated there will common decks behind the buildings and the driveways and areas around the buildings.

B. Dunbar noted these need to be spelled out and condo documents stating as such and submitted for review. Another question on the restrictions governing use in the Rural Residential Zone. Page 42 in the Zoning booklet, Section 463.a.2. Duplexes and multi-family dwellings must have a minimum of 1 acre per unit with no more than 4 dwelling units per structure and no more than one duplex or multi-family dwelling per lot.

S. Penney noted this application was accepted before that Zoning Change.

B. Dunbar stated that they never approved any multi-families on this subdivision. Added they tried to put this on the plans and the Board had them take it off because they were saying they could have multi-units on any lots.

S. Ames stated it was approved for up to 47 units. This is on the approval.

B. Dunbar noted the configuration was not on the plan and were told they would need to come for site plan approval and would have to comply with the Zoning that was presently in place.

J. Fortin read that the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction of number of unit that are going on each one of the lots. The application was approved according to the units on the plan. The notice is vague.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

S. Ames stated they have discussed this with Town Counsel because this was an issue.

J. Coronati feels they are still under the old zoning because they were approved under the old zoning and subject to coming back before this Board under the old zoning.

S. Penney has all the notices and the old zoning because they researched this, as well as the easement.

J. Coronati noted the old zoning does not mention having all the units being in one building. That's really the only difference there.

B. Dunbar confirmed but it's just how many structures are allowed on a lot may have changed.

J. Coronati stated the old zoning says no more than 2 dwellings per lot are permitted without subdivision approval, all uses one acre.

B. Dunbar added the Board was not approving a subdivision of numbers. They were approving lots and within those lots you have the ability to exercise site plan if they are large enough to go forward. That's why the Board would not approve numbers of dwellings or make them take it off. There were supposed to be taken off when the Mylar was signed.

S. Ames noted they were not taken off of the subdivision plan and it says up to a maximum of 50 units/21 lots.

B. Dunbar noted they can have 50 units quite probably but it's up to 4 to a building.

Recess at 8:20 p.m. resumed at 8:35 p.m.

B. Dunbar noted after research of the 2006 Zoning they fall under that Zoning. As put on that plat it actually refers to an incorrect number when they had already updated the Zoning and added it so it's really 463. There was a clerical error on the note. What was recorded with the Mylar was not exactly the Zoning they fall under but they will honor that it referred to the old 363 which is now 463. Duplexes are fine according to the Zoning.

B. Dunbar asked about on C-1 and what are the detention ponds for on Map 9.

J. Coronati stated they were designed as part of the original subdivision and it is for storm water drainage and treatment for the road. It is part of the overall drainage scheme for the whole project.

B. Dunbar asked if this will be built before any other construction?

B. Jones noted this will be built when the road is built. The pond should be in place prior to the buildings being built.

B. Dunbar asked about septic location.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

J. Coronati noted the 4-K area on the plans for the approved location of the septic systems by the Town and the State. Most likely they will go in the same location but it does have to stay a certain distance from the pond.

B. Dunbar asked how the lots are being conveyed.

J. Coronati stated he the structures will be built and sold as duplexes. Single owner for each duplex.

B. Dunbar asked for more clarification with regard to how they are being conveyed, sold as 4 units, sold as 2 units, question about the common areas, etc.

J. Coronati stated he did not know the answer to that question. He stated he was here tonight for the proposal for 4-units on one lot not condominiumized.

B. Dunbar stated they would need to come back to the Board again if they were to be sold individually.

J. Coronati agreed – condominium conversion.

D. Hussey asked who will own the common area.

J. Coronati informed there will be no common are on this lot or within the subdivision.

S. Penney asked about acreage being marked on the plans.

J. Coronati stated it was on C-1.

Open to the public for input.

None seen or heard.

Public input closed.

B. Dunbar asked about sight distance.

J. Coronati stated there is 250 feet in either direction.

B. Dunbar asked about the Fire Department recommendation regarding the cistern.

S. Ames noted they are working on cistern issues.

B. Curtin asked how close the two structures are going to be.

J. Fortin stated 130 feet apart with a well for 4-units.

T. Roy asked about the well and who will monitor this and are there storage tanks.

J. Coronati stated there will be storage tanks in each unit and the owner will monitor.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

General discussion on restrictions and how often water is to be tested.

**Motion** by B. Dunbar to approve Case P08-01 with the following conditions:

1. A copy of all necessary Federal, State, and/or Local permits must be received by the Planning Department and the permit numbers must be added in a note on the plat prior to plan signing.
2. Trees along the boundary of the 25 foot wetland buffers and area within 200 feet of the proposed development that will be disturbed by soil or involved in the removal of trees are to be flagged on the plat and accurately in the field on tree approximately every 25 feet with permanent markers identifying them as wetland buffers. The types of proposed signage to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board. Where trees have been previously removed or do not exist the wetlands buffer shall be flagged with metal fence posts displaying the markers, which should be affixed to the post with bolts. This is to be complete prior to the plan signing and certificate as complete by the surveyor who stamps the plat.
3. The following note should be added to the plan prior to plan signing: This subdivision plan is subject to the conditions of approval itemized in the February 19, 2008 Notice of Decision on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.
4. The following note must be added to the plan prior to plan signing: This plan consists of 6 sheets. The sheets are numbered C-S, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, and D-1.
5. Building permits may be issued as bonding is in place for the portion of Marie Drive that goes 50 feet beyond the intersection of Elizabeth Way. Certificate of Occupancy may not be issued until Marie Drive, 50 feet beyond the intersection of Elizabeth Way is built and finally approved by Town Engineer.
6. The detention pond on Map 9, Lot 53-20 is completed and no Certificate of Occupancy may be issued until completed.
7. The driveway placement is contingent upon the Highway Department permitting.
8. The Fire Department's recommendations are to be followed in that both units will need to be constructed in accordance with the latest version of the IBCNFPA1, and NFPA101 and NFPA70 as pertaining to one and two family dwellings.
9. A cistern will need to be installed before Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.
10. Applicant to schedule a pre-construction meeting with the Planning Department to go over check-list of items to be completed.
11. This condition of approval expires on February 19, 2010.

Second by B. Curtin. No discussion. Vote unanimous.



Minutes approved 5-5-08

**Case P08-07  
Byrne Development Co.**

**Map 15, Lot 17**

**Subdivision  
Route 28A**

Application submitted by Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. on behalf of applicant Byrne Development Co. to propose a 13-lot subdivision with private wells and on-site leach field areas. This parcel is located in the Rural Residential Zone.

B. Curtin disclosed that he has done previous business with Mr. Byrne and Mr. Byrne stated he did not have a problem with Mr. Curtin sitting on the Board for this case and the other Board members did not have a problem with this either.

Present for this case: Joe Coronati, Brad Jones and Joe Byrne

Noted from the Planner that the applicant proposes a three lot subdivision with a preceding lot line adjustment that includes Lot 17, Lot 17-4, and Lot 17-5. The Board will need to approve the lot line adjustment prior to the subdivision.

Waivers noted – margin size, they had checked no waivers and needed the signature on town application and original signature on agent authorization – received a copy of a signature. This was then signed in the meeting and corrected that there was a waiver.

Question on ownership of the lots. Mr. Byrne owns all three.

J. Coronati noted they would like the adjustment and subdivision approved as a joint application. They would not want to go forward with a lot line adjustment consolidation unless the subdivision was approved.

T. Roy asked the size of Lot 17-4 with the lot line adjustment?

J. Coronati informed approximately 52,000 square feet, labeled on sheet A-1.

S. Penney asked about copies of the warranty deed on original application and breakdown of three lots. Lot 3 1.66 acres, Lot 4 1.66 acres and Lot 5 12.62 acres.

J. Coronati informed that Lot 4 would be Map 15, Lot 17-4.

B. Jones added there will be no changes to Lots 1, 2 and 3.

S. Penney asked for the warranty deed for Lot 17.

J. Coronati noted that Lot 17 was referred to in the deed as Lot 6 and it is part of the application.

**Motion** by B. Curtin to accept the application for Case P08-07 as complete. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

J. Coronati presented their proposed subdivision on Eastside Drive consisting of 2 parcels with additional land from a third parcel. There were 6 lots subdivided in 2002 and Mr. Byrne purchased them and they are making some adjustments to one of them and consolidating the two larger lots. The total area for the project is 24.6 acres. One of the larger lots, Lot 17, has a lot of frontage on Mirimichi Hill Road, which is a Class 6 road. The proposal is for 13 lots to be subdivided off a cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac is roughly 1300 feet long. There are two wetland crossings for the site. One for the main road and one for a common driveway for Lots 2 and 3. They have dug test pits on all lots to prove they meet septic requirements for the State as well as the Town. Road design and cross sections, drainage calculations for the project have been done. The road is designed to slope a little way down – down hill from Route 28 and then a vertical curve in the road picks up and goes up the hill and then at the cul-de-sac it flattens out. The steepest part of the road is 8% grade and that is for a relatively short distance up the road. The sight distance on Eastside Drive is good, the road is continually sloping. It has been added to the plan to show sight distance. They have good sight distance exiting the property and they are going down away from the road to help the drainage on Eastside Drive to help prevent no water coming out of the project on to the road. At the entrance they did propose a fire cistern which maybe they will be reviewing with the Fire Chief as the process moves forward.

B. Holmes asked about the shaded that follows the road all the way around.

J. Coronati noted that was an easement on road for grading drainage.

B. Curtin asked if they eventually plan for the Town to take over the road.

J. Coronati affirmed and it will be built to Town standards.

B. Dunbar asked about the driveway on Lots 8 and 9 and lots 2 and 3.

J. Coronati added they proposing Lot 8 to access through Lot 9 in order to avoid a wetland crossing on Lot 8. And on Lots 2 and 3 they are actually looking to have a common drive to have only one wetland crossing to get to the buildable area, which is out behind the wetland crossing, closer to Mirimichi Hill Road.

B. Holmes asked about the drainage calculations.

J. Coronati noted they have done drainage calculations on the site. Designed all the cross culverts and looked at the ditch stability which is why they are proposing riprap on one side of the road. They have all the storm water treatment necessary. This site also does require a site specific permit from the State and they will also be looking at the storm water quality and quantity issues.

B. Dunbar questioned the miscellaneous structures on Lot 1.

B. Jones noted there were small sheds.

Open to the public for input.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

Don Rocus, 708 Eastside Drive. Stated Mr. Byrne builds a very good house. Question asked if this is the first time the Board are seeing the project.

B. Holmes stated yes.

D. Rocus asked if anyone from the Town walked the property.

B. Holmes noted they cannot yet do so.

D. Rocus stated he asked this because of the layout where the roadway is that is in the center of the valley of the property and the pieces of property from Route 28-A, the change in elevation from that roadway to what seems to be, a proposed building site on each one of those pieces of property is very drastic. If a home were to be built on the proposed level areas, the driveway would have to be fairly steep in order to get to the house. He just wanted to make sure the Board did know this and take care of that situation. Also there was a request to vacate 1300 square feet of marshland with regard to this project and wanted to know where on the plan that marshland is located. (Mr. Coronati indicated on the plans where this is located). According to the layout that he has seen, there are driveways on each lot and indicating where possible structures might be. Also on the layout are indications where septic systems and drain fields and the wells located. Are those set in stone or does each one separately have to be applied for when a house permit is requested.

B. Curtin advised there will be an approved septic design showing the exact location and that has to be approved by the State.

D. Rocus concern that the plans are proposed and not confirmed, concern for possible changes.

B. Dunbar noted that if the lot is found unbuildable a lot might be combined with another lot.

T. Roy stated these plans show where there are available areas for the septic and water.

D. Rocus noted concern for lot 2 and potential driveway and privacy to the back of his property.

Darlene LaCroix, 662 Eastside Drive. Presented a letter to the Board and referred to her concerns. Concern for more roads and run off for 13 lots. Past flooding problems, blind driveways, there is a small brook that runs through her property and feels this may disrupt her brook. Asked for the Board to say no to this subdivision proposal. Concern for steep hills that run in both directions.

Stacy Lundy for parents, Betty and Tom Sackos (currently out of town), 643 Eastside Drive. Concern for two problems. Subdivision of the property will cause 643 Eastside Drive to be under water when done. Asked if they have to apply for a wetland application that will need to be approved by the State. (confirmed by B. Holmes). Asked if there will be a culvert under the road? (B. Jones confirmed). Asked if this was going to be done on Lot 3 as well (B. Jones confirmed). Asked if all of that will take the natural flow of the water. (J. Coronati confirmed). Concern for the increased flow of water. Asked who did the water flow study (J. Coronati stated Jones and Beach did the water flow study). Confirmed that there will be no potential flow of increased flow of water. (J. Coronati stated the water on site is held by ditches, the culverts do not speed it up, it may actually slow it down in cases depending on how

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

they are placed) S. Lundy asked if paving the gully will not speed up the water on to Route 28A. (J. Coronati stated no, the road creates basically, a natural detention pond at the little intermittent stream before it goes into Saw Mill Brook – between lots 12 and 13, they also have different methods to hold the water from increasing off site). S. Lundy asked if a contingency plan could be put in place for any water damage for the lots that this stream runs through? This runs through the side and back of her parent's property where there is a leach field and a shed. (J. Coronati noted the calculations were done on a 25 year event). (J. Coronati confirmed that all the plans are reviewed by the Town and the State and they comply with all the storm water regulations in place. S. Lundy asked again what kind of contingency plan be put in place. (J. Coronati suggested a meeting can be set to meet with the neighbors and address their concerns).

Myrna Knight, Chestnut Cove Road. Currently has water running through fence. Has called Highway Department to remove rocks in culvert from previous construction. When water was high it washed away her driveway and the front yard was flooded.

B. Curtin reminded her that a lot of the recent high water is not just from construction. Noted extra high storms the last couple of years.

David Slade, Map 15, Lots 10 and 11. Noted the proposed property has been known for years as the "hopper hole". Concern for the view from above. Has a deeded view easement for Lots 7 & 8. Concern about what development would do to easement. Easement is on record. (B. Holmes asked for a copy of that easement to have on record). D. Slade will provide this to the Planning Office. Stated Mr. Byrne has been cooperative in discussions with him and would like to resolve this and is just bringing this to the Board's attention and asking that any approval be resolved to mutual satisfaction. Stated that Mirimichi Hill Road was closed to building as it is such a steep and dangerous road leading to the bottom of 28A which is a fairly blind entrance on to 28A and has residual concern for the development below that are close to Mirimichi Hill Road than the actual new road that might encourage traffic up and down. He called the town today and spoke with Pat Rockwood and would like to submit a letter to propose to the Town that, if possible, that he purchase just a piece of that old road at the top, in-between two properties, that he owns so that he can make it not a throughway to avoid the possibility of traffic going up and back down that road.

No further input seen or heard.

Closed public input.

S. Penney had question on C-2 with errors, buildable lot size table, total lot size is almost 56,000 and buildable area is 83,270.

J. Coronati noted it should be 53, 270.

S. Penney also asked if they were aware of the 25/75 ratio in terms of slopes and buildable area. Does not see this coming out correct on the lot configurations at this point.

J. Coronati stated all the lots all meet buildable size areas, which is half the lot size, he believes.

B. Curtin added, Lot 17-22 should be Lot 17-2.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

B. Holmes asked if the Board wanted to do a site walk.

J. Coronati added they would like to plan construction for beginning in June or July.

S. Penney asked where they were in the State process.

J. Coronati noted they have submitted all the permits a couple of weeks ago. They do have driveway permits.

T. Roy asked about a traffic study.

J. Coronati noted they have great sight distance.

S. Penney noted they need to pick an engineer of record.

B. Holmes stated they should do a site walk before April 15<sup>th</sup>.

General discussion on site walk. Decided to put this off to discuss at the next meeting when the majority are present.

B. Holmes would like the road staked.

**Motion** - by B. Curtin to continue Case P08-07 to the March 18 Planning Board meeting and at that time set a date and time for a site walk. Second by D. Hussey. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Case #P08-08  
Heath**

**Map 8, Lot 25**

**Site Plan**

**182 Frank C. Gilman Highway**

Application submitted by Thomas Varney of Varney Engineering LLC on behalf of agent Melissa Guldbrandsen of Alton Law and applicant Ryan Heath for a proposed 57 unit Elderly Housing Development. This parcel is located in the Residential Rural Zone.

Present for this case: Tom Varney, Melissa Guldbrandsen and Ryan Heath.

B. Dunbar asked the Planner about storm water plan and erosion control due to the amount of driveways and flat roofs and where it is going to go.

S. Penney noted a report was submitted.

**Motion** by B. Dunbar to accept the application as complete. Second by D. Hussey. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Discussion the time (10:50 p.m.) and the number abutters here. After discussion the Board agreed to continue for abutters to be heard.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

M. Guldbrandsen presented project. Elderly housing project. Specific section of the Zoning Ordinance with governs elderly housing. This project complies with all of those regulations to a "T". It was designed around the regulations. There are some wetlands and they were very careful to avoid the wetlands so the road comes in around wetlands where traditionally plans would have been to cross. The project has 57 units, which is somewhat unusual in the Town. The elderly housing ordinance is similar to cluster housing developments. There is also, along with the density, a certain amount of required open space. This has been done with at least 30% open space as required by the ordinance. This is also affordable housing for the elderly. This project would qualify for housing subsidies. They have gone through the regulations and planned this so it complies with the elderly housing voucher program. The other item is that the water on the property is contaminated by an oil spill from the abutting Irving Oil transfer station. Town water main comes relatively close to the project. Plans have been presented to the Town Water Department and they have looked at the calculations of gallons per day and passed around a letter that they will be able to bring town water into the project so it solves the big problem that this piece of property has with contaminated water. They have a driveway permit and it allows it to be shifted and this allows for increased sight distance and addressed the question for increased use. The road is designed to avoid wetlands for safety. This is not going to be a public road. Increased road plans for side walks. Road comes in 2-way to one way. \$2,350 feet in length. Low impact on the town services (i.e. schools). Easy accessible by fire, police, and rescue. There will be a community center, slowed in zoning for a general store limited to residents and guests located in the community center with bathrooms, pool area. Plenty of space for parking to comply. Ample area for new leach field if one should fail. Mailbox cluster with bench area for possible public transport. Maintenance buildings put up near front of property and reduced in size. 4 units per building with basement. Current house has been renovated with new door area, siding, new windows, all single story. Also a proposed sign on the plans they have reserved with a trade name, "Stone Meadow Commons".

B. Dunbar asked if maintenance building will be designed to fit in with design of houses. She would also like to see elevations of the plan.

Open to the public.

Randy Glinds, 234 Frank C. Gilman Highway. Expressed dismay of project. Traffic increase – already a problem and concern for increase of 57 cars. Concern for all equipment will be necessary for maintenance of property. Property values will decrease allow low-income property. Many hunt in the area and hunt at night (coyote). Change the entire nature of the rural community.

David Turner – 218 Frank C. Gilman Highway. Concern for low income housing in rural residential area. Concern that only one person in each household has to be 62. Noted there is a propane tank located at the exit, concern that the only way out if a fire should occur. What has the fire department reported? Who is paying for bringing the water up the hill (R. Heath stated he was paying for this.)? Corrected that the water contamination was a gas spill and the contamination is MBTE. This carcinogen is rancid and concern for elderly and this is absorbs through the skin. Asked about a traffic study and concern for elderly traffic, especially coming up the hill in the winter. Does not want 57 housing units behind his house in the rural residential zone. Feels this is a recipe for disaster.

## Minutes approved 5-5-08

Bob Bergeron – 170 Frank C. Gilman Highway. Asked about the snowmobile trail going through the property. Will this trail be able to continue through the property (R. Heath agreed)? Asked if there will be any stipulations that there cannot be any school-aged children living there (M. Gulbrandsen stated they would not be anticipating that kind of a stipulation). B. Bergeron asked if they would object to one. (M. Gulbrandsen stated that they possibly could not make this restriction, added that the owner is being careful to comply with the federal law). Due to that reply B. Bergeron stated that no one should go into this with the belief that there will not be school-aged children in this community and that they are really building low-income housing for the elderly. B. Curtin asked what percentage is required to be in the community of a certain age. M. Gulbrandsen stated the State law lists two alternatives; one is a 55 community where at least one resident is 55 and 80% of the population has to comply with that. The Asked how many bedrooms in each units (M. Gulbranden answered all are two bedroom with a couple one bedroom units also stated Mr. Bergeron was correct in that there realistically could be school-aged children in the community but would generally be low impact on the schools.) B. Bergeron continued that he is an abutter on two sides of this property and this will attract people that are looking for extremely affordable housing. His complaint is not about affordable housing, it's the density of the housing that is being put into, what was, the rural residential area. The other people in this area are paying the tax burden to live in a rural residential area. They are paying the tax burden of having large acreage restrictions on what they can do with their land and plunked in the middle of this now is a density that dwarfs it. To put this into perspective, if he did the same thing on his land that will be 2800 units. Also added encouraged the Board to come and view the line of sight from the driveways. This zoning regulation did not anticipate 57 units in an area of this size. Feels the wetlands delineation is not correct. The water line that is being run up the hill, will all properties that this passes be required to hook up to the water line. Concern for out buildings (storage, pool, community center) (B. Dunbar noted that ancillary buildings are not considered in acreage. Considered as a plus to the community). Also concern for what size main coming up the hill, will it be accessible for anyone to access. (B. Dunbar suggested he contact the water department with regards to those questions). Asked about Ferns Energy had an easement to the driveway (T. Varney noted it was on the plans). (M. Gulbrandsen noted it was an original easement was granted in 1963 and it was a right to pass and repass on a proposed road and it was not developed and they hold a position that this was an abandonment of this easement, and they have made an arrangement with Irving that they are welcome to use the proposed road.)

Notation from B. Holmes on the lateness.

Closed public hearing for this meeting.

Discussion that this will be first on the next Planning Board meeting.

Noted publicly that public input will still be heard on the next meeting.

**Motion** by B. Dunbar to continue case P08-08 to the next meeting on March 18 at 7 p.m. Second by D. Hussey. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Noted that there will be no formal notice. Abutters will not be re-opened.

**Motion** by B. Curtin to adjourn. Second by D. Hussey. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Minutes approved 5-5-08

Respectfully submitted,  
Carolyn B. Schaeffner