Called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Dube

Members Present: Jeremy Dube-Chairman, Bonnie Dunbar, Cynthia Balcius, Tom Hoopes, Wally Keniston, Cris Blackstone, Jean Crouse, James Bureau, Monica Jerkins-Planning Assistant, Carolyn Schaeffner-Recording Secretary

Appointment of Alternates Wally Keniston and Bonnie Dunbar

Approval of Minutes January 17, 2006, June 6, 2006, and August 17, 2006.

January 17, 2006 minutes discussed and corrections marked by the Planning Assistant on original minutes.

<u>Motion</u> by T. Hoopes to accept that the minutes of January 17, 2006 as corrected. Second by J. Crouse. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

June 6, 2006 minutes discussed and discovered that page 2 is missing from Board member copies. Minutes will be considered at the next Planning Board meeting.

August 17, 2006 minutes discussed and corrections marked by the Planning Assistant on original minutes. **Motion** by T. Hoopes to accept the minutes of August 17, 2006 as corrected. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Approval of Agenda

The following cases have requested to be continued:

Case P06-55 continued to the September 21, 2006 meeting.

Case P06-70, continued to the October meeting.

Case P06-74, continued to the October meeting.

Case P06-76, withdrawn per the applicant's request.

<u>Motion</u> by J. Crouse to accept the agenda as amended. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Public Input. None seen or heard. Closed public input.

Applications for Public Hearing

Case #P06-53
Joan L. and Terry J. Chase
Continued from the July 18, 2006 hearing.

Map 15, Lot 34 2-Lot Subdivision Route 28 & Gilman's Corner Road

- C. Balcius stepped down for this case.
- T. Hoopes stepped down for this case.
- J. Bureau is appointed for this case.

Present for this case George Chrisenton, Joan and Terry Chase.

G. Chrisenton discussed the reason for being back to have Lot 2 wetlands mapped. Noted a small area of about 4700 sq. ft. of wetland on Lot 2. There is a wavier on Lot 1 for wetland map. Noted details on map, delineation, stamp, and notes.

Open to public input.

None seen or heard.

Closed public input.

- J. Dube sees no problem with what the applicant is asking.
- W. Keniston asked about a possible driveway location on Lot 2 that projects into a stone wall and if the stone wall will be removed if they use that location.
- G. Chrisenton said yes, the stonewall would be removed.

<u>Motion</u> by J. Crouse to approve case P06-53 pending appropriate permits obtained from State, Federal, and Local authorities. Second by W. Keniston. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

- T. Hoopes resumed his seat on the Board
- C. Balcius recused herself for this case,

Case #P06-79 Robert and Angela Bystrack

Map 5, Lot 72-7

Design Review

Suncook Valley Road (NH Rte 28)

Request submitted by Robert and Angela Bystrack for a conceptual design review of a proposed 71-lot campground. The property is within the Rural Zone.

Present for this case Robert and Angela Bystrack.

- R. Bystrack stated they were back with their plan. They went to the ZBA and were approved. Noted they have been before this Board before and requested a couple of changes.
- T. Hoopes asked why they went to the ZBA
- R. Bystrack answered for a Special Exception Campground on use.
- M. Jerkins noted this project will be phased as noted on the application.
- J. Dube asked if they still plan to continue to phase the project.
- R. Bystrack stated the first phase would include the first 20 sites along with a bathhouse.
- A.Bystrack phased over approximately 5 years.
- R. Bystrack stated they may not build all 71, maybe 60.
- J. Dube suggested phasing to be on the plan, and possible only 60 sites.

- R. Bystrack met with DOT and suggested move driveway entrance over which they plan on doing.
- T. Hoopes asked for rough notes for phasing on the main road.
- R. Bystrack phase one would be a loop temporarily and noted this would be referenced.
- T. Hoopes mentioned the concern for off road vehicles. Feels this needs to be addressed.
- J. Dube noted benefit rides, off road would be restricted.
- R. Bystrack noted that the State trail runs through their property.
- B. Dunbar question on well radius and their protection.
- R. Bystrack noted they were proposed wells. Until the septic design is actually drawn up and submitted they will make appropriate adjustments.
- B. Dunbar asked about dates of operation.
- R. Bystrack April through November as maximum.
- B. Dunbar type of recreation on property.
- R. Bystrack 50 plus community (no children).
- J. Dube asked about campsite hookup.
- R. Bystrack each will have full hookup.
- B. Dunbar asked about refuse area marked on the plans.
- R. Bystrack noted the plan is to locate this up near front office.
- A.Bystrack would like to keep the sites "in the woods". No a lot of cutting.
- R. Bystrack noted office and bathhouse will be post and beam, rough cut lumber.
- W. Keniston asked about ZBA suggestions on what lots to cut out.
- R. Bystrack stated it was more the Conservation Board concern with the 25 ft no cut buffer. The camp sites are 60 ft long and really only need to be 35-40 feet deep. They are willing to make those suggested a non-site or make the sites smaller. They are willing to do what the Board would suggest.
- W. Keniston asked regarding main road coming in to park if this is one way.

- R. Bystrack informed the main entrance is 22 feet wide with traffic in both directions. The legs are swinging off are single direction with a minimum of 12 feet wide.
- W. Keniston asked phase one question and maneuverability of trailers and the end of the road.
- R. Bystrack noted the road would be cul-de-sac for ease of moving trailers.
- C. Blackstone asked if trailers would be store over winter.
- R. Bystrack no.
- M. Jerkins question on phase development and site plan fees. Asked how they would be charged for application fees.
- T. Hoopes noted if it were done on a phased basis you would pay on the phases as worked on.
- B. Dunbar noted it would be to pay for phase one, and when complete come back for approval for each consecutive phase.
- C. Blackstone does not want to see them be restricted on a phase timeline.
- B. Dunbar feels they need to have a vested interest in the project.
- A.Bystrack would like the entire project approved now.
- T. Hoopes asked if they want to pay the entire acreage fee upfront.
- A.Bystrack stated yes. Technically it is only phased as they can afford to do this.

Discussion among the board regarding fees.

<u>Motion</u> by J. Crouse to open up to public input. Second C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

None seen or heard. Public input closed.

- B. Dunbar asked what is being taken out of current use.
- R. Bystrack 20 acres out of 138 being taken out of current use.
- W. Keniston asked about open fires.
- R. Bystrack planning on fire pits.
- T. Hoopes they discuss this with the Fire Chief and have a plan.
- M. Jerkins asked about a waiver for the applicants to show the entire parcel.

- J. Dube does not see an issue with that.
- A.Bystrack asked if they want road changed around buffers.
- J. Dube said that would be the best to avoid the wetland buffers.
- A.Bystrack asked about wetlands and high water marks. Plan was done 2000.
- J. Dube said they need a stamped plan for this project. A stamp could either show the current plans have not changed or new plan. Need clear delineation on buffer
- J. Dube asked for any more Board input.
- A.Bystrack asked about the checklist on the application. Asked which "studies" the Board is looking for,
- J. Dube stated all of them.

Environmental impact and fiscal impact not need.

- B. Dunbar noted DOT will give you the information that they need when you go to DOT and the Board will most likely take the recommendation from DOT.
- A.Bystrack confirmed the Board is looking for studies on drainage, traffic and erosion control needed. Asked about the benchmark if this is sufficient.
- J. Dube confirmed yes.
- C. Balcius resumed her seat on the Board.

Case #P06-81 Holmes Land Trust

Map 2, Lot 23

2-Lot Subdivision Hollywood Beach Road

Application submitted by David A. Berry, on behalf of the property owner, Holmes Land Trust, for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

Planning Assistant noted in Board packet for this application is the Planner Report prepared by Peer Kraft-Lund with recommendations. This was also presented last month with this application.

Present for this case is John Berry and Richard Holmes.

T. Hoopes asked about Lot 23 having 1070 feet of frontage on Hollywood Beach Road and is 30.8 acres in area.

Discussion and question on perimeter boundary and the fact it was surveyed in 1985 and has not been updated and can the Board accept this. Concern due to the age of the survey.

C. Balcius noted that slope and wetlands are not on plans and thought this was requested the last meeting.

- J. Berry noted this was on page 2 just below locust map.
- C. Balcius noted 1.53 acres are left on Lot 23-2. Basically not steep slope or wetlands. Asked about topo area on lot 23.
- J. Berry referred to page 3 where the area has been topo'd on Lot 23. It is at least an acre of topo on Lot 23.
- C. Balcius noted this need to make sure it meets the criteria of steep slopes and wetlands. Need to make sure enough area is shown to determine whether you need the 25% rule.

Discussion of the three cottages on lot 23.

Discussion on the easement and the wetlands.

Discussion on where the remainder lot boundary line is and indicated on the plans.

- C. Balcius asked Mr. Berry to show property line.
- J. Berry noted on plans the property line.
- M. Jerkins suggest that the Board make a conditional acceptance. The applicant is here tonight with changes made as requested from the last meeting.
- T. Hoopes noted the last page which shows two cross-sections and the diagram shows birm to remain as protection to Morrison Brook. He feels this should be included as it should not be breached at any point and should be a part of the condition.

<u>Motion</u> by C. Balcius to conditionally accept the application for Case P06-81 granting a partial waiver on the survey requirements for Lot 23 provided that additional information is provided. Second by T. Hoopes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

John Berry noted page 1 of plan is based on a boundary survey and subdivision that is stamped and signed by licensed land surveyor and approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. Proposing to cut off a lot shown as 23-2 separating it from 23 using the Morrison Brook as the far lot line with a proposed new lot line. An intense survey was done and flagged by Varney Engineering in an around the area where development is going to take place. Page 2 areas are shown and cross-hatched to show areas of wetland. Morrison Brook had a flood plain and is shown. They are providing access to Half Moon Lake through Hassenfoos Lane. Meets and bounds description of that lane are provided so it can be incorporated into the deed when the deed is written the transfer has taken place. The proposed lot has approximately 241 feet along the lakeshore of Half Moon Lake. Lot area calculations are shown as requested. Page 3 shows topo on lot 23-2 and lot 23. SCS soils are depicted. Area in question is a Windsor soil (group 1 soil-sandy conditions). Test hole information is on plan. Show 4000 sq ft area shown around test pit. Two benchmark shown on Page 3 with potential house location not necessarily exactly where it will go. Prospected buyer of the property would like to build further back on the lot than more closer up to the front. There is an existing trail which will be used as proposed driveway. Page 4 changed scale in ½ for

25% slopes. Lot 23 slopes shown and is highlighted. Referenced question on Morrison Brook protection and a silt fence has been installed to prevent erosion. Page 5 shows cross sections shown on proposed house area and leech area. Noted existing birm to protect brook.

- T. Hoopes noted that reference be made about the Morrison Brook and birm and no cut buffer. Concern on restrictions on crossing the wetlands.
- C. Balcius question on sloping on Lot 23. Asked if new Belknap Soils survey has been used.
- J. Berry used old one.
- C. Balcius wetlands will not issue a boardwalk to access the lake.
- J. Berry confirmed that there is no access to the lake.
- B. Dunbar asked where the easement goes to.
- J. Berry no common waterfront.
- B. Dunbar question on exact access to water and 50 ft setback for Shoreline Protection Act.
- C. Blackstone asked about the current status of the cottages.
- J. Dube noted the designated easement space needs to be delineated.

Open to the Public

Justine Gengras

Not speaking on behalf of the conservation commission. Speaking as a neighbor and a member of Fern Hill Community. Yes, there is enormous amount of wetland and also during the drought period. That area can be walked on. The other side of the brook is the same way. Natural sandy beach in front of wetland. Pair of loons living there for three years and using the front of the lot as their home. Does not know if they are nesting.

- C. Balcius asked if the loons were documented.
- J. Gengras said it was not documented but they are there. Does not want to loose the loons. Noted about the easement that you can walk or drive to get to the water. Noted about the type of soils on the lot in that they are highly erodable. Asked for proper stabilization. Feels that anyone purchasing this property will be aggravated they do not have access to the beautiful sandy beach. The beach is very shallow for about 75 feet from the shore in the Fern Hill area.

Public input closed.

B. Dunbar referenced Page 51 of Zoning Ordinance, Section 601 Shoreland Protection Act that she feels is applicable to this subdivision; Commonly Used Waterfront Parcels or Lot. Need to see if this is a shared frontage.

- J. Berry will find out detail information of the existing cottages and will refer to the section in the zoning and work with the regulations.
- W. Keniston noted it is about ¼ of a mile to the access to the lake from the end of the driveway. A parking space needs to be marked at the access to the lake.
- J. Berry confirmed the area will be more definitively defined under the Zoning Ordinance read by B. Dunbar.

<u>Motion</u> by J. Crouse to continue case P06-81 until the October meeting. Second by W. Keniston. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

At 9:00 p.m. the Board took a recess.

At 9:05 p.m. Chairman Dube called the meeting back to order.

Cynthia Balcius recused herself for this case.

Case #P06-83 RACO Development Corp & Ernie Gillan, Jr. Map 2, Lot 20 & 20-1

Boundary Line Adjustment Prospect Mountain Road

Application submitted by Vern Dingman of V.W. Dingman & Sons, on behalf of the property owners, for a proposed Boundary Line Adjustment. The properties are located within the Rural Zone.

Present for this case Vern Dingman.

No Planner comments.

Motion by J. Crouse to accept case P06-83. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Vern Dingman described the boundary line adjustment. Parcel A will not be affected the subdivision.

Open to public

None seen or heard.

Public input closed.

J. Dube asked the Board for comments.

<u>Motion</u> by T. Hoopes to approve case P06-83 for a boundary line adjustment . Second by J. Crouse. No Discussion. Vote unanimous.

Case #P06-69 RACO Development Corp Map 2, Lot 20

4-Lot Subdivision Prospect Mountain Road

Continued from August 15, 2006 hearing.

M. Jerkins informed the Board the Review engineer has not be able to update this review. Noted it will be completed by September 22, 2006.

V. Dingman noted soils scientist letter and soils report. Noting a logging road cut a spring and creating the wetlands. Noting also this is a poorly drained soil. It is also under 10,000 sq ft and a buffer is not necessary. Sheets 4 and 5 show erosion control.

General discussion on well location.

Open to the public.

Aaron Sisoyan purchased home one year ago and lot not graded and landscaped. Asking for an exception to complete his landscaping. It has been over 13 months since he moved into his home and all the landscaping is not complete.

- J. Dube stated they cannot let him make a road until approved.
- M. Jerkins noted this is a civil issue.

Ernie Gillan asked why Mr. Ragonise cannot start the road.

J. Dube stated that if material needs to be moved without drastic excavation and cuts and that the road is not to be started he could move materials to work on landscaping.

Closed public input.

<u>Motion</u> by T. Hoopes to continue case P06-69 to the October 17 meeting. Second by J. Crouse. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Other Business

Old Business

1. Memo from Peer Kraft Lund on Town Policy on State Subdivision. Question on why Alton is the only town in the state of NH that does not simultaneously approve subdivision once approved by the state. General discussion on the Board's opinion. General consensus to change.

<u>Motion</u> by J. Crouse to re-notify NH-DES and request the Town approval prior to State subdivision review is no longer need. Second by T. Hoopes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

2. Peer Kraft-Lund came up with options for Cell Tower Balloon tests General discussion of potential sites. The Board will need to let the Planning Office know if these sites are acceptable within a few days so the test observation can be scheduled. Recommend skipping site B5 and B2.

<u>Motion</u> by T. Hoopes to continue beyond 10 p.m. Second by W. Keniston. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Need to find out if there can be three balloons per site. Agreed to continue discussion on Thursday.

3. Discussion on Robert Landry Well test on possible contamination. It was determined the Selectmen would like to see a test on Mr. Landry's personal well and compare to the test pits done. Mr. Landry questioned if he needs to pay for this. Discussion on Town responsibility and liability.

<u>Motion</u> by T. Hoopes that the applicant be notified he responsible for proving that his site is safely developable and require a VOC water of applicant's existing well test by town engineer and applicant is responsible for pay appropriate language be done by town attorney. Test to be performed by Eastern Analytical. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous

4. Calef Drive Release of Funds request. A letter from Ken Roberts recommended that \$15,000 be left in the account until finished pavement is complete. Also received a different recommendation and Ken Roberts stands by his recommendation. CMA review did not review Ken Roberts recommendation when making a decision. CMA decision was to hold all funds for an additional 5 years. J. Dube would tend to lean toward CMA engineers on a legal standpoint.

Suggest the CMA and town Road Agent to get with the Board's engineering committee with a report of the two reports. Planning office to coordinate this meeting.

New Business

1. Two NHDOT Driveway permits. Cherry Valley Road and Ridgewood Subdivision. DOT is looking input from the Town on the two sites. Both come off of the state highway.

Planning Department to ask Russ Bailey regarding sketches that are indicated and noted to be attached.

2. Road Upgrade/Access request re: David Widestrom. Request to be brought up to a class 6 road.

<u>Motion</u> by W. Keniston the board does not support the further extension of Drew Hill Road due to fact that it is seen as scattered and premature. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote Unanimous.

- 3. George M. Chrisenton Survey for Norman M. and Elizabeth T. Henderson, Trustees, The Henderson Living Trust, Echo Point Road, Alton Belknap County, New Hampshire. To be reviewed by the Board.
 - 4. Application for appointment to Planning Board from Peter Varney.

Suggested to inform Mr. Varney to apply as an alternate and thank him for his intention. Discussion on having a current alternate to fill the position for Pam McLeod. No decision made.

Correspondence

Monica recommended the Board review the items distributed to them.

Motion by T. Hoopes to adjourn. Second by W. Keniston

Respectfully submitted, Carolyn Schaeffner, Recording Secretary