

Minutes

Planning Board Meeting

November 3, 2011

Members of the Planning Board in attendance were Charles Moreno, Chairman, Jim Graham, Lynn Sweet, Mark Witcher, and Terry Hyland, Alternate member.

The Chairman called the public meeting to order at 7:32 PM and announced the members present. The closing date for applications to appear on the agenda for the December regular meeting is 5 p.m., Tuesday, November 15, 2011. The Chairman advised the audience that the agenda for the evening is long and reminded the audience that the Board has a policy setting time limits for meetings and that the Board will not consider any new business after 10:30 PM. It was agreed to postpone consideration of the minutes until after the formal business.

There was one item of continuing business for this evening's meeting, the application of JANET CHASSE PREVATT AND TERRY PREVATT for 3-lot, revised to 2-lot, subdivision of their property located at 79 Ridge Farm Road (Tax Map 15, Lot 22). Chris Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering presented the application; Janet Prevatt and a number of abutters were also present. Charles Moreno recused himself from the Board for this discussion as an abutter, and Jim Graham took over as Acting Chairman. Mr. Berry advised the Board that he has not prepared revised plans. He said that the reason that they are here tonight is to discuss the roadway. He then submitted a request for waivers to the subdivision regulations for road construction and addressed the Board. He began with the tax map, showing Board members what has already been subdivided and what could be subdivided in the future. He reminded Board members that the road at present has 11 homes, and is maintained regularly by Greg Messenger, who invoices the group for the work. Mr. Berry noted that it is a substantial distance from Ms. Prevatt's property to the Cross Road intersection, and to upgrade the road the whole distance would involve significant expense. She is proposing to keep her larger lot in current use assessment and cannot meet the cost of the full road upgrade. Further, he suggested that fairness is an issue, as other landowners would be free to subdivide at no cost if Ms. Prevatt paid the full costs of the road upgrade herself. Mr. Berry then suggested that if the Board approved the waivers, it would keep additional subdivision from snowballing. He said that he feels that the Board needs to come up with a reasonable solution. Now the road is 15 to 18 feet in width with 6 to 8 inches of gravel. They are asking for waivers to the requirements for width, drainage criteria, and depth of gravel as well as to the requirement for paving. They suggested that the Board use the ASHTO standards for low volume roads as a guide, which would allow the 15 to 18 foot width. They said that the existing drainage is in good shape and the road drains. Mr. Berry suggested that there should be some discussion regarding the depth of gravel. Jim Graham said that the Board understands the request. He said that it was unlikely that this road would become a town road without further investment, but noted the importance of bringing the area of the road required for frontage up to standard. Mr. Berry replied that he wants to make progress on this issue this evening so that his client can make financial decisions, and said that he understood that the frontage for the subdivision would need to be brought up to at least the same standard as the rest of the road. Steve Leighton, from the audience, noted that the Selectmen are having problems with private roads, and the precedent that allowing subdivision may hold regarding the right to petition to have a road accepted as a town road. Mr. Berry responded, saying that the regulations allow subdivision on private roads and allow the Board to grant waivers, and suggested that the voters would require full upgrade if the road was brought to town meeting for acceptance. He noted that the road includes right of ways over private land and said that he felt it would be hard for the town to accept without owners relinquishing their rights. Mark Witcher noted the question of liability for the town. Jim Graham and Mr. Berry both mentioned the Jim Lund plans approved last year with the condition that the plans include a note requiring that the applicants must return to the Board and bring the road up to specifications before the road could be brought to the town for acceptance. Steve Leighton noted the possibility of appeals and said that he feels that every private road approved for subdivision has become a headache. Terry Hyland noted that some of the people on Ridge Farm Road are adamantly against having the road become a town road.

The Acting Chairman noted that the Board would likely be okay with the proposal to waive pavement, but for base and width, the road may need to be brought up to specifications. He said that without the road agent at the meeting, there is nobody to speak to the condition of the road with credibility. Mr. Berry again noted the fact that the road passes over private property and said that landowners would need to give up rights before the road could become a town road. He said that they are requesting the waivers, and admit that their application may provoke others, but said that they cannot bear the costs of the road upgrade alone. Jim Graham again suggested that the key issue is the frontage section of the road. Lynn Sweet advised that it is an unknown question about the ownership and layout of the road and that it is hard to make any judgment without

more information. She asked Chris Berry if they had anything formal from Greg Messenger. He said no, that they had looked at national standards but did not get actual cost estimates or testing of the road. Mr. Berry said that they hoped to make regular progressive steps toward a solution. Lynn Sweet suggested that they need to work with Mr. Messenger, as he knows what needs to be provided. Following discussion, Mark Whitcher then made a motion to request ownership information on the road and a letter from Greg Messenger addressing what is there for a road now and what he'd recommend for subdivision. Jim Graham and Lynn Sweet both seconded the motion, and Lynn Sweet noted that this approach saves on engineering costs. Ms. Sweet then said that the Board of Selectmen would be willing to look at the letter from Mr. Messenger and said that she would make sure that Mr. Berry was put on the agenda for the Selectmen's meeting. The Acting Chairman then advised that the request for waivers and further discussion of the application would be tabled to the next meeting.

The first item of new business was the application of R. STEPHEN LEIGHTON for a renewal of his permit for Excavation of Earth in accordance with NH RSA 155-E for property located on Sloper Road (Tax Map 12, Lots 52-2 & 52). The Chairman returned to the Board. Mr. Leighton was present as were a number of abutters and neighborhood residents, including the Laurions, the Edmonds, Bruce and Anne Smith, and Camille Brown. Steve Leighton presented his application, noting that the original permit was granted 10 years ago for an area of about 7 acres and some of Andrea Crosby's lot. She has since passed away and that part of the project was deleted. The excavation has both town and state permits. Mark Whitcher asked about the time frame. Mr. Leighton explained that originally had thought to be in and out of the area quickly, but noted that the economy has changed and that the pit is used as needed. He does not know how long it will be before it is completely excavated. Jim Graham asked for the current status. Mr. Leighton noted that the final agreed-upon reclamation plan is not shown on the plans because he has agreed upon a larger pond with the owner of Lot 52. He said that the final slope has been completed except in the area nearest the barn and they have started digging the pond, which has given them fill material that they need to find a use for. Mr. Moreno asked about state permits. Mr. Leighton advised that the state permit is good and that you just update with them every 6 years. Mr. Moreno then suggested that they just go down the list of permit conditions from the 2006 permit renewal, beginning with number 2, noting that discussion will return to the question of operating hours. Regarding paragraph 4, Mr. Leighton advised that excavation actually began in the south and is proceeding north, and he agreed that yes, he is reclaiming as he goes. Mr. Moreno suggested that the words "reclaim as you go" be added to the requirement for reclamation of the previous acre. Mr. Leighton suggested that he would bring an updated plan after Corey Colwell surveys the pit again, and noted that they will show the subdivision line on the new plan. He hopes to have everything done on Lot 52 soon, but noted that they may not get the depth they need for the pond and may have to make adjustments. He then requested a 30 day extension until next month's meeting for the permit in order to allow him to proceed with the work, including reclamation, while he works on an agreement with Ms. Abels, the owner of Lot 52.

The Chairman then opened the public hearing on the application for permit renewal. Mike Laurion spoke first. He spoke to the long time frame and the way the plans for the site have changed over the years. He said that the hours of operation are the most important issue, noting Sunday morning operations and his concern that there have been a variety of trucks over the past few months, not just Steve Leighton. He said that they also have concern about the banks of the pit collapsing and children in the neighborhood. He said that learning that the permit might be renewed was disheartening. Jane Laurion said that they are worried about their well water and are concerned about things that might be buried on-site. Tom Edmonds addressed the Board with prepared remarks. He stated that he was glad that reclamation was underway on Lot 52, abutting his property, but noted his concern with issues that he feels would affect property value and safety. He identified and spoke to four main themes: instability of the slope; similar concerns with the new slopes on the active pit; the need to spread topsoil and seed the reclaimed slope areas; and concern that there are undesirable and/or hazardous and refuse items in the fill being used for reclamation. He said that he understands the need for small businesses and said that they feel that the reclamation should be a win/win for the operator and the neighborhood. He said that they would like to invite the Board to view the site. Indra Edmonds then addressed the Board, noting that her comments would be submitted in writing and also advising the Board that she was bringing a letter from Irene Abels, the owner of Lot 52. She spoke at length, saying that she feels that Mr. Leighton should get permits, but asked that the permits be suspended until the new agreements between Mr. Leighton and Ms. Abels are finalized. She noted physical and auditory pollution, and said that they feel that their concerns are not being heard, again noting concern about hours of operation among other items. She asked whether a bond had been posted and whether the Town could use any bonding to pursue reclamation. She then gave the Board a letter from Ms. Abels, who is away due to a death in the family and has asked for a continuance. The Chairman asked if there were any other comments from abutters. Camille Brown noted that she is not an abutter but agreed that she also has concerns about hours of operation. She said that the other speakers had already spoken to her concerns.

Steve Leighton then responded, inviting the Board to come look at the operation. He said that he was unaware of any issues with refuse and that he would remove anything found. He noted that fill from septic reconstruction is brought to the site but is stored separately. The Chairman advised the audience that Mr. Leighton would need a continuation of his permit in order to continue reclamation work at the site. Mark Whitcher suggested that the Board grant a 30 day extension in order for the new survey work to begin and noted that if the Board does not allow work to move forward, Mr. Leighton cannot do reclamation without the extension. Jim Graham agreed. Lynn Sweet also spoke to the need to keep the permit open in order for work on reclamation to continue and suggested that the Board set up a site review. Camille Brown asked about the hours of operation, and Jane Laurion said that they just want the permitted hours adhered to. There was some discussion of the need for certain materials to come into the site in order to reclamation to proceed, while other gravel and sand materials are taken off site. Following discussion, Mark Whitcher then made a motion to extend the current permit for 30 days until the next Planning Board meeting. Jim Graham seconded the motion, there was no further discussion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. An on-site review was tentatively scheduled for Sunday, November 6 at 9 AM, pending confirmation from Ms. Abels. Abutters were invited to attend.

The second order of new business was the application of GARY F. and SYLVIA YEATON for 3-lot subdivision of their property located on First Crown Point Road (Tax Map 18, Lot 24-2). Chris Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering presented the plans. The Donnellys and the Scrutons, abutters, were present. Mr. Berry advised that the applicants hope to create two frontage lots for possible sale and retain the larger back land/remaining acreage. Lot A would be 2.1 acres of uplands, Lot B would be 2.27 acres, and the remaining lot would be 29± acres, with adequate frontage for future development. They are requesting a waiver for the requirements for full topography and wetlands for the large remaining lot. Mr. Berry noted that the odd shape of Lot B comes from the previous subdivision following stone walls around the original farmhouse on Lot 24. Jim Graham asked if Lot B meets minimum lot size requirements for contiguous buildable area, given the hydric soils and the cemetery. Mr. Berry said that only jurisdictional wetlands must be deducted from the buildable area. Jim Graham then asked about driveway locations, given the steep grade. Mr. Berry noted that they have suggested 3 driveway locations, one for each lot, with 300 feet of sight distance for each. These locations have not been checked by the Road Agent. Charles Moreno suggested that they consider shared driveways and asked that the Road Agent be consulted. There was some discussion about the negatives of shared driveways and concern about the steep grades in this area.

Board members then reviewed the plans with the checklist. The following items were missing and/or need clarifications: metes and bounds on Lot A; buildings across the road. The Chairman then called for a motion on acceptance of the plan for consideration after explaining to the audience that this is a major subdivision by cumulative impact and that the formal public hearing could not be held this evening. Noting that the missing items are minor, Mark Whitcher then made a motion to accept the plans for consideration, conditional upon the completion of the items noted above. Jim Graham seconded the motion, there was no further discussion, and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. The Chairman then asked the abutters present if they had any questions. Lisa Clements Donnelly said that she owns the original house and asked for clarifications on the waiver request and expressed concern about the driveway locations, noting that the road is steep with curves and that her driveway is blind. Finally, she expressed concern about her well. Mr. Berry responded to the question about the waiver request, stating that they feel that the expense is not justified because they are not planning to develop the rear at this time. Jim Graham noted that the concern seems to focus on the area behind the Donnelly's home. Mr. Berry said that they could show the information in that area because it had been surveyed. Alicia Scruton's husband confirmed that this area, which abuts their lot, is wet and that there's quite a lot of drainage through the area. Mark Whitcher then made a motion, seconded by Lynn Sweet, to approve the request for waivers to the requirements for detailed information on the rear of the remaining lot. There was no further discussion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. Chris Berry then asked for a summary of the Board's concerns, saying that he had heard comments about increasing the size of Lot B, driveways and drainage. Mrs. Donnelly noted that the area is an importance wildlife corridor that runs up to Blue Job. It was noted that Chris Berry has not kept local setbacks from the area of poorly drained soils, suggesting that Strafford's Article 1.4.4, Section 3 would not apply. Mr. Berry now asked for clarifications from the Board regarding his interpretation of the ordinance, which he holds is only meant to apply to areas that would be sensitive for sewage disposal. Charles Moreno asked about the locations of the poorly drained soils. Mrs. Donnelly noted that her well is on a straight trajectory from the areas. Mr. Moreno asked if Board members would like to conduct a site review. After discussion, it was agreed that it would be difficult to schedule a group meeting, but that Board members were invited to independently take a look at the area. Steve Leighton noted in closing that the Town may need a drainage easement onto the property. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting.

The next order of new business was the application of WALTER M. and CORNELIA UNGER for the two-lot subdivision of their property located at 10 Pumphouse Road and Bow Lake Estates Road (Tax Map 23, Lot 63-7). Steve Ferguson of

Norway Plains Survey Associates presented the application. Mr. Unger and several abutters were present, including the Mosses. Mr. Unger advised the Board that this is an updated version of a plan that was conditionally approved in early 2008, which he had let go during a series of legal issues involving the docks in the development. The new application shows slightly reconfigured lots and the boundary adjustment with the Mosses that had not been completed at the time of the earlier application. They have not yet applied for WSPCC septic subdivision approval. Mr. Moreno asked if the new hammerhead shown as "Cody's Way" on the plan was now in place. They responded that the hammerhead had always been in place as it has carried forward from the original development of the island. Most of the island is gravel and they feel that all the original roads were built as shown. It was agreed that Cody's Way has not been improved and would need to be brought up to current specifications in order to serve as frontage. It was noted that the previous application had included a request for waivers to allow a gravel surface, etc. It was suggested that the applicants should again request waivers to the street construction standards for pavement, and the Board also noted that the road would need to be built or bonded before the plans could be signed. Steve Leighton noted that the Selectmen will also require bonding for construction inspection.

The Board then reviewed the plans with the checklist. The following items were missing and/or need clarifications: uplands calculation for Lot 63-9; flood zone line running along the 517 foot contour; plan set numbering; seals of surveyors and wetlands scientists. Christina Moss, an abutter, asked the Board about the road, noting that she just wants to see it done properly and stating that now the area is just loam and weeds. She said that she is concerned that the road be built properly and not drain into her backyard. She also asked about the wetlands delineation. Mr. Ferguson noted that they had not completed new wetlands surveys. The 2008 file was checked and it was shown that the lot was surveyed back in the 90s. Board members then agreed that the wetlands survey should be updated. Steve Ferguson then asked if the plans could application could be approved at the next meeting. The Board noted that this is a major subdivision by cumulative impact and cannot be completed in one meeting. Board members agreed not to accept the plans as complete and agreed that there are a lot of open issues. The Chairman announced that the Board would move forward to the next application. Mr. Ferguson asked for the Board to provide him with a list of missing items.

The next order of new business was the application of HERMAN and JEANNE GROTH for boundary adjustment between their properties located at 837 Parker Mountain Road and Mousam Road (Tax Map 10, Lots 14, 20 and 21 and Tax Map 14, Lot 1). Randy Orvis of Geometres Blue Hills presented the application; Mr. Groth and George Brown, an abutter, were present. Mr. Orvis advised the Board that the Groths have four deeds for parcels purchased at separate times. They hope to reconfigure their properties into four more equal lots and are proposing a plan that would keep all the frontages the same. The only lot being reduced in size is Lot 21, which would reduce from about 119 acres to 16.72 acres. The applicants are requesting waivers to the requirements for full topographic and wetlands surveys because three of the lots are increasing in area. The smallest lot once had a house, he noted, and the well still exists. The Chairman advised the applicants that the plan, on the surface, looks straightforward, but he noted that there are some important issues that might be deal-breakers. First, he noted that Parker Mountain Road is a Class V and Class VI town road, and they propose to create two lots that cross this road. There was a brief discussion of existing lots of record that cross roads, including the large Evans Mountain property reviewed for boundary adjustment in October. Secondly, the Chairman noted the requirements regarding lot configuration. Mr. Orvis suggested he feels that the lot configuration regulation should be interpreted to mean that the Board considers 75 feet as adequate. Jim Graham suggested that the original large lot, with a reasonable configuration, has become unreasonable as a result of the proposed adjustment which connects lots located on Route 126 with land behind the Groth's home by a long connecting strip. Mr. Orvis and Mr. Groth advised the Board that the layout had been designed to meet the Board's requirements for no subdivision on Class VI roads, because Mousam Road is a Class VI road. They agreed that the lot with the long connecting strip would likely be developed from the Mousam Road side. Mr. Moreno and Mr. Graham both urged the applicant to reconfigure the lots to eliminate the connecting strips. Mr. Groth pointed out that this could mean subdividing on Mousam Road rather than an adjustment using the existing frontage. Mr. Groth said that he is trying to maintain the integrity of the existing home and an adequate lot around the existing home. There followed a lengthy discussion of other ways to develop the total property. Steve Leighton asked why the Board was concerned about the frontage if the application is a lot line adjustment. Mr. Groth noted that moving to the Class VI frontage would make the lot less conforming to current regulations. There was discussion of whether a boundary adjustment on a Class VI road would trigger the need for upgrades to Mousam Road. The narrow width and scenic value of Mousam Road were noted. Board members asked if the four beginning lots needed to relate to the four ending lots for the application to remain a boundary adjustment, or whether consolidation and resubdivision would require different requirements. Jim Graham said that the dog leg connecting strip would not fly with current ordinances. Charles Moreno agreed. There was some discussion about crossing the road with a lot, and the difference between lots that cross roads prior to adjustment and the proposal here.

Board members then reviewed the plans with the checklist and waiver request. Noting that if the waivers were granted, there would be no items missing, Mark Witcher then made a motion to accept the plans as complete for consideration. Lynn Sweet seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the vote was unanimous in the affirmative. The Chairman asked if the abutters present wished to make any comments. George Brown noted that he hoped to file a similar application soon, and that he supported Mr. Groth. There was general agreement about the special nature of Mousam Road and that one-lane roads can work well. It was agreed to continue discussion another month and to consider different configurations that might meet the intent of the regulations.

The Chairman noted that the final order of new business for this evening would be the application of MARK and JUDITH WHITCHER for boundary adjustment between their two properties located on Wild Goose Pond Road (Tax Map 1, Lot 6-6) and Province Road (Tax Map 1, Lot 14). He advised the audience that discussion of the application for subdivision of Lot 14 will be postponed to next month at the request of the applicant. Chris Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering presented the application. Mark Witcher recused himself from the Board for this application. The Chairman designated Mr. Hyland as a voting member for this application. Mr. Berry noted that the proposal includes Lot 14A, and that the idea of the boundary adjustment is to provide access from Wild Goose Pond Road to the back side of the Province Road lot. They have kept the access strip more than 75 feet wide. By adding the back access, they felt that they could design better lots, although they will only have as many total lots as would be allowed by the frontage on Province Road. Board members looked at the proposal and advised that it faces the same problem as the Groth proposal because of the dog leg configuration. Board members briefly suggested other possible splits of Lot 6-6. Mr. Moreno suggested that perhaps they could totally reconfigure their proposal by combining Lot 6-6 and Lot 14. The large wetlands on Lot 6-6 was noted. There was some discussion about the regulation that says that dog legs and connecting strips shall not be allowed. Chris Berry suggested that there was no problem as long as the strip was 75 feet in width. Mr. Moreno and Mr. Graham said that they remembered the intent of the Board when the regulation was written and said that the 75 foot width was meant for smaller lots near the lake, not this situation. Discussion then turned to the larger configuration. Chris Berry asked if the Board would consider a frontage conservation development. Mr. Moreno noted that with this year's conservation development update, it would now be possible. Jim Graham noted that there needs to be reasonable common land for the conservation development.

The Chairman then asked the abutters if they had any questions. Rick Ferreira advised that he had submitted a letter detailing his concerns to the Board. Bob Sawyer was also present. Both abutters noted the wetlands on Lot 6-6 and expressed concern with the proposed rear lot and access from Wild Goose Pond Road. Mr. Ferreira noted that Mark Witcher had spoken to him about an easement from Province Road to access the rear, and noted wetlands areas nearer Province Road, including a vernal pool along his boundary, that he feels should be documented. He said that he concurs with Board members that there are ways to be creative with lot configurations for this property and still adhere to the rules. Finally he noted that the rangeway along the rear of Lot 14 is also a concern because of the possible legal issues along a range line. Mr. Ferreira noted that the plans submitted with the application showed little information, and asked that plans be submitted in advance so that abutters may review them. Board members reviewed the original subdivision file for Lot 6-6, which includes a letter from David Allain, the wetlands scientist, who said that there are only 2.4 acres of uplands on Lot 6-6. This would mean that it might jeopardize the viability of the lot to deduct the uplands along the Lot 14 boundary. Chris Berry asked if the Board would review the boundary adjustment plan for acceptance. Lynn Sweet advised that the adjustment may create a non-conforming lot that the Board cannot approve and suggested that further discussion be postponed. Board members agreed. Further discussion will be continued to the next meeting.

Board members then reviewed a letter from Gina Hodgdon of Ricky Nelson Road, who is applying for a state license for her day care business. She has asked the Board for zoning review. Board members reviewed the letter; her day care is run in her home with no outside employees, the children are picked up and delivered at staggered times, there is adequate parking for 8 cars in their driveway, they have a dumpster, and have agreed that they would comply with any requirements regarding signage in the future. Board members agreed that day care is a residential home occupation, and that the road in this area is flat and there is good parking. The Chairman can sign off on the zoning approval. Mrs. Hodgdon will receive a letter confirming that the day care as described would meet land use requirements and that any future expansion should be brought to the Board. There being no further business before the Board, it was moved, seconded and voted to adjourn at 12:10 am.

Minutes

Planning Board Site Review

November 6, 2011

Members of the Planning Board in attendance were Charles Moreno, Chairman, Jim Graham, Lynn Sweet, Mark Whitcher, and Terry Hyland, Alternate member.

Steve Leighton was present, as well as Cecil Abels, representing Irene Abels. Members of the public in attendance were Michael and Jane Laurion, Bob Turcotte, Bruce and Anne Smith, Ann Graham, and Indra and Tom Edmonds.

The Board met on-site at the gravel excavation operation on Sloper Road (Tax Map 12, Lots 52-2 and 52) at 9:00 AM.

The Chairman summarized the concerns raised at the regular meeting: debris, embankment/side slopes, property markers, drainage pipes, hours of operation, and fill coming into the property. The group looked at the piles near the entry road, which they identified as manure, wood chips, and loam. The group then toured the excavation site. A small stump and an old tire were found, and it was noted that there is an old farm dump at the far side of the excavation area. Steve Leighton explained the reclamation process. Mr. Leighton advised the Board that he would file an amended reclamation plan once he has completed an agreement with Irene Abels, the current property owner. The original reclamation plan was designed when Lot 52 was under different ownership. Board members climbed the slope above the pond area. Mr. Leighton indicated that it is a 2:1 slope. It was noted that a pocket has developed near the top and should be addressed.

Mrs. Edmonds asked if there would be any contamination of the pond if the river flooded into the pond. Board members and Bruce Smith noted that Mr. Leighton has constructed a stable rip-rap berm between the pond and the river area and there is no indication of siltation resulting from flooding in the area. Mr. Leighton noted that there are some materials from the site that cannot be used for the reclamation project, including clay deposits and ledge materials, and advised that reclamation requires that loam and organic debris be brought into the site for seeding. The Edmonds requested a gentler slope near the pond and seeding. Final plans will be based on agreements with Mrs. Abels, the property owner.

Indra Edmonds requested no Saturday or Sunday hours and a more stringent definition of emergency. It was noted that the back-up alarms on the equipment are OSHA requirements and cannot be silenced. In closing, it was agreed that the debris items should be taken off site, that Mr. Leighton should fix the top of the slope above the pond, and that Mr. Leighton should work with Irene Abels on an agreement for the reclamation of the back corner of the site. Board members agreed that the excavation area is pretty clean in comparison with other gravel operations.

The site review adjourned at 10:10 AM.

Minutes

Planning Board Work Session

November 17, 2011

Members present: Jim Graham, Terry Hyland, Mark Witcher and Donald Coker, Alternate Member

The Board met at 7:00 PM to review and discuss draft language for an ordinance regulating signs and for a “dark skies” ordinance. Strafford residents at the 2011 Town Meeting had requested that the Selectmen address these issues, and the Selectmen had forwarded the request to the Planning Board, which has the responsibility for proposing zoning and land use ordinances.

Members reviewed the draft language and suggested that the final paragraphs for the sign ordinance be condensed into a single item. There was some question about whether the Town’s regulation limiting signs to six square feet would address signage on outdoor tanks, fences, or trailers. It was suggested that the term “dark skies” be added to the Outdoor Lighting introductory purpose statement. Board members agreed to bring any additional comments to the next meeting.

Board members then turned to the minutes of the October regular meeting, noting that the November meeting had run so late that the minutes had never been addressed. After brief review, Jim Graham then made a motion, seconded by Mark Witcher, to approve the October 6, 2011 minutes as presented. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative with Donald Coker abstaining as a newly appointed Alternate member.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.