

Minutes
Planning Board Meeting
April 2, 2009

Members of the Planning Board in attendance were Charles Moreno, Chairman, Don Rhodes, Paul Eaton, James Graham, Lynn Sweet, and Kate Sawal, Alternate Member.

The Chairman called the public meeting to order at 7: 40 PM and announced the members present. The closing date for applications to appear on the agenda for the May 7, 2009 regular meeting will be 5 p.m., Tuesday, April 21, 2009. The Chairman 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.

The first order of continuing business was the application of JAMES N. LUND for a Public Hearing regarding his application to amend the conditions of approval for a conditionally approved plan (Lot Line Revision plan conditionally approved at the regular meeting of the Board held on May 1, 2008, for property located at 10/12/14, 31 and 35 Lund Drive and Second Crown Point Road (Tax Map 19, Lot 28-1, 28-4, 28-6 and 28-7)). Jim and Robin Lund were present, accompanied by Jon Berry of Berry Surveying and Engineering. Mr. Lund advised the Board that he was presenting the Board with revised plan sets showing the amendments as agreed at the last meeting, including the expanded parking and vehicle turning area by the multiunit structures located on Lot 28-4. The expanded parking area had been discussed with Board members near the end of the March 2, 2009 meeting. Two sheets of the plan set have been eliminated as a result and pages have been renumbered and the revisions list updated. Sheet 4 shows the revised road profile, showing a gravel surface with a 20 foot wide traveled section and 2 foot shoulders. There has been no change to the drainage structures except where eliminating the cistern has allowed a shift. Sheet 5 shows the detail for the expanded parking/turning area for the multiunit. There is ledge in this area. They plan to remove the topsoil and gravel the whole turning area as shown.

Mr. Lund then advised Board members that he wished to request that the Board revisit their decision on the safety gates and ramp required in the original plan in light of the fact that the expanded parking and turning area for the multiunit properties has been shown to be feasible. Mr. Lund asked that the Board eliminate the requirement for the safety gates and ramp, to be replaced with a requirement for construction of the enhanced expanded parking and turning area. He noted that this had not been voted last month, but that Board members had suggested that adding the turning area option might affect the requirement for the fence. Discussion of the turning area followed. Don Rhodes advised that there will need to be some restriction so that tenants do not park in this area. It was agreed that there should be a "no parking, emergency vehicles only" sign on the turning area.

Board members then continued to the review the revised plans. A new Note 10 is required stating that any further development will require the road to be constructed to town road specifications. Board members asked if it could be restricted so that the road could not be brought to the town for acceptance unless paved. Lynn Sweet said that she felt that this had been agreed. Jon Berry advised that he would and a new Note 11 stating that the road will be paved and brought to town specifications before any request is made to the Town for acceptance. Discussion returned to the question of the gate and the proposed safety ramp. It was noted that the new Fire Chief feels that there is adequate room to get in and out without the safety ramp connecting the road and the driveway. Jon Berry advised the Board that the new plan revisions show that a safety vehicle could successfully in and out without the ramp, allowing the Lunds to keep the integrity of the existing retaining wall. They are now asking for relief from the requirement for the emergency access ramp and gates in the wall. Board members noted that the financial guarantee for the project would need to include the new expanded parking/turning area. Kate Sawal noted that the required safety reflectors etc. on the fence/wall area would still be required. It was asked if they still intend to construct a new leach field, and it was agreed yes. Expenses for bonding would include the new road, the leach field, and the expanded parking/turning area.

The Chairman noted that a public hearing had been held last month on the request for amendment of the conditions of approval and this agenda item was included in public notices for the current month, so the Board could move forward. Jim Graham then made a motion, seconded by Paul Eaton, to alleviate the need for a ramp, based on the added requirement of widening/expanding the parking area by the multiunit buildings while maintaining the

safety reflectors on the fence area between the new private road and the existing multiunit buildings as shown on the previous plans; the financial guarantee is to include the expansion of the parking and turning area by the multiunit buildings on Lot 28-4 as well as construction of the new private road and replacement septic system. Discussion on the motion followed. Paul Eaton then made the following amendment to the motion, seconded by Jim Graham: to include a new Note 10 stating that any further development will require the road to be constructed to town specifications and a new Note 11 on the plans requiring that before any request was made to the town to take ownership of Lund Drive as a town road, the road would be paved and brought to current town specifications, and to require a "No Parking, Emergency Vehicles Only" sign be placed on the expanded turning area by the multiunit buildings. There being no further discussion of the amendment, the Chairman then called a vote on the amendment; the amendment was approved by unanimous vote of the Board. There being no further discussion of the amended motion, the Chairman then called the vote; the amended motion was passed by unanimous vote of the members present. Don Rhodes advised the applicant that the Board cannot sign the plans until the financial guarantee is in place.

The first order of new business was the application of DAMARA MASS, INC. for 6-lot conventional subdivision of their property located at Canaan Road and Back Canaan Road (Tax Map 4, Lot 83-1). Ron Haskell of Geometres Blue Hills presented revised plans, accompanied by Randy Orvis. Charlie Burnham and Chris Reagan, abutters, were present. Mr. Haskell advised the Board that the applicants are submitting slightly revised plans at the meeting, and he also submitted a drainage report. The private road is now shown as a cul-de-sac. There is one wetlands crossing and some wetlands impact in the cul-de-sac area. The road measures 792 feet to the center of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Haskell advised that the plan set shows the typical features, except that they are proposing wider ditches. They plan to install underground utilities as required.

Board members then reviewed the plans and abutters were shown the new proposal. Charlie Burnham asked whether there was concern about the proposed detention basin affecting the McCormick's well. It was noted that the basin would be outside the protected well radius. Randy Orvis said that the basin would be downslope from the well. It was agreed that the Board would ask the town's engineers to take a look at the basin. Plantings were also suggested. Board members then reviewed the plans with the checklist. The following items were found to be missing and/or need clarifications: locate the well on the Flanders lot; correct the address for the Burnhams; provide an 8.5x11 soils map for clarification; add the abutter for Lot 77, check buildings and driveways along Canaan Road; remove the cemetery note; and provide layout and specifications for the utility easements that will be needed. For the utilities, after lengthy discussion, it was agreed that a note might meet the requirement in part; Don Rhodes advised that the plans need to be clear that the utilities will be underground, and noted that the subdivision regulations ask for the locations. Noting that these items are minor, Lynn Sweet then made a motion, seconded by Jim Graham, to accept the plans as complete for consideration, conditional upon the completion of the items noted above. There was no further discussion, and the Chairman then called the vote. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

The Chairman then advised the applicants that this is a major subdivision and would go for engineering review for the road design, drainage, utilities, etc. Jim Graham noted that the consultants should look at maintenance issues for drainage structures, etc. and suggested that the Board request that the engineers look at the proposed drainage pond for future maintenance concerns. Chris Reagan noted the steep slopes at the rear of Lots 1-10 and 1-11 and asked about drainage. It was agreed that the slopes will need to be checked. Board members noted that they may want to specify building envelopes. Ron Haskell advised the Board that they would bring a set of plans to the Board for review before sending them off for engineering review. He said that they have told the property owner to expect a request for escrow money for the reviews. Don Rhodes suggested that the current information be sent to the Town's consultants so that they can update their rough cost estimate. Ron Haskell asked that the Board write a letter to the property owner requesting the escrow funds. He then asked the Board to consider the request of Geometres Blue Hills for a refund of the fees paid for submission of the 6-lot subdivision plans for Granite State Realty Trust in January 2009. It was noted that they had paid fees for 7 lots at the time. However, a new set of notices were sent when the application was resubmitted for the current April 2009 meeting under the name of the new owner, and no application fee was paid for the new Damara Mass, Inc. application; only postage costs were paid. The surveyors had requested a refund of the January application fees based on the ill health of their previous client and partnership problems. After some discussion, it was agreed that it was appropriate that a new set of application fees were paid in 2009, following the denial of the 2008 application. Discussion returned to whether there should be a rebate of the \$200 fee for one lot since the project no longer

includes a separate (7th) open space lot, despite the fact that there were no fees paid for the new April 2009 application. After discussion, a motion was made to return the \$200 in contention. Two Board members voted in favor of the proposal, with one nay and two abstentions. Further discussion of this project will take place at the next meeting.

The next item before the Board was to meet with Greg Messenger, the Road Agent, to work on a municipal and regional transportation priorities survey and report due for the Strafford Regional Planning Commission. Prior to beginning work on the survey, Mr. Messenger updated Board members on his conversation with Linda Colpritt regarding a driveway location for her lot on Webber/JoAlCo Road and his concern about natural drainage in the area near the driveway. Lynn Sweet advised Board members that the Selectmen have said that they will not approve the driveway location without a drainage easement or other similar agreement. Board members agreed that drainage is an issue and would have been addressed by the Board if it had come up during the Board meetings. Discussion then turned to the transportation priorities survey. It was agreed that many items did not apply to Strafford, such as public transportation. The Northwood Road bridge had been part of the long-range regional transportation improvement plan, but is now under construction. Strafford only has one other item on the long-range plan; a proposal for sidewalks connecting the school with the library. It was suggested that another bridge be added to the long-range list, and several other wish list items were noted, including bicycle paths, better signage, etc.

Board members then reviewed recent correspondence. There being no further items before the Board, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.