Members present: Kathi Mitchell, Jon Scanlon, Ben Wadleigh, Paul Rushlow, Bob Hardy, and Jim Cropsey.

Minutes: Paul Rushlow moved, seconded by Kathi Mitchell, to approve the minutes of December 16, 2013 with an added statement under Autoserve, that Jim Cropsey had suggested a permanent berm be created to protect the wetlands. Motion passed.

304 Laconia Road: Members reviewed an application for special exceptions for Groundwater Protection and Wetland buffers at 304 Laconia Road. The proposed project is to remove the existing building and construct a 3400 sq. ft two story building for retail and office use. The building would impact the 20 foot wetland buffer at the back of the property and the drainage pipe would impact both the buffer and the actual wetland in the north east corner. On the submitted plan, it appears that the first level of the building would be about 6-8 feet below the elevation than of the wetlands. Members were concerned that not only would there be water issues within the building, but also that drainage piping around the building would actually withdraw water from the wetlands itself. Further items of concern were:

- The retention pond near the road is only rated for a two year storm. The drainage report clearly indicates that it would fail for a 10 or 50 year storm. Since we have had many 50-100 year storms in the recent past, there is concern that this retention pond failure would flood Route 3.
- The plan calls for connection to the existing 15” culvert under Route 3 which was sized to handle the existing runoff. There is concern about the current condition of this culvert and whether it could handle increased runoff due to this project which calls for adding runoff from the roof and parking lot with a total of about 10,000 sq. ft.
- The snow storage area is located very near the proposed well.
- Jim Cropsey questioned whether the retention pond would be dry at 198 foot elevation as suggested in the drainage report as this is a wet area.
- DOT did not comment on the drainage plan, but does require that an easement be obtained from the abutter for the proposed new drainage pipe connecting to the existing culvert.
- It is not indicated on the plan how large the wetland area is behind the lot in question and how much water it is actually holding and therefore how much would be released with the new drainage.
- The plan indicates that the soil type is “Henniker – fine sandy loam” that is potentially highly erodible. The drainage plan also states that the “wetlands infiltrates into the upland soils” which further indicates there will be drainage problems within the building.
and the drainage system that may be draining the wetlands area as well as collecting rain water.

♀ The Date Check tool included with the application is not for this lot.
♀ The photos included in the application are of poor quality and not helpful in drawing any conclusions.

A letter will be sent to the Planning Board indicating the above concerns and reservations about this application. The general consensus is that this is too much development for the size of the lot. The Commission has enough concern that it requests a site walk and suggests that another wetland engineer and soil scientist review and comment on this application.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Eliza Conde, Secretary

Minutes approved 02-17-2014