MEMBERS PRESENT:
Chairman Mike Curley                         George Helwig, Vice-Chair
Michelle Jackson                                  Bob Sharon
Katherine Dawson, Ex-Officio              Sandy Plessner

OTHERS PRESENT:
Justin Daigneault                                   John Bernard
Joe Plessner                                         Ajay Chalooui
Arun Chalooui                                      Stephan Nix
Richard Morway                                  Captain Linda Wilking
Karen Benson                                      Gordon King
Dave Hilts                                            Jim Clements
Bev Clements                                       Edward Balkon
June Brown                                          Katie Surowiec
Helen Dawson

AGENDA:
6:30 PM           Call to order
Minutes of March 23, 2004
Correspondence
Any other business

Public Hearing for proposed changes to the Subdivision Regulations.

Changes to include:

Definition of driveway would be changed to read; “Driveway means an area located on a lot, tract or parcel of land and built for access to a garage or off-street parking space, serving not more than two (2) dwelling units.”

Paragraph 6.5.C would be changed to read, “Zoning
districts permitting multi-family dwelling units, apartments, townhouses and condominium subdivisions shall be limited to a density equal to that shown in the Table of Dimensional Values in the Tilton Zoning Regulations.”

Add to the driveway section and number; “Driveways in excess of 200 feet in length providing access for multi-family residential use shall be designed to conform with the road standards of the Tilton Subdivision Regulations.”

6:45 PM Continuation Case #04-05 for an Amended Site Plan for Tilton Lakes Ventures.

7:05 PM Continuation Case #04-06 for a Site Plan for Richard J. Morway, Sr.

7:30 PM Continuation Case #04-01 for a Site Plan for Constantino Pannullo.

8:00 PM Continuation Case #03-34 for a Site Plan for John Bernard for Lochmere Meadows Development, LLC.

6:35 PM Call to order. Chairman Curley asked if the Board members had read the minutes of 3/23/04. Michelle Jackson made a motion to approve the minutes of March 23, 2004. George Helwig seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor except Katherine Dawson who abstained as she was not present at the meeting of March 23rd.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Several e-mails from members of the Conservation Commission in regard to the John Bernard site plan.

2. Letter dated 4/9/04 from John Bernard to Captain Wilking in regard to putting sprinkler systems in the units of the proposed development.
3. Copy of RSA 674:21-a on conservation easements and restrictions.


5. Letter from Brown Engineering advising the Land Use office that Peter Julia had joined Brown Engineering.


7. Standard Dredge and Fill application from Winnisquam Resort Condominiums

8. Letter from BH Keith Associates to the NHDES in regard to Fortin & Redman Associates project.

6:35 PM Chairman Curley read the proposed changes to the subdivision regulations into the record and opened the public hearing to public comment and told the audience the hearing would remain open and closed at the end of the meeting.

Changes read into the record included:

“Driveway means an area located on a lot, tract or parcel of land and built for access to a garage or off-street parking space, serving not more than two (2) dwelling units.”

“Paragraph 6.5.C , “Zoning districts permitting multi-family dwelling units, apartments, townhouses and condominium subdivisions shall be limited to a density equal to that shown in the Table of Dimensional Values in the Tilton Zoning Regulations.”

Add and number, “Driveways in excess of 200 feet in length providing access for multi-family residential use shall be designed to conform with the road standards of the Tilton Subdivision Regulations.”

Sandy Plessner suggested to change the word “built” to “intended”. Board members approved the change.
Continuation of Case #04-05 for the amended site plan for Tilton Lake Ventures. Hearing on disqualifications, Chairman Curley told the members he had found the application to be substantially complete and asked for a motion. Sandy Plessner made a motion to accept the application. Michelle Jackson seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

Arun Chalooui, owner, gave a description of the addition they proposed to add to the east side of their existing building.

George Helwig asked if they were making any more impervious surface and was told only a little bit if any. When asked if they were loosing any parking spots, Mr. Chalooui stated they would only loose one as the proposed addition would be located where the refrigerated units were presently located.

Mr. Chalooui stated the addition would be 25 ft X 22 ft. and 25 ft high at the roof line. Mr. Chalooui stated the foundation would be the same as the existing structure.

Mr. Helwig asked if the addition would have an exterior door and was told it would not. Bob Sharon asked the applicant how many doors the store had and was told there was one.

The Board asked Captain Wilking if that was permitted and Captain Wilking replied the structure should have a second egress. After a brief discussion, Captain Wilking explained to the applicant he could have a blind door for emergency exit, meaning one could exit the store but people outside could not come in as there was no handle on the outside. The applicant agreed.

Chairman Curley asked what the addition would be used for and was told it would be used to enlarge the kitchen area and the retail space.

Open and close to public comment as no one asked to speak.

Katherine Dawson asked if the applicant was going to add any exterior lighting and was told they would like to install a motion detector light on the east side near the exit door as it was dark in that area. Ms. Dawson stated the Board would prefer to
see downcast type lighting.

Hearing no further discussion, Michelle Jackson made a motion to accept the amended site plan for Tilton Lake Ventures with the following conditions.

1. Compliance with State Fire Codes.

2. Add an extra door for egress on the northeastern portion of the building.

3. Update driveway permit with the DOT.

4. Downcast lighting for all additional exterior lighting.

Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

7:05 PM Continuation Case # 04-06 for a site plan for Richard Morway, Sr.

David Hilts, attorney, presented materials to the Board relative to the site plan. Mr. Hilts stated he had not been present at the meeting of March 9\(^{th}\) but it was his understanding the Board discussed several issues that it was concerned about. Mr. Hilts stated he understood there was quite a bit of discussion on the proposed driveway but the letter received by the applicant only listed three items that the Board wanted to see and did not accept the application at the March 9\(^{th}\) meeting. Mr. Hilts continued by saying the Board wanted to see elevation views of the project, snow storage on the plat and also had concern about getting footage information. Mr. Hilts stated he took that to mean the height of the building.

Mr. Hilts stated he had given the Board some elevation shots of the building and shots of what the building would look like. Mr. Hilts told the Board one of the pictures gave the height of the proposed building. Mr. Hilts stated there were three eight foot tall floors to the complex. The height of the roof, when completed, would be 33 feet 4 inches so it would be less than the 35 foot requirement. Mr. Hilts stated these had been the issues the Board had identified in its letter as to why the application was not accepted at the last meeting. Mr. Hilts stated
his position was the application should have been accepted at the March 9th meeting. Mr. Hilts stated he tried to find out what the Boards historical practices had been in regards to accepting site plan applications and from what he had found, there was a fairly regular practice of accepting applications without snow storage or elevations. Mr. Hilts stated what he was asking from the Board tonight was to stipulate that as of March 9th, the last meeting, Mr. Morway’s application was substantially complete.

Chairman Curley stated the amount of information that was missing was why the application had not been accepted. Chairman Curley continued by saying the Board had begun not accepting applications because of the number of times it was happening. The Board was trying to make sure everything was in the plans and the application was complete. Chairman Curley continued by saying if snow storage, for instance, was not on the plan and the applicant could show the Board where it would be, the applicant could put the information on the plan at the meeting and the Board would accept the application. If the sill information was missing and the applicant could not give the information, the Board could condition that information be added for approval. The Chairman stated with a number of things missing, the Board felt it was best to continue the case.

Mr. Hilts asked if there were more things that were missing and Ms. Jackson stated the road design. Mr. Hilts stated that had not been included in the letter sent to the applicant. Ms. Plessner stated she had not added the road design as the application had not been accepted and the Chairman had stated at the meeting of March 9th that the Board would not discuss the case. Discussion continued with Board members stating there had been no information on the building and what the building would look like. The Chairman stated that was substantial information that was missing.

Mr. Hilts stated his request was, given the prior practices of the Board, that the application should have been accepted at the last meeting and he was asking that the Board make the stipulation that the application was substantially complete as of March 9th.

Chairman Curley poled the Board.
George Helwig stated it (application) was not complete.

Michelle Jackson stated the application was not complete.

Chairman Curley stated the application was not complete.

Bob Sharon stated the application was not complete. The Board had been asked to approve an application with no idea of what the building was or would look like.

Katherine Dawson stated she concurred and added the site plan regulations were clear about what is required and the information was not there.

Mr. Hilts stated he understood but was going by the fact that the Board hadn’t followed its acceptance check list very strictly in the past and this application was as substantially complete as others that had been accepted in the past.

Ms. Jackson stated that was not true. Ms. Jackson stated things would be missing but the applicants were able to supply the missing information and it was added on so the application could be considered complete.

Discussion continued on various aspects of the application. Mr. Hilts told the Board he realized the discussion had been cut short at the March 9th meeting but the plan did have the raw elevations on it. Mr. Hilts continued by saying he realized it wasn’t an elevation view like what was presented tonight, but the raw elevations were available as well as the footprint.

Mr. Hilts felt the Board did have the footprint of the building, knew what the lateral dimensions would be, had a substantial understanding of what the height dimension would be given the different floors with the assumption that it would comply with the 35 foot maximum height. Mr. Hilts stated it seemed what was missing was the two snow storage plans and the elevation so those two things would render the application not complete.

Chairman Curley stated the new proposed zoning th
regulation vote was done on March 9 and the Board learned the results at the end of the March 9th meeting, which had been included in the letter Mr. Morway had received. The Chairman continued by saying the zoning regulations voted on had public hearings and was noticed before Mr. Morway’s application was received. The Chairman said the approval by the voters changed the density in the district that this proposed project was located so even if the application were accepted or continued, it would have been null or void because of the approved changes to the density.

Mr. Hilts stated he understood but asked that the Board separate the two issues and if the Board, given the discussions tonight, felt the application was substantially complete, Mr. Hilts was still asking for that stipulation (Complete as of March 9th) apart from whatever impact the vote to change the zoning ordinance would have on this project.

Ms. Jackson asked what difference would it make if the Board said the application was null and void because of the new rule. Ms. Jackson asked what the reason was that Mr. Hilts wanted the application acceptance to be March 9th. Mr. Hilts stated they had a great interest in seeing the project put in and Mr. Hilts had only recently been brought in on this project. Mr. Hilts stated he understood there were people in the neighborhood who would prefer the project not happen because they like the open space the way it is. Mr. Hilts stated people prefer to have a nice view beside their house as apposed to a development, however, one is entitled to make use of their property and understand that people would much prefer to have a field to look at. Mr. Hilts stated to answer Ms. Jackson’s question, they felt that it was obvious that some of the changes that were being proposed to the zoning ordinance, site plan regs. and subdivision regs. were targeted at foreclosing the possibility of this kind of development in Tilton and if they were to be able to have the site plan accepted, that would enable him (Mr. Hilts) to continue his catching up process and see if there could be any progress to be made from the zoning ordinance prospective.

Ms. Plessner asked Mr. Hilts what people’s opinion on whether or not they liked this proposal had to do with whether or not the Board approved or disapproved the application. Mr. Hilts
stated it really didn’t have anything to do with the application as acceptance was a technical process. Mr. Hilts added that public opinion always had a certain factor in deciding whether projects are ultimately approved as well as what they will look like. Mr. Hilts stated if one would have the minimum amount of acquired information in front of the Board from a combination of the list and the Boards practices of accepting prior applications, public opinion should not figure into that part of the process. Mr. Hilts stated he felt the public (opinion) would way much heavier later on in the process. Ms. Plessner stated that considering the application had not been accepted, the Board did not hear from the public in regard to this case. Chairman Curley stated the Board had no idea how the public might feel about this case.

Ms. Jackson stated she hoped Mr. Hilts did not think that the Board would be swayed from following the Town rules because of public opinion because they were not. Ms. Jackson stated they had approved things in the past that they may or may not have cared about but the ordinance stated it was allowed. Ms. Jackson stated that they listen to the public and make the project work the best that the Board can with all of the people involved. Ms. Jackson stated in the nearly two years she had been on the Board, she had never seen the Board not approve something if it were allowed by the ordinance.

Mr. Hilts stated that was why he had said accepting was a technical process and in that part of it, public opinion didn’t have much place. Public opinion, Mr. Hilts continued, came in at the tail end of the project where there could be design tweaking and the developer might agree to make some changes, not critical to the project, to keep people happy.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hilts asked if the Board’s opinion had changed at all. Board members stated they had not.

Mr. Hilts stated it was their intent to have a 30 unit condominium project and asked the Board to accept the application as complete.

Chairman Curley stated the area was no longer zoned for that number of dwelling units. Discussion ensued on whether or not the Board could accept the application. The Chairman
explained the application may be complete but the proposed project did not follow the zoning regulations. Mr. Hilt asked what they could do to have the project come into compliance between now and within the 90 days if the Board were to accept the application. Chairman Curley stated if the density had not passed at the Town meeting, the applicant could have continued with the proposed project. The Chairman stated if the application had come in before the notices and public hearings, the applicant could have continued with the proposed project. Mr. Hilt asked if they were going to deny the application. The Chairman stated if they accepted the application, they would have to deny the site plan as it did not conform to the zoning regulations. Mr. Hilt stated it might be more expedient to deny the application. Mr. Hilts asked what the new density was in the applicant’s zone and was told it was two dwelling units per lot.

Ms. Plessner stated the applicant could certainly go to the Zoning Board and try and get a variance approval. Mr. Hilts stated from 30 units to 2 units.

Mr. Hilts stated if the Board were inclined to not approve the application (site plan?) at the expiration of 90 days from now, they might as well go ahead and deny it now rather than wasting the Boards time with a place holder on the agenda waiting for the 90 days to expire. Chairman Curley stated the applicant could also pull the application. Mr. Hilts stated they were not going to do that.

Ms. Plessner stated she did not understand why Mr. Hilts would say the Board should deny the application if they are going to let the 90 days run out and deny it. Ms. Plessner stated the applicant could try and get variance approval and if successful, come back. Ms. Plessner stated for Mr. Hilts to say the Board would do that when the Board would have no idea what the circumstances would be in 90 days was very presumptuous of Mr. Hilts.

Mr. Hilts stated he did not mean to imply that as he was taking what the Chairman had said to mean it didn’t meet the zoning regulations.

Discussion continued on as to whether or not the Board should accept the application. Joe Plessner, code enforcement
and building inspector, stated, in his opinion, he did not see how the Board could accept the application if it did not comply with the town regulations. Mr. Plessner stated that to deny the application would only mean the applicant could either rework his site plan to bring it into compliance or go to the Zoning Board to try and obtain variance approval.

Hearing no further discussion, Michelle Jackson made a motion to deny the application based on the Zoning changes approved at Town meeting that had been noticed and had hearings on before Mr. Morway’s site plan was submitted to the Town. Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

7:35 PM Continuation of Case #04-01 for Constantino Pannullo. Sandy Plessner stated Mr. Pannullo had called and asked for a continuation. Michelle Jackson made a motion to continued the case until May 11, 2004 at 6:45 PM. Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

8:00 PM Continuation of Case #03-34 for John Bernard for the Lochmhere Meadows Development, LLC.

Stephan Nix, attorney for the project, began by touching on the highlights of the case presented so far by saying the plan was for a 47 unit multi-family development restricted to 55 and over. Mr. Nix stated they had requested a waiver for the road width to be 20 feet wide with 2 foot wide shoulders. Mr. Nix stated the width of the roadway at the entrance to the development was 34 feet and the road split and went around in a loop. Mr. Nix stated they were still requesting a waiver on the road width and wondered if the Board would want to deal with the roadway issues before continuing on.

Discussion continued for several minutes on the various aspects of the roadway. One of the reasons given for the waiver request was to lessen the impact on the wetlands. Katherine Dawson asked about the number of wetland crossings and was told there were four. Discussion continued. Mr. Nix stated the Towns standards would have an interstate sized road in a small development.

Bob Sharon stated he was looking at the safety issue. He
felt a 20 foot road with 2 foot shoulders, two way traffic, senior citizens and no sidewalks were safety issues. Mr. Sharon stated it was his experience that seniors do a lot of walking and with no sidewalks, these seniors would be walking in a roadway that is only 20 feet wide along with the traffic. Again, Mr. Sharon felt it was a safety issue.

Ms. Jackson stated she felt granting waivers should not be something that was done freely and that there should be very specific reasons for doing so. Ms. Jackson asked what the applicant’s specific reasons for asking for a waiver were. Mr. Nix stated they wanted to lessen the visual impacts, wetland impacts, cutting down on the number of trees that would have to be removed and Mr. Nix felt the standards in the subdivision regulations for Tilton far exceeded the minimum standards stated in the N.H. regulations. Mr. Nix asked why the regulations were so stringent and Ms. Jackson stated they were stringent because in the past, the Town ended up having to accept substandard road ways and then had to foot the bill to bring them up to standards and that was not fair to the tax payers. Mr. Nix stated the roadway bed would be built to Town standards and it would only be the width that would require a waiver. Ms. Jackson stated other large multi-family developments had not had any problems with the roadway standards. Ms. Jackson stated she understood the lessening of the impacts on the wetlands but personally felt if the applicant really wanted to have less impact, he could reduce the number of units. Ms. Jackson stated she understood their concerns but in her opinion, it did not out way the rules the Town had in place.

John Bernard stated they could put a 24 foot road in but they did not want to primarily for what it would look like aesthetically.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Bernard asked if it would make a difference if they made the road one way and put speed bumps in it. Katherine Dawson asked how they would enforce one way and Mr. Bernard stated he would put signs up.

Sandy Plessner asked if the roadway would be a raised roadbed or a bridge going up and over the 6 foot retaining wall
area. Ms. Plessner also asked if there would be guard rails and was told the road would be a raised bed not a bridge and there would be guard rails on the 6 foot retaining wall. Ms. Plessner asked if they would be using salt on the road and was told they could have a no salt use.

Bob Sharon asked if the roadway was approved as a one way road, would it be stated in the lease. Mr. Bernard said yes it could be added and the roadway would be well marked.

Discussion turned to the parking lots and whether or not there was enough room for emergency equipment. Captain Wilking told the Board everything was fine as far as the roadway and parking lots went. Mr. Nix stated the single floor buildings would also be sprinklered as the water district could not provide the pressure needed for the hydrants. Ms. Plessner asked if there was enough pressure for the sprinkler systems and was told there was.

Discussion returned to the roadway. Members did not feel speed bumps were necessary for a one way road. George Helwig made a motion to accept a 20 foot permanent one way road with two foot shoulders with provisions the roadway can never become a Town Road. Mr. Helwig went on to say the roadway was to be striped off to provide a 8 foot side walk area. Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

Discussion turned to the landscaping. Ms. Plessner asked if the cars would be up against the buildings. Mr. Nix stated there would be a walkway, shrubs and then parking. Ms. Plessner asked if there would be handicap parking spaces for those who might be in wheel chairs. Mr. Nix stated if wasn’t required in residential locations but they would have the engineer look at it. John Bernard stated the end spots were right by a 5 foot walkway and they could use them for getting wheel chairs in and out of vans.

Ms. Jackson stated there were no drainage retention ponds. Mr. Nix stated that was because they were waiting for the site specific plan to be completed with the State which would include drainage. Mr. Nix suggested that after all the permits were in place, the applicant would need to come back for a
compliance hearing to address the permits and the final drainage. Ms. Jackson stated she wanted them to make sure to show the snow storage in relationship to the drainage. At this point, Ms. Jackson asked Mr. Nix if the snow storage shown on the plan was calculated or just added to the drawings. Mr. Nix stated there was ample space on the property for snow storage. Ms. Jackson stated she knew they said there would be no salt used but there could still be contaminants so it was necessary for the snow melt to go into detention ponds to allow adequate filtering before anything would get into the wetlands.

Discussion turned to a time frame for a compliance hearing. Generally, people agreed that one year was not unreasonable. Mr. Bernard felt it would be next year before any work could begin.

Discussion turned to the conservation area shown on the plan. Ms. Jackson stated the Board had received several e-mails from the conservation Commission concerning the easement area as well as other items of concern. Mr. Nix stated a conservation set aside area was on the plan. Mr. Nix stated that according to RSA 674:21-a, set aside areas of conservation such as the area they were showing on the plan were enforceable by the Town and any affected party. Sandy Plessner asked if this would include the wildlife corridor and was told that it would.

9:00 PM Open to public comment.

Helen Dawson, Conservation Commission member, stated she and others had walked the property and they were concerned with the wildlife corridor staying in existence due to the development of the property. Ms. Dawson stated what had happened in the past was a conservation easement would be given for things such as this and deeded to the Town. Ms. Dawson continued by saying they were aware of other ways of protecting the corridor through giving up development rights and such. Ms. Dawson stated their biggest concerns were accurate definitions of the wetlands, concerns about the wildlife and making sure all those bases were covered as the development went forward. Ms. Dawson stated the site specific and DES permits were important.
Mr. Bernard asked Ms. Dawson if she had seen the areas set aside for the development. Mr. Bernard stated the blue lines defined the areas, which allowed for the movement of wildlife through the development.

Chairman Curley asked about the corridor where the road went through. Discussion ensued. Ms. Dawson stated the animals came in and followed the proposed roadway path around and wintered in a pine grove. Ms. Dawson added the Conservation Commission did appreciate the fact that the applicant was leaving a corridor for the wildlife. Sandy Plessner asked Mr. Bernard if there was a particular reason why he did not want to give a conservation easement. Mr. Bernard stated that trying to define and deed an area over to someone and having the public coming in and perhaps getting hurt was to cumbersome. Mr. Bernard stated they would highlight the areas and no one would be able to develop it. Mr. Nix added that they could put a note on the plan making reference to the RSA stature that would enforce the restriction. That way, Mr. Nix continued, the Conservation Commission, thru the Town, could enforce the restriction. Ms. Jackson asked if this would be something they could add to the deed so if the property were sold in the future, the new owners would know it is a conservation set aside restriction. Mr. Bernard stated they could but it wouldn’t matter as the property could not be further developed.

Ms. Dawson asked what the projected water flow would be and was told it would be part of the site specific.

Ms. Plessner asked about the trash pick up. Mr. Nix stated it would be picked up in the front by a private contractor. Ms. Plessner asked where the trash would be stored until pick up and Mr. Bernard said it would be kept inside. Discussion ensued as to where trash could be stored until pick up.

Ms. Plessner asked how the public was supposed to get into the development with the gate in place. Ms. Plessner stated visitors, delivery people and the mail man would need access and wondered what the process was for using the key pads. Mr. Bernard stated the mail boxes would be outside the gate and he would also like to add a bus stop for those living there who might not drive. Mr. Bernard stated he had not yet bought a gated
system so he wasn’t exactly sure how it would work but they would have a way for people who needed to get in to the community to be able to.

Joe Plessner stated the applicant needed to provide reasonable service to people living in the community and expecting them to store trash inside was not reasonable and could become a health hazard. Mr. Plessner stated there should be some kind of enclosure to keep the trash in near the unit. Mr. Nix stated they would like a condition added that an adequate trash removal system would be presented at the final hearing. Mr. Nix added the mail boxes and their location would be discussed with the Post Office.

Mr. Plessner had a discussion with the applicant concerning the distance between the buildings and whether or not there was ample room for backing out of the parking spots. After a brief discussion, Mr. Plessner was satisfied that there was enough room.

9:30 PM Close to public comment.

Sandy Plessner went over all the e-mails from the Conservation Commission to make sure all of the items mentioned had been addressed. Ms. Plessner asked Mr. Bernard if he had any further comments regarding the correspondence. Mr. Bernard stated he thought most everything had been covered and again stated he had had three wetland soil scientists on the site and all of them had agreed on how the wetlands had been delineated.

Ms. Plessner asked why they were gating the community and Mr. Bernard stated he felt the senior citizens that would be living in the community would want their privacy.

For clarity, Ms. Plessner asked again if the road would be built to Town standards except for the width dimension and was told it would be.

Hearing no further discussion, Michelle Jackson made a motion to approve the site plan for a 55 and over multi-family development with the following conditions.

1. The applicant has been granted a waiver for a
20 foot roadway with two foot shoulders.

2. Road to be designed as a one way road—applicant accepts the road is never to be accepted by the Town as a town road as per Subdivision Regulation 7.6:4:E which states, The applicant shall include a private road waiver on the project plan set (all sheets), acknowledging the Town will not consider accepting the private road as a local street in the future.

3. Road shall be built to town standards with the exception of the dimension waiver.

4. Drainage calculations needed for a 50 year storm.

5. Drainage storage ponds etc. No direct run off into wetlands.

6. Conservation restriction to be referenced on the plan.

7. Buildings require sprinklers as agreed upon by applicant and the Tilton-Northfield Fire Department.

8. Compliance with the State Fire Codes.

9. Trash to be handled privately; garbage removal will be addressed at compliance hearing.

10. Need to see actual snow storage in relation to drainage areas; have snow melt discharge into detention ponds.

11. No salt on the roadway or parking areas.

12. All state, local and federal permits.( Site Specific, Dredge & Fill, Federal Stormwater, etc.)

13. Completion of Municipal sewer to the site.

14. Completion of Municipal water to the site.

15. There shall be a compliance hearing before the Planning Board, noticed to all abutters to review and approve final plans. (Drainage, grading and erosion
control designs to be included.)

Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

9:50 PM Chairman Curley closed the public for the proposed changes to the subdivision regulations.

Ms. Jackson made a motion to approve the Subdivision Regulations changes with the minor word change. Bob Sharon seconded the motion. No further discussion. All voted in favor.

The Board spent several minutes discussing upcoming meetings and the need for a Planner to advise the Board. Board members decided to give the matter some thought to see what their requirements would be and address them at the following meeting. Once the Board would be in agreement, a letter will be drafted and sent to the Selectmen for consideration.

10:30 PM Meeting adjourned.

Minutes prepared by,
Sandy Plessner