TOWN OF TILTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JUNE 27, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Chairman Michelle Jackson               George Helwig
Sarah Paratore, Vice-Chair          Mike Curley
Sandy Plessner

OTHERS PRESENT:
Rick Fink                           David Johnston
Paul Buckley                        Bryan Bailey
Florian Devoisan                    William Seed
Joe Plessner

AGENDA:

6:30 PM     Call to order
Minutes of May 23, 2006
Minutes of June 13, 2006
Correspondence
Any other business
6:35 PM     Continuation: Case #06-12 for a Site Plan for David Johnston
7:00 PM     Continuation: Case #06-13 for a subdivision for Nel Benett.

MEETING:

6:30 PM     Call to order. Chairman Jackson asked alternate Sandy Plessner to sit as a
full member for the meeting. Chairman Jackson explained to everyone present that
because there was no quorum at the meeting on the 13th, the minutes of May 23rd had not
been approved and the correspondence had not been considered.

Chairman Jackson made a motion to approve the notes for June 13, 2006, which
explained what had occurred. Sandy Plessner seconded the motion. No further discussion.
Motion carried.

George Helwig made a motion to approve the minutes of May 23, 2006 as
presented. Mike Curley seconded the motion. No further discussion. Motion carried.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Letter dated June 26, 2006 from Rondal and Pamela Noyes to the Planning
   Board asking for a waiver to the requirement to have a sprinkler system in
   their new home.
2. Letter dated June 26, 06 from Rokeh Consulting, LLC to the Planning Board concerning a third party review of the Hampton Inn Drainage report.


4. Letter dated June 20, 2006 from the Tilton Conservation Commission to Chairman Jackson concerning a possible wetlands violation.

5. Letter and memos bidding on the peer review job for the Hampton Inn.

6. Memo from Bill Rollins to the Land Use Office regarding Winnisquam Village.

7. Wetlands and Non-Site specific permit #2005-02510.

8. Memorandum from the Lakes Region Planning Commission regarding the BMP Guidebook for the Tri-Town Aquifer Project.


10. Letter of gratitude from the Land Use Office and Planning Board thanking Bob Sharon for his years of service to the Town.

11. Sampling reports from VHB on the Konover site.

12. Unrecorded easement relocation agreement between Carnoustie Centre and George Ryan.

13. Local Government Center pamphlet advertising workshops for municipalities called, “Defining Your Building Program.”

14. Letter from the Land Use office to Burd Engineering outlining information to be addressed at the June 27th meeting.

15. Letter from Linda Goyette from the Lakes Region Furniture, Inc. outlining a temporary tent sales area on her property.

16. UNH 2005 data report titled, “Storm Water Center”

17. Letter from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy regarding the Citizen Planners Resource Kit.

6:40 PM Continuation of Case #06-12 for David Johnston Development for a Hampton Inn hotel.

Chairman Jackson asked the applicant if he would like to continue the case as the Town hired engineer, Jon Rokeh, had not had an opportunity to look at the plans Mr. Fink had revised and brought in reflecting the changes Mr. Rokeh had discussed in his letter.

Mr. Fink stated he had spoken with Mr. Rokeh and had tried to meet with him earlier in the day but Mr. Rokeh was not available. Mr. Fink stated he had discussed issues raised in Mr. Rokeh’s letter and had incorporated some of the changes into the plan.

Mr. Fink stated he felt Mr. Rokeh had referred to the site as a rather large hotel site but it was only 2 ½ acres. Board members stated they felt Mr. Rokeh was referring to the size of the structures. Mr. Fink stated the over all site was small and Board members stated the impermeable surfaces took up quite a bit of space so they felt the review was more important than some of the larger sites.
Mr. Fink stated the drainage was part of the site specific so the drainage was being reviewed twice, which Mr. Fink felt was redundant and slowing the process down. Chairman Jackson stated the purpose of the review was to let the Board know the drainage would work or what would need to be changed to enable it to work. Chairman Jackson stated none of the Board had civil engineer expertise so Mr. Rokeh was hired to look at the system and report his findings to the Board.

Sandy Plessner stated she had spoken with Mr. Rokeh late in the afternoon and stated Mr. Fink had called at 3:00 PM just as Mr. Rokeh was on his way to another meeting. Ms. Plessner continued by saying Mr. Rokeh had stated he and Mr. Fink had briefly discussed changes Mr. Fink had incorporated into the plans and they discussed things Mr. Fink had felt were unnecessary, such as the rip rap and oil water separators in the basins. Mr. Rokeh had stated he was willing to consider Mr. Fink's differences of opinion and would check with the State to verify any differences of opinion. Ms. Plessner stated she personally wanted to hear Mr. Rokeh’s findings and to know the drainage would work and not create problems on the site or to surrounding properties. Mr. Fink stated the site specific would do that as well. Ms. Plessner stated Mr. Fink had not submitted a site specific application until June 12th and any pending permit could be three to four months out, if there were no problems that could cause further delay. Ms. Plessner stated she personally did not feel the Board or Mr. Rokeh was inconveniencing the applicant at all. Ms. Plessner stated the applicant was utilizing a great deal of the site and she personally wanted to know the drainage would be right. Chairman Jackson agreed.

Chairman Jackson stated Mr. Fink was asking for direction on what would be required for a final plan. Chairman Jackson began by asking Mr. Fink if he had prepared a lighting plan and was told they had.

Chairman Jackson continued:

1. Has the applicant dealt with the existing buildings as far as demolition? Are there any oil tanks on the property? Any hazardous materials such as lead paint, or asbestos on site? Any floor drains in the existing buildings slated for demolition? David Johnston stated the report had come back good. Chairman Jackson stated they should be sure to include a note on the plans that stated everything was taken care of and there had been a proper closure of the existing well.

2. The access easement for going under the railroad tracks for the sewer. Mr. Fink stated they did not need that. Chairman Jackson asked if they were going to Rt. 3 for the sewer line and Mr. Fink stated they met with the sewer commission and they had agreed that there could be a gravity line that ran along Rt. 3 to the westerly edge of the property and then straight back to the railroad, tying into the interceptor that Burd had originally proposed tying into. Mr. Fink stated the crossing of the railroad would belong to the town.

3. Signage Plan. Mr. Fink stated he had a plan. The sign post would be 20 feet high. When asked, Mr. Fink did not know the square footage of the sign and was advised he would need to provide that. The code enforcement officer, Joe
Plessner, asked if the sign on the building would protrude above the roof line and was told it would not.

4. Resolution of the drainage plan and calculations. Mr. Fink stated he and Mr. Rokeh were going to sit down the next day and go over the changes.

7:00 PM Open and close to public comment as no one asked to speak.

Other items discussed:

5. DOT driveway permit. Mr. Fink was asked if they were required to do a traffic study. Mr. Fink stated they met with the DOT and were required to provide a form of a traffic study as they had to provide the car movement for entering the site in order to show how much of a bypass lane would be necessary. Board members asked that any conditions instituted by the DOT be provided to the Town for the application file.

6. Water Company. Mr. Fink explained the progress with the water company was very slow.

There was a brief discussion on possible conditions of approval. Chairman Jackson explained they would not condition the drainage plan and calculations. That would have to be resolved before any approval would be considered. Chairman Jackson continued by saying obtaining state permits could be a condition of approval.

The applicant asked if demolition of the site before approval was acceptable and Joe Plessner explained the process for demolition and stated once the proper paper work had been filled out, which reported possible hazards such as asbestos and lead paint, a demolition permit could be issued.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Jackson made a motion to continue Case #06-12 until August 22, 2006 at 6:35 PM. Sarah Paratore seconded the motion. No further discussion. Motion carried.

Sandy Plessner told the applicant she would need a letter waiving the 65 day rule for a decision as the applicant would go over the 65 days before approval. After a brief discussion, Mr. Fink stated he would write the letter asking for a waiver and send it to the town.

7:15 PM Continuation of Case #06-13 for a subdivision for Nel Benett. Chairman Jackson explained this case had been scheduled for June 13th but could not be heard, as there wasn’t a quorum present. Chairman Jackson stated she had reviewed the application and found it to be substantially complete and asked for a motion. Sandy Plessner made a motion to accept the application. George Helwig seconded the motion. No further discussion. Motion carried.

Bryan Bailey, engineer, went over the subdivision and explained to the Board the applicant had a buyer for the commercial portion of the site so they were here to subdivide the commercial portion from the residential portion of the property. Mr. Bailey
stated the proposed lot would have 3.90 acres, which took into account the amount of wetlands on the site and the minimum lot size. Mr. Bailey also stated because the lot would be less than 5 acres, they had applied to the State for the subdivision approval and had received it and showed the Board his copy of the approval. Mr. Bailey stated because of the Town setback regulation, the applicant had gone to the Zoning Board for variance approval as the new property line would have structures within the setback area. Mr. Bailey stated they were given a conditional approval.

Chairman Jackson stated the Board had been asking applicants to note the buildable acres on the plat as well as the percentage of lot coverage as it would make it easier for future reference to the site plan. Mr. Bailey agreed to do that.

7:30 PM Open and close to public comment as no one asked to speak.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Jackson made a motion to approve the subdivision with the following conditions.

1. Show percentage of lot coverage on the plan.
2. Show buildable area on plan. (Total acreage minus the wetlands equals buildable area.)
3. Compliance with the ZBA condition, which stated, “No new structures shall be built within 40 feet of the new property lines.”

George Helwig seconded the motion. No further discussion. Motion carried.

The Board spent several minutes discussing correspondence.

The letter from Rondal and Pamela Noyes was discussed at length. The Board asked that a letter be sent to the Noyes family explaining the Board’s policy and that this was a condition of approval offered by the applicant and that for life safety reasons, the Board did not feel they could issue a waiver.

Discussion turned to Linda Goyette’s letter stating she wanted to have a tent for the summer to feature sales. Board members agreed that they would not require any additional site plan review as long as the tent came down at the end of summer. If this was going to be more permanent, a further review would be required.

The sampling report sent by VHB on the Konover site was reviewed.

The possible wetlands violation on Dunlop Drive was discussed. Mr. Plessner offered to send a letter to advise the homeowner that there could be a problem and that he should investigate whether or not what he was doing would require a special permit from the State or from the Town.

8:30 PM Meeting adjourned.
Minutes prepared by Sandy Plessner