Members Present:
Sarah Paratore, Chairman  Robert Haberman
Mike Curley, Vice Chairman  James Dwyer
Nick Canzano  Katherine Dawson, Ex Officio
Ray Smith

Others Present:
Macgregor Smith  R. L. Robin, NH Biz Sales
John Bernard, Lochmere Meadows  Peter Graves, Rodgers Dev.
Pam Mamacos, Cuoco & Comier Engr  Kathi Mitchell
Kathy Smith  Chris Rice, Konover Dev. Corp

Agenda:
6:30 pm  Called to Order
Minutes of the December 11, 2007
Correspondence
Any other business

6:35 pm  Case# 07-17 Site Plan review for Lochmere Meadows.
Applicant John Bernard is proposing a 47 unit housing
Development for 55 plus located on Laconia Rd,
Lochmere, NH 03276.  Tax Map R10 Lot 7-1

7:00 pm  Case# 07-18 Site Plan/Subdivision review for Rodgers
Development for Hunt Brook II located on Sherwood Dr.
Tilton, NH 03.276.  Applicant is proposing 27 manufactured
Home sites in this park and requesting a consolidation/lot
Line relocation.  Tax Map  R-18 Lot 25.

7:30 pm  First Public Hearing for Petitioned Warrant Article for
Consideration at 2008 Town Election.  Petition received:
“To see if the town will vote to amend Article VII, ‘Chart of
Dimensional Values’, Appendix C of the Tilton Zoning
Ordnance to increase the minimum lot size in the Rural/
Agricultural district from three (3) to five (5) acres.”

8:30 pm  First Public Hearing for a Proposed Zoning Change for
Consideration at the 2008 Town Election.
Re-zone the properties referred to as Tax Map R22
Lots 16, 73A, 73B and 73C (the former Quinn-T Property) from
Industrial (IN) to Regional Commercial (RG).
MEETING:

6:30 pm           Call to Order

Macgregor Smith from the Town Line Plaza was in attendance concerning the lighting issue condition on the approval letter. Tractor Supply plans to rely on fencing rather than lighting this outdoor display area for security when its store is closed. Therefore, it considers installing motion sensor lights within Lot 23 an unnecessary expense and a nuisance to the neighbors that it does not want to impose on them.

They would like to request that this condition be restated in a more restrictive fashion as follows:

2. Any lighting installed in the former Lot 23 area will be turned off when the Tractor Supply store is not open to customers so that the lightening will not disturb the residences surrounding the area.

The board discussed this request. Katherine Dawson that she would like to have a time limit set for when the lights must be turned off. Macgregor Smith asks that we do not impose a time limit on the lights. The board asked when the lights were turned of at the movie theater. Macgregor states that on a weekend is maybe midnight, but he did suggest that the lights at the Tractor Supply display be turned off at 11:00 pm.

Sarah Paratore made a motion to amend the Notice of Decision to reflect that the Tractor Supply lights in the display area must shut off at 11:00 pm everyday of the week.

2nd by Robert Haberman

Open to discussion: Mr. Dwyer asks if the lights will go off at 11:00 pm and was told that the lights will be turned off at 11:00 pm.

Discussion closed. Board vote to approve.

6:37 pm Case# 07-17 Site Plan Review for Lochmere Meadows. Applicant John Bernard is proposing a 47 unit housing development for 55 Plus located on Laconia Rd, Lochmere, NH 03276.
Tax Map R-1 Lot 7-1
Sarah states that application appears to be substantially complete. Sarah made motion to accept the application. Seconded by Ray Smith. Vote taken and approved.

John Bernard states this a development that has already been approved and it’s in its final stages as far as he has already pulled a building permit. What you are doing is reviewing the plan for his changes.

Katherine Dawson asked to interrupt for a minute to ask question of John. She asks if this is a revision or another site plan? John states that it could be either way for the revisions. Katherine states that it has to be one or the other, but the way it was filed as a site plan. This was filed as a site plan because the changing of the building is a substantial change.

This is a site plan review per Sarah Paratore according to our documents.

Katherine states that before we can act on this since we do have an approved site plan, then the approved site plan has to be revoked. Mr. Bernard does not want to revoke to approve site plan until this one is approved. Katherine states you can’t have 2 site plans for one site. Mr. Bernard states that he wouldn’t ask for one to be revoked until this new plan is approved. You have to revoke the first one before we look at the new one. Mr. Haberman states this plan does not look like the first one. Mr. Bernard states that the buildings are in the exact location.

Katherine has been talking to Chris Northrop concerning this matter.

Sarah Paratore asks how does Mr. Bernard take care to not to revoke the one that is approved and then run into problems and end up with no site plan approval. Mr. Bernard asks if this could be approved with a condition that the other site plan has to be revoked, but the board would have to make a motion to accept this one first and have additional provision that the other be revoked.

Mr. Dwyer asks if the other was already approved then why don’t we call this one a revision. Katherine states that this one was not done as a revision it a was done as a site plan. Katherine states that this does qualify because it is a substantial change to the site plan due to the changes to all the buildings.

Mr. Smith asks if the board could look at the plans and compare it?
Katherine states RSA 676.4A revocation of recorded approval.

Back to the revision of the site plan, if you compare and scale the wetland have change on this one to the old one. The Conservation Commission members looked at this plan and scaled it and found differences.

Mr. Bernard states that the new plan did not change wetland. The way this is done they don’t change for those reasons. The way the plan is done is the exact same as the approved one. They removed those buildings, moved the other buildings out.

Katherine states that the board can compare the old verse the new plans to figure this out.

Katherine was reviewing the book for the section that describes what constitutes a revision to the site plan and it has to do with the substantial change. Mr. Bernard states he didn’t know that he could come in for a revision to the site plan. When Katherine describe to Chris Northrop what was being change on this plan, that you were changing the design of all the buildings. He agreed that was a substantial change to the site plan. This is not a subdivision, you didn’t have to subdivide. So the meat of this site plan was the buildings which you are changing which is a substantial change, but Chris has not seen the plan. Chris Northrop belongs to the office of Energy and Planning, he is our advisor down there.

Mr. Bernard states his reason for the change is he thought this was a better plan then the original plan. He has worked on this for the last 3 year has gone to different sites that are 55 and older and they have gone to convex which are separated. He states that the roads are already in along with the water lines, sewage lines, all wetlands crossings, and all retain walls are in. He has pulled a building permit to build out one of the seven units, if this plan didn’t go, then he could go ahead and build to the original site plan.

Katherine states that we could continue this and go down to Chris Northrop and have him review the original against the new plans.

We are back to original problem of revoking the original site plan. If you revoke then it is a do over.

Mr. Bernard states that the board must understand that what we are asking him to do by revoking the original site plan cost $150,000. So you are
asking him to make a $150,000 decision on a leap of faith that the new plan will get approved.

The Board stated that you can continue to the new date and have the Broad review the plan then you can make a decision on which plan you want to proceed. The chairman that he can take until 7:00 pm to decide or the Board can continue to review this plan but stop short of an approval, then there would not be 2 approved site plans.

The plans where past out along with the original plans. Mr. Bernard state the he has to go through site specific and they called this a revision. Katherine state that the state is only dealing with the soil or ground surfaces, not the buildings.

Mr. Bernard describes the changes from the 2 plans. The original plans the building were all together and new plans the building are spread out. That is the only change, same amount of units.

Sarah state that the Conservation Commission sent us a note, we had them look at the plans. The mapping on the wetlands on the new plans is somewhat different from the original site plan. Is there an explanation for that? John states that he disagrees. The board showed him that the buildings are closer to the wetland then on the original. John does agree that the building are more spread out so they should have less impact. Areas were noted that were closer than allowed and he would have to request a variance from the ZBA.

The location of the snow removal areas is not indicated on the new plan. It was recommended that berm be constructed around the wetland areas so salt does not flow directly into the wetlands. John states that there is no salt allowed and he would monitor as he would be managing the property for sometime.

The Conservation Commission would like to conduct another site walk of the lot. Mr. Bernard states that if he has a chance to say no, but the original site plan approval was that the Conservation Committee would oversee the wetlands. He states that they can walk around as much as they like. The stipulation for the Conservation Commission to oversee in lieu of an engineer. (This is listed as a condition on the original site plan approval)
The Lochmere Village District, Paul Boudreau gave the Board a note stating that they would like to see one water meter at property line at the entrance on Route 3. John states that by changing this they would end up with one water meter instead of 6, which right now they agreed to have 6 or 7 (one on each building). Lochmere Village District are concerned with the changes. He states that he would probably agree to do that. The cost of meters is very expensive.

The new plans all the snow removal area are gone and where is the submersible pump station. Location was shown on the plans. There are still areas for the snow removal. There will be no snow to be put in the wetlands.

Where is the paperwork for the person that did the wetlands? John states that he can’t remember but he can check as he has the bills. He used 3 soil scientist.

Katherine has reviewed the Conservation Commission folder on this property and the square footage of wetlands changed due to the size of the roads.

John asked for the name and phone number for Chris Northrop so he could meet and discuss this issue with him.

John states that it makes more sense to have this as a revision and he would make another application for next month. You have done more than what is required with what you have done with notice to abutter.

The Conservation Committee would like us to request the wetlands be done again by Nancy Randell of Bluemoon of Environmental. You are coming up on 5 years and it would need to be done again (letter dated 2003). He has already paid for 3 soil scientist already but he would agree to another one as long as the town pays for it.

The boards needs the following questions answered at the next meeting:

a) Proximity of the building to the wetlands.
b) Snow storage areas must be shown on the plans
c) Lighting is the same downcast
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Sarah suggest that we continue to February 12, 2008. This is will have the same conditions as the previous ones with the proximity of the building to the wetlands, snow storage removal areas, and lighting.

Motion made to continue Case # 07-17 Lochmere Meadows site plan review to 6:35 pm on February 12, 2008. Seconded by Robert Haberman. Vote taken and approved.

7:15 pm Case #07-18 Site Plan/Subdivision review for Rodgers Development for Hunt Brook II located on Sherwood Dr., Tilton< NH 03276. Applicant is proposing a 27 manufactured home sites in this park and is requesting a lot consolidation/lot line relocation. Tax Map R-18 Lot 25.

Sarah states that the application appears complete. A motion is made by the Chairman to accept the application. Seconded by Ray Smith. Vote taken and approved.

Peter Graves from Rodgers Development Company. He states that they own 7 manufactured housing communities in Massachusetts and New Hampshire including Hunt Brook Estates behind Walmart. We purchased this 100 acre parcel back in 1987. At the time it had 39 older manufactured homes along Rte 3 and 11. We built a new manufactured housing park at the extreme rear of the parcel and moved the existing 39 units back there and put in more units to fill up the 54 unit park. This freed up the acreage that give rise to Walmart and the 2 banks that are there now.

Last March we came into the Planning Board to obtain the backing for a warrant article to change the zoning for some residual acreage behind Walmart served by private roads was zoned commercial. This area had no signage or utilities are private road servicing it. Didn't real seems to work very well as commercial. We proposed to the Planning Board if we changed the zoning to allowed manufactured homes. We through the town meeting and did obtain that zoning change.

We hired an engineering firm Cuoco & Comier of Nashua, NH who have designed a 27 unit manufacture home community on that acreage. We have several small lots, fair size lot and big lot that they want to consolidate. We have 2 phases.

Phase 1. To consolidate the little lots, fair size lot and the big lot into on enormous 33 acre parcel, of which only the center section which would be
the area for the 27 units. This conforms to all the ordinance in terms of size of lots, size of acreage and we don’t encroach on any wetlands or buffers. We trying to maximize the dry land without getting any of the poorly drained soils. This leaves lots of open space total served by private road and private water system within the parcel it is even our private sewer system.

The board review the plans and had many question of Peter Graves to explain concerning the wetland easement, consolidation of the little lots, to house the 27 unit area. Also showed them where they house there pump building and the wells for the community water system. They have no desire to do any further development with that thumb area that sticks up near the behind Bitten Lane.

Phase 2. Site plan which we have also presented today. Pam Mamacos states that they have maintained a 20 ft wetland buffer.

Discussion open to the public.

Public discussion closed.

Discussion back to the Planning Board.

Peter explains the they are only proposing to build one new road. This road will have a 50 ft right-of-way proposed with 18 ft of pavement with gravel shoulders beyond that.

Snow Storage:

The snow will be moved into the shoulders to the road, but there is plenty of room for snow storage in the snow storage retention pond.

Sarah wants to discuss the blanket waiver for the road. Peter states they would like to request with the respect that this is a private roads. Instead going with a foot of crushed gravel. Pam states the roads have been designed curbing, road sloping, Culverts, gravel out to the required width of the road.
Drainage:

Discussion of catch basin and wetland area (C3). Peter explains the maps to Board concerning the drainage area in relationship to the wetland areas. The maps are also improving the drainage on existing roads.

Katherine request that all catch basins are installed with oil/water separators.

Open to public. Closed to the Public.

Open it back up to the board.

Sarah Paratore made a motion to approve the lot consolidation/lot line relocation for Case #07-18 Hunt Brook II.

Seconded by Ray Smith. With not further discussion of the board. Vote taken and approved by majority vote.

Sarah Paratore made a motion to approve Case #07-18 for site plan/subdivision for Rodgers Development for Hunt Brook II located on Sherwood Drive in Tilton, NH 02376 with the following conditions.

1) Snow storage be indicates somewhere on the plans.
2) All new catch basins installed will have oil/water separators.
3) The Fire Department clear your private road that will not be build to town standards. We need to insure that the people who live there are accessible for fire or emergency vehicles.
4) Compliance with all state, federal and local permits.
5) Compliance with state fire codes.
6) Compliance with town signage regulations and wetland regulations.
7) All lighting to be downcast lighting, if any is to be installed.

Seconded Mike Curley. Motion made and seconded. Vote taken and approved by majority vote.

8:00 pm

First public hearing for petitioned warrant article for consideration at 2008 town election.
Petition received: “To see if the town will vote to amend Article VII, ‘Chart of Dimensional Values’, Appendix C of the Tilton Zoning Ordinance to increase the minimum lot size in the Rural/Agricultural district from three (3) to five (5) acres.”

Kathi Mitchell was recognized by the Board.

She states that she has lived in the town for 30 years. She has seen a lot of changes in the development in the community. We have made strong commitment to development and infrastructure to support that. What she would like to see is a small commitment to protecting some of the rural agricultural lands that we have in this community. The master plan survey of 2000 at that point 304 people in this town said they would support town involvement to protect farm lands. They listed the lack of farm land and agriculture as the 4th most serious problem in town after traffic and high taxes. Mention on question #8 why Tilton was desirable to live and raise a family and the reason they states was scenic and unpolluted environment.

She also mentions a 43 page report done in 2005 by the Farm Viability Task Force. It states the agriculture is the corner stone of life in New Hampshire. The landscape the draws people here to live and visit is connected to the agriculture and the history of that. Farms are for the small local farmer or person who might be supplementing their income with farming (like haying).

The task force recommend some small changes. If you have 5 acres of land there is more room for growing several crops and also bring local products into the community. This is like the farms markets that we have.

Kathi states we are rural agricultural and 5 acres would be more viable for farming and would conserve open space in the community. The large lots would worth more and more valuable to the community. In addition the rural agricultural area doesn’t depend on town services and also the way to reduce the number of homes being built that would not use up water supplies and increasing the amount of septic lines to be put in.

Kathi supports is in changing from three (3) acres to five (5) acres.
Discussion open for the Board:

Mr. Haberman is surprised that more people from the farms markets aren’t here to support this.

Mr. Dwyer states there has been discussion on the radio concerning this issue.

Mr. Canzano states that some people have to subdivide to support themselves or to pay their taxes and be able to remain in their home.

Currently our zoning regulations state that they must be 3 acres. Sometime this has to be looked at a case by case issue.

The board has to decide if we are going to support this petition on the ballot.

Sarah states that she feels that there are other ways to maintain open space beside this. This eliminates the potential for somewhat affordable homes in a nice area with nice views and space by employing other feature base density or lot averaging. These would give the homeowner flexibility to sell some of their land to survive.

Sarah also states that if you had two five acre lots that could be combined to make a 10 acre lot and then a cluster development could be in.

Katherine Dawson states she would inclined to endorse this if the planning board aggressively pursued an alternate for next year. When we find an alternate then we would have to have another warrant article to change it.

Mike Curley states if this is changed it would be hard back with an alternative in place.

Sarah ask if the Board is ready to take a vote.

All in favor of supporting the proposed petition warrant article to increase the minimum acreage from (3) three to (5) five in the Rural/Agricultural District.

All those in favor: Katherine Dawson
All not in favor: 5 members of the Board and 1 abstained.

The Planning Board will go on record as not indorsing the warrant petition article at this time.

8:38 pm

First public hearing for a proposed zoning change for consideration at 2008 Town Election.

Re-zone the properties referred to as Tax Map R22, Lots 16, 73A, 73B and 73C (the former Quinn-T Property) from industrial (IN) to Regional Commercial (RG).

Chris Rice from Konover Development has been here several time and is here to refresh us on the 125 acres of the former Quinn-T property. He explains his request to change the zoning from Industrial to Regional Commercial. This would permit a wider range of uses than the Industrial zone does at this time.

He explains the plan and states that no tenants are serious about signing leases option until they know the property is rezoned.

This would permit a wide range of uses such as medical offices, retail, personal business services with a recreational area. There is a 100 foot area along the river for a walking path or picnic area.

There is a second plan that is switches of the office around depending on how the access for the site works out. A lot depends DOT. This way down the road. The access may have to be by Home Depot, but we don’t own the property and there is wetland crossing to be work through.

Konover will be doing the testing on the asbestos field to make sure they are safe.

Konover hasn’t purchased the property at this point but it is under agreement.

Open to public discussion: No questions from the public.

Closed to public discussion:
Sarah asks the Board if they are ready to vote.

All in favor of supporting the warrant article petition to re-zone the properties referred to as Tax Map R22 Lots 16, 73A, 73B, and 73C (the former Quinn-T property) from Industrial (IN) to Regional Commercial (RG)

All in Favor state Aye. Passed unanimously to support this petition.

Public session closed.

Winnisquam Village – RJ Moreau revised prints for the board to review. These prints are changing the designs of the buildings. Some units will be smaller, some units are all on one floor and some units would be 3 bedrooms.

After the review and discussion the answer to this lies in the original approval letter #4. Which states that Compliance with the Tilton ZBA Variance approval conditions dated April 20, 2005 which states the townhouse units will remain 2 bedrooms units, no expansion permitted.

Board voted to approve the following meeting minutes:

November 13, 2007 Minutes: Motion made and seconded by Mike Curley. Vote taken and approved as revised.

November 27, 2007 Minutes: Motion made and seconded by Nick Canzano to accept minutes. Vote taken and approved.

December 11, 2007 Minutes: Motions made and seconded by Ray Smith to accept the minutes. Vote taken and approved.

Motion made by Mike Curley to adjourn. Seconded by Sarah Paratore.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm