

**Moultonborough Planning Board  
P.O. Box 139  
Moultonborough, NH 03254**

**Regular Meeting**

**October 23, 2013**

**Minutes**

Present: Members: Tom Howard, Peter Jensen, Josh Bartlett, Paul Punturieri, Bob Goffredo,  
Judy Ryerson; Russ Wakefield (Selectmen's Representative)  
Alternate: Keith Nelson  
Excused: Alternate: Natt King  
Staff Present: Town Planner, Bruce W. Woodruff; Administrative Assistant, Bonnie Whitney

**I. Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Howard opened the regular meeting to at 7:00 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**Motion:** Mr. Jensen moved to approve the Planning Board On-site Minutes of October 9, 2013, as written, seconded by Mr. Punturieri, carried unanimously with Mr. Howard abstaining.

**Motion:** Mr. Wakefield moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of October 9, 2013, as amended, seconded by Ms. Ryerson, carried unanimously with Mr. Howard abstaining.

**III. New Submissions**

Mr. Nelson did not participate in the discussion for the new submission or public hearing for Harilla Landing & the State of NH DOT.

1. Harilla Landing Yacht Club & State of New Hampshire / NHDOT, Long Island Road Right-of-way (288-8 & 282/41)(484/490 Long Island Road)  
Boundary Line Adjustment

This was a request for a boundary line adjustment. Mr. Howard noted the request for waivers dated 1 October 2013 from T.F. Bernier, Inc.

**Motion:** Mr. Punturieri moved to accept the application of Harilla Landing Yacht Club & State of New Hampshire / NHDOT, Long Island Road Right-of-way (288-8 & 282/41) acknowledge the receipt of the waivers for the purposes of acceptance only, and to schedule a hearing for this evening, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, carried unanimously.

**IV. Boundary Line Adjustments**

1. Harilla Landing Yacht Club & State of New Hampshire / NHDOT, Long Island Road Right-of-way (288-8 & 282/41)(484/490 Long Island Road)  
Boundary Line Adjustment

Mr. Howard stated that this was an application for a boundary line adjustment (BLA).

Tim Bernier, of T.F. Bernier, Inc. representing the applicants presented the application for the BLA, stating he has been working with the applicants to resolve some boundary issues that arisen. About ten years ago, during a survey, it was discovered that the States right-of-way (ROW), a portion of the property was incorrectly bounded. The ROW lines passes through the club house of Harilla Landing Yacht Club. They have been working on a resolution which was presented tonight. The proposal is to take a 5,200 sq. ft. of state own land and annexed to Harilla Landing Yacht Club, which will fix the club house issue. In exchange for that a 20,100 sq. ft. piece of land, currently Tax Map 282, Lot 41, owned by the Yacht Club will be transferred to the State Of New Hampshire and will become part of the ROW, the landing area and the boat launch. The State will accept an easement over the 20,100 sq. ft. lot to allow the two docks that serve the Yacht Club to remain and provide an area for the docks to be stored in the winter. This will result in the elimination of Tax Map 282, Lot 41. Mr. Bernier stated they are requesting four waivers, 1. Locations of ponds or standing water, wetlands, rock ledges. 2. Soils & Slopes and contours. 3. All lines and bearings, Section 4.3 (A)(11), which has to do with the remainder of Lot 8. 4. Off-site geographic features within 200' pertaining to the application. Mr. Bernier answered any questions from the board.

Mr. Howard asked for any questions from the Board.

Mr. Jensen noted that the Yacht Club will be keeping control of the docks and will be used for their commercial purposes. Mr. Bernier said they will continue to use them as they have in the past. Mr. Jensen stated the docks will now be connected to a public shoreline, but the public will not be able to use the docks. Mr. Bernier stated that they will be privately owned.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board or the public.

**Motion:** Mr. Punturieri moved to approve the Harilla Landing Yacht Club & State of New Hampshire / NHDOT, Long Island Road Right-of-way (288-8 & 282/41)(484/490 Long Island Road) Boundary Line Adjustment located entirely in the Residential/Agricultural zone with the following waivers; 1. Locations of ponds or standing water, wetlands, rock ledges; 2. Soils & slopes and contours; 3. All lines and bearings to minutes and seconds; 4. Off-site geographic facts within 200 ft.; and 5. Unity density calculations/lot sizing; and with the following conditions: 1. Add owners' signature blocks to the plat and the owners shall sign the plat prior to recording. 2. Property bounds shall be set prior to the Chair signing the plat. 3. Submit executed deeds for recording with all recording costs at the time of recording the plat. 4. That the final plat be submitted to the Development Services Office in electronic format to include both a pdf and an approved cadd file format, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

Mr. Nelson returned to the board at this time as an alternate member.

## V. Hearings

1. Continuation of Public Hearing Jonathan T. White Realty (143-5)(278 Whittier Highway)  
Site Plan Review for a Family Dollar Retail Store

Mr. Howard stated that this was a continuation of the Public Hearing for a site plan review for a Family Dollar Retail Store. The hearing was continued on October 9<sup>th</sup> to allow time for the Planner to review plans that were submitted on October 8<sup>th</sup>.

Carl Johnson, agent for the applicant was present this evening representing Mr. White. Mr. Punturieri asked if the plan the Board had was the same that Mr. Johnson had on the cork board. Mr. Johnson stated pretty much and said he would explain the subtle differences. He stated that there have been a couple of hearings on this project and had discussions regarding several features of the site. They had requested a continuation to deal with some of the issues that came up at the site visit and the public hearing. As a result of these issues and comments, Erin Darrow, Engineer, provided some changes to the plan in response to some of the comments the board members had regarding the drainage. Those changes were a result of responding to the board's request to make the entrance and exit to the property such that you had a one way entrance and two separate lanes for exiting, one for turning the right and one for turning to the left. The site has been lowered in order to reduce the slope of the driveway going down to the highway. Additionally Ms. Darrow responded by changing some of the drainage and including another rain garden. In doing this, she generated a bunch of reports which were forwarded to the Planner for review. Mr. Johnson delivered revised plans to Mr. Woodruff and they were waiting for some response from Mr. Woodruff. For whatever reason, Mr. Woodruff never got the drainage reports from Ms. Darrow. When they did get a response, it was that he was looking for the drainage reports. Mr. Woodruff just got this information recently and has not had time to review the changes made. Upon review he was waiting to see whether or not that will rise to the level of a peer review as Mr. Woodruff had originally suggested.

Mr. Johnson briefly noted other changes to the plan which included the addition of two stop signs. They had a discussion on the two trees that they are hoping to save, noting that in the event that they can't, a note has been added to the plan that each tree would be replaced by two new red maple trees in their place. Next change noted was to the lighting. Mr. Johnson had provided the Planner with handouts of a particular light fixture which had a fully adjustable bracket, such that could be pointed down to absolutely minimize the amount of light that shines out. He felt that this was more restrictive than a cutoff fixture that it would be an ideal situation. He went onto say if you hired a lighting expert they would say you probably needed four additional parking lot lights on towers to adequately light the site. They are not proposing that. The fixture that was proposed does not meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Those requirements are very restrictive. The fixture that was proposed would require a variance. They have found a light that does meet the description of the Zoning Ordinance and he has amended the note on the plan stating that they will meet the requirements of the ordinance.

They have added notes to the plan, which are standard notes that appear normally on site plans. The hours of operation are noted as 8AM-9PM, seven days a week. When the business is closed, the lighting will go out, with the exception of some security lights that are in the building. The sign light will go off as well. There will be no lighting after 9 PM.

They will provide an as-built once the project is completed. All the building material shall comply with stated codes. They will mark, with a four foot high construction fence, the limit of the fifty foot buffer. A letter of credit will be posted to cover the cost of vegetating all of the disturbed areas on the site. In review of regulations, the propane tank has been relocated to its original location that is compliant.

Mr. Johnson commented one of the primary things that came up at a prior meeting was the discussion if a cistern and/or sprinkling of the building. In reviewing the e-mails from the Fire Chief and

consulting a private fire consultant, it was the position of Mr. White that neither the cistern nor the sprinkling of the building are required and so he not offering to either of them as they are not required.

Mr. Johnson noted that the state (District 3) has forwarded the highway revision plans to Concord for review. They have an engineer reviewing the drainage and the highway elements of the plan.

Mr. Howard asked that the Planner give the board a summary of the progress from his perspective and how it affects what they have been working on. Mr. Woodruff referred to his staff memo of October 21<sup>st</sup>, noting that there still are some missing pieces, the biggest of which is the storm water management plan, the drainage analysis and the operations and maintenance plan for the system. He commented that he has questions about how the grading on the site will work and how the drainage will work given what is shown for the grading, hence he had a strong recommendation to the board that the board authorize and require a peer review by the Towns contracted engineer, of the plan set, and when they do get it, the storm water management plan, drainage analysis and operations and maintenance plan for the system.

Mr. Johnson confirmed that that would require an estimate from the engineer and a deposit by the applicant. It was stated that was correct. Mr. Woodruff's recommendation, as stated in his memo, was that the applicant place up to \$4,000 in an escrow account. After sending the memo, he received an email from the Towns engineer and his recommendation was four to five thousand dollars. He has not seen the plans or any of the reports that he would need to review. Mr. Bartlett asked if the recommendation would require the applicant to use the Towns engineer. Mr. Woodruff stated that using the Town engineer is much more simple and cost effective for all involved as the Town engineer is on contract to the Town and one of his tasks in the contract is acting as the board's engineer with regard to required peer reviews on development plans. Mr. Johnson stated that it was his understanding that Towns consulting engineer reviews the current engineering plan and makes recommended changes where he feels necessary, he doesn't produce a new plan. Mr. Woodruff stated it was a give and take between the two engineers.

Mr. Punturieri had a question regarding the light to the rear of the parking lot and asked how that would be controlled. Mr. Johnson stated that it was the same as the other lights, they go on at the same time and go off at the end of business. Ms. Ryerson stated that she recalled a comment that the proposed lighting could shed light that was sufficient to cover most of the parking lot. Mr. Johnson commented that was right and stated that he had done a very simplistic analysis that showed the limit of the lighting. It will not cover the entire site with direct light, but would be indirect lighting in the parking lot. This will minimize the amount of light that goes off the site.

Mr. Goffredo asked if the change to not install a cistern or sprinkler system was that it was costly. Mr. Johnson stated the cistern was about \$50,000, not installed, and that it is cost prohibited for a project of this nature. It is not required and that investment is not going to be made for no reason. Mr. White may choose to sprinkle the building for his own benefit, i.e. lower insurance rates. If it is not required at this particular point, he is not offering to put it on the plan.

Mr. Jensen noted his concerns that the board has still not yet seen a storm water management plan, there are still issues with the drainage and does not think the board should go any further with this this evening, until they get that information. Mr. Howard stated that he would like to finish with any immediate questions with the board and open it to the public for comments and questions. Then revisit the specific issues of storm water, the fire issue and any others so that arise, so that they can give further direction to the applicant, so they accomplish something each time they are here. Mr. Johnson thought that that was a great idea and commented if the board was moving towards the peer review that the discussion should be limited until they get results of the Towns engineers input.

Mr. Howard commented that he had received an email relative to this project and noted his response. The email spoke to the need of such an establishment at this time. They had the same concerns that they have already heard in the prior public hearing and the emails that were forwarded by Mr. Woodruff. They made statements about what the assists' of our community are. Mr. Howard noted his response basically was "Thank you for your input with regard to the Family Dollar proposal. Your concerns are all being discussed by the Planning Board in its hearings. We too are concerned with storm water runoff, lighting and traffic issues. Each has controls that we can implement but the flip side of the coin is that the applicant has the ability to satisfy those concerns. The bottom line is that our Zoning Ordinance allows this type of commercial use in that location. So we need to do our best to accommodate the use, while protecting the community from negative consequences to the best of our ability within the parameters of our existing ordinance." Mr. Howard opened the hearing to the public for questions and comment.

Jane Fairchild, property owner of land on Lake Kanasatka and current president of the Lake Kanasatka Watershed Association (LKWA). Ms. Fairchild had presented a written testimony for this evening and would like it noted for the record and provided a copy to become part of the record. She stated that LKWA was there to try and protect the quality of the lake and its tributaries against pollution. She noted that this was a valuable asset for the town and is used by many people and enjoyed by the residents of the town. They are asking for the cooperation and assistance of the board to help them protect this resource. The majority of their comments were related to water quality. The Board of LKWA has discussed this development with the UNH Center for Freshwater Biology to guard against degradation of the lake. The Board of LKWA administered a survey to their members in which they received Fifty-three responses. These responses indicated that 93% of their members strongly opposed to the Family Dollar Store at this location. The primary concerns were: 1. Drainage from the brook into the lake carrying salt, hydrocarbons and pollutants. 2. Storm water runoff from building and parking lot. 3. Lighting reflecting into the lake at night. 4. Lighting from turning traffic entering and exiting the parking lot at night. 5. Underground leaching from septic system. 6. General appearance from the lake. The LKWA requested that the Planning Board not approved this location and engage on a more thorough study of the impact of the development on Lake Kanasatka. If it was to be approved they requested six (6) actions to be taken by the Planning Board and the town. These included a peer review, the applicability and impact of RSA 485-A, Requirement of a complete lighting analysis, a condition that the applicant to use environmentally safe snow/ice treatment product, that the applicant address Section D. Building Design and Layout of the Site Plan Regulations and that the Planning Board negotiate a legally binding agreement with the applicant to place 50% of the lot into a Conservation Trust for the land directly around the brook, wetland and other sensitive drainage areas.

Bud Heinrich commented that the Fire Chief had cited two codes requiring a cistern and questioned if the Fire Chief would have the opportunity to review these with the applicant. Mr. Woodruff stated that he has reviewed the plans. Mr. Heinrich asked what the results of that were. Mr. Woodruff commented that the Fire Chief has not given him anything in writing and if the told the board what he said it would be second hand. He suggested that the board request that the Fire Chief appear before the board. Mr. Heinrich asked if the applicant has been asked where he intends to get his water from for firefighting. Mr. Howard stated that would be an appropriate question for the Fire Chief. Mr. Woodruff noted that the Fire Chief had indicated to him that the water would come from the dry hydrant and for every 1,000 feet of hose that is placed down from the hydrant, he would have to place a pumper. Mr. Bartlett commented that it was his understanding that Aubuchon's has a cistern and asked if that would be available. Mr. Woodruff stated yes and sometimes the issue is the elevations that go up and down. He again asked the board that they request that the Fire Chief appear before them to answer questions.

Cristina Ashjian noted for the record that the Heritage Commission had submitted a comment sheet for this proposal.

Mr. Johnson addressed a few of the comments. The comments regarding the brook and the protection of Lake Kanasatka, the minutes of the meeting, the towns engineer should have a one of his primary tasks is to make sure that the drainage, storm water management adequately protects that. He further spoke to the preservation of the brook. Mr. Johnson stated that they have made every effort to minimize lighting on the site. Mr. Johnson commented that he represents developers as part of his livelihood, and went on record to state that his family has done more than its share of being concerned with land preservation and conservation, and every time he is involved in a project he is sensitive to the developers concerns and offer to a great extent his own personal recommendations as how to minimize any potential effects to the environment. Mr. Johnson stated that unless the board had any more questions he was done with his presentation. He will wait and get the direction and terms of the amount of the deposit.

Mr. Howard asked if he was correct in recalling that that there was in fact a net increase in off-site flow. Mr. Woodruff stated yes. Also were the travel lanes and the parking lot lanes wider than what they require. Mr. Woodruff stated they are wider than standards. We do not have a requirement in place in the site plan regulations. Mr. Howard commented that in order to help negate any increase in offsite flow, there might be an opportunity by reducing the travel lanes in the parking lot to reduce the amount of impervious surface on the plan. Mr. Johnson commented that they have already reduced it from what was originally proposed. He noted that there is a loading area in the back and there will be a larger vehicle that will access the back. Also they are open to having the cross connector to the abutting lot and it would not just be cars pulling in, but cars between the two sites. That is the primary reason for the increased widths.

Mr. Bartlett commented that the proposed parking spaces are shown as 10'x20' and that they have allowed 9'x18'. This would be a substantial reduction in square footage and would be a way to cut down on the amount of impervious surface. He further commented on the emails the board has received, noting that they are well thought out and articulate, but one of the concerns he has is that people don't seem to understand that the Planning Board is not an architectural review board and they don't get to choose what business goes into a commercial zone.

Mr. Punturieri commented that they do not have a storm water plan. He went back to when the board originally accepted the application as complete, and it still not is complete. Regardless of what the reasons are, he would like to think that board and public still has the opportunity to see how all of this is going to work together. He would like to think that the board maybe think of this as a lesson learned. Mr. Punturieri stated that he would like to see the storm water plan as part of an entire plan that included driveway, traffic, and lighting, what it is all going to be like working together. How are you going to address the concerns regarding Lake Kanasatka, fire protection, and so on. Not just a piece here and a piece there, because a month later you forget what you talked about.

Mr. Howard said that the applicant has suggested that they would allow an extension of the review period in recognition of the fact that they are probably headed that direction. Mr. Johnson stated that he'd like to make a point of clarification. There's a difference between a storm water management plan that's been produced to the boards satisfaction, which sometimes takes a few times, and not having submitted a storm water management plan. There's been a storm water management plan originally submitted, and there's been a storm water management plan revised to accommodate some of the changes in the grading I spoke of. The plans have been submitted, what was lacking. Mr. Woodruff excused himself at this time for interrupting. He noted that a partial storm water management plan that has many omissions and some unanswered things that are required in the zoning ordinance was initially submitted. But there has been no revised storm water plan submitted to the office as of this moment. Mr. Johnson stated that there has to be some sort of glitch, as he has the copies. Mr. Howard acknowledged that there has been a glitch and allowed Mr. Punturieri to continue as he was working a motion. Mr. Punturieri

commented that it was not a motion. He wanted to make certain that they don't approve conditions and say this is all we need from you next time. He thinks this is still a preliminary phase. Mr. Howard stated what he was looking for in a motion was that the board was going to request a peer review on the storm water issue. Mr. Wakefield added to Mr. Punturieri's comment stating that it is most important that all of these items, the storm water management plan, highway DOT input is received before they secure any of the towns engineer services for peer review. Members noted their concerns and frustrations with receiving things piece meal. Mr. Johnson agreed that the plan that the towns consulting engineer is reviewing should be the plan that he has seen. It is a revised grading plan that Mr. Woodruff does not have. It is the latest revision that incorporates the comments they took from the board and members of the public. That plan should be submitted, Mr. Woodruff should note to the Chairman that that plan has been submitted and that will be the plan that would be submitted to the towns consulting engineer for peer review.

**Motion:** Mr. Punturieri moved that the Planning Board require a peer review by the Towns contracting engineer, and that they are provided with the final proposed plan that include the operation and maintenance plan and that the amount of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) be placed in an escrow account. NO SECOND ON THIS MOTION.

Mr. Woodruff made a statement that in his perfect world he would love to have the motion that would require that every one of the suggestions that he has been making for over 2 ½ months be taken seriously by the applicant, his surveyor and his engineer to the extent that the board agrees with all of the papers they have been little, by little addressing the minor ones as we move along through the weeks, but not even looking at the major ones.

**Motion:** Mr. Punturieri moved that the Planning Board require a peer review by the Towns contracting engineer, and that they are provided with the final proposed plan that include the operation and maintenance plan and that the amount of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) be placed in an escrow account. Said plan to include complete responses to all review comments by town staff, seconded by Mr. Bartlett. NO VOTE ON THIS MOTION

Mr. Jensen commented that he wanted to make sure that the motion makes it clear to the applicant that the next time they come in here everything that has been talked about will be done. Everything that has been talked about since the beginning will be in a form that they are confident that they can present to us the way they should.

**Motion:** Mr. Punturieri moved that the Planning Board require a peer review by the Towns contracting engineer, and that they are provided with the final proposed plan that include the operation and maintenance plan and that the amount of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) be placed in an escrow account. Said plan to include complete responses to all review comments by town staff, and further to table the application for Jonathan T. White (143-5) and to continue the public hearing until January 22, 2014, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

It was noted for the record that the board has requested a written comment from the Fire Chief. Mr. Woodruff suggested an email from the Chair, through himself regarding this request to the Fire Chief.

A member of the public noted that at the last meeting there was a request to get a copy of the traffic incidents on that stretch of road, and asked if that was done. Mr. Woodruff stated they have not received a response from the Police Chief and that staff will follow up with both the Fire Chief and Police Chief. Mr. Woodruff stated that they were asking for an accident report in that area. The Chair stated yes.

The Board took a ten minute break at this time.

2. Continuation of Public Hearing - CG Roxane, LLC (408-1)(1455 Ossipee Park Road)  
Site Plan Amendment

Mr. Howard & Ms. Ryerson recused themselves from the Public Hearing for CG Roxane, LLC. (CGR) Mr. Jensen assumed role of Chair and seated Mr. Nelson in place of Mr. Howard.

Mr. Jensen briefly recapped what was discussed at the last meeting and questions from the site walk. Mr. Jensen asked Nick Sceggell, Engineer for the applicant, to identify the changes.

Mr. Sceggell, from Fluet Engineering Service identified the changes, noting after the site walk and hearing they took form it that water quality was a concern with the additional truck parking. They completed calculations on the increase of run off. As the result of the site being already being largely impervious, this additional impervious surface doesn't significantly increase the volume of run off. In order to address the water quality concerns they have added oil and debris snouts to the catch basins. The catch basins that are in place now have three foot sumps. The snout allows the floatable material that is collected within the catch basin to stay at the top of the water level, where the non-floatable clean water would pass under the snout and into the discharge pipe for the catch basin. In addition to the snouts they've added a bio skirt which is a proprietary manufactured fabric that wraps around the snout, which if there were any hydrocarbons that were to pass underneath it, it would be absorbed onto the fabric. That material would need to be regularly monitored and maintained and replaced as needed. They added to the plan three "No Idling" signs. Mr. Sceggell provided the board with a handout of the signs they have ordered. The plant manager has made an effort to try and regulate that as much as possible, acknowledging the truck drivers are not CGR employees and there is a limit to what he can enforce with them. Mr. Sceggell did provide a drainage report to the Planner identifying the slight increases in run off. They received comments from the Planner and they are more than willing to incorporate notes and wording on the final plan. One comment was about the stone swale at the bottom. Mr. Sceggell would like to have a surveyor take some shots so that he can get accurate grades on the ditch in order to provide that report. This was referring to provide an engineer's report showing whether the existing level spreader is still working as intended and whether it can handle the small increase in flow. There was a discussion regarding the large evergreen tree and if it could be saved. They are going to try and make every effort to transplant those on site to enhance the screening of the parking. This is a site plan amendment any they are still subject to the original rules for the site plan. There is no increase truck traffic. The purpose of the plan is to improve safety on Ossipee Park Road and they think this is an improvement for the town.

Yannick Rousseau, Plant Manager for CGR, stated that this proposal does not increase business and will cost a lot of money to do it, but the main concern is the safety of people on Ossipee Park Road. Creating the modification on the parking will allow them better control of the trucks, better control of the idling, and is a good project for them. The goal of the screening is difficult because of the swale. Their goal is to try and cover as much as they can from the gate house to the corner.

Mr. Wakefield commented that on the onsite it was pretty clear that screening around the corner would help.

Mr. Goffredo questioned how far apart the silt fence was proposed. Mr. Sceggell stated 6-8 feet. He will add a notation to the plan. The fence will be put up prior to any site work and once the pavement is down and the slope is stabilized they will take down the silt fence.

Mr. Bartlett noted that it was clear from the onsite visit that the catch basins were not maintained and emphasized how important it is to maintain the drainage system. Mr. Sceggell stated there will be a



note added to the plan requiring the monitoring of the sumps on an annual basis and there must be an inspection as well.

Mr. Jensen referred to the Planners email of October 21, 2013 the board reviewed each of the 8 items contained in the email discussing several amongst themselves.

Mr. Punturieri commented that it appears that the applicant has done everything they have asked for and then some. He then asked about the spruce trees, suggesting if one or both of them couldn't be saved that they contact the town before December as one could be a nice Christmas tree in front of the library.

Mr. Jensen opened the hearing at this time for public comment.

Michael Desplaines, Executive Director for the Castle Preservation Society commented that they support anything that will improve the safety on Ossipee Park Road for everyone that uses it. Their concerns regarding screening are being addressed in a positive way with the additional planting material being proposed. They have spoken with Mr. Rousseau about light pollution and they will try to minimize that impact, noting they have been very positive and proactive.

Cristina Ashjian stated she was pleased with what they were hearing this evening and all of the improvements are positive. She noted her concern that while on the site walk realizing how many people did not understand how many times the parking area had been altered since 1991. She would like it noted for the record, understanding all the approvals go back to the previous site plans, and it is extremely complicated when the parking lot and the catch basins are noted as being relocate frequently. She asked if the existing and functional catch basins and other systems could be put on this plan as so many of the previous ones are either buried or non-functional. Ms. Ashjian gave her version of the history of the development and amendments of the site dating back to 1991. Mr. Sceggell stated that the actual locations of the catch basins are on the plan. Each addition did not affect this portion of the lot.

Mr. Jensen closed the public hearing at this time.

**Motion:** Mr. Jensen moved to approve the site plan for CG Roxane (408-1), with revision date of 10/17/13, with the two requested waivers, and the following conditions: 1. Site Plan Notes #8 should indicate the lot coverage percentage with the proposed change as well as the maximum allowed; 2. Storm water management notes # 1 & 2 should change the word, "will" with the word "shall"; 3. Storm water management note # 2 should be revised to read "monitoring/inspection every six months" in order to be in line with submitted Drainage Report; 4. Storm water management notes: add a note #3 that reads, " all required monitoring/inspection results shall be submitted in writing to the Development Services Office no later than January 31<sup>st</sup> annually; 5. Consider adding/relocating landscaping plantings directly behind the proposed retaining wall (at the top); 6. That the site plan shows proper no idling and no parking signage where appropriate; 7. That prior to plan signing, the stormwater maintenance inspection schedule and inspection report forms will be submitted to the Town Planner for his review; 8. That prior to plan signing, the applicant provide an engineer's report showing whether the existing level spreader is still working as intended and whether it can handle the very small additional volume of run off; 9. The amended septic approval be submitted and the number added to the plan prior to plan signing; 10. That any state or EPA required permits be submitted to ODS prior to plan signing; 11. That prior to plan signing, the

applicant submit a letter of agreement that ensures the turnout area at the stop sign on Ossipee Park Road be used by two trucks maximum and that no parking or standing in the travelled way on Ossipee Park Road occur after this improvement; 12. That prior to plan signing, the applicant prepare a plan to increase the turnout area going up the hill for safety reasons prior completion of the improvement and construct said improvement within one year of this approval; 13. That the owner sign the plan; 14. That prior to plan signing, the final plan is submitted to ODS in electronic format to include both a pdf and an approved cadd file format, seconded by Mr. Punturieri

Mr. Sceggell, PE made a comment regarding condition #9, stating he was not certain that an amended septic approval was required for this project and if so, could he submit a letter from NH DES stating such if it is not required. Members were okay with that if they provide a letter from NH DES.

Vote on motion: Carried Unanimously.

Mr. Howard and Ms. Ryerson returned to the board at this time with full voting privileges.

**VI. Informal Discussions**

**VII. Unfinished Business**

1. Mr. Woodruff commented there were two on the agenda in which he will prepare material for and mail to the members for discussion at the work session next week, one being the Conditional Use Permit Process/Procedure and the second the process for changes of use for new tenants or new businesses in Multi-Use Buildings. Mr. Punturieri and Mr. Jensen will work with the Planner on an agenda for the work session relating to the Master Plan discussion.

**VIII. Other Business/Correspondence**

1. Mr. Howard noted that the Select Board was seeking a member from the Planning Board to serve on a committee to identify potential uses of the property at 970 Whittier Highway. After a brief discussion Mr. Wakefield nominated Mr. Goffredo and Mr. Bartlett nominated Mr. Punturieri. These were discussed amongst the board and after a consensus of the board the Planning Board appointed Mr. Goffredo as its representative on the committee to determine potential uses for 970 Whittier Highway.

2. Mr. Howard announced he would not seek re-election this March. Member Judy Ryerson made the same announcement that she would not seek re-election. Mr. Howard emphasized the need for volunteers to step forward to sit on the PB as alternates and to run for the open seats.

**IX. Committee Reports**

**X. Adjournment:** Mr. Punturieri made the motion to adjourn at 9:24 PM, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Bonnie L. Whitney  
Administrative Assistant