

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**Sandown Planning Board
Minutes
July 19, 2016**

Date: July 19, 2016

Place: Sandown Town Hall

Members Present: Doug Martin – *Vice Chairman*, Ed Mencis - *Secretary*, Mark Traeger,
Steven Meisner, John White, Terry Treanor - *Ex Officio*, Erik Dykeman – *Alternate*, Lisa
Butler – *Alternate*,

Members Absent: Ernie Brown – *Chairman*, Matthew Russell, *Alternate*

Also Present: Steve Keach – *Town Engineer*, Andrea Cairns – *Administrative Assistant*

Mr. Martin opened the meeting at approximately 7:03 p.m.

Mr. Martin appointed Ms. Butler in place of Mr. Brown.

Review of the 6/21/16 Minutes

Change the date from 6/20/16 to 6/21/16

MOTION: Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the 6/21/16 minutes as amended.

Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Traeger and Ms. Butler
abstained. The motion passed.

**Public hearing for review of an application submitted by James and Patrick Devine
for a lot line adjustment. The application proposes to adjust the lot lines between
Map 21 Lot 4 and Map 21 Lot 4-1. The properties are located at 574 and 564 Main
Street.**

Terry Trudel, SEC Associates and James Devine presented the application.

Mr. Trudel reviewed the application. There is an existing home and commercial building
and an existing garage with an apartment on the property. Patrick Devine lives at the site
and operates the existing business, HOP Services, which does power washer sales and
service. Lot 4 will go from 8 acres to 23 acres, and the abutting lot 4-1 will go from 18
acres to 2.9 acres. It presently has frontage off Main Street but there is a wetland between
the frontage and the buildable area. They are proposing to access the property through a
paper ROW off of Holmeswood Drive that was put in place when the original subdivision
was created. There is a small wetland at the entrance of that drive. They will need to get a
dredge and fill. They will need to get permission from the Board of Selectmen to use that
to access to their property. The reason for the curved area and potential driveway
easement on the plans is if they develop the back of the property in the future.

They have a letter from Mr. Keach. The lot is preexisting non-conforming. They will
need to get state approval.

45 Mr. Keach joined the meeting. He noted it is a straightforward lot line adjustment
46 application. There are two preexisting non-conforming lots that were created prior to the
47 existence of zoning.

48
49 Mr. Keach reviewed his letter dated 7/18/16.

50
51 Under zoning matters, comment 1, he is speaking to a time when they will come in to get
52 a building permit to put a home on the 2.9 acre lot. The intent will be to derive access
53 through a private driveway through a dedicated paper street that was part of the
54 Holmeswood subdivision. That will come at another day. For the lot line adjustment,
55 there is a clean and simple application before you.

56
57 Mr. Meisner clarified whether the public would be notified in the future if he was to
58 come back to the board to build on lot 4. Mr. Keach noted they would only be notified if
59 they were to subdivide the property further. There are two existing lots, so they would
60 only need to get a building permit.

61
62 Mr. Martin opened the meeting to public.

63
64 *Susan Driver, 576 Main Street*

65 Her concern is that they are talking about future subdivision. They have a non-
66 conforming 50 ft. ROW and had concerns about them going through the wetland. The
67 board clarified where the driveway would go, noting it was not going through the wetland
68 off of Main Street.

69
70 Mr. James Devine noted they are in the process of putting the property in a trust so it
71 won't be developed. They are leaving off 2.8 acres so one of their children can build a
72 home on it.

73
74 *Bob Winslow, 12 Holmeswood Drive*

75 Mr. Winslow lives next to the ROW. He raised concerns about future development. They
76 stated the way the driveway was curved was to allow the potential for future
77 development. If the ROW is going to be used for a driveway, then he has no issues, but
78 does have issues if it is going to be a road.

79
80 Mr. Trudel noted any other future owners would have to get approval for future
81 development.

82
83 Mr. Winslow noted the ROW is dedicated to the public. What is public use considered?
84 Is it a road to a new park or conservation land? A private driveway doesn't seem to fit
85 that.

86
87 Mr. Keach explained that in 1977 when Holmeswood was approved and recorded, under
88 NH common law, that was prescribed to be dedicated to the public for future use. For any
89 road to be an accepted road, they need to have the dedication and ultimately the
90 acceptance by the town. It has not been accepted. For use other than the original intention

91 the Board of Selectmen would need to approve that. It does set up the opportunity for him
92 to build on it the future. They are before the board for a lot line adjustment. That does not
93 make him eligible for a building permit. He must get approval from the Board of
94 Selectmen to use that ROW before he can build there.

95

96 Mr. Winslow noted he has no problem with the lot line adjustment but has concerns with
97 the future.

98

99 Ms. Driver noted if the intent is to build one home, she is comfortable with the project.

100

101 Mr. Devine noted the future application will be for a driveway, not a road.

102

103 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept for jurisdiction, the application
104 submitted by James and Patrick Devine for a lot line adjustment. The application
105 proposes to adjust the lot lines between Map 21 Lot 4 and Map 21 Lot 4-1. The properties
106 are located at 574 and 564 Main Street. Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. All members
107 voted in favor. The motion passed.

108

109 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to conditionally approve the application
110 submitted by James and Patrick Devine for a lot line adjustment. The application
111 proposes to adjust the lot lines between Map 21 Lot 4 and Map 21 Lot 4-1. The properties
112 are located at 574 and 564 Main Street. Mr. Treanor seconded the motion.

113

114 *The following conditions apply:*

115

- Receipt of NHDES subdivision approval for lot 4
- Receipt of correspondence from town engineer confirming all items contained in
116 correspondence dated 7/18/16 have been satisfactorily addressed
- Receipt of acknowledgement from licenses land surveyor that monuments shown
117 on plat have been installed
- Maintain positive PREA account balance

118

119

120

121

122

122 All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

He noted they were asking for three waiver requests

1. Wavier from Section 9.4 and 9.11 street right of way monumentation standards

- 137 2. Waiver from Section 9.23 requiring on-site recreation facilities. In lieu of, a
138 donation of \$1,000 per lot will be made to the Town of Sandown's Recreational
139 Revolving Fund.
140 3. Waiver from sections 9.2.3 typical cross section for construction of streets and
141 9.2.4 design requirements for cul-de-sac and single access streets. They are
142 proposing a 20'w gravel road.
143

144 Mr. Trudel noted that the previous plans had a retaining wall at the entrance which was
145 on lot 32-A. They moved that away and will slide the roadway and retaining wall off that
146 property. They currently cross over lot 32-A about 3-4 feet. They will move that so they
147 no longer cross that lot. They have an easement in place with a ROW on their deed. Even
148 though they are confident it exists, they would prefer to do it this way. Mr. Keach noted
149 the plan wasn't quite clear and didn't want to put the board in the position of approving
150 the plan that had an apparent non-documented encroachment so he is happy to see that
151 changed. Mr. Trudel believes the Buckleys actually have an easement through
152 prescription. It's been there over 20 years and it is documented, but they don't want to
153 fight it.
154

155 Mr. Keach noted they received state subdivision approval which was the only state permit
156 they needed.
157

158 Mr. Keach made the board aware of RSA 677:41 – erection of buildings on streets that
159 authorize building permits on properties accessed by a private driveway vs. a public road;
160 he had them add note 16 on the plans that acknowledges the applicant needs to provide
161 the town with a release of liability and have it recorded at the registry of deeds.
162

163 In addition, Mr. Keach noted because it is a private road that will be served by all three
164 homes, there needs to be documentation recorded at the registry that describes the
165 maintenance agreement. A draft was provided and it appears adequate. He would
166 recommend that town counsel review and comment on the sufficiency of it.
167

168 Mr. Keach added that roadways are future public ways which require a performance
169 guarantee be given to the town, as a financial surety of full and final completion of the
170 road, prior to the recording of the plan. In this case it is a family subdivision. As an
171 alternative to providing a financial surety, Mr. Keach suggested they simply build the
172 road prior to recording the plat. The road needs to be built before they can build the lots.
173 He feels that would be fair and equitable.
174

175 Mr. Traeger questioned if Mr. Keach would inspect it as he would other roads? Mr.
176 Keach noted he would just to make sure whoever he hires does a good job and make sure
177 it is sufficient to meet NFPA1 fire code requirements. In order for a building permit to be
178 issued, a road must be built to those standards.
179

180 There were no zoning matters. There was a variance issued in the past.
181

182 Waiver request capturing 9.2.3 and 9.2.4 of the subdivision regulations - Mr. Keach noted
183 SEC has provided on sheet 7, a typical cross section of the road construction. They are
184 proposing a 20' gravel road. It is a little narrower than an R1 road. He wouldn't support
185 this waiver if it were a public road. The second part deals with the hammerhead vs. the
186 full cul-de-sac. His comment was that he is comfortable with it if the fire chief approved
187 it, which he did. He can support granting of the waiver.

188

189 Waive request capturing 9.23 of the subdivision regulations pertains to recreation - they
190 spoke to that and will make \$1,000 donation per lot in lieu of on-site recreation.

191

192 Final waiver request for 9.4 and 9.11 of the subdivision regulations pertains to
193 monumentation of the road - they are suggesting they would install them at every new
194 point except on Mr. Buckley's side of the platted road. Mr. Keach can't support this
195 request, but he would support a partial waiver with replacing the granite posts with iron
196 pins. He feels bad about that, but it will be a permanent road and he can't support not
197 having it monumented. Whoever takes ownership of that property will also acquire a 1/3
198 interest in the road. Mr. Buckley appreciates being able to do the iron pins instead of the
199 granite.

200

201 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept for jurisdiction, the application
202 submitted by James & Christine Buckley for a minor subdivision. The application
203 proposes to subdivide two single-family residential building lots from the subject parcel.
204 The lots will be accessed from a proposed 50' wide right-of-way. The property is located
205 at 33 Showell Pond Road and identified on Map 3 as Lot 38. Mr. Treanor seconded the
206 motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

207

208 Mr. Martin opened the meeting to the public.

209

210 *Daniel Labossiere, M3 L12.*

211 Mr. Labossiere was unaware of the project. It involves a long right of way through his
212 property. The Buckley's have a ROW for one home. Mr. Buckley has been a good
213 neighbor, but he has concerns about more homes going in.

214

215 Mr. Labossiere noted the road was very narrow in some spots and suggested the board
216 encourage Mr. Buckley to speak with some of the landowners to get more width in the
217 road. People can't pass each other. He would like Mr. Buckley to work with them to
218 make sure the road is reasonable.

219

220 Mr. Traeger noted that the fire chief noted some concern about the width of the road in
221 his approval letter. Mr. Buckley noted the fire chief would like to see those things happen
222 if there was an association. The chief knows it is not just his responsibility to correct that.

223

224 *Fred Riley, 4 Showell Pond Lane*

225 Mr. Riley noted the last 10 years the Buckley's have maintained the road and Mr.
226 Labossiere hasn't participated in the maintenance of that road. His father used to do a lot
227 of work on the road but he hasn't.

228

229 *Leo Beauchamp, M 3 L24 & 25*

230 He owns property on both sides of the road. He was present when Mr. Buckley met with
231 the Board of Selectmen for a building permit for one home. They spoke about one house
232 and one house only. It should have been in writing, but there are no minutes of the
233 meeting. The pond has cyanobacteria and two more homes aren't going to help that. He
234 isn't for or against the proposal, but the original agreement was for one home only.

235

236 Mr. Keach noted they did request a building permit for only one home. Each time a
237 separate building permit is requested, they have to approach the Board of Selectmen and
238 provide a hold harmless.

239

240 Mr. Labossiere noted it is a year-round road. They are willing to do what they can to give
241 width to the road.

242

243 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the waiver request for section 9.2.3 of
244 the Sandown subdivision regulations for a typical cross section of streets and 9.2.4 design
245 requirements of a cul-de-sac and single access of streets. Mr. Traeger seconded the
246 motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

247

248 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the waiver request for section 9.23 of
249 the Sandown subdivision regulations requiring on site recreational facilities. In lieu of on-
250 site recreation facilities a donation of \$1,000 per lot will be made to the Town of
251 Sandown's Recreational Revolving Fund. Mr. Traeger seconded the motion. All
252 members voted in favor. The motion passed.

253

254 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to accept the waiver request for section 9.4 and
255 9.11 of the Sandown subdivision regulations requiring street ROW monumentation
256 standards. Iron pins will be placed at all locations as required by sections 9.4 and 9.11 of
257 the subdivision regulations. Mr. Treanor seconded the motion. All members voted in
258 favor. The motion passed.

259

260 Mr. Martin questioned if the road maintenance agreement would be recorded and appear
261 on the deeds of the properties moving forward. Mr. Keach noted it would be a condition
262 of approval that it be recorded. Mr. Martin questioned if the attorneys could amend the
263 documents so they didn't need to come back to the board. The board agreed that would
264 be fine.

265

266 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to conditionally approve the application
267 submitted by James & Christine Buckley for a minor subdivision. The application
268 proposes to subdivide two single-family residential building lots from the subject parcel.
269 The lots will be accessed from a proposed 50' wide right-of-way. The property is located
270 at 33 Showell Pond Road and identified on Map 3 as Lot 38. Mr. Treanor seconded the
271 motion.

272

273 *The following conditions apply:*

- 274 • Receipt of acknowledgement from town council that the “shared private right of
275 way maintenance agreement” is in proper form and content; and subsequent
276 recording of the same of even date with the final plat
- 277 • Receipt of performance guarantee, in an amount and form acceptable to the town
278 to serve as a financial surety for full and final completion of proposed private
279 road; or full and final completion of the proposed road prior to recordation of the
280 final plat
- 281 • Receipt of correspondence from the town engineer that all matters identified in his
282 correspondence dated 7/19/16 have been satisfactorily addressed
- 283 • Note waivers granted on final plat
- 284 • Maintain positive PREA account balance

285

286 Mr. Meisner stepped back in.

287

288 **Public Hearing for review of an application submitted by Raymond and Sandra**
289 **Marchetti for a minor subdivision. The application proposes to subdivide the**
290 **subject parcel into three single-family residential building lots. The property is**
291 **identified on Map 6 as Lot 11-7 and located on Phillips Pond Drive.**

292

293 The applicant requested a continuance. The hearing will be rescheduled to August 16,
294 2016.

295

296 **Continued public hearing for review of an application submitted by Kasher**
297 **Corporation to create a 50 unit open space development for multi-family dwellings.**
298 **The property is located on Wells Village Road and identified on Map 13 as Lot 1.**

299

300 Tim Lavelle presented the application. Fran McCarthy from Kasher Corporation was also
301 present.

302

303 Mr. Lavelle noted at the last meeting, Mr. Keach requested that the wetland scientist that
304 reviewed the plans recheck them to make sure the wetlands mapping was up to date. He
305 reviewed the soils and stamped them.

306

307 They didn't have an updated dredge and fill permit at the last meeting, but they do have
308 that now. They also received updated water supply approvals from NHDES for the wells
309 and are waiting on state subdivision approval. They are waiting to make sure nothing else
310 is going to change before they apply for amended approval. All other state permits are in
311 place.

312

313 Mr. Keach reviewed his letter dated 7/19/16.

314

315 Mr. Keach noted the town is in possession of a performance surety and he would
316 recommend they revisit that to determine if it remains adequate.

317

318 Mr. Keach noted there is an approved site plan of record at the Rockingham Registry of
319 Deeds for a 52-unit age restricted development. There are also minutes that contain

320 approval to convert that site plan to a 25-unit single-family open space subdivision that
321 was conditionally approved. If this amendment is approved, he would recommend that
322 one condition be receipt of correspondence from Kasher Corporation withdrawing the
323 recorded plan and for voluntary revocation of the approved site plan amendment so there
324 is only one approved plan in place. There is a process for voluntary revocation of a plan
325 so the board should follow that procedure.

326

327 On 9/1/15 the board granted a conditional use permit (CUP) for modifications of wetland
328 impacts for the road entry. There was a condition on that CUP that has now been satisfied
329 which was receipt of NHDES wetland permits.

330

331 If this project was to contemplate making these condominium units, there would have to
332 be a homeowners association created. Kasher Corporation will be the exclusive owner
333 and provided a letter dated 7/12/16 stating they will remain single-ownership.

334

335 Section 9.2.4 says that a single access road shall not have dwellings that serve more than
336 250 vehicle trips per day or are more than 1,000 ft. in length. The proposed road is
337 slightly longer than 1,000 ft. If the board accepts Chief Tapley's recommendation that
338 secondary access is not needed, then a waiver will need to be granted.

339

340 Mr. Keach provided a second memo that addressed the board's concerns about increased
341 traffic on Wells Village Road. Using the ITE trip generation manual, they have a variety
342 of data that is used to estimate average trip generation rates. This data suggests the 50
343 dwelling units planned at this time will contribute the following site generated traffic
344 volumes on an average weekday:

- 345 • Average Daily Volume (ADT) = 50 units @ 5.81 trip ends/unit = 290 trip ends
346 with 50% (145) entering and 5 % (145) exiting the site during the course of an
347 average 24 hour weekday.
- 348 • AM Peak Hour Volume = 50 units @ 0.44 trips ends/unit = 22 trip ends with 19%
349 (4) entering and 81% (18) exiting the site.
- 350 • PM Peak Hour Volume = 50 units @ 0.52 trip ends/unit = 26 trip ends with 64%
351 (17) entering and 36% (9) exiting the site.

352

353 Similar data for the previously approved 52-unit age restricted complex suggests the
354 following site generated traffic volumes on an average weekday:

- 355 • Average Daily Volume (ADT) = 52 units @ 3.44 trip ends/unit = 179 trip ends
356 with 50% (90) entering and 50% (90) exiting the site.
- 357 • AM Peak Hour Volume = 52 units @ 0.39 trip ends/unit = 20 trip ends with 46%
358 (9) entering and 54% (11) exiting the site.
- 359 • PM Peak Hour Volume = 52 units @ 0.35 trip ends/unit = 18 trip ends with 55%
360 (10) entering and 45% (8) exiting the site.

361

362 Mr. Traeger questioned how many bedrooms each unit would have. Mr. McCarthy noted
363 there would be 25 two-bedroom units and 25 three-bedroom units.

364

365 Mr. Traeger questioned if they notified Chester with regional impact. Mr. Keach noted
366 that needed to be done prior to this hearing.

367

368 Mr. Keach noted going back to the traffic data, over the last 20+ years, the Chester end
369 has been paved, the bridge was repaired and there has been a fair amount of development
370 along the Chester/Sandown line. He is not concerned about the added volume to Wells
371 Village Road. That road operates as Level of Service A. He does not feel the 290 trips
372 will change that in any particular way. When they did the bridge reconstruction, there
373 was a major seasonal variation, likely due to school traffic, and they recorded 1,800-
374 2,000 trips/day. He feels that is fairly accurate. He doesn't know exactly where the count
375 was taken, but it was in Sandown. In his opinion, requiring an additional traffic study will
376 result in data that they won't use for anything other than to have the data. The road
377 system can accommodate the increased volume.

378

379 The board asked for clarification on what Level of Service A meant. Mr. Keach noted it
380 is a measure of delay when you are dealing with an intersection. Little or no time delay
381 when you are waiting for one car to clear the intersection before you can go. If you
382 looked at the intersections with the two successive roads you likely don't wait more than
383 10 seconds. On the Chester side, to take a left onto 121A you might wait 15 seconds.

384

385 Ms. Butler noted she has more concern with the Hampstead road end. That is a difficult
386 intersection. Mr. Keach noted the additional 290 trips are over a 24-hour period. The
387 distribution between a.m. and p.m. tells you when the system is operating at its busiest
388 and where the true impact would be. Peak would be a one hour period during the day,
389 likely 6:30-7:30 a.m. when people are leaving for work and children are going to school.

390

391 Mr. Traeger noted he did speak with Rockingham Planning Commission about this. Cliff
392 Sinnott did say there was less traffic with apartments because they aren't doing as much
393 shopping and the average number of occupants is far less than a single-family home. Mr.
394 Traeger added that apartments are the trend in the area. Exeter has 542 units under
395 review.

396

397 Mr. Traeger clarified that it was not low-income housing. Mr. McCarthy confirmed it was
398 not. Mr. Martin questioned what the rent would be? Mr. McCarthy noted for the two-
399 bedroom around \$1,200/month and the three-bedroom \$1,400/month.

400

401 Mr. Traeger noted the reason for regional impact notification is for mutual aid for fire and
402 safety. Mr. Lavelle noted one of the benefits to the project is that all units will have
403 sprinklers per NFPA13. Mr. Keach noted generally, regional impact notification is done
404 upon receipt of the application.

405

406 Mr. Martin noted the board received a letter stating they will remove the existing
407 easement on the Bishop's property and restore that property to pre-construction
408 conditions.

409

410 Mr. Meisner questioned if school busses would be allowed to come into the
411 neighborhood. Mr. McCarthy noted they would be allowed.

412
413 Mr. Traeger questioned line of site issues onto Wells Village Road. Mr. Keach noted the
414 consulting engineer did a site distance profile (sheet 16). There is a current site distance
415 deficiency; 330' is necessary. The plan contemplates the removal of vegetation along the
416 frontage and cutting some of the grade down to achieve the proper site distance. That will
417 be necessary before building and construction takes place, which Mr. Keach will inspect.
418 They are good improvements and they will allow them to meet the required site line
419 distance.

420
421 Mr. White questioned if apartments would put more burden on schools and questioned if
422 anything was done to offset that increased burden. Mr. Lavelle noted they would pay an
423 impact fee per unit. Mr. McCarthy added they would be generating approximately
424 \$150,000 in tax revenue which is an estimation based on his other units in town.

425
426 Mr. Traeger noted that since there is no business in town, we all share in that burden.
427 Single-family homes also cost the town.

428
429 Mr. Martin opened the meeting to the public.

430
431 *Todd Fournier, 4 Schoolhouse Lane*

432 Mr. Fournier wanted clarification on how many buildings, septic systems and wells there
433 would be. He reviewed the plans.

434
435 Mr. Traeger explained the Open Space Development (OSD) ordinance. Mr. Lavelle noted
436 the open space is 33 acres after you block off what is lawn and septic. Mr. Traeger added
437 the intent of OSD is to do a yield plan and determine how many homes could be built on
438 the property, reduce down the density so house lots are smaller, but in exchange the
439 residents get more open space for wildlife and aquifers.

440
441 Mr. Lavelle noted at the last meeting the board requested they put aside an area for
442 passive recreation. They identified a 100'x50' area that can be mowed and used by the
443 residents. It will probably be more than that, but it will remain open and will be loamed,
444 seeded and mowed.

445
446 Mr. Lavelle noted the requirement for landscaping is to have a tree every 100' along the
447 road. They are not proposing to do that. One reason is the corner by the intersection, will
448 need to be kept clear for site distances. They also kept the trees more towards the units to
449 dress up the units. Longer sections of the road without units would eventually come back
450 into their own. The amount of trees they are proposing is the same, but they are placed in
451 more aesthetically pleasing locations. Mr. McCarthy noted they would be assorted
452 maples. They want to keep things away from the edges of the driveways because of salt.

453
454 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to grant the waiver request for section of the
455 Sandown subdivision regulations related to roadway landscaping to allow the proposal as

456 shown on the plans. Mr. Traeger seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr.
457 Treanor opposed. The motion passed.

458

459 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to grant the waiver request for section 9.3 of the
460 Sandown subdivision regulations related to cul-de-sacs to allow the roadway to be over
461 1,000' in length. Mr. Traeger seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Treanor
462 opposed. The motion passed.

463

464 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to grant the waiver request for section 9.3.1 of the
465 Sandown subdivision regulations related to single-access streets with over 25 units. Mr.
466 Traeger seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Treanor opposed. The motion
467 passed.

468

469 Mr. Traeger questioned if there was anything they could require to address the safety
470 concerns with the Hampstead Road intersection. Mr. Keach noted he wouldn't want to
471 discuss options without Mr. Genualdo, the Public Works Director present. The
472 impediment that Ms. Butler speaks of is real, but defined by the homes that are there. He
473 added there is a rational nexus, but doesn't know if there is a solution there.

474

475 Mr. McCarthy noted one of the issues is the hedges along one of the properties. He
476 questioned if better lineage would help. Mr. Keach would need to look at it with Mr.
477 Genualdo. They could review the area and report back to the board with suggested
478 improvements. The solutions could be simple signage, clearing brush and painting lines.
479 Mr. McCarthy noted he would not have a problem doing striping and signage.

480

481 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to conditionally approve the application
482 submitted by Kasher Corporation to create a 50 unit open space development for multi-
483 family dwellings. The property is located on Wells Village Road and identified on Map
484 13 as Lot 1. Ms. Butler seconded the motion.

485

486 *The following conditions apply:*

487

- 488 • Receipt of NHDES subdivision approval for current project configurations
- 489 • Provide performance guarantee, in an amount and form acceptable to the town, to
490 serve as a financial guarantee for full and final completion of roads and
491 infrastructure
- 492 • Receipt of correspondence from applicant formally withdrawing alternate
493 subdivision plan conditionally approved by the Planning Board in 2015
- 494 • Receipt of request for voluntary revocation of Plan D-35202 recorded at RCRD
495 from applicant per RSA 676:4-a and recording of same at RCRD together with
496 final amended site plan
- 497 • Satisfy any remaining conditions of approval for CUP granted on 9/1/15
- 498 • Receipt of correspondence from town engineer confirming all comments and
499 recommendations offered in his correspondence of 7/19/16 have been satisfied
- 500 • Note waivers granted on the final plan
- Maintain positive PREA account balance until project completion

- 501 • Intersection of Wells Village Road and Hampstead Road to be evaluated by town
502 engineer and director of public works. If pavement markings or signage is
503 recommended to improve intersection operation or safety, applicant shall
504 reimburse town up to \$2,500.
505

506 Members voted in favor. Mr. Treanor opposed. The motion passed.
507

508 **Correspondence**

- 509 • July 16th public hearing in Derry for a cellular tower
510 • Supply Lines Newsletter
511 • Town & City Magazine
512

513 **Review of the 6/21/16 Non-Public Minutes**

514 Change the date from 6/20/16 to 6/21/16

515 **MOTION:** Mr. Traeger made a motion to accept the 6/21/16 non-public minutes as
516 amended. Mr. Mencis seconded the motion. Members voted in favor. Mr. Traeger and Ms.
517 Butler abstained. The motion passed.
518

519 **MOTION:** Mr. Mencis made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Traeger seconded the motion. All
520 members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed. MEETING ADJOURNED at
521 10:01 p.m.
522

523 Respectfully Submitted,



524 Andrea Cairns
525