

**APPROVED MINUTES
PEMBROKE PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION
July 11, 2006**

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Bourque, Chair; Roland Lemoine, Vice Chair; Selectman Larry Young (Selectman's representative), Paul Andrews, Alan Topliff, John Harrington, Alternate Planning Board member; Cindy Lewis, Alternate Planning Board member; Kevin Foss, Alternate Planning Board member; Bill Faith, Planning Board member.

EXCUSED:

UNEXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: Laura Scott, Planning Director; Catie Tirrell, Recording Secretary.

Chairman Bourque opened the work session at 7:00 p.m. John Harrington were designated to vote for the vacate Planning Board position.

Conceptual Consultations

1) Lot Line Adjustment Map 563 Lot 40-6 (Ashley Drive), Lot 22-1-1 (Third Range Road), and Lot 25 (Pembroke Street)

Laura Scott advised the board that this item had been removed from the agenda.

2) Major Subdivision Map 563 Lot 110 (Beacon Hill Road and Third Range Road) which proposes a 17-lot subdivision with the development of a new road.

Laura Scott advised the board that there was a memo dated July 6th, which she mailed out to the Board as well as the applicant, briefing what the applicant intended as well as her concerns and observations. Also a letter from Barbara Dumond and a copy of the plan to be discussed were included in the packet.

The Applicant stated they are proposing to subdivide a 45 acres actually 57 acre lot, 45 acres they will be keeping a partial just under 12 acres. Out of the 45 acres that they will obtain they will have two frontage lots which are basically there all ready they are it is just a matter of closing off the back side of lots that fall on Beacon Hill Road and to construct an access road to the rear of the partial to create a cluster subdivision for elderly residents, single family detached units, as shown on the concept plan. The density calculations on plan showing that they basically, based on the rules and regulation of the town will have 14 lots. The plan was prepared by Steven C. Luger a registered land surveyor. Peter Schauer did the wetlands. The Applicant stated there would be a lot of open space, and they would be providing a 25 foot access way to the open space.

Mr. Bourque questioned why are we running a new road parallel to Third Range Road to come into this development?

The Applicant replied he was told it was against town regulations to proposing improving a class VI road.

Ms. Scott stated that they had a discussion that it would have to be upgraded to a class V road in order to do what the applicant is proposing and at this time the town counsel is reviewing the policy that would say how you would upgrade the road between the Planning Board and the Selectman. Ms. Scott said she told the Applicant that the Town was in the process of developing the policy of how you would upgrade a class VI road and the mechanisms to do that. Ms. Scott stated that as it stands now the Applicant can not do a subdivision off a class VI road without upgrading it to class V standards and making it a Town maintained road. Ms. Scott clarified to Mr. Lemoine that the road he is proposing has to be a Town road, town maintained, class V standards.

Roland Lemoine asked that they take a look at Beacon Hill Road as he feels it is very disastrous, that the road is not engineered and that recent floods almost took it out. Mr. Lemoine then stated with normal traffic the road is pushing out and any more traffic would only make it worse. He also stated bringing the equipment down the road would ruin it.

The Applicant stated there would not be much equipment going down the road and that there is not much earthwork to be done.

Mr. Lemoine asked if the units were going to be condo type unit or self owned, the applicant replied individual self owned units.

Larry Young voiced concerns of a new road being put in parallel to Third Range Road. He stated the cost of building a road to town standards has got to be greater than improving the existing Range Road. The Applicant did not disagree with Mr. Young and responded that originally that was his concept but after speaking with the town it was not an option until the town develops a policy where a developer can take over an upgrade a class VI road. Ms. Scott said she is planning to have that on the Selectman and Planning Boards agenda and was hoping for tonight although town counsel did not get back to her.

Mr. Borque stated the road to the cul-de-sac is over 600 feet long and there is a regulation for signal entry. Applicant responded unless you propose automatic sprinklers. Ms. Scott said that is not in the rules that is something that has past and the Fire Department has signed off when developers have exceeded the 600 feet. The Applicant said the reason for the 600feet is for fire protection.

Mr. Lemoine asked if it was going to be all well and septic. The Applicant replied that they would prefer to have each individual well and that the septic would be in the front of the lots the lower end and the wells in the rear.

Mr. Lemoine asked if the applicant realized that there is arsenic in the water . The applicant said if the water wasn't drinkable they would have to turn to a filter system.

Mr. Lemoine again voiced his concern again on the road in, Beacon Hill Road; the road is just barley holding up with the traffic now. The Applicant stated he would be willing to help the town out with the road in some way. Mr. Lemoine told the applicant the road would have to be taken out and redone because there is no base there. The applicant said he would hope

the town would not expect him to do the entire road but he would maybe do some engineering or have it done by someone else.

Mr. Borque asked if the applicant received a copy of Ms. Scott list of outstanding items. The Applicant said no he had not. Ms. Scott told him she mailed it on July 6th. A copy was given to the applicant and he did not think any of the items were a serious concern.

Cindy Lewis said she think they have to address whether this is going to be a town road or a private road. Also, Mrs. Lewis had questions on the lot calculations asking Ms. Scott if she took out non-contiguous. Ms. Scot said she quickly looked at the numbers they had presented and they meet cluster requirements except he forgot to take out the 15 percent for the road. Ms. Scott stated she could not verify the plans and they are not as detailed as they would be if and when they are formally submitted.

Cindy Lewis asked it lot 1 was being subdivided and the center was not a lot. The applicant responded yes. Ms. Scott clarified that the applicant was proposing to divide the lot into 3 lots and further subdivide lot 1. Ms. Scott confirmed with the applicant that lot 4 was not actually a lot that he was doing a lot line adjustment and that it is not creating another lot because it will not meet regulations. The applicant confirmed.

Ms. Scott stated her biggest concern besides the road is the policy for how applicants upgrade the existing class VI roads.

Her other concern is the elderly affordable housing and that it is exempt from the growth management ordinance, there is no legal mechanism to ensure this is elderly affordable housing. Mrs. Lewis said this is not exempt unless it is a HUD 202 project. Ms. Scott agreed unless it meets HUD standards. The Applicant stated they were in the process of learning the requirements for HUD.

Ms. Scott voiced a concern for making sure there is a mechanism for making sure conservation land stays conservation land. The applicant said he was sure all that could be worked out.

The Applicant voiced concern on impact fees. Mr. Lewis replied that there are no impact fees but there may be off site improvements.

Ms. Scott informed the applicant that if and when the plans are formally submitted that they will be sent out to police, fire, highway, town engineer, roads committee, and conservation for there input.

Mr. Bourque asked if anything was going to be proposed in the center of the cluster. The applicant said no it is open space for the enjoyments of the owners and they would like to keep it private so someone on one side can't see the other and that it will be owned and maintained by the association. Mr. Bourque told the applicant he had to have association paperwork and present it to the board. The applicant said he would be preceding full speed

ahead with the final application and they are intending to be starting in the tail end of the year. The applicant left the consultation.

Mark Dumas of 318 Beacon Hill Road stood up and spoke of a petition he and his neighbors signed 2 years ago regarding a request for construction by CATCH. They visited the impact and issues of the road. Mr. Dumas asked if anyone had been on Beacon Hill Road lately especially after the rain. He stated that pavement put down not long ago is concaved in areas. Mr. Dumas spoke for 100 percent of the residents saying they are very concerned on the impact of the construction and road with more traffic.

Steve Landry of 352 Beacon Hill Road, voiced concerns of the road not being able to handle the traffic it has now. Also Mr. Landry was concerned with the cul-de-sac and how close the lots were, saying we have it so it is spread out now let's keep it that way.

Mr. Dumas asked the board if and when it is proposed if they could put a stipulation to have the developer do an engineering review for traffic concerns. Mrs. Lewis stated she didn't think a traffic report would turn up anything. Ms. Scott said the engineer review would, especially if the road has issues.

Ms. Lewis agreed and added that the board may have leadthe applicant down a line to spend a lot of money if we are going to turn around and say the road can't handle the traffic. The Board discussed that the applicant may have left with the wrong idea regarding the road being redone.

Motion: Mr. Topliff moved to ask the town planner to send a letter to the applicant advising him that subsequent to the conceptual consultation that the Planning board had further discussion and to reinforce our concerns about the condition and potential cost to improve Beacon Hill road and would suggest that he may want to investigate that further before putting a complete set of plans together. Also give the Applicant Burton Curleys name at roads committee. Mr. Andrews Seconded.

VOTE: Roland- Y Paul- Y Bill- Y Bob- Y
John- Y Larry- Y Alan- Y

MOTION APPROVED ON A 7-0 VOTE

Mrs. Lewis asked questions to Ms. Scott regarding the Conceptual Consultation #1 that was removed from the agenda. A brief discussion on the Conceptual Consultation item removed from the agenda.

Review and Approve Meeting Minutes – June 27, 2006

Mr. Bourque advised the Board the minutes from the last Board meeting were on the agenda to be approved so that the tapes could be turned over to the Police department for an investigation and that normally the minutes are not approved at work sessions.

Motion: Mr. Topliff moved to approve the minute of June 27, 2006 as amended. (Page two last paragraph should be "there was" not "was there"; Page 6 remove "have BS& Chips"; Page 6 should be "positive" not "negative", and the Planning Directors edits).

Mr. Lemoine seconded.

VOTE: Roland- Abstained Paul- Y Bill- Y Bob- Y
John- Y Larry- Y Alan-Y

MINUTES OF 6/27/2006 APPROVED AS AMENDED ON A 6-0 VOTE WITH ONE ABSTENTION

CLUSTER SUBDIVISION/CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE REVIEW

The Board had requested Ms. Scott to develop a matrix to show all the different changes regarding cluster subdivision/Conservation subdivision Ordinance. The matrix was handed out to all Board members and the first item discussed was the current Cluster Subdivision Ordinance CRD-1: R1 & LO Districts with water and sewer available; and CRD-2: R1 & LO Districts with water only; R3 with no water or sewer voluntary only. The Proposed Revised Conservation Subdivision Ordinance was the same as the original. The proposed New Construction Subdivision Ordinance (1) Required is parcel 50 acres or more (2) Required is parcel abuts existing conservation land (3) Voluntary all other items.

Ms. Scott explained the matrix hand out to the Board and there was a lengthy conversation on understanding the reasoning on the proposed New Construction Subdivision Ordinance.

The Board voiced concern on the requirement of a 50 acre lot and Ms. Scott asked that they continue to look at the comparison as a whole instead of each individual item. Ms. Lewis stated she is concerned that we are dictating how people are going to live and that she is “pissed off” as to all the rules and regulations in place now and property owners are losing there rights.

Conversation took place between the Board on roads and the provisions that need to be made for private roads. Private roads would still have to be kept up to Town standards.

The Board decided to review the proposed changes and bring this item back for review at the August work session.

MEDIA PROTOCOL

A discussion was held with the board regarding the previous meeting and the policy the Board has with speaking with the media. The meeting was public however; no one from the Board should speak on behalf of the Board with out permission from the Board. All inquiries should be directed to the Board Chair.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE

Ms. Scott gave the Board a copy of a letter sent to Merrill /Dennison, LLC. An update was given to the Board regarding a meeting that the Town is trying to coordinate with the property owners and the Water Department.

MEMBER APPOINTMENT

Mr. Bourque requested to send a letter to the Selectman to appoint Todd Terrien as an alternate member.

ADJORNMENT

At this point, Mr. Andrews made the following MOTION: That the meeting is adjourned. Mr. Topliff seconded the Motion and the Chair that the Board unanimously approved the Motion by voice vote and he adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Catie Tirrell
Recording Secretary