

PEMBROKE PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of Meeting
(Adopted)
Tuesday, November 27, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Bourque, Vice Chairman; Cindy Lewis, Selectmen's Representative; Mark Zydel; Alan Topliff; Todd Terrien

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Kathy Cruson; Kevin Krebs

EXCUSED: Roland Lemoine, Chairman, Kevin Foss

STAFF PRESENT: Stephanie Alexander, Interim Planner and Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

In Chairman Lemoine's absence, Vice Chairman Bourque served as Acting Chairman and opened the meeting at 7:02 p.m. Acting Chairman Bourque appointed Alternate Member Krebs to vote in place of Member Foss, and Alternate Member Cruson to vote in place of Chairman Lemoine.

Selectman's Rep. Lewis stepped down from the Board.

Public Hearing

Minor Site Plan Application. Case #07-104. Map 266 Lots 58-3, 58-8, 58-9, 58-10, and 58-11 located in the Chickering Meadow development in the Medium Density Residential (R1) Zoning Districts. The applicant, Chickering Builders, LLC, is proposing to modify an existing Site Plan (Case #03-104) to allow for the retention of six (6) earth berms that are currently on site.

Jeff Burd, of Starter Building & Development introduced himself and Karen O'Rourke of Brown Engineering, LLC. Mr. Burd stated that, at the September 25, 2007 meeting, he did not have a chance to address the concerns raised by Keach Nordstrom Associates, Inc. (KNA), Pembroke's engineering consultants. He said that Brown Engineering submitted two plans: (1) Supplemental Grading Plan; and (2) a plan illustrating site distance. Mr. Burd said that in the resubmission, KNA found no significant changes to the original drainage study, but that the Supplemental Grading Plan provided grading corrections to make sure that the drainage goes where it was intended in the original drainage report. No drainage report was needed but the supplemental grading plan addressed KNA's concerns. Mr. Burd said that KNA's response dated November 12, 2007 (in the Member packets) stated that their issues were adequately addressed.

Mr. Burd said that he would like an amendment of their approval for the construction of six berms in the development. He said that the berms were generated by excess fill on the site. He feels the berms will add as a buffer between the units and add to the aesthetics of the project. Mr. Burd said that a number of residents of Chickering Meadows have raised drainage concerns and he will address those issues prior to turning it over to an association.

Mr. Burd said that an abutter across Osborne Road felt that too much drainage from the development was going through a pipe that straddles the property line. Mr. Burd did additional surveying to demonstrate that the project was built per the plan. He has had discussions with the abutter and the Pembroke's Public Works Director. Mr. Burd said he intends to submit the plans to KNA for their review.

Ms. Alexander stated that KNA's letter of November 12, 2007 requests a series of proposed "spot elevations" along each segment that could potentially be addressed in the future. She also noted a copy of the NHDES memo dated August 27, 2007 (in Member packets) which states that wetland violations were corrected.

MOTION: Member Topliff moved to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Member Zydel. Unanimously approved.

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

Acting Chairman Bourque stated that the requested spot elevations could be a condition of approval.

Acting Chairman Bourque opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

James Batchelder, an abutter with property located to the north of Chickering Meadows stated that along the stone wall and fence line which separates the two properties, a 20 foot high dirt pile has concentrated the runoff onto his property and not toward the South side of the development as it did prior to the development. Mr. Batchelder said that his understanding was that the property was suppose to maintain its natural slope.

Mr. Burd responded that he was not aware of this problem and that some of the supplemental grading was concentrated in that area. He will address the issue and take corrective action.

Bill Rossignol, 218A Kearsarge Drive asked what the result was of the revised drainage study?

Karen O'Rourke of Brown Engineering said that they looked at the original drainage plan and also at the pre- and post-conditions. They found that 4 of the 6 berms were central to the proposed subcaps which indicated that the drainage patterns remained the same. The conclusion was that there was no increase in runoff from the previous study.

Ms. O'Rourke said that the berm previously discussed in the right hand corner (East side) of the map, showed the grades going off the property toward the East. She said that they found that a portion of the berm that was built up was being directed toward the detention area which originally was not intended. In order to alleviate that, they added a swale, which is on the revised Grading Plan, to take the additional water and bring it toward the southeast, the originally intended direction.

Ms. O'Rourke said that the berm located on the very left of the map (northwest side of the project) was built close to the property line, and that the contours were going in the same direction as the original study indicated. The pre- and post-construction was draining toward the West. To alleviate that, they added a swale on the inside of their property to direct it in a southern direction as originally proposed.

Mr. Rossignol stated that during this past summer, there was concentrated flow along both edges of the berm located north of the roundabout. To the left of that berm, he said, it was mostly sheet flow across the area where the gazebo is located. Mr. Rossignol said that Starter Building & Development tried to stabilize those concentrated runoff areas.

Mr. Rossignol said that an association has not yet been created within the development.

Larry Perron of Dearborn Road said that the berms are holding back the water and creating wet areas.

Wayne Burt, 215B Pembroke Street stated that he has not seen an increase in water flow since the berm was constructed behind his property. He enjoys the privacy that it affords him.

Mr. Burd said that he intends to build a ditch behind Mr. Burt's property. He said that all the berms are vegetated. The internal lawn of the development is mowed, but the outer berms will not be mowed.

Ms. O'Rourke said that the ground gains rainwater absorption with rounded berms.

Mr. Burd said that the berm located near the last half of the Phase 3 buildings (northeast corner of the development) will gain the fill generated from digging the cellar holes. He said that it would not change the drainage patterns.

Wayne Burt said he would prefer that Starter Building & Development not build a ditch along the property line between his property and the development.

Mr. Rossignol said that, although Mr. Burt does not feel that a ditch is necessary, he would like to be sure that there is positive drainage in that area to combat future problems and, therefore, would like Mr. Burd to create a ditch for water run-off.

Seeing that there were no further comments, Acting Chairman Bourque closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

MOTION: Member Topliff moved to approve the modification to the site plan with the following conditions: (1) provide a series of spot elevations along the length of each segment of swale; (2) address the elevation issues associated with the northeast berm; and (3) address the issues associated with the western berm located behind Mr. Burt's home for a possible drainage ditch. Seconded by Member Terrien.

VOTE: Robert B. – Y Mark Z. – Y Todd T. - Y
Kevin K. – Y Kathy C. – Y Alan T. - Y

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MODIFICATION TO THE SITE PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: (1) PROVIDE A SERIES OF SPOT ELEVATIONS ALONG THE LENGTH OF EACH SEGMENT OF SWALE; (2) ADDRESS THE ELEVATION ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE NORTHEAST BERM; AND (3) ADDRESS THE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE WESTERN BERM LOCATED BEHIND MR. BURT'S HOME FOR A POSSIBLE DRAINAGE DITCH PASSED ON A 6-0 VOTE.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis returned to the Board.

Second Conceptual Consultation

Major Subdivision Application. Case #07-05. Map 563, Lot 110 located in the Medium Density Residential (R1), Rural/Agricultural (R3), and the Wetlands Protection Overlay District at Beacon Hill and Third Range Road. The applicant, Barloe Properties, is proposing to subdivide Lot 110 into one residential lot and 16 rural open space cluster lots, including two open space lots.

Ms. Alexander noted (1) memo from Geoff Ruggles, Town Administrator, to Barloe Properties, LLC dated November 21, 2007 which details the items to be addressed; and (2) KV Partners' November 20, 2007 memo indicating that the major issue was the intersection configuration and offset. Ms. Alexander stated that the following permits are still needed: NHDES Wetland Permit, Alteration of Terrain Permit, and Subdivision Approval Permit. She also said that there are a series of waivers that the Board should review. She said that the Town Engineer recommended the denial of the 125' offset waiver.

Leo Dumont introduced himself and his wife, Barbara. He noted that the project has not changed in the last year. He said that they petitioned the Board of Selectmen to upgrade Third Range Road and were denied, therefore, have returned with the original proposal to construct an access road parallel to range road. He has received comments by various town departments and has responded, point by point, to all comments.

Mr. Dumont said that he hired Northpoint Engineering to design a drainage and grading plan. He would like to have a meeting with KV Partners and Mr. Ruggles to discuss the remaining issues. With regard to the 125' offset, Mr. Dumont said that he does not believe that there is an intersection because Beacon Hill Road merely turns to the right – there is no stop sign or any signage whatsoever to create an intersection. He pointed out that Third Range Road is a Class VI road, closed subject to gates and bars, and which the Board of Selectmen recently denied any improvements. It is the applicant's contention that Third Range Road will never become a full-fledged road and, therefore, cannot be weighed as an intersection.

Mr. Dumont stated that the subdivision regulations note that a "less than 125' offset should be avoided". He does not feel that it is a rule. He said that the current offset is 50' by definition because there are two 50' right-of-ways side-by-side. He pointed out that the rule says "center-to-center", not "edge-to-edge". He said that, if all else failed, they could move the exit road 75' which would create an alignment that would be somewhat of a curve at the entrance. This would create a dead zone between Third Range Road and the proposed access road. Mr. Dumont said that he does not see the sense in creating this dead zone. He said that the issue is still unresolved with KV Partners.

Mr. Dumont said that the cluster regulations are very confusing and contradictory. He said that they have attempted to make notes on the drawings that were necessary and that the plan complies with the cluster development requirements. He said that the regulations have a definition for the term "usable" but not for the term "buildable".

Mr. Dumont noted that they have 3 lots that do not meet the minimum of 20,000 sq. ft. He said that the reason that the lot does not qualify is because of the 15% slope. It is their interpretation of the regulations that the 15% slope was used to determine how many lots were acceptable in a cluster (entire area – 15% slope – wetlands – easements = # of lots). He stated that the same 15% rule is being used to deny some of the lots and therefore feels that the Town is "double-dipping". He also said that there is no prohibition in the regulations on building on a 15% slope. He said that a 20% slope is ideal for a walkout basement. He said that they are looking for clarification if it will be part of the requirements.

Acting Chairman Bourque said that there are four lots that do not meet the square foot requirements, namely Lots 10, 11, 16, 17. He stated that he does not believe that the regulations are "double-dipping".

He said that once the 15% slope has been eliminated from the project area, the balance is the buildable area. The buildable area can be divided into lots that meet the 21,000 sq. ft. requirement.

Mr. Dumont said that they chose to create a cluster subdivision because it was more appropriate for the site, more environmentally friendly, a cleaner project, provides less disturbed land, and provides the owners access to much more land than they would otherwise have in a conventional subdivision.

Mr. Dumont said that the Conservation Commission has agreed to accept the open space outside the circle which would include the pond area.

Mrs. Dumont said that they intend to put in 2-bedroom homes. They are focusing on people who want to downsize. They feel that the 2-bedroom homes will not attract a family; it would be a lower income settlement where people can support each other socially. The homes will be approximately 1,200 square feet.

Mr. Dumont said that the total distance from Beacon Hill Road to the entrance of the loop road is 700'.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that it does not look like there is a possibility of opening Third Range Road to Brickett Hill Road because of the wetlands but that the Roads Committee is encouraging the extension of Third Range Road.

Member Topliff said that, given the fact that the Board of Selectmen is not comfortable with opening Third Range Road, the project still creates a deadened road.

Mr. Dumont said that the Fire Department indicated that as long as the homes are sprinklered, they are comfortable with the project.

Barbara Dumont said that cul-de-sacs are much safer.

Member Topliff suggested that Mr. Dumont consider porous pavement as an alternative to subsurface drainage. Member Zydel said that the porous pavement is still being tested in the northeast.

Mr. Dumont pointed out the comments on the plans regarding underdrainage (noted as No. 5).

Acting Chairman Bourque suggested that the applicant detail each waiver being requested by chapter and verse and note the reason for the waiver. Additional points were made:

- Waiver 1: Cite which regulations indicate the scale that is being waived.
- Waiver 2 – the High Intensity Soil Survey: It is Acting Chairman Bourque's opinion that if it was previously prepared, it could be updated, or requested that the Board accept the past one.
- Waiver 3 – NH Natural Heritage: Update previous report or request that the Board accept the previous report.
- Waiver 4: Acting Chairman Bourque suggested that the applicant explain more clearly what is being requested, the advantages to granting the waiver, and to note the Police Department's comments.

- Waiver 5: Acting Chairman Bourque said that he appreciated Mr. Dumont changing from a cul-de-sac to a U-shaped road but noted that the Board does not want the road length from the north part of the horse shoe to Beacon Road to be over 1,000'. Submit Police and Fire Departments' comments.
- Waiver 6: Briefly discuss. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that it was important for the Board to consider the curve of Beacon Hill Road. Mr. Dumont said that the Road Committee would like to see the proposed road swing where the Range Road does in order to line up. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis suggested that information regarding the intersection of Beacon Hill Road and Third Range Road be reviewed. She said that reviewing the previous subdivision would establish the property lines and it should clarify the radius. Mr. Dumont said that he is intending to place a stop sign at the loop road and one at the entrance. The Board requested that Mr. Dumont include the findings in his application.
- Ms. Alexander asked if the Board would consider a traffic impact study on the area? Mr. Dumont said that one is presently in progress. The Board requested the traffic study be submitted.

Acting Chairman Bourque asked if Mr. Dumont had discussed with the Roads Committee the intersection of the proposed road and Beacon Hill Road. Mr. Dumont said he spoke with Floyd Smith who also recommended that the road be swung in to line it up.

- Waiver 7: Mr. Dumont said that he feels this is a mute point because KV Partner's last comments suggested rip-rap.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that she would like to be guaranteed that the proposed 2-bedroom homes would not, in the future, be enlarged to 3-bedroom homes.

Because of the Board's concern about the lot sizes, Mr. Dumont said that he will have to place some of the lots on the interior of the circle rather than in the exterior area and combine a few of the other lots.

Ms. Alexander stated that the September 25, 2007 concerns of the Fire Chief were that the subdivision located on a dead-end road had only one ingress/egress, and he asked that if the subdivision is granted all the homes have sprinkler systems. She noted the Police Chief's response indicated that they would like proper traffic control signs (stop signs and 25 mph signs), proper street lighting, and requested a second opinion by KV Partners if the lines of sight changed for motorists approaching the intersection.

Acting Chairman Bourque asked that Mr. Dumont discuss the 2% grade waiver with KV Partners. Mr. Dumont said that they will address all KV Partner's concerns.

Member Topliff said that since it has been determined that the length of the road is less than 700', he does not have the same level of concern as he previously stated.

Mr. Dumont asked that he receive a copy of the minutes.

Mr. Dumont asked if he should pursue discussions with the Roads Committee on the upgrade of Beacon Hill. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said yes and that the upgrade would be part of the application to be approved by the Planning Board.

Ms. Alexander said that Mr. Dumont must submit the information two weeks prior to the January 22, 2008 meeting since he has already missed the deadline for the December 11th meeting.

Amoskeag Rowing Club Conditional Approval Extension Request. Case #06-103. Map VW, Lot 188-1. The applicant's extension to the conditionally approved Special Use Permit and Major Site Plan Application was extended on June 26, 2007 to December 31, 2007. The applicant requests an additional six month extension.

James Raymond of the Amoskeag Rowing Club said that when they received their approval last year there were two conditions: DES approval for the dock and the gas line. The Rowing Club is still waiting for the DES approval because of a lack of communication with their engineers.

Mr. Raymond stated that, with the Town's permission, they cleared some of the brush on the Town's land when they were clearing their land in order to allow for parking and grading. In the course of doing so, the Club discovered that the drainage pipe that previously was thought to come down the road actually cuts across their land at a junction. Mr. Raymond said that they will have to revise the plan once they have taken a closer look at the situation. He said that Concord High School, who is one of the applicant's club members, has proposed building a boathouse in Concord and that the city is behind it. The applicant may have to revise the plan once they have assessed that situation and the impact that it will have on the Club's plans. The Amoskeag Rowing Club is asking for an extension of the conditional approval for another six months. He said that by that time they will have the answers to those issues and hopefully have the dock issue decided and return with an amended plan or a new plan.

Mr. Raymond said that they have not received official approval from Tennessee Gas and have not received any indication that the approval will be denied. The field workers have indicated that the gas line can be moved.

MOTION: Selectmen's Rep. Lewis moved to extend conditional approval for Special Use Permit and Major Site Plan Application for an additional six months. Seconded by Alternate Member Cruson.

VOTE:	Robert B. – Y	Mark Z. – Y	Todd T. - Y
	Kevin K. – Y	Kathy C. – Y	Alan T. – Y
	Cindy L. – Y		

MOTION TO EXTEND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR AN ADDITIONAL SIX MONTHS PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

Finalize 2008 Town Meeting Zoning Amendments

1. Article XV, Enforcement and Penalties – ZBA

William Bonney, Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustments said that the Board reviewed the proposed zoning changes. He said that the changes fall into two categories: (1) Enhancement to the language of the zoning, specifically referring to the ZBA; and (2) to include the powers granted to the

Zoning Board by the RSA and are not presently in the zoning ordinances such as an equitable waiver and a conditional approval for junk yards.

For clarification, Mr. Bonney stated that the text that is bolded and underlined is to be added to the ordinances. The text that is neither bolded nor underlined will remain in the ordinance. The text that is crossed out will be omitted. (A copy of the 11-26-07 ZBA Draft was given to each member.) In order to clarify the changes, Mr. Bonney read the changes aloud and commented on the following:

§143-111 B. was misleading so the ZBA recommended striking the last portion of the paragraph and adding the text as indicated.

Mr. Bonney remarked that §143-111 D regarding the Equitable Waiver for Dimensional Requirements gives the ZBA the power to grant a waiver for a good faith error that was made and which would bring the lot into conformance.

§143-111 G is specifically defined as one of the duties and responsibilities of the ZBA under RSA 236:115 but was never included.

§143-12 A (3) allows the ZBA to decide if the Code Enforcement Officer has a valid reason to withhold a permit.

§143-113 C attempts to clarify “integrity or character of the district”

§143-113 F: After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the clause should read: “That there will be no excessive negative impacts from the traffic generated by the proposed use;”

§143-115.1 Upon further discussion, it was agreed that §143-115.1 B should include a listing of the four findings in RSA 674:33-a(I).

§143-116. Mr. Bonney clarified that a Special Exception or Variance will expire in one year if no substantial construction has occurred on the project. He said that the project does not have to be completed, but the applicant must have made a commitment to the project (expended funds) in order to be granted an extension.

Acting Chairman Bourque said that the ZBA changes must be reviewed by legal counsel and then scheduled for a public hearing on January 8, 2008. Mr. Ruggles agreed to make the revisions and to submit them to Ms. Alexander.

Mr. Bonney agreed to attend the January 8, 2008 public hearing in case there were any questions.

It was decided that the amendments should be presented numerically at the public hearing.

2. Article XIV, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Variances, and Special Exceptions – ZBA

Will not be revised at this time.

3. §143-42 Commercial Kennels – Roland Lemoine

Ms. Alexander noted that the changes discussed at the November 13, 2007 meeting were not submitted to her by Chairman Lemoine. She would like to place this article on the December 11th agenda.

The Board agreed that:

1. The definition of kennels should include boarding and breeding
2. The appropriate RSA should be noted in the article along with any police regulations pertaining to noise
3. Requiring site plan review for all commercial kennels.

The following suggestions were made:

Outside Kennel requirements:

- 400' setback from the road, 200' from sides and back. No minimum acreage noted.
- Outside run limited from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
- Require vegetation screening
- Allow a maximum of 15 adult dogs
- Allowed only in R3

Inside kennel requirements:

- 100' setback from roadway, 50' from sides and back.
- Require vegetation screening
- Allow a maximum of 15 adult dogs
- Allowed only in R3

Ms. Alexander will make revisions to the article. Mr. Ruggles will notify Chairman Lemoine.

4. Article VIIIA, Telecommunications Facility & Antenna Criteria – Alan Topliff

Member Topliff explained that if there is an existing tower with approval for 10 antennas but only has 3 antennas at the present time, the applicant will not have to go through the ZBA/Planning Board process. As long as an engineer has performed a structure analysis and the tower is structurally sound, the code enforcement officer can issue a permit. Towers are only allowed by special exception and is not limited to specific elevations.

Correction: §143-66.3D(2) should read “. . . for: (1) provided that replacement . . .”

Member Topliff will review the article again and Ms. Alexander will revise the article. Ms. Alexander will need the revisions no later than Noon on Monday, December 10, 2007. She will then submit them to Town Counsel.

5. §143-67 Architectural Design District – Cindy Lewis

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said she has no problem leaving the article as written. She suggested a demolition clause be added. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis said that Item C, Accompanying an Application for a Sight Plan Review include major and minor home business.

Ms. Alexander noted that the Soucook River Performance District had landscaping and lighting requirements that could be applied to other parts of the Town's regulations.

Alternate Member Cruson e-mailed James Garvin but has not received a reply regarding Pembroke Street's character preservation.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis suggested including a demolition clause that would allow the Town 2-weeks to consider saving the structure. She and Alternate Member Cruson agreed to leave the overlay district as it is written except for adding major and minor home businesses. Selectmen's Rep. Lewis will make the changes and will submit them to Ms. Alexander by December 10, 2007.

6. §143-69 Floodplain Development District – Geoff Ruggles

Mr. Ruggles said that he took the outline from Sandrine Thibault of the Office of Energy and Planning which is based on the FEMA guidelines. He reviewed the guidelines with Ms. Thibault. Mr. Ruggles said that anywhere that his definition differed from ours, Mr. Ruggles added the flood specific definition with the wording "for floodplain management purposes" and then noted the FEMA definition after Pembroke's definition. The corrections consisted of deleting most of the zones and including the flood boundary and floodway map definitions. All the changes were made to conform to FEMA guidelines for flood insurance purposes.

7. Article X, Cluster Subdivision Provisions – Kevin Krebs, Mark Zydel, Todd Terrien

Alternate Member Krebs said that small changes were made to the cluster provision and forwarded them to Chairman Lemoine. He said that they changed the word "Cluster Subdivision Provision" to "Conservation Subdivision Ordinance" and "Cluster Residential Development" to "Conservation Subdivision Development".

Alternate Member Krebs said that the dimension changes made were as follows:

- (1) for R1 and LO districts with town water, the lot area changed from 22,500 sq. ft. to 25,000 sq. ft.
- (2) LO and R1 districts without town water and town sewer and the R3 district, the lot area was changed from 30,000 sq. ft. to 40,000 sq. ft. and the frontage was changed from 100' to 150'.

Selectmen's Rep. Lewis noted that the Board agreed on the term "open space subdivision" rather than "conservation subdivision" and Alternate Member Krebs said he would revise the ordinance.

Alternate Member Krebs will e-mail Ms. Alexander the changes by December 10, 2007.

8. Article XVII, Growth Management Ordinance

Ms. Alexander said that there was not a lot of time to do much with the Growth Management Ordinance but, she noted that the GMO sunsets March 31, 2008. She said that the simplest thing to do would be to revise the date.

Acting Chairman Bourque suggested that in lieu of the growth ordinance, the Board propose keeping the portion of the growth ordinance that allows phasing of 5 or more house lots at a time phasing for a few years. Ms. Alexander reiterated that the Board would be striking everything in the GMO except for the §143-136. She said that with phasing, the Board must describe the purpose and the authority.

Ms. Alexander said that it would be necessary to keep most of the language and title it “Growth Management Ordinance” because the statutory reference is very short and talks about the timing and rate of growth. She concluded that she would have to cut up the sections, remove the annual building permit limitation the issuance of building permits is eliminated with phasing. She said that the Administrative procedure should stay. She felt that this is very short notice to be changing the ordinance to this extent and should be thoroughly reviewed by Town Counsel. Ms. Alexander noted that there is a lot of administrative tracking involved with building permits and if Town Counsel says that it is not necessary, then the Board should remove it.

Ms. Alexander asked when the Board would like the Phasing Growth Management to sunset? The Board agreed on March 31, 2011.

9. §143-71 Shoreland Protection District – will not be done this year.

10. Home Businesses – Bob Bourque – REVISED, DONE

Other Business

Review and Approve November 13, 2007 Work Session Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Member Topliff moved to accept the minutes of November 13, 2007 as amended. Seconded by Member Zydell.

VOTE:	Robert B. – Y	Mark Z. – Y	Cindy L. – Y
	Kevin K. – Y	Kathy C. – Y	Alan T. - Abstained
	Todd T. - Abstained		

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 13, 2007 AS AMENDED PASSED ON A 5-0 VOTE WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS.

Ms. Alexander noted the Pembroke Sewer Commission’s letter dated November 20, 2007 which states that the one-year extension will expire on December 20, 2007. Acting Chairman Bourque asked Ms. Alexander to send a letter to Pembroke 600 notifying them that their Planning Board approval will expire on January 8, 2008 with a copy to the Sewer Commission and the Code Enforcement Officer.

Ms. Alexander noted a letter from the Epsom Board of Adjustment dated November 5, 2007 indicating that a cell tower will be erected on Windymere Drive in Epsom. Acting Chairman Bourque requested that she send a letter thanking them for notifying the Board.

Ms. Alexander noted a Conceptual Subdivision Plan – Head’s Pond Project by Manchester Sand, Gravel & Cement co., Inc. of Hooksett. The developer is considering 428 housing units on Route 3. She asked for the Board’s concerns regarding this development. She suggested that Pembroke review the results of a traffic study to determine how the development will affect the Town. Ms. Alexander noted that there are two large housing units already developed on adjoining properties. She indicated that there is a hearing on December 3, 2007. Ms. Alexander said that the Board may want to send a volunteer to the hearing to express Pembroke’s concerns or a letter could be drafted to be read into the official minutes.

Acting Chairman Bourque stated that a letter could address the following concerns: the amount of traffic heading North and South, the wear and tear of the roads, how the aquifer will be affected by the construction and road salt, wildlife displacement.

Ms. Alexander noted that the proposed “parkway” to run through the entire development is 102’ wide. There is also a proposal for a second future “parkway” on the north side. Ms. Alexander stated her concerns from a regional prospective:

- (1) The parkway is too wide
- (2) The plan should show the existing housing stock in the areas
- (3) The open space is severely fragmented
- (4) Community facilities, traffic impact studies, and fiscal impact studies should be completed for at least Allentown and Hooksett
- (5) There is significant impact to the wetland
- (6) The plan should show the proposed future development for the next 10 years
- (7) They should show the density increase in the area
- (8) Consider a second egress for the village area
- (9) Endangered species
- (10) Wildlife displacement

Ms. Alexander also recommended that Pembroke receive a copy of the impact study. Acting Chairman Bourque asked Ms. Alexander to prepare a letter outlining the bullet points to be signed by the Chairman of the Planning Board. Mr. Ruggles will call Chairman Lemoine and inform him.

MOTION: Member Terrien moved to adjourn. Member Zydel seconded.

The vote was unanimous in favor of the Motion.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jocelyn D. Carlucci
Recording Secretary