

Pembroke Planning Board
Meeting Agenda
(Approved)
Tuesday, April 22, 2008

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

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

Chairman Bourque opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

New Public Hearing

1. Major Site Plan Application. Case #08-102. Map 565, Lot 80 located in the Medium Density-Residential (R1) District, Architectural Design (AD) Overlay District, and Wetlands Protection (WP) District at 408 Pembroke Street. The applicant, Ralph Littlefield of Community Action Program of Belknap & Merrimack Counties, is proposing to build a 40-unit elderly housing facility. These one-bedroom independent living units and common areas would occupy three floors totaling 33,062 sf, and a parking area of 44 spaces would be constructed.

Chairman Bourque noted for the record that Selectmen's Rep. Lewis stepped down from the Board.

Interim Planner, Stephanie Alexander said that the applicant had been before Board in September 2007 and January 2008 for conceptual consultations and have met with the Technical Review Committee and Town Departments. She reviewed the contents of the member packet:

- (1) Applicant's response dated 04/07/08 to Ms. Alexander's 03/0708 site plan application review;
- (2) KV Partners correspondence dated 03/04/08 and 04/20/08;
- (3) Letter from the Pembroke Water Works dated 03/17/08 stating that they have no further issues with the project;
- (4) Letter from Pembroke Sewer Commission dated 04/11/08 stating that they have no further issues with the project;
- (5) Comments from Everett Hodge, Code Enforcement Officer dated 02/28/08 regarding the building height;
- (6) Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) Notices of Decision;
- (7) Town Department comments:
 - a. Public Works Director stating that the parcel abuts the Route 3 State of New Hampshire roadway;
 - b. Conservation Commission request for more information on drainage outflow and runoff, the impact on the vegetation and surrounding area, the plans for the land behind the buildings, and if there would be future expansion of the project. Ms. Alexander said she would provide the Conservation Commission with a copy of the drainage report.
 - c. Certifications from HUD regarding Section 202 Supportive Housing dated 10/31/07, and 11/03/06.

Gary Spaulding, G. R. Spaulding Design Consultants, LLC reviewed the proposed site map. He stated that the 350' of land at the rear of the property will not be developed or improved upon in the future. It will only be mowed.

There will be 44 parking spaces (1 per unit). The plans were submitted to the Department of Transportation (DOT). DOT asked that 2 notes be added to the plan stating: (1) that an excavation permit would be required prior to any excavation being done within the right-of-way (ROW) and (2) that any existing pavement within the ROW would be removed, loamed, and seeded so that there would be only one curb cut. He said that the handicapped parking is at the main entrance of the building, parking is separated with landscaped cells and bioretention cells for drainage. The dumpsters will be located in the rear and be screened, a large bioretention area is in the rear for runoff. There will be screening along the abutting property lines and in front of the building, a pump station, fire hydrant, and municipal water and sewer. They have provided stop bars, stop signs, sidewalks, and a retaining wall. He explained that the reason for the retaining wall is to help handicapped accessibility to the parking lot at a 5% maximum grade and have daylight on the basement level of the 2-3 story building.

Mr. Spaulding explained that the ALTA survey is a HUD requirement that is prepared once the project is completed to ensure that the existing conditions and improvements are recorded at the Registry of Deeds. The applicant would like the Board to consider requiring only the ALTA survey to be recorded since it will consist of the existing conditions, site plan, and the landscape plan and it would be an "as-built" of the entire parcel.

Mr. Spaulding said that a driveway application has been submitted to the State (a copy will be sent to the Town).

Mr. Spaulding reviewed the e-mail dated 04/15/08.

- #15, there has not been an ALTA plan prepared and, therefore, there are no plan references. He did add plan references to the plan set for the existing conditions plan.
- #16, the architectural plans note the sign details.
- #19, applicant has had two conversations with DOT about the traffic impact concerning the proposed roundabout. DOT has not asked the applicant to do a traffic study. Applicant would like the traffic study waived.
- #25, they will note on the plan the average number of cars in and out of the site, the width of the driveway opening and the curve of the apron. They have provided the fire alarm detail on the plan but there will not be a burglar alarm system and will make a note of such on the plan. With regard to "drainage features and electrical components that should have safety features", Mr. Spaulding said that there are no components on the site. There is no proposed drainage structures, deep ponds or anything that will need safety requirements around it.

Mr. Spaulding said that the ALTA plan will take 6-9 months to be completed once they begin construction. The ALTA survey must be done before the HUD closing.

Ralph Littlefield, Director of Community Action Agency, said that the ALTA survey is usually done within 60 days from the time that all of the work has been completed on the project.

Mr. Spaulding addressed the outstanding issues noted in KV Partners' 04/20/08 letter:

GENERAL:

1. The retaining wall is 10' high and tapers down to nothing in the rear of the building. Aesthetically, the only location that the wall can be seen from is inside the building. It cannot

be seen by an abutter. Mr. Spaulding explained that the reason he did not show too much detail pertaining to the wall is because when the project goes to bid, someone may propose a different style of retaining wall. If the detail was originally placed on the plan, the applicant would be required to return to the Planning Board to show the style change of the wall. He is asking that the Board allow the applicant to not change the wall and safety railing proposed on the existing plan.

2. The proposed lighting is cut-off and down-grade lighting. The fixtures are 15' tall. The applicant does not have a photometric analysis noted on the plan. KV Partners referenced Section 7.2.12 of the Site Plan Regulations but he cannot find the notation in the regulations. The applicant requests a waiver of Section 7.2.12.
3. Sidewalk ramp/landing detail will be corrected on the plan to include the added rumble strips and slope. Details of the level spot and handicapped entrance will be detailed on the plan.

DRAINAGE:

1. Mr. Spaulding explained that there are three drainage areas. The total drainage increase is 70% of a very small number (from 1.55-2.55 CFS). The increase is broken up into 3 areas of the project. He noted that the increase of 1 CFS on the hydrograph in the drainage report happens for approximately 15 min. in an entire storm. He explained that during a rain storm, water collects on the site and at approximately the 12th hour of the storm, the hydrograph peaks and drops back off. The discharge from the site, which is 1 CFS increases over 3 areas, and is for a 15 minute timeframe between the 12th hour and 13th hour.

Mr. Spaulding explained that the time of concentration on how long it takes the water to travel to discharge begins when a drop of water hits a site. The applicant also took 44.9 minutes for pre vs. 56 minutes for post and reran the numbers using the faster numbers. They found that when they used the faster number of concentration, the difference is another .3 CFS. Therefore, using a faster time does not increase the runoff significantly (from 1 CFS increase to 1.3 CFS). The difference is in the peak discharge – a discharge is over a 60 minute time frame between the 11th, 12th, and 13th hour. In conclusion, he agrees that there is an increase, but it is a very small increase, and the abutting properties on the down slope of the west side of the property will not see it. The applicant is asking the Board to allow the slight increase. They do not feel that further analysis for drainage test pits is warranted for this small development.

2. Regarding the drainage that comes toward the bioretention area, Mr. Spaulding explained that the rear corner has less than a .2% slope. To correct the slope, the applicant will need to raise the elevation in the rear corner 3.5 inches to meet the Town's requirements. They are willing to do so.
- 3-4. The applicant will extend the stone swale as noted by KV Partners and show all details on the plan regarding the flow from the parking lot to Bioretention Area No. 4, including the depth and width of the stone.

PERMITTING:

1. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be completed at time of construction
2. The NH DOT permit has been applied for.

Ms. Alexander reiterated to the Board that the applicant is requesting the following:

- Waiver for retaining wall details

- Waiver of photometric analysis
- Waiver for additional drainage calculations
- Waiver for test pit data

Ms. Alexander noted that a special use permit is required by the Planning Board for any use in the Wetland Protection District.

The ZBA noted a condition of approval from the Pembroke Fire Department that they approve the height of the building (35'). Cindy Lewis, Architect for this project, said that the approval is forthcoming.

Member Cruson said that a floor plan of the interior of the units and common areas would be helpful for locating the exists, entrances, and emergency service exits in comparison to the location of the rooms.

Ms. Lewis explained that the prior floor plan that was submitted is similar to the existing floor plan. The first floor of the house structure contains 4 units and the common space, office, and laundry. On the second floor, there are 6 units. The 3-floor barn structure has a central corridor, 10 units per floor, and a stairway on each end and the core area. The elevator is in the center core area. She said that there are fire separations and the building is fully sprinklered.

Ms. Alexander said that the applicant has indicated that there is no outdoor seating areas, or light recreation areas proposed.

Chairman Bourque indicated that since DOT does not require a traffic study, the Board will not require it.

With regard to the ALTA plan vs. the recorded plan, Ms. Alexander said that the ALTA plan, as an as-built, can be the final plan that is recorded but the site plan cannot occur without a recorded plan registered. Therefore, a plan must be recorded. Plan SP-1 most closely matches what could be acceptable. She felt that all 3 plans need to be recorded.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Topliff moved to accept the plan as complete. Member Terrien seconded.

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

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE PLAN AS COMPLETE PASSED ON A 6-0 VOTE.

When asked by Member Terrien why there was no burglar alarm, Michael Cohan of the Community Action Program explained that it is a self-contained community with a secure entry system. There will be a keypad system in a lobby with a bank of codes for each unit. A visitor would code-in the particular unit which would then ring the tenant's telephone, and the tenant would press #6 on the phone and the lobby door would open. Burglary has never been an issue for any of their facilities.

Mr. Spaulding said that: (a) The drip edge around the building goes into crushed stone down to a foundation drain; (b) There is a 5' grass panel, between the walkway and the top of the 10' retaining wall. There is also a safety rail and fence to keep people from wandering into that area; (c) The curbing along the side of the parking area will be bituminous curbing and granite along the sidewalk; (d) The snow will be pushed to the snow removal areas at the end of the parking lot. When the snow banks become too

large, the snow will be removed; (e) Each parking space is of standard measurements (9' x 15') and the handicapped parking spaces are the required measurement; (f) There is a total of 44 parking spaces including 4 handicapped spaces. There will be 4 visitor parking spaces available but has not yet been placed on the plan.

Mr. Cohan noted that 65%-75% of the population will have vehicles. If another handicapped space is requested by a resident, HUD will make reasonable accommodations for that person as a matter of policy.

Chairman Bourque opened the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

Rick Frederickson, 1 Donna Drive asked for additional screening to be placed along the northern edge of the upper parking lot portion of the Donna Drive property line to shield headlights from entering his windows. Mr. Spaulding agreed to plant 5' to 6' evergreens along the edge for screening.

Irmgard Hauschulz, 11 Donna Drive stated that the existing drainage system on Donna Drive is inadequate. She said that her home presently has water issues and would not want it to worsen. Mr. Spaulding suggested that she review the Donna Drive plans to see what might have changed since the development was created.

Dana Carlucci, 8 Prospect St. said that the development driveway is approximately 350' from an intersection (Pembroke Hill) that was identified as a safety concern. The Pembroke Hill Study Committee contacted DOT to perform a study to find a solution to the problem. Mr. Carlucci asked if it would be appropriate to contact the Pembroke Hill Study Committee for input to ensure that additional vehicles from this development would not increase the already existing safety issues at this intersection.

Chairman Bourque directed Ms. Alexander to inquire as to the contact person for the Pembroke Hill Study Committee.

Mr. Spaulding said that construction would begin late summer and would last 6-9 months.

Member Zydel asked what the ultimate height of the trees surrounding the building will be when full grown. Ms. Lewis stated that the evergreens would be 7'-8' and the others approximately 8'-12'. Mr. Zydel said that the Board may want to consider doing a better job at screening the building. He noted that the Board could have done a better job at screening the Associated Grocers building from the road.

Mr. Spaulding said that the exterior of the building is designed to fit into the architecture and style of Rt. 3. He felt it would be counterproductive to hide the building.

Mr. Spaulding said that with regard to DOT and the roundabout, the highway design group received a letter from DOT dated 06/25/08 concluding that the project should not affect operation and capacity of the proposed roundabout at Pembroke Hill Road and Rt. 3.

Mr. Spaulding said that they will push the snow 5'-10' off the pavement. Chairman Bourque asked that a condition be made to require the applicant to remove the snow once the snow banks have reached the pavement.

Chairman Bourque asked if there would be a knock box at each door. Mr. Cohen said that they would do whatever the Fire Department wanted. Chairman Bourque suggested that a knock box be placed at the north and west entrances.

Chairman Bourque noted that the Code Enforcement Officer suspected asbestos on the existing garage and building and asked if it had been tested? Mr. Littlefield said that the exterior of the main building and barn have asbestos siding and the piping in the cellar of the building has asbestos. He said that whoever is contracted to remove the buildings will have licensed people to remove the asbestos according to State regulations.

Geoff Ruggles, Town Administrator said that Community Action facilitated the Town securing a Community Development Block Grant to assess the sewer manholes in, primarily, the downtown area in order to seal or repair them so that groundwater does not get into the sewer system. They anticipate that by doing this, the loss of infiltration will create enough extra capacity in the sewer system for use by this project. A copy of the letter is in the Planning Board packet. Mr. Ruggles said that it is anticipated that there will be more capacity available, once the repairs have been made, than is necessary for this project.

Mr. Spaulding said that the drainage study was given to KV Partners and the Town. The applicant feels that additional studies are unnecessary considering the small increase of water that will be discharged over 360' of meadow. Chairman Bourque said that the Board will wait for KV Partners' response.

Member Zydel stated that the applicant should define the minimum requirement for the retaining wall and railing. Mr. Spaulding asked if a contractor proposes a different style of a retaining wall and railing, would the applicant need to return to the Board for approval of the new wall and railing?

Ms. Lewis said that whoever supplies the wall prepares engineered drawings. The engineered drawings might change depending on the product manufacturer and the engineered drawings are needed for the Building Permit. She said that the applicant could stipulate what they would like the wall to look like but the product manufacturer might change.

Vice Chairman Topliff asked that the Board convey to KV Partners to do whatever is reasonable to ensure that the existing water problems along Donna Drive not increase.

Mr. Spaulding will provide manufacture cut-sheets to the Board regarding the light fixtures. Ms. Lewis said that the Safety Center lights are cut-off lights and they do not disturb the neighbors.

Mr. Ruggles said that no bond will be required for the offsite sewer improvements. The engineer's calculation was based on the minimum amount that would be gained when the manholes are repaired. Therefore, the money the Town receives will cover the identified places where the Sewer Commission thinks there is infiltration. It should supply more sewer capacity than is needed for the project. The Town receives the grant money directly and is in charge of the project.

Mr. Littlefield noted that there will be tables and chairs in the patio area for residents to sit, but with regard to exercise or walking trails around the property, he said that HUD does not usually pay for anything beyond the building. The responsibility for those extra features would fall on the Community Action Program.

Member Cruson asked if chairs could be placed around the building for people to sit. Mr. Littlefield said yes, as long as it is in the immediate area and does not extend into the field.

Chairman Bourque asked Ms. Alexander to look into any grants that would be available for walking paths.

Member Zydel suggested that the applicant ask HUD if they would cover the creation of walking paths or would know of anyone who would. Mr. Littlefield said that before HUD would answer that question, they require a complete set of drawings, bid specifications, and costs. He anticipates that they would receive a “maybe” from HUD. CAP is willing to look into other applications for grants that might be available to accomplish it.

Mr. Cohan said that CAP encourages tenant associations but cannot mandate it. The association would arrange activities such as bingo nights, field trips, and potluck suppers.

Harold Thompson asked what the feasibility would be of having a crosswalk located across Route 3 from Donna Drive. Mr. Ruggles said that Donna Drive residents approached the State for a crosswalk in October 2007 and it is still in the works.

Mr. Carlucci said that it was his understanding that there is money available from the Pembroke Hill and Route 3 intersection, to dedicate toward that intersection that could possibly be used for a caution light or crosswalk to help traffic get onto Route 3 from Pembroke Hill. He also said that it was his impression that the Board of Selectmen wrote a letter to DOT stating that a rotary would not be an option for that intersection. A crosswalk is very important.

Chairman Bourque asked Mr. Ruggles to contact the State on that issue. Mr. Ruggles stated that it is his understanding that the Pembroke Hill Study Committee was disbanded once the traffic light was turned down and a roundabout was proposed.

The Board discussed adding a note to the plan to not allow development beyond a certain point on the property.

There being no further discussions or comments, Chairman Bourque closed the public hearing at 8:34 p.m.

Conditions: Applicant will:

1. Provide a rebuttal to KV Partners based on the 04/20/08 review. Total of 9 bullets.
2. Redesign SP-1 consistent with the requirements of the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds for registration of a plat.
3. Provide a letter from the Pembroke Fire Department stating that the height of 35’ is acceptable.
4. Submit NH DOT driveway application to the Board. Once the permit is received, a copy will be submitted to the Board.
5. Add the average number and maximum number of cars per day as a note to SP-1.
6. Add a note on the plan of the width of the driveway opening and curb of the apron.
7. Add a note on the plan that no features on the property requires safety measures.
8. Add a note on the plan that no burglar alarm will be on the premises.

9. Display sidewalk ramp detail to include the cross slope in the ramp and landing areas and detectable panels per ADA requirements.
10. Provide appropriate detail where sidewalks are large enough to have landing areas at the top of the ramp.
11. Add a note to the plan that when the snow storage area has reached its maximum capacity, the snow will be hauled offsite.
12. Add a Knox box at the west entrance.
13. Add a note to the plan to ensure safe and appropriate asbestos removal.
14. Regrade the parking lot to provide a minimum of 0.5% with 1% slope preferred along the berm next to Bioretention Area 4.
15. Provide the depth and width of the stone for Bioretention Area 4 to the stone swale detail.
16. Provide retaining wall and railing detail and add a note stating that the details are subject to modifications during the construction bid process.
17. Provide lighting fixture specifications subject to review and approval by Town engineer.
18. Explore recreational grants to build a walking trail and other amenities around the site.
19. Plant 5'-6' evergreens along the northeast parking area next to Donna Drive.
20. Add a note to the plan stating that no further development of the parcel will take place West of the lot line between Lots 81-58 and 81-59 extended to the southern property line, and this area will be left at a natural state.

Chairman Bourque asked Ms. Alexander to reference the placement of medallions every 25' on the portion of the land east of the property line and discuss something lower to the ground that will not interfere with lawn care.

Chairman Bourque stated that once KV Partners has responded to the applicant's drainage issues, the Board will discuss it.

Ms. Lewis noted that the Code Enforcement Officer asked that the existing garage be moved back from Pembroke Street. She said that CAP could not afford to move the garage. They would have to build a small shed instead for their lawn equipment. They would prefer to have it remain at its present location and remove the asbestos. The Board agreed that it is existing and could remain at its present location.

Chairman Bourque will continue the public hearing on May 27, 2008.

The Board recessed at 9:00 p.m.

Chairman Bourque called the meeting to order at 9:07 pm and noted that Selectmen's Rep. Lewis had returned to the Board.

- 2. Major Site Plan Extension. Case #07-101.** Map 632, Lot 18-5, located on Riverwood Drive in the Commercial/Light Industrial (C1) and the Aquifer Conservation (AC) Zoning Districts. The applicant, Gladstone Brothers Construction, is requesting an extension to the conditional approval of a four-building planned industrial development granted on April 24, 2007.

David Ledoux of Gladstone Brothers Construction said that the Applicant is looking for a six-month extension to the conditional approval in order to acquire a DES subdivision approval for a septic system. He said that the State granted site specific approval but not subdivision approval.

Ms. Alexander stated that a fax that she recently received noted that the applicant is requesting a six-month extension and the Subsurface Septic application was denied by DES because of four items: (1) commercial condos require that subdivision approval be received first; (2) needed a copy of Alteration of Terrain Permit; (3) Subdivision Condo documents; and (4) water supply approval from the supplier.

Mr. Ledoux said that since Allenstown voted not to expand the sewer facility, the applicant must get a Subsurface Septic Permit. Their engineers have completed the DES application and will be submitting it. He stated that DES and KV Partners have reviewed the loading calculations and the applicant does not foresee any problems.

MOTION: Member Zydel moved to grant the 6-month extension. Second by Chairman Bourque.

Chairman Bourque tabled the motion and opened the public hearing at 9:12 p.m.

There being no discussions or comments, Chairman Bourque closed the public hearing at 9:12 p.m.

MOTION: Member Zydel moved to grant a six-month extension. Second by Vice Chairman Topliff.

Member Krebs asked when the Subsurface Septic Permit was applied for? Mr. Ledoux said it was before July 2007 because he received the State's comments in July 2007. One of the conditions was to get the Site Specific Permit which they received in August 2007. They decided to wait to submit the application in hopes that Allenstown would vote for the extension of the sewer facility.

Ms. Alexander stated that the construction bond has yet to be provided to the Town (\$5,300). Mr. Ledoux said that the bond, according to the zoning regulations, is not presented until the time the mylar is brought to the Board for signature. Ms. Alexander questioned whether the amount of the bond would be increasing?

MOTION: Member Zydel moved to grant the six-month extension and evaluate the bond capacity at the conclusion of the sixth month. Second by Vice Chairman Topliff.

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

MOTION TO GRANT THE SIX MONTH EXTENSION AND EVALUATE THE BOND CAPACITY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE SIXTH MONTH PASSED ON A 6-1 VOTE.

Minutes

3. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes of March 25, 2008

MOTION: Chairman Bourque moved to accept the March 25, 2008 meeting minutes as presented with no corrections. Seconded by Member Cruson.

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

Cindy L. - Abstained

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MARCH 25, 2008 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED WITH NO CORRECTIONS PASSED ON A 6-0 VOTE WITH 1 ABSTENTION.

4. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes of April 8, 2008

MOTION: Chairman Bourque moved to accept the April 8, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. Seconded by Vice Chairman Topliff.

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

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APRIL 8, 2008 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED PASSED ON A 5-0 VOTE WITH 2 ABSTENTIONS.

Miscellaneous

5. Select CTAP Workshop for Pembroke

Mr. Ruggles said that Sharon Wasson provided a list of consultants to revise the Open Space ordinance. He said that Ms. Wasson thought that CTAP would approve using a portion of the \$15,000 toward this project and that it would only cost approximately \$6,000 to revise the Open Space Ordinance. Mr. Ruggles gave each Board member the list of names.

Chairman Bourque asked Mr. Ruggles to contact the people on the list to see who would be interested in taking on the open space project. He suggested that the Board discuss what they would like to change at the next work session.

Mr. Ruggles will contact the people on the list of consultants and tell them that the Board is looking to clean up the existing ordinance and would like suggestions to improve it based on experiences in other towns. The Board will be more specific once the person meets with them on June 10, 2008.

Selectman Fred Kline asked which CTAP workshop the Board would like to be presented in Pembroke. The Board chose the following topics in order of importance: (1) V. Impact Fees; (2) X. Village/Neighborhood Master Planning; and (3) XII. Traffic Solutions & Walkable Communities.

6. Correspondence

Ms. Alexander said that a Memo from the Town Administrator indicated that the Board of Selectmen have changed their meeting days to the first and third Monday of the month beginning June 2008 and that a tentative schedule was provided.

A letter from Gerry Coogan was received outlining his availability to perform work. He noted that he developed a growth management ordinance for Loudon and assisted the Town of Deerfield with their open space development ordinance.

Ms. Alexander also noted a number of workshops in May and June 2008 that are available to any Board member interested in attending. The information is in the planning office.

7. Committee Reports

Member Krebs said that the Conservation Commission would like the Board's opinion on actively seeking conservation easements on land. Vice Chairman Topliff asked that it be placed on the next work session agenda. Member Krebs also said that the Conservation Commission asked if the Board would be in favor of a landowner placing land use restrictions on a conservation easement such as no hunting. The Commission also said that, based on the amount of time that was spent developing the criteria sheet for determining whether a parcel of land would be accepted or not, it would be unlikely that their rating system would be changed but they would provide better reasoning behind their decisions.

Selectman Kline noted that the Roads Committee will be touring the Town on Saturday, May 3, 2008 and their next meeting will be the following week. He said that Cross Country Road is a concern.

8. Other Business

After reviewing the Notice of Decision and discussing the mylar pertaining to the Estate of Robert Clark and William Field lot line adjustment, the Board agreed that Chairman Bourque should accept and sign the mylar as presented.

Ms. Alexander said that she will not be available for the May 27, 2008 Board meeting. She will leave notes with Mr. Ruggles who will take her place.

It was decided that Mr. Ruggles will be the Planning Board Primary on workshop nights and Ms. Alexander will be the Primary on public hearing nights.

Ms. Alexander will speak to Mr. Ruggles and Jim Boisvert of the Public Works Department regarding residential driveway construction standards and will place it on the agenda. Mr. Ruggles will invite Jim Boisvert and Chief Paulsen to the May 13, 2008 workshop.

Mr. Carlucci stated that the Pembroke Economic Development Committee does not have a Planning Board representative and wondered if any Board member was interested. He said that discussions of expanding the C1 area have been mentioned. Chairman Bourque said that the Board would discuss it.

Member Krebs researched the subdivision regulations and found that there is no definition of "substantial development" or "completion of improvements" and according to RSA 674-39, if there is no definition, then every site plan approval shall be exempt from any changes in the site plan regulations or zoning regulations for 4 years.

Member Krebs drafted a definition for "active and substantial development" and presented it to the Board members.

Chairman Bourque tabled the discussion until the May 13, 2008 work session in order to provide the Members an opportunity to review the data.

Brian Seaworth came before the Board and expressed an interest in joining.

Chairman Bourque asked him to submit a letter to the Planning Board and they will forward it to the Board of Selectmen.

Adjournment

MOTION: Selectmen's Rep. Lewis moved to adjourn. Seconded by Member Terrien.

The vote was unanimous in favor of the Motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jocelyn D. Carlucci
Recording Secretary