

Pembroke Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting
January 24, 2017
ADOPTED

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Topliff, Chairman; Brian Seaworth, Vice Chairman; Larry Young, Sr.; Kathy Cruson; Brent Edmonds; Richard Bean; Vincent Greco, Selectmen's Rep.

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

EXCUSED: Robert Bourque

STAFF PRESENT: Stephanie Verdile, Town Planner; Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary; and Everett Hodge, Code Enforcement Officer

Chairman Topliff called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Old Business-

1. **Government Land Use Proposal by the New Hampshire Army National Guard on Tax Map 632, Lot 18, located at 96 Sheep Davis Rd., in the Commercial/Light Industrial (C1) Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District, the Shoreland Protection (SP) District, and the Floodplain Development (FP) District.** The applicant, Bryan Ruoff, PE of Stantec Consulting Services Inc., on behalf of the New Hampshire Army National Guard has submitted a Governmental Land Use proposal that includes: plans, specifications, explanations of the proposed changes available at time of submission, a statement of the governmental use according to RSA 674:54.I, and a proposed construction schedule. The purpose of the application submission is to allow the Planning Board to issue nonbinding written comments relative to the conformity or nonconformity of the proposal with normally applicable land use regulations.

Continued from December 13, 2016.

Present: Bryan Ruoff, P.E. Project Manager of Stantec; Chief Warrant Officer Larry Rea of the Army National Guard.

Chairman Topliff stated that government entities are required to come before the Planning Board for an informal presentation for an exchange of information. The Planning Board can make comments to the Applicant, the Army National Guard and their representative but all suggestions are nonbinding.

Chief Warrant Officer Rea said the existing Regional Training Site is 99% complete. The tenants will begin to occupy the facility in the next few months. The current proposed facility is a Readiness Center for military police. The center will be used for training, physical education, classrooms and for storing equipment. There will be approximately 70 military policemen training at the site and it will store their law enforcement equipment and military humvees. The assembly hall will also be used as a basketball court. The government has designed the facility as a community multi-use facility. The full time staff will be approximately 3-5 soldiers. The Regional Training Institute is already hosting military and civilian uses.

Chairman Topliff asked if the facility would involve hazardous material that would be a concern to the aquifer. Officer Rea said no.

Officer Rea said the Regional Training Institute address is 722 Riverwood Drive. 96 Sheep Davis Road is not the actual entrance address - Riverwood Drive is.

Member Edmonds asked if any weapons or ammunitions would be stored on site. Officer Rea said there would be organizational weapons but no ammunitions will be stored. Ammunition is stored at ammunition supply points which are normally at the ranges. The military police may have special dispensation that is worked out with the State Police. There is a weapons vault for military police assigned weapons but no ammunition will be stored at the facility.

Susan Burt, 215 Pembroke St. asked if there would be any type of noise coming from the facility.

Officer Rea said there is no shooting range and, therefore would be no shooting coming from the facility and no helicopters landing.

Office Rea said there is a basketball court, and a quarter-mile track at the facility. The goal was to give the soldiers a place to exercise.

Member Edmonds asked if the government planned to compensate the Town of Pembroke in lieu of taxes to cover such things as response by emergency vehicles or any other town services that might have to be on site.

Office Rea said he was only responsible for the construction and the federal money spent in the site construction. He said the National Guard is a state organization that is federally funded. The property and building are owned by the state even though the federal government built it. He did not have an answer to that question.

Mr. Ruoff described the facility. He said it was an expansion of the existing Army National Guard facility off of 96 Sheep Davis Road. There is a road access way from Riverwood Drive. There is an asphalt driveway of approximately 875 ft. to a personal parking area and to a military parking area.

The building consists of: An assembly area, classrooms, lockers, gymnasium, fitness, heated storage, a kitchen area for large assembly, a fully supplied fire suppression system, and a natural gas emergency generator.

Mr. Ruoff said that Stantec Engineering has met with the Town's Technical Review Committee (TRC), the Pembroke Water Works, Pembroke Sewer Commission, Liberty Utilities, Eversource, and Northern Pass to ensure that the plans were not disrupting any proposed plans or existing easements. The facility is currently in the overhead easement for Eversource wires and Stantec has coordinated everything with Eversource. They have also met with Liberty Utilities regarding the road that goes over their 12" steel distribution gas main.

Because of the area of disturbance (approximately 340,000 sq. ft.), the project requires an NHES Alteration of Terrain permit that has not been submitted. They are awaiting a report by the National Guard. The site consists of open and closed drainage systems. It contains catch basins in the rear and sheet flow to the South of the site along with 2 detention basins which will utilize infiltration as part of NHDS AOT requirements. The site is all sand and highly infiltratable.

There were two comments from the Town Engineer. One was to move the detention basin away from a steep slope which is being incorporated as part of the 100% design. Mr. Ruoff could not recall the second comment from Pembroke's engineer but said that they were incorporating that as well.

There will be secure access to the site with gates at the edge of the easement and into the military parking areas. There will be chain link fencing around the military vehicle parking area and there will be a wood rail at the far reaching perimeter of the site similar to what is already present.

They propose to use Town water and sewer. They have a proposed pump station on site which will be sent to the discharge point on Riverwood Drive. They will be coming into the site with an 8" duct line water pipe supplied by the Town. Per Stantec's meeting with the Sewer Commissioners, they will be separating the discharge point. In other words they will be separating the private portion of the sewer line from the public by adding a single discharge point manhole for the 2 forced mains -- one for the existing facility and one for the proposed facility making the proposed manhole a private use manhole where the 2 forced mains discharge and then going to a public use manhole where it goes to gravity at that point. Mr. Ruoff said that that was the Sewer Commissioners' definition between a public and private system.

The site will incorporate landscaping. Private vehicle parking will also be on the facility.

Officer Rea said the plans for the facility will be 100% complete in February 2017, the bid process will begin in the spring with the start of construction later in 2017.

He also said the facility is an LEAD silver certification design consisting of a tight envelope and high condensing boilers. They tried to incorporate everything we can to meet LEAD silver.

Officer Rea recommended that the public tour the facility. He encouraged the Town to use the facility if they needed classrooms or the gymnasium. He said that it would be for rent to the public.

Ms. Verdile asked what the disturbance area was. Mr. Ruoff said that he needed the Alteration of Terrain permit for 100,000 sq. ft. He said that he thought that the actual disturbance area was 340,000 sq. ft.

Ms. Verdile asked Mr. Ruoff if he was required to get an EPA permit due to the amount of land area disturbance because anything over an acre required an EPA permit. Mr. Ruoff said he would research that.

There were no further questions from the Board or the public. The Board thanked them for their patience and agreeing to attend this meeting as they were continued from the December 13, 2016 meeting due to lack of time to review the application.

New Business-

1. **Minor Subdivision Application, Lot Line Adjustment #16-06, G. Stetson Heiser Revocable Trust, owner of Tax Map 941, Lot 42, located at 356-372 Academy Road in the R-1 Medium Density-Residential; R-3 Residential Rural/Agricultural Zone, and the Aquifer Conservation District and Justin West, owner of Tax Map 941, Lot 42-1 located at 374 Academy Rd. in the R-1 Medium Density-Residential; R-3 Residential Rural/Agricultural Zone, and the Aquifer Conservation District** are proposing to adjust the boundary line between the referenced lots in order to transfer approximately 1.06 acres from Lot 42 to Lot 42-1. The lot line adjustment will leave Lot 42 with approximately 31.5 acres and Lot 42-1 with approximately 12.80 acres.

Present: Ammy and Stetson Heiser.

Ms. Verdile said the waiver requests were in order. They are for C, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, Q, S, U, V, W, and X. There was an acreage error on the plan and Ms. Verdile said that she has spoken with the agent and it will be corrected prior to signature.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Seaworth moved to grant the waiver requests for Minor Subdivision #16-06 and accept the application as complete. Seconded by Member Young.

VOTE:	A. Topliff – Y	B. Seaworth – Y	V. Greco – Y
	L. Young – Y	B. Edmonds – Y	K. Cruson – Y
	R. Bean - Y		

MOTION TO GRANT THE WAIVER REQUESTS FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION #16-06 AND ACCEPT THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

Chairman Topliff opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m.

Stetson Heiser said when they sold the property on Academy Road, they told the buyer that it would be available for current use.

Ammy Heiser stated their surveyor was not aware that current use requirements had changed. Because of the setback that is now instituted as part of current use, the driveway could not be calculated as lot size so an additional .7 acres was needed to qualify. The lot line adjustment will allow Mr. West to have his acreage in current use.

Richard Giordano, 136 Dudley Hill Road, asked what the lot line adjustment could mean in terms of a minor subdivision.

Chairman Topliff said the zoning ordinances have specific types of applications- one of which is a minor subdivision. Anytime someone takes one piece of land and makes 2 or more lots out of it, it is called a minor subdivision. A subdivision does not necessarily imply that they will be building homes.

Ms. Heiser said their intention was to sell the house and keep the remaining land as conservation. They have no desire to develop the land. They also did not want to sell it to someone who might do that, so they kept the property and sold the house with a portion of the land with the intention to keep the lot with house in current use.

Ms. Verdile read aloud the conditions of approval.

There being no further questions from the Board or the public, Chairman Topliff closed the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

MOTION: Member Edmonds moved to approve minor subdivision application case #16-06 with the following conditions:

1. Provide the signatures of all property owners and professionals on the final plan and Mylar.
2. All waivers granted and conditions of approval are listed on the plan with the date granted.
3. The updated land area needs to be shown on Lot 42-1.
4. Monuments are to be set in all required locations.

Seconded by Vice Chairman Seaworth.

VOTE:	A. Topliff – Y	B. Seaworth – Y	V. Greco – Y
	L. Young – Y	B. Edmonds – Y	K. Cruson – Y
	R. Bean - Y		

MOTION TO APPROVE MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION CASE #16-06 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. **PROVIDE THE SIGNATURES OF ALL PROPERTY OWNERS AND PROFESSIONALS ON THE FINAL PLAN AND MYLAR.**
2. **ALL WAIVERS GRANTED AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ARE LISTED ON THE PLAN WITH THE DATE GRANTED.**
3. **THE UPDATED LAND AREA NEEDS TO BE SHOWN ON LOT 42-1.**
4. **MONUMENTS ARE TO BE SET IN ALL REQUIRED LOCATIONS.**

PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

2. **Special Use Permit Application, SUP-WP #16-312, Ross E. Williams Family Limited Partnership, owner of Tax Map 937, Lot 1, located at 339 North Pembroke Rd. in the Rural/Agriculture-Residential (R3) Zone and in the Wetlands Protection (WP) Overlay District, The applicant, Timothy Bernier of T.F. Bernier, Inc. on behalf of the property owner Ross E. Williams Family Limited**

Partnership, requests a Special Use Permit from Article 143.72. D (2), Wetlands Protection District, which is required for the construction of streets, roads, and other access ways and utility rights-of-way, if essential to the productive use of adjoining land. This permit is associated with the Major Subdivision Plan application. Sub #16-07.

- 3. Minor Subdivision Application, #16-07 Ross E. Williams Family Limited Partnership, owner of Tax Map 937, Lot 1, located at 339 North Pembroke Rd. in the Rural/Agriculture-Residential (R3) Zone and in the Wetlands Protection (WP) Overlay District,** The applicant, Timothy Bernier of T.F. Bernier, Inc. on behalf of the property owner Ross E. Williams Family Limited Partnership, proposes a minor subdivision for three (3) lots ranging in size from approximately 22 acres to approximately 2.0 acres.

Present: Tim Bernier of TF Bernier Inc.; and Doug Ricard, realtor representing the Ross E. Williams Family

Ms. Verdile said the applicant has requested a waiver from the Subdivision Review Regulations: Part A checklist items C, K, M, P, R, S, and W which, in her opinion, are reasonable. They have also received the State Subdivision and Wetland Permits.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Seaworth moved to grant the waiver requests and accept the application as complete. Seconded by Member Young.

VOTE:	A. Topliff – Y	B. Seaworth – Y	V. Greco – Y
	L. Young – Y	B. Edmonds – Y	K. Cruson – Y
	R. Bean – Y		

MOTION TO GRANT THE WAIVER REQUESTS AND ACCEPT THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

Chairman Topliff opened the public hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Mr. Bernier said the parcel consists of 37 acres which the Ross Williams family would like to subdivide into 3 lots. There will be 907 ft. of frontage on N. Pembroke Road across from Hardy Road. The frontages are: 310 ft., 304 ft., and 292 ft. where 200 ft is required. There is an existing house on Lot 1. There was enough frontage to subdivide 4 lots, but the Ross Family preferred 3 lots.

The largest lot is Lot 2 with 22.7 acres, Lot 3 has 12 acres, Lot 1 is 2.6 acres with the existing house.

Mr. Bernier said they received State septic approval for the house lot. There is also wetland that runs through the property behind the house with a naturally occurring detention area which was created when N. Pembroke Road was initially built.

All the drainage will run to the proposed 15” culvert.

They designed a driveway to access the area and run across the wetlands. There are snowmobile trails, and wood roads.

Mr. Bernier said the Conservation Commission asked why they could not cross the property up further in order to get away from the wetlands. When he reviewed the plans more closely, Mr. Bernier realized that some of the contour lines were missing which made the land look much flatter than it actually was. The grade from the edge of pavement to the property line is 10 ft.

There is an existing gravel crossing of the wetlands with a culvert that they wanted to use in order to avoid making a second crossing. If they crossed the wetland higher on the property and moved the driveway over, the square footage of the buffer impact would be about the same. Everything on one side of the hill would go toward a ditch (roadside ditch at 8%) to N. Pembroke Road. He did not want to cause additional water problems to the already existing water issues along N. Pembroke Road. There is presently 690 ft. of total wetland impact. There would be much more impact if they crossed higher.

The property consists of a number of large hills. He said that they tried to do the best they could to get a reasonable driveway on the property along with reasonable grades, reasonable issues with storm water, and minimize the wetland impacts. In order to get a culvert under the road, there is quite a bit of regrading that must be done because the curb is so steep. The drainage is very shallow through the area. Mr. Bernier said that they felt that a culvert was needed. There are areas that will need regrading but the majority is close to grade. There will not be any major cutting and filling in order to build a driveway.

Ms. Verdile said she received an e-mail request for more information from Patricia Boucher of 339 N. Pembroke Road. She asked about drainage and wanted a copy of the Technical Review Committee minutes which Ms. Verdile sent to her.

Ms. Verdile read aloud Ms. Boucher's response:

"We also have concerns about water runoff and drainage. The section of our property which is directly behind 338 North Pembroke Road (which is across from 339 North Pembroke Road) has water run off issues already. Our pasture and meadow flood and have been negatively impacted by improper drainage and lack of drainage. Additional stress on an inadequate system can only compromise our property further. In addition, the utility road which is directly across from our driveway, floods as well. The culvert in front of our property at #344 does not direct the water run off properly which negatively impacts our driveway and the land behind it. Any additional usage or stress to this area would compromise our property further. Since I am unable to attend tonight's meeting, I'd like to have our concerns recorded in the minutes."

Mr. Bernier said he has not had any time to go out and research her property. He did point out on the map the location of Ms. Boucher's property. He stated that #344 North Pembroke Road is quite a ways up, vertically, from the project. He said Ms. Boucher's house is approximately 16 ft. higher

than the driveway and all the drainage from both house sites and the driveway will discharge to the 15" culvert which is even lower. He said that the Ross Williams' development will not affect Ms. Boucher. He suggested that she speak to the Road Agent to take care of the water drainage issues.

Ms. Verdile said at the TRC meeting, Jim Boisvert, the Director of Public Works focused on the driveway locations. There was no discussion about drainage issues.

Member Bean asked how long the driveway would be.

Mr. Bernier said approximately 680 ft.

Member Bean asked if the driveway would be put in before or after the lot is sold.

Mr. Bernier said it would be up to the buyer but there is no need to build a driveway until the house is under construction. He said that the wetland permit is good for 5 years. He also said that the driveways are designed at 12 ft. widths but are usually constructed at 10 ft.

Chairman Topliff said in the past, the Fire Chief has had difficulties with long steep grade driveways. He asked if the Fire Chief commented on the length of the driveway.

Ms. Verdile said no.

Chairman Topliff said that driveway standards would have to be followed.

Mr. Bernier said the steepest grade on the driveway is 3-1/2%. He said that the crown of the road is 2%. The driveway will be 680 ft.

Member Bean asked what would happen to the snowmobile trails.

Mr. Bernier said that it would be up to the property owner.

Member Edmonds said Mr. Bernier's comments about drainage runoff and wetland minimizing impact is quite appropriate. He said the Conservation Commission discussed the snow mobile trail and no one on the Commission knew what the official status was of the trail except that it was significantly used. Mr. Edmonds also said the Commission heard from an individual who was involved in snowmobile trail siting and in all cases, whether the trails were State maintained trails or private trails, it is incumbent upon the local riders to work out any right-of-entry agreements with the property owner. He said if the trail gets relocated or obliterated and the snowmobile club wanted to cut a new trail, they would have to discuss it with the new owner. If the snowmobiler is on someone's property without permission, that person is trespassing. The land owner can bar the property.

Member Bean said he felt that the Board should do a site review.

Chairman Topliff asked what Member Bean thought that the Board would learn from a site review. Mr. Bean said that he did not know.

Chairman Topliff said it is fairly common for people to have concerns when things are changed in their neighborhood. If Mr. Bernier, as a registered land surveyor, says that Ms. Boucher's property is upgrade from the site, then it is so. The Board has to look at whether there is anything about this subdivision that would make an existing drainage issue worse. The Board can encourage Ms. Boucher to contact Town Hall and the Highway Department. From a Planning Board perspective, unless the Board can identify something in the proposal that would exacerbate the existing drainage, the Board could go see the site but there may not be any value to it. The report from the Town's Engineer found no issue with the proposal.

Member Bean said he would look at the site.

Member Edmonds said that, given the information presented by Mr. Bernier, the abutter is impacted more by the existing conditions. He felt that her discussion should be with the Director of Public Works.

Member Cruson agreed. She said it does not seem that it would be possible that any changes to the grade would affect Ms. Boucher's property. She also said that she would not hold anything up for that reason.

Bruce Laccaillade, 321 N. Pembroke Road, said the applicant's property is a deer yard. He showed photos of the proposed spot for one of the houses and pointed out that the area is all dug up from the deer. He said that the deer are attracted to the area because of the wetlands and the surrounding fields. He also showed photos of the snowmobile trail which was also dug up from the deer. He was concerned that, as the Town grows, the wildlife area is being lost. He said it would be a shame to see one of the last few good deer yards destroyed.

Member Cruson said the Conservation Commission discusses land preservation but probably not the preservation of deer yards.

Chairman Topliff asked Ms. Verdile if there was a phrase such as land size, that would prompt an investigation of such topics.

Ms. Verdile said if a grid map was filed with the NH Historical Preservation organization, the State would research the topics. To her knowledge, it is just for endangered species and not for existing wildlife use.

Miguel Grenier, 338 N. Pembroke Road, lives across from the existing house on Lot 1. He said that Ms. Boucher and the field that she spoke of is behind them. He agreed that there is a great deal of runoff from the applicant's property. Across from Ms. Boucher's driveway is an access road on the North side of the property. (He referred to the map and pointed to a metal shed at the back of the house.) The runoff from the applicant's property along with runoff from Mr. Genier's property affects Ms. Boucher's property.

With regard to the snowmobile trail, Mr. Grenier said it is known as 15 North which is a major North-South corridor. It is the only way to get North from Bear Brook on this side of the river. He

said that the snowmobile club will have an issue relocating the trail because it comes to Hardy Road and crosses over.

Mr. Grenier said that if someone stands at the driveway for Lot 2 and looks toward Concord, there is a 12-15 ft. hill. He said that the topographical maps are inaccurate. If someone at that location looks left toward Epsom, there is a bend in the road which makes it impossible to see a car coming until its too late. Because of the elevation change on N. Pembroke Road, an on-coming car cannot be seen until it is at Mr. Grenier's driveway.

With regard to Driveway #3, there is an issue with elevation. If a person looks toward Epsom, a car cannot be seen until it is at Mr. Lacklaid's house.

With regard to the locations of the houses, especially on Lot 2, the house is on the side of the hill. He suggested that the Board walk the property. The well is on top of the hill and the septic is on the side of the hill next to the wetlands. The water is draining because of the hills.

Mr. Grenier said there would need to be more excavation done than Mr. Bernier has mentioned. He also said that N. Pembroke Road is a 30 mph road but in the summer, motorists travel at approximately 45 mph. Site lines, lot locations and driveways were Mr. Grenier's major concerns. He said that two cars had gone off the road this week and landed in front of his home.

Mr. Bernier said that subdivision approval from the State was not required because the lots were 22 and 12 acres, but they did dig test pits to make sure that the location could support a septic system.

Mr. Bernier said that Mr. Williams was not being greedy. The land could support 4 lots but he only wanted 3. A great deal of land is being preserved by default on the 22 acre lot. He is hoping that the price of the 22 acre lot will be affordable enough that someone who would like to preserve it could purchase it.

Mr. Bernier said the Road Agent and the Police Chief went out to see the driveway locations. The Road Agent's only concern was that a few trees should be cut for site distance.

With regard to the drainage on the existing house lot, there is a ridge that runs through the field. Everything from that ridge located on the house lot drains toward the road. Mr. Bernier said that he could see that, but is not proposing any change to that house which is completely in the building setback and very close to the road.

Mr. Bernier said there is very little drainage on one side of the road. He said that they are not proposing any construction to the lot other than the driveway. When he designed the culvert, he had the drainage issues in mind. He said that there are no existing culverts in the driveways at the existing house and no distance line either. He said that it is an old house which is right on the road. The right-of-way line goes right across the front steps of the front door.

Mr. Ricard said that Mr. Williams decided to keep the lots large enough so a buyer could keep the land in current use and not feel forced to build a house right a way. He said that nothing being

proposed would increase the drainage on any lot. Mr. Ricard said that it is all natural drainage except for the one place where it continues under the road.

Mr. Ricard said this subdivision will enable Mr. Williams to sell the land while keeping the character of the area.

Jordan Graustark, 328 N. Pembroke Road, said that any driveway that is built on the site will be a blind driveway because of the dangerous curve. She said that because her driveway is opposite the border of the applicant's land and is also down from the property, all the water in her driveway comes from N. Pembroke Road.

Mr. Bernier said that 328 N. Pembroke Road was the lowest property.

Ms. Graustark said that her house has a setback of approximately 70 ft.

Mr. Bernier said that the proposed driveway for Lot 3 is directly across from her driveway. The house would be built approximately 250 ft. back because of the wetlands in the front. The only thing that will be cleared would be the driveway curb cut across the street from Ms. Graustark's lot. With regard to drainage, Mr. Bernier said that there is a natural detention area for all of the second lot except when there is extreme weather and it overflows and crosses through the culvert just North of Ms. Graustark's property line.

Mr. Bernier said that presently the road has a 12" culvert. They have proposed an 15" culvert so that it would help the drainage in the road.

Chairman Topliff said that the Town Engineer has not been a party to the discussions on drainage. He suggested that the Board ask the Town Engineer to look at drainage concerns and validate whether there would be any negative impact to the existing drainage situation as a result of the subdivision.

He also said that there is nothing in the ordinance that has to do with wildlife, therefore there is nothing that the Board can do. He suggested that Ms. Verdile speak with Central NH Regional Planning to validate that there are no State requirements relative to wildlife impact.

And lastly, Chairman Topliff said a site walk was suggested but because the ground is snow covered, wetlands may be difficult to see, but the Board may get a sense of the slopes.

Member Cruson said she was concerned about the line of sight for the driveways and would like the time to go out and view the property. She suggested that the Director of Public Works be asked to look at the site for possibility of driveways, and hazards.

Chairman Topliff said that the regulations require 200 ft. of sight from both directions.

Ms. Verdile said the comments from Jim Boisvert, Director of Public Works, were related to the culverts, the driveway locations, and sight distance. She said that if the Board has more concerns, they could ask the Roads Committee to provide their input.

Mr. Bernier said they staked out the driveways and Mr. Boisvert checked them. Mr. Boisvert indicated that they were okay. He pointed out the vegetation that he would like removed when the driveways are built.

Ms. Cruson asked Mr. Bernier if he felt good about the line of sight at the property. Mr. Bernier said yes. He admitted that the existing house was the worse situation because it is at the top of the hill which is where the curve comes around.

Mr. Bernier said that he would make sure that the grade stakes are still marking the driveway locations.

Member Young said that the Police Chief was going to go out and make an observation because of accidents that occurred. Member Young said although the Town might require 200 ft. for line of sight, if someone is traveling over the speed limit, it would not be adequate. Perhaps the speed limit should be reduced to 25 mph.

There being no further questions from the public or the Board, Chairman Topliff closed the public hearing at 8:41 p.m. He said that the agenda items would be continued until February 28, 2017. Abutters would not be renoticed so he advised them to refer to the Town's website and to monitor the Planning Board agendas.

Ms. Verdile said that she would share all the concerns with Mr. Boisvert.

Member Bean suggested the Board members look at the site individually.

Mr. Bernier suggested that Ms. Verdile also ask Mr. Boisvert to look at the drainage. He said that perhaps Mr. Boisvert could do something about Ms. Boucher's concerns.

MOTION: MEMBER BEAN MOVED TO CONTINUE NEW BUSINESS AGENDA #2 AND #3 TO FEBRUARY 28, 2017. SECONDED BY MEMBER YOUNG. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Chairman Topliff recessed the meeting and excused himself at 8:51 p.m.

Vice Chairman Seaworth reconvened the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

2017 ZONING AMENDMENTS

Vice Chairman Seaworth said this was the final public hearing on the 2017 Zoning Amendments.

Vice Chairman Seaworth opened the public hearing at 8:58 p.m. on Zoning Amendment #2

Zoning Amendment #2

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town Zoning Ordinance as follows:

ARTICLE VIII - Signs (§ 143-57 — § 143-66)

§ 143-58 General requirements.

A. The following are prohibited in all districts unless stated otherwise herein:

F. Non-conforming signs:

- (1) Continuance: A non-conforming sign lawfully existing at the time of adoption or subsequent amendment of this section may continue, although such sign does not conform to the provisions of this section, unless, however, said sign poses a safety problem as defined in 143-58 (C) Safety Standards.

§ 143-60 Sign regulations.

In the following Dimensional Table of Signs the symbols shall mean:

C. The letter (V) shall indicate that the size of the permitted sign varies.

§ 143-62 Dimensional Table of Signs.

Signs permitted in each district shall be as set forth in the following Dimensional Table of Signs:

TYPE	R1	R3	B1	B2	C1	LO	Special Conditions
Portable Signs	P	P	P	P	P	P	§ 143-63(J)
	12	12	12	12	12	12	
	(T)	(T)	(T)	(T)	(T)	(T)	

§143-63 Special conditions for specific types of signs.

In addition to the standards set forth in the Dimensional Table of signs, signs shall also adhere to the following special conditions:

- B. Free-Standing: A self-supporting sign not attached to any building, wall or fence, but in a fixed location. (This does not include portable signs.
- I. Window signs: Any sign which is painted or mounted onto a window pane, or which is hung directly inside the window. (Such signs shall be counted towards the number of signs permitted on a lot.

There being no comments from the public or Board, Vice Chairman Seaworth closed the public hearing at 9:04 p.m. on Zoning Amendment #2.

MOTION: MEMBER BEAN MOVED TO ACCEPT ZONING AMENDMENT #2 AS PRESENTED AND SEND ZONING AMENDMENT #2 TO TOWN MEETING. SECONDED BY SELECTMEN'S REP. GRECO. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Proposed Zoning Amendment #4

To amend Zoning Ordinance Section 143-28.G as follows:

§ 143-28 Minor Home Business

G. There shall be no advertising on the premises other than as provided under § 143-62, Dimensional Table of Signs.

To amend Zoning Ordinance Section 143-29.G as follows:

§ 143-29 Major Home Business.

G. There shall be no advertising on the premises other than as provided under § 143-62, Dimensional Table of Signs.

Vice Chairman Seaworth opened the public hearing on Zoning Amendment #4 at 9:06 p.m.

He said that the Home Businesses referred to a portion of the sign ordinance that was being stricken. Zoning Amendment #4 removes the reference.

There being no comments from the public or the Board, Vice Chairman Seaworth closed the public hearing at 9:07 p.m.

MOTION: SELECTMEN'S REP. GRECO MOVED TO ACCEPT ZONING AMENDMENT #4 AS PRESENTED AND SEND ZONING AMENDMENT #4 TO TOWN MEETING. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Minutes- January 10, 2017.

MOTION: MEMBER YOUNG MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 2017 AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY MEMBER EDMONDS. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Miscellaneous

1. Correspondence-

Ms. Verdile said that she received Business New Hampshire Magazine.

2. Committee Reports-

Conservation Commission: Member Edmonds said that he had nothing further to add to his previous comments regarding the lot line adjustment and the subdivision.

Board of Selectmen: Selectmen Greco said that the Board is working on the budgets in preparation for Town Meeting.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that this year the Budget Committee will hold the budget hearing on a Thursday night rather than a Saturday morning. They are hoping that holding it on a weeknight would allow more people to come.

3. Audience Items-

Wayne Burt, 215 Pembroke Street, said that he thought there would be a discussion on the 110 lot development which met with the Zoning Board of Adjustment on January 23, 2017.

Mrs. Burt asked where her questions pertaining to the development could be sent. She was told to send them to Ms. Verdile who would, in turn, forward them to the project engineer.

MOTION: Selectmen's Rep. Greco moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Member Bean. Unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary