

**Pembroke Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
(ADOPTED)
April 24, 2018**

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

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Robert Bourque

EXCUSED: Kellie Dyjak

STAFF PRESENT: Carolyn Cronin, Town Planner; David Jodoin, Town Administrator; Matt Monahan of Central NH Regional Planning Commission; Susan Gifford, Recording Secretary

Guests: Michael Vignale, Town Engineer and James Boisvert, Director of Public Works, Fire Chief Harold Paulsen.

Chairman Topliff called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. He welcomed Carolyn Cronin as the new Town Planner.

Old Business-

1. **Special Use Permit Application SUP-AC #17-304, Timothy Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, LLC, acting as the applicant on behalf of Keystone Pembroke, LLC, 17 Bridge Street, Unit 103 Billerica, MA, owner of Tax Map 634 Lot 1, located at 31-39 Whittemore Road in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.** The applicant requests a Special Use Permit from Article 143-68.E, Aquifer Conservation District for construction roads, utilities, infrastructure, and building lots for a three (3) lot subdivision and an Open Space Development. A Special Use Permit is required for any activity taking place within the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District. This permit is associated with the Major Subdivision Plan Application #17-03. *Continued from March 27, 2018.*
2. **Special Use Permit Application, SUP-WP #17-305, Timothy Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, LLC, acting as the applicant on behalf of Keystone Pembroke, LLC, 17 Bridge Street, Unit 103 Billerica, MA, owner of Tax Map 634 Lot 1, located at 31-39 Whittemore Road in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.** The applicant 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 #17-03. *Continued from March 27, 2018.*
3. **Special Use Permit Application, SUP-OSD #17-306, Timothy Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, LLC, acting as the applicant on behalf of Keystone Pembroke, LLC, 17 Bridge Street, Unit 103 Billerica, MA, owner of Tax Map 634 Lot 1, located at 31-39 Whittemore Road in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.** The applicant requests a Special Use Permit per Article

XVIII Special Use Permits and Article X Open Space Development for the design and construction of an Open Space Development (OSD) and for OSD Reduction in Specification Standards. This permit is associated with the Major Subdivision Plan Application #17-03. *Continued from March 27, 2018.*

- 4. Major Subdivision Plan #17-03, Timothy Peloquin, Promised Land Survey, LLC, acting as the applicant on behalf of Keystone Pembroke, LLC, 17 Bridge Street, Unit 103 Billerica, MA, owner of Tax Map 634 Lot 1, located at 31-39 Whittemore Road in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.** The applicant proposes to subdivide Map 634 Lot 1 into three (3) single family lots and construct an Open Space Development consisting of eighteen (18) 4-plex two-bedroom units for a total of 75 residential dwelling units. The total area of the lot is approximately 88.8 acres with 23.54 acres developed for residential use, approximately 31.99 acres reserved for future activity for the Pembroke Pines Golf Course, and 33.3 acres to be dedicated/deeded to the Town of Pembroke/Conservation Commission. *Continued from March 27, 2018.*

Present: Timothy Peloquin of Promised Land Survey, LLC, Robert MacCormack, and Stephen Pernaw, P.E., Stephen Pernaw and Company.

Chairman Topliff said that this was the original agenda item/application. The applicant has worked with the Planning Board and the numbers and division of land have changed.

Chairman Topliff stated that the first discussion tonight is to discuss the best options for the roads – Nadine Drive, Par, Whittemore and Bow Lane.

Mr. Monahan of CNHRPC said that the main priority of any solution is safety, what makes the intersection of Route 3 and Whittemore Road a safe intersection. Also, the board should think holistically about the entire area.

Chairman Topliff stated that he had been considering that no one is advocating for the future residents of Keystone Pembroke LLC's development and their safety. He would appreciate hearing input from the Donna Drive neighborhood considering the full scope of the area. The Public Works Director and the Fire Chief are present this evening. Chairman Topliff hopes to get a balanced discussion on road safety.

Chairman Topliff reopened the public hearing at 7:08 pm on Old Business Agenda Items 1 through 4 all related to Major Subdivision Plan #17-03.

Mr. Peloquin said that his client came to the town early last fall and has had wonderful negotiations on how to make the best development possible. We have secured all State permits. The last issue as we understand it is roads and whether to abandon the gate. Lastly, we will try to seek approval if the board sees fit in the next month or two.

Stephen Pernaw, Traffic Engineer, reported that he met at the site of the intersection with Matt Monahan, Carolyn Cronin and Mike Vignale to present options for the intersection. Mr. Pernaw referred to his traffic study of August 2017 and the addendum of October 2017. His client asked him to speak 7 minutes about the gate situation and 7 minutes

about possible mitigation. He presented 5 conclusions regarding the Whittemore/Donna Drive/Bow Lane area if the gate is open. The ZBA has removed the condition that a gate be installed.

- Open roads provide additional access for emergency vehicles in both neighborhoods.
 - Without a gate, there is an alternative means of access to the north.
 - With three egresses there would be a decrease of (-18) in traffic on Route 3.
 - The impact north of Whittemore or south of Bow Lane is the same.
 - Whittemore has only one way out. Residents may prefer to use the signal at Bow Lane to head north. Without a gate there are two ways in and out of Whittemore, and residents have a choice of routes. Stephen Pernaw. presented five mitigation options for the intersection of Route 3 and Whittemore Road, bearing in mind that Route 3 is a State of New Hampshire highway and any changes need to be approved and executed by NH DOT. The pm peak load is 64 with no build and 110 with build.
1. Do nothing. The left turn into Whittemore Drive has not been problematic. The distance from the double yellow line to the curb is 19.5 feet where the ideal would be 21 feet.
 2. Left turn on a minor street using two approach lanes, freeing vehicles to take the right turn without waiting for those taking a left turn.
 3. Widen the shoulder area on Pembroke Street to 10 foot bypass for 300-400 feet.
 4. Widen the entire road and have an exclusive left lane turn with storage for two vehicles. Again, this is up to Town and NH DOT.
 5. Have a three lane road with central turning lane in a continuous corridor.

Stephen Pernaw noted that the Town of Pembroke does not currently assess an impact fee. The Town could assess a fair share contribution to the developer for any project selected to mitigate the intersection. The amount would need to meet a rational nexus. For example, 17% of the am peak load makes a left turn and 48% of the pm peak load turn into Whittemore.

Member Cruson asked what the shoulder width is currently. It is 8 feet. Vice Chairman Seaworth is concerned with what is on the side of the road if any widening is done – steep slopes, sidewalk, retaining wall in the setback and a fire hydrant.

Town Engineer Mike Vignale said he met with NH DOT. The cost and feasibility of option 3 may be reasonable, with the increase from 13 to 25 vehicles turning left. Any plan for wider shoulder use must be submitted for NH DOT review.

Member Bean is concerned that with alternative 2 or 3, the table on Whittemore cannot be lengthened to hold more vehicles.

Rick Mulcahy, 17 Melissa Drive, asked is there going to be more traffic turning left into the gas station, Lang's and the chiropractor. Why did NH DOT feel a wider shoulder may be appropriate? Vice Chairman Seaworth stated that NH DOT was considering the number of cars stacking for a vehicle to take a left turn. Selectmen's Rep Bond asked if the left hand turn figure includes new residents. 13 left turns are current situation and 25 left

turns is with new residents included. Also, aren't there certain sections of Route 3 where parking is not allowed?

Town Manager David Jodoin clarified that the sidewalk on Pembroke Street is 4 ½ feet wide and DPW cannot get a snow plow down it in the winter. If the sidewalk is moved or altered it must be brought into compliance with ADA and it is not possible to put a 5 foot sidewalk in that location.

Selectmen's Rep Bond asked when the State is planning to pave Route 3. Mr. Boisvert said the project went out to bid 2 weeks ago and may be completed in 2018. Member Cruson noted that the town accepted federal funds to make the bike path along Pembroke Street.

Mr. MacCormack, applicant, stated that he agrees with Mr. Monahan that it really is a matter of safety on Donna Drive, Bow Lane, and Whittemore. He met with Mike Vignale and found out that Route 3 is out of compliance by 18 inches. Any mitigation must keep a straight traffic line. We are lucky we have not had serious accidents in this location, and a resident's driveway is located in the way of implementing several options. Rather than proposing any work on Route 3, Mr. MacCormack is offering an exaction fee of \$30,000 for whatever work the town feels needs to be done as an impact of the proposed development.

Mr. MacCormack wants safety for people who come to the golf course, current residents and new residents. At the start, it seemed simple to put the development on a dead end road. After reviewing the meaning of "public road," where anyone can travel the road, Mr. MacCormack considered it would be safest to offer his people a choice to go to Bow Lane for safe egress at a signalized intersection. He recommends keeping the road open and using the exaction fee to complete any work required.

Fire Chief Paulsen agreed that having a through street is safest situation for everyone. Mr. Boisvert, DPW director, stated that his crew does not like hammerheads. They are a safety issue. If the whole corridor of Route 3 cannot be done properly, he does not recommend using partial solutions. The sidewalks cannot be maintained in winter.

Vice Chairman Seaworth spoke about the Roads Commission discussions, where members had a sense of larger safety concerns but did not take a stand on any mitigation option.

Ann Whytemare, 730 Borough Road, said she has a 15 year old who is learning to drive and traffic is not supposed to pass other cars on the right. She is terrified to let her 12 year old son ride his bike on Pembroke Street.

Mike Vignale confirmed that left turn accommodations were discussed because of the increase in number of left turns with the development. NH DOT felt that option 3; the shoulder widening may be beneficial. Selectmen's Rep Bond asked about an exaction fee offered for potential work on a state maintained road. Could the exaction fee be used for any related purpose?

Chairman Topliff stated that exaction fees could be used for work the town felt was needed in the context of the development project. Member Bean stated that the fee was equivalent to \$400 per unit.

Mr. Peloquin stated that the town has to apply to NH DOT for any change to Pembroke Street. Chairman Topliff stated that improvements to Bow Lane where it is narrow would be a safety enhancement. Selectmen's Rep Bond asked if the exaction fee had gone before the Board of Selectmen yet. It has not. Town Manager David Jodoin said that per RSA the funds would be put into an escrow interest bearing account and could be used for culverts or maintenance in the area for a period of six years.

Stephen Pernaw stated that if the gate is left open, left turn increase is one, or minimal. Alternate Member Bourque stated that there would be three entrances to the neighborhood, and not all would go onto Whittemore. A departure lane would help right turns. Alternate Member Bourque stated that Nadine Drive needs to be ungated.

Matt Monahan read RSA 674-21 V.(J.). The exaction fee must be used on highway, drainage, sewer or water improvements necessitated by the development and there is a time period of six years to spend the funds.

Rick Mulcahy, 17 Melissa Drive, asked about restricting access on Par Lane, one of 28 cul-de-sacs in the Town of Pembroke. Chairman Topliff had nothing to offer on this topic as it was not relevant to this application.

Ms. Cronin, Town Planner, read a letter dated April 24, 2018 from Janet Sanderson Pitman Anderson who was unable to attend the meeting. Her family house was built in 1775 with stone boundary. She is opposed to additional traffic on Whittemore Road.

Chairman Topliff conducted a straw poll on whether to restrict access emergency vehicles. Members asked whether the road is public or private. It is not clear from the plans. If a gate is in place the road is private, and with no gate it is public. If the new road is built to town standards, the developer can petition the town to accept it as a town road in the future.

Member Bean stated that with no gate, traffic will disburse to three exits. Member Bean does not like the table on top of Whittemore Road which can only hold two vehicles. It is unsafe in winter. Mr. Monahan defers to the safest option. Ms. Cronin said based on traffic volume, ungated road appears safest. Vice Chairman Seaworth is not in favor of restricted access. Selectmen's Rep Bond abstained as she lives in the neighborhood, but noted that her neighbors purchased their properties as being on a dead end road. Alternate Member Bourque would recommend changing Par Drive to "Nadine Drive" all the way through.

Mr. MacCormack said that originally, Par Drive was proposed as separate but now would be Nadine Drive all the way with no gate, and would allow through traffic. Member Young prefers no gate, and open road. Member Edmonds would like to see signs posted to discourage pass through traffic. Chairman Topliff would like wide open roads rooted in safety concerns. The 911 issue would like the extended road called "Nadine Drive". Selectmen's Rep Bond asked who her neighbors would address to request a STOP sign.

That would be the Board of Selectmen and the Police. Town Planner Jodoin asked what speed is posted on Nadine Drive. It is currently posted 25 miles per hour. State law is 30 miles per hour. Mr. Jodoin will research what speed could be posted and enforced.

Chairman Topliff stated that he appreciates Mr. MacCormack's open offer of exaction in the amount of \$30,000. This offer frees the Planning Board from discussing potential mitigation. Those with more knowledge and insight can determine what projects need to be done and determine the costs of those options. Should the town look at options and get budgetary numbers?

Member Edmonds respects the generous offer Mr. MacCormack made. It would be prudent to cost out the options. Member Edmonds is opposed to alteration of Route 3 as it is not necessary, and is in the purview of the State of NH Highway Department. Sufficient right of way does not exist to widen Route 3 and any work done on Route 3 would be done properly and best by NH DOT.

Member Young stated that without a specific project in mind, Mr. MacCormack has made a very generous offer. The town should explore the cost to widen Bow Lane.

Selectmen's Rep Bond said the town should look at other budgeted items that could be completed with Mr. MacCormack's generous offer.

Vice Chairman Seaworth stated Mr. MacCormack made a generous offer. Bow Lane has existing issues, and the incremental addition of funds from this developer could fund some needed improvements on Bow Lane. This is a very good proposal to get by the impasse. Off-site improvements are usually a known entity.

Ms. Cronin said this is a generous offer from Mr. MacCormack. The board should think about specific projects and solid conditions that could be acted upon within the six year time frame.

Mr. Monahan stated that the board can tie the project(s) to something that improves safety in the neighborhood.

Member Bean stated Pembroke does not have impact fees but we can utilize the exaction money for projects with direct correlation to the development like Bow Lane. Any project proposed must be justifiable.

Member Cruson said she appreciates the exaction fee offer and the way Mr. MacCormack has worked with the Planning Board throughout this proposal. He has been more than conciliatory. Member Cruson would like to see the money put toward improving Bow Lane and Nadine Drive at the curve.

Town Administrator Jodoin stated it is up the Board of Selectmen to spend the exaction. A survey would be needed of the right of way on Bow Lane. There are many variables. Perhaps Mr. Peloquin could be hired for the survey. This is a generous offer.

Vice Chairman Seaworth asked whether in drafting an agreement, it is okay to restrict the use to a specific project or is there flexibility in the RSA.

Mr. Monahan said the projects should originate with the Planning Board and impact highway, drainage, sewer or water improvements necessitated by the development.

Mr. Boisvert said that the Board of Selectmen asks for recommendations from the Roads Commission and the 10 year plan they develop. The Water Department recently made some repair/replacement to the infrastructure on Bow Lane. There would be difficulties widening Bow Lane and obtaining 45 feet right of way with stone walls.

Stephen Pernaw and Mr. Peloquin would be happy to take a preliminary look at Bow Lane. Mr. Peloquin will coordinate a site meeting.

Chairman Topliff stated that Mr. MacCormack has been gracious and patient throughout the proceedings. Staff and the Board need to spend time on conditions of approval. Good progress has been made.

Mr. MacCormack stated that he spent a lot of time thinking about the exaction and it was not based on a per unit decision. Option 3 was quoted a cost of \$10-20,000 as a rough estimate. He decided to use \$30,000 as an exaction figure. However the Town of Pembroke and its residents are benefitting from this development in other ways:

1. The gas company is adding a mile and a half of gas line to bring natural gas to the area for the benefit of all residents.
2. Mr. MacCormack saw the water main at the top of Whittemore and Nadine, and added 800 feet of water line to provide shut off areas in a loop, and better water pressure to all users.
3. The size of White Sands Beach is almost tripling with the donation of conservation land to protect that area in perpetuity.

Mr. MacCormack stated he is building in Pembroke because he owns a golf course, which is headed in a good direction. Mr. Whittemore wanted to sell me land for the golf course. I subdivided some land to use for a future driving range. The profit margin on these units is very low. There is a ceiling that buyers of 72 multi-family units are willing to pay, and a limited market who will pay a premium for upscale finishes, single floor living and outside maintenance in a beautiful area.

Chairman Topliff thanked Mr. MacCormack and said that he would entertain a motion to continue Old Business agenda items 1-4 to May 22, 2018 so the Board can work on conditions of approval.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or the public, Chairman Topliff closed the public hearing at 8:46 p.m. on Agenda Items 1, 2, 3, and 4.

MOTION: ALTERNATE MEMBER BOURQUE MOVED TO CONTINUE CONSIDERATION OF OLD BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS 1, 2, 3, AND 4 TO THE MAY 22, 2018 MEETING. SECONDED BY MEMBER CRUSON. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

All interested parties should return on May 22, 2018.

The meeting recessed at 8:47 p.m.

Chairman Topliff continued the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

5. Minor Subdivision Application #18-02, LDW Enterprises Development Inc., acting as agent and owner of 210 5th Range Rd. on Tax Map 939, Lot 63 located in the Rural Residential (R3) Zone.

The applicant and owner proposes to subdivide Tax Map 939, Lot 63 into two lots with one lot having approximately 1.9 acres and the other lot having approximately 8.8 acres. *Continued from March 27, 2018.*

Mr. Monahan noted that Minor Subdivision Application #18-02 is now complete, with the NH Heritage review and request for waiver on designation as prime agricultural land. There are no engineering or department head comments. Assessing notes that this subdivision will eliminate current use and there will be a penalty due.

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

VOTE:

K. Cruson – Y	R. Bean – Y	B. Seaworth – Y
A. Topliff – Y	A. Bond – Y	L. Young – Y
B. Edmonds - Y		

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

Chairman Topliff opened the public hearing at 8:57 p.m. He asked that anyone wishing to speak address their comments to the Chairman and state their name for the record.

Larry Wurster, Owner/Applicant, stated that there is an existing house on one lot. One lot will be 1.9 acres and the other will be 8.8 acres. He has adequate frontage for the proposed subdivision on Fifth Range Road.

Laura Carlier, Esq., of Cronin, Bisson and Zalinsky, representing Doris and Arick Drache, stated that her clients have no objection to the current application to subdivide, but do have concerns about the applicant not having adequate frontage for possible future subdivisions.

Mike Carroway, 165 Dudley Hill Road, is concerned that Fifth Range Road is not in adequate condition for a major subdivision. Fifth Range Road is not up to standard for a Class V road. The applicant in the past has asked for a larger subdivision, and Mr. Carroway is concerned that he may again request a subdivision. GPS sometimes incorrectly directs vehicles to Kimball Road instead of Kimball Street. A service truck and an 18 wheeler have gotten stuck and had to back out. Garbage trucks back down Fifth Range Road.

Chairman Topliff stated that the Planning Board cannot unlawfully restrict the property owner per State law. If someone improved Fifth Range Road in the future and had adequate frontage, they could apply for more subdivision.

Mike Carroway asked where is the legal end of the Class V portion of Fifth Range Road. Is it 500 feet from the corner of Dudley Hill Road? Is it the end of the pavement, the end of the Draches property? The first house was built before zoning. The town provided services and other houses were built.

Chairman Topliff agreed that the roads were laid out in colonial times. There are no gates and bars. The town made improvement for safe access. Technically, the non improved road is the Class VI road. I would rely on the Code Enforcement Officer, Roads and Public Works to determine the end of the Class V road.

Vice Chairman Seaworth noted that on the plan for this 2 lot subdivision, there are two markings – the end of the pavement and the end of the Class V road. There is enough paved road for one additional lot. However, I would not want the plan recorded with an incorrect notation of where the Class V road ends.

The Board discussed a possible condition that the marking for the end of the Class V road be removed. The map used to pave Fifth Range Road goes back seven years ago. Mr. Boisvert stated that DPW reports to the State how much paved and how much Class V road the town has each year. The footage of Class V road has increased 100-200 feet. The Draches driveway is close to the end of the pavement. The road extended 200 feet into the woods from the property line. Uncertainty impacts this plan because Fifth Range Road beyond the paving is classified wetlands.

Chairman Topliff stated there is adequate frontage for this two lot subdivision. Vice Chairman Seaworth stated we need verification where the town section of the road ends for recording. Mr. Monahan said the remaining lot has between 234 and 337 feet of frontage. Mr. Monahan said he was present the last time this property owner made application for a 3 lot subdivision.

Town Manager Jodoin said it is more difficult than you think to determine the end of the Class V road. The town plowed and maintained and could have paved over Class VI road. The named markings describing the location of the Class V road are now gone. When a town stops maintaining a road subject to gates and bars, the land reverts back to the property owners on both sides.

Larry Wurster, 236 Fourth Range Road, applicant, noted that he marked the end of the Class V Road on the plan as the end of the property across the street. The road was maintained to the stone wall. There is a drainage swale on the end of the property across the street. I believe the plan is correct as shown.

Mr. Monahan noted there were nine suggested conditions of approval in the March 16, 2018 packet. Based on tonight's discussion, numbers 4 and 7 are not relevant.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said if Mr. Jodoin is correct and no accurate answer can be found, the marking for end of Class V road is not needed for this subdivision, and it may be better not to mark the end.

Mr. Monahan recommended a condition that the note depicting the end of Class V road be removed from the plat. The applicant is still able to create a second lot.

Member Cruson asked if there is enough frontage on the Class V portion of Fifth Range Road to develop future lots. Mr. Monahan responded no, not unless the road was brought up to Class V standards and accepted by the Board of Selectmen.

There being no further questions from the Board or the public, Chairman Topliff closed the public hearing at 9:25 pm. If consideration is not completed, the public hearing and consideration will be made to the next business meeting and will not be renoticed. He advised that anyone interested in this case should monitor the Town's website and Planning Board agenda.

MOTION: Member Cruson moved to approve the Minor Site Plan Application Case #18-02, Case #15-108 with the following conditions.

1. Monument at the front of Lot 63 to be shown as a granite bound. Monument at the back of Lot 63 to be shown as a drill hole.
2. List applicant's phone number on the plat.
3. Depict the width of 5th Range Road on the plat.
4. Depict spot elevations at high points and low points on the plat.
5. Receipt of State Subdivision approval for Lot 63.
6. Execute the deed shown on Lot 63-1 for the benefit of Lot 63.
7. Remove the note depicting end of Class V road from the plat.

Seconded by Member Bean.

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

MOTION TO APPROVE CASE #18-02 WITH CONDITIONS PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE

New Business-

1. **Election of Officers and Committee Representatives -Postponed**
2. **Major Site Plan Application #18-102, Mark C. Sargent of Richard D Bartlett & Assoc, LLC, acting as agent on behalf of the property owner John Dapergolas, D'Pergo Realty Investments LLC, owner of Tax Map 561, Lot 35 located at 107 Sheep Davis Road in the Commercial Industrial (C1) Zone and the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District.**
The applicant, Mark C. Sargent, proposes a change of use of a portion of the site for the operation of Michaels Power. Proposed is to lease the first and second floors of the 2 story wood building (2,760 square feet) and 6,488 square feet of the east end of the 2 story metal frame building. Offices will occupy the front building and the warehousing of equipment and wire will be had in the steel frame building.
3. **Special Use Permit Application #18-303, Mark C. Sargent of Richard D Bartlett & Assoc, LLC, acting as agent on behalf of the property owner John Dapergolas, D'Pergo Realty Investments LLC, owner of Tax Map 561, Lot 35**

located at 107 Sheep Davis Road in the Commercial Industrial (C1) Zone and the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District.

The applicant, Mark C. Sargent, requests a Special Use Permit from Article 143-68.E for activity within the Aquifer Conservation District. This permit is associated with the Major Site Plan Application #18-102.

Mr. Monahan reported that no plans were received after he provided Planner Notes following the Technical Review Committee meeting for Major Site Plan Application #18-102 and Special Use Permit Application #18-103.

Mark C. Sargent of Richard D Bartlett & Assoc, LLC, acting as agent on behalf of the property owner John Dapergolas, D'Pergo Realty Investments LLC, owner of Tax Map 561, Lot 35 sent a written request that the Planning Board please continue these applications to the May 22, 2018 Planning Board meeting.

MOTION: MEMBER CRUSON MOVED TO CONTINUE CONSIDERATION OF NEW BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS 2 AND 3 TO THE MAY 22, 2018 MEETING. SECONDED BY VICE CHAIRMAN SEAWORTH. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

4. Notice of Voluntary Merger of Pre-Existing Lots, Ryland & Kathleen Weisiger, owners of Tax Map 563, Lots 51 & 50-1 located at 215 & 221 Brickett Hill Road.

The owners request a voluntary lot merger pursuant to RSA 674:39-a.

Mr. Monahan explained that NH RSA 674:39-a allows a property owner to merge two lots for municipal and taxation purposes with no notice, no public hearing and no survey plat recorded. If the owner later wants to subdivide, he/she needs to come back to Planning Board for subdivision approval. A signature of the Planning Board Chair is required on the voluntary merger. A copy is mailed to assessing officials.

MOTION: VICE CHAIRMAN SEAWORTH MOVED TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN A VOLUNTARY LOT MERGER AS REQUESTED BY RYLAND AND KATHLEEN WEISIGER. SECONDED BY MEMBER EDMONDS. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Town Manager Jodoin noted that the tax year runs April 1 to March 31. This tax year these are listed as two taxable lots. Next year, they would be a prime and residual lot. Because the tax bills have not been run, Assessing may be able to process this merger prior to the billing. Mr. Jodoin will research how taxes are handled on a Voluntary Lot Merger and advise the property owners.

Other – Consideration of electronic agenda packet

Initial discussion occurred on benefits and drawbacks of using electronic agenda packet items versus hard copy paper packets. It was discussed that the town would save money on copying, paper, postage and staff time. Eventually, applicants could also file their applications electronically. The agents for applicant could bring their presentation on a thumb drive or computer and show it to the audience and board members on a monitor. Presenters could zoom in and out and use aerial photography. Plans may be difficult to view as electronic documents. Large paper plans are still needed for the Planner and

Code Enforcement Officer to review. Alternate Member Bourque reported that the Zoning Board of Adjustment considered this item at their April 23, 2018 meeting and may be willing to try electronic documents on a trial basis. Many towns have adopted electronic submittal and review of documents. This discussion will continue at the May 8, 2018 work session.

Board consensus is to also continue the below items to the May 8, 2018 work session.

Minutes- March 27, 2018 Meeting

Miscellaneous

1. Correspondence-
2. Committee Reports-
3. Other Business–
4. Planner Items-
5. Construction Escrow-
6. Board Member Items-
7. Audience Items-

MOTION: Member Cruson moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Member Bean. Unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Gifford, Recording Secretary