

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

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

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Robert Bourque; Timothy Goldthwaite

EXCUSED: Kellie Dyjak

STAFF PRESENT: Carolyn Cronin, Town Planner; Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

Vice Chairman Seaworth called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and said that Chairman Topliff may not be available for the entire meeting, therefore, he would assume the position of Acting Chair. Also, if Chairman Topliff is not available, someone will be assigned to vote in his place.

New Business

1. **Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-06, Eric Pearson, Equivise, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of Cole Family Trust, owner of Tax Map 565, Lot 55 located at 354-356 Pembroke Street in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District, and the Architectural Design (AD) District.**

The Applicant proposes to subdivide Map 565, Lot 55 into sixteen (16) single-family residential lots on a proposed roadway. The proposed development will be serviced by municipal water and sewer, and includes a closed drainage system and associated drainage easement area. This permit is associated with Special Use Permits for the AC and WP Districts (SUP-AC #18-307 and SUP-WP #18-308).

2. **Special Use Permit Application SUP-AC #18-307, Eric Pearson, Equivise, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of Cole Family Trust, owner of Tax Map 565, Lot 55 located at 354-356 Pembroke Street in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District, and the Architectural Design (AD) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit from Article 143-68.E., Aquifer Conservation District, for single-family residential use over the aquifer. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-06.

3. **Special Use Permit Application SUP-WP #18-308, Eric Pearson, Equivise, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of Cole Family Trust, owner of Tax Map 565, Lot 55 located at 354-356 Pembroke Street in the Medium Density (R1) Residential Zone, the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District, the Wetlands Protection (WP) District, and the Architectural Design (AD) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit from Article 143-72.D., Wetlands Protection District, for single-family residential use on a parcel containing wetlands. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-06.

Present: Brenton Cole, PE and Dan Pascue, PE both of Keach Nordstrom Associates; Eric Pearson of Equivise LLC; and Stephen Pernaw of Stephen G. Pernaw & Company, Inc.

Ms. Cronin said that this is a major subdivision application. There are two Special Use Permit applications. One for the Aquifer Conservation District and one for the Wetlands Protection District.

A portion of the development is in the Architectural Design Overlay District, which is not a Special Use Permit but does have its own criteria for the Board to consider.

She said that the applicant submitted a few checklist waivers: Part A - Items P for blocks, S for proposed open space, T for phasing plan, and W for open space development. Ms. Cronin said that these items are not applicable to the type of subdivision application that is being applied for.

She also said that Part A, Item A for signature of all owners is not provided but could be a condition of approval.

Ms. Cronin said that there were two Subdivision Regulation Waiver Requests §205-41 Design Standards, Section E(3) superelevation of the roadway and §205-41 Design Standards, Section E(19)(a) sidewalks required on both sides. The applicant would like to install a sidewalk on one side of the development road.

She also said that the Technical Review Committee met on June 27, 2018. Staff comments were relative to house numbering, traffic safety, roadway connectivity, sidewalks, and conservation.

Ms. Cronin said that the checklist waivers are appropriate.

Alternate Member Bourque asked for clarification on the Special Use Permit for the Aquifer Conservation District. He said that in his review of §143-68, there was a sentence that indicated that one and two-family homes are exempt from a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Cronin said that because this is a major subdivision plan, the Town needs to look at its impact on the aquifer. The Special Use Permit pertains to the overall impact of the development to the aquifer rather than the individual houses.

MOTION: Member Edmonds moved to accept the waiver requests for checklist items: Part A – Items: P, S, T, and W. Seconded by Chairman Topliff.

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 WAIVER REQUESTS FOR CHECKLIST ITEMS: PART A – ITEMS: P, S, T, AND W PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

MOTION: Chairman Topliff moved to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Member Edmonds.

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.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that he would like to discuss whether this application is a Development of Regional Impact.

Member Cruson said that the Board should think of the development with relation to traffic, water, and sewer. She pointed out that Allenstown and Pembroke are dependent upon each other because of water and sewer and that the traffic situation on Pembroke Street is a challenge. She said that she felt that it is a Development of Regional Impact (DRI).

Ms. Cronin said that she reviewed the Subdivision Regulation criteria and the RSA and nothing tripped the criteria for a DRI. She also spoke with Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC) and sent them a copy of the plan. They agreed that traffic would be an impact but did not think that it tripped any criteria for a DRI.

Acting Chairman Seaworth read aloud the 8 criteria in §205:12 (pg. 205-9). The consensus of the Board was that the criteria did not require a DRI.

With regard to the sewer court case, Member Cruson asked if Pembroke had sewer to offer the applicant.

Ms. Cronin said that the two Towns are still working on an agreement.

Member Bean said that if septic systems are needed in the subdivision because of the lack of Pembroke's sewer capacity, it may be very difficult on the smaller lots.

Member Cruson said that it could be considered a DRI because of the possible lack of sewer capacity.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that if Allenstown decides not to give Pembroke any sewer, Pembroke would not be impacting Allenstown, therefore, a DRI would be unnecessary.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the plan would have to propose sewer connections which would be conditional on receiving sewer capacity, otherwise, private septic systems would have to be designed. The Board would have to approve one form or the other.

Chairman Topliff said that it would be helpful to keep in mind that this is a subdivision of 16 houses and not the 110 that the Board has recently reviewed. It has fewer homes than Sherwood Meadows. He also pointed out that, according to the information provided, the traffic will be negligible. He said that the Board would be hard-pressed to make it a DRI.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that she agreed with Member Cruson. No one is guaranteed sewer. There are other developments that still have not secured sewer.

Chairman Topliff asked how would Pembroke having sewer or not having Town sewer affect Allenstown with regard to a DRI.

Member Cruson said that it might impact what Allenstown can do because Pembroke would be using their sewer capacity.

Chairman Topliff said that the sewer plant sets the sewer allocation to each town. If one town uses their sewer capacity, it would have no affect on the other town. He said if the applicant cannot get the necessary sewer capacity, they would have to design the subdivision accordingly. If the applicant proposes private septic systems, it would not affect Allenstown. It only affects the developer.

MOTION: Chairman Topliff moved that the Planning Board not find the application a Development of Regional Impact. Seconded by Member Cruson.

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

THE MOTION THAT THE PLANNING BOARD NOT FIND THE APPLICATION A DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT PASSED ON A 7-0 VOTE.

Acting Chairman Seaworth opened the public hearing at 7:27 pm. He said that if the application is continued beyond this evening, the public hearing would also be continued to future meetings and the Planning Board would not re-notice the public hearing. If the public has an interest in the application, he asked that they check on the Town's website for meeting announcements. He also asked that, if members of the public wish to speak, they state their name and street address and to address all questions to the Chair.

Mr. Cole said that the parcel consists of 49 acres located at 354 Pembroke Street across from Kimball's Cav'ern. It is owned by the Cole family which he pointed out was no relation to him. The property has minimal frontage along Pembroke Street and minimal frontage along the Merrimack River.

The property is located in the medium density residential district. It is in the Architectural Overlay District, the Aquifer Conservation District, and the Wetlands Protection District.

The Tennessee Gas Line, the Town sewer main, and Eversource all bisect the property. The applicant plans to only develop the uphill portion of the parcel.

Mr. Cole said that the subdivision will consist of 16 lots and a 1,800 lineal foot roadway to be known as Long Meadow Circle. All development will be east of the Town sewer main. The remainder of the property will be undeveloped. The roadway will have municipal sewer and water, gas, underground utilities and a closed drainage system consisting of catch basins that lead to an infiltration basin on the other side of the Town sewer where they will mitigate and treat stormwater and recharge the aquifer.

He said that he met with the Conservation Commission, Technical Review Committee (TRC), the Roads Committee, and the Sewer Commission. They submitted an application to NHDOT for a driveway permit. They also applied for an Alteration of Terrain permit. They have not submitted an application for a sewer connection permit because of the questionable sewer allocation status.

Mr. Cole said that the development will mimic the Peaslee Drive subdivision. It will have a similar design and a similar loop road.

Mr. Pernaw said that he prepared a trip generation dated March 22, 2018. The subdivision will create a new "T" intersection on Route 3. The latest NHDOT statistics for Route 3 showed that it handles 14,600 cars per day. From past experience and data, Mr. Pernaw said that there are two distinct peak hour periods – 7:00 to 9:00 am and 4:00 to 6:00 pm. The subdivision will generate 16 to 17 trips during the peak hour periods. In the morning, most will be exiting, and in the evening, most will be arriving.

Mr. Pernaw said that the trips will disburse in different directions at the subdivision intersection. In most cases, the impact will be single-digits. Based on his experience with the Route 3 corridor and the study results, increases from the subdivision will not alter the traffic impact along Route 3. The Town's consulting engineer concurred.

Mr. Pernaw said that he made three recommendations: (1) the proposed intersection should operate on a stop sign control; (2) an 18" wide stop line; and (3) a double yellow center line to separate inbound and outbound vehicles.

Chairman Topliff said that he concurred that the proposed traffic count is insignificant to the total that is seen along Pembroke Street. His concern is with safety especially with the left-hand turn at peak hours. He asked if the applicant had considered tying the development into Bow Lane or Peaslee Drive.

Mr. Cole said that that was discussed at the TRC meeting. He said that it was impossible to get to Peaslee Drive from the development because of a significant drop off and a series of ravines that lead to the Merrimack River.

With regard to Bow Lane, leaving a future right-of-way was discussed so that if the adjacent large parcel which has frontage along Bow Lane should ever want to connect into

the subdivision, it could. He said that the challenge is that many times people buy parcels and do not realize that a right-of-way is on the property which later becomes a by-pass situation.

Mr. Cole said that they spoke with Tennessee Gas about a potential right-of-way and they are okay with it. He said that he ran the counts and the project would not lose any density. It would be up to the Planning Board whether a future right-of-way would be added.

Chairman Topliff said that he thought that it was a great idea. He asked how many properties would a line drawn from Lot 55-9 north to Bow Lane intersect. He said that someone needs to advocate for the future homeowners in a development from a safety aspect. Making a left-hand turn out of the development would be difficult and he would love the applicant to explore the possibility of a right-of-way.

Alternate Member Bourque said that the development only has one way in and one way out. In his opinion, it is a cul-de-sac. In the past, the Board has preferred to have two entrances and two exits from a development.

Mr. Cole pointed out that the loop road was very short.

Chairman Topliff said that he suspected that the Fire Department required sprinklers because it only had one access. He said that, perhaps, the Fire Department would be willing to forego the sprinkler requirement if there were two exits and entrances.

Mr. Cole said that he could not see that it would be affordable to have a 1,000-foot road to Bow Lane with only a 16-lot subdivision but he was willing to run the numbers.

Member Cruson said that she agreed with Chairman Topliff and Alternate Member Bourque that it would be decidedly better to have another exit and entrance.

Member Bean suggested taking Lot 55-12 where it abuts the Vega property, and taking the "dog leg" as it returns to Route 3 and creating a separate ingress and egress with an island between them. The benefit would be that there would be two separate entrances in case of an accident along one route. It would be possible to come in or out of the development from another way. It also would provide for a wider road. Member Bean considered it a safety issue.

Mr. Cole said that the proposed roadway is 28 feet wide.

Mr. Cole said that they have already been contacted by the Conservation Commission and have proposed an easement so that they can continue to connect to the rail trail.

Member Bean asked if there was any other land that was given to the Town for conservation.

Mr. Cole said that it is presently all included in Lot 7 but would place it in a development restriction similar to the back land of Pembroke Meadows.

Mr. Cole said that Lot 55 has approximately 212 ft. of frontage on Pembroke Street.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that, to him, it speaks to the limit of possibility of putting more than one road in that 200 ft. He said that the state would not look kindly on curb cuts that are a dozen feet apart. From the drawing, the Town requires a 50 ft. right-of-way for a road and there is an apron that is extended out to 100 ft. which is what the road's impact on Route 3 would be. He concluded that if two roads were put side-by-side, it would take up the entire space.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the TRC notes show that the Fire Chief suggested that the developer include an easement for the future in case the next property is developed.

Ms. Cronin said that the Fire Chief was looking for another entrance to the development for safety reasons in case they could not get through the single proposed access. If it's not feasible to construct the connecting roadway now, at least setting aside a piece to be designated as a future right-of-way or stub for a future right-of-way would be good. She said that there was no preference as to whether it was connected to Peaslee Drive or Bow Lane as long as it accessed the development with something other than one egress/ingress from Route 3.

Mr. Cole said that, based on aerial images, it would be easier to go to Bow Lane than Peaslee Drive because of the wetlands and grades not conducive to building roads. He said that he has no objection to providing a 50' strip for a developer of the Whittemore property to connect to the proposed subdivision.

Chairman Topliff said that simply having a conversation with the owner of the other properties to see if they are interested in providing that in the near future would not hurt.

Mr. Cole handed out a few copies of home designs that are being considered.

Mr. Pearson said that the homes will sell in the \$300,000 range. They will be approximately 1,800 to 2,100 square foot homes – capes and colonials with two-car garages. He said that he envisions a small tight community. The parcel that they would provide a right-of-way to is quite large. In the future, if the larger parcel was developed, he wondered how the Board would feel about a larger development cutting through a small 16-lot development.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that the Board of Selectmen did not approve the last application because it had a cul-de-sac, yet the Planning Board is considering approval of a subdivision which is primarily a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Cole insisted that it was not a cul-de-sac. It is a loop road. He said that it does not meet the Town's cul-de-sac regulations. He said that it would be exactly like Peaslee Drive. It would not have a typical 50 ft. swath of pavement to turn around in, it would have a full road.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that it still only has one way in and one way out. She said that the Selectmen have had a number of discussions and they required two entrances.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that Pembroke has very few ways to get through Town going North and South. As the Town has grown, the Board is more concerned about this issue and sometimes wonders if they are making an existing problem worse. Acting Chairman Seaworth said that that is why the applicant is hearing concerns and suggestions to solve some of the problem.

Chairman Topliff said that he understands that the project has to be profitable for the developer and the Board is not mandating the applicant to put in the road, but merely to look at the possibility.

Mr. Cole said that two Special Use Permits are required because of the Aquifer Conservation District and because there are wetlands on the site. The development that is in the Aquifer Conservation District is only the infiltration pond. There are no roadways and minimal number of houses in the aquifer district if they chose to develop that portion of their land. He said that they are helping the aquifer by providing non-aquifer water to recharge into the aquifer.

With regard to the Wetland Special Use Permit, Mr. Cole said that they have no wetland impacts or wetland buffer impacts. A few parcels have wetlands on them but the development will stay outside of them and their associated buffers.

One of the waivers from the Roadway Design Standards is the superelevation of roadways. The regulation says that all turns must be superelevated. Mr. Cole said that for a development of this size, a superelevated roadway would increase the speed in the development and the applicant would prefer to decrease the speed in the development. He said that superelevation is used for highways and not for rural roads such as this.

The second waiver is the sidewalk on one side of the road which will help the Department of Public Works with maintenance and costs. Because it is different from the Town's regulations, and the regulations do not address the non-sidewalk side of the road, Mr. Cole said that they spoke with the Roads Committee about an alternative to granite curbing. They were fine with bituminous curb on the non-sidewalk side of the road.

Mr. Cole said that the Town Engineer had no issue with going down to a 24 ft. wide road. He said that the project is barely profitable as it is and that a 24 ft. wide road for this size project is the norm in most New Hampshire towns.

Mr. Cole said that they did not yet request a waiver from the 28 ft. wide roadway and wondered if the Board would be willing to entertain such a waiver. They did not want to redesign the project until the Board was approached on the subject.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that the applicant, when speaking with the Roads Committee, discussed the Town taking responsibility for the maintenance of a drainage area that will be used to recharge back in the ground.

Mr. Cole said that with most roads, all the maintenance of the infrastructure is taken over by the Town. The developer provided a maintenance road to the infiltration pond. It will require minimal maintenance according to NHDES such as mowing and checking for sediment. The pond should have no water in it, minimal sediment, and is a fairly low maintenance stormwater practice. He said that the DPW would eventually be responsible for its maintenance.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that Mr. Boisvert of the DPW was present at the TRC and had no comments.

Jason Pietsch, 355 Pembroke Street, said that his property has two driveways. The placement of the roadway would be critical. He was concerned about competing left and right turns.

John Gouin, 23 Peaslee Drive, said that his property abuts Lot 55-5. He asked if the development would be leaving the trees within the setback or if they would be taking all of them down to the property line. He also wanted to know how close the house would be to the 40 ft. setback.

Mr. Cole said that Lot 55-5 is one of the bigger parcels. He said that there is a small path that a driveway could fit around the wetland to get all the way to the back of the lot to develop. Mr. Cole could not say where a homeowner would place their home, but in all likelihood they would develop the portion of land near the roadway rather than to put a 200 ft. driveway to the back of the property. He also said that the homeowner would have to comply with the 40 ft. setback Town requirement for all structures.

With regard to the removal of the trees within the 40 ft. setback, Mr. Cole said that it is not the developer's intent to remove the trees from the setback but he could not say what a homeowner may do.

Alternate Member Bourque said that the Board could require that a buffer be left with natural vegetation as a buffer between the new lots and existing lots.

Ms. Cruson said that she would want to know what the natural vegetation was before deciding that it would need to be retained.

Chairman Topliff said that a buffer probably would have to be a deed restriction from the developer to the new owner.

Member Bean said that his homeowners' association has certain restrictions on the buffer areas.

With regard to the two waivers, Member Cruson said that she was in favor of both waivers. Superelevation does not make sense with the length of the road and the landscape. The sidewalks on both sides of the road are not necessary as long as the Town is willing to provide a crosswalk somewhere on that road.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that TRC and the Roads Committee discussed that this will be "a sidewalk to nowhere" – it will not connect to a sidewalk on Pembroke Street. The Roads Committee pointed out that it is part of a larger picture. Someday there will be more sidewalks on Route 3 and putting the sidewalk in now will provide for a connection when it comes to fruition.

Member Cruson also said that many residents walk along and around Pembroke Street. There also may be a bus stop added to the development so a sidewalk would be good.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the Roads Committee discussed whether granite curbing was necessary and they agreed that it is necessary when there is a sidewalk immediately next to the road.

The Committee also was in favor of a bituminous curb on the other side of the road.

Mr. Edmonds said that all the mailboxes will be on the non-sidewalk side of the roadway.

Mr. Cole said that that is now the norm in developments. The sidewalks will be 5 ft. wide per the regulations.

Member Cruson said that Edith Whittemore is misspelled. Whittemore should be spelled with two Ts.

The consensus of the Board was for granting the two waivers for superelevation of the road and sidewalk on one side of the road.

Mr. Cole said that underground utilities are proposed.

With regard to a 24 ft. vs. 28 ft. roadway, Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the Roads Committee discussed the plowing and roadway parking on a 24 ft. road but had no recommendations one way or another. He said that the decision may have to come from the Board of Selectmen.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that Pembroke has parking issues and, if the road was 24 ft. wide and people parked on the road, it would become a very narrow roadway. She also said that if there is a bus stop, parents will park on both sides of the road to wait for the bus which may create a danger.

Alternate Member Bourque said that Sheet 2, Lots 55-2, 55-4, and 55-5 had a great amount of wetlands and some of the buffers were in the proposed area of the lot. He asked if there would be a home on Lot 55-7.

Mr. Cole said yes. There is a development portion in the front of the wetland buffer, adjacent to the road which is likely where the house will be placed. The owner could also develop within the larger portion of the lot. The owner has the right to cross the 50 ft. gas easement with a driveway. The developer has already had that conversation with Tennessee Gas. They would need approval from Tennessee Gas before it is done, but Tennessee Gas had no problem with it.

Mr. Cole said that Lots 55-2, 55-4, and 55-5 meet the proposed development area on each lot, even with the wetlands. The Town has a minimal area of 70% to be developable and they meet those regulations.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked if the homeowner would be able to impact the wetlands. Mr. Cole said that they would not be able to work within the wetlands area.

Alternate Member Bourque asked if the applicant would place medallions along the wetlands buffers.

Mr. Cole said that the Conservation Commission did not mention it, but that it helps the homeowner know where the wetlands are.

Alternate Member Bourque said that he was not convinced that Lot 55-4 had enough buildable area when taking into consideration the wetlands and the buffers.

Mr. Cole said that setbacks are part of the buildable area. He said that the regulations say that 70% of the whole lot has to be buildable. Sheet 1 has a table that indicates what that buildable area is. The buildable area for Lot 55-5 is 18,570.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the Town engineer will review the plans and drawings. He asked Ms. Cronin to confirm that the Town's engineer has looked at it.

Mr. Cole said that the lots are sized for water and sewer.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that if the sewer connections were not available, the applicant would not be able to build the lots as presently sized.

Mr. Cole said that the entire development is predicated on getting sewer. If sewer was not available, the applicant would have to reevaluate the project.

He said that he spoke with Ms. Malo of the Sewer Department who said that the Commissioners had met and that Allenstown was formulating a fee structure for Pembroke.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that, with water and sewer the road frontage is 120 ft. and, without sewer, it is 150 ft. of road frontage.

Mr. Cole said that most of the lots exceed the minimum frontage for water and sewer. He did not know what would be required if they had to add septic systems.

Alternate Member Bourque said that the Table in §143-21, indicates that a lot with only Town water available requires a 60,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area.

Ms. Cronin said that sewer approval could be a condition of approval.

Member Edmonds said that the Town is negotiating with Allenstown to purchase 100,000 gallons per day. He did not know when the negotiations would be complete.

Ms. Cronin said that, with regard to the house plans, the front portion of the development along Pembroke Street is within the Architectural Design Overlay District. The criteria for the overlay is very loose. Those few homes along the front half of the development would have to be "in harmony" with the existing structures on Pembroke Street and maintain a New England residential rural character, as intended in the Master Plan.

If the developer offers a catalog of homes that they can build and the Planning Board says that the design of those homes fit the neighborhood, then that is all that would be required to meet the criteria of the zoning requirement.

Chairman Topliff excused himself at 8:45 p.m.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond questioned whether the Town should maintain a road if there are no houses on the road.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the regulation's concern is the opposite – that a builder might subdivide a lot, build a short section of road and a few homes and run out of money and walk away without finishing the road or the utilities. He said that the regulations are such that the builder must make substantial progress. It prevents them from leaving the road and utilities unfinished.

Mr. Pearson said that the Town would maintain the road once it is officially adopted by the Town. During the construction phase it is the developer's responsibility to maintain and plow the road.

Ms. Cronin said that the Town will hold a bond in case something happens and the work has to be completed.

Mr. Pearson said that the homes will have full foundations with basements and foundation drains if the slope requires it.

Mr. Cole said that construction will begin once the Planning Board process is completed. They are hoping that they may be able to begin in September, but it could be in the spring.

Mr. Pearson said that he is hoping that the project would be completed in two years.

Mr. Cole said that he reviewed the engineering comments and they should be able to achieve those and get a new plan set made. He asked what the Board's thoughts were about the 28 ft. vs. the 24 ft. road width.

The consensus of the Board was that a 28 ft. road would be preferred. Bituminous curb on the non-sidewalk side of the road is acceptable.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the Board was in favor of a right-of-way for additional access to the development.

Mr. Cole asked if that was a consensus because it would require a great deal of design work.

Mr. Pearson asked if the right-of-way was more for people to cut through from another larger development or more for safety reasons and emergency access. The potential of residents of a larger development cutting through his small development should be taken into consideration by the Board.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the Town has seen that it is redundant to have developments with separate entrances abutting each other. If an accident occurs on Pembroke Street, the Town does not want to cut off the ability for your residents to go north or south, for example. It is a safety and emergency access issue which has multiple pieces to it, such as school buses, plows, and garbage trucks. Bow Lane has a light that residents could use for safe left hand turns.

The problems on Pembroke Street are not going to get better. They will only get worse. As it becomes more difficult to make a left turn onto Pembroke Street, it would be nice to have an alternative to make a left at a signal because it would be safer. It is a combination of all these factors that causes the Board to have a preference for alternatives. That is why the Board would like to see what that means to have an easement and what the possibilities are. He understood that the Board was asking for additional work on the applicant's part.

Alternate Member Bourque said that if sewer capacity becomes available and the houses are not built immediately, in order to retain that capacity, fees would have to be paid yearly. If the fees are not paid, the capacity would go away. He said that his concern is if the sewer fees for a lot were not paid and the lot was sold. If a septic system was required, the lot, as designed, may not be large enough to accommodate one.

Acting Chairman Seaworth said that the developer's goal is to sell the lots as quickly as possible. Town sewer could be a condition of approval and would need to be worded in such a way to prevent such a thing from happening.

Mr. Pearson said that if they did not provide the Building Department with the necessary sewer, they would not issue a building permit.

Ms. Cronin said that Pembroke Pines did not have all their sewer capacity and it was added as a condition.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or the audience, Acting Chairman Seaworth closed the public hearing at 8:57 pm. The meeting and the public hearing will be continued to the next business meeting (August 28, 2018) and anyone interested is asked to go onto the Pembroke website or call the Planning Department to learn the dates and times of the meetings. Abutters will not be re-noticed.

MOTION: MEMBER EDMONDS MOVED TO CONTINUE THE HEARING UNTIL AUGUST 28, 2018. SECONDED BY MEMBER BEAN. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was recessed at 9:00 pm

Acting Chairman Seaworth reconvened the meeting at 9:04 pm

Minutes June 12, 2018 & June 26, 2018

MOTION: MEMBER YOUNG MOVED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 12, 2018 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY MEMBER EDMONDS. APPROVED WITH ONE ABSTENTION – SELECTMEN'S REP. BOND.

MOTION: MEMBER EDMONDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 26, 2018 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY SELECTMEN'S REP. BOND. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Miscellaneous

1. Correspondence

Ms. Cronin received Continental Paving's ground water monitoring results for 2018. Everything was okay.

She also received Continental Paving's air quality inspection dated July 2018. Everything was okay.

Ms. Cronin received copies of the NHDOT driveway permits and Historic Resource requests for project reviews which consisted of:

1. Beacon Hill Road reconstruction - had no historic properties affected;

2. Eagle Creek Renewable Energy of Suncook for work at the Allenstown dam for a partial removal project. The notes said to check with the State, the Historical Society and Meet Me In Suncook Committee to see if they had any concerns, and an architectural historian.
3. Two driveway permits: (1) 335 Academy Road, single family residential driveway; (2) Ann Whytemare, Pembroke Street house and possible plant nursery business driveway permit.

2. Committee Reports

Roads Committee: Acting Chairman Seaworth said that they met with the applicant for Long Meadow Estates Major Subdivision. The Poirier land being sold to the Conservation Commission was reviewed. The newest proposal is that the sale does not have the Town taking over any roads which the Committee was happy about.

Board of Selectmen: Selectmen's Rep. Bond reported that the 4 Union Street parking was adjusted and new signs will be made. Monday through Saturday from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. will accommodate only tenants and patrons. From 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. will be public parking and all day Sunday.

The final street light conversion list public meeting will be held on Monday at 7:30 p.m. Alternate Member Bourque asked Selectmen's Rep. Bond to make sure that the street light in front of his house remains since he owns it and pays for it himself.

The Pembroke and Allenstown Old Home Day permit was approved.

Zoning Board: Alternate Member Bourque said that the ZBA met with Town Counsel to discuss a few things. Also, there was a variance where an applicant was not required to come to the Planning Board with a site plan. The way it should have proceeded was a two-step process to get the variance for that use and then come to Planning Board. He said that that procedure is being worked on.

Alternate Member Bourque said that the ZBA is getting together on the August 30, 2018 where they will be starting on the Manzelli case. He will recuse himself from that case because he voted with the Planning Board.

Tri-Town Ambulance: Alternate Member Bourque said that they are working on the 2019 budget. He said that this year there is a substantial difference in savings to both towns. This year they do not have any major equipment to buy and the amount of service provided increased and, therefore, they are able to reduce the amount that the Towns contribute to the ambulance.

CIP: Member Young said that CIP will meet at the Safety Center on August 1, 2018.

Conservation Commission: Member Edmonds said that the Commission discussed the ATVs on the range roads. They will be seeking some ordinance changes to severely limit ATV use on the range roads.

With regard to enforcement, Member Edmonds said that the Police Chief said that he puts officers at the access points. If they see vehicles with trailers, they check them when they come out of the woods. They presently do not have the authority to kick them off the roads.

3. Planner Items

Ms. Cronin said that:

- The Economic Development Mast Plan group has created draft goals for the Master Plan.
- The Master Plan Transportation Committee meeting is July 25, 2018 at 5:30 pm.
- Cultural and Historical Resource Committee will meet on August 8, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.
- The next TRC is August 1, 2018 at 10 am with two applications.

She attended a Central NH Regional Planning Committee meeting about their draft Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) plan for the region. It will help the approved projects get funding for a municipal project that will foster economic development.

Member Cruson asked if the North Pembroke Road bridge would qualify.

Ms. Cronin said that if the bridge had potential to open a new commercial development area, it would probably qualify. She said she would talk to the CNHRPC.

The Master Plan rail trail site walk is being held on August 16, 2018 at 4:30 pm.

4. Board Member Items

Member Edmonds said that the reconstruction of East View and East Meadow Roads is complete and came out really nice.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

