

**Pembroke Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
(ADOPTED)
June 25, 2019**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Seaworth, Chair; Kathy Cruson; Selectman's Rep. Ann Bond; Robert Bourque; Clint Hanson

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Dan Crean

EXCUSED: Alan Topliff, Vice Chair; Brent Edmonds

STAFF PRESENT: David Jodoin, Town Administrator; Carolyn Cronin, Town Planner

Old Business

- 1. Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant proposes a 48-lot subdivision, including a new roadway and improvements to Fourth Range Road and Flagg Robinson Road. All lots will be served by private on-site septic and well. This plan is associated with Special Use Permits SUP-WP #18-318 and SUP-DW #18-319.

- 2. Special Use Permit Application SUP-WP #18-318, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit in accordance with Article 143-72.D., Wetlands Protection District, for construction of roadway resulting in impacts to the wetlands. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09.

- 3. Special Use Permit Application SUP-DW #18-319, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit in accordance with Article 143-53, Driveways, to permit three shared driveways in the development. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09.

Present: Jon Rokeh of Rokeh Consulting, LLC; Kenny Lehtonen, Vice President of San-Ken Homes, Inc.; Chris Guida, Fieldstone Land Consultants; John Cronin, Attorney; Steve Pernaw, Traffic Engineer.

Members Cruson and Bourque recused themselves.

Alternate Crean will vote in place of Member Edmonds.

Ms. Cronin said that since the last time they met on the application, a site walk was held on June 15th. Member Hanson and Alternate Crean attended from the Planning Board. We walked 4th Range Road to the edge of the applicant's property and Robinson Road to the intersection of 5th Range Road. We did not walk the property itself, since the site walk was for the Road Opening Request. The Selectmen held their hearing the following Monday. I was directed to get quotes for a wetland peer review and a hydrology study. I received two hydrology quotes and three wetlands quotes. We have those for discussion tonight. I received memos from DPW and the Roads Committee in regard to the stormwater system because there were questions about who would be maintaining the system. The applicant submitted a revised intersection plan and a school distance plan. After the submittal deadline, they submitted the traffic study, which you are receiving tonight. This is the last regular meeting before the review time limit expires, which was voted to be extended to July 11th. That's something maybe the applicant and Board want to discuss to move forward. Also, a resident letter was just received tonight, so I will stamp that into the record and you will receive copies in your next packet.

Chair Seaworth said the Board obviously has not reviewed the traffic study, but he acknowledged Steve Pernaw was at the meeting. He asked the Board if they would like Mr. Pernaw to make some introductory comments tonight or if they prefer to spend time with the study first.

Alternate Crean suggested that the first order of business be to address the review deadline because the Selectmen will meet on the road request after the Planning Board deadline. We can't act on the application until after the Selectmen vote on the reclassification of the roads. Therefore, I think the deadline should be addressed first.

Chair Seaworth explained that the precedent of the Board in regard to the review time limit, is that they look for a letter from the applicant requesting the deadline be extended. Presuming a letter is received, the Board typically votes to extend the deadline, provided the date is agreeable to both the Board and the applicant. My understanding is that there was no request sent to us prior to the meeting, in which case we have to open the public hearing and have that discussion with the applicant. Per our precedent, we don't vote on motions during the public hearing, which will require that we can't vote on extending the deadline until after we close the hearing. I would recommend that we proceed as if there will be a future meeting, and if it turns out that won't be the case, then we will deal with it.

The public hearing was opened at 7:11 PM.

John Cronin greeted the Board and stated that he has been retained by the applicant to provide legal assistance. To address your initial concerns, it's our hope that we can make some progress tonight. We were able to have Mr. Pernaw attend, so we are hoping he will be able to discuss the details of the traffic with the understanding that you will need to review the study and may have further questions. We are hoping to make progress tonight, so I see no reason why we wouldn't extend the review deadline, but we can take that up at the end of the meeting, as is your typical procedure.

Jon Rokeh explained that they submitted an exhibit showing the distance from the project to the school. We are looking for a waiver from curbing, even though we do propose curbing in part of the site. The regulations say curbing and sidewalks are required within a one-mile radius of a school. I did a Google map blow-up and showed the radius of one mile from the school. Mike Vignale's letter said it seems like the one-mile radius extends 300 feet into the subdivision. That's where we show the line as well. So when we ask for a waiver from curbing, that's the only area where it is required. The rest of the development technically doesn't need a waiver. We wanted to give some clarity on what we are requesting a waiver from.

Chair Seaworth asked Mr. Rokeh to discuss where curbing is shown on the plan.

Mr. Rokeh explained that he talked to the Roads Committee and Selectmen about a combination of open and closed drainage. In areas where there are wetland crossings there is curbing because we want to contain the stormwater runoff and direct it to detention basins. I added curbing and a catch basin at the top of Pembroke Hill Road to an outlet into the development's ditch. By adding the curb, there will be no change to the water going into the existing diagonal pipe under the road. Our development won't affect that pipe. Mike Vignale met with DPW at the site to review where the pipe goes and they couldn't find the outlet. DPW was going to research it further. We can fix that pipe however it needs to be, but it's a Town structure. We would like to have Steve Pernaw give his traffic presentation tonight. I think it will be helpful for you to have the presentation ahead of reviewing the study. Chris Guida, our wetlands and soils scientist, is here tonight and we would like him to discuss the hydrology and wetlands quotes with the Board.

The Board agreed to hear the traffic presentation.

Mr. Pernaw introduced himself. He is with Pernaw and Company and their office prepared the traffic impact assessment. I think this overview will help you when you read the report. We received input from Town staff on what the study area will consist of. We looked at the intersections of Flagg-Robinson and Pembroke Hill, the signal at Pembroke Hill and Route 3, and the intersection of Borough Road and Route 106. We were asked to do traffic counts, estimate how much traffic the site will generate, and come up with future projections. We did 2020 projections and a 10-year projection. We look at intersection capacity and level of service.

Mr. Pernaw said he used NHDOT count data on Route 3 and Route 106 from 2018. The higher of the two counts was Route 3 south of Bow Lane, which saw 14,500 cars per day. 15,000 cars per day sounds like a lot and it is, but a traffic engineer is more interested in the rate of traffic flow. We plot the traffic flow throughout the day. On Route 3, the peak of traffic is at 7am-9am and again at 4pm-6pm. The PM peak is higher than the AM and the school nearby affects that. We did traffic counts at the peak hours (7am-9am and 2pm-6pm). We wanted to capture the school traffic volumes.

Mr. Pernaw said they did data collection on two weekdays. From 7am-8am or 7:15am-8:15am, they counted 1,541 cars on Route 3, less than 1,000 cars on Route 106, and 53

cars at the site (Pembroke Hill and Robinson). The evening peak (4pm-5pm or 4:15pm-5:15pm) showed higher volumes than the morning.

Mr. Pernaw said they did projections for 2020 and 2030 without the development for morning and evening peak hours. We took the raw data, estimated it up to a peak month condition, and took into account the residential development at Whittemore Road, the Cole Family subdivision, and the school merger. Residential traffic data is based on number of dwelling units. The highest PM peak is 49 trips, most trips coming into the subdivision. In the AM, it's 38 trips. In regard to trip distribution, the majority will use Pembroke Hill to get to Route 3 and the minority will use 4th Range Road. We compared the no-build to build scenario. There will be 1% AM increase and 2% PM increase to Route 3 traffic. Because Route 3 is a busy corridor, the percentages are low. The volumes at the site intersection are very low today. There are 67 trips in the morning and it will increase to 105 trips with the development, so it's a 57% increase in traffic. It will be almost double the traffic in the evening, but we are starting with a very low number to begin with.

Mr. Pernaw said they looked at the capacity of the signalized intersection at Pembroke Hill and Route 3. We look at level of service. For reference, a level of service of "A" means less than 10 seconds of delay and an "F" is more than 80 seconds. We also look at delay estimates. The good news is that in the PM peak hour, the intersection operates at 74% capacity with or without site traffic. There is less than a second increase in delay. In the AM peak, the intersection currently operates at 88% capacity and will be 91% capacity with the development. The school traffic has an impact on AM traffic volumes. The level of service is a "D" with or without development traffic, so more traffic and more delay will not affect level of service. In 2030, our analysis shows the signal will be operating at capacity. These are peak month analyses, which means it will happen one month of the year in a peak hour situation, which means it only happens once a day in that peak month. We look at a worst-case scenario.

Mr. Pernaw said that at the intersection of Borough Road and Route 106, if you are taking a left hand turn from Borough onto Route 106 today in the AM, the level of service is "E". With site traffic, it is also "E". In the PM, it is an "F" with or without site traffic. The good news is that all of the volumes are below the hourly capacity of the intersection. We looked at queue estimates, how far back the cars will stack, and at this intersection it does not change from no-build to build scenario. The queue is relatively short; up to four cars.

Mr. Pernaw then discussed the intersection at the site (Pembroke Hill and Robinson). The recommendation is to line up the approaches of the four-way intersection and to install stop signs at all four approaches. Four stop signs is typically not the best thing to do in terms of capacity, but we have low volumes here, so you can still put in four stop signs and have ample capacity (10%). The queue will be less than one vehicle.

Chair Seaworth said his concern is if you are travelling down the winding part of Pembroke Hill Road and have to take a left at the signal that is a difficult scenario for a commuter, which may not be picked up in this type of analysis.

Mr. Pernaw said his analysis shows lane groups. It predicts that the Pembroke Hill approach goes over capacity by 18% during the peak hour in the peak month. So for part of that hour, yes, you will have stacking. The next time the light turns green, it would clear. The queue is 7 vehicles without site traffic and 8 with site traffic during the worst case period.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked what peak month is.

Mr. Pernaw explained that, generally, you try to come up with the month of the year that has the highest traffic, but it's not the same everywhere. For this report, we used DOT's average and we looked at three years of their data for this area, and May was the highest month. We factor up to the highest month whatever it is.

Chair Seaworth asked if an intersection or a road is at capacity, what would be required to create more capacity at that intersection or road in anticipation of an increase in traffic.

Mr. Pernaw said when dealing with signalized intersections, the only way to see a big improvement in capacity is to provide two lanes northbound and two lanes southbound. Since the State just rebuilt that intersection, I don't think we will see it become 5 lanes in my lifetime. With the alignment what it is, there aren't a lot of opportunities to divert off the highway and take a parallel road. Short of doing an expansion project, that road is built the best they could. I'm curious why they didn't build a roundabout there. When you put a signalized intersection on a one-lane road with 15,000 cars per day, you will build up queues. I don't advocate roundabouts everywhere, but it would have made sense here.

Alternate Crean asked how demand lights factor into the traffic counts, whereby you have a traffic light that is tripped by a car coming up to the intersection. One car could trigger a delay.

Mr. Pernaw said it is factored into the analysis. All four approaches have detectors in the pavement. Appendix G has timing charts with that information.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked if the report shows actual counts or does it factor in the 120 additional children that will be attending the Hill School?

Mr. Pernaw said Appendix E shows that the school merger will add 91 AM trips and 24 PM trips. The Hill school projections are built into the analysis.

Chair Seaworth asked if anyone from the public had questions regarding the traffic study, keeping in mind the Board just received the study that night.

Brian Mrazik, Pembroke Hill Rd. – The total number of trips per day from the development was previously stated as 470. Has that number changed and can you give us the total daily amount of trips adding in the other subdivisions and the school merger? I'm interested in the intersection of Pembroke Hill and 4th Range.

Mr. Pernaw said 47 homes expect to generate about 520 daily trips on an average weekday. 260 trips in and 260 trips out. The intersection sees about 500 daily trips currently, another 500 will be added from the development, and another 80-100 trips will be generated by the school merger.

Kathy Cruson, Pembroke Hill Rd. – I have a question about the Montessori School near the traffic light. They have difficulty getting out onto the road. Sometimes there are near misses. Their driveway is not in a great place. Do you have comments about the intersection in regard to the private school? The driveway is about 80 feet from the intersection.

Mr. Pernaw said that's why traffic engineers like to maximize separation of driveways. I can't put a positive spin on it. It's an existing condition that doesn't sound like it's working too well. I can tell you the impact from this development is so incremental, it won't change anything. There is a natural variation in traffic from one day to the next. Traffic flow is random. There is more variation in traffic flow from day to day than there probably will be from the subdivision. The magnitude of the traffic increase fluctuates just as much from one day to the next.

Mr. Cronin asked Mr. Pernaw how long he's been doing this type of work and how many studies for subdivisions he has done.

Mr. Pernaw said he's been working in the field since the 1970s and has done hundreds of traffic studies for subdivisions.

Mr. Cronin asked if this subdivision gets built out, what impact it will have on the safety of these roads based on your education, training, and experience. Will the incremental increase in traffic have a negative impact on the health, safety, and welfare of the community?

Mr. Pernaw answered no, he believes it's a wash because traffic varies from day to day, so you will not see a spike in delays or crashes. You won't be able to perceive a difference in traffic once it's built.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said most of the residents comments were about the traffic on the winding road that Pembroke Hill is currently.

With the traffic presentation ended, the Board decided to discuss the hydrology and wetlands quotes next.

Mr. Rokeh said they reviewed all the quotes. He said they wanted someone to walk the site with their wetland scientist, and Meridian was the only quote that offered to do that. We feel the Meridian quote should be chosen for the work. In regard to the hydrology report, the two proposals are completely different. We would like Mr. Guida to discuss with the Board what you are looking for in terms of a hydrology report. We feel that because both Mr. Guida and the consultant from Meridian are soils scientists, that the hydrology

questions can be addressed with them. We don't know that the hydrology quotes you received could provide anything different than a soils scientist could offer.

Chris Guida introduced himself as a certified wetland scientist and certified soil scientist with Fieldstone Land Consultants. I believe you put out nine different wetlands requests and three returned quotes. Of those three, Meridian was the only one who reached out to me about the project and the site. That showed a level of professionalism I appreciate. They are more than adequate to evaluate the wetlands here. I think we struggled a little but with hydrology at the last meeting as far as what exactly it was that the Board was looking for. This site is located near a high point and there is not a lot of velocity in the water. Hydrology is typically more applicable when you're building or repairing a bridge, in instances where there are high flows. This site is relatively flat with forested areas, farm fields, and forested wetlands. There are some intermittent flows and seasonal streams, but not a lot of flows. A hydrologist would look at the velocity of flows and I don't think that's applicable in this situation. I don't believe that's what the Board is looking for.

Mr. Guida suggested that the Board may want to reach out to a consultant and ask them to look at the wetlands, soils, watersheds, and drainage analysis. I think that's what the Board is looking for and will be the most accurate and applicable information. In regard to the delineation review, every wetland scientist goes through similar training and education and their professional opinions on a wetland line can vary, but it may only be by about 1-5 feet. So I don't think a delineation review would yield a significant difference.

Alternate Crean said that he is less concerned with delineation. I don't think we will find major differences in the delineation. My concern is to look at what's proposed and how that affects the end result.

Mr. Guida offered that if that is the case, then the Board is probably looking more for an impact assessment as far as wildlife, drainage, impacts from roads and homes. Mr. Guida said that through the AOT Permit review the drainage would be looked at.

Alternate Crean said that he is a retired municipal lawyer and has had dealings with the State in the past, and his experience is that he does not place a lot of faith in State reviews. I'm concerned with what we have been told about the wetlands on-site. I'd feel better to have some kind of review showing how the development will affect wetlands, what the changes there will be, and what those impacts are.

Mr. Guida said the Wetlands Permit is reviewed by the State but also administered by the EPA and the Army Corp of Engineers. Through their review they will look at secondary impacts, which sounds like what you are alluding to. DES and NH Fish and Game also look at that.

Alternate Crean said that he anticipates the Board will not approve the project until they have seen a wetlands approval.

Mr. Guida said that they are still in the process of preparing the Wetlands Permit application, but the application and wetland impact could change based on the Town

approvals given for the project. We can also do a revised permit. Either way, it will still be a major permit (over 10,000 SF of impact).

Alternate Crean said they are being asked to approve a fairly large subdivision that affects a significant amount of the town. It's an environmentally sensitive area. We can't approve the project without state permits and procedures and without knowing what is going on at the state level.

Mr. Cronin agreed to Alternate Crean's point about how they can approve something without knowing what's going on. They are running into a "chicken and egg" situation if you get your state permits before your local permits and vice versa. The mechanism is to conditionally approve something based on getting the state permit. The Board can do its analysis and condition items that need to be satisfied and if not, they would have to come back for a compliance hearing. We want the Board to have the studies and reports they need, within reason, so that they have comfort with the third party review that goes on and the feedback that they give.

Chair Seaworth said that Mr. Cronin is correct in that when it comes to State requirements for wetlands we don't generally ask to see that done before approval, but make it a conditional part of the approval. In addition to that, we do have a request for a Wetlands Special Use Permit, which is Pembroke's town regulation and independent of the State requirements. Chair Seaworth read aloud the purpose of the Wetlands Special Use Permit from the Zoning Ordinance. Based on that, the Board has more responsibility than just going through the State process. That's one of the reasons we want to make sure we have the necessary reports and advice.

Ms. Cronin added that the Conservation Commission will get the opportunity to comment on the State Wetlands Permit and they did comment on the Special Use Permit. Part of the criteria for the Town's Wetland Special Use Permit is that we like to see the State Wetlands Permit Application. We run into the "chicken and egg" scenario, as Mr. Cronin mentioned, because the Town wants to see the Wetlands Permit application while they are reviewing the Wetlands Special Use Permit. The applicants are having a hard time putting together their Wetlands Permit before they get more input on the plan, so these are the things we need to work through.

Chair Seaworth said that on the one hand there were questions about the locations of the wetlands so we felt the process of having someone review the wetlands delineation with the applicant's wetland scientist was an adequate approach. We have three bids for that work. The second request was more open-ended where we had questions about the hydrology. Some of that will be reviewed by the State, but it seemed last time that several members of the Board thought that there was information we wanted to understand about the impacts of the development on the hydrology. We used the term "hydrology," which pushed the proposals in a certain direction.

Chair Seaworth explained that they got two bids that answered different questions. GeolInsight would review the drainage plan, but that might not be necessary and they could

reduce the scope if we wanted to focus on something else. Emery & Garrett said they weren't qualified to review the drainage plan, but proposed a number of things in other areas. It seems that neither of the proposals seem to get at what the Board was asking for when we made the request. The applicant made a good point that depending on what we are asking for, it's possible a wetlands/soils scientist is qualified to look into those things for us.

Chair Seaworth suggested that the Board had a couple items to discuss: 1. having seen the wetland delineation review proposals, are we satisfied with one consultant. 2. What to do with the hydrology request. One possibility is that we may need to delegate it back to the Planner to refine the scope down to exactly what we want if we aren't satisfied with the proposals in hand.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said her question is the end result of the development on the wetlands and on the neighbors. I think Alternate Crean is asking the same thing.

Chair Seaworth felt they were all on the same page and the task is to turn that into a response to the proposals they received. We could either ask the wetlands consultants to add that into their review or they could go back to the hydrology consultants and refine the scopes.

Mr. Rokeh suggested that if you are looking at the hydrologist, they would be focused on the water flow. What it sounds like you are looking for is a functions and values report for the site, which is more based on wetlands and soils. The two hydrologists may not be able to quote on that.

Ms. Cronin explained that the hydrologists are looking at groundwater and the wetlands scientists are looking at wetlands, and there are a lot of different questions that have come up around those two things. So to try and narrow that down to what the questions are would be helpful. There was such a broad range of questions and concerns about the stormwater design, wetlands impacts, and well and septic impacts. Geolnsight proposed reviewing the stormwater design, understanding that the Town Engineer has already reviewed it. Geolnsight could look at it again based on what information they have regarding hydrology and they can try to address questions. They are a hydrology and engineering firm.

Ms. Cronin said when she talked to Emery & Garrett, she was trying to compare apples to apples, so she asked them to produce the same scope as Geolnsight, but they are not an engineering firm, so they don't review stormwater design. They review groundwater and can look at hydrology of the site and address the questions that have come up in the meetings. The question to the Board is what is the water issue that you are trying to get to the crux of? That answer will direct you to one of the two very different proposals. I think we need to focus on what type of information the Board wants to see so that I can better direct that scope to the appropriate parties.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said she wants to know about both the stormwater and about the impacts to the water.

Chair Seaworth clarified that the Town Engineer has already reviewed the stormwater design. Are we asking for additional review?

Mr. Rokeh pointed out that the State will also review the stormwater through their Alteration of Terrain review.

Mr. Guida suggested that the Board may be looking for an environmental impact assessment, which will take all of these wetlands and drainage issues into account and how they affect habitat, wildlife, roads, and wells. It's an all-around approach to look at impacts from the development. It's typically done by a wetlands and soils scientist. That may be what you are looking for.

Chair Seaworth reiterated that he wasn't sure if an additional stormwater design was what was intended when they discussed having a third party reviewer look at the plans.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond agreed.

Member Hanson said his recollection is that the concerns were about the impacts of the development. It seems that the environmental impact assessment will give some feedback in that direction.

Chair Seaworth asked that the environmental impact assessment not be concerned solely on the wetlands and wildlife because we also want to know the impact to the existing houses in the area.

Mr. Guida agreed and said that it would be overall impacts. It would address the land characteristics now versus how they would change after development, including runoff, impervious surfaces, vegetation, and amount of water. I could prepare the report for review by the third party wetlands scientist.

Mr. Rokeh asked the Board if Mr. Guida could prepare an environmental impact assessment to be reviewed by a third party. He suggested Ms. Cronin get in contact with those who supplied bids and ask if they would be able to review the report.

Alternate Crean said that made sense to him.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked about the status of the Wetlands Permit application.

Mr. Rokeh said that a lot of the application is done, but a big part of why they haven't moved forward with it is because some of the waivers we are asking for will substantially affect the application process. We ask that you let us know what kind of information you need to make a decision on the waivers.

Chair Seaworth asked if the Board would like to award a bid tonight and allow Ms. Cronin to work with the consultant on a revised scope to cover the environmental impact

assessment review. If not, he would like to know what the Board would like to do with the proposals before them.

Alternate Crean said his thought is to let the applicant submit their version of an environmental impact assessment and have that reviewed by a consultant. He does not feel that a wetland delineation review is significant at this time. I suggest at this point the most efficient way to go is to have the applicant's wetland scientist do the assessment and for us to get an independent review. I don't feel prepared to vote on the waivers or the shared driveways tonight until I have all the information.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond and Member Hanson agreed with Alternate Crean.

Member Hanson asked if it's possible to act on the Special Use Permit with the condition of State approval.

Ms. Cronin explained that for the Wetlands Special Use Permit it is a standard condition that the applicant receive State approval.

Chair Seaworth clarified the applicant's request. As the plans in front of us are not compliant with the subdivision regulations, because we require the sidewalks and we don't allow the shared driveways, the applicant is asking if the plan is acceptable with the waivers and the special use permits.

Mr. Cronin agreed that if the Board grants the sidewalk waiver and shared driveway special use permits, that allows the applicant to go forward with the State, but it won't negate our obligation to meet the town requirements on the special use permits. By granting the waivers, it's not side-stepping anything. It just gives the definitive way to complete the State application. The reason for the driveways is to protect the wetlands. There seems to be consensus that we submit an environmental impact assessment and allow you to pick the appropriate consultant to review it.

Member Hanson said he is not sure he is ready to vote on any of those waivers tonight without first seeing the environmental impact assessment.

Chair Seaworth assumes that the environmental impact assessment will be done based on the plan in front of them (without sidewalks and with shared driveways).

It was agreed that the report would reflect the plan design that was submitted.

Ms. Cronin asked for a point of clarification. She said it sounds like the applicant will prepare the environmental impact assessment and the Board will hire a consultant to review it, but is that in lieu of the wetland delineation peer review and in lieu of the hydrology study?

Alternate Crean and Member Hanson replied yes. Selectmen's Rep. Bond said no.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond thought the Board was going to award the review of the report to a consultant tonight.

Chair Seaworth said that would be difficult because as of now, the scope did not include the environmental impact assessment review. We need to revise the RFP and see what their bid would be first. We were asking about that review in lieu of the other two studies.

Mr. Cronin said he thought it was imperative that the Board vote on the curbing and sidewalk waivers and shared driveway special use permits tonight so the applicant can move forward. The Roads Committee and the Town Engineer both signed off on them. We're fine with extending everything else, but we would like a vote on those three items tonight. When you accept jurisdiction of the plan, the vote of that is that you have sufficient information to make an informed decision on what's before you. We could do independent driveways but they will have more wetland impact and I think everyone is in favor of minimizing wetland impact. I'd like to provide some definitiveness to the applicant, who is bearing the brunt of the expense, to move forward in the best way possible.

Alternate Crean said if they approve the waivers, he views it as a conditional approval pending receipt of the environmental impact assessment and State approvals.

Mr. Guida said that Mr. Cronin is accurate as far as the shared driveways being a positive aspect to preserving the wetlands. I think it's great that people are focused on the environmental impacts, and granting these waivers will minimize the impact to the environment.

Mr. Cronin said he has never heard of a conditional grant of a waiver. It doesn't really help us. We still have to satisfy the requirements of the special use permits. If you grant the waivers, that just gives us the right to file with the State for the Wetland Permit and continue with this process to satisfy your requirements. I think you inherently have that condition. Granting the waiver does not approve the project.

Chair Seaworth clarified for everyone, in terms of the waivers, the applicant is asking if we are OK with the plans as presented or if we want them to revise it to meet our regulations.

Jackie Zeaman, 406 4th Range Rd. – I live across from the development. Will this environmental study address how 47 new wells will impact the neighbor's wells? We all have trouble with iron. Both houses that sold near me have high radon. The new wells should be tested. The people buying these homes need to know they will have to put in some kind of system.

Mr. Guida said the assessment will address the issue to the extent of the information that they have. The State has data from well logs that we can review. The State requires the water to be tested. We can't predict what the water will be like, but we will do our best with the information we have.

Mr. Cronin added that the disclosure requirements to sell a home in New Hampshire address private water and septic. That information has to be made known to the buyer.

Riparian rights say everyone has equal rights to the groundwater. The wells require State approvals.

Ammy Heiser, Conservation Commission Chair – In terms of shared driveways, you're saying it's to minimize wetland impact but I think it's to allow more houses on a lot that is already environmentally sensitive. This will be 47 houses in a very wet area. Shared driveways will more than likely allow three more houses, which increase the impact of this development even greater. I don't think any waivers should be given so they can maximize the number of houses going in.

Chair Seaworth explained that those lots with proposed shared driveways all have frontage and could be considered buildable lots whether they grant the special use permits or not. To deny the special use permits for shared driveways would not reduce the number of house lots nor the amount of wetland impact.

Kathy Cruson, Pembroke Hill Rd. – I disagree entirely with shared driveways and driveways that go over other people's land. This is a legal error. A driveway needs to be contained within the parcel.

Chair Seaworth described the shared driveway requests as two different types. Two of them are each shared between two homes. The other type is three houses on a private drive. That will be a named street with street numbers. The residents on the private drive will not have public service for trash, plowing, or street maintenance.

Mr. Cronin said he appreciates Ms. Cruson's personal opinion, but as far as the planning regulations go you have to think about its impact on the public. The homeowners will own the driveway. Shared driveways exist throughout New Hampshire. In Hollis and Bedford, affluent communities with expensive homes, they encourage shared driveways for conservation of land. There will be an easement and an agreement in place. People that buy them know what they are getting into. I respect people who don't personally want a shared driveway, but there's a segment of the market that don't seem to mind them.

Peter Gailunas, 415 4th Range Rd. – It's obvious these plans have been engineered to make the maximum amount of money they can make on this property. This development does nothing for the town. Shared driveways are absurd. This plan is ridiculous.

Stanley Grimes Jr., Buck St. – If the shared driveways aren't approved and there are wetland impacts from the independent driveways, would the State have to approve the wetland impacts? What would be the next step for the Wetlands Permit? Also, there was discussion that the developer would turn over the retention ponds to the town. Has there been precedent for that? The people on the property should be responsible for maintaining it.

Chair Seaworth said that was the crux of the Wetlands Permit application issue. The applicant's application filing is dependent on whether or not the Board grants the shared driveways.

Mr. Guida added that NHDES, EPA, and the Army Corp would all review the plan concurrently.

Chair Seaworth said there has been some misunderstanding on the detention ponds. The purpose of the drainage system is to manage the stormwater from the roads, not the houses or the property around the houses. The current requirements are that stormwater is maintained on the property. So instead of pipes that carry the water off-site, like is seen in older developments in town, water is now required to be treated and infiltrated on-site. That's why we see something different than there was a generation ago.

Ms. Cronin said typically if the Town is going to take over the road as a Town road, they take over the stormwater infrastructure associated with that road. This question came up at the last meeting and there was a directive to get further comment from the DPW and Roads Committee. Ms. Cronin read the memos into the record. Both recommended that the stormwater ponds be maintained by the Town. The Roads Committee had questions on how to enforce existing stormwater easements.

Alternate Crean said in regard to the comment from the Roads Committee that, "any homeowners' association can be dismantled, preventing the Town from enforcing the maintenance," is incorrect. You would make the homeowners association a condition of approval. It would be a violation of the approval to terminate the homeowners association. In my role as town counsel, I have reviewed many of these documents and I always ensure the homeowners' association documents say they cannot be amended without approval of the Town. I disagree completely with that statement from the Roads Committee.

Wendy Weisiger, Academy Road. – I own a shared driveway. Unlike people in Hollis and Bedford, I don't own a million dollar home and I can't afford attorneys to work out disagreements with my abutter. I disagree with shared driveways when they result in further development. There is an option on the part of this landowner to have less impact, and that lesser impact can be fewer homes. We should be talking to the developer about considering that. If the town doesn't allow or approve shared driveways, then there is always the option to build fewer homes. If the shared driveways are not approved and there is more wetland impact, the Board should consider that as it relates to the Wetlands Protection District.

Bob Bourque, Pheasant Run – I have a question about the sidewalk waiver. What is the applicant requesting exactly? In the past, this Board has required developers to put in sidewalks throughout the entire development. The only waiver we have granted is to allow them on one side of the road instead of both sides of the road. This development should have sidewalks on at least one side of the road. I agree with most of the comments here about shared driveways. It's great if you have a great neighbor, but there are people who make it tough to have a shared driveway. You shouldn't have to go to court to resolve issues. I'm against shared driveways in this development or any development. I'm against driveways that go on someone else's property because that person would not have full use of their property and is paying taxes for someone else's driveway.

Brian Mrazik, Pembroke Hill Rd. – The applicant has to make an economic decision on whether it's cost effective to move forward without those shared driveways. If they do go forward with those additional houses, there will be a wetland impact. It will be additional mitigation required for that wetland impact. Traditionally, mitigation for wetland impacts is the set aside of land of equivalent ecological value. It's typically a donation of conservation land. I think that should be the developer's decision. If it's cost effective to continue to put in the houses, then put in the separate driveways and increase the contribution to the mitigation effort. It's an economic decision and shouldn't be put on this Board. The real concern is we could get two more houses.

Mr. Cronin said that what he is hearing is that it's not a shared driveway problem, it's a density problem that the people are concerned about. To me, the shared driveways make all the sense in the world. The applicants own the property and will do all the easement work to make it right. If it gives anybody additional comfort, this subdivision being over ten lots, requires review by the Attorney General's office under the Land Sales Full Disclosure Act. They will want to see those easements and see that they are properly done. People that own property in town could give easements to a neighbor if they chose to, probably without Planning Board approval. Whether or not there will be problems with neighbors in the future is not a basis to deny shared driveways. If you can do it legally while preserving some conservation land and lessening the impacts, it seems to make sense to do.

(First name inaudible) Parris, Beacon Hill Rd. – There is a reason that Pembroke has a no shared driveway policy in our town. There is no reason why that needs to change.

Chair Seaworth said there are a couple things to resolve before they end the public session. The practice is that we look to the applicant to request an extension to the review time limit. If we agree on a date now, we can vote on that once the public hearing is closed.

Mr. Cronin said they would be willing to extend it to the next meeting (July 23rd), on the condition that the Board vote on the sidewalk and curbing waivers and the shared driveway special use permits tonight. It's essential to the applicant that they get those three items voted on.

Chair Seaworth explained that there are a number of things the Board could do if we expect that we won't have another meeting to vote. A motion could be made to approve or deny the application. If the Board does not make a decision, the applicants have a process to require the Board to make a decision. The deadline is not tonight; it's July 11th.

Chair Seaworth then asked the Board if they want to comment on whether or not they want to take a vote to act on any of the waivers tonight.

Ms. Cronin offered that since the shared driveways are so tied to the wetlands and since the Board has discussed requesting an environmental impact assessment, would it make sense for the Board to make that request and the applicant provide that report with alternatives showing with and without the shared driveways? Would that provide more information to the Board in order to make a decision?

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said yes.

Member Hanson asked if that runs counter to the applicants request for extension, since they will only extend it if we vote on that item tonight.

Mr. Jodoin added that there seems to be some apprehension and reservation about voting on this tonight. My opinion would be to have that study done with both alternatives and authorize staff to have it reviewed, that way you will have that information for the next meeting and you may feel comfortable and ready to vote on those issues at that time. The applicant would have to request an extension to the next meeting to make that work, depending how long it would take to prepare the report.

Mr. Guida said that the impact of the shared driveways on the overall environmental report will likely be minimal since the majority of the wetland impacts are from the roadway. The environmental impact assessment can take a while to put together. It will take longer than a week.

Ms. Cronin said that the submittal date for the July 23rd meeting would be July 13th, which is two weeks from now and there is a holiday in between. Even if we received the report by the 13th, if we have contracted with a consultant by then, I don't know what their timeline would be to review it.

Member Hanson said his opinion is that conditioning the extension on our action on those waivers is like holding a gun to our head. I don't respond to that kindly, so my inclination would be to vote no.

Alternate Crean said he has not seen the written waiver request and would want to review what the reasons are for the waiver requests.

Mr. Lehtonen said there was an understanding with the Roads Committee that there are no other sidewalks in this area, so there would be no sidewalk connectivity. The DPW would have to bring a sidewalk machine up here just to maintain this subdivision alone, which didn't seem feasible. It was recommended by the Town Engineer and the Roads Committee to support the waiver and not provide sidewalks in this area. With the shared driveways, the number one factor was to reduce wetland impact. Without the shared driveways, we would have the same number of lots, but more wetlands crossings.

Chair Seaworth mentioned that generally the purpose of the curbing is to protect the sidewalk. In the past when we talked about the curbing requirement, it is in relation to the sidewalk so if there is a waiver granted from the sidewalk, typically the curbing waiver is granted as well. In discussions about the development of Fourth Range Road, it was mentioned that the rest of Fourth Range Road doesn't have a sidewalk, so would it be out of character to then put in a sidewalk there. That might be something the Board considers.

Mr. Rokeh explained that the majority of the internal subdivision road is outside of the area that requires sidewalks.

Kathy Cruson, Pembroke Hill Rd. – The sidewalk machine already goes up that way to go to the Pembroke Hill School.

Brian Mrazik, Pembroke Hill Rd. – The culvert issue has not been resolved yet. Are they diverting the entire flow of that culvert to their own drainage system? If they are rebuilding that intersection, they need to bring the whole intersection up to Town standards, which is to carry the 10-year stormwater discharge and to have a minimum 15" culvert, so we can't leave the existing 8" culvert there. You can't even get the engineer's computed discharge (29 cubic feet per second) through a 15" culvert, so the issue has not been addressed. The Board is making a mistake by blowing off the hydrology review because I looked at one culvert and it makes no sense to me. I've been a professional hydrologist for 30 years. All the culverts need to be looked at. Also, we can talk about traffic but the real issue is the extremely dangerous "S curve" at Pembroke Hill and Fourth Range. It does not meet any of the Town's standards for even a Class C road. There is no line of sight around that corner. There is no shoulder at all. If a big truck comes the other way, you are hugging the edge of that road. If a truck is coming one way, and another car is coming the other way, and there is a pedestrian at that curve, someone is going to get it. We heard that total traffic will more than double. That means the probability of having two trucks and a pedestrian will more than double. There will be people with kids living in that subdivision and they will walk and bike to school, which will increase the probability of someone getting wiped out at that curve. The smart thing to do would be to cut the subdivision in half until that is fixed and to take the money for Fourth Range Road and fix that corner. Nothing else makes any sense.

At 9:53 PM, the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Member Hanson moved to request an environmental impact assessment from the applicant. Seconded by Selectmen's Rep. Bond.

VOTE: B. Seaworth – Y A. Bond – Y C. Hanson – Y
 D. Crean – Y

MOTION TO REQUEST AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FROM THE APPLICANT PASSED ON A 4-0 VOTE.

Ms. Cronin asked, relative to the study, does the Board want to wait to receive the study and then ask the wetlands consultants who provided quotes to amend their quotes to review the study?

Chair Seaworth asked that when we receive the report that we reach out to those consultants for revised quotes, but we will not be acting on any quotes tonight.

Alternate Crean noted that it doesn't make sense to discuss the bid process until we know what the deadline will be for action.

Chair Seaworth said that in the past they have asked for a written request from the applicant to extend the deadline. We don't have that request tonight. We could conditionally grant an extension, provided the applicant submits a written request, to the date they request.

Alternate Crean said he hesitates to extend to July 23rd if that's the meeting date, because something could happen where they don't have a meeting.

The Board members had no motions on the waivers.

MOTION: Alternate Crean moved to extend the review time limit to July 25th, conditional upon a written request from the applicant stating that they are agreeable. Seconded by Member Hanson.

VOTE: B. Seaworth – Y A. Bond – Y C. Hanson – Y
D. Crean – Y

MOTION TO EXTEND THE REVIEW TIME LIMIT TO JULY 25TH, CONDITIONAL UPON A WRITTEN REQUEST FROM THE APPLICANT STATING THAT THEY ARE AGREEABLE PASSED ON A 4-0 VOTE.

MOTION: Member Hanson moved to continue the public hearing to July 23rd. Seconded by Selectmen's Rep. Bond.

VOTE: B. Seaworth – Y A. Bond – Y C. Hanson – Y
D. Crean – Y

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JULY 23RD PASSED ON A 4-0 VOTE.

Chairman Seaworth noted that per the Board's rules, they do not hold the meeting past 10:00PM unless something is urgent.

MOTION: Member Hanson moved to defer review of the June 11th minutes to the next meeting. Seconded by Selectmen's Rep. Bond.

VOTE: B. Seaworth – Y A. Bond – Y C. Hanson – Y
D. Crean – Y

MOTION TO DEFER REVIEW OF THE JUNE 11TH MINUTES TO THE NEXT MEETING PASSED ON A 4-0 VOTE.

Members Bourque and Cruson returned to the Board.

Member Cruson asked if an applicant has their attorney present, shouldn't we have our attorney present?

Mr. Jodoin explained that our two attorneys were travelling and they were not necessarily needed tonight.

Member Bourque asked for clarification on whether the Board is waiting on a letter from the applicant in order to continue the business to July 23rd. If that doesn't happen, procedurally what would happen next?

Chair Seaworth said if they are not allowed to continue to review the application, we won't have to take a vote, and the applicant has a process to force a vote at some time in the future. It would probably not be appropriate to meet at another date to discuss the application.

Ms. Cronin said her understanding is that the continuance of the hearing is conditional upon receiving a letter from the applicant saying they are agreeable to that. If we don't hear from them before the deadline on July 11th, I believe that continuance is off the table.

Chair Seaworth said we will consult with our attorney on what happens if certain dates pass.

Member Bourque noted that in all his years on the Planning Board he has never seen an applicant present an ultimatum.

Mr. Jodoin warned the Board member to limit their discussion since the hearing is now closed.

Chair Seaworth agreed that it is not appropriate to discuss what happened.

1. Correspondence

Ms. Cronin said the Board received a driveway permit from DOT for a duplex building on Academy Road. Also, DES notified the town that interns will be performing stream crossing culvert assessments in the area this summer.

2. Committee Reports

Member Cruson said she went to Regional Planning and they had a presentation on easements and brownfield sites. Pembroke Village School may become a brownfields site. They redid the DRI guidelines.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said the Energy Committee is meeting on July 11th at 6:30PM in the Town Hall. We will finalize the street light regulations at our next Selectmen's meeting. The Range Road meeting was held June 17th. 30 people attended the site walk.

Member Bourque said the Zoning Board saw four cases last night. Gallo was continued because they are waiting on sewer, a variance was denied to put a 5th unit on a property on Buck Street, Continental Paving is moving their operation from Ricker Road to North

Pembroke Road and we approved the height of the silos, and setback relief for a shed was granted.

Member Hanson said Pace Academy closed on the building for \$1,010,000.

3. Other Business

None.

4. Planner Items

Ms. Cronin said TRC meets tomorrow morning on two applications. New England Flower Farms wants to expand their greenhouse again. Michel's Power is moving into the H. P. Fairfield property.

5. Board Member Items

None

6. Audience Items

None.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Cronin, Town Planner

357 Pembroke Hill Rd
Pembroke, NH 03275

RECEIVED

JUN 13 2019

TOWN OF PEMBROKE
PLANNING DEPT.

June 10, 2019

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Board of Selectmen
Town of Pembroke
311 Pembroke St.
Pembroke, NH 03275

Dear Selectmen,

This is in response to your undated Public Hearing Notice in regard to the petition by San Ken Homes, Inc. to reclassify Robinson Road and portions of Fourth Range Road from Class VI to Class V. The reclassification is proposed as part of the petitioner's plan for construction of a 48-lot major subdivision (Plan Application #18-09 for Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45) at 373 Fourth Range Road. I am hereby invoking my right to submit the following written testimony in opposition to this petition. I am also resubmitting my April 8, 2019 letter to the Board (enclosed) as part of my testimony.

I am concerned that statements by unauthorized Town representatives have lead to a plan for Fourth Range Road which is unnecessary, inconsistent with the Town's subdivision ordinance, and detrimental to the rural character of the neighborhood. The developer's initial concept plan of September 2, 2017 did not include any proposed changes to the Class VI portion of Fourth Range Road. In the October 3, 2017 meeting of the Roads Committee, the developer was told that "...they [the Fire Department] do not like one way in and out of a development"; that "there were still possibilities [to place improvements on Class VI range roads] if the developer includes the cost to improve the roads in their plans"; and that "It is the opinion of the Roads Committee that Fourth Range Road be opened up from Pembroke Hill Road to the end of the property as well as Flagg/Robinson Road to Fifth Range Road."

Only the Planning Board has the authority to issue requirements and specifications for subdivision approval, yet the developer has revised his plan to incorporate each of the 'requirements' stated by the Roads Committee. Subsequently, in the Planning Board meeting of October 24, 2017, the developer asked if there would be a sidewalk requirement for Flagg-Robinson Road and Fourth Range Road (as required by Town ordinance). The former Town Planner replied that "there would be a waiver for that". Subsequent discussion at that meeting indicated that most Planning Board members were in favor of sidewalks. By email of January 9, 2019 from the Town Planner to the developer's engineer, he was told that, for the subdivision application to be complete, he would have to submit *"A letter requesting the following items be waived from the Subdivision Regulations with justification for each....b. 205-41.E (19)(a) Sidewalks (Request to not provide sidewalks for reasons of character of the neighborhood, drainage/impervious, etc)."*


More recently, at the April 23, 2019 meeting of the Planning Board, in a presentation by the developer, I learned that the developer had again revised the design plans for the Fourth Range Road upgrade such that it would now meet the specifications for a Class B Collector roadway as opposed to a Class C Local roadway (normally required for a subdivision). The revised plan now calls for 1,800 feet of roadway with a 24-foot wide paved surface, 4-foot gravel shoulders on both sides, and flanked by drainage ditches. Again, no sidewalks are shown on the plan, which is inconsistent with the Town's subdivision regulations regarding roads within 1 mile of a (Pembroke Hill) school.

The developer stated that the road plan was revised in response to the review letter of January 11, 2019 from KVPartners, LLC (the engineering firm under contract to the Town) and for consistency with the Town's Master Plan. This review letter stated that "*4th Range Road may eventually become a collector street as noted in the TRC comments. Since that is a possibility and a desire of the Town, we recommend the roadway width be increased to Collector Road standards or 24' wide.*" I remind the Board that an updated Master Plan does not exist until approved by the Planning Board and cannot be used as the basis for the proposed reclassification or an enhanced roadway design. Likewise, evidence that the use or upgrading of Fourth Range Road, as a 'Collector Road', is a 'desire of the Town' does not exist and, in fact, evidence to the contrary is abundant, as discussed in my letter of April 8. Furthermore, a recommendation by a Town consultant does not constitute a directive from the Planning Board. In the record, I can find no action by the Planning Board to change the specifications for Fourth Range Road from Class C to Class B.

In summary, as a result of statements made by Town representatives, other than the Planning Board, the developer has moved from a position of not proposing any upgrades to Fourth Range Road, to agreeing to put in place a Class B Collector roadway, some 1,800 feet in length, with 24 feet of paved width, 8 feet of gravel shoulders, but no sidewalks and curbs, as a condition for the Town's approval of his subdivision. The Board of Selectmen is now being asked to lay out this road despite the fact that it is not required for the development, no public benefit will be achieved by it, its plan is inconsistent with the Town's subdivision ordinance, and it is detrimental to the rural character of the neighborhood.

I would like to finally call the Board's attention to RSA 674:40 which requires that in a municipality with a Planning Board that has subdivision approval authority, a highway cannot be laid out as part of a subdivision without the prior approval of the Planning Board. I therefore request that, to avoid further usurpation of the Planning Board's authority, the Board of Selectmen either reject the petition outright, or take no further action on the petition until the Planning Board has defined the need for, and specifications of, any roadways to be laid out.

Sincerely,



Brian R. Mrazik

Cc: Pembroke Planning Board

6/25/2019
Peter Gailunas
415 4th Range Road
Pembroke NH 03275

RECEIVED

JUN 25 2019

TOWN OF PEMBROKE
PLANNING DEPT.

TO: Planning board, Town of Pembroke NH.

RE: San-Ken Homes Plan Application #18-09, Special use permit application SUP-WP # 18-318 and Special use permit application SUP-WP # 18-319.

Planning board Members and council,

I moved to 4th Range Road 17 years ago to get away from exactly what San-Ken homes is proposing to build at 373 4th Range road.

A 48 home project of this magnitude in this delicate area only promotes urbanization and the destruction of the rural beauty of Pembroke. Our town does not need another Donna Drive style development. By refusing to grant this subdivision permit and associated special use permits, the Planning board of Pembroke has the power to stop or significantly limit this project.

Looking at the plan San-Ken has submitted to the Planning board, it's pretty clear they have engineered the usage of every inch of this land to maximize the profit they will make on this project. From the sheer size of this project, its location and requested exceptions it is clear that San-Ken has no regard for the rural character of this part of Pembroke. The request for shared driveways is absurd and clearly an indication that the land cannot support this much development.

San-Ken could withdraw its applications and re-apply to build fewer homes. I doubt anyone would complain if they were requesting to build 10 or 15 homes on this site. 10 or 15 Homes would be a reasonable use of land with much less environmental and abutter impact while maintaining Pembroke's rural character.

Allowing this large 48 home compact development sets a precedence that the town may not be able to control moving forward. With our towns rural character is ruined, Pembroke will be ripe for explosive growth.

As a direct abutter, I am firmly against this project and the destruction of peaceful rural country living that this project will bring. I respectfully ask the planning board to listen to the will of the abutters, town's people and recreational users of the Range Roads. Do not be intimidated by San-Ken's lawyers. Refuse this application and 2 associated special use permits.

Peter Gailunas



