Town of Northwood
Planning Board
July 24, 2014

Chairman Robert Strobel calls the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Robert Strobel, Vice-Chair Lee Baldwin, Selectman Representative Timothy Jandebeur, Lucy Edwards, Rick Wolf, Joseph McCaffrey, Alternate Victoria Parmele, Board Administrator Linda Smith, and Board Secretary Lisa Fellows-Weaver. Richard Bojko arrives at 6:34 p.m.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Robert Strobel, Lee Baldwin, Timothy Jandebeur, Lucy Edwards, Rick Wolf, Joseph McCaffrey, and Alternate Victoria Parmele.

ABSENT: Alternate Ken Rick, and Alternate Adam Sprague

MINUTES:
July 17, 2014
Mr. Jandebeur makes a motion, second by Ms. Edwards, to approve the July 17, 2014 meeting minutes, as amended as follows:
Page 3: Change: …lot… to …*boundary*…; Add: …*to the*…
Page 9: Delete: …that exceed a surveyed plan
Motion passes; 6/0/1. Mr. Wolf abstains as he was not at the meeting.

CASE: 14-09: Maureen Cahill and Sandra Hassett, 10 Welsh Rd. Map 242; Lot 23. Applicants seek a minor site plan review for a pet rescue, boarding and temporary quarantine facility for dogs and cats.

Mr. Jandebeur has recused himself for this case and leaves the table.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Robert Strobel, Lee Baldwin, Lucy Edwards, Rick Wolf, Joseph McCaffrey, and Richard Bojko.

Mr. Strobel states that he has received a request from Maureen Cahill to continue this case to August 28, 2014.

Ms. Smith indicates that the application has not been accepted as complete yet and the board may want to consider a continuance for consideration of acceptance of the application**. Ms. Edwards makes a motion to accept the request received from Ms. Cahill to continue case 14-09 for consideration of the application, until August 28, 2014. Mr. McCaffrey seconds. Motion passes unanimously; 6/0.**

Mr. Jandebeur returns to the table and is added to the voting member.

CASE: 14-05: 598 First NH Turnpike, 598 First NH Turnpike. Map 222/Lot 23. Applicant seeks minor subdivision to subdivide one new lot of 2.85 Acres from existing 5.4 acre lot.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Robert Strobel, Lee Baldwin, Timothy Jandebeur, Lucy Edwards, Rick Wolf, Joseph McCaffrey, and Alternate Victoria Parmele.

Scott Frankiewicz is present representing the applicant. He provides an update of the project. He explains that he applied for a variance to create a lot with less than the required minimum of 1 acre of contiguous upland soils from the ZBA, which was denied. He states that they will now proceed with a wetlands permit to cross the wetlands and will need to go back to the ZBA for a special exception. He states that he will be meeting with the conservation commission on August 5 for the wetlands crossing and it assumes that a site walk will be necessary. He notes that he has received state subdivision approval as well as the NHDOT updated permit for a residential driveway. In addition, the driveway has been moved farther to the west to get the 530 ft. of sight line. He adds that new test pits will be done in the rear of the property.

Ms. Smith states that the application has not been accepted as complete to date.

Ms. Smith asks if it is Mr. Frankiewicz intent to meet with the ZBA at the August 25 meeting. Mr. Frankiewicz replies yes. Ms. Smith states that the application deadline is August 1.

Ms. Edwards makes a motion to grant a continuance for discussion of completeness of the application for Case: 14-05 to August 28, 2014. Mr. McCaffrey seconds the motion. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

CASE: 14-07: James & Linda Grant-Piper Cove Properties, 258 First NH Turnpike. Map 231; Lot 9. Applicants seek an amendment to an existing site plan to add an Aroma Joe's Drive-Up Window to existing business/retail complex.

Mr. Jandebeur makes a motion, second by Mr. McCaffrey, to accept the application as complete. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Licensed Land Surveyor William Wormell is present representing the applicants.

Mr. Strobel opens the public hearing for this application and reads the abutters list. Abutters present are Phillip and Debra Elliot and Francis and Catherine Bernier.

Mr. Wormell provides updated plans. He explains that the revised plans include information and details per request of the board from the July 11 work session.

Mr. Wormell provides an overview of the proposal and site. He explains that the proposal is for an Aroma Joes franchise, which is a coffee and food distribution

franchise. He states that the proposal includes a drive-up window and an inside counter service at the retail space within the current Northwood Garage building.

Mr. Wormell explains that the traffic flow is proposed to come in on the East side of the building and exit around the building onto Rte. 4; one-way traffic around the building for that purpose only. He notes that there are arrows added to the plan to show the traffic flow.

Mr. Wormell states that the proposal will be to add pavement to the drive-thru area in the rear of the building; permeable asphalt will be proposed, which will allow water to run thru it. He states that this is shown on the plan and will be approximate 12 ft. wide and 1,214 sq. ft. He explains that it is a gravel based area currently and even though it is drivable now; it would be preferable to have the permeable pavement added.

Mr. Wormell refers to the side of the building at the proposed drive-up window and notes that there is a small piece of concrete in the paved area that is proposed to be removed and replaced with the permeable asphalt as well. He adds that it is a concrete pad now. An asphalt curb will also be added at 1½' off the face of the building, and approximately 8" high. He states that this will alleviate cars from being up against the building.

Mr. Wormell states that a menu board is proposed to be installed in the area as a car approaches the building area with the drive-up window. He states that the board will be approximately 48" x 54" and on two posts.

Mr. Wormell notes that he moved the title block as requested and renamed the title to Piper Cove Properties. In addition, he changed note 5 as requested regarding the lighting regulations. He adds he has changed the hours of operation to 5 A.M. to 9 P.M.

Mr. Wormell provides an overview of the landscaping on site. He explains that he has described the plantings on the plan and has tried to indicate what exists and what does not exist. He states that the arborvitaes screening will be re-established when the storage building is built. Mr. Wormell notes that there was a prior approval for the storage building. He states that the building permit has lapsed; however, that building will be built. Ms. Smith states that the approved site plan date was July 11, 2005.

Mr. Wormell states that it was proposed in 2005 to have three trees planted in the grass island. He states that the owners requested to not plant the tree noted in the sign area as it would block viewing of the sign. Mr. Wormell provides a

copy of a letter from the former building inspector stating that the one tree would not need to be planted.

Mr. Strobel notes that the proposal is for a walk-in area and a drive-up service. He asks if there will be any seating inside. Mr. Wormell replies that there will be no inside seating.

Ms. Parmele asks about the amount of traffic and the traffic pattern. Mr. Tower, applicant, provides current traffic counts based on existing Aroma Joe's as well as the capture rates. He states that the low is expected to be 243 cars a day and the high is 510 cars per day. Ms. Smith states that in NH a traffic study must be done by a licensed traffic engineer. She clarifies that the traffic information provided by the applicant is an internal document for the board's information and review. Mr. McCaffrey asks what the capture rate is. Mr. Strobel replies that the capture rate is the amount of cars that pull off and then continue on.

Mr. Bojko expresses concern with the traffic relative to using both accesses for entering and existing the parking lot. He asks if there is a plan for the East bound side to remain as an access and egress or just an entrance to the plaza.

Mr. Strobel states that he, too, has traffic concerns and suggests that a site walk be held before any lengthy discussion continues regarding the traffic and traffic flow. He expresses concern with the traffic on the other side of the property near the restaurant and gym. He refers to the existing 4 spaces in the rear where there appears to be only 15' to the end of the parking space and the paved travel path, which could be an issue with backing into the flow of traffic coming around the corner.

Mr. Strobel also mentions the traffic flow arrow across the water line by the gym. He states that this could be a "pinch point" and further explains traffic scenarios and suggests that something be painted on the pavement or a stop sign or yield sign to indicate that there is traffic there. Mr. Wormell states that he has had discussions with the property owner regarding situations that may occur in that area. Mr. Strobel states that this is one issue that will be better addressed on the site walk.

Mr. Strobel notes that there may be a conflict with the handicapped parking space with the passenger door as it may be in the traffic flow. He suggests moving the lines or spaces away from the drive-through.

Mr. Strobel asks about trucks servicing the dumpster. Mr. Wormell explains that the contractor will follow the traffic pattern of the traffic flow.

Mr. Strobel notes that the snow storage has been noted on the plan.

Mr. Strobel asks if there is a known amount of people that would utilize the walk-in service. Mr. Tower replies that there is no data on this at this time as there are no other shops like this. He feels that most of the walk-up service would be customers from other businesses on site.

Mr. Strobel expresses concern with walking through the traffic to enter the building. Mr. Jandebeur indicates that this is similar to any other fast-food services. Ms. Parmele adds that walking in is normal; however, it is dangerous at some times.

Mr. Wolf expresses concern with the traffic on Rte. 4 and the concern for the noise and privacy for abutting properties. He states that this lot is a small lot with 5 businesses already and an apartment on site as well. He suggests a traffic study be done and asks how much more can reasonably be added to this site.

Ms. Smith states that the buffer requirement is 20 ft. and she asks if the existing vegetation is 20 ft. in width. She notes that it is deciduous so there will be no buffer in the winter months. She adds that a fence is an option.

Ms. Smith asks about the storage building referenced and asks if this is for onsite storage for the property owner only. Mr. Wormell replies that he is not sure as to the intent of the storage.

Mr. Wolf asks if there is an expiration for approved building permits as this storage permit was approved in 2005. Ms. Smith states that an approval for a site plan has an exemption for 4 years as long as substantive progress has been made. Discussion ensues. Ms. Smith states that there was a house there and the lots were merged. She feels that the approval should still stand unless there are now different zoning requirements. Further discussion ensues regarding abandonment. Ms. Smith states that this building has not been built yet. She adds that the issue now is if the approval is vested and unless there is site work that needed to be done and was not done, she does not believe that they would lose the approval.

Mr. Jandebeur asks if the storage building will be used for rental purposes. Ms. Smith states that she believes the use was for the owner. This issue will be looked into.
A discussion is held regarding a site walk. The site walk is scheduled for August 2, at 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Strobel opens the public comment section for this case.

Abutter Deborah Elliot expresses concern with exhaust fumes. She states that she measured 21' from vehicle exhaust pipes to her windows. She expresses concern with the amount of traffic that could potentially be going through the area from 5 A.M. to 9 P.M. She states that they cannot open their windows as it is and with this proposal it will make it worse. She asks if a traffic study will be done and notes that there were three accidents in front of her house last September. She states that there will be more traffic turning into the plaza now. She explains that cars now drive in the breakdown lane in front of her home when someone is turning left into Cooper Hill Pizza causing her to have trouble getting out of her own driveway. She adds that there will now be more traffic lined up outside in the morning hours. She states that the existing tree line has been there for at least 36 years. She states that the bushes are an invasive plant that die off in the winter and come back into spring. She also asks if the board has considered the air quality. She suggests that a traffic study be done. She asks about the East bound traffic entering the site. Mr. Strobel replies that traffic will be one of the issues that will be addressed at the site walk.

Ms. Smith states that one item that a traffic study includes that is not provided in the data presented is the peak traffic times for the specific use, which in this case would be critical to have. Also, if the cars would be queuing up and then end up along Rte. 4. Further discussion is held regarding the traffic along Rte. 4.

Ms. Smith asks if the application has applied for the driveway permit to accommodate the use. Mr. Wormell replies that this will be done.

With no additional comments from the public, Mr. Strobel closes the public portion for this case for tonight and the case is continued to August 28, 2014.

<u>CASE: 14-08:</u> John Ovadek, 1064 First NH Turnpike. Map 217; Lot 45.
Applicant seeks minimal impact site plan review to change existing use from office space to automotive shop.

Mr. Ovadek is present.

Ms. Edwards makes a motion, second by Mr. Jandebeur, to accept the application as complete.

Ms. Smith suggests that the board review the 14 points for the minimal impact application and then determine if the application is complete. Discussion ensues as the board reviews the 14 points.

Mr. Strobel asks about the footage of the garage. Mr. Ovadek replies approximately 1,200 sq. ft. Mr. Strobel states that 4 parking spaces would be required.

Ms. Parmele asks about the drainage on site and any impacts off site. She states that the use is being changed and is going back to a garage. Mr. Ovadek states that this was originally a garage and he would like to change the use from retail/office space back to the garage. He intends to rent the property out and he is not sure as to who will be in the unit at this time. He is not sure if there is a floor drain in the unit. He explains that the garage is really more the size of a garage at a house and the rental would be for small engine repairs, not a large scaled garage service center. Mr. Wolf notes the state law requirements.

Mr. McCaffrey asks if there is a bathroom in the shop area. Mr. Ovadek replies that the unit is a two-bay garage with a bathroom.

Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Mr. Strobel opens the public portion of this case and reads the abutters list. No abutters are present.

Mr. McCaffrey states that this is a business with limited on-site traffic. He comments that this is a slow paced business.

General discussion ensues as the board reviews the proposed plan.

Mr. Strobel requests that the previously approved date be added to the proposed plan. Ms. Smith states that the original date was June 8, 2012.

Ms. Smith reviews a potential list of conditions. She states that typically the board requests a change in use from NHDOT. She adds that at one point the entire area was an automotive garage. Mr. Ovadek states that he met with NHDOT for the retail proposal in 2012 and was told that nothing new would be necessary. Mr. Strobel states that this change of use proposed is a minimal traffic impact and he does not feel that anything from NHDOT is necessary.

Mr. McCaffrey asks about signage. Mr. Ovadek states that all of the signage has been previously approved.

Mr. Ovadek states that he received the list of suggested conditions of approval and has updated his plans accordingly. He adds the original plan date to the revised plan. He states that he has added a note regarding the lighting stating that it will be in compliance. Mr. Strobel states that there is a note on the plan relative to hazardous waste and this may be in conflict with the garage. Mr. Ovadek removes this note from the plan.

Mr. Jandebeur makes a motion, second by Mr. McCaffrey, to approve the revised plan with the following condition:

- **All necessary local, state & federal permits be obtained.**

Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Mr. Strobel signs the plans.

Mr. Strobel calls for a recess at 8:17 p.m. Session resumes at 8:30 p.m. Ms. Parmele left the meeting during the recess.

CASE: 14-10: Lake Shore Farm, LLC., 275 Jenness Pond Rd. Map 203; Lot 2. Applicants seek a minor subdivision of 26 Acs. into two lots; one lot with existing Lake Shore Farm Inn to become 5 Acs.; remaining lot to be 21 Acs.

Alden Beauchemin of Keyland Enterprises is present along with the property owner Dick Daniels.

Mr. Beauchemin submits revised plans as well as waiver requests. He states that the reviewed plans are a result of additional requests from the planning board's work session.

Mr. Beauchemin states that the surveyor's signature has been added to the plan.

Mr. Beauchemin submits two waiver requests for Section 4.09 regarding area of coverage and for Section 3.03 regarding driveway access. He states that the sight distance for the two existing driveways is not shown on the plan and could be a condition of approval.

Mr. Beauchemin explains additional changes that have been made to the plans. He states that a greater detail is provided on the cover sheet showing the actual subdivision of the parcel and renumbered lots. He adds that the abutters have been corrected. He states that he has also added the existing septic design. Mr. Beauchemin refers to sheet 2 and explains that the existing well easement has now been noted on the plan. He also provides standard language for the easement as a draft for review. In addition, the building setback lines have been added including the setback to the wetlands for 20'. Ms. Smith states that the application has not been accepted and the discussion is providing specific details.

Mr. Strobel asks about the state subdivision approval. Mr. Beauchemin states that a lot greater than 5 acres does not require state subdivision approval and the smallest lot proposed is 5.029 acres. He adds that they will be obtaining a state septic approval for the new lot.

Mr. Strobel notes that the plans submitted tonight do not meet the 15 day requirement. The board reviews the new materials provided to determine completeness.

Ms. Smith asks if the parking change is an addendum to what was previously received. She adds that she does not see the parking easement. Mr. Beauchemin states that there is a small sliver of the parking lot that crosses over and he could pull it back if required. He states that there is now no need for the easement. Mr. Strobel inquires about the driveway. Mr. Beauchemin explains that they will utilize the existing gravel driveway for the legal access. He adds that the current owner may use the other access; however, it will not be the formal access. He states that if the property were sold the existing driveway would be utilized.

Ms. Edwards makes a motion, second by Ms. Baldwin, to continue the case until August 28 for consideration of completeness, due to the fact that additional information was not provided within the 15 day timeframe. Ms. Edwards states that the board has procedures to follow and to accept the application at this time would be setting a precedent that should not be set. Mr. Beauchemin requests that the board consider continuing to the work session. Mr. Strobel notes the items that were missing and although it appears that all information required has now been submitted; the board's process is to have materials provided 15 days prior to a meeting to allow sufficient review time for the members and public.

A discussion is held regarding continuing the case to the work session, August 14. Mr. McCaffrey states that he feels that the applicant has showed a good faith effort to gather the materials and comply with the requirements. He would be receptive to continue the case to the work session.

Ms. Smith states that she feels that in this case the letter of the law would be met for the 15 days and would allow the board to open the case up to the public and hear any comments/concerns from the public. She suggests the board schedule a site walk at the work session, briefly discuss the case, and defer deliberations until the end of the month meeting. Ms. Smith states that a site plan is not required for this case as long as there is no change in the use.

Ms. Edwards amends the motion to continue the case to the work session, August 14, 2014. Ms. Baldwin seconds the amendment. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

<u>CASE: 14-11:</u> Richard Chandler, Gulf Rd. Map 114; Lot 8. Applicant seeks to subdivide 34.25 Acs. into two lots: one lot of 19.860 Acs. and one lot with existing buildings of 14.391 Acs.

Surveyor Webster Stout is present along with property owner Richard Chandler. Revised plans are provided based on the comments from the board's works session. Also in attendance is Alice Thompson, the realtor for Mr. Chandler.

The plans are reviewed by the board.

Ms. Edwards makes a motion, second by Mr. Bojko, to accept the application as complete. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Mr. Strobel opens the public hearing for this case and reads the abutters list. Abutter John Gardner is present. Mr. Stout states that the Town of Deerfield was added as an abutter to the prior application and added again due to the town line boundary. Ms. Smith states that Deerfield was notified as a courtesy.

Mr. Stout provides an overview of the project. He refers to sheet 1 and explains that a lot line adjustment was approved a few months ago. He states that the camp was on the wrong piece of property and is now on its own piece of property. He states that this is land to the east, approximately 34 acres. He notes the existing buildings on the site.

Mr. Chandler states that the house was built in 1790 and is the original house on Pleasant Lake. He provides a history of the area and acreage. He states that the intent is to get a good piece of land and preserve and protect the area.

Alice Thompson states that originally the 90 acres was for sale. The subdivision is being done to maintain the acreage in current use, and perhaps be more marketable.

Mr. Stout refers to the board's comments from the checklist and addresses each item as follows:
Section 2.04(5)(b): Copies of Applications for State Permits
Mr. Stout states that the driveways are existing driveways to the house and the lot that will be left and undeveloped. There is a 10 ft. gravel road that was installed about 8 years ago and the town's road agent is aware of the gravel road. He refers to sheet 2 and indicates that this area is the toe of a very steep slope.

Section 3.03(A)(4): Driveways and Access Points-20 ft. to side
Mr. Stout states that between the two driveways there is approximately only 25' and these are the closest edges. He states that there is a pin between the two edges of the driveway and it is only 25'. Mr. McCaffrey asks about the locations of the driveway. Mr. Stout explains that it would be very difficult to move the steep slope as it is almost vertical. He notes that the road agent gave an approval for the current driveway location, 8 years ago. Mr. Chandler adds that

the location of the driveway was provided to NHDES and approved. Mr. Strobel requests that a copy of this information be provided and added to the file. Mr. Stout shows that the driveway turns into the property.

Section 3.01: Design Standards-Oddly Shaped Lots
Mr. Strobel asks if it is the intent to keep contiguous land on the other side of the town line. Mr. Stout states that the Deerfield land is landlocked. The appendage is to allow the sale of that lot. Mr. Chandler notes that fieldwork was done by NHDES prior to woodlot cutting and this was the recommended and approved route for the loggers and skidders to get from the section behind the barn and into the lots of Deerfield. Additional discussion is held regarding the lot configuration. Mr. Stout states that he can refigure the lot to meet the requirement of 100 ft. He notes that the land in that area is wet. Mr. Jandebeur states that the lot will still be an odd lot even if the configuration is moved and he suggests leaving it as it is. Mr. McCaffrey adds that he too is okay with the configuration aspect. Ms. Smith states that there are two issues; width and lot configuration. Mr. Stout states that he will adjust the lines to try to keep the lot more square.

Section 3.06: Monumentation
Mr. Stout states that the monuments will be set. He refers to comments from Ms. Smith regarding the recording of the prior boundary line adjustment. He indicates that the pins will be set for both projects. Mr. Strobel states that this could be one condition of approval.

Section 3.09: Utilities
Mr. Stout states that the utilities to the existing house are underground.

Section 4.06: Zoning Districts
Mr. Stout states that the slopes have been delineated on the plan. He states that these slopes are 25% and/or greater. In addition, he refers to the details shown on the plan for each lot. He reviews each of the lot's acreage, frontages, and the area of topography with contiguous upland soils. Ms. Smith asks if the contiguous upland includes the steep slopes. Mr. Stout replies no and adds that it does not include the septic system, 4,000 sq. ft., the steep slopes, or any wetlands.

Mr. Stout refers to note 8 and states that there is a state approved septic design for the existing lot.

Section 4.10: (A)(2): Abutters Information
Mr. Stout states that the abutter's names, addresses, map, and lot numbers have been corrected. Ms. Smith notes that there are still some corrections needed to the plan.

Section 4.10: (D): Setback Lines
Mr. Stout states that the setbacks to the soil lines are shown because they have requested a waiver for the soils. He states that they have requested a waiver because the lot is 34 acres. He states that one lot has an existing structure. They are proposing two lots; one 19 acres and one lot will be 14 acres. He states that there is topography and he has shown the wetlands that would impact either lot. He states that he is not a wetlands scientist; however, he does design septic systems. He states that he has digitized plans. He states that this plan does tie into prime wetlands maps. He explains that he has run *a* traverse and has walked the entire parcel.

Further discussion is held regarding the prime wetlands. Ms. Smith notes that the conservation commission has provided comments relative to the proposal and impacts to the wetlands. She asks if Mr. Stout added the statement "edge of delineated wetland typical" to the plan and *he acknowledges* he is not a wetland scientist. Mr. Stout states that is correct and explains that he augers but does have to know the soils for designing the septic systems.

Ms. Smith refers to the plan showing the soil types and asks if the section is a part of the prime wetland. Mr. Stout replies no and explains that this area is the town line where the line stops. He adds that it could be a part of the *prime* wetland as it actually goes into Deerfield and then returns back into Northwood. Ms. Smith states that if it is a part of the prime wetland there is a 100 ft. buffer required and this presents issues with viability of the lot. Mr. Stout states that what he has shown on the lot is an area of 2.7 acres of topography with wetlands except for the steep slopes, which are excluded from the calculation of contiguous area. Mr. Stout feels that he has demonstrated a buildable area on a 19 acre parcel. He adds that the 100 ft. buffer does go along the edge of the house with the designated wetlands.

Mr. Stout states that the existing gravel road was utilized by the state; it is good material, excessively drained soils.

Mr. Stout talks about the costs to delineate and survey the wetland. Mr. McCaffrey asks if it is the applicant's position that it is not necessary. Mr. Stout suggests a portion be done to include what has been topo's, rather than the entire wetland.

Ms. Smith explains that the zoning ordinance does not allow digitizing for the delineation of prime wetlands. She states that the board can waive the need to show a portion of the wetlands. She expresses concern with the board accepting a plan showing a delineated wetland by anyone other than a wetland scientist. She states that the board needs to decide if it feels comfortable with only a portion of the lot being shown with the wetlands being delineated.

Ms. Smith states that one of the items that the conservation commission is concerned about is the potential impacts if a home owner does not know where the wetlands are located. She adds that this wetland is one of the 19 designated prime wetlands that the commission worked on for years, prioritizing, before choosing the 19. These were adopted by the voters. Plans were created, and then approved by the State of NH. She states that there is a 100 ft. buffer to the prime wetlands and the town's zoning ordinance states that the buffer must stay in its natural state of vegetation. She states that it is going to be difficult without the actual information to develop the lot and not impact the wetlands.

Discussion ensues regarding a potential survey. Mr. McCaffrey suggests a smaller survey. Mr. Stout suggests surveying only the areas where topography and existing structures are located.

A discussion is held regarding conducting a site walk. Mr. Chandler encourages the board to hold a site walk. Ms. Smith suggests a joint site walk with the conservation commission.

Mr. Stout refers to the 2004 Master Plan noting the need for a second access on Gulf Rd. He states that the property is beyond the 1,000 ft. requirement. Mr. Stout states that this portion of Gulf Rd. is a Class 5 road and is town maintained.

Mr. Stout states that the steep slopes are shown on sheet 2. He states that he has changed line types. In regards to recording, Mr. Stout suggests recording sheet 1 only and he will add a note to sheet 1 stating that sheet 2 is not recorded at the registry of deeds. The board agrees that this is acceptable.

Abutter Mr. Gardner requests that his address be updated. Mr. Stout states that this will be corrected. Mr. Gardiner comments that the wetland area should be defined accurately for the future. He states that when talking about prime wetlands and how the land will be used in the future, defining the boundaries now can be carried forward for future use and there will be accurate information available.

Mr. Strobel makes a motion, second by Ms. Edwards, to conduct a joint site walk with the conservation commission for Case 14-11, August 5, at 5:00 p.m. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Ms. Edwards makes a motion, second by Ms. Baldwin, to continue this case to August 28, 2014.

A discussion is held regarding needing a waiver for the 1,000 ft. requirement. Ms. Smith notes that the 1,000 ft. access point would not need a waiver request as it is pertinent only for new subdivision roads.

Motion passes; 6/0 Mr. McCaffrey is out of the room.

OTHER:

Proposed 2015 Budget

A suggested budget is provided to the board for their review. The board will discuss the budget at the August 14, 2014 meeting. Ms. Edwards requests that the budget be emailed out to members prior to the work session.

Work Session ~ Master Plan

A discussion is held regarding rescheduling the August 7 work session meeting, which was scheduled for the Master Plan. The board agrees to meet August 5, after the Chandler site walk.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Wolf makes a motion, second by Mr. Bojko, to adjourn at 10:30 p.m. Motion passes unanimously; 7/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Board Secretary