

**Kingston Planning Board
Public Hearing
Minutes**

March 20, 2018

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 6:49 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Mr. Coppelman congratulated Mr. Coffin and Ms. Croteau on their re-election to the Board. He introduced Phil Coombs, one of the new members of the Selectboard and their representative to the Planning Board.

Members in attendance:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair
Peter Coffin, V. Chair
Carol Croteau
Ernie Landry, alternate
Phil Coombs, BOS rep.

Chris Bashaw
Peter Bakie
Lynne Merrill
Robert Pellegrino, alternate (left early)

Members absent: Ellen Faulconer, alternate

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner, Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer

Mr. Coppelman reminded the Board to be sure to use the microphones so comments could be captured for the minutes since Ms. Faulconer was not present this evening.

Mr. Coppelman noted that there was another passing of a significant Town employee, Cathy Grant, the Selectmen's administrative assistant; he added that she was an important part of running the office downstairs and keeping the web site up-to-date and the Selectboard informed; she was always helpful to this Board as well. He stated that her efforts were very much appreciated and will be missed. The Board joined him in a moment of silence for Catherine Grant.

Mr. Coppelman explained that the Board's by-laws stipulate that the first meeting after the elections will elect officers and appoint a representative to the HDC (Historic District Commission). He said it can be done first thing or put off to the end when Board business is done.

MM&S to put the elections off to the end of the meeting during Board Business. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bashaw). **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman noted that the full Board was seated so there were two alternates who could join in on discussion but not voting.

Bresnahan Moving and Storage
7 Marshall Road
Tax Map R41 Lot 7-2

Mr. Coppelman announced the first public hearing adding that the Board had received a request for a continuance to April 17th which he read aloud. Mr. Coppelman noted that the Board had invoked jurisdiction. Ms. Merrill confirmed that jurisdiction was invoked on February 6th. Mr. Greenwood said that by the applicant asking for the continuation, therefore they have waived the 65 day requirement; so the Board is fine.

MM&S to continue to April 17th and placed on the agenda after the three that are already on the agenda. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie) **PUNA**

<Board note: Mr. Pellegrino left the meeting at this time due to an emergency.>

Mr. Coppelman noted that Mr. Greenwood had prepared written notes for the remaining hearings; Mr. Quintal has comments that he will provide verbally as they were not extensive.

Kings Landing Condo. Association
7A Monarch Way
Castle Court and Monarch Way
R33 Lot 27

Mr. Coppelman read the public notice for this hearing; he asked the presenters to introduce themselves to the Board.

Bob Marley, association Board member, introduced other Board members: Rick Sylvain and Fred Poinea. Mr. Marley explained the proposal that included moving the Limited Common Areas (LCA's) from the sides of the homes to the rear of the homes; there are 44 homes in Kings Landing; 21 of the homes have the LCA's on the side of the structure; 13 of the LCA's can be moved without any restrictions as they don't interfere with any setbacks; 3 of them are located close to the property setbacks; 5 of the homes require Conditional Use Permits (CUP's) and they are marked in yellow; 5 of the homes use impervious material to construct a patio if required at some point; no vegetation will be removed, if anything, it will be added; there will be no added lights; the LCA's allow avoidance of any code violations pertaining to the distance for propane tanks and gas grills and other septic requirements; the septic tanks were placed very, very close to homes; the third page gives a complete breakdown by unit, house number, street number and the ones being changed. The Board distributed the hand-outs. Mr. Marley re-iterated that page 3 had the specific information on number of houses involved; how many had changes without issues; how many needed CUP's; those houses with possible set-back concerns. Mr. Marley explained that this issue came up when people started asking for patios and they would wind up being 10 feet from 1000 gallon propane tanks, septic systems and pumping stations. He asked the Board to pay attention to the slopes involved. He reviewed other issues that may impact possible patio placement. He referred the Board to 16 Monarch Way as an example of concerns

with the LCA's and patio placement with the current LCA location as opposed to a flat, non-impacted area for the possible LCA. Mr. Marley noted other examples in the hand-out regarding possible conflicts with propane tanks and a possible gas grill close to the tank. Mr. Marley continued reviewing the hand-out. He described examples of the pervious material that could be used at the LCA's near the wetlands. Mr. Marley noted that Kings Landing needed the Planning Board's approval to change the LCA's. He added that they needed a CUP for the 5 homes (marked in yellow) to allow the homeowner to have a usable space for a property owner's family to have a cook-out or play with grandkids away from the utilities; he said that it was good for the property values and benefited the Town of Kingston as the property values will go up and will benefit the homeowner as it will make the house easier to sell.

He had questions for the Planning Board: does anyone have a problem with the moving of the LCA's to the rear of the house. Mr. Bashaw noted that his first concern was that when it was first constructed, the builder could have built it with the LCA's in the rear but probably would have been limited with the number of units that could have been built; in order to maximize units, profits and sales, it was designed in this way and now it is asking to be changed after things have been squeezed in as much as possible. Mr. Marley stated that the builder is gone at this point and it is now up to the owners to do what they can for their community; he said that he does not know why the builder put them on the side. Mr. Marley said that 16 of the homes could immediately be moved to the rear of the house.

Mr. Marley said the second question goes to the three homes that are violating or come close to the property set-backs; there is a note on the plan stating that they will not violate the property setbacks; if the LCA needs to be cut-back, they will do that. So, if there are no problems with the 13 or 16, they would like to get that taken care of now and then move to the next two questions that they have.

Mr. Coppelman asked for clarification, adding that there are department comments to read especially from the Conservation Commission. He confirmed with Mr. Greenwood that this is a formal application and there is a written request for the CUP. He asked Mr. Greenwood for his comments. Mr. Greenwood said that LCA's are associated with condominium developments that the developer establishes; the condo. rules say that any changes need to come before the Planning Board. He said the desire to change the locations appears to be as explained; making the unit more usable; the Board does not look at LCA's when determining the density for development, it is done by the size of the parcel with certain areas and areas for road construction removed. He said this isn't an issue of affecting the density of the overall development; they don't impact that but they do impact the development on the site as there are setbacks that need to be adhered to and they need to deal with the necessary utilities for all of the homes. He added that the applicant has done a good job of attempting to be upfront with possible issues and the approach to get it resolved. Mr. Quintal said that during development there had been a lot of talk about the density; vernal pool and setback requirements; it had been strongly suggested that all the setbacks were met, even though there is a high density; he stated that they didn't meet the requirements from the 100 foot setback for the buildings and the limited common areas; he said for projects like this, LCA's don't have to be rectangular; he has seen a number of areas designated as LCA's that are variable in their size and their shape; also seen

patios and decks that are pervious and even over septic tanks, so that could be done. Mr. Quintal continued that the ones that are near the propane tanks would be a concern, especially with gas grills; he said when looking at this type of proposal, he asks if there is a want or a need and it looks to him more like a want than a need especially for the use with setbacks; he said it is reasonable to meet the requirements; he was able to re-sketch on his plan to have them easily meet the setback requirements not only in the building setbacks but also for the CUP requests. He doesn't have a strong argument for the Board to grant the requests.

Mr. Coppelman read the comment from the Conservation Commission (KCC) which included the comment that the KCC is opposed to any infringement of vernal pool buffers; Kingston Zoning Ordinance Article 202, Wetlands Conservation District Table A, shows that vernal pools earn the maximum 100 points on the wetland buffer width chart; they feel a 100 foot vegetated buffer is a minimum requirement; this was made clear when Trendezza submitted their original plans; buffers don't have to be circular and they would be willing to compromise with the proposal KCC submitted that included widening the western buffer on either side of the wetland buffer in the direction of the SE Land Trust property in exchange for a slight and equal incursion for the revised LCA's of units 24 and 25.

Mr. Marley asked for clarification of KCC's comments. Mr. Bashaw explained the comments received from KCC for Mr. Marley who said that they were not opposed to the suggestions from KCC. Mr. Coppelman explained the process for the rest of the hearing and possible modifications or conditions of approval.

Mr. Coppelman read Department comments: Fire Department – no comment; Health officer – no comment; Fire Department CUP request – no comment; Health office CUP request – no comment.

Mr. Coppelman opened up discussion for the Board. Mr. Coffin questioned a note on the plan re: "not violate property line setbacks". He questioned the use of impervious surface on other locations not near setbacks/wetlands as he believed that the percentage of impervious surface had been calculated during the initial review process; if patios are put in that are impermeable then the calculations will change; he questioned what the initial coverage had been. Mr. Greenwood stated that he would have to look to get this information. Mr. Coffin suggested that the Board might want to stipulate that all patios be pervious coverage. Mr. Greenwood will look for that number. Mr. Coffin said that otherwise new calculations should be provided for the whole project to make a proper determination. Mr. Sylvain noted that they are not changing the sizes of the LCA's, just the locations. Mr. Coffin said at the time they were approved, they were considered permeable surfaces as they were lawns; if you are possibly building on that using impermeable material then the coverage is changing and there is a maximum for the project; this will need to be checked. Mr. Sylvain said that they have nothing that limits patios; Mr. Greenwood will check the original plan regarding density and coverage. Mr. Coffin said it might be easier to just stipulate that all of the patios would be made of permeable materials.

Another member of the Kings Landing Board (not identified) asked to clarify that when the LCA's were put on the site plan, they were not intended to be impervious. Mr. Coffin said that

they were not calculated to be impervious as nothing was intended to have anything constructed within them. Mr. Coffin said that without the new calculations done at this time or the pervious stipulation, every time someone asked for a building permit, they would have to provide the calculations. Mr. Coffin said that this could be a small amount of work done now to save a lot of work later.

Mr. Sylvain said that there are some patios that already exist so they couldn't go backwards on them but they can take into consideration that all the patios for the remaining LCA's could be pervious; Mr. Marley suggested a note for all of the patios on Castle Court near the wetlands could have this stipulation. Mr. Coffin said that it is the whole project that had calculations for pervious coverage; it may turn out that there are no restrictions and they might not impact the maximum available coverage; he questioned the calculations of the existing patios; it could work out that the last ones to build may not be able to due to maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Landry said that there was Open Space set aside, 8 or 9 acres, and he wondered where that location was and would any of the LCA's intrude into those open space areas, he stated particularly in the northwest section. Mr. Marley could point out two specific areas: in the middle of Monarch Way is a horseshoe of open space that they can use and in the circle at the top of Castle Court. Mr. Landry explained that as this was a development with higher density, there was supposed to be a number of acres within the development itself to be conserved for open space and he is curious where that land is located and whether any of the changed LCA's will intrude into that open space. Mr. Marley is unaware of open space land showing on a plan; he is aware of 18 acres being given to the SE Land Trust. Mr. Quintal had the full set of original plans and it does show the common open land Mr. Landry is referencing and it is shown as "hatched/dotted"; going up the building setback line. He continued that if you are within the building setback line, you are probably okay but there is a 100 foot setback to wetlands and around the back there is a building setback line that would be the line for common open space; shown on sheet 2 of 12 which he thinks is one of the recorded sheets. Mr. Quintal said if not recorded, the full approved plan is signed and kept in the office. Mr. Landry asked if any of the moved LCA's would be intruding into the open land area. Mr. Quintal said they would be in the 100 ft. setback to the vernal pool and the building setback line that is in behind the cul-de-sac. Mr. Coppelman suggested that it would be helpful for the proposal to be shown on an overlay. Mr. Quintal said that the applicant may need to review to make sure that the open space is maintained. Mr. Quintal pointed out the setback lines to the applicant. Mr. Coffin explained that there are two problems: one is the wetlands setback and one is that you are impacting land that has been set aside as non-buildable. Mr. Quintal reviewed possibilities for LCA's that were different in dimension, size and worked around the building setback requirements. Mr. Quintal added that he remembered that during the original proposal's discussion pertaining to the LCA's there had been discussion that there would not be windows on abutting properties so as not to impact the abutter. One of the applicants confirmed that the properties had been designed with windows on one side so that adjacent houses would not be looking out their windows into someone else's windows; the issue would be a patio placed near the utilities that are also between houses in or near the LCA's. Mr. Quintal stated that there are other options and those options are able to maintain the setbacks but he is not sure of the possible infringement with the tanks; there could be some areas that could be incorporated and meet the setback requirements

and suggested the applicants look at the other possibilities to maintain the open space requirements and possible impervious area requirements.

Mr. Coppelman asked for any public comments. Abutter (name unclear on recording) who lives at 23 Castle Court stated that he was a little confused as whether the discussion was for the 16 homes with no setback violations or concerns, or just the 5 or 6 with setback concerns. He said he was confused about what was being approved or disapproved at this time. Mr. Quintal said he was looking at it from the requirements for the need for the CUP and the setback issues but for the ones that did not need the CUP or setback issues; the board would not have a problem with their location so he didn't look at those for those issues. Mr. Sylvain said that there was a proposal from Conservation that sounded reasonable; there were three others needed the permit and there are a total of 16 that would be ready to go; there would be work needed on the remaining three. Mr. Quintal said that, other than Mr. Greenwood getting the information for the impervious issue and Mr. Landry's concern that the open space requirement is maintained with no infringement. Mr. Sylvain said that is the concern for the "three"; all of the others are within the setbacks. Mr. Quintal said that the plan needs to be reviewed to see the comparison of the proposed plan from Conservation as they don't match with what is shown for the open space; he added that the open space includes that area where the two points come down and is supposed to be open space so it wouldn't be a trade for "apples to apples". Mr. Quintal said he has a copy of the drainage calculations in his office. Mr. Greenwood said that by what he looked at in the office, he could not make the determination that they don't infringe upon the impervious coverage maximum so it would take more investigation.

Mr. Coombs said that it makes him nervous to set a precedent in which a builder comes in with a plan and then the residents are stuck with trying to fix the problem after the fact in very tight quarters; he thinks the Board needs to be cognizant of this for the future. He had concerns about any equipment needed to build patios as it was close to the wetland areas and utilities. Building of current patios on-site was reviewed.

Public comment continued: Margaret Bean, abutter, said that the fence is not for people but to keep the turtles out of their backyard so they don't get run over.

There were no further public comments.

Mr. Coffin said they needed to get the plans that show the limitations of open space, the lot coverage and some possible re-design; he said there was a difference between what the Conservation Commission was proposing as setback to the wetlands for the vernal pool and how it impacts with the open space as the areas they are "swapping" are already included in the open space so nothing is really gained by the "swap". He suggested that the plan be re-drawn with the restrictions that the developer had for the original proposal which may explain why the LCA's were on the side of the units. He recalled the discussion of having the walls without windows to address the privacy issues of the LCA's on these locations. Mr. Coffin said that he had no issue with moving the LCA's around but they needed the accurate base information first and not encroach on the previously calculated open space area. Mr. Sylvain asked if they could spend some time with Mr. Quintal to have the correct prints. Mr. Coppelman said that the escrow

funds were less than usually required; Mr. Quintal suggested that the amount was enough for the short period of time he would need to work with the applicant.

Mr. Coppelman, per previous Board discussion, asked if any Board member felt they had a conflict with the developer and proposal; a personal or financial interest. There was none.

Mr. Coppelman explained the jurisdiction process. There was discussion regarding the timeframe to receive the appropriate changes based on the required information. Mr. Coffin suggested that the Board could accept jurisdiction as there would be enough time.

MM&S to invoke jurisdiction on the plan before the Board. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

Timing and requirements for a revised plan were reviewed.

MM&S to continue to May 1, 2018 at 6:45; first on the agenda; revised plan to be submitted by Tuesday, April 24th. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Coffin) **PUNA**

The Board confirmed that the applicant can work with Mr. Quintal; his time to be paid for through the applicant's escrow.

Mr. Marley asked the Board for any other changes regarding notes. Mr. Quintal stated that this would depend on the discussion; he suggested that Mr. Greenwood could also provide assistance regarding the notes for the plan. There was discussion about issues that might require notes, depending on the information for issues discussed during this evening's review. Mr. Quintal explained that any additional notes could be a condition of approval.

YMCA/Camp Lincoln
67 Ball Road
Tax Map R25 Lot 3

Mr. Coppelman read the notice for seasonal tree house proposal for day-time program space; plans were distributed for the Board's review. Mark Cadman, Director of YMCA/Camp Lincoln introduced himself to the Board. He reviewed the history of the camp which had changed to a day camp in the 1980's and current use of the property. He noted that they received a use variance for both this and the next hearing projects back in December. Mr. Coppelman read the two variances from the ZBA: variance to 103.2 to permit a construction of an ADA compliant treehouse and to construct two non-sleeping cabins. Mr. Cadman explained it is a treehouse-inspired project; it is a seasonal structure primarily used in the summer but could also be used in the spring and the fall; for daytime usage; this has a single support system; it is not constructed on any trees but is constructed close to trees to have the feel; he reviewed the architectural plans. He noted that brings the feel of a treehouse to their entire community regardless of physical abilities. He reviewed the possible uses of the structure. He did request a number of waivers per the checklist. Mr. Greenwood explained that it was a blanket to the checklist to allow for the use of the plan that was provided; it is a 60 plus acre parcel of land and this is for the construction of

this small structure within the overall parcel. The Board would have to agree to the waiver as it would not be an engineered plan which is required per the regulations. Mr. Greenwood said that he doesn't have a lot of problem with that; the regulations are geared for the process of non-residential uses but the camp is a bit different but it would require granting the waiver. Mr. Coppelman read the waiver request from Pearson Associates Inc.; it was specific to both applications being heard this evening. Waivers: not submitting a mylar at this time but could be done for final if needed; not indicating special flood hazard areas; BFE (base flood elevation) delineation; no conditional use permit; shoreland protection delineation; snow storage areas, noise ordinance compliance, dust control plan, hazardous chemical storage areas; percent of impervious cover for the overall property; detailed stormwater management, vernal pool delineation (none near proposed projects); proposed dumpster and solid waste locations, landscaping plans, lighting design; the existing sign at the entrance will be maintained as is so there is not proposed signage, no detailed parking lay-out but travelled ways and parking areas are shown on the plan; not locating all wells and septic systems within 200 feet of the perimeter but note that the water supply and sewage systems on the property are shown on the existing plans; many utilities are shown on the plan but some are not yet located.

Mr. Coppelman asked Mr. Cadman to get a copy of the hydro report from Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Coppelman noted that the Board would have to keep in mind whether a mylar would be required to be recorded. Mr. Greenwood re-iterated that it was pretty much a blanket waiver.

Mr. Cadman answered that there was not electricity in the building; there is no plumbing; the total square footage is 486 sq. ft. Mr. Greenwood said it is a really small structure on a very large parcel of land. Mr. Bashaw noted that it has no utilities running to it; he sees no issue with it. Mr. Greenwood confirmed for Ms. Merrill that the cabins will be shown on a different plan for the next hearing; she thinks the Shoreland Protection and Flood Plain should be shown on the plan specific to the cabins. Mr. Greenwood said that the plan with the cabins does show those items. Mr. Cadman confirmed that there is electricity to the cabins; no water or sewer but there is electricity. Mr. Coppelman cautioned that the Board was not reviewing the cabins yet. Mr. Coppelman read the Fire Department comments: if the treehouse or cabins are used for daytime use only, very little requirements are needed for life safety codes; if used for overnight accommodations, there may be requirements for fire protection and suppression and a fire-protection engineer should be hired for the review on behalf of the Town; a secondary, gated-emergency access road was proposed for future consideration. Mr. Coppelman said that this came up during the hazard mitigation plan. Mr. Cadman said that this might be something they would be interested in; he thought it was a great idea. Mr. Greenwood confirmed that anything being proposed during this evening's hearings were for daytime use. Mr. Cadman added that there are other cabins that are used for overnights – two different units on the other side of camp – but these cabins are not used during the day.

Mr. Coppelman brought the discussion back to the treehouse; it does not have electricity or water. Ms. Merrill asked if the process would be to address the waivers individually for each proposal. Mr. Greenwood agreed as they are actually two different applications.

Mr. Quintal provided comments as the plan he had showed the proposed treehouse but also showed a “proposed archery platform” so he asked if both were actually proposed. Mr. Cadman said it was just the treehouse; they have decided against the archery platform changes at this time. Mr. Quintal cautioned that it is on the plan before the Board and if the plan as presented is approved, it would be approving the archery platform. Mr. Greenwood said the Board would need to make it clear that it was not being approved. Mr. Coppelman suggested the final submittal of a plan that did not include the archery on the plan.

Mr. Quintal added that there are a lot of wetlands on the site so, while the treehouse may not have a lot of impact, it is not verified by the plan; the proposed structure is greater than 100 feet from wetlands so he doesn’t see any issues there; if there is a concern about roof run-off and impervious surface there could be the installation of swales or level=spreaders. Mr. Quintal said if requiring a mylar, it will take a bit of work as there is a lot of writing over text and other necessary corrections. He questioned whether there was a mylar on record already for the project that might be sufficient. Mr. Greenwood did not think there was a mylar on file. There was discussion regarding mylar requirements.

Mr. Greenwood found it to have limited impact. He doesn’t find himself thinking that a mylar was necessary in this case for the treehouse proposal. Mr. Coppelman suggested that the wetland scientist stamp should be on the plan as wetlands are delineated. Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Quintal agreed. Mr. Chapman said that groups do start coming in by the end of April. Mr. Quintal questioned the amount of cars that could be parked on site. Mr. Cadman said the biggest event included the parents and could have 300 – 400 cars at that time. Mr. Coffin brought up the triathlon event which would include working with the police. Mr. Cadman agreed that family nights, on Thursdays, impact the local roads but all the parking is done on-site.

Mr. Coppelman asked if there are any conflicts to disclose. There were none.

**MM&S to accept the plan for jurisdiction. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Coffin)
PUNA**

Ms. Merrill said that this was a children’s camp and questioned security; she was unsure that the Board wanted them publicly recorded and suggested asking the police chief for input. She reviewed the pros and cons of recording the plan. Mr. Bashaw didn’t think that this was something the Board should take into consideration; it was a law enforcement issue. Mr. Coppelman said the initial discussion should be about the recording itself. Mr. Bakie did not think it needed to be able to be recorded as long as the plan was available in the Planning Board office; Mr. Coffin agreed.

MM&S to grant the “blanket” waiver as requested for the plan for the treehouse. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bakie) PUNA

MM&S to not require a mylar; a paper plan is acceptable that shows the treehouse location that includes having the licensed land surveyor stamp and the wetland scientist stamp, the

removal of the archery platform proposal from the plan. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coombs) PUNA

MM&S to approve the plan for the treehouse for Camp Lincoln as noted in the two previous votes that include the paper plan with the land surveyor and wetland scientist stamps and the archery platform proposal removed from the plan; the plan to be submitted within 60 days. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Croteau) PUNA

The Board added that the plan will be signed and dated once received by the Chairman; the applicant cannot proceed with the plan prior to the Board's receipt and signing of the plan.

YMCA/Camp Lincoln
67 Ball Road
Tax Map R25 Lot 3

The plans were distributed and reviewed by the Board. Mr. Cadman walked the Board through the plan and use of the area; there are 5 cabins along the ledge that they would like to shift to a semi-circular configuration and add two cabins as it creates a centralized, social space in the middle of the units; he explained the safety and supervisory features associated with the move. He said these are day cabins used essentially as "home base" for campers. Mr. Coppelman read part of the notice; he and Mr. Greenwood noted that the two additional cabins' use had been approved by the ZBA. Mr. Bakie confirmed with Mr. Cadman that the checkered buildings are existing and the "lined" are where they will be put. Mr. Cadman said that the new buildings approved by the ZBA have not been built yet. Mr. Coffin said that the note should be 5 existing cabins with two to be built in the semi-circle area. Mr. Cadman said that the two existing cabins, closest to the office, couldn't be moved so they will be demo'd or use them for storage but more likely they will spread themselves out a little bit more.

Mr. Quintal said that the plan is confusing since it is just to move the cabins but they include proposed septic plans and a proposed dining hall; he suggests having a plan to be approved that doesn't include the other proposals; there should be a plan that includes and identifies the existing features with appropriate labels and show only what is being proposed for approval. He continued that he has no other issue with the cabins as they are far enough from the wetland and setbacks. He did say that it would be important, like the previous application, to have the appropriate stamps on the plan and not needing a mylar. Mr. Coombs asked if there needed to be a more comprehensive drawing of the cabin itself. Mr. Quintal said that there is enough information submitted but the plan should only have what is being approved on it. He reviewed the extraneous details that included proposed leaching areas, alarms, pump chambers. Mr. Cadman explained that the septic system was completed last year. He stated that it would not be a big deal for the engineer to clean up the plan. Mr. Bakie confirmed with Mr. Chapman that the septic system exists and the dining hall is not currently being proposed or reviewed. Mr. Greenwood pointed out the Shoreland setback on the plan; Ms. Merrill suggested the setback should be identified on the plan and the Flood zone should be identified as well.

MM&S to invoke jurisdiction of the plan. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Bashaw)
PUNA

Mr. Coppelman read Department comments: Conservation: please design roofs so that pitch will not create downhill run-off; Mr. Coffin said that the site is only increasing by two cabins and water will flow in both directions off the roof and are being moved farther away from the lake and will be an overall improvement to the drainage. Mr. Coppelman asked if there was any capturing of the rainwater as it came off the roof; Mr. Chapman answered “no”; the buildings are 16’ by 15’. Mr. Quintal said it is quite a distance from the cabins to the edge of wetlands and there is quite a lot of infiltration in the existing soil so there wouldn’t be an impact to the wetlands. Fire comments: same as the previous application; if there is overnight use, there may be building codes and requirements but daytime use has very little to be done to meet the life safety code. Mr. Chapman re-iterated that it was day use. Mr. Coffin and Mr. Coppelman suggested that a note regarding day use only be added to the plan; Mr. Coppelman suggested that Mr. Chapman speak with the Fire Department about safety issues and perhaps speak with the Fire Department about emergency access concerns; Mr. Greenwood said that it is something that the Town is very interested in pursuing. There were several comments about the possibility of this occurring. ZBA comments: confirming waiver; Health: no comment. Mr. Coppelman noted that there was no public present for this and the previous application.

Mr. Coppelman noted that the conflict of interest question to the Board would have been the same from the previous application so it carried forward.

The Board reviewed requirements for the plan and requested waivers. Mr. Coffin re-iterated Ms. Merrill’s previous comments about having Shoreland Protection and Flood Zone designations shown on the plan. Mr. Greenwood said that the Board may want to give guidance that the Board is interested in a plan showing existing conditions and eliminating items like the proposed dining area and show that the septic system is approved not proposed; show proposed structures. Mr. Quintal added labeling all the physical features that were on the plan. Ms. Croteau added the need for the appropriate stamps; the Board determined that there should be stamps for Wetland Scientist, Licensed Land Surveyor and Engineer on the plan.

The Board reviewed and contributed to the language in the motions.

MM&S to grant waivers as requested with the exception of the plan needing to have Soil (Wetland) Scientist, Engineer and Surveyor stamps and show and label existing conditions/features and proposed structures (7 cabins) only; remove septic design and dining room from the plan; add in Shoreland Protection and Flood Zone designations; add a note on the plan that the cabins will be used for day-use only. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Croteau) Discussion: Mr. Bakie noted that the septic was actually on the site. Mr. Coffin explained that the Board did not need to have the design of the existing septic on the plan. **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman explained that while the emergency access was not before the Board, it would be the Board’s recommendation and the Fire Department to discuss it with the Camp’s Board and

the Town to see what options might be available. The possible avenues in which to address this were reviewed.

MM&S to approve the application from YMCA to move the 5 existing cabins, the addition of two new cabins with the following conditions: a note that the cabins will be for day-time use only, a new plan be drawn with the proper Wetland stamps and Shoreland Protection and Flood Zones shown and designated; engineering stamps and surveyor stamps on the plan; show and label only the existing conditions, noting on the plan the waivers in place; the plan will be due within 60 days of this meeting. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman re-iterated that the plans would need to be submitted so they can be signed and put in the files; the timeline to approve was reviewed.

<Board note: The Board took a five minute break.>

Board business:

The Board agreed to do the elections as the last item of the meeting.

Correspondence:

- Brochure (Vernal Pools) received from Conservation Commission for Mr. Pellegrino; copies were made for other Board members.
- Hand-out/Brochures from RCCD (Rockingham County Conservation District)
- Application for a dealer license which had been reviewed at the last meeting and determined that it had to be denied – “Bid One” sales at 4 Main Street; Mr. Coppelman explained the local process; Mr. Bashaw explained to Mr. Coombs that the only license available for the site without further review was a salvage license. Mr. Bakie questioned a sign that has been put up for Bid One Auto sales that can be seen from Rte. 125; he was curious as to how it was put up and if it had appropriate approvals. Ms. Merrill reviewed the RSA re: business signage. The Board determined that if the use was not approved, the signage would also not be approved. Mr. Coppelman signed the application with the recommendation to deny as not approved for vehicle sales and forward to the Board of Selectmen.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer to ask the Building Inspector about the signage at Bid-One Auto Sales.

- Bond balance report
- Copy of Bresnahan continuance request
- Memo from Ms. Faulconer re: AAAL (All American Assisted Living) – re: how to proceed. Mr. Greenwood noted that it was premature. Mr. Coombs said that yesterday they were drilling on site and did not get the required pump rate; the BOS extended the easement, in theory and there will be a cost associated with that; he added that they are “not there yet”. Mr. Coffin asked if they have settled on the easement instead purchasing the land; he was told yes. The Board agreed that Ms. Faulconer could return the check as things were just a bit premature.

- Letter from Bedford Designs Consultant – requests a 60 day extension on the conditional approval for AAAL

MM&S to extend the Board’s conditional approval for another 60 days for the AAAL project. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman reminded the Board that they were going to review the site walk minutes from the Bresnahan site walk; the Board discussed reviewing the Feb. 20, 2018 minutes. Mr. Coppelman noted that Mr. Pellegrino had said he had some comments so the Board might want to consider putting them off again as he is not here; he added that it had been suggested that he put the corrections in writing like Mr. Bashaw had done. Mr. Bashaw agreed with Mr. Coppelman’s suggestion to table them. Mr. Coffin noted that he had a printed copy of the Feb. 20, 2018 minutes but not an electronic copy; he added that they were long and he hadn’t finished them; Mr. Bashaw suggested tabling them for the same reason. Ms. Faulconer will re-send the 2/20 minutes to the Board. Mr. Coffin asked that the Meeks Road site walk minutes draft be sent to the Board.

Mr. Coppelman reminded the Board of the meeting for the Historic Resource Chapter of the Master Plan. He added that there would be a meeting on the 29th at 6:30 for the Public Listening Session for Agricultural Land Uses.

Mr. Coppelman announced that tonight would be Ernie Landry’s last night with the Board; he has been a regular Board member for 6 years and an Alternate for 3 years. He stated that, on a personal level, he was sorry to see Ernie step away; he wanted to publicly thank him for all of his service and contributions to the Board and the Town. He will still be involved with Heritage and Open Space for the Town. Mr. Landry said that it was a good nine years and wanted to thank Mr. Coppelman, Mr. Greenwood and Ms. Faulconer for their leadership that is given to the Board. He continued that Mr. Coppelman has selflessly taken the leadership role when given to him and he has done a great job and it is important; it has been an interesting experience and he has learned a lot. The Board thanked him.

Mr. Coppelman said that since Mr. Landry is leaving at the end of his term, there is now an alternate spot open; there are two folks who have expressed interest. He asked the Board if they wanted to invite them in to speak with them or do we want to advertise to see if there is anyone else interested. Mr. Bakie said the Board should advertise; Mr. Coffin suggested checking with Ms. Alessio about also requesting for alternates for the ZBA and advertising together. The Board agreed with this process; Mr. Bashaw suggested that the advertisement could include that anyone interested could submit a letter and come to a specific meeting to meet with the Board; contact those who have already expressed an interest to come to that meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer to do the advertisement; coordinate with Ms. Alessio.

Ms. Merrill questioned the agenda for the first meeting in April. She thought it might be a good time to start the preliminary discussion on the Rockingham County Planning Commission contract. She said that the first meeting in April last year included a discussion of items that the

Board might want to tackle during the year. Mr. Coppelman said these things would normally occur in the “new year”.

Mr. Coombs said that he has been reading the minutes for the past few months and expressed concerns with builders causing issues for residents; he suggested an after action review on cluster developments and have ideas of things the Board doesn’t want to do for the future; get Board members thoughts and reflections. Ms. Merrill said that there are some areas that could have improvement but specifically to Kings Landing, when it went forward, it did meet all the requirements but now the new owners want changes; there wasn’t anything wrong, it is a matter of preference. She said that at one of the other condo. projects in Town; there is a major issue regarding follow-through and we may want to review concerns with private roads and bonding private roads; make sure there is a way to make the developer follow-through with the plan. She noted that these were two separate issues and could be done within the Board process and not need a warrant article. Mr. Coppelman said that this would fall into the project review that Ms. Merrill just spoke about; he explained the process.

Board Election:

Mr. Coppelman referred the Board to page 2 of the By-laws regarding elections to the Board; he read the language in the by-laws. He added that the representative to the HDC (Historic District Commission) needed to be determined.

Mr. Coffin nominated Glenn Coppelman to continue as Chairperson.

Mr. Coppelman asked if Mr. Bashaw was interested, he said his plate was already full. Ms. Merrill made a motion to close the slate for Chair. Mr. Bashaw noted that he just wanted to stir the pot to change how the Board did the election; he didn’t want to be Chair.

All in favor of Mr. Coppelman as Chairperson was 6 in favor, none opposed; Mr. Coppelman abstained.

Ms. Croteau nominated Peter Coffin as Vice-Chair. There were no further nominations.

All in favor of Mr. Coffin as Vice Chair was 6 in favor, none opposed; Mr. Coffin abstained.

Historic District Commission (HDC) representative: Mr. Coppelman stated that it was something that he has done and would be happy to give it up if anyone wanted to do it. He noted the obligation of the Commission. No one expressed any interest.

Mr. Coffin nominated Mr. Coppelman as the HDC rep. All in favor of the nomination was 6 in favor, none opposed, Mr. Coppelman abstained.

MM&S to adjourn at 10:22. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by everyone) **PUNA**