



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Members Present: Sue Foote, Chair; Mark Preston, Vice Chair; Paul Garand, CEO; Tom Morgan, Planner; Karen Knight, Selectmen's Rep; Mike Lowry, Peter Evans, Paul Himmer, Keith Sanborn, Patricia Welch, Secretary.

Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM on Tuesday, November 1, 2005 by Chair Susan Foote. First item on agenda are the minutes of October 18, 2005.

Morgan: Lillian Knowles asked for a correction to map and lot number on page 21 was made, changing 293 to 2-93.

Motion: Lowry To accept minutes of October 18, 2005 as corrected.

Second: Himmer Unanimous. Karen Knight abstains, as she was not present at the whole meeting.

Next on the agenda are Capital Improvement Plans. Tom Morgan distributed changed pages to the plan.

Morgan: Shall I explain what's different? The recreation department's request is now incorporated beginning on page 48. With those proposals inserted into the plan, that also changed the spreadsheet on pages 72-75 so those were revised as well. No big surprises from rec. I know you had discussion last meeting as to whether all those proposals are bona fide capital improvements. We haven't changed anything since that discussion.

Foote: I see a typo, I believe, on page 48 "the wench let go" should be changed to winch.

Morgan: the title page has a different date for formally adopting on November 15th and the planning board picture is gone and that has become the signature page and also removed from page 5.

Foote: new town policy from what I've been told as far as removing pictures from web site for privacy purposes.

Lowry: but it's okay to be on TV

Knight: the employees' pictures are supposed to come off the web site

Foote: should also board pictures for the same reason employees' pictures have come off?

Knight: employees asked to have their pictures removed

Secretary: will the picture wasn't of the current board anyway

Preston: we could do a new picture, but I would think people would want to see who their elected officials are

Knight: elected is one thing but we gave the employees the option and they voted they didn't want to be on. But that doesn't mean pictures can't be on.

Foote: It only goes out to department heads anyhow it's not for the public.

Knight: true, but that mean we don't do PowerPoint's and stuff with pictures on?

Foote: I don't know.

Knight: neither do I and I'm chairperson. I'm confused

Morgan: so what's our final call here? Are we going to put the pictures back in or leave them out?

Foote: leave them out.

Morgan: page 11 we have a final tally on how many proposals, the second paragraph on page 11. Your text I passed out tonight says 137, but I talked to the fire chief this afternoon so there is actually only 136 so we're going to change that as well. The one that was deleted was on page 36. Jeff told me it no longer needs to be in here as this equipment was purchased this year already. FD#13, Breathing Apparatus. And while we are in the Fire Department section, Jeff did read over what is in front of you and he says everything is fine except for the air packs. You notice that three of the projects on page 34, the platform truck, page 35 the beach sub-station, and on page 36, roof replacement at the fire station. Jeff declined to put a specific date



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

on any of those proposals. Initially when I didn't know when exactly they were going to happen on the spreadsheet I assumed the worst and assumed they were going to happen right away so your spreadsheet shows some of these projects beginning to be paid for in 2006, which is apparently not the case. Jeff tells me that the Fire Department will propose no capital improvements for 2006 but he's uncertain as to when he wants to put the platform truck and sub-station into the mix, exactly what year. So I'll look to the Planning Board for input as to how you want to handle the platform truck and sub-station. Obviously we'll push it back from 2006 but how far to push back is up to the Planning Board.

Footte: so the ladder truck is 1994 so it's 11 years old? Put that in for 2007, 2008? What's the average life of a fire truck?

Preston: It's what he wants to replace it with it's not the life that he's concerned about. He wants a platform truck rather than a ladder.

Morgan: if you want to play it conservatively and plan for the worst-case scenario, 2007 would be the way to do it. All he's told me definitely is it will not happen in 2006.

Preston: It's going to be reviewed next year anyway.

Knight: it is an issue of height and safety

Sanborn: you can use a platform to rescue anything, ice, or anything. It's a lot better than your 70-foot aerial ladder.

Footte: so go 2007?

Preston: sounds good to me.

Morgan: what about the beach sub-station? Same thing?

Footte: I don't think we should put them both in the same year.

Preston: well, that's \$800,000 of it is from what, the feds or something he's planning?

Footte: he is saying there are federal funds to match, but

Preston: we didn't get any federal funds this year in homeland security so I can't imagine they'll be giving us \$800,000 for a fire station.

Knight: well they think kind of funny you know.

Sanborn: Concord or Manchester, yes, they're first

Preston: or Nashua and Manchester

Footte: so what do you say, 2008? We can always push it out again next year if we need to

Morgan: also on page 36, you've got to replace the roof on the fire station

Preston: when do they need it? Oh, it's an immediate need.

Footte: didn't they do some repairs on it this year so it wasn't falling in?

Garand: that should be put into the budget because that's something that needs to be done

Knight: it has to be done

Footte: make that 2007?

Garand: it will last until 2007?

Footte: well he said he didn't want it for this year

Knight: well, after tax bills we expect a lot of items to get voted down

Footte: it doesn't make any sense to me to put \$20-30,000 into repairs if you're going to lose the roof

Garand: or lose the building or the ceilings or something worse

Preston: or equipment, radio equipment

Footte: from what I understood the repairs that they did were sort of emergency stopgap

Garand: at the same time that is the Emergency Management Building and they should have adequate facilities maintained properly.

Footte: next?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Morgan: that's it. Those are all the changes that occurred since you've looked at this last. I have not heard from the library, school or housing. Otherwise I'd say this is pretty much ready to

Foote: what does the Planning Board have in it?

Secretary: I called the library trustee and the housing person and I re-e-mailed the person from the school board.

Foote: and no response

Secretary: no one returned my phone calls

Knight: I'm shocked.

Foote: Planning Board starts on page 41. Number 2 can come right out of there. Don't you Karen?

Member Peter arrives at 6:20 PM

Knight: yes

Foote: PB2 study reconfiguration and reuse of PSNH pier for public use. Didn't the contract the Selectmen signed with the coop pretty much settle that so there is no need of \$30,000 for a study?

Knight: no the study is done

Foote: so pull out PB2 and the photo below it. I'm trying to cut back on pages too. We can double side it when we get to the final. Pull the photo of Shepherd's Brook on page 40. PB3 also goes away, Playground, Park & PSNH pier. PB4, I think I would push out because there doesn't appear there is going to be a warrant article for that, push it to 2008. Bike Path on B&M railway, we can leave it there for 2008 but it's never going to happen.

Evans: just need to make sure everybody on the bike path has a security clearance

Foote: and their own lead suit. PB6, Light on Lafayette Road.

Morgan: those are simply to prepare us for what might come.

Foote: Planning Board have any other ideas of things we might want to implement? Did we hear anything back from the historic society as far as maintaining the buildings?

Secretary: yes, I forwarded it to you and to Tom.

Foote: I got something from Eric but it's not incorporated in the historical society stuff.

Secretary: to **Morgan:** you didn't get it again?

Morgan: from Eric?

Foote: no it came from Planning Board but she forwarded it to you and me.

Morgan: I read all my emails through this morning and I didn't see anything.

Secretary: it was the middle of last week. I'll go and see if I can find it.

Morgan: just forward again.

Garand: should we look at widening some of the roads in the industrial zone as far as like Stard Road, Batchelder and so forth, putting those in the planning so that down the road if we have developers come in, we can say we need off site improvements for these things. It might be something to look into

Foote: definitely Stard Road, Batchelder Road

Knight: well, if you're holding everybody to it on Route 1 it should be done.

Garand: at the same time because of the Batchelder and Ledge Road intersection

Foote: some day that's going to need a light

Garand: exactly.

Foote: these are all state roads. We should be looking at the town roads.

Morgan: Stard, Batchelder, any others?

Garand: Stard, Batchelder, Ledge Road intersection with Batchelder and,

Morgan: everybody agree with those three?

Evans: yes (head nods around table)



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Foote: I'm trying to think of what else.

Garand: might even lessen the traffic looking at Folly Mill extending it back over too

Foote: bridge across 95 to reconnect Folly Mill?

Sanborn: they took that one 40 years ago and said we didn't need it

Foote: definitely need to as part of PB7, Improve 107 that should include putting the bridge that crosses 95 up to five lanes

Morgan: what's this about Folly Mill Road, is that something you guys are serious about?

Garand: it's something to look into.

Morgan: is it something to put in the CIP?

Garand: it wouldn't hurt because right now we're limited to one access crossing over 95 and it would create a second access for safety and lessening the traffic

Preston: bridge to Salisbury?

Garand: quick escape

Sanborn: buy a dirt bike

Preston: we have enough complaints about speeders on Folly Mill can you imagine if you put a bridge there?

Foote: anything else? I would leave them the same as these, implement as soon as possible

Morgan: how's November 15th for a Public Hearing?

Secretary: it's already been advertised so I hope it's okay.

Morgan: how many copies of the final do you want?

Preston: 30 should cover it

Foote: it'll be double sided?

Secretary: if you want to just bring me a digital, I can run it on the photocopy machine, it'll be a lot cheaper

Foote: also, make sure we get a digital copy so it can go on a web site. I was told today that we have scads and scads of room on the web site. We don't have to worry about running out of space. That's it for the CIP tonight unless has anything else they want to add?

Foote: I do have an announcement to make. Planning Board will be live on Channel 22 beginning November 15th. They are running the boom mikes tomorrow, and they are going to coordinate with Patricia to make sure there is no feedback from our mike and starting at our next meeting we'll be on Channel 22 live.

Preston: if you really have no life you can sit and watch the Planning Board at home

Foote: I think some of our meetings could be very entertaining

Preston: I can't believe there was that much of a call that people wanted us televised

Knight: but can they be as entertaining as the Selectmen's meetings?

Foote: we can try

Morgan: does this broadcast beyond the boundaries of Seabrook?

Foote: no just Seabrook.

Garand: I bet we could make money if we did sell it

Preston: so on a default budget we spent \$800 on boom mikes, plus you have to have an employee here on overtime

Garand: exactly

Preston: smart

Foote: next on the agenda, changes to the Zoning Regulations. I believe we reviewed all of them at our last meeting and everyone should have received them and also attached as email. The Public Notice has gone out and we'll be covering them and either approving or altering at our next meeting. So they are on the November 15th Public Notice. Item #4 Requests for Security Reduction.

Secretary: that one just came in today



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Footnote: we received one today from Provident Bank requesting reduction in their security in the amount of \$21,000 in regards to the new branch located on 1 Provident Way. Construction is now complete.

Secretary: they would also like to have the case closed at the same time

Footnote: on any site plans when we release the security we should also close the case at the same time. And we have a request from Bruce Brown for a one-year extension for case #03-31 the eight-lot subdivision at 31 Adams Ave. Work has been started and a bond of \$41,800 is in place at BankNorth but he figures he won't finish it up by his two-year substantial completion on November 4, 2005 so he's asking for a one-year extension. So we'll need a motion on that.

Motion: Preston To extend Case #03-31 for one year to November 1, 2006.

Second: Sanborn Unanimous

That also was the correspondence folder so we've dealt with that so now on to the Public Hearings. Case #05-50 Proposal by Clayton P Gould and Anthony & Dorothyann Genna for a two-lot subdivision at 8 & 16 Adams Avenue, Tax Map 15, Lots 132 & 133.

Henry Harrison Boyd, Jr., Millennium Engineering: everybody is probably familiar with this lot, it started with Clayton Gould's lot, which is almost an arrowhead shaped parcel that you see to the southwest on the plan, shown on this plan as lots A & B. The Genna tract is known as Map 15, Lot 133, which is on the northeast of that and up further Adams Ave towards Route 286. The original plan that we had just involved Mr. Gould's lot but it really was problematic for me to begin with because when we first started the survey and when we finished the perimeter, I knew that the Genna's were going to be horrified when I set their front right corner, which would be Clayton's left front corner. If you look up to what would be the right hand side of what would be the Genna tract, and the Genna's are with us this evening. Their front corner was essentially right out in front of the right front corner of their house. They had no idea this would happen. I scoured for something to disprove this was where it was we spent a lot of time and a lot of money trying to solve this perimeter. What I had found was back in the old Parker Survey archives I found a sketch that had been done back in the early 80's that showed that the owner of the house at the time had told Mr. Parker that the line was eight feet off the house. Sure enough we find a pipe in the back and we connect the line through there and there are lilacs that are dead on that line. As you know lilacs are plants that are planted by humans and once they grow wild they go crazy and grow everywhere. But these lilacs are dead on-line and I had gone down and I think all surveyors should do this, meet with neighbors of abutting properties. They don't do that, I do that, and I think it should be done. And I explained to them that there was going to be a crew here setting up monuments and rods and you are going to flip out and think I am a bad person, but here is why they are setting it here. So I took the time to do that. We subsequently approached the Planning Board and submitted an application for Clayton to be able to divide his property that is 30,000 square feet. The Genna's came as abutters to the hearing and we had talked before that and we continued that hearings if you remember because they thought it might be wise if we actually did a lot line adjustment in here so that it would bring more quality to their property and make it make sense. This area of South Main Street, especially going up in south Seabrook is a mess. All the land titles are just out of control. None of them were ever done by survey. They were all done by deed and I'll give you an example. This tract right here, map 15, lot 131, the legal description says the land on which the barbershop once sat. No abutters, no distances, doesn't even say which road it's on and no area. So you try to imagine being a surveyor and putting that on the ground. About five years ago, I started surveying tracts down the street and subsequently worked up, as Valerie would buy the rest of the neighborhood. So in doing a survey for Valerie for her son's piece, which he bought off Richard Blanchard, we entered into negotiations with Clayton who had purchased this piece because we could not determine where the boundary line was. In fact I had been hired by a Mr.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Jeff Rollis, which I think everybody knows, because he before Clayton bought this, entertained buying it himself. I spent about \$2200. on that piece of property and could not tell him where that property line was. He wasn't happy, but he sold that information to Clayton who in turn bought it and he and Harold, based upon my advice, did a boundary line agreement. Now I just need to get this off my chest. You people have known me for nine years or more coming before this board. Somebody in the TRC or the TRC in aggregate had suggested that I did something illegal and I can tell you that I wasn't happy. It's the second time it has happened and I don't know a lot about a lot of things in this world, but I know a lot about surveying. And I know a lot about ethics and I know a lot about survey boundaries in particular and where boundaries aren't sure to be placed on the ground and what the law allows me to do as a licensed land surveyor in the state. When something accuses me of doing something illegal, people that I've known for nine years, it really bothers me and it should bother all of you. I photocopied the statute pertaining to boundary line agreements and unfortunately I didn't bring it with me. I'm not a lawyer, I'll paraphrase. It says that when two land adjoiners are unsure of their boundaries and are in dispute because of obliteration or loss of monuments and the boundary line cannot be placed upon the ground, they are to hire a surveyor. A survey is to be made of the ground, monuments set in the ground, agreed upon by the abutters and the plan filed and it affixes the boundary line for good. That's what I did here. The comment comes on the first review from Mr. Gould's stuff and I'm going to let this go after this because I really don't like to feel this way. It says August 2nd, 2004, page 8 of 8, the Tech Review Board and the last sentence says illegal boundary line agreement never brought before the Planning Board. The fact is, boundary line agreements are a civil matter between two parties. The only time it can be done is me as a surveyor cannot place that line on the ground because the deeds are so poor and there are no monuments. I cannot affix the line where I choose. Now some surveyors in the past did that but I don't do that. I can't do it so we did a boundary line agreement on this line right here. You'll notice that the plan references up here a plat of land showing a perimeter survey at eight Adams Ave. I also have a copy of and I'm not trying to be a know it all, or a jerk here, I just need to get this straight. You should know me better. This is a certified recorded copy of the boundary line agreement which you are absolutely are welcome to take a copy of to know how one is properly done. I did this

Footnote: I can give you a bit of background on where that comment came from. It was when the plans were sent to the assorted department heads and it was Shay Perkins who compared this with the tax map and she was reading the original plan that was submitted and the reference to the boundary line recording and she was quite upset that it did not agree with the tax maps and the acreage is changed and that the assessing office was never notified of the difference in the boundary so that they could correct the tax maps and correct the acreages to make sure the proper assessment was made and that's where it came from.

Boyd: but you can see why I am upset. It says illegal boundary line agreement.

Footnote: it was the assessing office that told us that unless they were notified that they did not consider it legal.

Boyd: I don't care what the assessing department says about that. We since have talked about me providing perimeter surveys to the Planning Board so that you can provide them to them and by the way every month, the Registry sends to the assessor everything that has been recorded. My only reason of protest in giving you and the assessor copies of the perimeter plans is because I believe they were unfairly called to bring before this board and since that you have changed your regulations to not require a fee of \$50. to show you their plan. In the future they will get all those and that's a promise that I made to you. It wasn't right.

Footnote: I think your beef isn't with this board but with the assessing office.

Boyd: well, this comes from the tech review board.

Garand: when they made this agreement behind here to find this line, is this lot still 30,000 square feet?

Boyd: it's actually a little more than 30,000 square feet



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Garand: so it still is in conformance for the duplex structure that is on there

Boyd: but, keep in mind, that line, even though we have agreed upon that spot, it still has been agreed upon based upon all of the deeds that I have for the entire neighborhood. I had to reconstruct the whole of south Seabrook from the Rand Church up just to be able to do one of these parcels. This one, you might know that the barbershop sat on, this road at one point used to go out to the center here and the town used to have a water tower here, Sue might remember that and what did they do, they never took that from the people that owned it, they just occupied it. People didn't care then. Then they put a road in here and never cut a deed for it. There is nothing registered against this deed by way of an easement that gives the town for this. But people have acquiesced, they've accepted it, this town has prescriptive rights, it's part of the prescriptive right of way in my opinion as a surveyor today and what we are doing, we are not even arguing with it. In fact, we're defining for the town a new right of way. So just be careful when things come out and say, this is illegal, because it is not. And I've taken this around with me for two months. Maybe I get too sensitive about these things, but I take a lot of pride in what I do and I'm very ethical about these things and it's just wrong. That's all I'll ever say about it. Promise. Now, this line was affixed by boundary line agreement. It's on a recorded plan that shows this and affixes it here. What we've done in agreement with the Genna's we've actually straightened their lot and made it square. Now the line comes all the way over and the plan should be revised to say a subdivision and lot line agreement at 8 & 16 Adams Ave and I will fix the plan for you and I think it should be revised to say as much. It squares their lot off, it gets them in conformity with their setback where now they are only eight feet and this is much more usable property than the back corner.

Footte: I have a question. The lot width and depth for lot B is that something that has to go to variance?

Boyd: I don't believe so, but it's one of the items that's in the tech review.

Footte: we can't waive the zoning box. It's a zoning thing.

Boyd: understood. The boxes you can waive, but you cannot waive lot width and there is some gray area there because the boxes are required in the subdivision regulations, not in the zoning code so there is a little bit of an overlap and I have been attempting for about four years to get the town to come up with a definition of lot width.

Footte: there is a definition in zoning.

Boyd: yes it's as much gray as...it's tough to deal with

Morgan: that definition is pretty tough

Boyd: let me finish and then you can beat me up or applaud me or whatever you'd like to do when I am done. If we fix the Genna lot and if you look over here you'll see the detail, parcel one and two detail, we've actually done an exact 690' lot parcel swap and also created a straight line. Because I know the town likes that. What we've done after that, in striking that boundary line agreement, this ended up, to get back to Paul's question, I think that lot for Harold I think it has 30,300 square feet or something like that. I couldn't take more from Clayton's to do this because he still has 15,000 square feet. He can still do a duplex no matter what. He could build on to that. He favors single-family homes. I told him we need waivers, at least waivers on the boxes, possibly a variance, but I don't believe that it's a variance. And why I say that because in lot depth we have 230' of lot depth. Now it does nip up in the back on both of these lots but that's the natural shape of the lot, we can't control that. As far as the frontage, you'll note that this lot actually has 137 feet, nearly 140 feet of frontage so it's wider than it needs to be. Remember also that the town has taken without permission, years ago, this chunk of land that I am convinced belonged to this piece at one time. Now it's true that the boxes do spill over, but you'll notice that in the existing dwelling for lot 8 there's 15.3 feet to the property line that we're proposing so there is plenty of room to make it work. I am asking also for a waiver onto the Genna piece from the box for lot A but you will see that it's to accommodate them to



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

get some room around their shed. We really worked hard with them to try to make something that would make the whole neighborhood down there better. And maybe you are interested in asking them how this came about, but I do spill over slightly here and in the back corner you'll notice that is the edge of the box. And this box spills over. You can say we need to go to the zoning board for the lot width.

Garand: what size is the shed?

Boyd: the shed is, I don't know off the top of my head but I know it can be within two feet of the line if it's less than 100 square feet I know that.

Garand: so this right here is scaled out, so what is it?

Boyd: they still would need a waiver on the box even if I got to two feet because actually the box is right up against the edge of the shed. Two feet you really can't get a mower around it, I don't know if you've seen their yard, they take a lot of care and a lot of pride in their yard, they just want to be able to get a mower around it essentially. So if you tell me that I've got to go to the zoning board, I guess that's where we go.

Footte: it says the shed setback is 5'7"

Boyd: it is from the new lot line

Garand: you can if the shed is under 100 square feet, that's allowable, but it looks like the shed could be about 15x15

Boyd: it's bigger than 100 square feet

Garand: than you can't make something that is non-conforming unless you go to the board of adjustment for that also

Boyd: well they could move the shed if they had to

Garand: to meet the zoning requirements for setbacks, they would have to

Morgan: where is the shed?

Boyd to Gennas: do you know how big that shed is?

Anthony Genna: it's roughly 12 x15

Boyd: so it's larger than 100 square feet; so if you want to leave it there, we've got to go to the zoning board; if you can move it we don't. But what I would say is if we don't need to go to the zoning board, the shed will be moved; if we do have to go to the zoning board we'll ask for a variance for a shed at that point. In reading the definition of lot width and lot depth, I don't see that you have, but then again we have had disagreements about this in the past

Garand: one thing I would remind you about on Walton Road we had the subdivision with the same exact shaped lots and so forth and we required them to go to the zoning board of adjustment. So just to treat everyone the same...

Footte: I think we need to make that decision before we make a decision whether or not we consider it administratively complete and start the 65-day clock

Boyd: and I agree

Preston: I don't want it to come back us later with someone else saying you did it for him

Garand: exactly so we've already done it with one subdivision we did on Walton Road so I think we need to treat everyone fairly and equally and at the same time they would also be able to go in for the shed so they wouldn't have to move the shed and you're only talking one month out

Boyd: we'll structure it that way and I don't have a problem with that. I just wanted everybody to understand how hard we've worked on this and I do believe as Tom has said in the past that part of your job is to create harmony in the neighborhood and you can ask them how hard we've worked on this with them to resolve this

Footte: I'd like to ask, both parties are here tonight? If you are both agreeable and pleased with the way the lines are?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Genna: I am more than happy with the way the measurement came out. Obviously it would be nice if I didn't have to move the shed, but just to have the property line straightened out and to have a enough room on the side of the shed and keep the neighborhood peaceful and Henry did come me on his own, we didn't have to fight and could have basically done whatever he wanted both Clayton and Henry have been more than agreeable in trying to work something out so everyone winds up happy.

Foote: Mr. Gould, you are pleased with it?

Boyd: Mr. Gould is not here.

Foote: Mr. Gould is not here. Well, I think we need a motion to send this to the Zoning variance board.

Motion: Knight To send case 05-50 to Zoning Board of Adjustment

Second: Lowry Unanimous

Boyd: thank you for allowing me to talk about that.

Foote: we can continue it out to January 3rd^h? We have to continue it to a date certain.

Boyd: I am going to be in Germany

Foote: would you rather it be January 17th?

Boyd: no, let's leave it on the third and I'll have somebody fill in. Hopefully you won't act like piranhas.

Foote: send Chris, we haven't seen him in a while. Next item, case #05-51 Proposal by 286 Seabrook Realty Trust, Lori Dunlap, Trustee for site plan review to add a 1,000 square foot structure for walk-up pizza at 418 & 418A Route 286, Tax Map 17, Lots 44 & 44-1.

Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach Engineers: Lori Dunlap is here tonight with me. She is the owner and operator of Dunlap's Ice Cream. What we are proposing, most of the members know this site, it used to be the old Dairy Queen, now it's Dunlap's Ice Cream, has an existing parking lot along the side, gravel parking along the back, there's an old dumpster pad way out in Salisbury and then we have another lot just to the east of this. Back a few years ago, the state came in on 286 and put in those raised concrete islands in front of the lot and what we are proposing is to take the existing building and add an 1000 square foot addition. The addition will have the same overhang in the front so it will be consistent with the existing building. We are going to try and keep the same façade with the brick on the bottom and it's going to be a block building. Some of the things we've done on the plan is we've added a dumpster pad to the back of the site. We show a loading area and although it is in the gravel that's exactly where they load right now. So we're keeping many things the same as they currently are on the site. We are not proposing any more pavement on the site and the addition that we are proposing is completely within the existing pavement so there is not more impervious to be added to the site. Utilities are going to be serviced underground. We met with Warner and found out where the store line came in and decided to put a sewer manhole behind the building for sampling because it's a lot easier out in back especially how the utilities are now. We figured we need a new water line to go to this because it will have to be sprinkled for this addition so a new water line will come in to the back. We're showing the proposed parking spaces along the front although there is a large amount of gravel parking on the side. That's the proposal. The last sheet on the set is basically the architectural pretty similar to what's out there now. We're going to carry the brick on the bottom. We're going to have glass along on the front and on the east side of the building there will be an entry door so in the winter you'll be able to step inside so you won't have to stand up against the glass counter, you'll be able to step inside to a small counter and get your pizza inside out of the wind. It's all going to be one building; we are not proposing any additions to that parcel to the east.

Knight: Wayne, how many parking spaces do you have?

Morrill: parking spaces that we are proposing is 13.

Preston: there is no seating inside?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Morrill: there is no seating on either operation.

Garand: Wayne, on sheet C2 it shows a proposed pylon sign. At the tech review we talked about the only one pylon sign allowed on site. No off-site signage allowed.

Morrill: is that considered an off-site sign because it is on the separate parcel?

Garand: exactly so it would not be allowed.

Morrill: so in order to do signage, could we add, as long as we're underneath the square footage, to the Dunlap's Ice Cream sign?

Garand: for Dunlap's, you go through the sign ordinance, you're allowed I believe 32 square foot per added business on a commercial site. So you'd actually be able to add a 16 square foot sign below or above the existing sign. You can't have an independent pylon sign off-site, that's not allowed. I believe it states parking and so forth right now. That's a non-conforming sign. If that is removed it has to come into conformance.

Morrill: there is an existing sign on this lot over in that corner that's been there for quite some time

Garand: it says parking and so forth

Morrill: okay. We'll modify that so all the signage is either on the Dunlap's Ice Cream sign and we'll have some signage on the building as well.

Garand: as long as it goes along with zoning for sign use

Morrill: Thank you.

Foot: I realize there is salt marsh directly across the street and salt marsh behind it. I don't see the Shoreline Protection Zone line. And you realize that any construction in a Shoreline Protection zone needs a dredge & fill.

Morrill: I know that we're not in the Shoreline Protection

Foot: Shoreline Protection is 250 feet from the highest observable tide line. You can build to within 50 feet of the high tide line, but if you go 250 feet from the north side of 286 and I'm not sure exactly where the tide line is on the back side of this, but it's definitely within 250 feet of the building. It drops off fairly steep at high tide.

Morrill: That would require a permit from DES for construction with the Shoreline?

Foot: yes. Within the Shoreline Protection zone.

Morrill: that's not a problem.

Foot: there shouldn't be any problem or objection because it's already impervious surface, but it does require a permit. And you should show on the plans where the two Shoreline Protection Zone lines overlap because I have a feeling they probably do.

Morrill: I don't think there is anything left out there.

Garand: Wayne, will you have a construction sequence added to the plan showing what order you'll be doing things or is that, it just says specifications, it doesn't show sequencing. So we have something to go on.

Morrill: we can do that, Paul.

Garand: before we go over this plan further, is this plan a complete application for review?

Foot: we haven't touched that yet. Let's go through the tech review: NHDOT will likely require a bond for water service excavation with their right of way; Design of all signs: Can't change non-conforming use only 1 pylon per parcel; **Morgan:** I don't recognize all the initials here who is TR?

Foot: Tech Review; Tom Morgan, Mike Fowler, Patricia Welch. Manufacturer's Cut Sheets: Not legible. They probably had small plans.

Morrill: pretty much the fixture we've been using from Sharon Inc., the full cut off and the wall mounted ones are a little different, they're like a dome but they are still a cut off because we have to affix it to the slope of the roof.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Footte: well, Paul's the one that's going to have to be checking so is it acceptable to you?

Garand: I checked the cut sheet and it looked good.

Footte: Does plan minimize traffic congestion? 2 existing curb cuts & installed by State. So that's N/A. Buffers are not required. Sufficient off-street loading: loading area not labeled, no new proposed loading areas.

Morrill: that's the old tech review sheets before these revisions. There's a loading area going in the back we're just going to keep the gravel.

Footte: paved parking and loading areas not indicated, again, you've addressed that. Drainage design for fifty year storm: JS: DO NOT WAIVE; call Thelma Murphy in Boston and get her to do it

Morgan: who is JS?

Footte: John Starkey. Means nothing to me.

Garand: she's the director in Boston who makes the rules and John said he can't waive it, go to Thelma.

Morrill: I didn't understand that one to begin with.

Footte: he's right. We can't waive drainage design because of EPA Phase II Stormwater and because it's going to flow directly into a salt marsh untreated. While it's currently doing that, when you do an addition you have to bring it up to code.

Knight: that doesn't make them happy

Footte: when you're altering the site, you have to bring it up to code.

Morrill: okay.

Footte: you might be able to get away with

Morrill: what Josh presented to me was to take the roof and actually put the roof leaders into some leaching catch-basins in the back similar to what we did at West Marine. Leaching catch basins, perforated pipe between them and take all the discharge and put it back into the ground. It just means a little bit more in construction costs.

Footte: Drainage study provided: says it's requested. Post development drainage flows: no study. Groundwork installed in such a way to prevent erosion: can't be sure no study. Oil Water Separators provided: no. Fire Safety Codes is left blank. Sanitary waste facility connected to municipal sewer: yes. Says existing sewer not shown properly at street or behind building.

Morrill: that was the old one with an existing trench going at a wacky angle and we thought it was a sewer but it wasn't

Footte: note on refrigeration trucks I noted. Note on dumpster hours. Sidewalks are already there per the State. Curbs done by State. External machinery muffled so that no noise is discernable. Is there going to be?

Morrill: note #26.

Footte: yes. We've gone through all the lighting. Is there a note about timers on lighting?

Morrill: lights will reduce illumination levels to non-operational values per regulations.

Footte: parking requirements wrong formula used—24,000 square feet, 9 required have 12.

Morgan: my comment. Has that been fixed Wayne?

Morrill: the parking formula?

Morgan: yes, you had it for retail instead of a restaurant

Footte: but it doesn't matter. They require 9 and they have 12 so they have more than what's required.

Garand: there's no seating, it's all take-out

Morgan: and I'm saying there is a note on the plan showing how they calculated their requirement and they used the wrong formula

Preston: you put it under retail



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Morrill: with a restaurant you calculate per seats, so in restaurant we calculated you need zero required; so we went with a higher value, doing it by square foot and we'll just change that to restaurant.

Garand: just take the formula out

Footo: just take number 3 right out of there or just say parking spaces provided 13.

Morrill: okay.

Footo: because it would be really difficult to figure out how to calculate it because it's technically a restaurant but it has no seating. Engineering comments. Warner Knowles: Only one water service; will have one water meter-internal plumbing. Is that true? Aren't you adding a water service?

Morrill: we're adding a water service for this new one because there has to be fire suppression

Footo: and that way there can be a meter for each business

Morrill: correct then both businesses can shut off independently

Footo: and the Tech Review says that more than 50% changed you're required to meet current regulations. So we have to decide if it's administratively complete. I believe that most of the issues that were brought up by the tech review were addressed. We do know that it will require a dredge and fill permit prior to them being able to begin construction so if and when we get around to approving this, it will have to be conditional pending the dredge and fill permit.

Preston: how long does that usually take?

Footo: they supposedly have a new regulation that they have to turn them around in 120 days. Key word supposedly.

Garand: they are six weeks behind right now.

Footo: unless they require for more information and then their 120 days starts again so I think that's what they are doing, asking for some obscure little bit of information.

Morrill: this would also fall under that minimum; it should be an expedited I would think because it's under 3000 square feet.

Footo: or you might find that Frank Richardson will come down and review it and decide a permit is not necessary; he's doing that to an awful lot of the houses that are being rebuilt on Seabrook Beach unless they are absolute waterfront. He just writes a letter to the Town saying he has done a pre-application consultation and he deems there are no sand dunes in the area that are going to be impacted therefore a permit is not necessary. But to make sure we cover all the bases

Preston: that's putting them in the same footprint, though

Footo: because technically all of Seabrook Beach is considered a sand dune community—even a house in the middle of Ashland Street that's no where near anything; but where we know you have salt water from both sides, I just want to make sure we cover all bases.

Morrill: we'll get a hold of Frank right away and try and get a permit resolved

Footo: I don't want someone coming forward saying you let them go without it so we don't need one either. So do we consider this administratively complete?

Knight: yes

Motion: Knight To accept case #05-51 as administratively complete for deliberations

Second: Lowry Unanimous

Footo: so we have accepted this as administratively complete, we've gone through the tech review, Wayne has done his narration of it does anyone have any questions, comments, or concerns?

Evans: yes I do. On Sheet C2 the applicant has misspelled the name of the applicant's business. Change Dunlop's to Dunlap's. How many employees are on site during normal business operations?

Lori **Dunlap:** at one time?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Evans: yes, when you've got the pizza and the ice cream running at the same time.

Dunlap: probably six.

Garand: Lori, you also own the lot next door? So you can actually have employees park next door also?

Dunlap: correct

Evans: I'm interested in what the little clouds are off the southern border?

Morrill: last remaining bushes on the marsh.

Evans: sometimes you use those for snow storage

Morrill: I don't plan on putting snow out there

Evans: one request that I would ask the applicant to consider installing a dry sprinkler system as we have such a water problem and a dry sprinkler system does not require flushing. That's merely a request.

Preston: it has to be sprinkled for a couple pizza ovens?

Garand: yes. One thing I'd like to point out, they do have granite curbing here.

Foote: polls rest of board. No one has any additional questions.

Sanborn leaves meeting at 7:15PM

Foote: any abutters who would like to speak? No one responds. Then we're reading to take some form of action.

Preston: no bond or anything required on this?

Foote: site plans all require a minimum of \$5000.

Garand: Sue, you talked about the drainage and so forth. Before that's approved, shouldn't the drainage be looked at least a little bit?

Foote: we're going to need a drainage study and evidence that they have at least applied for a dredge and fill permit, he's got to correct the spelling, and remove the parking formula, remove the second pylon sign on the vacant lot.

Preston: if that's non-conforming as existing, so now that he's adding something he has to remove it?

Garand: he can't change that sign unless he brings it into conformance status

Preston: can't change wording on it?

Garand: really you're not supposed to maintain or change or do anything once it's there, it there and if you change it it's supposed to come into conformance

Foote: is there anything else that needs to be done to the plan?

Morrill: construction sequence

Garand: how long do you think it's going to take you to get all these things done?

Morrill: two weeks at the most; it'll probably be done in a week; basically it's the drainage and getting those applications out and that will be done before the end of the week.

Preston: does he require a continuance?

Foote: do you want the 15th or December 6th? We'll continue to November 15th at 6:00 PM or sometime thereafter. Next case #05-13 Proposal by GRA Real Estate Holdings, LLC, for a site plan review to expand site at 27 & 39 Stard Road, Map 4, Lots 9 & 11.

Secretary: we have had a request from Henry Harrison Boyd, Jr. to continue that to 11/15/05.

Foote: okay. We will continue case #05-13 to November 15, 2005 at 6:00 PM. Next case is #05-41 Proposal by Eugene J. Dean III, Stard Road Realty Trust II, to build a 4,500 square foot addition, Tax Map 4, Lots 18, 19-22 & 21.

Morrill: I'd like to continue this case due to the fact that we are in the process of trying to do the lot line abandonment that was requested. We're having a little trouble out on Route 1 and all the different PSNH properties trying to make sure they all close. So we'd like to be continued to the 15th if possible. My surveyor tells me he should have it done by the end of the week.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Footo: one other item. This is to build a 4,500 square foot addition. Has Mr. Dean completed his first site plan and is he prepared to ask to close the plan because we can't have two plans open.

Morrill: that's what we're working on right now, which will be done by the end of the week with both the as-built and lot line abandonment and I plan on turning those in to the Board by the end of this week.

Footo: okay.

Garand: are you going to be in contact with Mr. Dean, Wayne?

Morrill: yes I will.

Garand: can you either have him contact me or tell him that the storage containers at his other office are not allowed in that zone. Storage is not allowed in commercial.

Morrill: okay.

Footo: so that is continued to November 15th. Boy, the 15th is going to be a busy night. Are you sure you want the 15th, you sure you don't want to go into December for this?

Morrill: if the board needs an extra two weeks, that's fine. I don't want to

Footo: it's just that we've got a really big docket already for the fifteenth. We've got major zoning proposal changes that we have to do the public hearing on.

Morrill: why don't we continue to the first one in December.

Footo: so that's continued to December 6th. Case #05-42 Proposal by Marianne Gibbons for a 4-lot subdivision on Dow's Lane, Tax Map 12, Lot 14. Since we have last seen this, they have done a drainage calc on the box culvert and they found out that a 2x3 foot box would be more appropriate than 2x2.

Morrill: as Sue just said, we did a drainage analysis not only for ourselves but also for the future of Dow's Lane. We analyzed the whole entire watershed up above the railroad tracks and found a 2x3 would allow the flow a lot easier. That was submitted to the board so it would be in the public record. A couple other minor changes that you see on the plan is on Sheet C2, the water lines now going on a common drive that's six individual water lines so there is an individual water shutoff for each house. There was a request by Paul to possibly have a second driveway to service these two houses. The problem is if we did that this house would be between two driveways and its value would go way down. We kept it the way it was; we looked at it.

Garand: that's okay, it was just an idea.

Morrill: Another thing added to the plans is note #8 to the subdivision plan just calling out that the driveways and the utilities will be in the common driveway easement and that driveway is to stay private for the rest of its life so no one could every come back to the town and say they wanted it a Town road. And I believe those were the comments from the last time we were here. On that same note here, the condominium documents and the association is in charge of the pump station and utilities.

Garand: will there be a private sign, private way sign at the end of the driveway?

Morrill: we could probably do that

Garand: just like the one at Adams Ave—that's granite and says private way, and Katelyn way

Footo: I don't believe it's necessary to come up with a name on a private driveway because it confuses people. We had a really hard time convincing the assessing office that Katelyn Way was a private driveway not a road, so it didn't have to conform.

Morrill: the minute you put a road sign up, people think it's a Town road.

Footo: have you seen the way they did it? It's a large rock structure with a big granite thing in the center that says Katelyn Way

Garand: like the mailbox structure on Elephant Road—that's nice. I think Charlie would put one of those up.

Preston: you would think he would

Garand: him? He can't even build a detention pond!

Footo: what else were we supposed to look at?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Morrill: the one thing we told the board we'd send you too was the condominium or association documents and I was told by Mr. Sarri that had been sent to the board and I'm just finding out right now from Patricia that maybe it's not here yet.

Foote: you do intend to condo these?

Morrill: they will be sold as individual units, yes so there will be an association

Foote: this subdivision site plan review, so we don't absolutely have to have the condo documents here; it's when you come back to do the condominium conversion, that's when we'll need the condo docs that designate the rights to the road and all that sort of stuff. So technically, the first lot, has two houses on it so you're probably going to want to condo every lot.

Morrill: that first lot will not be part of the association because they don't have to share the common drive

Foote: it will just be a two-unit condo and theoretically could just be a duplex; owner owns one and rents the other.

Bagley: whatever you recommend

Morgan: I would like note #8 on Sheet A1 better if it said something about perpetuity. That's the one where he promises to keep it a private road. But if he added the words in perpetuity it would be stronger.

Bagley: can you spell that Tom?

Morgan: no, but I can say it.

Foote: it shall remain in perpetuity as a common driveway

Morgan: or as a private driveway forever

Preston: fa eV ear

Foote: anything else we need to address? Polls the board. There are no comments. Polls the abutters. There are no comments.

Lowry: what do we need for the bond?

Foote: Mike Fowler hasn't seen these revised plans. He said bond would be deferred until corrections and further information are provided on water and sewer service details.

Morgan: there isn't much infrastructure; it's mostly on private land.

Garand: the only thing we might want to guarantee is that the crossing over the wetland is taken care of. Maybe like a \$5000. security.

Foote: we have to have \$5000 for as-builts and digitals. And there will be the deed transferred to the town for that section of road. Do we want to put money on the deed they are supposed to write just to make sure we get it?

Knight: yes.

Foote: that only brings it up to \$11,000.

Garand: and the water and sewer will be off site so they'll have a road cutting bond in place for that work so that should cover any improvements off site.

Motion: Foote To set a site security of \$11,000 (\$5,000 for digitals and as-builts; \$5,000 for box culvert installation and \$1,000 for deeding road section to Town) on case #05-42.

Second: Himmer Unanimous

Motion: Knight To approve case #05-42.

Second: Preston Unanimous



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes **Draft**

November 1, 2005

Five-minute break is taken.

7:45 PM Public Hearing is re-opened.

Next case is **#05-47** Proposal by Gregory Burzynski, G&D Realty Trust for site plan review to construct a 3,300 square foot addition with stormwater controls to an existing manufacturing facility at 146 Batchelder Road, Tax Map 6, Lot 13-1.

Footnote: I received a message about G&D Realty Trust. There appears to be two of them, the second being Gary Boyle.

Secretary: that's all straightened out. Boyle is a Massachusetts corporation and this is a trust and not a corporation. I verified that with this company.

Secretary: we have a written request from Mr. Boyd to continue this to November 15, 2005 because they didn't have time to complete the revisions.

Garand: at this time our agenda is packed for the 15th.

Footnote: I'd be tempted to put it to December 6, 2005.

Garand: why don't we move it to December 6th?

Footnote: okay, we'll continue it to December 6, 2005 at 6:00 PM. Finally we come to case **#05-48** Proposal by David Tomlinson & Eno Urbani for site plan review to remove existing structures and construct a 5,480 square foot wholesale retail building at 49 New Zealand Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 78. We first reviewed this at our last meeting and there were several changes that were requested.

Wayne G-Whiz Morrill II from Jones & Beach Engineers: There were five changes requested by the board at our last meeting. First is pull the rip-rap back on the outlet structure to insure that water does not erode the property of the abutter. If you look at the grading and drainage plan, C3, Erik pulled it around the corner as much as he could. The problem that he had is that the elevation of the outlet that he had if he brought it around the corner even more, what was going to happen he was going to create a situation where there was going to be a foot and a half of stored water at all times in the pond. And was going to create what John Starkey calls a mosquito factory out there. So we tried to pull it around the best we could and then what he did was turn the outlet so it will come and splash against the rip-rap and then go to the side so it's not a direct push right at the abutter. The next thing was to look at snow storage along the truck dock. That should be on Sheet C2 I believe

Garand: that's way to the east now

Morrill: what happened is the abutter was talking about I know what they're going to do, they're going to push the snow right down along the lowest spot, so we're showing it on the lowest spot. That's pretty much where the snow will be stored and basically there will be enough room to allow passage around the snow pile to get to the back of the building.

Footnote: and I see you are now fencing the entire site.

Morrill: yes, we're fencing the entire site as requested.

Footnote: actually it was only requested on both sides, you could have left the back open.

Morrill: the back was already falling apart so we figured while we're doing it we might as well make it a nice looking site

Preston: what is this going to be?

Evans: curtain store

Garand: pink store number two

Morrill: this is Seacoast Bargains up on Route 1 in Hampton Falls. This is where they are going to put a lot of their overstock like curtains and things like that. And the last item was a note added to the plan about no



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

idling trucks on site. That was a request of the neighbor to the side; he didn't want the trucks sitting at the truck dock idling all night.

Morgan: where is that note, Wayne?

Garand: we also talked about continuing the granite curbing around in front of the next building?

Morrill: what?

Garand: don't you remember that Peter?

Evans: sounds familiar

Morrill: number 20 of the site notes is the note about no extended idling. I believe those were all the comments from the last meeting. If there are any questions, I'll be glad to answer.

Preston: just a comment. I know the area. I don't think I'd pick that for a retail/wholesale store.

Foote: it's basically going to be wholesale and very little retail. The gentleman said he receives orders for curtains for motels and stuff like that. This is a place for him to store the large stock he buys and then come in with his truck to deliver large sets.

Garand: is the dumpster going to be screened?

Morrill: is there a detail on the plan?

Foote: there is a six-foot high stockade fence all around the property.

Garand: but it doesn't screen the dumpster by itself.

Evans: you haven't revised the lighting grid since you put the fence in I see; but I don't think that's necessary though.

Morrill: basically when you put up a six foot high stockade fence the lights are going to stop at the property line. Just more calculations for another firm to do so we left it alone.

Foote: any other questions or comments? The board all responded no or all set. The audience was polled. No comments. I guess we're ready to take action on this. We should do the customary site security of a minimum of \$5000. for as-built digital plans.

Garand: this is the last meeting we can have any fun if we're going on Channel 22 next time.

Foote: I don't plan to change just because we're on TV.

Garand: big brother will be watching you.

Knight: I don't change just cause the TV's on.

Preston & Garand: we know that. Everyone LAUGHS!

Mitchell from audience: that's what we like about you Karen

Foote: we have a real challenge here. We have to improve the ratings better than the selectmen's meeting. I expect you guys to perform.

Evans: will we get cancelled if we don't?

Preston: will they vote me out if I act up?

Foote: so we need a site security of \$5,0000.

Motion: Foote To set a site security of \$5,000 for case #05-48

Second: Knight Unanimous

Motion: Foote To approve case #05-48

Second: Preston Unanimous



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Footte: we'll have the signed notice of approval done by Friday. It's going to require my signature and your signature so I'll be in there Friday morning to sign them and you can pick them up any time after that and just sign both of them. Take one and we keep one.

Tomlinson: in the code enforcement office or where?

Footte: in the Planning Board office, it's right next to code enforcement

Tomlinson: when do I give you the security?

Footte: the approval will have directions on how you go about setting up site security and what's acceptable and what not. We're now putting together an extensive information package. We've learned from people like Charlie that we have to tell people how to do things.

Knight: just for the record it was the flu fighter that she makes that's awesome stuff

Bagley: put a lot of pictures in there we can understand it though.

Footte: we can do drawings. Little cartoons? Walking to the bank

Garand: walking in with a full wheelbarrow and leaving with a piece of paper

Footte: we have one more item that we have to address here. We have a letter from Mr. Scott Mitchell Real Estate hereby requesting "an extension of site plan approval for lot 120 on Ledge Road, consisting of 3.74 acres of land, the planning board approved this site plan on September 9, 2005. The security must be in place 60 days after said approval. The security amount is \$33,775. I am requesting to have the sixty (60) day clock start from April 15, 2006 because of winter conditions we will not be able to start this project earlier." So you're saying that you want 60 days after April 15th.

Mitchell: April or May we are going to start the project because of the winter conditions

Footte: so you'll be putting up the site security in April

Mitchell: well, I have 60 days from April is how I would look at it. We're starting April 15th is what I am planning to do right now.

Evans: has any work been done on the site yet?

Mitchell: just staked out bounds. I have my intent to cut from the State.

Morrill: we've informed Mr. Mitchell that he is not to cut any of the trees because the trees are the thing keeping the water table down at this point.

Mitchell: I was all ready to go and cut. He stopped me.

Footte: even a hemlock tree sucks up 100 gallons of water a day in the winter.

Mitchell: he rode my ass like Zorro

Uproarious Laughter.

Garand: and all that for under \$5000

Knight: Scott, too much information

Footte: did you enjoy it?

Mitchell: just being honest

Footte: so basically what you're asking us is to waive/extend the criteria that the applicant/owner has 90 days from date of approval to meet all the conditions set forth or the plan will be automatically revoked. And this was approved with conditions and one of those conditions was site security. Because he doesn't want to start the project within 90 days, he was originally approved in September so that means he would have to start by December 9th. So he's asking us to extend that to April 15th.

Knight: are you expecting a big tax return?

Mitchell: you guys changed the rules; I didn't pick that day, that's when the contractor says he can start the work.

Garand: I think it's better for everybody if we do extend it at that point. It will give a better project.

Footte: so by this, you're asking for 60 days leeway starting on April 15th.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Mitchell: in other words, I want the approval to like theoretically start April 15, 2006. My contractor is telling me he can be ready by the 15th, but I want that leeway in there so I'm not in breach of the conditions in case I can't start until May 15th.

Evans: so you're asking for an extension to June 15th?

Foote: an extension that the site security must be posted no later than June 15, 2006 or the project will be revoked. What does the board feel on that?

Evans: I see no problem with that.

Motion: Preston To grant an extension to post the site security no later than June 15, 2006 on case #05-61

Second: Knight Unanimous

Preston: Motion to adjourn.

Foote: wait, I'd like to bring up some things. This is the time of year to think about zoning issues and zoning changes. Several different individuals have brought it up to me over the past three or four months about how come we don't allow apartments over in the commercial zone. A lot of towns if you have your classic downtown, you've got your retail down stairs, and you have apartments over. Currently our zoning will not allow that. I think that's something this board should think about.

Preston: what do you mean? We've got it all over town.

Garand: at the same time we may be opening ourselves up for more apartments all over time; we ought to look at the verbiage in that.

Foote: it's something I want everyone to think about. We have until our second meeting in December to public notice a zoning change. But it's one area of possibly allowing affordable housing. Certainly these subdivisions that are getting built are McMansions, they are not affordable housing. There is nothing we can do to control that.

Garand: while we're on this thing about we need clothing allowance for Channel 22, makeup and

Foote: hairstylist?

Garand: no bald spot preparation and anything else we can get

Lowry: we didn't even get a dinner from last year and you want a clothing allowance?

Garand: just write that off we're giving it back

Secretary: what about the lot width that Henry brought up tonight.

Foote: we should work out a better definition for lot width and depth for an acceptable lot

Garand: there has always been a question about the zoning box. Maybe we ought to make it so the zoning box has to fit within the lot and that basically would prove they have minimum lot width and depth.

Foote: 100 x 100 proves they have the minimum 15,000 square foot lot

Preston: would this be the time to bring up the thing about condos?

Foote: yes

Knight: I think if you're going to go for the verbiage on the apartments/condos whichever way it goes, that you should inquire now with the town attorney before he gets clustered by the town's issues.

Garand: also another thing. We have a survey going on in the Beckman woods. I've always been pro town houses or cluster houses so that you don't put in an infrastructure of roads that's going to be a burden on the town. Put all the houses in one area, leave the rest undisturbed.

Foote: back when I first got on the board I proposed cluster housing time and again and I got shunned and almost driven off the board.

Preston: I'd rather see a 20-unit development of townhouses because it's affordable for young people.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Garand: if you put in one main road and put four houses off each cluster, you could have a nice development, but at the same time if we don't think about this now, we're going to be inundated by major roadways being put in there.

Morgan: how big is that parcel, Paul?

Garand: over 120 acres I think

Footo: I heard they were looking at up to 120 houses

Preston: where?

Garand: all the orchards and everything

Preston: who owns it now?

Footo: some development company out of Nashua bought it as far as I know.

Preston: from Beckman?

Garand: this is just hearsay but the plans also includes Browns property in the back

Footo: and some of Donnie Felch's

Garand: that's Browns, Felch's and Melba Beckman's lots—all those lots are actually in the planning

Preston: he won't get Leo Fowler's

Garand: that's the only parcel you won't get but at the same time

Footo: they're going for the back area of the lots like Donnie's goes really back

Garand: you know the backside of Causeway Street around there

Preston: that's nice land out there

Footo: start thinking about cluster housing and possibly also we haven't got many parcels left to develop but if we want affordable housing is there somehow we can say if you're doing more than four houses, 25% must be affordable. But then how do you define what is affordable housing? What's affordable or do we say Seabrook has enough affordable housing with all the mobile home parks and apartments.

Garand: that would be the way to look at it if you think about affordable housing

Footo: by state criteria we are more than saturated with affordable housing

Evans: I think that's the least of Seabrook's worries right now

Garand: granite curbing is our worry. Let's go

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia R. Welch, Secretary
Seabrook Planning Board



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes Draft

November 1, 2005

Motion:

Second:

MYLARS RECORDED		