



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Members Present: Sue Foote, Chair; Paul Garand, CEO; Tom Morgan, Planner; Karen Knight, Selectmen's Rep; Mike Lowry, Peter Evans (arrived at 6:15 PM), Paul Himmer, Keith Sanborn, Patricia Welch, Secretary.

Meeting called to order by Chair Foote at 6:07 PM. First item on the agenda is the minutes of August 16th. Board polled as to questions, comments, concerns.

Motion: Lowry To accept minutes of August 16, 2005
Second: Sanborn Unanimous with Knight & Himmer abstaining because they were not present at the meeting.

As a quorum of regular members was present, Paul Garand asked to serve as the CEO representative rather than as an alternate at this time.

Next, continuation of Public Hearing on changes to the Subdivision Regulations begun at last meeting when the Board noted more detailed changes need to be made. Public Hearing opened at 6:10 PM. The changes were read:

- 1) At the beginning of Article III, remove references to lot merger and perimeter surveys. The proposed text will read as follows:
"Article III - Procedures: In order to subdivide land or adjust lot lines (i.e. move or eliminate property lines), merge lots or record perimeter surveys, prior approval by the Planning Board..."

Foote: do we want to deal with them individually or read them all? No response to questions.

Knight: doesn't that leave kind of a wide spectrum by wording it that way?

Foote: actually all we're removing is merge lots or record perimeter surveys. Primarily because by State Statute they don't really have to come for Planning Board approval but if anyone is doing a lot merger or recording a perimeter survey, they are supposed to provide us a copy of it so that we know that it's going on, but it doesn't require our approval for it to happen. Next item,

- 2) In Article III Section E, reduce the fee for perimeter surveys and lot mergers from \$50 to no charge.

Foote: that way it encourages people who are doing lot mergers or perimeter surveys to provide us with a copy of their plans. As Mr. Boyd so eloquently championed last meeting that it cost someone quite a bit of money to do this, it's not required that they have to do it and to charge them \$50.00 on top of it is not really fair.

- 3) In Article III Section O, amend the procedures for project field changes. The new section will read as follows:

"O - Revisions: Subsequent to Planning Board approval, changes to the proposed land development may be undertaken only after the applicant/contractor and appropriate municipal department head(s) approve, sign, and submit a rough sketch and a written explanation to the Planning Board office for technical review. Changes in the field require prior approval by the Planning Board. The Planning Board may determine that additional information and/or hearings are necessary."

Basically what this changes is that in the past changes were submitted to the Building Inspector and the Building Inspector had to notify the Planning Board. We're taking the Building Inspector out of the loop of forwarding information especially now that the Planning Board has an office in the building and there is someone there four days a week. There's no reason it can't be handled by the Planning Board office.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Last item:

4) In Article III Section P, as-built plans shall be submitted to the Planning Board instead of the Building Inspector.

Chair Foote polled Board Members and audience for questions comments or concerns. There were none.

Motion: Himmer To accept changes to Subdivision Regulations as printed in Public Notice.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Public Hearing on changes to Subdivision Regulations closed at 6:15 PM. Member Evans arrived at 6:15 PM.

Chair Foote opened New Public Hearings at 6:16 PM. The first case was **#05-42 Proposal by Marianne Gibbons for a 4-lot subdivision on Dow's Lane, Tax Map 12, Lot 14**. Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach Engineers after receiving some documents about this case, I have spoken to Mr. Boyd from Millennium Engineering who has indicated that he might have more information to shed some light on the actual rights-of-way on Dow's Lane for us, so I would like to continue this case and any information that was given to the board from the abutters, for more documentation I'd like to take that back with me so we can come back and not waste the Board's time dealing with a civil matter and we will take care of that ourselves.

Foote: So you want to continue to 9/20/05 at 6:00 PM and then you will know whether you continue with this case or withdraw.

Morrill: that would be great.

Secretary left to make copies for Mr. Morrill. Copy of Plan for Case #05-42 given to Mr. Boyd.

Foote: Now on to case **#05-43** Re-submittal of sidewalk & driveway cross-sections on case 03-38 Pineo Farms Subdivision, Tax Map 4, Lot 14 and 14-2.

Morrill: Madam Chair may I push this one back because Mr. Boyd has only one case so he can go home.

Foote: sure.

Henry Harrison Boyd, Jr. Millennium Engineering asked that case #05-39 Proposal by Clayton Gould for a minor subdivision at 8 Adams Avenue, Tax Map 15, Lot 132 be withdrawn. We are working with the abutter right now to do a lot line adjustment that serves both of the parties.

Foote: so case #05-39 you want to withdraw?

Boyd: yes withdraw the application.

Foote: but you do want to go forward with case #05-37 ? Is that your only case tonight?

Boyd: yes

Foote: we are now going forward with case #05-37 Proposal by Thomas Dieter for a minor subdivision at 33 Weare Road, Tax Map 1, Lot 18-1. We have received a letter from Public Service of NH, an abutter who was not notified for the original hearing on August 2, 2005, giving their opinion.

Henry Harrison Boyd Jr. with Millennium Engineering and we have a plan that was presented to you before. There are some differences. This time we have a second sheet that was added. The last time we were here the Planning Board tried to stress to the applicant and myself how important it was to show sidewalks, to incorporate sidewalks into the design so if you look at the second sheet, you will notice there is a sidewalk running along Weare Road with curbing. The other thing that we've decided to do since we have added a proposed bunch of amenities and utilities, we have included that in the second sheet. The other concern was where will the new driveway go. We've shown the new proposed driveway, proposed sewer lines, water lines to serve and the main issue was that there was an oversight in notification of abutters. There is a 225-foot wide,



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

most of it being on our parcel, power line easement that belongs to PSNH. I had forwarded a letter and copy of the plan explaining to them that they had been inadvertently not notified by the Planning Board because I didn't include it. I sent a letter to review the plan and if they had objections to respond back in writing so that I could give the Planning Board a copy of that. Would you like to read it Sue?

Chair Foote read the pertinent paragraph: "PSNH finds the proposed subdivision does not impact its easement and therefore we do not have any concerns or comments."

Boyd: I think the Board did have some reservation that so much of the easement on the proposed new lot A1 that there would not be enough room for a building block so I did demonstrate on there that there is a proposed dwelling, in fact, two of them and you will note that it will fit in here but this may not be the actual size, shape but it must comply with the building regulations so I wanted to show something to prove that we did have buildable area within the lot. Other than that I think it's fully compliant.

Foote: so you are planning on lot A2 will keep the existing house and it will be a single family dwelling and lot A1 will be a duplex?

Boyd: A2 is also large enough to be a duplex lot, but there is no plan at this point as far as I am aware of with Mr. Dieter to convert it into a duplex, but the whole lot is upland soils and there is area to do that. But if he does he will have to have a second water line put in and all those things. There should be no secret that A1 at this time they will be trying to pursue building a duplex on that lot.

Foote: and you did clear up sharing an existing sewer service with both lots?

Boyd: Sheet 2 shows it's to be divided. We don't know exactly where the sewer comes off the street, so we've got actually a new proposed sewer line coming up where the driveway is to be relocated and then a new sewer service coming where the old one does. What I did, since we didn't want to destroy any of the old ancient wall that's out there, the second, new driveway that comes off 1A is where the existing driveway is now. We wanted to protect as much of that ancient stonewall as we could.

Morgan: what is this double dashed path here? One is the edge of the easement, what's the other one?

Boyd: I'm just showing an actual line off the easement to show that we're not next to the easement in construction. So we're not building next to it.

Foote: so it would be like your side setback

Boyd: I'm applying a 10' side setback there. That's what it is.

Foote: did you add the note about the permanent wetland markers? Oh, that's right you discussed that because of them going through with the brontosaurus the markers won't stay there long.

Boyd: and nobody is allowed to do anything out there but Public Service to begin with. So we didn't want to put those out there. I don't think they want posts out in their easement.

Foote: so it appears that everything in the checklist has been addressed.

Foote polled Board. No comments. Any members of the public? No comments.

Morgan: we are all aware that you are not allowed to build anything in the easement, and certainly Public Service will do their best to enforce that, but it wouldn't be a bad idea to put that on the record Because there are people who are ignorant and that will be one more flag that might catch their attention.

Foote: we could do that as part of conditions of approval.

Motion: Evans To accept case #05-37 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Motion: Evans To approve case #05-37 with the condition that no building is to be located in the PSNH easement without PSNH's agreement that it is acceptable.

Second: Lowry Unanimous

Foote: This is case #05-43 Re-submittal of sidewalk & driveway cross-sections on case 03-38 Pineo Farms Subdivision, Tax Map 4, Lot 14 and 14-2.

Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach Engineers: This is a very simple one. Sidewalks along Stard Road were originally proposed to have a three-foot grass strip and then a five-foot sidewalk and it was thrown on the plans at the very last minute at the time this board was approving it. When we went to go to construct them, the telephone poles were right in the middle of the sidewalk. So we're adjusting the sidewalk not to affect the Wetland Permit so it can be constructed and be taken care of. Also, on that same note, we have been working with John Starkey on sheet D1. We added a couple of driveway details that were for a DOT driveway which wanted to have an 18 foot platform before you even started to go up on the rise. What happens is the way these buildings are constructed, some of them are twenty feet off the edge of the pavement so by the time you get down in there we can't keep the positive grade away from the structure that's required by the Planning Board. So in meeting with John, he's come out to the site every time, we've come up with a new detail that allows the roadway goes nine feet down, hits the culvert and then goes back up to the structure. And that's what you're seeing here is this little detail. This is our only change. We've added one of John's notes: all proposed driveways to have a minimum of one percent slope away from the proposed building so we can maintain that. Also on note on Phase I, all driveways on the North side of Pineo Farms Road shall be graded uphill for a short distance so that stormwater flowing along the curb does not enter the private driveway. I believe the detail shows that also. What we're doing is giving the contractor driveways that actually work out in the field. They are all duplexes. All the houses you try to keep them as tight to the road and not have long driveways so in order to be compliant with the approval of this Board, we're back in front of you for a driveway and sidewalk approval. I didn't see anything in the checklist other than Mike Fowler asking for a \$14,970 security for the sidewalks. I didn't know if it was in the first one or not? It was not. Okay.

Garand: does that mean I can't issue any more building permits until that security is in place for the sidewalks, and no occupancy permits? Some are required tomorrow? I'm just looking for instruction.

Foote: he doesn't instruct you, we do.

Morrill: so this Board knows, we've been working really hard with the selectmen and Sue Foote and the Conservation Commission to get the Conservation Easement in place. I believe it's in front of the selectmen tomorrow to be signed. All the language is acceptable to everybody so it's just a matter of signing that language tomorrow.

Foote: polled the Board.

Sanborn: shouldn't that be Seabrook DPW and not Newfields DPW; lower bottom right over the caps?

Foote: so that requires a correction. Good eyes Keith. Any members of the audience? No comments. I believe we're looking for a motion that includes correcting the typo.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Motion: Evans To accept case #05-43 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Motion: Evans To approve plan 05-43 on the condition that the note mentioning Newfields DPW be changed to Seabrook DPW and a security of \$15,000 be included in the existing bond of \$900,000.

Second: Lowry Unanimous

Garand: I have a question before approving this. Is another security required since they already have a security established for this road way. Has that bond been retired or returned to them? If that security is existing at this point, I have a couple final occupancies that are going to be given out.

Morgan: is it a good letter of credit, Paul?

Foote: we have a letter of credit for \$900,000.

Morgan: all they have to do is go to the bank

Foote: I think that \$900,000 will more than cover the \$15,000 consider the offset of what they have already completed. They've done more than \$15,000 worth of work out there already.

Garand: so we can just add that to the amount of the bond but offset it by what has already been done so it's not required to add anymore, to deposit anymore.

Foote: correct. But it will be added to the final number for when it comes to calculating the reduction. We'll have to make a note that when we start making reductions, there is \$15,000 less than what we're actually holding. So the first reduction will reflect that extra amount and we'll compensate for it so from there on

Garand: I'm just trying to make it so we don't have to hold off on occupancy or any building applications because of lack of security.

Morrill: can we do all these condos now. They should go real quick. You'll see the same thing six times. House floor plans. I read the regulations. What we've done is we submit a copy of the actual floor plans for the Board although it doesn't get recorded with this actual application. We're going to record the floor plans as the units are actually completed. Because sometimes, there are exterior walls and we're giving you the box where the utilities are and as they put up the walls they modify them. So floor plans will be submitted and recorded prior to transfer of property. So we give you floor plans for your records. Then we'll submit the floor plans to the registry.

Foote: so you'll take the responsibility of recording the floor plans as part of the transfer of ownership?

Morrill: that's correct. That way you don't have to worry and look at interior floor plans. That way one unit can be sold and the other can still be built on and if there is an internal wall, that if I give you a wrong dimension here and you approve something and submit it then we have recorded plans that have a wrong dimension on them.

Foote: is that acceptable, Tom.

Morgan: I want to look at the regs real quick and see if it's something the board wants to go along with and see if a waiver is required.

Foote: waiver the floor plans



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Secretary: we have a lot of condominiums that do not submit a second page mylar and the registry does not require the floor plan be recorded. If we're going to hold Wayne to a different standard than everyone else then we're going to be in trouble since we have at least six condos that are already recorded without a page two.

Morgan: floor plans are required by Section A; so if you do want to go along with Wayne's request it will require a waiver by the Board.

Secretary: all it says is we require them to review; it doesn't say we have to record them does it?

Foot: it has to be part of the package.

Secretary: all the floor plans are in the individual files; but I called the Registry to ask because we had someone else who did not submit a floor plan and then recorded it later. The registry told me they could care less if they have a floor plan or not. All they want is the condo conversion and it's up to the individual people to record it when they transfer property. We have the floor plan in the files.

Foot: we have the floor plans if anyone wants to review them. They are in the files. But it doesn't say that we have to submit them for recording.

Morgan: I wasn't suggesting that. Maybe I misunderstood. I didn't think Wayne brought floor plans with him.

Secretary: all the floor plans have been there from the original get-go.

Morgan: then there is no waiver required.

Lowry: note number 7, Wayne, what's a back glow?

Case #05-44 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 6 & 8 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-102.

Foot: so this is CS102 which is really

Secretary: 05-44. And there were no comments at the tech review whatsoever.

Sanborn: I think we should continue it until he gets glow changed to flow.

Morrill: if the board remembers we had a lot of hatching on the plan trying to prove out LCA's and everything. It was very confusing and the Board asked us to remove all the hatching so it was nice and clear as to who owned what. We came through with a nice big black line here with limited common area line, depicted on both sides where it all goes and the common area in a dot pattern on the driveway itself, which is on the legend as common area line. Right around the driveway. Each unit that you are going to see here tonight, there is a common area for the driveway, utilities come into each unit, the water shut-offs are out on the roadway itself, and each lot has a limited common areas and it's all calculated in a little Limited Common Area box here on the area for each unit.

Foot: why do they have two sewers leaving the buildings? There are four sewer lines. Water, water, sewer, sewer, unless S means something else. But you've got four of them labeled S.

Morrill: there is only two. Just intersecting the driveway. The registry does not allow anything with lines over text, so when you have to break every line so there are not lines over any text at all, so unfortunately the S gets broken right at the driveway so it looks like the driveway is a sewer line.

Evans: unfortunate scale

Evans: Madam secretary was this plan submitted prior to the deadline?

Secretary: absolutely.

Evans: the date on this particular print has a 9/6, which I believe is today.

Secretary: yes, but he didn't have all the copies on Friday. We did the rest of them today. I told him to bring them to the meeting.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: just for the record, in this block down here it had a 14-105 and I noticed it on Thursday afternoon after our submission was done, so we didn't run back down here on Friday. We took off the note about the wetland markers because there are no wetlands on this site. If I had noticed the g in backflow I would have corrected that also.

Foote polled the Board and audience. No comments.

Motion: Himmer To accept case #05-44 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Motion: Himmer To approve case #05-44 once backflow is corrected to backflow and insomuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Next we have case #05-45 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 28 & 30 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-107.

Foote: I like your secondary locus plan that shows exactly where it is in the subdivision.

Morrill: same exact notes on this one. Number 7 is spelled correctly this time. Wetland marker note is on this plan because we do have wetlands. This dredge and fill was part of the original approval to access the two units out in back. Limited common area for each unit.

Motion: Lowry To accept case #05-45 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Himmer Unanimous.

Evans: what's the tombstone shaped thing coming off Pineo Farms Road, those little rocks?

Morrill: rip-rap swale

Foote polled Board for comments and concerns.

Evans: the underground electric appears to go onto the next lot.

Morrill: it goes into 106. As far as we can tell, we're hoping it's on 107 but once you get out there the conduit is really buried but the transformer is in front of 106 on the corner.

Foote: and the driveway stops about 25 feet short of the house.

Morrill: on this? No it makes it in. That's the common area. Once you make it to a point it can split out and you can make it two, the two individual driveways include the limited common area.

Foote polled the audience. No comments or questions.

Motion: Lowry To approve case #05-45 insomuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations.

Second: Himmer Unanimous.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Now we have case #05-31 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 7 & 9 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-114.

Motion: Evans To accept case #05-31 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Morrill: same thing. 114 is the second one on the left hand side. Limited common area, wetlands are depicted, wetland markers to be installed. Actually all the wetland markers in the entire project were installed before they started cutting any of the lots. And then that's how they put up the sill fence on this project. Same notes. Same plan. Water shut-offs in the town right-of-way.

Footnote polled board and members of the public. No comments.

Motion: Evans To approve case #05-31 inasmuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

Now we have case #05-32 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 18 & 20 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-105.

Motion: Lowry To accept case #05-32 as a completed application for deliberations.

Second: Himmer Unanimous.

Garand: can you explain why the underground electric is water?

Morrill: that W is supposed to be a UG. The one that comes off the transformer? It comes into the meter on that side of the building and then wraps around to the second building.

Footnote: so this needs correcting also.

Garand: can you make a motion to have the chairman sign once that is corrected?

Footnote polled audience members for comments. None forthcoming.

Motion: Evans To approve case #05-32 inasmuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations and the chairman may sign the plan once the Underground Utilities has been corrected from Water line to Utility line.

Second: Lowry Unanimous.

We'll continue with case #05-33 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 24 & 26 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-106.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Motion: Lowry To accept case #05-33 as a completed application for deliberations.
Second: Himmer Unanimous.

Morrill: permanent wetland makers on plan, water & sewer okay, backflow note okay, common areas identified Foote polled Board.

Evans: I am pleased to see that the underground utilities are coming from the electric utilities from lot 105 are shown on this. My only question is do we need a note showing that it is for the benefit of 105 that they can't just dig them up?

Foote: you mean an easement to the benefit of?

Evans: the code enforcement officer informs me that if someone decided to plant a tree it could result in civil action if they failed to call Dig Safe for example.

Morrill: the condominium documents for the entire Wildwood Realty handles all utilities, that's why there are no easements on every single utility going to every single building because all utilities are covered by general condominium utilities.

Evans: the applicant has satisfactorily answered my question.

No other comments from Board. Foote polled members of audience. No response.

Motion: Evans To approve case #05-33 insomuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations
Second: Lowry Unanimous.

On to case #05-34 Proposal by Wildwood Real Estate Holdings, LLC for a condominium conversion at 19 & 21 Pineo Farms Road, Tax Map 4, Lot 14-112.

Motion: Lowry To accept case #05-34 as a completed application for deliberations.
Second: Himmer Unanimous.

Board members discuss apputenant as misspelled appurtenant in surveyor's block.

Morrill: the only difference on this plan is the Board asked to have a wetland area table added to this lot because there was a large portion of each lot that had wetlands on it, so a second table was added. Foote polled Board. No comments or concerns. Foote polled audience members.

Motion: Lowry To approve case #05-34 insomuch as it complies with the Town of Seabrook Condominium Regulations.
Second: Himmer Unanimous.

Five minute break taken at 7:15 PM. Public Hearing reopened at 7:30 PM.

Now we will hear case **#04-61** Proposal by Border Winds Development LLC to erect a 24,000 square foot industrial building 103 Ledge Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 8-120.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Member Evans recused himself from sitting on the Board as he is an abutter

Morrill: last time we were in front of the Board, the Board asked that what we had to do was minimize any buffer impacts and things like that. So you will see on the site plan that we have moved the driveways as close as possible for this lot and the next case, the Fudge lot itself. The problem that we have is that the two sites are six feet different in elevation. What we tried to do is put them as close as possible and if you look at Sheet C3, what we done is create a hole in between the two of them. We're going to put in a little guardrail horseshoe between the two of them, the signs will be attached to the actual guardrail post and then everything will be just contained in that one small area. All the grading got pulled back so that we are minimizing any cuts into that buffer area as much as possible. All the utilities on Sheet C2, are going right through this driveway cut for both this project and the next project also. Just like the Board said, we tried to minimize as much as possible. We've added stone check damns in through the swale to try and slow down any flow that's coming into the back of the swale into this small detention pond which is on lot 110, the one next door. Photometric grid is on sheet C4. All wall mounted lights. A couple of mast arms on two corners and one at the entrance way so the entrance is lit up so you can actually find your way into the site. Per the request of the board we put trees down in between the two sites and all around the sign inside the horseshoe to get more trees back into the area we are disturbing during the cut. The rest of it is all details. What we tried to do is take the advice of the Board from last time and try to make the plan exactly what the Board asked. Also, Sheet C2 has the note the Board requested, note 21: parking is limited to the number of spaces on this plan. Any changes in the units requiring more than the allotted spaces will require site plan review from the Town of Seabrook Planning Board. Any changes from this and we've got to come back.

Foote polled Board

Garand: I'm still looking at lighting and checking to make sure everything is there.

Sanborn: just on the parking. Wasn't this originally sixteen? You've got 24 on one side and 18 on the outside.

Morrill: we didn't change any of the parking from the last plan set that was in front of you. The only thing we changed was the entrance way.

Foote: the sewer has a testing manhole

Morrill: per the recommendation of this Board we added that additional manhole at the entrance so we can get down into the sewer. There is a lot of ledge coming down over that hill.

Knight: are we going to have the same problems? Make sure everything is according to plan.

Foote continued to poll Board.

Knight: to Garand: will you be overseeing this to make sure that it is done according to plan? I mean seriously step by step to make sure

Garand: my only concern still is if you are going to condo it down the road that the water utilities are fed by one water service coming in. If one person who owns a condo doesn't pay it, the responsibility becomes clouded at that point. And then the termination of the water service would compromise the safety for the fire.

Morrill: I understand.

Lowry: is that what you have the utility building for Wayne?

Morrill: I have the utility building so you can go in there and shut

Garand: one person off. But still, it doesn't address the I still think the Planning Board should get together with the water superintendent and separate the water for the sprinklers and the water for domestic use.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: I know that when Warner was doing it he always liked to have the main trunk line go into the building then you siamesed after that and that's what we tried to do. These utilities were done a long time ago and we haven't changed them since. But I understand where you're coming from.

Foote: isn't that something we could do as part of conditions of approval? The main trunk will service the fire suppression system and then split out to individual unit services?

Garand: the only reason I was addressing it is because the way it's done is that if one person doesn't pay the water service

Foote: this isn't coming forward for a condo right now even though it's called assorted different units. With it being a site plan of one owner, it still should have the fire suppression system and then some sort of potential shut off for regular domestic use so if they don't pay their bill and we have to shut off their water, we shut it off after the fire suppression.

Garand: exactly. But in most cases the town shuts it off at the road and terminates the fire suppression system to the building. At least if we address the domestic use to the fire suppression system, we can leave one on and shut the other off and then we put a detector check on the backflow for the fire system to make sure they are not utilizing the water off the fire system to do anything inside the building. Because once the Town shuts the water off, it's a liability on the Town. It's a safety issue for the firemen going in there to fight a fire.

Foote: there was just a thing in plan-link about that

Garand: Exactly. That's why I'm bringing it to your attention, that's all.

Foote: in some place the town got sued because they shut off the water in an abandoned building and it caught on fire and the insurance company sued the town for shutting off the fire suppression system

Morrill: Paul is there a new water superintendent yet?

Garand: I have no idea. I'm brining it up because it's something I'm uncomfortable with that's all.

Morrill: I think I agree with you and if these start going to condos, I think we have to come to a decision because there are a lot of buildings like this. I'd like to have one thing and just carry it through to every unit.

Foote: well, it appears by them being labeled multiple units that it probably will go condo. At that time, when it goes condo, we can include the Town access easement to that utility structure.

Morrill: I don't know if the owner is going to lease all the units or if he'll, at this point it's hard to say.

Garand: I'm just trying to address the fact that if someone doesn't pay the water bill it gets terminated. The fire and the domestic should be separated that's all.

Morgan: when did the tech review committee last review this property?

Foote: within the past few months.

Morgan: The fire chief and the water superintendent had a look at it then.

Sanborn: do we have two owners and developers here? One says John Colliander and on EL1 it says Bob Putnam from Indian River Shores in Florida. One's in Portsmouth, one's in Florida.

Knight: Bob is involved in this?

Sanborn: EL1 and C1 owner developer John Colliander

Morrill: it just carried over from Lot 50. It is Colliander that is on all the rest of the plans. EL1 has the wrong owner on the plan.

Knight: so Bob's not involved with this?

Morrill: Bob is not involved. Bob is Lot 50.

Morgan: another question I had. We talked about sidewalks along Ledge Road.

Foote: yes we have a letter from Mike Fowler addressing the sidewalks, "break-down of the escrow contributions to be levied against individual site plans for Ledge Road and London Lane sidewalk constructions.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Assume layout will be a five-foot wide asphalt sidewalk with granite curbing along the north side of Ledge Road due to the steep slope immediately at the edge of the road and no cut zone on Ledge Road. The London Lane sidewalk was designed as a five-foot wide asphalt without granite curbing. The lots on London Lane all share the assessment, whereas the Ledge Road contributions will come from the undeveloped north side only." This is Lot 120, Mike assesses as being 422 feet long and Mike assesses that to be \$14,770.

Morgan: last year when Mike had a look at this he recommended a security of \$24,500.

Knight: forty thousand

Sanborn: I think if I wanted to build a building and I was the owner of the building, I would be here tonight. The developer or the owner of the building.

Audience member identified as **Scott Mitchell:** I'm the developer of the building. The only reason we haven't transferred the property is because we filed an application back on December 22nd of 2004 and we're holding the deed in escrow. But this is my project and I'm going to build it. I'm curious why Mike Fowler came up with 422 feet because I don't have 422 feet. I only have 265' frontage. I'm certainly not going to build the sidewalks for Cimarron Apts. He has plenty of money.

Morrill: here's 260 feet of frontage.

Foote: so you say you have 260? I think the cost is correct, he just has the footage wrong.

Discussion of how Town Engineer might have arrived at his amount is discussed among Board Members.

Lowry: it should be \$9275.

Morgan: did we specify an asphalt sidewalk by the way?

Foote: I don't think so.

Mitchell: I think that number has got to be way wrong. It's twice what it should be.

Knight: how did you come up with that figure Mike?

Lowry: 265 feet times \$35.

Morrill: he's using \$35.00 per linear foot

Lowry: and I came up with \$9275.

Morgan: are we all okay with asphalt as opposed to concrete?

Foote: yes. Concrete tends to fall apart with salted roads. The only reason we specified concrete on Route 1 was because way back we had an engineering study that designed sidewalks for the whole town and they were the ones that specified concrete but we're finding all of the concrete sidewalks that we've built in Town, the first winter they start to break down.

Knight: they look nice but they don't hold up

Garand: and they also require an abundance of maintenance, linseed oil and all kinds of good stuff. And we don't want to use salt up there anyways and this right here will make it so it melts from the sun.

Foote: we'll ignore his numbers and just calculate the footage along the frontage and multiply it by \$35.00

Peter Evans, abutter: Madam Chair, might it be prudent to ask the engineer how he arrived at his figure?

Perhaps there are some mitigating circumstances due to the slope or some other thing that he didn't express in his memo.

Morrill: if you go by the \$35.00 per linear foot on Mike's cost and going by the frontage for each lot.

Foote: he's got Ledge Road has asphalt with granite curbing and London Lane is just asphalt only. So are you happy with \$9275?

Mitchell: I'm happy with nothing.

Foote continued to poll the Board. Then polled the audience.

Evans: I was wondering what the proposed hours of operations are for this facility?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Mitchell: 24/7. Loud bands, nightclubs. I don't know. I don't know who the tenants are going to be so I'm not aware of any zoning violations that limit the hours.

Foote: Industrial doesn't have time restrictions.

Mitchell: so there will probably be none.

Garand: if they have complaints against them, the noise ordinance will take of it. It will be a police issue at that point. My only concern is make the motion for the \$9300 on the sidewalks on the condition that if there is a reason why Mike Fowler had a different amount to bring it back to the Board.

Evans: I'm assuming that a tractor-trailer can turn around so that it won't have to back out onto Ledge Road.

Foote: it looks like they should be able to drive around the whole building.

Evans: I have concerns that the parking lot doesn't turn into a campground. I notice there are often trucks waiting to get into Poland Spring, idling in focus and certain other places and while that doesn't really bother me particularly, they do occasionally leave trash beside the side of the road, which is a burden to the Town.

Garand: wouldn't that be a Police issue also Peter

Evans: I think so.

Foote: I think it's more a matter of Poland Springs having people in their guard shack and letting people in.

Garand: they do have someone in the guard shack. They will not allow them in before hours.

Foote: either they should inform the truckers not to show up before and stop on the rest area on 95 or let them in. One or the other. They shouldn't be stacking up on Ledge Road.

Garand: if they come from the north there is no rest stop they can pull over

Foote: they can park in the liquor store parking lot without having to go in and buy liquor

Evans: and finally, I share the Selectmen's representative's concern that this site be built according to plan. I know that the CEO's office has plenty on its plate already, and I'd like to suggest the board consider requiring an engineer to oversee the progress of the site development.

Mitchell: you haven't required anybody else to do it out there. I own two projects in Town. You guys know what CVS and the Bank is, have you had any problems with any development that I've done?

Foote: not that I'm aware of.

Mitchell: I don't need to be babysat.

Morrill: we'll be out there we have an interest that each one of these ties in correctly.

Knight: it's the name that was the problem, Scott, Colliander.

Mitchell: yes, but it's me and the only reason guys just so you know that I haven't closed on it is that I'd have to file a new application and pay all those fees so that's why we signed a deed and held it in escrow waiting for this otherwise it would be in my name.

Knight: you're giving us your word that this is your project.

Mitchell: it's my project.

Foote: we got problems, we call you.

Mitchell: and you know where to find me.

Lowry: and you'll give us updates too Wayne right?

Mitchell: I'm going to have Wayne there like I did when I had Brad Jones go down for the CVS, to spot grades, checking material and we had material taken out of there that did not pass. I'm going to do the same thing on this project. I don't want to pickup.

Foote: very good. Any other questions or comments?

Knight: you won me over Scott

Mitchell: just telling it like it is. I don't need a babysitter on this project.

Lowry: do you plan on developing the back section as well?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Mitchell: yes I do. I was already at the Conservation Commission and what I'm planning is a 697 square foot wetland crossing to get out back. I went to the Conservation Commission and showed them a plan. There's another 6000 square feet. I'm going to do exactly what Karpenko did and take that lot and have 125 feet and have an easement area. There are 6000 square feet that I'll build in Phase II. Mark West filed the application to the Wetland Board weeks ago. Sue asked us for some additional catch basins and drainage items. So yes I will be coming back for Phase II. We will build Phase I first and then we'll be back for Phase II, 6000 square feet.

Garand: you were aware that that was the original condition of approval that there would be no further wetland crossings.

Mitchell: I'm very aware of it Paul and what Mark West told me is it's totally illegal for the wetland board to do that. They have no right to do that and there have been many cases

Garand: that was a condition of the Planning Board too wasn't it?

Mitchell: only of the Wetlands Board. It was never a condition of the plan.

Garand: when it was presented to the Board it was stated that they would not seek any further wetlands crossings and that this would be the only lots and the only development that they would do.

Foot: unfortunately, those of us that were there remember it being said, but there is no documentation of minutes that say it.

Morgan: for what it's worth I remember it as well.

Mitchell: I remember Dorrie came back and said we could have one wetland crossing and that's what I did. I sent Mark out there to see if we could get around any wetland impact at all. Mark came up and we gave him a copy of the Wetland Permit and we showed him what they said and he said they can't do that. He said that he could cite six difference cases where they have done that and it's been overruled every time. So this is a joke.

Garand: so you're sitting here right now saying you've given enough to the Town, squawking about footage on Ledge Road for sidewalks, but then you're saying you want to go and expand the site further down the road.

Mitchell: I wasn't squawking about sidewalks.

Garand: yes that's what the condition of this approval is going to be, what they're just saying, that sidewalks will be required. But at the same time, you were making comments that the Town was wanting an awful lot and so forth but you are wanting to expand past what the Town's original approval was.

Mitchell: I have no problems with the sidewalks, Paul.

Garand: personally I have a problem with expanding the sites beyond what was approved back when the original subdivision was done.

Mitchell: When I come back here you will have your choice to vent your opinion.

Sanborn: I don't know how you can approve a plan without the developer's/owner's name on the paperwork. By law it's supposed to be on that paperwork before we vote, complete or incomplete.

Knight: if the deed's held in escrow it's still under the LLC

Sanborn: word is good, but writing is a lot better especially when it comes to being in court, which I imagine you probably will.

Morgan: this Phase II, where exactly are they going to access that current land?

Garand: where the snow storage is.

Morgan: then where are they going to put the snow?

Garand: I have no idea.

Mitchell: we've got ideas. I'm not here to talk about this. You asked me a question, I'm not going to lie to you. I've been doing business in Town for twenty years. Sue knows that I've been here, I showed her the plan, we discussed it, she told me what she wanted me to do and I'm going through the steps necessary to do that. But



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

I'm not here to talk about that. I'm here to talk about this plan. And I'll be happy to address that when we come back to the 6000 square feet.

Morgan: what I'm hearing is you don't really have a plan for the snow.

Mitchell: we have looked at it; we have plenty of room for the snow

Morrill: the snow storage will be relocated in the second phase.

Foote: so right here tonight we're to discuss what is in front of us. If anything comes forward in the future then we deal with it in the future.

Morgan: sounds like you looked at the minutes. What about those little letter of decision forms do they have any stipulations on them?

Foote: no. previous administration left an awful lot out.

Morgan: I remember assurances given on many occasions.

Foote: I remember too. Verbally there was a lot said. But it's not on paper anywhere, so we haven't got a leg to stand on should they take us to court because no where does it show up in any of our documentation.

So we're here tonight to deal with what we see drawn in front of us. Does anyone else have any questions, comments, or concerns? So I guess we're ready to take action which would also include the sidewalk and Mike's original \$24,500 plus the sidewalks for \$9275. So it will also include a site security for \$34,000. And we actually should specify the two different amounts because they have to go into two different accounts. The sidewalks at \$9275 and \$24,500 for the site. No rounding up.

- Motion: Himmer To approve case #04-61 with a site security of \$24,500 and a sidewalk escrow of \$9275 with the stipulations that if there are any changes from the engineers report saying that there are extenuating conditions that could change. A total of \$33,775 security.
- Second: Lowry Unanimous. Sanborn opposed because the site plan does not have Mr. Mitchell's name on this piece of paper.

Foote: whoever does the development we expect to hold them to the same standards and build to the plan. Regardless of who owns it now or in the future. It applies to everyone. So it is approved.

Knight leaves the meeting. Plans are signed by Chair Foote.

04-63 Proposal by Fudgit LLC for a proposed 14,400 square foot industrial building and condominium conversion at 99 Ledge Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 8-110. You realize we have to approve this site plan before we can approve a condominium conversion.

Member Evans recuses himself from sitting on the Board as he is an abutter. Foote advises applicants that while we have a quorum, we do not have a full board and they have the option to ask for a continuance.

Morrill: changes to this plan. Last time we were in front of this Board, this plan was approved quite some time ago, the approval ran out. When we were in front of the Board last time, the Board noticed there was grading into the no-cut zone so what we did was we shrank the drive aisle in front of the building from 30 feet to 24 feet, taking that whole lane in which then equates to a 1:1 slope on the side being able to have no-cut in the no-



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

cut. Just what the Board wanted. Again, here is your horseshoe with the little hole in the middle between the two lots, which will be graded with a piece of guard rail around that.

Garand: I think you have the driveway lined up a lot better with the building and everything.

Morrill: it's going to make truck circulation a lot better. Everyone of these sites we have an auto turn program and we make sure that a tractor trailer can come in and out of the site. This actually works better for traffic flow and as the Board asked, there will be one cut that will have a hole in the middle, but where the sites are six feet different you couldn't put them right on top of each other otherwise they wouldn't be able to get a truck into either one of the sites.

Foote: creates far less impact to the no-cut zone.

Morrill: I agree. We pulled it back so there is no cut along that whole side, it's now pulled all the way in so reducing that drive lane made a big difference on the whole site. Kept the same parking. This one has the utilities a little bit differently laid out because this one went through a condo review with Warner and this is how the utilities were laid out with him. We have the sewer on the outside, water is going to be going into the utility building so it might be a little bit backwards from what Paul was explaining a little bit earlier about water and sewer. When we go into a condo plan, we're going to be back here and we're going to have to come up with a method to get this right.

Garand: you're addressing the sewer. Each one has sewer line going into it but at the same time the Water still goes into a common area. You're going to have problems inside and for the safety of each unit as far as backflow, depending on the nature of the use of the building and the hazard, each one is going to have to be addressed with its own backflow unit to the main backflow and the Town is going to require a backflow on the fire so you're looking at a lot more backflow units also.

Morrill: I think what we should do is sit down with yourself and the water super and just go through and come up with a good plan that works for everyone.

Garand: the backflow program is intended just to protect the Town water source, but when you have a different owner in each one of these units, if someone has a potential hazard in one unit you could actually bring hazard inside the building and everyone could be impacted but the Town water supply is safe so that we don't really, it's not that we don't care about the owners individually, but at the same time our ultimate responsibility is to the Town and the water system. So you really should address that and talk it over with the water super.

Morrill: I think it's a good idea.

Foote: I know the sewer department wants test manholes. Is one sufficient or does there have to be one for each unit?

Morrill: I have a sampling tee on every single unit and I'm going into a sampling manhole. I can isolate with a sampling manhole on both ends so I can check one side or the other and I can check a tee for every single unit. This one is set up to go to a condo. Except for the water I think the water needs a little addressing.

Garand: if you brought in individual water lines to each unit, then at the same time they could do away with the small building and have the shutoffs on the Town right-of-way at the same time. You'd only have the main water service going in for the sprinkler and then each one would have a shutoff.

Morrill: twelve shutoffs?

Foote: twelve water lines?

Garand: each one would have its own backflow or if it was an office situation, a dual check valve. But at this time right now you're looking at a dual check valve, detector check, small meter on the fire systems, an RPZ on the water service coming in but each individual unit would require its own backflow also for its own protection.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

So each device that's installed has to be tested by type also either yearly or twice a year.

Footo: but your backflow device one way or another they are all going to have to have a backflow device.

Garand: the internal protection of the building would be addressed at the time. The liability would not be with each person internally in the building; it wouldn't be impacting anybody at that point.

Footo: I see that as six of one half a dozen of another.

Garand: at the same time if the unit didn't pay for the water use, terminate the water at the curb site, no questions, don't deal with any condo owner, just direct owner responsibility, shut the water and the fire isn't impacted.

Lowry: what do you have for lighting?

Morrill: in the original plan we asked for a waiver because it was all the sundowners; so the original approval had a waiver for the sundowner wall lamps.

Footo: I remember reading that in the conditions of approval of the original

Garand: my whole thing is if you shut the water off in the building you run into the problem of safety again. And is the town going to send someone into a building at the time of the fire to contend with each owner and shut off water

Footo: I've heard it discussed in the past that if you could send the water bill to the condominium association and they can fight it out amongst themselves as to who pays and who doesn't pay and then we would only need one shut off and it would be billed to the condominium association and that would save an awful lot of meters.

Garand: the Town will only supply one meter anyway.

Footo: the Town wouldn't supply any meters to this because it wasn't built prior to

Mitchell: can't we put a lien against the property if they don't pay the water bill?

Garand: it would be against the building itself, the property

Mitchell: isn't one easier to deal with?

Garand: we have a similar situation in a building in town that has a service coming in off the fire riser and basically they are looking at terminating that and five businesses water, so one person not paying, and the property owner is sick of paying the water bill so he's going to terminate the water.

Footo: ultimately it's the property owner who is responsible for the water bill

Garand: so if you have a high water user, like an industrial use, and you end up with a \$500 bill and the association pays it and then it gets another bill like that and how long before they say they are not going to pay that anymore; go to court, couple months it doesn't get resolved, they shut it off.

Mitchell: if you have twelve units, and twelve backflow prevention units

Garand: you might be required to have that anyway depending on the use inside the building

Mitchell: so it's on the water use?

Garand: it's on the type of use in the building internally

Footo: the backflow protects the other people, say you have something toxic that sucks up in and the guy next door decides to have a drink

Garand: the Town water supply is protected because it has a main reduced pressure zone device on the entrance to the water supply, but internally you're not protecting each user

Mitchell: it seems as if it would be so much easier to have the condo association responsible for the water bill

Garand: does the condo association want to take on that liability?

Mitchell: I'm the developer so I can do what I want to do so I'd rather do that then have twelve meters and twelve backflow devices unless you have somebody that has an issue like toxic but I'm not looking for anybody toxic to be in there

Garand: you may not own this forever also; we have to look down the road



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Mitchell: if you have a condo association and once you sell 60% or 75% of the units to turn it over, would be there for life, it doesn't matter who the developer is because it's in place. It's a lot easier

Foote: the only problem that could be a potential situation is that the original condo documents are supplied to us and verified by your attorney that they are all proper; it has come to my knowledge that there is at least one duplex condo in town that the two half owners decided to rewrite their condo docs and they went and recorded them and we knew nothing about it and it changes limited common area and it does a lot of stuff to it. Now there are new condo docs that they have sold the unit to someone else don't comply with the plan that was approved.

Mitchell: I understand Sue that's a good point. Couldn't you make it a condition when you approve the condo conversion that the condo docs couldn't be changed or altered unless it comes back to the Board?

Foote: our regulations pretty much cover us on that and the state regulations cover us on that but that doesn't stop two neighbors going ahead and doing it and going to Rockingham and recording it and then selling the unit.

Garand: if we go by the condo regs it requires that each unit have its own water shut off on town property; the regs say that in the condo regs

Mitchell: I would rather have just one

Garand: I can see why you would because it would be cheaper, but at the same time, it's easier for the Town to regulate individual water; it's not a point of brain damage or not, downstairs it's less paperwork, less responsibility on the Town, it puts all the responsibility on you. Where you are putting the services in, put the money up to do it.

Foote: so you are recommending that each condo have its own meter

Garand: I think the Town should revisit the way that we're addressing water services to our industrial buildings that are going to be condo'd. Seriously look at that and reconsider them. We can approve this tonight because it's one owner and just readdress it down the street when the condo conversion comes in.

Foote: and just realize that while you have trenches open in the ground, it could be a lot easier to run extra stuff now even if you never have to plug into it; then to not have it in the future and then have to dig everything up again

Mitchell: if the Board's flavor is to have individual, then we'll do what they want us to do, but it seems like it would be a lot easier to have the condo association responsible for it. Somebody needs a backflow because they don't fit the envelope correctly; I understand that.

Garand: but regardless, because the unit has more than three units, it's required to have a backflow anyway; it's not an issue because if you have multiple units, you're required to have a backflow; it depends on the degree of hazard as to what type

Mitchell: I own a condo in Florida and there are 79 other owners and I can tell you there aren't 79 shutoffs. If we don't pay our water bill, they eject us and that's the end of it.

Foote: in other towns one bill goes to the condo association

Garand: but they may also have one service coming in just for the water supply and one for the fire riser

Mitchell: I agree with you there, Paul. You're absolutely correct; it should be separate.

Garand: the condo association should not be responsible for the fire safety

Foote: so, back to this plan tonight.

Garand: do we need another written waiver for the lighting or is that still in place?

Foote: I think it probably would be appropriate to have a written request for the lighting waiver because in essence this is a new case, the old one expired and this has a new case number and everything;

Garand: what were the other conditions on the plan?

Foote: on the previous? This is the one we can't read.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Garand: can I see it?

Footo: reads from old approval: "waive the photometric grid on condition that only 250 watt sheltered lights be use (shielded?); bond of 10,000 for lighting, as-built design and construction of entrance; typing error to be corrected 50' storm in NH."

Morrill: what's that all mean?

Footo: those were the original conditions of approval

Garand: so they waived the grid with the requirement as long as there was no larger than 250 watt bulbs, fully shielded, fixtures with no SAG lenses

Morgan: something about your drainage study

Footo: did a bond for \$10,000.

Garand: did Mike Fowler look at this plan again and set a bond amount

Morgan: I find no record of that

Footo: Mike especially hasn't looked at it since the driveway was changed

Morgan: \$7350

Morrill: sidewalk seems correct on that one; Mike has not seen this driveway change.

Garand: I think the driveway change is an improvement; I think it lines up the driveway with the building better; it's a straight shot in for emergency vehicles.

Footo: so this must have been sometime this spring (referring to papers from old case); here's the old lighting waiver signed by Wayne Morrill so if you want you can just write on this, add a note to it that you respectfully request that you apply this waiver to case 04-63. Morrill does this.

Secretary: so the \$10,000 bond according to the August 2002 minutes was for lighting, as-built design and construction of the entrance.

Footo: so that waiver is covered; the security would be \$10,000 plus, \$7350 for sidewalk; \$17,350 total.

So are there any other questions, comments, or concerns?

Peter Evans, abutter: I'd just like to ask the question, I think I know the answer, what are the intended hours of operation, the point being that note 9 on sheet c3 with regard to outdoor lighting with timers reducing illumination during non-operational hours.

Morgan: what are the operation hours?

Morrill: I am not aware of hours at this time

Fudgit: I thought there wasn't a requirement on industrial hours of operation.

Footo: there isn't and you can actually run 24/7 three shifts if you want to; but what the note states is that if there is no one there working then the timers will dim the lights so if it's all one shift and someone wants to go into a second shift they don't really care if the lights are dim anyhow

Evans: I would also like to voice my opinion that a photometric grid can be useful in determining and I believe Mr. Cox was on the Board at that time and I trust he was accurate with the 250 watt limit, a photometric grid might show that you could have higher illumination levels possibly; cut sheets show you can put 400 watt lights in there and I think in a couple recent cases where the marina fellow where they actually went through the exercise of putting together photometric grids that didn't turn out to meet the Town of Seabrook regulations there and I realize it's an extra expense and the applicant has been put upon quite a lot, but in general I think it's a good idea to have a photometric grid. Thank you for you time.

Footo: any other questions, comments, or concerns?

Garand: the lighting waiver should note that it's limited to the ten fixtures on the building and they are limited to 250-watt light bulbs and they have to meet all the present regulations of the lighting at this time



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: it basically says as shown on the proposed grade and utility plan, sheet C3, we're proposing six wall mounted units be located on the building

Garand: you're limiting yourself to six?

Morrill: I'd like to go to ten.

Foote: also, this is showing more units than the original application also

Evans: if that's the case, then you're practically doubling the amount of wattage being set up

Morrill: the lights on the side of that building over there (pointing across street to Lighthouse Realty Building) are 250 watts with no cut offs, so the amount of light that is going to come away from that building is minute. And I think this sundowner 19 light that we're showing here was approved by Mr. Cox because it did have a full cut off and I believe the light only illuminated

Foote: just goes down the side of the building; it doesn't scatter any

Garand: code requires you have a light over each door so you can't go less than what the code requires at the same time safety and I think that's what the note stating that they be turned down during off hours.

Morrill: that's a good reason for not having it 24/7 although there are no hours of operation because it's not a huge lit up site

Garand: so we're going to change that note from six to ten

Foote: yes, we're changing it from six to ten

Garand: the code requires that every man door or access door have one light so limiting it to ten is going to make it so it doesn't comply with code; you have to make it twelve and each unit has to have its own light fixture over the man door. And I agree with the note on C3, number 9, the timers reducing the elevations of illumination in off hours.

Foote: anything else? Any other comments from members of the Board? Are we ready for a motion?

Motion: Lowry To approve case 04-63 with conditions of waiving the photometric grid, limiting the light fixtures to twelve light fixtures of 250 watts or less, and posting a security of \$10,000 for the site work and \$7,350 for sidewalk escrow account.

Second: Himmer Unanimous. Sanborn opposed.

Mitchell: question. You want us to build the sidewalks correct?

Morgan: no, just send us a check.

Mitchell: what happens if you don't do it?

Foote: if we don't build the sidewalks within six years we give your money back with interest; it goes into an escrow account for the Town to build sidewalks. State law says any offsite improvement must be completed within six years or we have to refund the money to you. Sidewalk will be on Ledge Road, yes.

Mitchell: on our property

Morgan: no

Foote: we can't guarantee it will be on your property

Morgan: it probably won't be

Foote: primarily because

Lowry: do you want to put it on your property?

Mitchell: I just say, we're going to be building it



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Foote: we're probably going to start at one end of Ledge Road which more than likely will be the east end and travel west; it's hinging on the Town getting appropriations to make up the difference in the parcels that aren't contributing to it. The reason why you don't want to do it because you will have to get a dredge and fill permit to work on Town land and fill those drainage ditches.

Mitchell: enough for me

Foote: leave it up to the Town and hope we make it across the front of your property

Morrill presented pictures to the Board of the London Lane road construction. Discussion of bond expiration (December 31, 2005) and date work would be completed (two weeks) ensued.

Foote: so case #04-59 Proposal by Border Winds LLC to erect a 2,400 square foot contractor's job shop at 7 London Lane, Tax Map 5, Lot 8-10.

Members Evans sits this one out as an abutter.

Morrill: this is a 4.67 lot, first one on the left hand side of London Lane as you come in; has the existing drainage easement on core Border Winds on the actual property itself; the development happens up here and there is a large wetland between the two condo associations and this. What we are proposing is a small gravel yard with a proposed 2,400 square foot building, utilities coming off of London Lane, utilizing the existing stubs, underground utilities from the telephone pole into the site, 6" water line coming in to the existing building. We're depicting 15 parking spaces at the front of the building and the rest of the lot is gravel.

Sanborn: do we have an actual owner/developer on this one too?

Morrill: yes, John D. Colliander. He is Border Winds Development. Small pond, gravel yard, everything sheds away from the building into the swale carries down to the small pond, dumps in, goes across the large pipes that go under London Lane. Photometric grid. We've got two pole mounted and four wall mounted units; cut sheets are on the lighting plan. We're putting screens along London Lane to shield this somewhat. We've got junipers going around the sign itself and the rest are red maples.

Foote: do you know what the use is going to be on this site?

Morrill: it's being built for Dupere Corporation, I believe. In which they have a lot of those contractor's cube trucks; they're going to be parking their cube trucks at night, employees come in they trade their car for a cube truck, they go out in the morning to a job site. Basically what they plan on doing is putting a small office in there. Right now they have three little office spaces in Stratham, NH. What they are trying to do is condense everything into one small building. This site here I told them we could have gone four times larger on the building, they really didn't want to do that. They want a nice small building that they can do their business out of and they at this time I don't believe they are planning on putting a fence around the whole thing because they don't plan on having any materials laying around outside. They plan on having everything in the cube trucks. Internally they are going to have doors on the side.

Foote: is there going to be any truck servicing on site?

Morrill: truck servicing, like draining oils and that? All they have is this garage door that's a through door that they can unload materials from their trucks into the building. So they don't plan on changing oil, doing truck repairs inside here. Mainly this is for a contractor who builds houses.

Garand: my only situation is knowing the type of stuff that actually a contractor that does the type of work he does keeps on site, you'll have concrete forms which will have form release agents on it, you'll have coatings, oils and there are situations where they have contaminants and where this is our well-head protection area, I would



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

prefer to see the driveway or the area where they're going to be doing the lay down storage at least paved with some kind of oil and separation hoods and devices.

Morrill: that can be a condition that any areas that have any materials exterior need to be paved as a condition of any approval from this board.

Garand: because basically what they are showing is parking and the rest is just a gravel lay-down area and the lay-down area could have the most contaminants going in. They'll be pulling in, parking their own, their dump trucks, their bull dozers, excavator, piling stuff in from jobs, their box trucks, you'll have fuel coming out there. Everything will be out there. And to have no protection with an open wetland next to it, I'm just uncomfortable with it.

Foote: it's been my observation that contractors that respect their equipment service it every day; so you've got gobs of grease falling off the fittings where they re-lube it and all sort of...that's why I asked what type of business is going on here. People don't think a guy with a hammer and nails throwing together two by fours can do many pollutants, but if he has like Paul is saying, concrete forms, big equipment, back hoes.

Morrill: I think that's a great observation because you never know that one company I'm talking about might not be there in four years.

Garand: and at the same time any containers of fluids over five gallons are required to be in secondary containment; they should be required to follow the BMP practices; I just want to have a bunch of requirements up there

Morrill: no problem, I agree. We're too close to a water source. Any vehicles or any outside storage should have paved areas underneath them.

Garand: and if I'm not mistaken this is where it crosses over and goes under Ledge Road into the well fields also; so that's the equalization culvert for that area I believe.

Morrill: water flows towards us, but it is a wetland

Garand: that is s a direct line. I like to see treatment or at least grease hoods put in so if there is a spill or contaminant they can catch it.

Morrill: grease hoods?

Garand: I'd like to see water treatment or a detention pond on this site to keep everything inside the site. The parking lot paved.

Morrill: you want the whole parking lot paved?

Garand: I'd like to see something put into place over there.

Foote: I can't see a necessity to pave that entire parking lot right now; because, what if he isn't going to be using any of that stuff on site? If you pave that entire parking lot, you're going to have to quadruple the size of the detention pond.

Garand: right but at the same time who is going to guarantee and police it that he's not going to be respecting the wetlands at the same time? I see the construction sites out there, I see the job trailers and how they leave the equipment, it's a babysitting business and basically I'm already torn into thirteen directions and I don't need the fourteenth to look after.

Morrill: right now this is what we want to do and I think if there is any outside storage those areas have to be paved and I agree with you Paul, but that could be a situation that we come back to the Planning Board that you can sit there and make a stipulation there is no outside materials to be stored otherwise it comes back to the Planning Board and then that way we're paving areas and we have to enlarge the size of the pond

Garand: excellent, that covers it all.

Lowry: is that a two-story building?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: yes it is. It's going to have a mezzanine in the first side and we carried some windows because it was going to be pretty dark so we need to let in light.

Foote: we have to be careful with outside storage but what are we talking about. I understand no outside storage, you can't throw concrete forms down there, but if a truck isn't being used for a week or two because it's not needed is that storage? If you bring your backhoe back on your flatbed every night because you don't think it's safe on the job site, that's technically not storage, but if they service it in that yard before they drive off to the site the next morning, it's not storage, but it's dropping pollutants. So we've got to figure out how to phrase this

Morrill: the only way to actually police it so that Paul doesn't pull out his hair is to put a couple catch basins with underground storage ponds to catch the pollutants right in them and dump it into the detention pond and not increase the size of the pond because it can't get any bigger; but store some of that water underneath the ground and have a release that we can actually block it and take it out of the ground.

Garand: is the garage door going to be towards London Lane? Is that whole section paved? It's all gravel also. At least in front of the garage door they should have either concrete outside immediately outside the garage door and then paving going around to at least the corner of the building.

Morrill: Paul, to be honest with you, I think you're going to have a hard time because whoever goes in there is going to be putting a backhoe, or a cube truck and it could sit there for two weeks. How are you going to know? Are you going to go over and mandate how long it can be there? I think the best thing to do is pave the site and then that way there is no question. I can put a shallow catch basin with a sump and a grease hood and then go into an underground detention tube slow the water down and then dump it into the pond.

Garand: exactly. How long will it take to draw that up?

Morrill: no time at all

Garand: so you want to continue this to the 20th?

Morrill: that'll be fine. If that's okay with you, Sue. I don't like to put down pavement if I don't have to. But I think it's going to solve two problems if all of a sudden we come back to this Board say five years from now and all of a sudden we want put a bigger building

Foote: and it's a new board and they don't understand why you're doing it

Morrill: right. It's going to be a policing thing for Paul from day one. So might as well get it right the first time

Foote: and every thing will be suitably graded

Garand: and it protects the well heads and all the good stuff that's out there also.

Morrill: that's fine

Foote: and you're going to have to incorporate snow storage

Morrill: the drainage will all have to be changed on those so give them back to me and I'll modify those for you.

Evans: before we send Wayne on his way, I just wanted to voice my concerns. One of my main concerns is that they ought to keep a tidy site; there's a place, Water Industries on Bachelder Road that's a complete eyesore, they've got all kinds of left over junk piled over the place. Tyler Machine is a good neighbor and a water line outlet like the one on Bachelder Road, that storage facility is a real wreck.

Morgan: as a practical matter what should the Board do?

Evans: I'll have to think about what I suggested. I don't think there is a problem with cube trucks. I know Mr. Dupere. I'd be concerned about trucks sitting around idling. I'd also like to have an idea of the hours of operation because certainly there will be some noise emanating from the site and dropping forms on one another can sound like a rifle going off.

Garand: if that occurs, then you'd call the police station and file and lodge a complaint and then the police



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

would go down there and have to take care of it. 7 o'clock on they are allowed to make the noise. If not, the noise from external machinery cannot be discernable at the property line. 7 o'clock is when construction sites can make noise. Don't put a condition on the plan. It's a matter for enforcement at that point anyway.

Evans: thank you for hearing my concerns. I like what they have done with the lighting. I think you have addressed the wellhead protection concerns.

Sanborn: I make a motion we continue the last two cases to September 20th because of time constraints. We're after nine now. We're at a three-hour total and we don't have many cases for the 20th.

Foote: what have we got? Adams and another Border Winds?

Garand: is 8 London Lane ready to review at this point?

Foote: I'd like to continue on and get it off the docket.

Garand: limit it to fifteen minutes and we'll be out of here by 9:30

Foote: if we can't resolve in fifteen minutes we'll continue them; how's that? But, we've got to aggressively work on them. Motion died, no second.

The next case is #04-60 Proposal by CBAN LLC to erect a 30,600 square foot industrial building at 8 London Lane, Tax Map 5, Lot-8-50.

Garand: also did they address the sidewalk and the requirements so they are aware of that?

Morrill: I've got your list so I'll make my client aware of it. Same with this one also. 3.280 acres, first lot on the right hand side when you go into London Lane, has the detention pond from London Lane on the backhand side. We're proposing 30,500 square feet of building, parking all around, one entrance off London Lane coming in, utilities coming off London Lane to service the building; bollards on each side of the building; new detention pond being installed that ties into the existing detention pond; no water going from the Town one into this one, but we're using the back side of the berm to enlarge that; closed drainage system, catch basins with sump and grease hoods into drain manholes; swale that runs along the front along London Lane to convey the water down into the back into this pond; light and illumination grid done by Sharon Inc. We have pole-mounted lights, cut sheets, on the corners and on the entrance wall-mounted lights along the building; full cut off remarks; we're proposing to put trees around this entire swale that we're doing and then white pines along the rear. Grading, a small little grade right on the top on that 50-foot no-cut, right here. We're actually away from it a little bit so 50-foot no-cut is actually out here so there will be no grading in the 50-foot no-cut.

Lowry: any proposed uses?

Morrill: proposed users right now are Boston Barricade, CBAN is Boston Barricade. They came up with this thing instead of using metal studs and sheet rock when a business in a mall closes down, they came up with this new product that actually uses plywood and puts a plastic wrap that gets stapled onto it and makes a temporary wall so there is no sheet rock that gets destroyed, they reuse the actual plywood and they put it up with metal studs so they reconstruct and put it back up. So that's one of the users. All the rest are going to be possibly other condos that are going to be in through the building.

Garand: one thing I'm noticing is that the buildings are pretty damn ugly.

Morrill: the only building that is a little different is Mr. Mitchell's. We're going to put a four-foot brick shoulder around the entire thing. So we're spending a little bit of money on that first one as you come down, but all the rest of them are all that metal pre-fab and

Garand: ugly as sin

Morrill: there's not much you can do

Foote: and not very efficient as far as energy

Garand: it's like the slums of Ledge Road; also there's no handicapped parking addressed

Foote: sort of reminds you of Gulfport, huh?



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Garand: we should look for something better. We have Xalloy and Poland Springs, which are beautiful buildings towards the road and these buildings right here don't do anything for the neighborhood. This right here should be one of the nicest looking buildings on this entrance because it's the corner lot going in. It really is poor.

Lowry: maybe if we're lucky they'll paint it yellow

Garand: I'm just looking at the elevations, but there is no handicapped parking addressed either.

Morrill: we have all those painted stripes there are 14 feet wide, we just don't have them labeled as handicapped

Garand: so they have to be labeled

Morrill: okay. We do have enough spaces that you can't park in front of the door and they are wide enough for a handicapped spot, you are correct they should be labeled.

Garand: they should be on the plan.

Foote: so is this another one that will probably go condo units?

Morrill: I think in the future it will. I know Boston Barricade is going to take a large portion of this building and he's basically constructing it so he can move his operation out of Florida.

Garand: doesn't he want a better-looking building than this? A nice brick façade on one or two sides?

Morgan: you owe some money on sidewalks. \$18,770.

Morrill: what? I think he's off on frontage again. I have 250 on Ledge and 243, 85 and 100 on London

Secretary: He's off by 73 feet. He's doing the corner maybe?

Morrill: he's doing the corner. That's fine.

Foote: I don't see anything that mentions the permanent wetlands signs.

Garand: when was the last time this went through technical review?

Morgan: when you got spreadsheets like this

Secretary: way back. When it first came out. None of these has been reviewed recently. Tom Morgan's note was January 1, 2005.

Morrill: I don't have the wetland marker notes; they need to be added.

Lowry: snow storage, dumpster areas?

Garand: hours of dumpster pick up?

Morrill: hours of pick up are on there, just no dumpster

Garand: is the construction sequence listed? I don't see that.

Morrill: should be on E1.

Morgan: what about landscaping on Ledge Road?

Morrill: we've got white pines along the rear, we have nothing along Ledge Road, we're not cutting the 50-foot buffer.

Garand: that's a no-cut zone

Morgan: are those plantings along London that I'm looking at there?

Morrill: red maples to hide the buildings.

Evans: it says on note 13 that the plants have to look nice. They will.

Foote: I can't see anything else but that doesn't mean something won't come back to bite us.

We've got to continue it anyhow because he has to add handicapped parking spots, the note for the wetland flagging, he has to put on the dumpster and snow storage.

Garand: can I ask a question? You have a six-inch water main going in. Is that going to be enough for the sprinkler and the water use in the building?

Morrill: I think so Paul.

Garand: I was just checking on that because that's a 30,000 square foot building



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: I'll check with the client. I know he doesn't use much water at all but I'll check on the water usage.

Foote: and you also realize that while this is probably grandfathered prior to our change in regulations passed last meeting as far as the two conduits for town use for fire alarms and that sort of stuff. It'd probably be in your best interest while you've got the trench open for the underground utilities to throw in a couple four-inch conduits for Town use. We can't force you to do that, but it would probably be a good thing to do.

Evans: will the Port Lighting sign remain on this property?

Morrill: no.

Garand: when is the main sign going to go on London Lane?

Morrill: the main sign?

Garand: the sign for London Lane itself, wasn't there a sign approved for London Lane? No sign to tell what businesses were located there?

Morrill: no, a street sign. No directory sign.

Mitchell: you'd need a variance for that wouldn't you?

Foote: yes because it would be off site signage.

Sanborn: four totem poles

Foote: they could make it out of some of that corrugated metal? And graffiti it.

Morgan: I was looking for some evidence the Town would have access to the detention areas. You had a whole network of detention areas that were going to have easements in case the Town ever had to go in there and maintain it.

Foote: the Town should not have to maintain the detention ponds for the individual sites.

Morrill: I believe it showed the actual easement area from the London Lane plan set that goes around the London Lane pond.

Morgan: the proposed easements, how do they fit into this picture exactly?

Morrill: the London Lane access to this pond is from London Lane.

Morgan: do any of the easements cross this lot?

Morrill: it's on this lot.

Morgan: can you point it out?

Morrill: points to pond on plan.

Morgan: and the easement is

Morrill: for pond maintenance, construction, access, everything

Morgan: it's in favor of the Town in case the Town has to go in there?

Morrill: yes off of London Lane

Garand: can we continue this to the 20th?

Foote: yes. Continue to September 20th at 6:00 PM

Morgan: in case we forget, Mike Fowler did review the earlier plan and recommended a bond of \$39,500.

Garand: and that is not including the sidewalks.

Secretary: that's additional--\$18,770.

Himmer: did you say this had to go for a tech review?

Garand: I was just wondering about the water main size and so forth.

Foote: so, on to our last case for tonight, **05-29** Proposal by Edwin Adams for a site plan review to construct a 4,500 square foot restaurant on Lafayette Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 62.

Evans: I'm out of the slums and back on the Board (as he resumes his membership position)

Sanborn: this case was supposed to go before a tech review because we didn't know what was going in the building or anything. Paul asked for a tech review on it.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Secretary: we had a tech review on it and you got a copy of it

Sanborn: but there has been a land swap in between here

Mitchell: yeah, we're going to put Hooters in there

Sanborn: no, it was a land swap. I was told there was a land swap between two owners.

Morrill: back about a year and a half ago. This lot hasn't changed in size in over a year ago when there was a lot line adjustment then. The building next to Irving came in front of the Board.

Sanborn: we still don't know what's coming in here.

Lowry: we were told we would know the name.

Morgan: so what's the name of the restaurant?

Garand: also, there were supposed to be elevations.

Morrill: we went to technical review because we changed the entire site plan. We used to have the building next to the rec center and we flipped the entire thing and made the Town happy and then we made the driveway line up with Boynton Lane. We lost six parking spaces in doing so and actually came up with a better layout. The wetland permit was submitted by NH Soils on behalf of this project and it actually comes out to a pretty nice flowing plan. We have 86 parking spaces, 1.23 acres, restaurant of 4,500 square feet. As the Board requested, the drainage swale that goes down through the site would catch that water and treat it through a bored centreet. Drain manhole, all the drainage on site goes into catch basins with sump and grease hoods, goes into a vortech and then dumps into the detention channel out back which is currently there that drains next to the rec center.

Sanborn: the little brook you're talking about

Morrill: the little brook that ties into Mary's Brook

Morrill: water, sewer, grease trap, 1500 gallon grease trap tying into the utilities on Lafayette Road, underground power from the existing telephone pole and gas coming from Route 1. Lighting was done by Sharon and Company, pole mounted lights as Paul's going to tell you we don't have lights showing on the buildings because we don't have lights, that's a lot that the technical review committee noted, that the lighting is not shown from the building itself. This is the light on the parking lot.

Garand: so this is still an incomplete plan then.

Morrill: part of my waiver request is that I asked to have this plan set reviewed and to come back in front of this Board with the actual client once Mr. Mitchell gets a client. This building is tailored to two different outfits, so that's why I'm in front of this Board. Landscaping is moved out of the way of the utility poles so they don't have to be cut when they get too high; we moved some of the smaller plants to the front; we have planting beds, we actually took away some of the plants that were being covered by snow. I still see a problem with some of my plants because it's into our headwall.

Garand: what are the two proposed businesses?

Foot: restaurant A and restaurant B

Mitchell: well, we've got several people that we're trying to get interested in Seabrook. Part of the problem we have is that most of the restaurants want 100 parking spaces, there are actually a couple that would like to have 125 parking spaces which is undoable. This layout that we copied, if you go to Woodbury Avenue and see the Ruby Tuesday's that I just did in front of the Shaw's where they are going to install a light there. This building we've copied their prototypical site plan. There is another company that we're talking to that's very interested in coming to Seabrook and you know, it's going to be one of the three and I think there are three of them up in the air right now and it's really going to be a matter of working with them to try to consummate the deal and I don't have a signed agreement yet with them. I represent Mr. Adams, for the record. As soon as we know, that's why we want to come back for technical review, we know the wetland permit takes so long, we do have a driveway permit that came last week, I don't know if Mr. Morrill gave it to you from DOT.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

Morrill: I've got it right here.

Mitchell: so really the only permit waiting for is wetlands. Your concerns that you brought up last time, it's better for us to get the tenant and come back in and have an architectural review but not change the site plan.

Lowry: how is this going to affect Phase II?

Mitchell: how does it affect it? I've tried to make a deal with Mr. Korff for how long Wayne, ever since Lowe's been approved. And I've tried several things to work with Robert on trying to tie these developments in. As you can see in the newspaper article, you can see we're quieting title out there right now, it takes two pages in the Hampton Union.

Foote: that's one of the questions. This huge long thing is not referencing this parcel here?

Mitchell: that's correct. Mr. Adams owns that property.

Foote: that's for obscure properties out back.

Mitchell: when we have good titles, Mr. Adams and Mr. Korff, that was part of, I can't think of his name, that has good title so what land we have on our site has all great title, so there is no problem with our title. Will Phase II happen? Yeah, I think so. I'm probably 95% sure it will. We do have a tenant that we are speaking to and I know that I've dropped that name here before and we're very close right now and considering Robert is the majority landowner on all the titles there, if anybody tries to play cute with him, it'll be a better deal for him to sell it to them. It's just going to take some time before we come to see you on Phase II. But there are some concerns about Phase II that him and I have had since day one and they are not listening so all we can do is...we can't force those two to work together even though that's what we think this Board wants.

Morrill: we're going to come in front of this Board with Phase II and this Board is going to tell us what to do.

Mitchell: they aren't listening to me and I'm sick of fighting with them. I am going to show you this and then your eyes have never seen this. These are a couple of options that we are thinking of but I want them back. Two totally different. Option A which would be right in and right out and making some kind of a deal with him to increase the parking and to increase the size of the restaurant.

Foote: but this doesn't line up with Boynton Lane. Throw that away. We will never approve that if that does not line up with Boynton Lane.

Morrill: can we get that in writing?

Lowry: get a copy of the minutes and you'll have it.

Foote: and this does line up with Boynton Lane and then it has the Irving entrance. But they redraw it to give them parking.

Morrill: we'd like to be continued on this matter, not to the next meeting but to the following one. To try and iron out some of the things that we have. Hopefully by then we'll have a contract.

Garand: October 4th, or October 18th, at 6:00 PM

Foote: continue to October 18th at 6:00 PM

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia Welch, Secretary.



Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

September 6, 2005

	MYLARS RECORDED SEPTEMBER 7, 2005	
04-49	John & David Tucker, 5 Lot Subdivision Almena Way, 136 Walton Road & Washington Street Tax Map 10, Lot 93; Drainage Easement Deed 8:27	D-33011 64918
05-34	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 19 & 21 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-112 Condominium Documents 8:37	D-33008 64925
05-31	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 7 & 9 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-114 Condominium Documents 8:39	D-33009 64927
05-33	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 24 & 26 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-106 Condominium Documents 8:37	D-33006 64921
05-45	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 28 & 30 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-107 Condominium Documents 8:36	D-33007 64923
05-44	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 6 & 8 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-102 Condominium Documents 8:37	D-33013 65126
05-32	Wildwood RE Holdings LLC, Pineo Farms Condominium Conversion, 18 & 20 Pineo Farms Road, Map 4, Lot 14-105 Condominium Documents 11:26	D-33012 65124