



**Stratham Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 21, 2016**  
**Municipal Center**  
10 Bunker Hill Avenue  
Time: 7:00 PM

---

Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman  
David Canada, Selectmen's Representative  
Jameson Paine, Member  
Tom House, Member  
Nancy Ober, Alternate  
Lee Paladino, Alternate

Members Absent: Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

---

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The Chairman took roll call and asked Ms. Ober to be a full voting member in Mr. Baskerville's absence. Ms. Ober agreed.

**2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**a. November 16, 2016**

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

**b. December 07, 2016**

Mr. House made a motion to accept the meeting minutes of December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

**3) Public Hearing**

- a) **Cabernet Builders, P.O. Box 291, Stratham, NH 03885** Conditional Use Permit and Subdivision application for a 22-Lot Cluster Subdivision for the location at 96 Stratham Heights Road, Stratham NH Tax Map 5 Lot 120 (*Continued from November 2, 2016*).

Ms. Paladino recused herself.

Mr. Scott Cole, Beals Associates introduced himself and Tim Mason, Cabernet Builders, Catherine Moran, Attorney and Christian Smith, P.E. Principal from Beals Associates.

Mr. Cole said last time they met, they discussed the Yield plan which determined this to be 16 lots. Tonight they would like to discuss their open space cluster subdivision proposal.

Mr. Cole described the proposal which includes open space to the north and south, there is a view shed along Stratham Heights road and at the entrance way there is a 50' slither of the buffer and from there to the northern edge of the property is roughly 700'. There are 2 vernal pools on the property which have

been kept as part of the open space to the left side of the entrance. They are proposing 21 lots in total plus an existing lot which has a home on it. The average lot size is 0.75 acres and each lot has the minimum 50' of frontage as required by zoning.

The applicant has requested 3 waivers for: Road width reduction, an increase in road length and road grade within the cul-de-sac. Mr. Cole said that under Section 4.6.5.b it is under the Board's discretion to award up to 2.5 lots for frontage lots. He explained that there is developable area which they are leaving as open space; it will stay in its natural condition and includes some of the vernal pool area which is also valuable for the Conservation Commission. Mr. Cole asked the Board if they saw that as viable.

Mr. Paine said that the first thing he noticed was how Mr. Cole identified an area that is steeper than the norm. Mr. Cole said he has had lengthy discussions with the Highway Agent and the Town's Engineer and they had no problem with the grade. Mr. Cole stressed that over 50% of the development is open space which qualifies them for a bonus lot, but they feel it makes for a better subdivision to have the open space.

Mr. Mason said at the last meeting that he would not be seeking any additional bonuses other than the 20 lots because they looked at recreation trails, 50% open space and he thinks the concern is that they may try to come back at another date to ask for more than 20; he said they will not do that.

The Board looked at the calculations for the bonus lots. The applicant would qualify for 22, but they are asking for a total of 21. Mr. Austin clarified that there would be 20 actual house lots.

Mr. House referred back to the percentage of the grade in the cul-de-sac and asked if there had been a discussion about how the water would drain away. Mr. Cole said they have done a full drainage analysis which was sent to Civilworks for review who had a few minor comments. Mr. House asked if they were all set with Civilworks. Mr. Austin said as far as he is aware the applicant did receive comments from Civilworks and has amended the plan to reflect compliance with those comments.

Mr. Christian Smith talked about the drainage for the benefit of the Board. He explained how the water would be directed in the cul-de-sac through the use of swales, culverts and a gravel wetland. He added that they will need an Alteration of Terrain permit too so there will be further review. For the roofs on Lots 1 – 4, run off will be conveyed into stone drip edges so the run off will be contained and infiltrated that way.

Mr. Paine asked the applicant if he anticipated this being a homeowners' association. Mr. Mason said there would be for the open space. Mr. Paine asked if the drainage outlets would be maintained by the association also. Mr. Mason replied that generally they give an easement to the Town although there is not really much to maintain on them. Mr. Smith said that typically responsibility for the maintenance of drainage would be the homeowners' association. Mr. Paine asked which direction the water flows at the southern portion and whether it flows back or away from the farm. Mr. Smith said it continues to head towards the south. Mr. Mason added that they have put the well for the 4 lots in the back yard and the leach fields up near the road and the houses will be moved up toward the road so the front yards will drain towards the road swale. They have been working with the people on the farm and had a few meetings about the drainage with them. They will mention in the deeds about the 50' no cut, no disturb so everybody is aware of it and they are also going to disclose in the purchase and sales agreement that there is a working farm behind lots 1 – 5.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the application as complete. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Houghton asked the applicant if there was anything from Civilwork's review they would like to share. Mr. Cole said there were just general comments. Mr. Cole continued that they did realize there were some concerns regarding sight distance so Mr. Mason did hire a professional traffic engineer, Steve Pernaw, to review the site and he made recommendations which are reflected in the plans. The Highway Agent is happy with the plans, but has requested to work with the developer as a failsafe.

Mr. Houghton asked if the applicant could talk through the highlights of the traffic report. Mr. Cole said the weekday total for traffic visits would be a total of an additional 190 trips over a 24 hour period. The peak morning hour shows 15 trips and peak evening 20 trips. There is a recommendation for sight distance

which they have followed which allows for 360' of stopping sight distance for the 35 M.P.H. speed limit plus 10 m.p.h. The applicant has 370' to the south and in excess of 400' to the north east. Mr. Cole added that another recommendation was to add a stop sign to the entrance from the subdivision heading out and a short distance 2 lots of 4" yellow divider lines to keep the entering traffic out of the path of the exiting traffic. They are happy to do that if the Board wants it.

Mr. Canada thanked Mr. Mason for making the changes that he wanted to see.

Mr. Houghton opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Fitch, abutter asked about drainage; he has a culvert that comes onto his property and he wanted to know the maximum flow of water through the site now and how it will change. He asked also where the 360' stopping distance was shown on the plan. Mr. Cole showed it on the plan. Mr. Fitch asked how far it was from the peak of the grade and felt people wouldn't be able to see from a safe distance and thinks the distance is less than 360. He added that there could also be a backup of cars waiting to turn so he thinks the line of sight is going to be critical. Mr. Cole explained that the sight distance is not in the middle of the road and that the sight line increases as a driver progresses up the road. Mr. Mason added that Paul Connelly also reviewed the traffic report. He reminded everybody that he will be working with the Road Agent and if he wants a tree or a hump removing or whatever it might be, they will remove it.

Mr. House suggested making the plan clearer so people could better understand the sight line issue. Mr. Paine said he would like to emphasize that the easement in that area is large enough for maintenance. On the plan it appears to be pretty tight against the road.

Mr. Smith addressed the issue of drainage from the existing pipe under Stratham Heights road for Mr. Fitch. There is a reduction in all the storms they reviewed and he shared the data.

Mr. Castello, abutter said looking at the traffic study, he would like to understand the data behind the 360' sight line as he can't see any analysis or references. He said also that if you refer to the NHDOT Highway Design manual, at 45 M.P.H. a distance of 460' would be required for sight distance. Mr. Castello said they should think about snow banks too. He asked if the Town was prepared to shave down snow banks throughout the winter. Mr. Castello said he looked at the site access plan and if you were to measure out from where the current proposed intersection is and went up the 460', it would end being west of the intersection of Country Farm road. He's not convinced that this is the right location for the intersection and he asked the Board to consider moving the intersection farther to the west, relatively close to the top of the crest curve. Another suggestion would be moving the intersection further to the east almost down to the vernal pool which would provide the 460' sight distance which would go just beyond the crest of the curve.

Mr. Smith said he believes that Mr. Pernaw uses the actual criteria in the Town's Ordinance and regulations and this is something he does for a living so he finds it hard to believe he wouldn't create something safe.

Mr. Mason was asked by the Fire Chief if he could create a 50' x 100' easement for the Town if they ever wanted to put in a cistern. They do have a space where it could go should it ever be needed. Mr. Cole said they are not currently showing the space for the easement on the plan, but will add it.

Mr. Paine referred to the existing conditions plan and said it looks like the existing Breslin residence currently has 2 drive accesses onto Stratham Heights road. Mr. Mason explained there used to be a barn attached to the house there and that is where the hay wagons used to come in. He doesn't think Ms. Breslin uses that as a daily access point.

Mr. Robert Roseen, resident asked what types of consideration had been given for natural resources and if this application had been before the Conservation Commission. Mr. Austin said there is nothing that requires review from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Mason added that there were members from the Conservation Commission at their well-attended site walk. He believes they would be happy with there being over 50% of open space and staying away as far as possible from the vernal pools. They also offered the property for sale for conservation purposes. Mr. Roseen asked where the vernal pools were and the distance from them. Mr. Cole showed them on the plan and said the closest structure was roughly 150'.

Mr. Smith added that they had filed with the National Heritage Bureau and nothing came back from their database for endangered or threatened species on that property.

Ms. Charity Chatfield, abutter talked about the waiver for the road width and asked why it needed to be narrower. Mr. Mason said when the road needs to be repaved 15 years from now it will be an expense to the Town and making it narrower will help save costs. The Fire Chief has also written a letter saying he is in favor of the 22' wide road. Ms. Chatfield asked for a better understanding of the regulations concerning the width. Mr. Houghton explained that the normal required width is 24' which for heavier traveled roads is appropriate and in the case of this road there will only be 20 houses using it. It helps environmentally too.

Ms. Chatfield said the grade seemed pretty steep especially going from a 2% requirement to a 5% requirement. She is also concerned about the sight distance.

Mr. Houghton asked if the applicant intended to have signage. Mr. Cole said yes and that it was on the plan.

Mr. Mason added that Chestnut Way off of Winnicutt is designed with a one-way which is preferable for snow plowing according to the Road Agent.

Mr. House asked Mr. Austin if the traffic study was available to the public. Mr. Austin said it was, but it hasn't been put on the website. Mr. House thinks it could help the understanding of the sight line.

Ms. Chatfield commented that the meeting materials were not available on line although the planning department did email her the materials, there wasn't enough time for her to truly review them. Mr. Mason wanted it understood that he submitted all the documents in a timely fashion.

Ms. Jean Pauly, abutter asked if there was some metric available to show what the reduction in run off would be. She then addressed Mr. Mason because she thought the deed would refer to Lots 1 through 6 and not 1 through 5 as stated by Mr. Mason. Mr. Mason said putting in Lots 1 through 6 would be fine. Mr. Mason informed the Board that he had added in some stone drainage specifically for Ms. Pauly's residence which is the farm and that this was not a requirement from the drainage study.

Mr. House made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

The Board started addressing the 3 waiver requests for the reduction in road width, the increase in road length and the increase in grade for the road.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the waiver request from Section 4.4.2.a.ii road length. The applicant is requesting an approximate 1200' road length where 800' is the maximum. He believes the intention is to allow flexibility in the design which will carry out the spirit and intention of the regulations. It allows, according to the plans, avoid some of the natural resources that are out there and provides for a more complete plan. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the waiver request for Addendum A Table 1 Road Width where the applicant is seeking a 22' roadway where currently a 24' roadway is required. Based on the fact that the Town's Road Agent has provided input and agreed with the plan and also the Fire Department and it also goes to the nature that the Board discussed earlier with use and benefits to the environment, it carries out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the waiver request for Addendum A Table 1 Road Grade within a cul-de-sac. Currently a 2% grade is required for roadway design within a cul-de-sac, the applicant is seeking a waiver to allow 5.3% grade to lower the proposed disturbance in the area. The existing slope is approximately 11% and as stated this will help to minimize impacts where possible. It carries out the spirit and intent of the regulations. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. House made a motion to accept the conditional use application as it pertains to a residential open space cluster subdivision development, Zoning Ordinance Section 8 for a 22 lot subdivision, location 96 Stratham Heights Road, Map 5 Lot 120. Mr. Paine asked Mr. Austin if they can extend the easement within the clear zone for the sight distance concerns such that any easement in that area would be as far

back as the Town Road Agent request plus 5' for future access considerations. Mr. Austin said he would recommend including that with the subdivision application and not the conditional use permit application. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Houghton said there are a number of housekeeping items relative to the plans and he would instruct the applicant to work with staff to make sure that conforms to what is required by the regulations.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the subdivision application for a 22 Lot cluster subdivision proposed by Cabernet Builders for the location at 96 Stratham Heights Road, Stratham, Tax Map 5, Lot 120 with the conditions as stated:

**Conditions Precedent:**

1. All final revisions to the plans required by the Planning Board, Town Counsel, and their consultants be addressed prior to endorsement and recording of the plans;
2. Obtain all necessary Federal, State, and local permits and approvals including without limitation, state subdivision approval;
3. All required permit information, waivers, and conditions of approval be added to the subdivision plans prior to recording;
4. Applicant to meet with Town Assessing Department to develop a list of addresses for all new homes and verify Map/Lot numbers; and
5. Final Mylar plan set to be provided for Planning Board signature in accordance with the Town's Subdivision Regulations.
6. Easements at the entrance of the intersection of Breslin Farm Road and Stratham Heights Road shall include all clear areas proposed by the Town Road Agent plus 10'.
7. Lots 1 – 6 would have a restriction in the deed that says there is a no cut, no disturbance and within the sales and purchase agreement it will include there is a working farm.

**Conditions Subsequent:**

1. All appropriate costs and fees be paid;
2. Performance guarantee bond amount to be set and bond posted prior to issuance of any building permit in accordance with Subdivision Regulations;
3. All final revisions to subdivision-related documents (including homeowners association documents) required by the Planning Board, Town Counsel, and their consultants be addressed prior to recording of each document;
4. All documents be in final form and recorded prior to issuance of first certificate of occupancy.

Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Chatfield inquired as to what the next steps are. Mr. Austin explained that the applicant goes through the process of everything discussed tonight and once all the comments from consultants are addressed and turned into formal plans, the plans will be submitted for Planning Board signature.

**b) Proposed Zoning Amendments**

- a. **Town Warrant Article – Exempt Sign Specification.** To see if the Town will amend Section VII, Subsection 7.5 *Exempt Signs*, Subsection 7.5.j. *Real Estate signs* to establish clarification of the permitting process for these exempt signs. And in connection therewith amend Section II, to add 2.1.52 *Premises* as the term has been added for clarify of intent within the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move the Planning Board amendment **a.** forward to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation for approval. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

- b. Town Warrant Article – Technical Review Committee.** To see if the Town will amend the Zoning Ordinance, Section III, Subsection 3.8 Gateway Commercial Business District, by amending Subsection 3.8.6 Review and Permitting Process to further clarify the permitting requirements and procedures for developments within the Gateway Commercial Business District. And in connection therewith amend Subsection 3.8.8 Table 5 related to street improvements.

Mr. Austin explained the format being used for the zoning amendments and added that the where proposed section whether it be accessory dwelling units or exempt signs or otherwise a definition has been included and/or a renumbering of the Ordinance for consistency. Mr. Paul Deschaine, Town Administrator said that everything that goes tonight was contained in the previous notice; it's just been reorganized to make things logistically easier.

Mr. Canada said he had asked Mr. Nate Merrill to look at the changes pertaining to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and one suggestion he had references page 33 Section 3.8.6.a.iii.I.g. Mr. Merrill felt that it would be hard not to "impact adjacent properties and uses in the District". Mr. Merrill wondered if this could be modified to read something like "unduly adverse impacts". Mr. Deschaine asked what constitutes an adverse impact. It could be that a new building casts a shadow on an existing one. Mr. Houghton thinks the language should be modified to include the word "unduly".

Mr. Houghton made a motion to change the language to "does not unduly impact adjacent properties and uses in the District" and that no additional public hearing is required. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move the Planning Board amendment **b.** forward to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation with the editorial changes noted tonight. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

- c. Town Warrant Article – Accessory Dwelling Units.** To see if the Town will adopt the recent statutory changes to NH RSA 674:70 Accessory Dwelling Units and replace Section V, Subsection 5.4 *Accessory Apartments* with an amended 5.4 *Accessory Dwelling Units* to reflect this change. And in connection therewith amend Section II Definitions by replacing Subsection 2.1.2 *Accessory Apartment* with 2.1.3 *Accessory Dwelling Unit*. And in connection therewith further amend Section II, to add 2.1.69 *Transient Occupancy* as the term has been added for clarify of intent within the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move the Planning Board amendment **c.** forward to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation for approval. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

- d. Town Warrant Article – Accessory Outside Storage.** To see if the Town will amend Section V, Subsection 5.5. *Outside Storage* to *Accessory Outside Storage* establish the criteria and permitting process for the accessory outside storage of materials.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move forward the Planning Board amendment **d.** forward to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation for approval. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

- e. Town Warrant Article – Residential Open Space Cluster Development.** To see if the Town will amend Section VIII, Subsection 8.9.a.iii *Buffer Area* by adding 8.9.a.iii.4 to establish the Planning Board's ability to grant a waiver to wetland/shore land buffer areas upon creation and adoption of regulations establishing criteria to evaluate waiver consideration.

Mr. Tim Copeland spoke on behalf of the Conservation Commission and said this suggested amendment doesn't state anywhere that the Conservation Commission will be consulted at all so there is concern that the Commission will have no input on future ordinances. Mr. Deschaine commented that the Commission is withholding opposition to the amendment if there is a collaborative role that the Commission play in writing those enabled regulations. They have an extreme reservation about the manner in which this has been brought forward; putting that aside, they have expressed an interest in working with the Planning Board on it. The Commission could see that this amendment will sometimes be beneficial. Mr. Austin added that the Commission understands that regulations are not subject to Town warrant or Town meeting. Mr. Copeland said they would like to have some input in the way the draft of the warrant is going to be put out there. Mr. Austin said there is the possibility of going to the ZBA for wetland buffers, but it opens the application up to the possibility of disapproval when the Planning Board can see that overall it is an excellent application. Mr. Houghton observed that they only have an advisory role anyway. This amendment won't change that. Mr. Paine stressed that the Commission just wants to have some input in the language of the article.

Mr. House suggested adding them to the check list as a reminder to run an application by them as part of the review process. Mr. Austin stated that all agendas are circulated to all Boards and Committees. Mr. Houghton thinks it is a good idea to work together with the Commission to develop the language so it meets the spirit and intent of what we all want to see accomplished. Mr. Austin said that this amendment allows that to go to fruition as regulations. Mr. Deschaine said this reflects on record the Planning Board's willingness to work with the Commission on the regulations should this pass.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move the Planning Board amendment **e.** to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation for approval. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

- f. Town Warrant Article – Telecommunications.** To see if the Town will amend Section XIX, Subsection 19.4.2 *Use Districts* by amending 19.4.2 to reflect the Gateway Zoning District zoning established in 2013 and clarify the permitting process for the Telecommunications Facilities.

Mr. Paine made a motion to move the Planning Board amendment **f.** forward to the 2017 Town Warrant with the Planning Board's recommendation for approval. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Public Meeting**

- a. Rollins Hill Development,** Rob Graham, Agent-- Preliminary Consultation for re-subdivision of Rollins Hill, Phase III (Map 3 Lots 66-74) to increase from 9 lots to 27, single-family detached homes.

Mr. Mark Stevens explained why they were back before the Board. They have been asked repeatedly to provide something that is affordable so they took a look and decided the only way to achieve that was to make phase III of the original approval denser. They have taken the 9 2 acres lots in Phase III and reduced it into a single family, detached, condominium development. They drilled a well and got over 50 gallons a minute; they need about 8 in order to supply a water system for this denser configuration.

Each single family house has its own septic system and they have developed a porous pavement and porous system so that the groundwater is at net complete recharge so whatever falls onto the ground, goes into the ground. Mr. Stevens discussed the length of the road and said they had a waiver for the length of the road as part of the overall development application and he showed them the existing plan with an overlay plan showing what they are proposing. He observed they look like they are exactly the same, but because the curve has become tighter, the road length is slightly shorter so they don't need to change or modify what they've done for that road section.

Mr. Stevens said there are 43 homes on the original plan which means each homeowner owns 1 x 43<sup>rd</sup> of something. The 1 x 43<sup>rd</sup> is the common land and the cost to maintain the cisterns because you can separate the developments by drawing a line down the middle of Rollins Hill Road so that the sections can take care of their own road systems; they are creating a second level association for the new plan. The new section will have its own condominium association to take care of lawn and driveway maintenance plus insurances. Mr. Stevens said they meet all the Zoning Ordinance requirements and had Rockingham County Conservation District out to witness test pits and only one failed. They had Mr. Pernaw do a traffic study for the extra density and it has no impact and they went to the Conservation Commission last week to let them know what was being done so they know there will be no effect on wetlands.

Mr. House asked how close together the condos would be. Mr. Stevens said the closest one will be 30'.

Mr. Rob Roseen said he was there to reassure the Board that all the obligations committed to previously concerning the protection of natural resources will still apply. The redesign for Phase III still fulfills all those elements. They won't be using dry wells or rain gardens in the space between the homes. Previously the homes had heated driveways, but for this redesign of Phase III, they will use permeable pavers which enables them to capture the roof top run off either in the form of gutters or drip edges. This allows them to do landscaping between the lots. This change will be reflected in the operations and management agreement and the homeowners' association will be responsible for the operation and maintenance.

Mr. Paine said with the amount of run off coming from the roofs and the anticipated run off from the driveway, he wondered what each driveway could hold in the event of a storm. Mr. Roseen said the road base underneath the pavers will be a 4" base only to capture a 50 year storm. For structural purposes, they will put in a 10" base which will be enough for a 100 year storm. Mr. Paine asked if they were prepared for seasonal events and asked if they anticipate any problems with water coming down from frozen ground. Mr. Roseen said they didn't have any concerns because the road ways will be designed with a good drainage system.

Mr. Paine asked about the cul-de-sac design and if it was just one road around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Stevens said it was a 2 lane road. Mr. Paine asked if they would be open to a one lane similar to what was proposed by the 96 Stratham Heights proposal. Mr. Stevens said there is no reason for a 2 lane roadway. The road will be private and therefore it doesn't need to be maintained by the Town. Mr. Houghton asked if the road was being built to Town specifications. Mr. Stevens said it is being built to State highway standards because of how much stone is involved which means it is being built above Town standards. Mr. Canada asked if it might become a Town road in the future. Mr. Stevens said that he didn't think so.

Mr. Austin said he understands that the road length will be shortened from the currently approved road length, but said there is the addition of the Southern Cross portion and asked whether that is additional or makes up the difference between what was approved and what they are requesting now. Mr. Stevens said it would be additional road, but it is not an increase in length.

Mr. House asked about snow removal as there appears to be one house lot that could end up having all the snow being piled there. Mr. Stevens said it can be slid off in different ways.



Mr. Austin asked if 27 units, as far as an association, put together the funding the typical snow removal, lawn maintenance and the community well system. Mr. Stevens said he didn't see a problem with that.

Mr. Paine asked where the Breslin property was in relation to this application. Mr. Paine requested that the applicant have lots of information concerning the aquifer due to the amount of abutter and Town concerns as this whole area is becoming a heavily used area.

Mr. Rob Graham said that they have to prepare a hydrology report as part of the contemporary permit process for community wells. That is now more rigorous than it was even 5 years ago. The well that has been drilled would handle approximately 120 homes if they were pumping water for 24 hours a day.

Mr. Paine asked if there was a fire suppression plan in place. Mr. Stevens said they will use the cistern. Mr. Paine asked if that would be enough for the additional units. Mr. Stevens said it would be.

Ms. Ober confirmed that these additional lots would still be 55 and older and asked what the square footage would be for each unit and how many bedrooms they would have. Mr. Stevens said they were still 55 and older, they were all 2 bedroom units and the square footage will range from approximately 1700 – 2000 square feet.

Mr. Graham introduced Helen Joyce and Sally Boyd who have been participants in this redesign.

Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Graham to define "affordable". Mr. Graham said their target price is \$399 - \$499,000. Mr. Houghton thought a hydrogeology study had been done before. Mr. Graham confirmed that was so, but that was for individual wells.

Mr. Graham said he hoped they could submit a formal application for the meeting on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

Mr. Paine asked if there was a possibility to incorporate some walking trails into the open space areas. Mr. Stevens said they had gone through that whole process back then and the consensus of the Board at that time was not to allow general access to the conservation area. Mr. Paine asked if there were alternative locations. Mr. Stevens said he didn't think so. He did add that the roadways are nice and flat without much traffic so people could use those.

Miss Kathleen Breslin, abutter asked to see the plan.

Ms. Helen Joyce, resident showed some concerns about this project when it first started especially with the price point. She, along with others in the community who are over 55 would like to down size and she felt the price of the houses was too high. She hopes the Board will approve this. Mr. Canada asked Ms. Joyce if the price range of \$399 – 499,000 was in her definition of affordable. Ms. Joyce said she and her husband had looked at the Vineyards and they are being sold for over \$500,000. She feels \$499,000 seems more in line with the market.

Ms. Ober asked what the homeowner fees were likely to be. Mr. Stevens said it is a little premature at this stage to know, but the Vineyards Association fees are about \$300 a month. He would like to make it less for this development if possible. Mr. Graham added that fees for things like snow plowing would be the same whether there are 9 lots or 27 lots.

Mr. Stevens turned the topic to cell towers and said he had heard that there might be interest in using one of his locations. He would like to discuss it tonight as he doesn't like the current proposed location and he thinks he can propose a better location. Mr. Austin advised the Board to tread cautiously as this is new and a quasi-preliminary consultation that the Board hasn't received formally. Mr. Houghton suggested that Mr. Stevens bring the proposal to staff. There followed some discussion about the correct legal process for discussing this item. Mr. Deschaine, Town Administrator said as long as the discussion can stay on topic on their site, there's any comparative or contrasting of a competing application that should be off limits.

Mr. Stevens continued to share the plan and location. The Board agreed the applicant should come back with a preliminary consultation should they want to bring it before the Board for formal consideration.

**5. Miscellaneous**

Mr. Austin informed the Board that the balloon float test for the 57 Portsmouth Avenue has been rescheduled for Friday, December 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016 from 08:00 am – noon.

**6. Adjournment**

Mr. House made a motion to adjourn at 10:03 pm. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.