

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 19, 2020**

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

The following notice was read aloud “A Checklist To Ensure Meetings Are Compliant With The Right-to-Know Law During The State Of Emergency” (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Secretary Cindy Kirkpatrick called roll:

PRESENT ROLL CALL: Tim Doherty – present
 Jim Bergeron – present
 Cindy Kirkpatrick - present
 Danielle Masse-Quinn – present
 Alternate Bruce Bilapka – present
 Alternate Paddy Culbert - present
 Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote - present
 Planning / Zoning Administrator Jennifer Beauregard – present

Via Telecommunication:

Roger Montbleau – present via telephone; no one in the room
Paul Dadak – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Samuel Thomas – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Richard Olsen- present via telephone; no one in the room
Alternat Mike Sherman – present via telephone; no one in the room

ABSENT/

NOT PARTICIPATING: Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEETING MINUTES

September 28, 2020 and October 5, 2020

MOTION: (Dadak/Montbleau) To approve the September 28, 2020 and October 5, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
 Mr. Bergeron – Yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
 Mr. Montbleau- Yes
 Mr. Dadak - Yes
 Mr. Cote - abstain

(6-0-1) The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS**Case #PL2020-00012****Map 24 Lot 12-204****LOOSIGIAN, Peter & Lisa - 8 Foreman Lane - Proposed 4-Lot Subdivision**

Representing the applicant was Karl Dubay of The Dubay Group who joined the meeting via Zoom. Also joining via Zoom was the applicant Tom Loosigian. Mr. Dubay provided the Board with a summary update of the items that had been amended based on the review letter submitted by Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm). He noted a storm water study and calculations were submitted. He believed Mr. Keach had reviewed the updates and submitted an updated letter. He discussed the additional amendments that would be made based on the most recent letter. He described the proposed drainage system.

Mr. Steve Keach addressed the Board via Zoom. He noted all State approvals are in-hand. He spoke about his review letter dated October 15, 2020 that was issued in response to Mr. Dubay's revised plans. He saw that the diminished frontage (granted by Variance) had been incorporated into the design. He referenced note #10 on sheet #4 of the drawings that spoke to a series of proposed dedications of easements and voluntary vegetative buffer restrictions; he recommended draft copies of those instruments be received and reviewed by Town Counsel as a condition for approval. Mr. Keach recommended the applicant request and felt it would be reasonable for the Board to grant a waiver of site-specific soil survey mapping. He understood a waiver was also being sought for the 75ft. protective well radii for the interior lots; he had no objection to the Board granting a waiver for this. He spoke about the width of Foreman Lane having a prevailing width of approximately 18ft. The proposed extension (new construction) contemplates a new pavement width of 20ft. He understood after a conversation with the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') they supported the 20ft. pavement width; he was not opposed to this and was not opposed to granting a waiver for centerline curve radius (from 150ft. to 100ft). he said all the waivers were described in words on sheet #4 of the project plan. He said the most significant thing that came out of his review is what he didn't talk about in his letter because he didn't have to. He indicated Mr. Dubay had worked diligently to address drainage on the site. He added drainage was the biggest constraint on the property. He was first introduced to the neighborhood in 2010 because of drainage concerns that had arisen because of roadway drainage improvements on Ballard Road as well as concerns expressed by a resident who no longer lived in the neighborhood.

Mr. Keach noted Mr. Dubay had devised a plan with an approach to drainage and placement of buildings and lots, that do not impact discharge of storm water as it comes out of an existing storm water detention pond (on the southerly end of Ballard Road) and runs over the northwest corner of the Loosigian property. He said the discharge will not be impacted in any way by the proposal; in fact, the thread of the primary flow was (pretty much captured) within the area of the voluntary vegetative buffer restriction. More importantly, in the portion of the site to be developed with the roadway extension of Foreman Lane and the turn-around, the Dubay Group had designed a 'necklace' of five storm water ponds. Four of the ponds (beginning with the south easterly one heading clockwise) are dry ponds. They will have the base elevations at or above the seasonal high-water table. Only the northerly pond will be a wet pond for any duration of time. He stated additional storm water will not run off the property. He said he worked with Mr. Dubay to arrive at this outcome, which is different from when the Board first saw it because they paid closer attention to seasonal water table depth. Mr. Keach ended by telling the Board he felt the applicant had given an excellent design for the neighborhood and he supported it.

Mr. Dadak felt the review and Mr. Keach's comments were very thorough and 'hit all the points'. Mr. Montbleau believed Mr. Keach covered everything in great detail.

Ms. Kirkpatrick didn't find the waivers in the plan file. Mr. Dubay recalled when submitting the application, they include waiver requests; however, the exact subsections requests have been adjusted. He pointed out the waivers were listed on the top left of sheet four. He said they were reviewed and supported by the HSC. He said they had not requested a waiver for the site-specific soil designation as it came up late in the process. He

offered to put the designation on the plan as an administrative annotation and have the soil scientist stamp the plan.

Mr. Culbert asked Mr. Dubay to request the waivers in writing. Mr. Dubay noted the waivers were listed on the plan. Mr. Culbert wanted a written request to have in the file. Mr. Dubay said he would do so. Mr. Bergeron asked for clarification regarding the waivers being requested. Mr. Doherty wanted written waivers; there was nothing in the record showing they had been accepted for consideration.

PUBLIC INPUT

Amber Morse, 3 Foreman Lane came forward in person. Prior to the meeting she forwarded the Board emails, photographs, and a video of the rain fall. She said she had tried to have answers to questions regarding the road and drainage studies but had not heard back from anyone. She believed the Board should have received an email from Town Administrator Brian McCarthy earlier in the day and questioned if they had.

Mr. Doherty mentioned the microphone sound within the hall was cutting out with every few words. Mr. Bergeron agreed the room had bad acoustics. Mr. Doherty invited Ms. Morse to sit and use a microphone at a table rather than the standing microphone.

Ms. Morse referenced the discussions during the July 20, 2020 meeting and the question she raised at that time about a drainage study being done on the road. At that time, she was advised to contact the Highway Department; she called and sent an email but had not heard back. She followed up on her correspondence but has still not received any answers. She was confused as to what version of the plan the Board was reviewing; she picked up a plan earlier in the day (from the Planning Department).

Mr. Cote stated he received the video (Ms. Morse forwarded) of rainwater coming down the street. He understood the applicant proposes to reduce the amount of runoff coming down the street by installing drainage structures near the top of the proposed cul-de-sac. He believed this would help reduce the runoff coming down the road. Ms. Morse believed the elevation of the area was lower than the seasonal high-water level. Mr. Cote asked for clarification of this point. From what he understood there would be drainage structures installed to reduce runoff toward the neighbors below. Ms. Morse wanted to know if the water table would be increased because her basement currently floods.

Mr. Bergeron heard Mr. Keach indicate there was water coming from a previous subdivision (in the north west) that can not be changed by the proposed plan. Mr. Cote believed Ms. Morse was concerned about Foreman Lane. Currently the road is flat and if it is going to be built to standard, the center slope will stop the water from her house from flowing and stay on her side of the road.

Mr. Keach referenced sheet #5 (overview plan) lot 24-12-203-16 (situated to the west)(12 Ballard Road). He showed how beyond that lot Ballard Road intersected with Mulberry Lane. The southerly end of that lot contained a storm water pond that creates a point discharge. He called attention to the existing grade contour lines. He said water flowed in a northerly direction from this lot onto lot 24-1-202-1 (6 Foreman Lane) and ultimately goes under Foreman Lane and highway culverts to the south of Ledge Road and Foreman Lane and continuing to the east. He noted both of the referenced lots had 'pit and mound' topography by today's standards consist of poorly drained soil. He didn't feel the flow of water was tremendously relevant to the conversation because it doesn't impact the Loosigian property in any way and is un-effected by the proposed subdivision, other than it will continue to flow in an equal volume as it has over the last decade. He noted he couldn't say whether that flowage is cause for difficulties realized by Ms. Morse since she purchased her home. Although, he did mention there was no expectation for that flow of water to be made better or worse as a result of the extension of Foreman Lane and the addition of three homes.

Mr. Doherty didn't believe this was the area being referenced by Ms. Morse. Mr. Keach replied his comments needed to be in the record because he received Ms. Morse's still photographs and video. He wanted to eliminate those concerns. To Mr. Cote's point, Mr. Keach referred to sheet #6 and the cul-de-sac turn around at the southerly end of Foreman Lane. Mr. Doherty asked that they discuss Ms. Morse's concern regarding the applicant not wanting to do the soil specific mapping. He said if they are going to be putting more water into the ground on their property if it would then come up onto her property. Ms. Morse told the Board if there is a lot of rain, she currently gets water in her basement every spring; in 2019 it flooded. Mr. Keach understood the concern as it related to the ground water piece. He didn't see the plan having a negative effect on her, although it may not help her. He said the volume of water running off the site will be maintained effectively at zero and may actually help a little bit of surface water that travels in her direction today. The 'necklace' of ponds will catch all water running off the site. Ms. Morse wanted to know where the water would go. Mr. Keach replied the question should be 'where does the water come from', which he answered, 'from the sky'. He explained the water currently traveling north to northwest would continue to travel through. He said the only thing they are dealing with on the property is water that already accumulates to begin with. He added the proposed design gave the water a place to go. Based on his on-site inspection, he felt it was fair to say that a lot of the existing homes on Foreman Lane were built on land that probably wouldn't be built on today because there are substantial areas of wetlands. Mr. Keach mentioned he didn't anticipate construction of the project to have a benefit to Ms. Morse's property (from a drainage standpoint); however, he didn't believe it would exacerbate problems she currently had.

Mr. Morse was concerned that all the water basins were coming up toward the front of the Loosigian property. She wanted to know if they would fill up with water. Mr. Keach stated the one closest to her would have water in it. Ms. Morse wanted to know if she would be affected by the water going into the ground. Mr. Keach believed she had a flux of water generally moving through her property from west to east. From a surface water standpoint, it may capture and direct surface water runoff from heading in the northerly direction.

Ms. Morse questioned if there was drainage that could be put in the street given there were proposed basins close to the road. She asked if there were new pipes going underground. She wanted to know where all the water would go. Mr. Keach replied no additional surface water would flow off the Loosigian property in the post development conditions than does today.

Ms. Morse inquired about the road and wanted to know if the existing Foreman Lane would be widened and repaved by the applicant or the Town. Mr. Loosigian commented that would be a question for the Highway Department; it wasn't anything he could answer or speak for them. He said he heard in the HSC meeting that the Highway Agent spoke about possible future improvements to Foreman Lane that was already being discussed by the Town. He did not hear any commitment regarding when, where or to what degree. Ms. Morse didn't understand why the cul-de-sac couldn't just come directly off the road and why it curved into the property. She felt bad for her neighbor and recalled there was a plan shown to the Zoning Board that had the cul-de-sac pushed back into the property. Mr. Loosigian explained they amended the initial plan and went to the Zoning Board for a Variance so they could develop the site in a manner that would disturb less vegetation and trees in order to get the road in. The proposed plan shows a much less impact to drainage and water issues. He said if they were to do the other plan more of the land would need to be cleared in order to get the cul-de-sac further into the lot, which would make it so they would need to mitigate more water. Ms. Morse spoke about the width of the road, which currently posed difficulty when two cars are passing each other. She reiterated her concern regarding water in the area of the road. She also felt the proposed development would create more traffic and added her concern about the safety children in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cote noted the HSC suggested they liked the proposed plan. Mr. Loosigian added the HSC supported the plan as its shown. Ms. Morse stated she would like to see the road widened. She told the Board she reviewed the meeting minutes from when the Board met regarding her neighbor's property (Lisa Gagnon). She saw that a Board member brought up a drainage study, which made her curious if it could be done given there were three additional houses being proposed. Mr. Keach informed a drainage study was done as an integral part of the

application to the extent they are obligated. Because of his familiarity with drainage problems that plagued the area, he was familiar with the prevailing drainage pattern and interested to see how the last undeveloped property in the neighborhood would be handled. He said if/when the day comes that there are improvements to the existing Class V portion of Foreman Lane he assumed they would do some analysis to determine what the property culvert size and geometry is for the pipe that goes under the northerly end of the road. Ms. Morse didn't understand why the drainage would not be considered now if the road is going to be widened as part of the project. Mr. Keach replied that was not the applicant's burden under the Subdivision Regulations. He stated he works with the Highway Department and to date has had no specific conversation about improvements to Foreman Lane in the immediate timeframe. Based on its condition, it is a prime candidate to have some work done to it in the not too distant future. Ms. Morse said she was currently fine; she had already spent a considerable amount of money to fix her water issue. She didn't expect it to get better, but at the same time didn't want it to get worse. Mr. Keach asked if she had perimeter drains around her footings (foundation). Ms. Morse replied there were no plans on file at Town Hall for her property.

Mr. Dubay described the design upgrades that were done. He referenced sheet #13 that laid out a Foreman Lane profile. The existing road ended with a stub. He said they would be putting in a small/hybrid cul-de-sac that would be sensitive to the drainage and helps traffic circulate/flow. He said the Board and abutters had asked them to shift the approach away from the abutter's house (lot 24-12-205 – Margery Moore) and add a green area. Additional under-drain would be added in that area that pull water back into the applicant's property. Ms. Morse commented she was more concerned with the ground water than the surface water because she's controlled the surface water up to this point. Ms. Morse inquired if the road and drainage would be built before the houses. Mr. Dubay stated the road and drainage will be fully bonded with warranties; they will be built prior to the houses being built. The gravel will be extended with wider shoulders. Extra under-drains, ponds and ditches have been added. Ms. Morse asked if the water emptied anywhere. Mr. Dubay discussed the current conditions. Ms. Morse said she sent a video to the Board to show there was a large amount of water coming into the area. Mr. Dubay mentioned there was a massive wetland system in the back of Ms. Morse's house that kept going further and filled up with water. He said Ms. Morse's house was built too low and currently flooded. Ms. Morse said it happened seasonally. She wanted to know what she could do and who would be responsible if her basement started flooding all the time.

Mr. Culbert said that situation would be a civil matter. He noted there should not be any change in drainage from pre- to post-development. Ms. Morse said it was just a question, she really didn't want to do that. She asked if the road would be widened. Mr. Dubay recalled hearing someone say during the HSC meeting they had a road improvement program and at some point, the road (Foreman Lane) would be on the radar. He also recalled discussing the subject and hearing from the neighbors that they didn't want the road touched. Ms. Morse replied she didn't say that and knew of another neighbor that also didn't say it. It was her understanding the road would be fixed as a 'bonus' by the Loosigians and was now hearing that's not the case because the Town may or may not do so. She told the Board she was unable to hear back from the Town regarding the Road, but it seemed everyone else had. Mr. Dubay said he attended the HSC meeting and the only takeaway he had was they were doing a good design with a hybrid cul-de-sac that benefits the Town for access and emergency services.

Ms. Morse reiterated her concern about sitting water in the event of a large rainstorm that would causing the water table to go up and flood her basement. Mr. Dubay said it wouldn't any more than it currently does. He said when he walked the area, he saw a large flat wooded wetland. Ms. Morse mentioned her basement floods when the sides of her yard floods. She repeated her question about Foreman Lane; will it be repaved and widened.

Ms. Masse-Quinn thanked Ms. Morse for sending the email (September 21st) with information.

Ms. Morse said she had heard different things about Foreman Lane. She recalled originally the Loosigians were going to pay for the repaving of the road; however, in speaking with Mr. Loosigian, he indicated the Town possibly taking care of it, so it was no longer 'on the table'. So now, she didn't know if the road would be

widened. She added she wished the cul-de-sac at the end of the road. Mr. Loosigian explained she was correct. He said initially that was proposed; however, from a combination of pushback by certain neighbors not wanting to see a wider road and liking the character of a narrow road as it currently was and learning it was a candidate for improvement in the near future, they decided to show the limit of work as shown on the plan. Ms. Morse didn't recall that discussion.

Mr. Dubay stated he reviewed their original application and saw they had requested waivers at that time. He noted some of the specific sections were slightly adjusted based on what the Town is looking for. He said they didn't have a separate piece of paper with the requests; instead, they included the specific language on the plan. Mr. Doherty noted they were still hearing from the public.

Ms. Margery Moore, 5 Foreman Lane came forward in person. She mentioned the applicant previously had a plan that did not require a variance and met all Zoning laws. She said the only hardship presented by the applicant was that they wanted to save the trees. She added by being granted the variance, the applicant has saved all the trees in front of their own home but will take down all the trees on the side of her property. She then read aloud a letter dated October 15, 2020 (copies were provided to the Board). The letter listed the negative affects of the proposed development that she felt would disrupt her peaceful enjoyment of her property and her requests: 1) a no-cut buffer be maintained along the left side of owner's property abutting her property (as would be maintained along the back of the proposed lots), 2) the elimination of basin 1 in its entirety including any underground or overground pipes and that Legend L1 on the proposed post development watershed plan be moved to basin 2 so it collects any/all water from her property and stays on owner's property, 3) she felt moving her fence will not be necessary because the proposed plan indicates that Foreman Lane will be redirected to the right, away from her property, 4) Foreman Lane be paved to the location of her exiting driveway and 5) request that the Board reconsider the necessity for a cul-de-sac and instead allow the existing means of egress (private driveway) to be the main entrance into the proposed subdivision. She wanted to know if the Town would own all the property in front of her house and how it would affect her 200ft. of frontage. She was concerned with the area around basin 6 at the end of Foreman Lane and wanted to know if it would require cutting many trees, who will maintain this area. Ms. Moore ended by informing there was an existing water problem with flow coming off the owner's slanted driveway into her driveway/property. She commented erosion continues to occur on her property and water hampers access to her barn and floods her pastures.

Ms. Lisa Gagnon, 6 Foreman Lane came forward in person. She referenced the area along her property line that abuts lot 3 and said there was a narrow margin between her property line and that lot. She believed the elevation of lot 3 would be higher than her home and wanted to know what the area/buffer would look like to maintain the privacy of her lot. She understood the water conditions on her property and asked for clarification of Mr. Keach's comment that they would not have been buildable now (today's standards). She wanted to know if her property would receive runoff from the applicant's property.

Mr. Doherty understood there was no work being done on the back of the applicant's property. He said the water currently flowing would continue. Ms. Gagnon saw that the proposed home abutting her lot would be built further back into the lot and above (based on topography). Given that situation, she wanted to know if there would be any change to the manner that water flows. Mr. Keach referenced sheet #6 of #14; the drainage/grading plan. He explained the development and clearing proposal and noted there was nothing that would prevent a future owner from clearing the lot. Mr. Dubay pointed out there was an intercept swale between the houses (sidelines) to make sure any water coming off the side yard would go into the wet pond and not over the property line. He noted the plan showed the survey shots of a portion of Ms. Gagnon's lot to show the relationship between the lots. The proposed garage will be faced forward (with a back-up stub), not toward Ms. Gagnon's house.

Mr. Doherty referenced sheet #7 and questioned if the series of stone check dams were within the interceptor swale. Mr. Dubay answered yes. Mr. Doherty asked if they would eventually go away or if they would stay

after the property was built out. Mr. Dubay replied they were required temporary erosion control measures. He said they are usually taken out once everything had grown in and the swales are working the way they should.

Mr. Cote inquired why the Board didn't have all the plan sheets. Ms. Beauregard noted the plans contained in the Board member meeting packets were the latest plans dropped off by Dubay Group. She said it looks like they only provided the plan pages containing corrections. Mr. Culbert said if he was a voting member, he wouldn't approve the plan unless all the pages were reviewed (together). Mr. Bergeron stated the applicant is requested to submit fourteen sets of plans; they should be prepared for the meetings. Mr. Doherty added that the Board received a handout from Ms. Moore containing a lot of comments that he would like to see if the Board wanted the engineers to review. Ms. Kirkpatrick mentioned they still needed to address the waivers.

Mr. Doherty stated the Board was having problems with the plan and the meeting. He suggested they close the hearing down and date specify to another meeting because they were having too many problems.

Regarding comments that were made, Mr. Cote referenced the meeting minutes of June 15th that spoke to the what the applicant told the Board about their intentions for the road. During that meeting Mr. Dubay made a comment that they would like to reshape Foreman Lane to 20ft. wide from the beginning to the end, with the end turning into the applicant's property with a 100ft. wide green center cul-de-sac. Mr. Cote read a portion of the meeting minutes aloud pertaining to the reconstruction of Foreman Lane. Mr. Loosigian explained initially they offered to widen and reshape the road and were met with feedback from multiple neighbors that they liked the character of the road as it was. Mr. Cote pointed out there were five neighbors and only one said they don't want the road redone. Mr. Loosigian stated they brought the plan to the HSC and told them where the limit of work was being proposed; the HSC told them they were looking at doing something in the future. He said with no ruling being made, he didn't know where they stood; however. He said he was approached by a neighbor who told him they purchased their home based on the quiet narrow road and didn't want the road any wider. Between that feedback and the feedback from the HSC they decided it would not be part of the plan. He apologized it was not clearly stated to the Board.

Mr. Culbert pointed out the HSC is an advisory board. He said the Board was under the assumption the road would be widened based on the comments previously made. Mr. Cote mentioned that all the neighbors did not want the development.

Mr. Loosigian said they would reintroduce widening the road if the Board wanted. He said they would perform on anything decided at the meetings. He said if it was the wish of the Board to do so they will add it back into the plan. Mr. Culbert stated the Board doesn't design plans the applicant's do. Mr. Bergeron didn't feel he could proceed in good faith and get answers to the questions raised by the abutters with the limited amount of information they had. Mr. Doherty agreed. He said it had been a confusing meeting; the acoustics were terrible, and it was difficult not having the applicant in the room. He had difficulty with Zoom meetings.

Mr. Culbert asked if there would be site-specific plans done. Mr. Dubay said it was easy to do site specific soil plans; they will do it and annotate the information on the plan. He said it would reflect the amount of work they have done on site. He asked the Board to make a decision regarding the road; should it be improved at 18ft., leave it alone or something else. He understood the Board was jurisdictional; however, they were told a lot of things and were trying to make people happy.

Mr. Dubay spoke about the comments made by abutters. He discussed the proposal and asked for the Board's input and direction. Mr. Cote felt the applicant had been diligent and accommodating to the requests of the abutters. He did not want to see the cul-de-sac extended an additional 100ft. Mr. Dubay hoped to come to a resolution. Mr. Culbert questioned if the plan would be site specific (homes/drainage) rather than requesting a waiver. Mr. Keach believed to the applicant it meant site specific soil mapping and to Mr. Culbert it meant siting the homes as shown on the plan. He said Mr. Dubay has agreed to the method of doing soil survey mapping. He believed sheet #6 of the plans showed the locations of homes/driveways and related improvements

and believed Mr. Culbert wanted to know if that was how Mr. Loosigian intends to construct those homes. Mr. Loosigian stated he intended to construct the home in the general location as shown. Mr. Culbert asked that they be located ‘specifically’, not ‘generally’. Mr. Loosigian mentioned in the past he’s had the flexibility to slide a house a few feet to avoid ground obstructions and asked for the freedom to do so based on site conditions. He described the type of situation that might require a house to be moved. Mr. Culbert was not in favor of allowing houses to be shifted. He said if there is a boulder they could blast or use a rock hammer. Mr. Loosigian replied in most situations a resolution could be met, although the cost may be exponential. He said they are usually given a ‘buildable envelope’. Mr. Dubay noted there were certain aspects of the plan they’ve agreed to and shown on the plan. He said to appease Mr. Loosigian’s ability to make small adjustments, they could annotate certain things on the plan and described how assurance could also be provided to the Board.

Mr. Dadak questioned if the test pits gave any indication of what they expected to run into during construction. Mr. Loosigian explained he did not have the houses specifically designed (with floor plan) yet and said it would be a shame to lose a customer because of not being able to orient a house a certain way. Mr. Culbert said he had a problem with trying to squeeze houses into a tight lot. He was afraid of the exceptions. Mr. Loosigian replied they tried to avoid blasting and hammering could have adverse effects. He said if they ran into something, he would figure out how to locate the houses as they were shown on the plan. Mr. Dubay believed they could come up with a control mechanism that could be pointed to on the plan and still provide the applicant with flexibility to have high quality houses.

Mr. Doherty said the meeting was difficult; he was hearing every other word from those on Zoom. He did not want to continue doing Zoom meetings. He asked the Board to provide the applicant with guidance and wanted to know if the members wanted them to work on (pave) the entire road. Mr. Bergeron wanted to know what the Town’s involvement would be to address the drainage problems on Foreman Lane that are not the inherent responsibility of the applicant. He said if the Town were not going to move in that direction, he would be willing to say the developer doesn’t need to tear up the whole road. Mr. Cote replied the Town had a plan for the roads but didn’t have it in front of him. Mr. Doherty had a problem with paving the entire road because after doing so the Town may never look at the drainage. Mr. Cote said it didn’t make any sense to only re-pave the road because for the drainage to be done the road would need to be ripped up. He understood why Ms. Moore did not want the road to be redone. Mr. Culbert asked Mr. Cote to bring these points up at the Selectmen’s next meeting. Mr. Cote stated he would.

Mr. Loosigian told the Board the plan brought to the HSC did not have a full re-pavement proposition in it. That meeting happened after receiving feedback from the neighbors. The plan currently in front of the Board shows the proposed limit of work. Mr. Dadak asked for clarification. He wanted to know if the applicant would be going back to the HSC if the neighbors wanted road improvements to Foreman Lane. Mr. Loosigian said they have heard different opinions from several neighbors. Mr. Culbert wanted Mr. Cote to poll the Selectmen. Mr. Cote sent an email (during the meeting).

Ms. Kirkpatrick was curious who would maintain the drainage and basins once the project is done. Mr. Dubay replied all systems had easements granted to the Town. They were designed for easy maintenance. He added the shoulders had been expanded for snow storage. Mr. Bergeron commented he had a small set of plans that didn’t contain all pages.

The Board discussed the dates for the upcoming meetings. Mr. Dubay requested date specification to November 2nd. Mr. Doherty asked both Mr. Dubay and Mr. Keach to review the letter submitted by Ms. Moore to see if her concerns could be addressed. He also asked that written waiver requests be submitted.

The plan was date specified to November 2, 2020.

DISCUSSION

Discussion regarding adding Disallowed (Prohibited) Uses Table in the Mixed Use Zoning District ('MUZD') Ordinance

Discussion deferred.

Zoom meetings

Mr. Doherty wanted to know if the Board would reconsider not holding meetings via Zoom. Mr. Cote replied Covid was not looking good. He said if the number of cases continued to increase the Town Hall may be shut down. He said the State was reviewing issues. There was a discussion regarding how to proceed. At present the Board will continue conducting meetings in person with a connection via Zoom.

DATE SPECIFIED PLAN – November 2, 2020

Case #PL2020-00012 - Map 24 Lot 12-204 - LOOSIGIAN, Peter & Lisa - 8 Foreman Lane

NON-PUBLIC SESSION – If requested in accordance with RSA91-A:3

Not requested.

ADJOURN

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Montbleau – Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Mr. Cote- Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary