

Waterville Valley Planning Board
Summary of the Minutes for the
Regular Planning Board Meeting
Held on Thursday, October 8, 2015 at 8:00am

1) Chairman Terry Waite called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

2) Roll Call and seating of alternates:

Full members in attendance: Chairman Terry Waite, Vice-chair Cyndy Piekos, Bob Guilbert, Nancy Knight, Wendi Rathgeber, Harry Notowitz

Alternate Members in Attendance: Ray Kucharski, John Recine

Members Absent: Ex-Officio Bill Larsen

Alternate Members Absent: Kathy Chandler, Cheryl Saenger

Public in Attendance: Mark DeCoteau, Tina Koppel (Wig Wag rep), Bill Cantlin, John March

Alternates Seated: John Recine seated at 11:35

Ray Kucharski left the meeting at 11:30; Nancy Knight left the meeting at 11:35; Wendi Rathgeber left the meeting at 11:45

3) Review and Acceptance of the Minutes of September 10, 2015 Meeting.

Bob Guilbert made a motion to accept the regular meeting minutes of September 10, 2015 with amendments (as follows).

- *Second on accepting minutes from previous meeting (Line 39) amend to read Bob Guilbert*
- *Line 66 amend to read “The fence would **be** along the inside of the access road **and** along the inside of the ditch.”*
- *Line 78 amend to read “Mark DeCoteau said they would **need to** pick something that is allowed;....”*
- *Line 245 amend to read “larger than the wetlands they are trying to protect, in some cases. **He** would also....”*
- *Line 292 amend to read “of. Mark said **that** any replacement signs...”*

Wendi Rathgeber: 2nds.

Motion was carried by a unanimous vote.

4) New Business

Site Plan application ~ Moose Crossing Townhouses Tax Map 105-010.25 Brownstone Way

- Presented by John March of Mountain Mapping, representing owner Bob Digennaro. Alan Ward is also present to answer any questions pertaining to the construction.
- Terry Waite reminded the board that once the application has been presented there will be no further discussion outside of the meeting.
- John March mentioned the zoning issue which came up at the August presentation of the application. There was an error on the map. The zoning is Village Commercial (VC) versus Lower Density Residential (LDR). The error is noted on the zoning map.
- He added a diversion/drainage ditch to keep runoff away from the wet areas. He then noted the main road (Brownstone Way) will be paved with semi-impervious driveways.
- Mr. Waite noted there are no culverts under the driveway (two entrance areas). Asked about drainage going into a stone-lined pit. John said the size will hold a tremendous amount of runoff and is on-site; will not increase or decrease runoff to abutting properties.
- Mr. Waite asked if any drainage overflow would go toward the stream on the building side of the road. John March answered it would sheet flow along the side of the road toward the stream. Mr. Waite then asked if they had considered putting culverts there; John answered he personally would rather have a little dip as culverts require constant maintenance.
- John continued they have removed the dumpster (from the plan) as discussed at the August meeting.
- There will be two swales behind the building to divert the drainage from the steep areas; one feeds into a new swale and the other feeds into the drainage structure. This will keep water away from the back of the building.
- The propane tank will be buried (subsurface).
- Brownstone Way is private.
- John reminded the board there was an issue of height with the new building. 35' is the maximum allowed height. Alan Ward discussed this with Chris Hodges and it was determined the new building can be as high as the existing buildings. Measuring from the garage slab to the ridgeline, measured in the field, the height is 40'3".
- Discussion on building size regulations.
- Two parking spaces were removed (previous plan versus current one) for snow storage. In the event of a heavy snow year, snow would probably have to be carted away.

- Each unit will have two parking spaces – garage plus one.
- Mr. Waite asked about the bond in regards to this application. John answered the owner did not do a bond there in 2005.
- Mr. Waite asked Mark DeCoteau if the application could be left open. Mark answered no and in order to have them discuss it they need to accept the application as complete to be able to open a public hearing. Mark continued that a Subdivider Improvement Agreement is usually for municipal improvements like water & sewer lines, town roads, etc. This agreement would be between the town manager and a developer after approval. The board can require whatever they want.
- Discussion on bonding and what was done historically.
- Mr. Waite stated he would like to leave this open for discussion after acceptance. Mark said he would try to get an answer from town counsel.
- Ray Kucharski asked if the VC versus LDR concern had been answered. Mark said this property is located in VC and the new maps reflect the correct zoning.
- Mr. Waite suggested the application be presented as no bond, if they accept the application they can discuss if it will be required. John March was asked to change that on the application.
- Mr. Waite asked the board if there was further discussion as to the application being complete. No further discussion so he asked for a motion to accept the application as complete.
- Mr. Waite made a motion to accept the application as complete; motion seconded by Cyndy Piekos. All in favor
- **Public Hearing opened at 8:30 am.**
- Mr. Waite said he was concerned about the steepness of the slope and height of the wall on the backside of the building.
- John March commented the land between the two retaining walls will be graded so the slope is less than 8%. Two 10' retaining walls with the slope of land between them being AB by spec. John continued that he wanted three retaining walls but the engineering to do that didn't work. He showed on the chalk board the walls/slope/back of the building.
- Discussion on construction of the back wall.
- John March will update the plan to show dimensions of the retaining wall.
- Discussion on materials being used for retaining walls. The board would like to see what face design is planned for the retaining walls.
- Alan Ward informed the board they would be using bark mulch as a landscaping material on the section between the two retaining walls. Mr. Waite asked for that to be shown on the cross-section plan.
- Mr. Waite asked if other board members had concerns about drainage running down the side of the road over the two access drives, they don't know how much flow there is. He asked what might happen in the spring when snow melts and then the ice starts to build up. John replied he'll amend the plan to show direction of drainage.

- Bill Cantlin commented Waterville Company owns the property across the road. He wondered why the drainage on the opposite side of the road can't run to the north. He continued with they are supposed to put water in existing drainage channels and going around wetlands is a wasted effort. He would rather see a ditch on the south side and doesn't want sheet drainage if retention overflows.
- Mr. Waite said the area encompassing the new building drains down slope to the southwest or heads northwest into the existing stream. Maintaining the current flow would be better. Would have to slope from southeast corner of the back of the building toward the northwest.
- John March asked if the board wants him to have drainage go straight into the wetlands. Harry Notowitz asked if the Conservation Commission should look at the plan.
- Bill Cantlin answered it should go into an existing water course and pointed one out on the plan. Shows where drainage could follow the road.
- Mr. Waite asked Mr. Notowitz if the Conservation Commission might want to add anything about the ditch being on the north side of the building. Mr. Notowitz replied he can't answer unless they want the commission to look into it.
- Mr. Waite doesn't see the need for the ditch. Wendi Rathgeber also thought it would be better to not have the ditch as it could also divert water away from the wetlands.
- Bob Guilbert asked if there are lawns which could create a possibility of fertilizer flowing into those wetlands. John said hopefully they can plan use of plants with minimal fertilizing needs.
- Mr. Waite said he doesn't think the ditch provides anything positive to the drainage needs when John asked if he needs to remove the ditch.
- Mr. Notowitz commented regulations state to not reduce water flow into wetlands. If the ditch remains it would reduce the flow.
- Board members had no objection to removing the ditch.
- Mr. Notowitz asked Bill Cantlin if he had objection to splitting the drainage direction. Bill stated it was fine with him to have the overflow go onto his property.
- Mr. Waite suggested they (John March and Alan Ward) look at the design of the back wall of the foundation. He stated he cannot direct them to do anything.
- Mr. Waite asked about lighting to which John March said it is on the utility plan.
- John Recine asked if the backside of the building is 8' below grade. Alan Ward replied the fill is 7' below grade. 7' of fill against the back wall.
- Mr. Recine asked what they plan on doing to keep water from coming up into the floor of garages, what is being done for drainage in that area. Alan Ward went to the chalk board to show what they will be doing.
- Discussion on drainage at back of wall of building along with size/thickness of the back wall.
- Mr. Waite would like to have this information solidified.

- Ms. Rathgeber went over the key points of the information the board would like to see finalized:
 - Zoning changed (on plan to reflect correct zoning designation of VC)
 - Cross section for retaining walls
 - Show landscaping between the walls
 - Look of the retaining walls/photo of face to be used
 - Changes in the drainage. Show ditch heading into Waterville Company's property and note it on the north end.
 - Fix contours on sheets two and three
- John March responded the plans will show the drainage going under the proposed driveways as well.
- Mr. Waite asked if there was any further discussion on the current application. He continued there were too many changes to give a condition of approval at this time. The Public Hearing will be continued at the November 12, 2015 meeting. The board is reminded to not discuss the application outside of the meeting.

- **Conceptual Discussion on White Mtn. Athletic Club Field**

- Presented by Mark DeCoteau.
- The White Mtn. Athletic Club is thinking about changes to their pool area.
- They would like to clear the field between their facility and the school. They have asked the town to participate in that. They offered the school room for a playground behind the school which would get them out of the parking lot. The town would offer an easement/99-year lease to have the playground in that area.
- Combination between school/town/athletic center clearing the lot and moving the play area, improve the walking path between Curious George cottage area and the athletic center. Clear the interior of the land, install drainage and make a large grass field leaving a buffer of trees. Field will have parking offering access to the field. Details haven't been all worked out.
- Prefer it remain in private ownership. Rec. Dept. could have access in the summer rather than walk down to the Packard Field.
- Potential to add basketball courts offering interest for basketball camps.
- Went over wetlands study regarding this land with David Orlarsch. Small amounts of wetlands were identified on the property. They aren't talking above the state's threshold for disturbance. They could mitigate areas which would help improve drainage issues.
- The Select Board decided this will go before the Planning Board for approval and then it will go back to the Select Board.
- Zoning is Special Civic so what can go onto this property is limited.

○ **One-Way traffic pattern around the Village**

- Per Mark several years ago there was discussion regarding one-way traffic in town. Valley Road going around to Snows Brook, back out to Tecumseh. Everything else one way. The entire circle could be one way. It was never studied formally.
- Ms. Rathgeber said the Town Core Group had talked about this a bit. If they were looking at doing one way, where would they put signs. It was suggested to get feedback but first bring it to the boards.
- Mr. Kucharski said there was a lot of push back last time. The reason being simply change.
- Ms. Rathgeber said if they want everyone to become comfortable on the roadways they either have to expand them or restrict them.
- Discussion on how to do this – curbing, bicycles, etc.
- The consensus is they have to show a plan, something with visual concept, to be able to get support on this.
- Discussion on the traffic pattern covering various roads.
- Discussion on widening roads versus the one-way concept. It involves taking out the granite curbing and repaving which would be costly.
- Bill Cantlin commented he believes another aspect of one-way pattern is to help keep visitors from getting lost.
- Mr. Waite asked what the next step would be. Mark said the Select Board is waiting for the planning board's consensus before they discuss this any further.
- Mr. Guilbert asked if this was in conjunction with the Pedestrian Village Study. Ms. Rathgeber replied there won't be an answer until April 2016 on the grant they applied for. There won't be an answer on the Tiger grant until fall of 2016. It's the cycle of how town funding works.
- Mark said the cost is minimal ~ change the direction of traffic (paint, signs).
- Mr. Guilbert said people are going to ask why this is being done. They have to let people know the benefit.
- Mark suggested the board take a consensus to see if they feel this is worth the Select Board pursuing. He also suggested planning board member(s) talk to the Select Board to let them know the board's opinion.
- Mr. Waite asked the planning board members for their consensus as to how they feel regarding this issue.
 - Mr. Guilbert pursue proposal
 - Mr. Notowitz pursue proposal/will personally need convincing
 - Nancy Knight pursue proposal
 - Mr. Waite pursue proposal
 - Ms. Piekos pursue proposal
 - Ms. Rathgeber pursue proposal
 - Mr. Kucharski pursue proposal
 - Mr. Recine pursue proposal

- Select Board will meet on November 28th. Mark suggested the planning board have a couple of members attend.

5) Old Business

- **Skateboard Park Notice of Use Renewal.** To be added to the November Planning Board agenda.
- **Wetlands Regulations Draft.** Mr. Notowitz said the Conservation Commission submitted a letter to withdraw the application. They are seeking time to re-evaluate.
- **Changes to Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations.** Suggested changes have been approved. The only remaining question was the wording for the Registry of Deeds and the board had concluded they did not need to change the wording.
 - Move to Public Hearing
 - Mr. Notowitz made a motion to move the Changes to Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations before a Public Hearing at the Planning Board's November 12, 2015 meeting. Motion is seconded by Ms. Rathgeber.
 - All board members are in favor.
 - Copies of suggested changes attached to these minutes.
- **Dormitories in VC.** Mr. Notowitz commented he had done research on regulating dormitories in the Village Commercial zoning area. He found regulations for areas that do have specific regulations.
 - Mr. Notowitz continued they either need to encourage or discourage that use as they can't risk rowdy behavior from this group. Special Exception was mentioned or listing uses.
 - Mr. Waite commented that his problem with this issue was it appears they are trying to control the quality of the occupant. Ms. Rathgeber continued with asking how they would stop someone from calling a dormitory a multi-family dwelling.
 - Mr. Waite said the limitations have to be with the structure and facility and they would have a hard time controlling who the occupant is. He said he felt that is what the goal is. Controlling disturbance of the peace is more what they are trying to do.
 - Mr. Notowitz read his examples (San Diego, CA and Lowell, MA). The examples don't apply to Waterville Valley but show they do have restrictions.
 - Ms. Knight commented they need to define not regulate.
 - Mr. Kuchnoski said he felt Mr. Notowitz's concern was in using a single room to house several occupants or bunk rooms.
 - Mr. Notowitz said he was more concerned with the use than the structure; and perhaps it is best to deal with it if there is a noise problem.
 - Mr. Waite replied this is why there are police and noise ordinances.

- Mr. Notowitz said to drop the issue due to lack of desire to make the changes.
- There was discussion on changes that were done at the time of various zoning changes. This will be put on the agenda for the November meeting.

6) Communications

- **North Country Council “Containing Local Highway Costs”** ~ Ms. Piekos stated she is planning on attending this meeting being held in Plymouth.
- **Letter from the Conservation Committee** ~ Withdrawal of application to draft wetlands regulations (letter mentioned in Old Business)

7) Committee Reports

- **Town Core Group (presented by Wendi Rathgeber)**
 - The group met October 1. The Our Town Grant for \$120,000 is a matching grant with the town needing to come up with \$60,000 which is reflected in the CIP. They will hear soon if they are rejected, if approved they should know by April 2016 with work being able to start in August.
 - TAP grant requires matching funds which is why they are focusing on the Tiger grant which is straight out grant money. They will need to hire an engineering firm to lay out plans first. This would be in regards to transportation system.
 - A Benefit Cost Analysis would need to be done with an approx. cost of \$40,000.
 - Both of these would be a plus as they would be a large income source.
 - Mark had suggested Grafton County Economic Council and/or PSU students being brought in to help defray the cost.
 - The Tiger grant deadline is in July.
 - Ms. Rathgeber reported Bill Cantlin is hitting a brick wall with lighting. He recommended hiring a lighting engineer and this could be another funding potential.
 - Ms. Rathgebeger also reported on signage. In trying to prevent sign changes she checked the sign ordinance (page 27) and it already states that the Select Board gets involved with any sign changes.
 - Mr. Guilbert asked if the grant might help business owners with funds to get their signs converted all at once rather than have it take several years.
 - There was discussion on the power of the Select Board and the Our Town grant in regards to signage.
- **First Draft of 2016-2021 CIP (presented by Mark DeCoteau)**
 - Copy of CIP attached to these minutes.

8) Tickler Files

- **C1 Density**
- **Shared Parking**
- **Restricted Parking**

9) Adjournment

Mr. Notowitz motions to adjourn the meeting at 12:05 am.

Mr. Guilbert: 2nds.

Motion was carried by a unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Pelchat

Planning Board Coordinator

Waterville Valley Town Office