

**OSSIPEE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 7, 2016**

Minutes recorded by Laura Nash, Planning Board Secretary; amendments are noted by ***bold/italic*** type.

Call to Order: Ski called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Attendance by roll call: Connie Billings, Bruce Parsons, Dennis Legendre, Ski Kwiatkowski, Frank Riley, Bob Gillette, Rick St. Jean (Alternate) and Steve McConarty **Absent:** Roy Barron
Rick St. Jean was moved up to voting status.

Meeting Minutes: Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2016 were reviewed and corrected.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean., seconded by Bruce P., to approve the minutes from May 17, 2016.
All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

New Business

- **Case #16-3-SUB:** Mark E. & Jane M. Wright – Tax Map: 104 Lot: 14 – Bents Road, request for subdivision of 3.58 acre lot, Lot 1, from a 128 acre lot. Also seeking a waiver for Subdivision Regulations 8.01.N for topography to be shown 200 ft. beyond the boundary and seeking 6 waivers on the remaining 124.4 acres, Lot 2.

James Rines – White Mtn Surveying & Engineering – presented case representing Mark & Jane Wright in plans to subdivide property for estate planning purposes. Existing lot is 128 acres and approximately 1,300 ft. of road frontage on Bents Rd and over 6,000 ft. of combined water frontage on Big & Little Dan Hole Ponds. The subdivided lot is 3.58 acres east on Bents Rd. with no water frontage. Water frontage will remain with existing campground. The plans delineate the wetlands and the Ossipee Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance which requires 1 acre ... as well as comply with soil and slope ordinance. Some slopes are greater than 25% and those cannot be counted towards the minimum lot size. You can build on them but they cannot be counted towards the minimum lot size also the wetlands cannot be counted towards the minimum lot size either. Received NH DES subdivision approval. Jim stated they're requesting several waivers for this property. **Waiver #1:** from section 8.01.N which requires topography to be 200 ft. from the boundary lines requesting for subdivided lot of 3.58 acres. **Waiver #2:** from section 8.01.N which requires topography to be 200 ft. from the boundary lines requesting for remaining lot of 124.4 acres. **Waiver #3:** from section 8.01.L for wetland delineation of all remaining land. **Waiver #4:** 8.01.N for five-foot contours. **Waiver #5:** 8.01.O for soil types, test pits and percolation tests. **Waiver #6:** from section 8.01.Q for soil types, test pits and percolation tests. **Waiver #7:** from section 9.05.L for location of remaining land boundary. **Waiver #8:** 9.05.P for location of all natural and man-made features. Justification for this is because lot 2 is 124.4 acres in size, fully developed, and the additional cost will not offer an equivalent benefit to the Boards review. **Waiver #9:** request a waiver to sending a copy of the plan to the electric company. **Waiver #10:** for curb cut approval from Brad Harriman as requested on the checklist until the lot is developed.

John Danforth: voiced his concerns for the extreme slopes and how ant construction filters down to Dan Hole Pond, which is what the Dan Hole Watershed Trust was named after. John Danforth also questioned if the Conservation Commission has done a walk through. A brief discussion of the regulations were explained to Mr. Danforth and Jim Rines stated how they have complied with all the rules and regulations for this subdivision. The PB advised Mr. Danforth, he has 30 days to express his concerns to the Conservation Commission.

Ski K.: with no further comments discussion was closed.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean., seconded by Bob G., to approve the application as complete.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver #1 & 2: section 8.01.N requires topography to be 200 ft. from the boundary lines

Motion: by Connie B., seconded by Bob G., to approve the waiver for the 3.58 acres lot and all remaining land 124.4 acres. **All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.**

Waiver #3: section 8.01.L for wetland delineation of all remaining land.

Motion: by Connie B., seconded by Bob G., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver #4: section 8.01.N for five-foot contours

Motion: by Connie B., seconded by Bruce P., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver #5 & 6: section 8.01.O & Q for soil types, test pits and percolation tests

Motion: by Rick St. Jean., seconded by Connie B., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver #7: from section 9.05.L for location of remaining land boundary.

Motion: by Connie B., seconded by Bruce P., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver # 8: section 9.05.P for location of all natural and man-made features.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean., seconded by Bruce P., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Waiver #9 & 10: request a waiver to sending a copy of the plan to the electric company and for curb cut approval from Brad Harriman as requested on the checklist until the lot is developed.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean., seconded by Bob G., to approve the waiver for the 124.4 acres lot.

Discussion: Bruce P., questioned if we waive these two items, do we have no say in what happens after that? Jim Rines explained, when the applicant goes to develop the owners will need to get a drive permit from the town and they would need to see the power company at that time. The power company would negate where the poles and lines will go based on the plans and design of the house.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Motion: by Connie B., seconded by Rick St. Jean., to approve the subdivision.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

Informal Discussion:

- **John Puchacz:** Puchacz Family Trust – 946 Route 16 - Tax Map: 123 Lot: 9 - Wants to add 4 ft. to existing structure where tree used to be.

Ski: read the informal discussion and indicated the applicant is looking for a Special Exception

John Puchacz: presented his plans to repair the rear roof damage caused by two trees which had fallen on the cabin and enclose where it had been built around the tree stump. John Puchacz also indicated wanting to expand the rear (length) by 4 ft. He started the construction but was stopped by the ZEO, Steve McConarty because of no permits. John P., received Shoreland permit and now presents to the town PB.

Bob G., indicated the owner should go before the ZBA for a variance or special exception and refer the question to Steve McConarty.

Steve M., indicated depending on the zoning ordinance for this area if it's commercial the PB would oversee but if it's residential then the ZBA would oversee this discussion.

Bob G., stated the SPR regulations only pertain to commercial or multi-unit housing. Either way the Certificate of Denial says he needs to apply to the ZBA.

John P., explained he eventually wants to rent out two of the cabins to the public. After discussion, John Puchacz was informed by the PB that he needs to present his case to the ZBA for a Special Exception for

the building construction he wants to do and then return to the PB for a Site Plan Review to make the property commercial in order to rent out two of the cabins.

Ski K., read the Zoning Ordinance 23.3.2 – a non-conforming structure may be expanded or altered by a Special Exception under Article 26.2, as a business or conditions warrant, providing, however, that such expansion does not make a conforming structure non-conforming or a non-conforming structure more non-conforming. John Puchacz was referred to the ZBA for a Special Exception.

Unsatisfied Conditions: Updates in Blue

| Board | Hearing Date | Applicant | List of Conditions |
|-------|--------------|--------------------------------|---|
| PB | 11/03/15 | LBWD (new name) | Ltr stating he limit manufacturing to light industry only- Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #1: Official Letter from Fire Chief - Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #2: Driveway permit approval from NHDOT- Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #3: Final Sale Agreement/Deed - Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #4: Sanitary/Septic approvals - Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #5: Town Water Connections/Permits - Pending |
| PB | 05/03/2016 | Lisciotti Dev't/Dollar General | SPR granted pending 6 conditions: #6: Subdivision Plan approval by PB - Pending |
| PB | 05/17/2016 | Aubuchon Hardware | Impervious percentage of 46%, Town percentage is 40% - Steve M., per visual review - coverage is close to 65 – 70% but not sure if surface is pervious or impervious. Steve to follow up. |

* Items attached for Board review and decision.

Old Business:

• **Case #16-1-SPR – Mountain Grainery Distillery:** Tax Map 130 Lot: 9; Conditional SPR Granted on February 16, 2016. Conditions have been submitted as follows: Here for final approval.

1. Obtain NHDOT driveway permit – we have received this permit – [Received 03/04/2016](#)
2. Obtain NHDES septic system approval – we have received this approval/permit – [Received 05/24/2016](#)
3. Obtain NHDES alteration of terrain permit – we have received this permit – [Received 03/21/2016](#)
4. Obtain Approval from Chief Riley of Ossipee Fire – PB received the approval letter from Chief Riley – [Received 05/24/2016](#)

Ashe Fischbein and Shawn Bergeron: present for comments. Ashe restated the final approval was based on meeting the 4 conditions listed above and all copies were provided to the PB Secretary.

Motion: by Bob G., seconded by Rick St. Jean., to approve final approval SPR with Conditions met.

All in favor by show of hands, motion passed.

The following case will be transcribed word for word per official recording:

• **Case #16-3-SPR – Westward Shores Lakeside Camping Resort,** 110 Nichols Road, Tax Map 29, Lot 1, 23-6, 23-7, 23-8, 24-15, 24-18, 24-19, 24-40, 28-5, 28-6, 29-2, 29-3, 38-15 for expansion of a recreational camping park. [Continued from May 3, 2016 PB Meeting.](#)

The following letters were received for **PB information only** concerning WWSCG: (Copies in packet)

- **Wild life Corridor Report:** by Gove Environmental Services, Inc.

- **NHDES:** Ltr Received on April 28, 2016 - Request for more information pertaining to application of Wetland File #2016-00369, Northgate Ossipee LLC, 110 Nichols Rd, W. Ossipee, Tax Map/Lot #28 & 29 /5 & 1 – RSA 482-A:3, XIV (a)(2) NH Standard Dredge & Fill Law.
- **NH Div. of Historical Resources** – Ltr Received May 4, 2016 - receipt of request for review for the short report prepared by Dr. Robert Goodby
- **NHDES:** on April 12, 2016 - Request for more information pertaining to application of Alteration of Terrain #160309-030 - **NHDES:** on May 18, 2016 - Approval of application of Alteration of Terrain, Permit: AoT – 1088 for Tax Map: 24 Lot: 15
- **Mr. & Mrs. Patrick Fatyol:** Ltr received 05/17/2016 wanting it read during meeting.
- **Green Mountain Conservation Group:** Ltr Received on May 18, 2016 – Stating misinformation being presented by SFC Engineering; based on ZBA Meeting Minutes of March 8, 2016. Issue was addressed at ZBA Meeting on May 10, 2016.
- **Green Mountain Conservation Group:** Ltr Received on May 18, 2016 – ltr from GRCG to Craig Day of NHDES of Wetland Bureau, voicing concerns.
- **Ossipee Lake Alliance:** Letter received 05/23/2016 - Denies approval of letter written from Bob Reynolds.
- **Freedom Conservation Commission:** Ltr Received on June 1, 2016 - Concerns for “Potential Water Contamination & Development Regional Concerns of RSA 36-A: 2
- **NH Div. of Historical Resources:** Received 06/02/2016 – Proposed Wetland Impact on Map: 29 Lot: 1 and expansion. No Historic Properties affected – Report acceptable.
- **Hastings Malia, Public Attorney’s:** Letter Received 06/02/2016 - clarifying potential miss quotes from previous meetings.
- **Hastings Malia, Public Attorney’s:** Letter Received 06/06/2016 – responding to allegations that had been made in the local newspaper regarding statements made at a ZBA meeting by his client’s and have since been posted to Ossipee Lake Alliance website and additional allegations from Freedom Conservation Commission.
- **Effingham Conservation Commission:** Ltr Received on June 6, 2016 - Concerns for “Potential Regional Impact” under RSA 36:54 through RSA 36:57

Ski K., started the discussion by reading the subject of the above letters but first Ski wanted to bring to the attention the PB received letters from Freedom & Effingham’s Conservation Commissions.

Note: PB members were provided copies of each letter and Dan Flores was also provided copies at this meeting.

Ski K., did not feel a need to read the complete letter but give a general synopsis. Both Effingham and Freedom are concerned that they were not notified of the Westward Shores application. Given that they are abutters in a sense to this project on the lake.

Ski K., ask Bob Gillette to provide the reference.

Bob G., Both (Effingham & Freedom CC letters) site RSA 36:56 to 36:58. Which the RSA was designed to ensure that if a community feels it is likely to be affected by a development, a regional affected development across a town’s boundary they should be invited first of all to be given status of abutters and invited to provide testimony to the relevant land use Board. In this case the Planning Board. To site the relevant sections RSA 36:56 says “A local land use Board, (i.e. Planning Board) upon receipt of an application for development, shall review it promptly and determine whether or not the development, if approved, reasonably could be construed as having the potential for regional impact.” This later defined to include impact on shared bodies of water, streams, and aquifers. “Doubt concerning regional impact shall be resolved in a determination that the development has a potential regional impact.” The other reference RSA 36:57 says “Upon determination that a proposed development has a potential regional impact, the local land use board shall afford the regional planning commission (i.e. Lakes Region Planning Commission) and the affected municipalities the status of abutters as defined in RSA 672:3 for the limited purpose of providing notice and giving testimony.” So, Effingham and Freedom have requested to be given status as abutters before any final decision is made in this case and be given the opportunity to present their point of view to

the this PB, the Town of Effingham and Freedom and I think simple neighborly curiosity requires us to do this if not law, actually the law does actually. Anyone who wants to read this, I have a copy of the full RSA but it's only those two paragraphs that are relevant one here I just read.

Ski K., suggested Laura N., - PB Secretary, should communicate to both of the Towns of the development, as I don't know as we (PB) will be making a final determination tonight. So it would give them a chance to a

Bob G., says it indicates the PB should make a formal determination that this project has a regional impact

Dennis L., questioned if you have State and Federal permitting WWSCG has to go through. Is that correct?

Ski K., replied yes.

Dennis L., continued saying if they have to have all these permits done and given to the PB before the PB can make a decision.

Ski K., replied, that's correct.

Dennis L., continued, The Town of Ossipee as Zoning Ordinances, they (WWSCG) have to follow, is that correct? If they meet all of those, I can understand maybe they want to have a conversation about it but what could they possibly say or do that could affect the outcome.

Bob G., replied, you could ask the same of any abutters within Ossipee, who are land owners and I would say probably, possibly nothing but who knows. But the abutters by law have to have a right to express their point of views, their concerns and have their concerns satisfied. Maybe just by stating the following regulations have been complied with but we can't exclude our own abutters and this state law, quite clearly I think, gives this status of abutters to neighboring towns when they express a concern like this. So I present seeing any harm in inviting them here to our next meeting. But we need to make the determination. Now if there's disagreement among us as to whether this has a regional impact, it says here (regulation book 36:56 - I) by definition has a regional impact.

Bruce P., if we are going to say they are abutters, then we cannot listen to this case today because they (Town of Effingham & Freedom) legally have to be notified.

Bob G., replied, I think that would be right.

Ski K., stated, I think the part of the impact on the two towns would be the water traffic and or the water quality/pollution

Bob G., specified, water pollution because of septic issues.

Ski K., continued, because when it's (septic) in the water and it goes all over.

Bob G., confirms based on the points made in these two letters this what they are concerned with.

Bruce P., states, so we have to determine if they are abutters or not. Is that the Lakes Region Planning Commission too?

Bob G., replied, No, if this has a "potential regional impact" if it does then they are granted the status of abutters under this RSA.

Dennis L., question is, is it...does it? I understand then we are setting a precedence that anyone who wants to build on Ossipee Lake, any size property with a septic system, then every town should have a say in it.

Bob G., I disagree with that, it says "potential regional impact," so somebody building a house is not going to have a regional impact. But somebody building a project that might bring 500 extra people in using a septic system which could potentially effect lake quality as their concern. That does probably feel like a regional impact and that's the point their making.

Rick St. Jean commented; it would have been nice if Freedom afforded us the same opportunity when they approved the campground over there.

Bob G., it probably would have been nice.

Ski K., noted Danforth Bay Campground.

Bob G. asked; did we ask them for that privilege, probably not.

Rick St. Jean stated; he was not on the PB at the time.

Bob G., stated he was there and we did not.

Ski K., But they are both formally by letter asking for inclusion

Bob G., as on the grounds that this is likely to having a "potential regional impact."

Ski K., acknowledged Peter Malia, attorney with Hastings/Malia from Fryeburg, Me., representing the applicant.

Peter Malia; I noticed some of you have the red book (NH Planning and Land Use Regulations) containing the statutes. This is a decision for you obviously, not us or any of the abutters, the PB to determine if this is a case of regional impact but RSA 36:55 does give you 6 categories and if an application falls into any of those categories then it will qualify as a case of regional impact, so if you want to look through 36:55 category 1 – 6. Those are your criteria's for determining whether this is an application of regional impact. I would suggest a town merely sending a letter and expressing an interest does not necessarily qualify this as a case of regional impact but it has to fit into one of these six categories.

Bob G., asked Peter Malia, if he had read the letters.

Peter Malia, responded no.

Bob G., stated the letter specifically site that section

Peter Malia stated, whatever the decision is...its fine with them. If you do decide this is a regional impact

Bob G., interrupted by stating they site reference #5 under 36:55 which states "Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries."

Peter Malia; acknowledged, that would certainly might be the one that qualifies because the other five don't apply at all. So if any it would be that one. So an argument can be made that any application that affects Ossipee Lake or any lake or body of water can be under that analysis of case of regional impact. That's decision for you to make...we do ask if you do decide this is a case of regional impact that we at least be allowed to give you an update on where things stand as of tonight. Understanding there won't be a final vote tonight. We are here and a couple of my clients have come out from Michigan. We would like to just give you an update on some of the pending issues if you do allow Effingham and Freedom to come in.

Bob G., amplified what points **Connie B.**, has made; per RSA 36:55 Definitions. Point #1 under the criteria states: "Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock."

Bob G., so we really do need to take into consideration in determining the scale of this project. It's one person building a house or one small business, but it's quite a large project.

Motion: by Bruce P., seconded by Bob G., to consider regional impact

Ski K., asked for discussion...with No Discussion

All in favor by show of hands: Connie Billings, Bruce Parsons, Ski Kwiatkowski, Bob Gillette, and Rick St. Jean (Alternate) voted in favor.

Dennis Legendre stated with state and federal government in our town, we set our regulations for zoning and if you ignore those I don't think the town has anything to do with this; I think it's a waste of time.

Opposed by show of hands: Dennis Legendre and Frank Riley, **with a vote of 5 – 2 the motion passed to consider of having a regional impact.**

Rick St. Jean asked a question, due to the complexity of the plans and the infrastructure requirements; I think the Board should consider having an independent review of the engineering.

Bob G., asked if we (PB) could consider this separately. Rick agreed.

Bob G., so we have taken a vote with an outcome vote of 5-2 in favor of considering this a regional impact. So Effingham and Freedom should be notified and Lakes Region Planning Commission, which acts as an arbiter in these matters, be notified.

Bruce P., stated be notified as abutters

Ski K., and **Bob G.**, agreed notified as abutters according to the RSA.

Bruce P., stated, seeing as we have to continue this meeting/application now

Ski K., we can still hear him talk but there's a chance at our next meeting, when we have the other participants, that this might have to be repeated.

Peter Malia agreed. As previously stated I represent Northgate Ossipee, LLC. With me tonight are George Ferdette and Dan Flores from SFC Engineering, Greta and Chelsea Bossenbroek from Northgate Ossipee, LLC, and TJ Lawrence, Campground Manager. Thank you for having us here tonight and I would first like to begin by addressing some allegations of misrepresentations made in the local paper and another local

publication over the past month or so. After that I would like to turn it over to George and Dan to give you an update on some of the loose ends that are pending. There was an article in the CCI on May 12, 2016, entitled “Westward Shores Expansion Plans Fails Fact Checks,” that article referenced a ZBA meeting which took place on May 8, 2016. That article said George and Dan from SFC Engineering, said that they had been in contact with and had the support of several organizations.

Laura N., corrected Peter Malia; the ZBA meeting was on March 8th not May 8, 2016.

Peter Malia, continued; the article in the CCI said that George and Dan from SFC Engineering, had made representations to the ZBA on March 8, 2016 that they had been in contact with and had support of several local organizations, when in fact according to the article they had not. I would like to address each of those 3 allegations starting with Ossipee Lake Alliance (OLA). A letter was submitted on May 31, 2016, Mr. Chairman have you received this letter and was it copied to the other Board members.

Laura N., replied yes.

Peter Malia; addressed the following allegations:

Allegation #1: in that letter I started with OLA and my clients had in fact been in contact with OLA prior to the March 8, 2016 meeting. Greta Bossenbroek, who is here tonight, had talked with Bob Reynolds and David Smith. Greta also had email exchanges with Davis Smith, and then Mr. Reynolds from the OLA had written a letter on OLA letter head and sent it to the ZBA prior to the March 8, 2016 meeting. So it was perfectly reasonable for us, my clients and the engineers, to assume that a letter written on OLA letter head from I believe a Board Director, constituted the position of that organization. So, there was no misrepresentation made on March 8, 2016 to the ZBA regarding OLA. We had in fact been in touch with the folks at OLA, they had submitted a letter on letter head to the ZBA, we didn’t write the letter and put it on OLA letter head, somebody from OLA did. So, it’s reasonable for us to assume that was the position of OLA. Turns out maybe it wasn’t subsequently. But apparently, the Board decided that Mr. Reynolds, who wrote the letter on OLA letter head, wasn’t speaking for the organization. To me that’s more of an internal issue for the OLA Board to address. We have since been in contact with OLA regarding this project. March 8, 2016 there was no misrepresentation made regarding OLA.

Allegation #2: NH Audubon Society and Chris Martin – just to note the minutes of these meetings are not transcriptions. They are summaries of what is said but I thought the minutes of the March 8, 2016 ZBA meeting were well done although this particular portion of the minutes, I think were inaccurate. Prior to the March 8th meeting, Dan Flores had been in touch with NH Fish & Game (NH F&G) via email quite a bit. Dan had not been directly in touch with Chris Martin with NH Audubon Society. The closest Dan Flores came to speaking with Chris Martin, was an email exchange with Kim Tuttle of NH F&G dated February 18, 2016. In that email Dan Flores said to Kim Tuttle, and Chris Martin was copied on it, Mark Garland would be available to meet Chris Martin at the campground entrance. That’s when Chris Martin from NH Audubon Society was making arrangement to come to the campground to do his study, look for eagles’ nests. So Dan Flores communicated with Kim Tuttle that somebody named Mark Garland would let Chris Martin into the campground on such and such date. That’s as close as the communication between Dan Flores and Chris Martin. The minutes incorrectly imply that either Dan or George setup a meeting on March 8th and had spoken with Chris Martin. I don’t know if there is a recording of that meeting, if so it would be helpful, neither Dan nor George recall saying on March 8th, I think they would have said on March 8th that they spoke with Chris Martin, because in fact as of March 8th they had not. They had been communicating with Kim Tuttle of NH F&G. So to the extent of minutes of March 8th indicate that either Dan or George said they talked to Chris Martin. I would suggest that particular portion of those minutes are inaccurate. They wouldn’t have said that because they didn’t talk to Chris Martin by that date.

Allegation #3 – GMCG: I think the controversy involving GMCG is from an incomplete sentence involving the March 8th meeting. The sentence says “George states they met the GMCG,” there’s something missing from the sentence. We believe the word “standard” is missing because that conversation was taking place on view sheds. In any event, George and Dan had relayed to the ZBA, on March 8th, that review of the GMCG standards from their website of model ordinances and they compared those to this project. So the missing word is “standards.” George states they met GMCG “standards.” Apparently the author of the

article in the CCI, took it upon herself to insert the word “met with” into that sentence. So she read it to me and states “George met with GMCG,” and that I don’t believe is what George or Dan conveyed to the ZBA on March 8th. What they did say was they looked at the GMCG standards and compared them to this project and here’s where they come out.

Bob G., asked, the word “with” does not appear in the minutes.

Peter Malia replied, no. The minutes say, “George states they met the GMCG.” We believe it meant to say “George states they met the GMCG standards.” So it was just a typo or an incomplete sentence. It was put in an article and GMCG read the article and demanded an apology from George and Dan. Saying, why did you show up at the March 8th meeting and say you met with us when in fact you had not. We didn’t say we met. We said we met your “standards.” A lot of this is tempers in a teapot but it is affecting George and Dan’s reputation and the reputation of Northgate Ossipee and the community, unfortunately.

So to conclude this discussion of March 8th, neither my client’s nor the engineers misrepresented on March 8th their interactions with any state agencies or local conservation groups. My letter to you on May 31st does say when did a thorough review of all the minutes and everything that had been written and said. We did find one sentence, Dan had written to you the PB in a letter on March 14, 2016 that was poorly worded. Dan has subsequently submitted a new letter correcting a sentence. But on March 14th, Dan wrote to you and he said, we have worked with state agencies as well as two private environmental protection groups the OLA and GMCG. As I just explained, it’s true with state agencies. I think it’s true in regards to Ossipee Lake Alliance, but not entirely accurate in regards to GMCG. Again, what Dan meant to say in my May 31st letter was that they met the GMCG standards. So, Dan has submitted a corrected letter to the PB.

Bob G., so that letter did contain the word “with” meaning a face to face meeting of some kind. Can I ask, have they had any face to face meetings with GMCG or OLA Board other than Mr. Reynolds? **Peter M.**, deferred to Dan Flores for response. **Dan Flores** replied, he has since met with GMCG. **Greta Bossenbroek** – Northgate Ossipee, stated she did speak with David Smith, OLA back in March. It was not face to face but we did speak on the phone for about 30 minutes. Bob Reynolds was on the call at the same time but then his call drop off and then it was just me and David Smith.

Peter Malia (cont.) - the poorly worded March 14, 2016 statements, “as we’ve worked with state agencies, as well as two private environmental protection groups, the OLOA and GMCG. Dan now realizes to say on March 14, 2016, to say that he “work with the GMCG” was not entirely accurate. He had worked with the GMCG standards. He submitted a new letter to you correcting that statement. On March 8, 2016, they are fairly certain they would have told the ZBA “we worked with the GMCG standards.” We did not meet with anybody from GMCG. More recently the OLA, posted an article on their website called the “Alliance Report,” and a new allegation has emerged on that article again regarding the March 8th ZBA meeting. That allegation is in relation to Officer Scott MacLaine, NH Marine Patrol. I wrote another letter to the PB and ZBA and I wanted to make sure you have that letter Mr. Chairman, it’s June 3, 2016. It was sent via overnight mail and were the Board members given copies. Because I wanted to respond to that as well.

Laura N. confirmed receipt of the letters and copies were provided to the Board members. Peter Malia (cont.) so, the minutes of March 8th ZBA meeting, say “George spoke with Scott MacLaine, who has no issue with the expansion of Ossipee Lake. He also said, the river and coves remain fairly busy on the weekends but the larger parts of the Lake remain open.

Bob G., asked Scott MacLaine is with who?

Peter Malia replied; he is with the NH Marine Patrol. My letter dated June 3, 2016 addresses this and it was actually Dan Flores not George, who spoke with Scott MacLaine. Dan spoke with Mr. MacLaine on March 1, 2016 and although whoever from OLA, who contacted Scott MacLaine, apparently he said to them he vaguely recollects talking to him. Although Mr. MacLaine only has a vague recollection to this conversation. Dan took contemporaneous notes of his conversation with Scott MacLaine of March 1st. I have copies of those notes and I quoted them in my letter to you dated June 3rd. His notes say Scott MacLaine, Marine Patrol, State Police, No Rules, nothing on their end, all lakes are crowded, weekends only, rivers plus bays, all traffic, large areas empty, not overcrowded now, “no issue.” Dan says he would not put “no issue” in quotes unless it was said to him.

Bob G., It seems we have quite a tangle of hearsay here. That you representing or trying to represent making your most honest effort to represent what other people you have spoken to have said. It seems to me that it would be useful if the other people would submit their own dealings directly to the PB or any other Board that's interested in this and tell us what they think of this project, good, bad, or indifferent.

Rick St. Jean said; there's a history of this kind of stuff with OLA, especially with David Smith.

Bob G., if they have a view, an agreed view among themselves, then I for one would like to hear what it is same thing GMCG and the Marine Patrol? But I don't think it should be incumbent on you in the first place to tell us what other people are thinking about this project.

Peter Malia; well, thank you and certainly by notifying all interested or affected parties. We're notifying them of what we're doing and we're giving them an opportunity to weigh in if they deem necessary.

Bob G., that's what we do here.

Peter Malia, but the allegations and misrepresentations printed in the local newspapers have been disturbing and I think it has negatively impacted our collective reputations. We felt the need to address those allegations.

Ski K., it's just too bad that the people, who supposedly or are involved are not here.

Bob G., maybe they are here.

Peter Malia, I would like to conclude my opening remarks, and then I will turn it over to Dan and George to update you on their various efforts to obtain all the necessary approvals. I appear before a lot of local Boards and so do these guys, and our reputation is very important. We would never intentionally lie about a meeting that didn't happen or a conversation that didn't take place in an effort to gain approval. That would just be stupid. Even if we did get the approval, our clients are going to need to come back before you in the future for ...I'm sure there will be more visits back to the PB and ZBA. We are working hard to be as accurate as we can in relaying information to you. We feel like we have been accurate. We will certainly try to be more precise in the words we use but we will never intentionally misrepresent any meeting or conversation that took place.

Bob G., you might also avoid hearsay in the future.

Peter Malia, we could certainly invite people to write letters. We can't force them too... Mr. Reynolds wrote a letter and look where that got him.

Ski K., before we continue there was a question in the back.

Corey Lane – GMCG; I'm the Water Quality Coordinator and Project Manager for the Ossipee Watershed Management Plan. I am here to represent GMCG and we do not support this project as our mission is water quality protection. I did not meet with anyone from this group. I did speak with Greta Bossenbroek briefly. It was very far from an approving conversation. I offered to set up a meeting and you called me last Wednesday or Thursday to set up a meeting for either yesterday or today, which was not possible. GMCG wants to make it clear, we are not in support of this and personally, the organization, as he's been stating would like to see how he is saying that WWSCG is meeting the "standards" they have taken from GMCG website. I don't feel like this development is something that would be ...

Bob G., know what would be really useful, in my personal opinion here, if you all met with the engineering firm and went over your standards and try to determine, if in your own minds, you may disagree but see if they are complying with GMCG suggested standards and you both submit something in writing that says and expresses your points of view. You may disagree.

Corey Lane – GMCG; we submitted letters

Bob G., complaining about the confused hearsay. I want to see your view and I want to hear the developers view and engineering view and how they comply with your "standards." Do we have that?

Corey Lane – GMCG; replied, No.

Connie B., acknowledged we do have letters from GMCG.

Bob G., questioned if they demonstrate their views.

Corey Lane – GMCG; we schedule a meeting for June 15, 2016, I don't have my calendar with me, but because we're very as well, we couldn't do right away. We scheduled a meeting to discuss the issues that are at hand but it has not been before this.

Bob G., but what we can do is as abutters come forward or organizations come forward, we can get you all together with the developer to work out your differences and concerns. If there's no resolution, tell us!

Corey Lane – GMCG; we did meet with Dan Flores as well. According to Dan, I don't have my notes from that day, there's really not much room for negotiations to summarize from what I took away from the conversation. The peninsula very important to develop. I didn't feel like there was much to discuss at that meeting. Which is why we have set up another meeting.

Bob G., if someone has a view as to how this project could be made better for environmental and other points of view, we would welcome that. We could discuss it with the developer.

Peter Malia; if we could start focusing on the merits of the application instead of pointing fingers as to who said what on March 8th.

Bob G., replied, yes.

Peter Malia; so if I could this over to George and Dan to update you on where things stand. Is this the appropriate time for this?

Ski K., yes, was there another question in the back.

Greta Bossenbroek; stated she did have her hand raised earlier but stated she had emailed Corey Lane on March 15, 2016. They tried to setup a meeting but things were hectic for GMCG at that time but she asked me to let her know the next I'm in town. Which I did last week but again they were busy. So we tried.

Bob G., and Ski K., both stated do your best to get together.

Ski K., This has been going on since February or March and there have been time when things could have been discussed and people have gotten together. Now all of a sudden, there was a call last week to get together.

Greta Bossenbroek; stated no, March 15th, was her original email.

Bob G., indicated the distance their apart tonight and to work out a time to meet.

George Ferdette – SFC Engineering; jokingly said Corey Lane lets meet on June 15th?

Corey Lane replied, 10 o'clock.

George Ferdette – SFC Engineering Partnerships; before we move on from this conversation. I was a primary presenter on March 8th, meeting. It was in response to the ZBA having tabled previously looking for more information. We came back and delivered lots of information. In fact, there was a hand out of everything. My speaking notes were handed out to each of the members. As Peter just said, what I said and what people heard, at least in some cases, has been two different things. We are the engineers, the merit of the application are based on our design and the facts that we present. I stand before you tonight, saying I stand behind everything that was said that night. I want to clarify that if anybody has any concerns about what they've heard, read, seen, what I said, I would like to address those tonight. Because there was nothing on the table ... it was a public meeting. That's why I'm here tonight. I will respond to any questions about what was said at the meeting and then I will turn it over to Dan so he can update you further.

Ski K., asked if anyone from the Board have any questions.

Bob G., I think your attorney has done a fine job of sorting out the hearsay.

George Ferdette; thanked Mr. Gillette for his thoughts and suggestions. George turned the meeting over to Dan Flores.

Dan Flores; we have submitted the entire 31 page plan set including the septic tonight. On page 1 - we have included the NH DES permits we have received. Since the last meeting we have received the AoT permit, Shoreland permit, and well location approvals. The overview plan (pg. 3) we had previously proposed using an existing well on the peninsula. That has been moved to a new location in the upland area (illustrated on map) and does have NHDES approval. All proposed wells have NHDES approval. Another item requested was the WWSCG seasons has been added to the overview plan (pg. 3) as a note.

Bob G., questioned what are the seasons?

Dan F., read from the plans: Summer season is from first full weekend of May to the first weekend after Columbus Day. Winter season is from the day before Thanksgiving to March 15th (limited occupancy subject to approval by West Ossipee Fire Chief)

Bruce P., asked if they're going to change their sign.

Dan F., did not have an answer

George F., addressed the question by stating – We hadn't addressed any modifications to that sign but if the PB feels it appropriate that we put the dates up there then we will. It does cover all four seasons we talked about. One thing, I wanted to say about the winter season is the water utilities are shut down as a necessity because it's a camp ground.

Bob G., I appreciate that but isn't that information you put in a brochure not on a sign?

George F., yes, but I was just addressing the question about the sign.

Bruce P., I think the sign is a little misleading when the sign says four season

Greta B., We're making a new sign it's getting designed right now though.

Bruce P., thank you that's all I asked.

Greta B., he (Dan F.) didn't know we were doing that.

Dan F. (cont.) at the last presentation I wanted to give everyone an idea of land area. I don't think I did a good job of explaining the areas. In particular the wetlands. The dark green area (illustrated on the map pg. 3) is wetlands delineated by whoever designed the plans. We're staying out of there. The wetland area for the 300 acre site represents 43% or 132 acres. Again, I wanted to address this because it was a specific question. Another item is the peninsula itself (map pg. 7). As previously stated since the last meeting we have Shoreland Protection permit. There were comments previously that these site were too close to the Un-named Tributary. They have been moved, all sites are now no closer than 20 ft.

Bob G., But in the flood plain?

Dan F., yes, and again the State has issued that approval. Another item is the access road (map pg. 8) coming into the peninsula. We went before the ZBA last month and received a variance to have a 16 ft. wide road where a 20 ft. wide road is required. Something that's been added since we met last, is 4 ft. wide shoulders have been placed on this road in the upland areas only, in order to create the 20 ft. for passing areas. Another item was boat storage, there is space at the ongoing sites for storage, and however we have shown a future storage area next to the leach field area #2 (illustrated on map pgs. 8 and 3) there is space available in this area, right now we're showing 50,000 sq. ft. for roughly 100 plus boats.

Ski K., that's just regular grass area?

Dan F., replied yes. One other item, I would like to bring up is that, we are dealing with wetland permit review comments. There are essentially two comments, they recommend we address comments from NH Fish & Game and the Loon Preservation Committee. At this time we are attempting to address their comments. We have proposed an easement on the property (see map pg. 3) from the floodway limits up to the property line, west to the western property line. It's roughly 34 acres.

Bob G., the easement is for what purpose?

Dan F., protection ... general environmental protection...

Bob G., commented general wildlife/environmental habitat.

Dan F., replied yes. I have not shown it, it's not completed yet.

Bob G., (response unclear on recording)

Dan F., but this what we are working on now to present back to the wetlands. That should be the final major NHDES permit that is for the wetland impact on the access road. Otherwise the other plans, again will be for the collection system for sewer and the effluent disposal areas.

Dennis L., I try to discuss and ask people their impression of what going on, the people around town. I did speak with people at WWSCG, a lot of the people that are there now. I ask if anyone had concerns about the project. Most people were happy with the way things are there now but they had one concern. They were concerned about the beach areas. Are you expanding the beach at all? They say it feels kind of small.

Dan F., we are only proposing this single wetland impact for the road widening.

Ski K., any other questions from the Board?

Bob G., do I understand that this is largely for seasonal camping? This is not an overnight drive in one night, setup camp and leave the next day. This is mostly for or entirely for long-term, RV camping.

Dan F., there hasn't been a final decision on that. They don't have a preference on seasonal vs. transient. Essentially the market will decide.

Bob G., that's a business decision but it would impact the amount of traffic coming in and out.

Dan F., I did send a letter to the PB at the previous meeting, the CC had some items they had question on. I hope I answered those but I'll go through them real quick.

**Copied from Dan Flores's letter to the PB*

1. Asking for a wildlife corridor study on the areas of Pond Road 1, 2, 3 sites (like Rick Van de Poll does)

A wildlife corridor study was conducted by Gove Environmental Services, Inc. The report dated April 16, 2016 states "Overall no significant corridor or yarding areas exist on site, where the proposed campsite expansion is proposed".

2. Asking for a parking lot for boats and trailers

I described there is room available at the proposed Pond Road sites for boat parking, as well as additional storage possible near Septic Area #3.

3. Finding out where the septic areas are for the peninsula sites

Recap: there is currently there is a septic system for the house. We are disconnecting that and moving the Peninsula sites pump to Septic Area #3, which is to the west of the existing campground and approximately 1,000' from Ossipee Lake.

Bob G., stated, so the current septic uses a leach field on the peninsula and you propose to pump it up 1,000 ft.

Dan F., confirmed we are moving all septic off the peninsula.

Connie B., over the causeway

Dan F., it in a thick PVC 8 in. sleeve force main. Details are in the plans

4. Asking for more setback for the peninsula sites located along the unnamed tributary (presently only 10 ft. setback)

All sites have been moved a minimum of 20' from the unnamed tributary and Ossipee Lake. Please see NHDES Shoreland permit 2016-00640 dated May 18, 2016.

5. Asking for a DOT traffic study on the corner of Nichols Rd and Rt. 16

MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc. is currently conducting a traffic study at that intersection with traffic counts having been collected during the Memorial Day weekend. I presently only have an email preliminary results

Ski K., stated your talking capacity but you're not talking about traffic turning in or out of Nichols Rd. onto Rt. 16. Rt. 16 has capacity but will it have flow.

Dan F. replied; yes, that is my understanding, there were attachments depicting the flow of the intersection.

Frank R., said he spoke with Chief of Police in town about the intersection of Nichols Rd. and Rt. 16, asking him the questions of about how much problems he's had in the past. Keep in mind half of these camp sites are existing, and he said "zero problems through that intersection." So when you look at the intersection, the intersection is on the right side of the curve to give you visibility of both directions and he brought that up. I did talk with about four officers as well as he's been here 20+ years. I do respect his opinion and he did not feel that intersection was a problem.

Bob G., asked if there was a street light at that intersection?

Someone answered, yes. You mean traffic light?

Bob G., said no, a street light to illuminate the intersection. Someone nodded yes, per Bob G.

Mark Garland said there is a street light, it just the bulb replaced in it. PSNH is taking care of that, it sitting on the post there.

6. Asking that the two corners be widened on Nichols Rd as Brad has asked for

Notes are on the Overview Plan stating that the two shoulders on the inside of both corners are to be paved per Mr. Harriman's specifications.

Bruce P., asked if they're going to have lighting on the roads.

Dan F., asked on the campground roads?

Bruce P., your roads.

Dan F., said no.

Bruce P., stated no lighting in the camp at all, great!

Dan F., replied, no, other than bathhouse etc...

Bob G., that's the way camps are these days. Night time experience see the sky!

Frank R., stated it's the kids on bicycles you worry about.

Bruce P., or the drunks in the golf carts.

Dan F., asked if there are any more questions he could answer?

Ski K., ask if the Board had any more questions.

Ski K., asked if there are any questions from the public

Corey Lane- GMCG; did you change the number of structures on the peninsula from 18 or is it still 18?

Dan F., replied it is still 18.

Corey L., and at our meeting a few weeks ago you said these structure are 600 sq. ft. each?

Dan F., the structure itself is not. The structure is less than 400 sq. ft. per RSA. To explain it further, (map pg. 7) the development we are doing here is reducing the impervious area on the peninsula. All of the camp site pads and access road are gravel paved and are pervious. We are proposing a 42 ft. x 12 ft. gravel pad for each of the 18 camp sites.

Connie B., asked what height/elevation be? And what is the flood plain elevation there?

Dan F., it's at grade but does not have that number with him currently but the grade is below flood plain.

Connie B., if the pad is below the flood plain grade and going to allow 12 month storage for campers...

Dan F., said if it's 12 month storage it must be raised above the flood plain. If it's temporary or a wheeled unit it has to be ready to move off.

Bob G., which flood level? 5 year, 10 year, 50 year?

Dan F., replied based on the FEMA based levels.

Ski K., these structures that going to on the pads, are they going to be company owned structures to be rented out?

Dan F., replied yes sir.

Ski K., ask it all 18 sites.

Dan F., Yes sir.

Ski K., so they're going to be permanent structures.

Dan F., movable but permanent

Ski K., will they have wheels on them or they be placed on concrete?

Dan F., on wheels.

Bruce P., commented "a genuine trailer park"

Ski K., asked for any other comments from the public

Corey Lane (spoke referring to her meeting with Dan Flores), trying to better understand going from 258 previous sites to 522. At our meeting you said, about 90 % of these, I believe your ordinance calls them manufactured homes when there in the flood plans. So 90% of these homes will remain in the flood plans year round?

Dan F., states, I don't recall saying that at all.

Corey Lane, how many do you think now? Referring back to my notes, I have 90%. If that's true, then 469 out of 522 would remain in the flood plains. As an estimate, is there a flood emergency plan to remove all these units? Because I believe it was said that the person who owns it is responsible removing it if there was a flood.

Dan F., any unit that is left year round is raised above the flood level. Any unit that are not year round have to be on wheels and able to be movable.

Corey Lane; in case of an emergency situation, of course, if it's on wheels it can be moved. But if the owner is not nearby...how would these things be moved? I wasn't here in 1998, but from my understanding, I heard someone say the other day, that campers were going over the dam, when there was a flood back then. That's just what I heard but water quality is a concern and if you have these structures in an emergency...

Dan F., the campground manager would be best to answer that.

Camp Ground Manager; we have a plan in place where we are able to hook onto these units as with any trailer with a 3-point hitch. We would hitch it to a tractor and move these units up to higher ground or off site if someone is not able to do it. (Example; if a customer calls in and says I'm not here, I don't have my truck with me in order to move my unit.) We have vehicles on site where we would be able to do that.

Corey Lane, so they would have to contact you to ask you?

Camp Ground Manager Generally, but if the storms are coming up and nobody is there then we will make contact with them and do our best to hook onto the unit and pull it out of there for that customer.

Corey Lane; but if it's there more than the 180 days it would be raised up or...

Camp Ground Manager; Correct.

Rick St. Jean; where would you put all these outside the flood plains?

Bruce P., asked Rick where his back yard is!

Camp Ground Manager; with the road higher up, my first gut reaction would be to pull them up to the higher ground. Pull them up to the right and left sides of the roads of the new addition to the park.

Rick St. Jean, But isn't pretty much the entire property the flood plains

Dan F., confirmed it is.

Rick St. Jean; asked, what is the base elevation?

Dan F., stated he believes its 414, Rte. 16 side of property and 412 in the peninsula area.

Ski K., stated, so actually there would be no place to put these 200 some trailers.

Corey Lane, it would 469 with the 90% estimate.

Bruce P., you have to disconnect the electric, the plumbing, and do all that and then move 400 trailers before to rain hits.

Bob G., and the septic systems is under water!

Chelsea Bossenbroek; I don't see how this any different than say actual trailer park or mobile home park! These people are responsible for their own trailers. As cavalier as that sounds, if there's a massive flood coming in they need to make arrangements with either themselves or with us to get their property in a position where it's safe. That's why they have insurance.

Connie B., stated, that's not the point!

Bruce P., and if they don't we're repairing the dam.

Ski K., I take it your with the LLC?

Chelsea Bossenbroek; stated, I am!

Frank Riley; you know if it became a real issue as in the past in that area. There's a lot of volunteers who go in and help move these trailer and get them to safety. The fire department did a tremendous amount of work moving these back a few years ago when floods came in. They're not going to be by themselves if a flood should come, I don't believe.

Bob G., said you can help them.

Frank R., replied, I would go help them!

Corey Lane; commented, so the Town would be responsible?

Frank R., NO! I didn't say the town, did I! I said, **I** would go help them!

Bob G., said he (Frank Riley) is a volunteer for the fire department.

Corey Lane, Oh he's on the fire department! I'm sorry!

Frank Riley, said "Don't misquote me, please!"

Ski K., asked for anymore comments?

Marie McConarty; I don't see any difference in the trailer park than any of the other homes or camps down there on Ossipee Lake, on the end of Nichols Rd. that are on cinder blocks? I know there all pre-existing and have been there forever and a day but I don't see anyone complaining about those flooding and washing into the lake! And their septic's?

Connie B., stated they're still there!

Marie McConarty, exactly, they're still there! And they're further down towards the lake.

Connie B., they're still there after all the floods.

Marie M., agreed, they're still there and they're septic is still there. I'm just speaking as a tax payer. I think this is an excellent tax revenue for the town. I know there are a lot of concerns with the lake but with Danforth Bay, I know it was brought up but I don't think we have a lot input from them but...Freedom gets there tax break from there camp ground. I think that it would be a benefit to Ossipee, as a revenue, just as a tax payer.

Bob G., I think the question before us is whether to do it but how to do it so it complies with all the state...

Sam Martin; ask for Bob G., to speak up, she could not hear his response to Marie McConarty.

Marie M., replied but if the state has already approved the wells, the septic, and the setbacks. NH DES has already been approving these. I think it's now up to the town what we're going to approve, what you're going to approve. But like I'm saying, as a tax payer, I think it's a benefit to the town.

Corey Lane; to touch on a tax benefit; obviously GMCG focuses on water quality. As most of you know your tax base is intimately tied to the health of our lake system. We do lake testing every month. We actually just did it today. Last month's result came in and Ossipee Lake is a high quality lake that's tittering on the edge of becoming middle aged, if you will. Danforth pond is a middle aged pond. You think of Provence Lake, that's is an old lake where it fills in with nutrients and sediment. So I can't quote the exact number but for every meter of clarity you lose, you lose property values. So if Ossipee Lake changes to a lower quality lake, I think it could impact your tax base as well. So it's one thing to consider when looking at this project because 90 % of NH lake pollution, according to NH DES, from non-point source pollution from things like this. This whole project is in the flood plains and I know they're being called campers and temporary structures but when there left there year round their impervious surfaces and that's 469 impervious surfaces on that property. I'm just going off the estimate of 90% and there is currently 232 and your adding 237 more. So you're doubling the amount of impervious surface on this property, that's all in the flood plains and surrounded by wetland.

Frank Riley comments, most of our water quality problems on all our lakes in the entire State of NH are the existing homes that have the existing sewer systems that are not up to today's standards. When these developers come in, their systems are up to a better standards than 99% of the people who are now owning property on our water/sewer system. So, yes I agree with you it could be a problem but I think the biggest problem is already existing on our lakes. Not necessarily brought to us by some development that is done correctly in accordance with federal, state and local requirements. That's my comment!

Bob G., states I would agree with but I would add if you or any other organization feels that this project has a potential negative impact on the quality of the water. We need to see the line of reasoning, the evidence, from the structures, from the project that is planned here to an impact on water quality. A generic concern about development equals lower water quality doesn't help. We need to see a line of reasoning and potential evidence. What impacts will have effects on the lake. So if you can provide reasoning and analysis like that, that would be of interest but generic concerns are not particularly helpful.

Chelsea Bossenbroek; if I could just comment on that, the clarity of the water that's what draws people to this area. We don't want people coming to the campground, looking at the water and saying are you kidding me! This is no place to vacation! We are invested in maintaining clean water, we're invested in doing this the right way. We want to do it the right way!

Sam Martin, Ossipee resident – I have a question a bottom line kind a question. If they get all of their permits from NHDES, and I don't know if their dealing with the Army Corps, and everything is approved. What is there left for the town to stop them? Because that's what it sounds like here. Your trying to find every little thing you can to try and stop the project!

Bob G., I don't think that's correct...

Sam Martin, these people know what they're doing, their engineers, and they're doing it right. They're protecting the land. They're protecting the water. So, NHDES has rules, I don't know if their dealing with the Army Corps but they have rules, so once they have all of those and those supercede our zoning ordinance. What do we have left? What is the bottom line? How can you stop this project? Or can you just keep going along like this and making them come back, come back and come back. And I'm speaking to the Chairman.

Ski K., states, well the town can have more stringent ordinances than the state.

Sam Martin, that's not what I asked Mr. Chairman. I asked if we have stringent. Are our zoning ordinances rules more stringent than NHDES and Army Corps of Engineers? Are they going to supercede those rules and regulations and those decisions?

Bob G., there are 3 sets of regulations.

Sam Martin, accuse me, I am addressing the Chairman.

Ski K., said Bob G., can speak for him.

Bob G., I am addressing you! We are not here to stop any project. We are here to ensure that a project duly conforms to the zoning ordinances, if necessary been approved by the ZBA, complies with ours, state and federal regulations. We have our own Site Plan Review regulations. We concerned with how this project is put together not whether it should go forward. We don't have the authority, as far as we know, to stop a project unless it clear it's not compliant with our regulations. I don't know if any of us have seen any evidence to that affect. We're only here to ensure it complies with our own SPR regulations because that's what this whole process is about. Now it's going to be delayed a little bit, not much, so the Town of Effingham and the Town of Freedom and the LRPC can have their say as well. And we're happy to hear any line of reasoning or evidence that organizations, like GMCG, might like to present. But we're here to make sure it's the best possible project that it can be in conforming to all our regulations. As this young lady (Chelsea Bossenbroek) stated their also invested in that interest as well. So I don't think there's a lot of disagreement with this going forward...slowly.

Bruce P., a question was before about the pads. Are they gravel or are they going to be concrete or hard surface?

Dan F., stated the pond road area will have gravel pads and gravel roads. The peninsula will have gravel pave which is pervious, it's not impervious.

Bruce P., because my point would be, someone brought up the point that the trailers, structures, whatever you want to call them, is impervious and it's going to be impervious...if there's gravel underneath them and their up off the gravel, then it's not impervious.

Dan F., under NHDES regulations for Alteration of Terrain, the gravel pads are considered impervious. In the Pond Road area we have designed a storm water treatment system to account for that. We have undisturbed forest buffers several areas, as well as bio-retention areas separating the sites from the wetlands as detailed in the plans. In order to capture any of that runoff and treat it before it gets into the ground. On the peninsula, again we're using gravel paved, it's pervious it lets the water in.

Bruce P., another question the CC had was all the wetlands (to the bottom and left on the map) you can't use it for anything. You can't use wetlands. Why don't you put it in a conservation easement to Dan Hole Pond or to the town as the conservator's?

Dan F. that is something we are working on now.

Bruce P., but you're only going to put a little strip along the river.

Dan F., I think we're putting about 34 acres.

Bruce P., why not put the whole wetlands?

Peter Malia stated because the state was not asking for that. They told us what they wanted.

Bruce P., said the CC is asking for it?

Peter Malia, asked the CC is asking for all the wetlands to be put in conservation easement?

Bruce P., said yes

Peter Malia – When did they ask for that?

Bruce P., looked to Tim Otterbach for input.

Tim O., stated it was before his time.

Bruce P., said it was in the letter, they wanted the wetlands. I don't they stipulated just along the river. Unless I misunderstood at the meeting what we were asking for was make the wetlands conservation easement.

Dan F., read the CC letter lists of concerns.

Rick, questioned why the CC would ask for a traffic study?

Bruce P., said he didn't remember them asking for a traffic study.

Dan F., said it's in the letter but nothing on a conservation easement of all the wetlands.

Bruce P., said he must have fallen asleep during that part of the meeting.

Ski K., ask for any other comments from the PB or public.

Bob G., said Rick St. Jean had a proposal

Ski K., said oh yeah and asked him to address his proposal.

Rick St. Jean, this is pretty extensive and I think the Board should consider review by an independent engineering firm.

Ski K., why don't I poll the Board to see if the Board agrees...

Connie B., it's a motion. It's a motion!

Dennis L., exclaimed, "What am I missing here!"

Ski K., asked Rick are you making a motion?

Rick St. Jean said yes.

Ski K., said Rick has made a motion to have an independent engineer.

Bob G., Rick can you be more specific than engineering. Engineering to review what?

Rick said compliance with Ossipee Zoning Regulation

Bob G., and on our own Site Plan Review regulations

Ski K., & Rick St. Jean said yes

Rick St. Jean said we can do that per our Zoning Regulations. I don't have an engineering background and as far as I know, know body on the Board does as well. It would be good to have another set of eyes look at it. I don't mean to have whole thing picked apart but to have another engineer look at it for a day, I think is pretty reasonable.

Bob G., so to surface questions we might not have thought to asked.

Rick St. Jean, right. To confirm compliance.

Dennis L., shouldn't this question be better asked by the State? If I were these gentlemen, I'd be pulling my hair out. Every time they come here we throw something else at them. I mean and it's uncut. Now there being hit by Ossipee Lake Alliance and Conservation Groups. They've had plenty of time to be here before this, this has been going on for months. Now Freedom and Effingham want to get involved in it. This is a business, somebody set me right if I'm wrong. They have a business, and it's a working business, they want to enlarge it. They've got approvals. They've got permits. They've met all those request. What else do they have to do? I think we need to tell them tonight because I'm getting frustrated, so I know they have to be.

Ski K., the State does not look at our ordinances & regulations

Dennis L., I understand that but our zoning ordinances but they pretty much follows what the State has.

Several members stated; No they don't.

Dennis L., it's not as strong as theirs, is it?

Rick St. Jean, the issues the State looks at are totally irrelevant to what our zoning ordinances are. Some of it is along the same lines, soil types, water supply, and they look at the sewerage. But as far as the setbacks and other stuff like that... I mean there's a lot of stuff in these plans. I've been on the other side of the table. I don't think it's that unreasonable. Other towns have engineers, Ossipee doesn't have a town

engineer per say but the ordinance does allow the Board to request an independent review. I don't think it's out of order, this is the biggest project I've seen come to Ossipee, since I've been living here.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean seconded by Connie B., to have an independent engineer review of the WWSCG plans.

Ski K., stated now we can continue the discussion.

Connie B., (speaking to Dennis L.), if I remember correctly, they have been here twice, the original presentation and tonight. They have requested 3 or 4 continuances. Every time we had a question, the Chairman ruled we could not bring up the discussion because we had to wait for them to be here. So, you're saying you're frustrated. I'm frustrated because we couldn't ask what we wanted too.

Ski K., repeated what Connie was saying. When we had a continuance and the applicant was not present, we could not discuss the case because they were not here and able to answer. So that's what Connie is saying. So you're saying you have been here so many times but they actually haven't.

Dennis L., well it's no much that, I'm still learning this process and I guess some of it I'm just not getting it. It's just been going on a long time.

Bob G., as a result of the continuances as they (WWSCG) worked out the issues with the state agencies. But the state agencies, as Rick has pointed out, don't deal with our ordinances or our regulations. I think it's not unreasonable to have a limited engineering review to surface any questions we may have failed to ask. Because now's the time to do it, not 2 or 3 years from now when a problem evolves no one had thought about or we misunderstood each other about something. So, it's not expensive, it's not going to take much time and we've done it before.

Ski K., the cost will be borne by the applicant.

Bob G., gladly, to reaffirm the quality of their plans.

Ski K., called for any more discussion, with no discussion, Ski K., called for a vote. **All in favor by a show of hands: Ski K., Bob G., Connie B., Rick St. Jean, Bruce P., and Frank Riley. Opposed: Dennis L.**

Bruce P., read a letter from the CC requesting a conservation easement stating: "the CC asked for a conservation easement on the area between the present campground and south of the Pond Rd. area and the Bear Camp River. They (WWSCG) originally wanted to develop the area along the Bear Camp but the chief engineer, asked Northgate to drop them from the permit because of the permit hassle. But they may just want to get the rest approved and come back with some signs later. A conservation easement would stop any future development." That's what was written and no it does not stipulate exactly where the conservation easement was wanted but the discussion was why not the entire wetlands.

Bob G., stated the wetlands can't be developed anyways.

Bruce P., right but it doesn't state the wetlands

Rick St. Jean, why not collect the tax revenue?

Peter Malia, requested a copy of the letter.

Ski K., ask Rick for suggestions of engineering firms?

Rick St. Jean, noted the Board could consider Norway Plains, who are familiar with our zoning ordinances and Jones & Beach Engineering out of Stratham. They're both very reputable firms and have the capacity to act on short order.

Ski K., we can have to secretary contact them for a proclamation of cost for a review.

Rick St. Jean, I think they would have to look at a set of the plans in order to review.

Ski K., noted also a time element.

Rick St. Jean, usually a technical review can happen pretty quickly. I don't see it taking more than 30 days because we have to notify Effingham, and the other parties involved. I don't think it will hold the project up at all.

George Ferdette – SFC Engineering stated he welcomes the review. I'm very proud of the project we have put together. But just in the interest of dollars being spent by my client, you said the zoning review is limited to the zoning ordinance, compliance with zoning. Is that correct?

Bob G., stated and the Site Plan Review regulations

Rick St. Jean, I don't think we have the authority to go beyond that.

George F., noted the storm water was a big deal and AoT already went through that. That would be a big chunk.

Rick St. Jean, I more concern with meeting setbacks and pervious areas. We're not going to redesign the septic areas.

Ski K., I will ask the secretary, once the two firms have reviewed the plans to get you the estimate of cost.

George F., you stated on notifying Effingham and Freedom, how is that going to happen and how am I involved?

Rick St. Jean, stated the law says we have to notify them in 5 days.

Bob G., suggested we send copies to Effingham and Freedom's selectmen, and conservation committee's so they're aware of what's going on.

Bruce P., says we hire an engineering firm, we have to pay for them out of our professional fees. We send them the bill and they in turn pay the Town of Ossipee and the amount goes into the general fund not our professional fees.

Ski K., noted to RSA's that pertain to this which are 674:44.5 and 676:4 – B those cover the process.

George F., my last point – I believe we are going to have the wetlands in place by the end of June. By the way there is no Army Corp involvement. The Army Corp does have the latitude to get them invested in a project, randomly. However this project does not meet the jurisdiction, keep in mind the wetland permit on this is for about 1000 ft. of wetland impact. It small but the wetlands in looking a larger impact through Fish & Game as you suggested, all I'm doing is letting you know the time frame of what we are looking at. We hadn't come back here because it was clear to me at the last meeting we presented, that we should get all our state permits lined up. I think we continued twice because we didn't have everything but because it had been sometime and because of some of the noise we've talked about we just wanted to set the record straight, update you and then come back. But we are only weeks away from having at least the state permits but will be working with you and other stake holders.

Bob G., we're not holding up this project the state permits still remain impediment right now.

George F., I never considered you of holding us up.

Bob G., noted okay

Rick St. Jean blurted, someone else does!

Ski K., acknowledged that WWSCG representatives have answered questions as they have come up and we all know that.

Motion: by Rick St. Jean and seconded by Bob G., to continue this meeting until July 5, 2016. **All in favor by show of hands, motion passed. Case is continued until July 5, 2016.**

- **Master Plan 2016 Revision** – Work Group Committee (WGC): Bob Gillette, Rick St. Jean, and Dennis Legendre: Ski K., commented he was at a planning board conference and it was suggested of having a section in the Master plan related to agriculture. **Bob G.**, said he believes there already is a section. **Dennis L. and Rick St. Jean** provided updates, suggestion of a 10 – 15 question questionnaire survey for tax payors response, working with the Housing Coalition, and seeking Grants.

Letters:

Ski K., read letters:

- **NH DES:** Notice to Owners of Property w/ Drinking Well Water & Groundwater Contamination Notification Program
- **NHDOT:** Driveway Permit granted to Carrie Hurn of Big Moose RV with conditional Temporary Logging expires 11/13/2016

• **91 – A Request For Information:**

Sam Martin stated she had sent the request and has not had a response from any of the PB members. Sam noted they are in violation of the 91 – A Request for Information; they had until the 5th to respond to the

request. After some heated discussion, insults and accusations from some Board members, **Mark McConkey** addressed the board as an interested party, embarrassed by this exchange back and forth. If Sam has provided a letter, I would like to know from the secretary if and whether it was received.

Laura Nash replied, the letter was received and I emailed to each member and a copy was put into their packets and mailed last week.

Mark McConkey, so if that's the case and that's how things happen in this town, which what I remember is how things happen in this town. A request comes through a secretary, then I think it would behoove of you gentlemen to behave in a different manner than the exchange I am party to right now!

Bob G., stated pardon me gentlemen; I did not know who "admin" was in order to respond.

Mark McConkey, noted to Mr. Gillette, I am asking you as a Board member who represents the people of this town, to have curtesy to someone who puts a letter out in front of your Board. How it gets there and who responds to it does not matter but I think curtesy is what should be in order.

Ski K., thanked Mr. McConkey and stated the Board can act appropriately.

Bob G., stated oh I will!

Any Other Business Which May Come Before This Meeting

- May Budget & Revenue Report
- **Jac Cuddy** – Executive Director of the Economic Counsel, Victoria Laracy of the MWV Housing Coalition and Theresa Kennett – President of MWV Housing Coalition ; presented his presentation of the PDI report on the results of the Mount Washington Valley Regional Coalition as it relates to Ossipee. This is a follow-up to the presentation given by Theresa Kennett at the beginning of the project. Results show a shifting demographic pattern with an increase of population of older citizens and retirees and a loss of younger people. A perceived lack of diversity in the local economy with a focus on tourism and retail. All the results and finding can be found at www.mwvhc.org.
- **Ed Cuomo** – Representative from Concord and from Government Oversight spoke on the 91 – A. The 91 – A law is very specific. You have 5 business days to answer. Any request from a citizen more than 5 days and you are in violation. All Sam needed was the fact you received it and you're working on it. It can't be ignored. I'm sure you're aware of what happen up at the county. When I asked them for a request and was denied over and over again it ended up in a lawsuit. So it's behooving of you to answer the 91 – A request. **Bob G.**, I understand that this is a freedom of information law, and I respect that completely. But I recall receiving is "admin wants the following" but no way to respond, no deadline, and if there was an attachment, I did not see it. Several Board members claimed inappropriate form of request, they have email capabilities, and no attachment on the email and what is Sam's responsibility for asking this request. **Ed Cuomo** answered their questions and went offered training updates for 91 – A laws.

Adjournment

Motion: by Bob G., seconded by Ski K, to adjourn. **All in favor, motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Next Meeting June 21, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes approved by majority vote of the Board on - _____
Date

Ski Kwiatkowski, Chairman