

**APPROVED**

**Town of Grantham-Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
October 1, 2009**

---

Carl Hanson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the Grantham Town Hall located at 300 Route 10 South in Grantham, NH.

Present: Carl Hanson, Chairman  
Charles McCarthy, Vice Chair  
Alden H. Pillsbury  
Karen Ryan  
Bob Barnes, Alt.  
Larry Fuller, Alt  
Warren Kimball, Selectmen’s Rep.  
Jessica Smith, Clerk  
Several members of the public

Absent:

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Hanson asks the Board if there are any corrections from the June 4, 2009 minutes. C. McCarthy stated that there was a word missing on the first page, under new business, third paragraph, second line. It should say “he is aware *of it*”.

K. Ryan remembered that she was the one that motioned for approval for Barry Cunningham Site Plan Review Application and that L. Fuller had seconded it.

With no further corrections brought forth, *C. Hanson entertained the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Motion made by K. Ryan and seconded by W. Kimball to approve the minutes of June 4, 2009 as submitted.*

**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

C. Hanson reminded the board that they have all been invited to the Dedication Ceremony and Student Ribbon Cutting on October 17, 2009 at 9:00 am.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Karen McGhee / Phi Baby Kappa Children’s Society; Tax map 226 Lot 20 – 151 Route 10 North (Site Plan Review Application)**

C. Hanson asks K. McGhee if she could tell us what she would like to do. K. McGhee explains that she is looking to open a child care center, Phi Baby Kappa Children’s Society, which is an academic child care, looking to work with children between the ages of 1 through 5 years of age. In the beginning only working with Children between 3-5 years of age, in hopes to later open it up for ages 1-5.

**APPROVED**

K. McGhee explains that the original plan was to open the Children's Society in the white building at 151 Route 10; however, the building across the parking lot has become available. It presently houses OT in Motion and would like to use that space instead. Everything will pretty much stay the same except for being in a different building and the layout of the play yard will be different, however the parking and address are the same.

C. Hanson asks how many student will there be. K. McGhee states that in the beginning there will be between 12-24 children, it will be herself, 1- assistant, and 3-4 volunteers/substitutes. A. Pillsbury questions the state requirement regarding the number of children per staff. K. McGhee explains that between the ages 3-5, there needs to be one staff member per 12 children. The state has very strict guidelines as far as what is permissible and what is not regarding the number of children per staff and they do random checks to make sure that everything is within their guidelines.

C. Hanson confirms that the states also has a lot of guidelines regarding physical space whether it is indoors or outdoors, such as banisters, steps and barricades. K. McGhee explains that is one of the reasons why she would like to go into the brown building instead; it would keep her facility on one level/no stairs.

K. Ryan asks if the play yard is going to go out back of the brown building. K. McGhee states that this space has a sliding door on the back side of the building in which go right into the play space. C. McCarthy asked if she had a sketch of the new space that she is going to be occupying as the sketch in the application is for the white building. E. Collier states that he submitted one a couple of months ago for OT in Motion, it's just a square space, 40x60. C. McCarthy states that for this file to be complete they would need a sketch of the new space.

L. Fuller questioned the state requirements per child vs. square footage. K. McGhee states that for in the interior it is 35 square feet per child, exterior is 50 square feet per child, and this space is much larger then what is required for the number of children she will be working with. L. Fuller asked if there is a restroom in this space. K. McGhee states that there is one bathroom, and believes that the state regulations require one bathroom per 20 children. She does have plans to add another bathroom facility at a later time.

C. McCarthy asks if there are any sign proposals. K. McGhee stated that she does have a sign application completed with her tonight but was unsure if she could present it tonight. C. Hanson stated that they would look at it tonight. K. McGhee brought in 7 copies of the sign application for each member. K. McGhee explains that the sign would go above the doorway were the existing sign is for OT in Motion.

C. Hanson states that he does not see any problems with parking as it should be more of a pick up and drop off situation and there is plenty of parking for the staff. K. Ryan asks E. Collier if there is any business in the small space next to this space. E. Collier confirmed that it is the dance studio.

***With no further questions, C. Hanson entertained a motion to approve the Site Plan Review Application as submitted. Motioned by C. McCarthy and seconded by A. Pillsbury.  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED***

***C. Hanson entertained a motion to approve the Sign Permit Application as submitted. Motioned by A. Pillsbury and seconded by C. McCarthy.  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED***

**APPROVED**

**Daniel & Elinor Redmond / Doc's Drive; Tax Map 242 Lots 5, 6, & 7  
(Boundary Line Adjustment Application)**

C. Hanson points out that W. McCutcheon is present. C. McCarthy asks where the existing house in relation to this map is. W. McCutcheon points out that it is out in Croydon.

W. McCutcheon explained that this is a combination, Boundary Line Adjustment and Annexation. He is going to explain the boundary line adjustment first. Back in 1980 he did a subdivision for France Rutter; she lived in Eastman and bought all kinds of land. Out of this land that she bought, I created three lots I called Parcel's A, B, & C. Parcel's A and B are both shown on this plan and Parcel C is now owned by someone else. Parcel A is a smaller lot that she created and the boundary line of her lot that she wanted me to do then was on the south side of Doc's Drive. So, the boundary line adjustment part of this plan we are doing is moving the boundary line from the south side of Doc's Drive to the north side of Doc's Drive. So, the Redmond's will retain ownership of Doc's Drive.

The Annexation is the north part of this parcel owned by Daniel and Elinor Redmond. Their intention with this parcel is to annex the north part everything above Doc's Drive to this lot that we just made a boundary line adjustment to. When we get done there will be this lot here and all of the land will be on the north side of Doc's Drive. They are going to annex the south side of this lot that had nothing to do with the Rutter's subdivision to the lot on the south side of Doc's Drive that's Parcel B on the Rutter's subdivision. There are presently three tax map and lot numbers, three pieces of land, and when we are done there is going to be two.

C. McCarthy asks if the driveway it self will be part of the larger lot. W. McCutcheon confirms this is true and that the land will stay in the family. C. Hanson confirms that the parcel on the north side of Doc's Drive will have the right to use that access road. L. Fuller asks if the Redmond's parcel continues into the Town of Croydon. W. McCutcheon states that they have no intentions of selling any of that land their plans are to keep it in the family.

C. Hanson states that they have a one acre lot size minimum and knows that some of this parcel is very steep. Is there any chance that there is less then an acre out of that 20 that is less then 20% grade. W. McCutcheon states that most of it is.

C. Howard states that this lot has been surveyed fairly recently and my daughter and son-in-law have followed our boundary lines until the land got to steep, and then went around it. At the top there is a rock pile, and she would like to know if it was on her land or the Redmond's. She was wondering as years ago, her husband and kids made that their play area. W. McCutcheon stated that it was on the Redmond's property. W. McCutcheon explained to C. Howard the purpose for the boundary line adjustment and annexation.

***With no further questions, C. Hanson entertained a motion to approve the Annexation and Boundary Line Adjustment Plan for Daniel and Elinor Redmond on Doc's Drive as submitted. Motioned by C. McCarthy and seconded by A. Pillsbury.***

**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

**APPROVED**

**Eastman Community Association / Sewer Pump Station; Tax map 215 Lot 61 – West Cove A Beach (Site Plan Review Application)**

C. Hanson confirms that W. Davis from CDL Engineering is present and ready to give details regarding this application. W. Davis explains that he is here representing Eastman for their West Cove A Sewer Pump Project. This project is part of an overall improvement plan that Eastman is undertaking for their entire waste water treatment system. It is located in West Cove A Condominium Association.

W. Davis explains that the existing facility no longer meets code. The current wet well houses the submersible pump which means that they are in the wet well. The purposed project would improve on what's inside the building by providing you with control panels, new electrical and upgrade on everything existing. In addition to that, the projects install a concrete pad outside the building that would house the new generator. The existing building does not have adequate space to house the new generator. We would also be installing a new enclosure for sentrifical pump, which is a different kind of pump, which is a lot easier to operate and maintain. We would leave the existing wet well intact.

In addition to this, we would also be installing two over flow tanks, which would in the event of any back up or problems with the pump it would then go into the tank giving the operator more time to respond to the issue at hand. The tanks would be underground and the only thing above the ground would be a flush cover. As part of the project we would be providing some natural screening (evergreens) around the new enclosure. The new pump & generator will be more efficient and will create less noise.

C. McCarthy questioned how loud a sentrifical pump is, W. Davis stated that he could not get an exact noise rating for the pump however; he has been told by several people that they are very quiet. C. Hirshberg explains that the sentrifical motors are down in an enclosure with a fiber glass cover that helps minimize the noise. R. Wren asked C. Hirshberg how high he thought this enclosure will be. C. Hirshberg stated that it comes 18 inches above grade and basically is just a cover that sticks up, as the pumps are down below.

R. Wren questions if the pumping station will change the elevation as it relates to the sewer connecting to the existing condos? We have had problems in the past with the sewer backing up. C. Hirshberg states that they are adding two over flow tanks, and two alarm systems, in hopes to prevent any further back up issues.

R. Wren stated that he objects to the generator being left out in the open. C. Hirshberg explains that the existing generator which is inside the structure, the exhaust pipe still has to be on the outside. The noise is coming from the exhaust which is on the outside of the building. R. Wren clarifies that the condo association will probably object to the appearance of the generator, even though you plan on putting up some evergreens to screen the generator it will still be seen through the trees and shrubbery.

**APPROVED**

C. McCarthy states that there is going to be an addition layer of approval, that's going to be with the Eastman Community Association, and the esthetics will be addressed at that level. R. Wren states that he hopes that it would be brought forth in front of the Condo Association as they are the ones that own that part of the property that they are using.

C. McCarthy clarifies that the ECC representing the ECA Board addresses all changes issues throughout Eastman including condo properties. So this application would go to the Environmental Control Committee and they would address the esthetics.

L. Fuller ask with this new generator is it feasible to enclose it. W. Davis states that it can be however it would require building a larger building. The generator itself is built with its own white metal enclosure. K. Ryan stated that in her opinion it would become an eyesore and was wondering if there was a better way to screen this generator. C. Hirshberg suggests that they could consider a high wooden fence enclosure with plants around it.

C. Hanson suggests that we let the applicant finish with their presentation, before we address specific concerns. W. Davis states that they already received approval from DES for the project. C. Hanson asked if there are any additional permits that you might need from the state to operate. W. Davis confirms that from the state they will need approval from the Waste Water Engineering Bureau.

***With no further questions, C. Hanson entertained a motion to approve the Site Plan Review Application as submitted. Motioned by C. McCarthy and seconded by A. Pillsbury.  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED***

**Eastman Community Association / Sewer Treatment Plant; Tax Map 222 Lot 281 – Clearwater Drive (Site Plan Review Application)**

W. Davis is representing this application as well for Eastman. This project is located on Clearwater Drive basically right on the property of the entire treatment facility. Eastman has been trying to get a ground water discharge permit for their waster water treatment facility for the past ten years. In the most recent requirements or conditions was that they provide flow metering and PH metering at their treatment facility and track waste water volume and monitor PH levels.

Another reason the existing systems comes down to this man hole and across here to another man hole and then to this building which is currently serving as the head facility which is a 5x10 building with very little working space, doesn't really meet any codes, the grinder is currently not functioning, so they are using a bar screen which has to be rigged up put into a bucket and then disposed of. This is not an ideal situation for an operator, so with that we were put in charge of coming up with a new facility for the operator.

The idea is that we will come out of this man hole and put a new pipe that will flow into an additional man hole here which will then flow through the building in a concrete channel and then will be piped over to the existing head facility so that it can be piped into the lagoon from there.

The new building will be 14x8x28; the purposed look is potentially like the other treatment facility building basically a brown structure. We will be installing a new grinder and a small control room where all the panels will be, this will be receiving electricity from the old lower building. This project has received approval Waste Water Engineering Bureau; we have also received approval from PUC, meeting the energy code and we have applied for a building permit.

**APPROVED**

W. Davis explains to C. Hanson that the building is approximately 12 feet from Clearwater Drive; the interesting thing about Clearwater Drive is that it is not a public right of way. R. Tabor Questions the lighting fixture that will be put on the building. W. Davis explains that it is a motion light and will be directed straight down in front of the door so that if the operator needs to go there after dark they can get into the building safely. It should not spread light anywhere else.

***With no further questions, C. Hanson entertained a motion to approve the Site Plan Review Application as submitted. Motioned by A. Pillsbury and seconded by K. Ryan.  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED***

**Other Business:**

E. Collier explains to the Board that he is possibly considering in the white building at the Greenway; a convalescent living for seniors. He knows that he has to go through the Zoning Board and the whole process. What he is looking to do is “Green Living” where it would be about 7-10 Seniors that live in a family environment. He remembers that some other senior housing had come before the Planning Board and wanted to know if there was anything specific that he should be aware of before going any further.

C. Hanson states that it was a totally different project. C. McCarthy suggests that he go through a state agency to see what the requirements are for such a facility. K. Ryan asks if it will be staffed. E. Collier states that it will be staffed but not with nurses, as it would be more like a group home. E. Collier remembers that another agency came before the Planning Board, but he could not remember why they were turned down. K. Ryan explains that they were looking to build a bigger building which exceeded the height requirements.

***With no further business before the Board, C. Hanson said he would entertain a motion to Adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by A. Pillsbury and seconded by C. McCarthy. The Planning Board voted unanimously to adjourn at 8:20 p.m.***

**The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held on November 5, 2009.**

Submitted,

Jessica Smith