

TOWN OF THORNTON PLANNING BOARD

Approved on: 12/19/13
PB Initials: TBP
Rec'd by Town Clerk on: 31 Dec 13
Town Clerk Initials: JK

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES November 21, 2013

CALL TO ORDER:

T. Phillips called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm and led the pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

The following members/alternates were present:

T. Phillips, Chairman	S. Babin, Vice Chairman	M. Peabody, Ex-officio	S. Macintosh, Member
G. Kimball, Member	F. Freeman, Member	C. Piantedosi, Member	
R. Gilman, Alternate	F. Gunter, Alternate		

Planning Board attorney M. Serge was also present.

T. Phillips reminded those present to sign in and introduced M. Peabody as the new Ex-officio member of the Planning Board.

T. Phillips opened the Public Hearing at 6:15pm.

Determine Jurisdiction to Consider Site Plan Application / CBDA Development, LLC

At 6:15pm a Public Hearing will be held to determine if the Planning Board has jurisdiction to consider a Site Plan Application submitted by CBDA Development, LLC for a Recreational Campground on property located off on US Rt. 3 identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 8-8 owned by Carlton C. Ham.

T. Phillips stated proper notice for the hearing was given which included a corrected notice being sent to address a mistake made in the first notice.

T. Phillips noted that the corrected notice met the "10 days prior to the hearing" requirement.

T. Phillips stated that the purpose of the public hearing is to determine whether or not the application submitted on October 9, 2013 has substantially changed from the application submitted in 2012 which is now in litigation.

T. Phillips requested that if the discussion is opened to the public that those present keep their questions directed to how the application has changed and refrain from getting into matters outside of that realm.

J. Cronin introduced himself as legal consul for CBDA, D. Anagnost as the developer, S. Keach as the principal engineer for the project and A. Michaud as an another engineer working on the project.

J. Cronin stated a contentious aspect of the first application centered around the debate of Park models and recreational vehicles.

J. Cronin stated the developer has made an attempt to address the concerns of the Planning Board in the new application.

J. Cronin stated the applicant is submitting a subsequent application as suggested by the Planning Board during the initial process.

J. Cronin stated the new application is modeled after the approved campgrounds within the town.

J. Cronin stated the initial application included references to a long term lease/licensing agreement between the developer and patrons of the campground to be part of the operation of the campground and that the new application is being submitted with no such long term lease/licensing agreement for patrons of the campground to use.

J. Cronin stated the initial application was submitted with a density lower than the state requirement due to the fact the developer wanted larger sites to accommodate all of the park models.

J. Cronin stated that the new application has incorporated smaller sites for pop-ups and tents which results in an application with a greater number of total sites and a higher density than the initial application.

J. Cronin addressed the subsequent application doctrine and stated his opinion that it generally refers to zoning cases.

J. Cronin referred to two court cases that take up the issue of subsequent applications: Boyce v. Manchester and Fisher v. Dover.

J. Cronin stated his opinion that these cases support the idea that if there is some change at all in a subsequent application the Planning Board has jurisdiction to hear the application.

J. Cronin stated his opinion that any change in the law would require the Planning Board to find that it has jurisdiction, and suggested the proposed new definition of recreational campground currently being considered as a zoning amendment by the Planning Board would be such a change in the law.

J. Cronin summarized by stating the new application is different enough and addresses the specific concerns expressed by the Planning Board during the initial application so that they have the right to be heard.

T. Phillips asked for clarification as to how the proposed amendment applies.

J. Cronin used the example of an applicant applying for a variance to allow 3 parking spaces on his property and is denied.

J. Cronin continued stating that the same applicant can return with the same request if the regulations change regarding the number of allowed parking spaces.

J. Cronin stated that any change in the regulations/laws relative to a previously denied application allow for the same application to be submitted to be heard under the new regulations/laws.

F. Gunter asked for more specifics as to how the new application is different from the previous application.

J. Cronin stated there are more campsites, no requirement for a park model to be on every site, no requirement for the park model to be purchased on site from the developer, no long term lease agreement and the traffic counts will be different.

D. Anagnost added that other differences include the size of the sites, the relocation of the clubhouse and managers office, the provision of common facilities located close to the area where the tents sites are.

M. Peabody asked if the recreational vehicles will be stationary on site for the season.

D. Anagnost responded that the length of stay will be determined by how long a patron wants to rent the site – for a weekend or a season.

T. Phillips asked if there is a maximum length of stay.

J. Cronin responded there is no maximum length of stay which is similar to the other campgrounds in town.

J. Cronin stated that it would be limited to the seasonal nature of a campground and not a place to establish residency.

F. Freeman asked if the sites would be designated for use by tents, pop-ups, 5th-wheelers and various other types of recreational vehicles – and asked for the breakdown in numbers of types of sites being offered.

J. Cronin stated the campground will have various types of recreational vehicles staying for varying lengths of stay.

T. Phillips asked if the same 180 day restriction that applies to the other campgrounds in town will apply in the new application.

J. Cronin stated there is no intent to make this a year round facility but to stay within the 180 day season.

T. Phillips asked if park models will be allowed.

J. Cronin refused to use the term "park model" but agreed that recreational vehicles consistent with the state statute will be allowed.

D. Anagnost stated this is his first venture into developing a campground and designed the new application in response to the concerns raised during the process involved under the initial application.

D. Anagnost stated the new application has 267 sites which is a change from the 246 sites in the initial application.

D. Anagnost stated the sites are open to be used by all types of recreational vehicles rather than being restricted to only park models as proposed in the initial application.

D. Anagnost stated the new application has 49 tent sites which are smaller and have limited utilities available which were not provided on the initial application.

D. Anagnost stated that the new application provides sites to meet all types of camping and allows for various lengths of stay.

D. Anagnost summarized by stating the new application is substantially different and addresses many of the concerns raised by the Planning Board during the process for the initial application.

F. Freeman asked if the new application could fit the business model associated with the initial application into the new application if/when it was approved.

D. Anagnost stated park models no longer fit on all of the sites.

F. Freeman asked if the 219 sites large enough to accommodate park models could all be used as proposed in the initial application.

D. Anagnost responded that the new application is focused on the transient use of a campground rather than a permanent/long term use.

S. Keach stated that the size of the sites in the initial application was designed to accommodate the stationary fixed units proposed, with space to allow for the usual additions to the units such as seasonal rooms and porches owners make as well as code requirements.

S. Keach noted that some of the sites on the new application are larger to accommodate the moving in and out of the recreational vehicles.

S. Keach noted the new application has sites designed to meet a wider variety of uses than the initial application and that the new application is designed to capture as much of the transient business from people traveling I-93 as possible.

T. Phillips asked if the new application was for a campground that stays open 365 days a year.

D. Anagnost responded that the new application is not for a campground that stays open 365 days a year.

T. Phillips stated the initial application was for a campground that was open for approximately a 5 and a half month period and another 3 and a half month period and asked if the new application proposed a campground with the same proposed schedule of being open.

D. Anagnost responded that the new application does propose a similar plan for being open for two distinct periods of time.

T. Phillips asked if the units on the campsites would be allowed to stay on the sites during the time that the facility is closed.

D. Anagnost asked if there is anything that prohibits that from occurring.

T. Phillips stated his intent to contrast the new application with the initial application and that one of the issues discussed during the process with the initial application was whether the camping units would be allowed to stay on the site during the time the facility is closed.

S. Keach noted that park models are not easy to move so the initial application included an allowance for

the park models to remain on site when the campground is closed.

S. Keach added that the new application provides for sites to be used by various types of recreational vehicles and is not exclusive to allowing only park models so that the expectation is not to have 216 park models on the sites on a permanent basis.

T. Phillips summarized for clarification that the new application would allow for any type of camping unit to stay on site while the campground was closed and the occupancy of the camping units by patrons of the campground would be limited to the period of time the campground is open.

M. Serge asked what was submitted to the Planning Board.

S. Keach responded that the following has been submitted as required for any new application: full sets of drawings, (41 sheets) drainage study, traffic study, physical study, the site plan review checklist items, fees, and everything that would be required to meet the submission requirements of the Thornton Planning Board.

T. Phillips asked if the members of the public had questions for the applicant and reminded them to direct any/all questions through the chairman and to keep the questions on the subject of how the new application differs from the initial application.

B. Burbank asked if the new application allowed for access to the snowmobile trails adjacent to the property.

T. Phillips responded that the initial plan included fencing to prohibit unauthorized access to the trail system.

S. Keach stated that the application is not proposing any direct access to the trails because it would require crossing land that would be owned by someone other than D. Anagnost.

F. Gordon asked if the new application could potentially have 219 park models on site year round and added that is very similar to what was initially proposed.

D. Anagnost stated that the initial application required a park model, purchased from the developer on site, be placed on all of the sites and that is not part of the new application which lessens the likelihood of having 219 park models on site.

D. Anagnost did admit that because 219 of the sites are open to any kind of recreational vehicle the possibility exists for 219 sites to be occupied by park models and added there is also the potential for 267 sites to be occupied by tents.

J. Cronin restated the new application is different because the requirement for sites to be occupied only by a park model has been removed.

P. Sutton expressed his concern regarding the potential of having an influx of 500-1000 people to the property beside him and stated his concern that the new application should include provisions to adequately manage that large of an influx of people.

P. Sutton asked if the board members have looked at the material submitted for the new application.

T. Phillips responded that he and other board members have come into the office to review the application documents submitted and added that a casualty of Mr. Keach's preparedness is the challenge it creates for the Planning Board members to review all of the material submitted.

P. Sutton asked if the new application is available for review by the public.

T. Phillips stated that it is available for review any time the town office is open.

B. O'Donnell asked if there is a significant change in the proposed density from the density proposed in the initial application looking at each application with 100% occupancy.

J. Cronin stated the density in the new application is different and is still lower than what is allowed per state statute.

T. Phillips reined in the discussion regarding density when it moved into specifics that would be part of the site plan review.

C. Schofield asked if the traffic study is the same one submitted with the initial application.

S. Keach stated the traffic study for the new application was prepared by the same professional and used the same data collected for current traffic conditions but was applied to the different proposed type of more transient use as proposed in the new application.

C. Schofield asked if the same number of septic systems and wells were to be used in the new application.

S. Keach responded that a similar septic plan and proposed well site are included in the new application.

C. Schofield asked if the new application included a pool and camp store similar to the initial application.

S. Keach indicated a pool and camp store are included in the new application.

S. Keach noted the operating manager will determine when/if the camp store will be open to the public and not just patrons of the campground.

T. Phillips reminded the public to keep the discussion centered on how the new application differs from the initial application.

M. Serge noted the initial application is progressing through the judicial system and is scheduled for mediation.

M. Serge asked J. Cronin to explain the status of the initial application and how it applies to the new application.

J. Cronin stated the initial application and the new application represent two separate cases and anything can happen in mediation.

J. Cronin added that it is hoped that some progress can be made as the opportunity for dialogue is being provided through the request of the Supreme Court.

J. Cronin stated there are various potential outcomes for the initial application which could include the application being withdrawn, settled between the parties involved or decided by the court.

T. Phillips asked if the new application was the application preferred by the developer.

J. Cronin stated initially the developer thought the initial application was preferred but has learned through the process that the town was not receptive to the initial application.

D. Anagnost stated as a developer he is not a litigious person and puts it back to the Planning Board to work toward an acceptable plan.

T. Phillips stated that it is not entirely clear as to whether the town liked or did not like the previous application, instead, there was a difference of interpretation of what was being proposed and whether the current regulations of the Zoning Ordinance allowed for such a proposal as was presented in the initial application.

K. McIver asked if the new application will allow for the recreational vehicles to be skirted in and if the park model users will have some type of user agreement.

J. Cronin responded that no user agreement will be used and the new application proposes an *ad hoc* type basis similar to what the State Parks require.

K. McIver asked if units will be allowed to stay year round if the owner is willing to rent the site year round.

T. Phillips stated that this was a critical issue relative to the initial application.

T. Phillips stated that he understands the applicant believes the occupancy of the recreational vehicles is to be temporary but that some of the Planning Board members expressed the concern that the occupation of the site by a recreational vehicle should be on a temporary basis.

T. Phillips asked if the new application allows for the same recreational vehicle to remain on a camp site for two years.

S. Keach stated that the new application would allow for recreational vehicles to remain on a camp site and referred to the Thornton Campground Regulations which states the following:

Section III: Special Conditions D. Off season storage of vehicles or trailers in the campground by the owner/manager, is permitted, but storage of abandoned or derelict vehicles and trailers is not permitted.

T. Phillips stated that he is aware of this provision but indicated that this does not necessarily mean that the units stay at a site; they could instead be put in a storage area that is screened.

J. Cronin suggested that the length of time a recreational vehicle can be left of site may be a specific condition of approval and that the applicant would be open to discussion regarding this issue as the new application moves forward.

J. Ham stated that he attended every one of the hearings for the initial application and stated his opinion that what was initially proposed during that process changed into a completely different project over the course of the hearings.

J. Ham stated his opinion that what he heard tonight was a proposal more in line with what was discussed in the informal review phase of the initial application.

T. Phillips and the board members discussed reviewing the information presented and making a determination regarding jurisdiction at a future meeting.

MOTION: "To continue the public hearing to Thursday, December 19, 2013 at the Thornton Town office beginning at 6:15pm."

Motion: F. Freeman

Second: G. Kimball

Discussion: None

Motion passes 7 – yes, 0 – no

T. Phillips opened the Public Hearing at 7:30pm.

Site Plan / Valley Snow Dogz, LLC

At 7:30pm a Public Hearing will be held to consider a Site Plan application submitted by L. Dale-Mesaros of Valley Snow Dogz, LLC to allow educational sled dog excursions on property owned by B. Benton and H. Steele identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 3-37.

T. Phillips and Board members reviewed the minutes of the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the Notice of Decision issued by the Zoning Board of Adjustment regarding the site plan application before them.

T. Phillips referred to the portion of the Site Plan Review Regulations which allow for waivers to the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Section C. Waiver Producers

2. A proposed development involving an existing site and buildings and change of use is being requested.

The new use is being accommodated with no physical changes to the site or buildings except for the purposes of identification.

The Board agreed that the application qualified to be granted a waiver on the submission requirements.

MOTION: “ To find that requiring the applicant to meet all of the requirements of submission for site plan review would be inconsistent with the intent of the Site Plan Review Regulations and place an unnecessary burden on the applicant, and that the application meets the criteria of Section C. 2 of the site plan review regulations to waive the requirements.”

Motion: S. Babin

Seconded: F. Freeman

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7 – Yes, 0 – No

S. McIntosh asked what the educational aspect included.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that they educate their customers regarding the dogs, their training, and other aspects of dogsledding.

F. Freeman asked if they have worked with small groups.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that they have done some work with the area schools and other small groups like the boy scouts.

S. Babin asked if they are currently operating elsewhere in the area.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that they are operating on a limited basis in the town of Waterville Valley.

C. Piantedosi asked if some of the neighbors attended and expressed concern about the noise of the dogs barking.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that at the hearing she explained while they are hooking up the dogs there will be barking but it is limited to approximately 5 to 10 minutes and that the dogs are silent once they begin the ride.

L. Dale-Mesaros stated that it is by appointment only except for occasional training that will take place on the property which will take place within the parameters set by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

T. Phillips asked if any lighting will be added to the site.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that they will only use their headlamps.

T. Phillips asked if they will be selling any merchandise.

L. Dale-Mesaros responded that they would not be selling any additional merchandise.

T. Phillips asked for input from the public.

J. Demeritt suggested placing a sign over existing sign to avoid having too many signs in that area.

A discussion followed regarding how signage could be used.

The Board determined that the applicant could either use a temporary sandwich type sign (or a sign fixed to the ground/snowbank with a stake) when on site or use a banner to cover the existing sign for the Sugar Shack Campground.

T. Phillips clarified that the applicant would be allowed to use the existing Sugar Shack Campground sign and no more than one temporary sign while they are on site.

T. Phillips stated the applicant would need to return to the Planning Board if any change was made to the signage in the future.

MOTION: "To approve the Site Plan application submitted by L. Dale-Mesaros of Valley Snow Dogz, LLC to allow educational sled dog excursions on property owned by B. Benton and H. Steele identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 3-37 with the conditions listed on the Zoning Board of Adjustment notice of approval for a Special Exception which include the following conditions:

1. To adhere to RSA 466:31
2. To use the existing gravel parking area on the left of the access road as indicated on the plan.
3. To use only the Sugar Shack Campground access road to access the site.
4. To operate not more than 114 days between the period from October 16 through April 16.
5. To operate between the hours of 8:00am and 7:00pm not to exceed 4 hours per day.
6. To limit the number of vehicles on site to not more than ten.

And with the following condition regarding signage set by the Planning Board:

1. To reuse/cover the existing Sugar Shack Campground sign and no more than one temporary sign while they are on site.

Motion: F. Freeman

Second: C. Piantedosi

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7 – Yes, 0 - No

Franz Dubach / Informational

F. Gunter recused himself.

The Board met with J. March of Mountain Mapping regarding a subdivision approved in 2007 on Fondue Ave.

J. March explained that F. Dubach recently sold his existing home on Map 17 Lot 1-3-20 and plans to construct a new home on the lot across the street, Map 17 Lot 1-3-17.

J. March explained that the subdivision was approved with a right-of-way through Map 17 Lot 1-3-17 which serves Lots 17/1-3-21 and 17/1-3-20.

J. March asked the Board's opinion regarding constructing a driveway to serve the new home to be built on Lot 17/1-3-17 and also be used to serve the other two lots; 17/1-3-21 and 17/1-3-20.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the creation of a driveway that will serve three lots.

Board members made reference to *RSA 674:41 Erection of Buildings on Streets* which deals with the requirements of road frontage for a building permit to be issued for any parcel of land.

T. Phillips discussed with the board various options to remedy the situation.

T. Phillips stated that the lots without frontage will face challenges to obtain permission to build on those lots and that this would be a good opportunity to correct the deficiency of having back lots without road frontage.

T. Phillips suggested a road should be constructed to serve Lots 17/1-3-21 and 17/1-3-20 but understands the reluctance to do so.

J. Marsh asked the Board if they would consider allowing the relocation of the driveway for Lot 17/1-3-17 to serve 3 lots: 17/ 1-3-17, 17/1-3-20 and 17/1-3-21.

J. Demeritt stated the right-of-way should be made wider to allow for emergency vehicles to access the lots.

F. Gunter recommended allowing the relocation of the driveway to access the three lots.

R. Gilman suggested that the developer should build road to meet the frontage requirements.

B. Burbank suggested creating a 20ft. wide travel lane right-of-way to access lots 17/1-3-30 and 17/ 1-3-21.

R. Gilman suggested the board seek legal advice.

S. Babin suggested that the proposal come in with a clearly drawn set of plans showing what is being proposed.

T. Phillips reminded the Board that plans are not reviewed during conceptual/informational discussions.

T. Phillips asked if board members feel it needs legal review.

G. Kimball stated she was in agreement with R. Gilman's suggestion to seek legal advice.

T. Phillips summarized the concerns of the Planning Board are as follows:

- Fire safety and the ability for fire trucks to access the lots
- Recognize that there may be challenges in obtaining permission to build on lots 17/1-3-20 and 17/1-3-21 and that this would be a good opportunity to correct the deficiency of having back lots without road frontage.
- The opportunity exists to improve access to lots 17/1-3-20 and 17/1-3-21 to lessen the potential problems in developing those lots.

T. Phillips stated that F. Dubach can proceed with his plans to construct a new home on 17/1-3-17 and encouraged him to take into consideration the potential problems associated with developing lots 17/1-3-20 and 17/1-3-21 in the future.

F. Dubach stated there is already an approved separate right-of-way that would access lots 17/1-3-20 and 17/1-3-21.

S. Garber Presentation

S. Garber, a graduate student at the Center for the Environment, Plymouth State University, made a presentation regarding the Flood Hazard Analysis for the Town of Thornton which used the following outline:

1. Objectives
2. Scoping Process
3. GIS Spatial Analysis and Topology
4. Findings of Significance
5. Recommendations
6. Flood Resiliency
7. Open Discussion

Planning Assistant Items:

1. Fraser Meadows:
N. Decoteau presented a copy of Letter of Credit request sent to Community Guaranty Savings Bank and the Letter of Credit received in response for the Board's review.
2. Zoning Verification: Simes Day Care
T. Phillips signed the Zoning Verification Form from the NH Child Care Licensing Unit for Simes Day Care located at Map 16 Lot 4-36 as part of their State Licensing Renewal.
3. Meeting Dates:
Dec. 3, 2013 – Public Hearing Zoning Amendments definitions
Dec. 19, 2013 – Regular Meeting Date

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: "To approve the minutes of October 17, 2013 as presented."

Motion: S. Babin

Second: F. Freeman

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 4-YES, 0-No Abstained: T. Phillips, M. Peabody, C. Piantedosi

MOTION: "To approve the minutes of the November 7, 2013 Workshop as presented."

Motion: F. Freeman

Second: G. Kimball

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 3-YES, 0-No Abstained: S. Babin, F. Gunter, M. Peabody, C. Piantedosi

Adjournment:

At 10:25pm the following motion was made:

MOTION: "To adjourn."

Motion: F. Gunter

Second: G. Kimball

Discussion: None

Motion Passes: 7-Yes, 0-No

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy Decoteau

Planning Board Assistant

TOWN OF THORNTON PLANNING BOARD

AGENDA

6:00PM Thursday, November 21, 2013

A. Call to Order – Salute of Flag:

B. Roll Call:

T. Phillips, Chairman

S. Babin, Vice Chairman

John Paul-Hilliard, Ex-Officio

S. Macintosh, Member

G. Kimball, Member

C. Piantedosi, Member

F. Freeman, Member

R. Gilman, Alternate

F. Gunter, Alternate

C. **6:15 PUBLIC HEARING:** Determination of Jurisdiction re: CBDA/Recreational Campground
At 6:15pm a Public Hearing will be held to determine if the Planning Board has jurisdiction to consider a Site Plan Application submitted by CBDA Development, LLC for a Recreational Campground on property located off on US Rt. 3 identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 8-8 owned by Carlton C. Ham.

D. **7:30 PUBLIC HEARING:** Site Plan / Valley Snow Dogz, LLC
At 7:30pm a Public Hearing will be held to consider a Site Plan application submitted by L. Dale-Mesaros of Valley Snow Dogz, LLC to allow educational sled dog excursions on property owned by B. Benton and H. Steele identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 3-37.

E. Franz Dubach / Informational (*ETA – 8:00pm*)

F. Planning Assistant Items:

1. Fraser Meadows:

a. Copy of Letter of Credit request

b. Copy of Letter of Credit from CGSB

2. Zoning Verification: Simes Day Care

a. Kathy Simes Map 16 Lot 4-36 in the General Residence Zone / Allowed use

3. Meeting Dates:

a. Dec. 3, 2013 – Public Hearing Zoning Amendments definitions

b. Dec. 19, 2013 – Regular Meeting Date

G. S. Garber Presentation / Flood Hazard Analysis (*ETA 8:30pm for 30 minutes*)

H. Approval of Minutes:

October 17, 2013 Regular Meeting

November 7, 2013 Zoning Amendment Public Hearing

I. Adjournment

PLANNING BOARD
November 21, 2013
SIGN IN SHEET (Please Print)

- 1 ~~JAMES DEMERITT~~ 7/ FADDER RD
- 2 DEVEN M. EVERT 2959 US RT 3 Thornton
- 3 ROBERT PAULSON 3089 RT 3
- 4 Donna O'Donnell 2913 U.S Route 3
- 5 Byron O'Donnell 2913 U.S Route 3
- 6 BUREN BURKMAN 161 Upper MAD River Rd.
- 7 Cynthia Schfeld 21 C Ampton St. Th.
- 8 Helen Steele Thornton
- 9 ~~Sam Nuhn~~ G Mitchell Rd Th.
- 10 Dan Clark 2886 US RT 3 Th.
- 11 Pat Sutton 2886 US RT 3
- 12 ANIKA DALE-MESAROS Eastern Corner Rd Compton.
- 13 LIANARD DALE-MESAROS " " "
- 14 Jonathan A. Ham Ham Farm
- 15 John Cronin
- 16 Alexander Michaud
- 17 DIKE ANNGWOST
- 18 John March Mad River Road
- 19 Peggy Dubach 68 Foulmer Ave
- 20 Sandy Kehler 29 Sunrise Hill Rd.
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25