

**APPROVED**

**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
July 6, 2020**

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

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

Secretary Cindy Kirkpatrick called the roll:

**PRESENT ROLL CALL:** Tim Doherty – present  
Jim Bergeron – present  
Cindy Kirkpatrick - present  
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present  
Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote – present  
Alternate Paddy Culbert – present  
Alternate Bruce Bilapka – present  
Planning Director Jeff Gowan – present

Via Telecommunication:

Roger Montbleau – present via telephone; no one in the room  
Paul Dadak – present via Zoom; no one in the room  
Alternate Mike Sherman – present via telephone

**ABSENT/**

**NOT PARTICIPATING:** Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde  
Alternate Sam Thomas  
Alternate Richard Olsen

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if they wanted to resume having ‘regular’ meetings without using Zoom (telecommunication). After a brief poll of the Board there was a general consensus to continue having meetings in person with an option for telecommunications.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**June 15, 2020**

**May 26, 2020 (Special Meeting)**

**May 28, 2020 (Site Walk)**

**MOTION:** (Dadak/Cote) To approve the May 26, 2020 (Special Meeting) minutes as written, the May 28, 2020 (Site Walk) minutes as written and the June 15, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Mr. Doherty – Yes  
Mr. Bergeron – Yes  
Ms. Kirkpatrick – Yes  
Mr. Montbleau – Yes  
Mr. Dadak – Yes

Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes  
Mr. Cote - Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

### **NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

Mr. Bergeron requested entering into non-public session to review legal opinions received in accordance with RSA 91-A:3, 2 (l) legal.

**MOTION:** (Bergeron/Cote) To enter into non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,2,L (legal)

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

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The Board recessed to enter into non-public session at approximately 7:25pm.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 7:42pm. Minutes of the non-public session were sealed during non-public session.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **CASE #PL2020-00002**

#### **PAWTUCKET ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC - 32 A & B Valley Hill Road – Proposed 3-Lot Subdivision consisting of duplex style units**

The applicant, Mr. Bob Peterson, came forward with his representative Doug MacGuire of The Dubay Group. Mr. MacGuire told the Board they had received their first review of the plan set from Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm). He said they had started to review the comments and make adjustments to the plans to meet recommendations. He indicated they would update the plans and come back in front of the Board for a second review. Mr. MacGuire understood the Town hired a third-party review of the existing conditions on site that was submitted to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services ('DES'). He noted earlier in the day they received a letter from DES stating they would review the information and determine if there are any discrepancies. He told the Board they had a discussion with the wetland scientist who did the reporting of the site and understood they didn't agree with the third-party reviewer and would stand by their original analysis. He mentioned they previously 'tentatively' scheduled a meeting with the Conservation Commission last month but had held off doing so pending a meeting with the State (DES). He commented the DES letter was inconclusive as far as any direction given and was unsure how the process would 'play out'. Their wetland scientist would like to justify their findings and 'weigh in' on the third-party review.

Mr. MacGuire requested the Board continue the case to allow them to address Mr. Keach's comments and to have an opportunity to follow up with the DES and Conservation Commission. He would like to be placed on the next Conservation Commission agenda.

Mr. Doherty confirmed that Mr. Dadak, Mr. Montbleau, Mr. Sherman, and the Recording Secretary were still connected to the meeting. Mr. Sherman was the only person not to verbally answer (however, he was still connected via telephone).

Mr. Gowan informed the next Conservation Commission meeting would be held Wednesday August 12<sup>th</sup>. The next Planning Board meeting after that date was August 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. MacGuire felt continuing to August 17<sup>th</sup> would give them an opportunity to receive feedback from the Conservation Commission and provide Keach Nordstrom with revised plans to review.

Mr. Doherty inquired about the normal timeframe to receive feedback from the State. Mr. MacGuire responded he and the applicant had been reaching out to the DES for direction; they just received an initial findings letter earlier in the day. Their goal was to reach out to DES to understand the process and address concerns. They would try to have the items addressed prior to meeting with the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication. No one came forward or voiced via telecommunication a desire to speak with the Board.

Mr. Culbert inquired when the application 'clock' would stop. Mr. Gowan replied the clock wouldn't stop if an applicant requests a continuance which the applicant had done.

Mr. Gowan didn't recall the plan going to the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') for review and offered to place it on their agenda so the Board would receive a letter of opinion prior to the Board's next hearing of the case.

Mr. Bergeron understood there were issues raised by Mr. Keach dealing with road centerline intersections among other things and suggested the applicant resolve those issues prior to meeting with the HSC. He recommended the applicant satisfy the DES and third-party review items coming to a finding before proceeding with other matters. He cautioned the Conservation Commission from making any decisions prior to that occurring.

Ms. Kirkpatrick agreed with Mr. Bergeron's comment about addressing matter in chronological order.

Mr. Montbleau also agreed with Mr. Bergeron's recommendation to hold off on other matters until learning more about the DES actions. Mr. Dadak agreed with the comments and would like to know how the DES letter would be concluded.

Mr. Doherty informed the applicant that the Board would like definitive information regarding the DES letter when they return in August. Mr. MacGuire agreed with Mr. Bergeron's analysis and said it was their intention to deal with the DES item first. He felt meeting with the Conservation Commission was an important piece to doing so.

The Board had a brief discussion regarding whether or not to hold two meetings in August. Mr. Gowan commented if he weren't able to be present the Planner/Zoning Administrator (Jenn Beauregard) would attend the meeting in his place. Mr. Montbleau stated the Board typically held one meeting in August. Mr. Doherty noted if a member was unable to attend a meeting an alternate could be appointed to vote in their absence.

The case was date specified to the August 17, 2020 meeting.

**CASE #PL2020-00003****Map 27 Lot 3-125****COREY CONSTRUCTION, LLC - 499 A & B Mammoth Road - Proposed 12-Lot Subdivision consisting of single-family homes**

The applicant, Mr. Bob Peterson, came forward with his representative Doug MacGuire of The Dubay Group. Mr. MacGuire mentioned since the last meeting they had conducted a site walk and received initial comments from Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm). Mr. Keach's June 29<sup>th</sup> letter reflects information contained on the revised plans. He felt they had made significant progress and took a few minutes to review the amendments made to the plan set based on Mr. Keach's recent letter. The main item was the concern regarding the Bush Hill Road improvements; Mr. MacGuire indicated they were able to meet the sight distance requirements from Mr. Keach's initial review. Curb cuts to Bush Hill Road had been reduced from four (access points) to two curb cuts; one being the access to the development the other being a driveway to a residential home. The driveway was designed to meet stopping and intersection sight distance for a collector road which were much more stringent than typically contained in the regulations for a single-family home.

Mr. MacGuire pointed out they had done substantial drainage improvements on Bush Hill Road to improve the existing conditions, which were included on the plan set reviewed by Mr. Keach. He understood one of the remaining concerns was construction management and construction sequence with regard to Bush Hill Road. He called attention to plan set sheet T1 – Traffic Management Plan and described the process of construction. Mr. MacGuire stated they were proposing a detention pond to collect the vast majority of drainage runoff from the existing portion Bush Hill Road while certain area will come from reshaped slopes on the property frontage. The improvements will provide substantially safer conditions with sight distance and also assist with current drainage concerns. In his review of Mr. Keach's latest comments, Mr. MacGuire saw there were some house-keeping items, notes and other minor items but saw the big issue was the Bush Hill Road traffic management. He had no issue with addressing the remaining comments.

Mr. Culbert thought sight distance was supposed to be 400ft. Mr. MacGuire replied the main intersection had 400ft. sight distance; it drops down to 325ft for a driveway on a collector road. Mr. Culbert confirmed that was per AASHTO. Mr. MacGuire answered yes. Mr. Culbert questioned if there was a landscape plan. Mr. MacGuire replied they weren't proposing landscaping because it was not required for a standard subdivision; however, they added the required street trees to the grading plan. He referenced plan sheet 6 that depicted the proposed trees. Mr. Gowan commented the Town doesn't have a good track record of maintaining vegetated cul-de-sac islands. He recommended choosing low-maintenance plants/treatments for the long-term attractiveness of the project.

Mr. Keach joined the conversation via Zoom. He stated he issued a lengthy initial technical review letter on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. He said Mr. MacGuire responded by providing a revised set of plans in early June that resulted in the recent letter of June 29<sup>th</sup>. He noted many of the concerns from the April letter had been satisfactorily addressed; the most significant was the matter of Bush Hill Road. He described the area and the proposed intersection. He referenced page 13 of the plan set that addressed 'pretty much all' the deficiencies. He said Mr. MacGuire has demonstrated that attainment of proper sight distance for the roadway intersection can be done; although he didn't know what the volume of excavation would be but presumed, he would receive information. He added the excavation could create a substantial improvement to that piece of road. Mr. Keach pointed out (on page 13) the vertical alignment at the proposed subdivision road (at the intersection) had been reworked. He said he will review the submitted information and have a report in due time. He said the project was going in as good of a direction as it could be given the daunting task he presented to Mr. MacGuire to achieve the work without being a nuisance to the area. He said he was being provided with better and better plans and hoped it would continue in that direction. Mr. Keach summarized the remaining remarks contained in his letter, which he felt should be able to be addressed.

Mr. Bergeron stated he would refrain from commenting on the unresolved items Mr. Keach spoke about. He referenced the peculiar shape of Lot 3-125-7 and questioned if the effluent disposal area ('EDA') would have to be cited in the 4K area because of the shape. He saw there were overlapping well radii but was unsure about what legally had to be done for them within a new subdivision. He wanted to know the distance between the boundary and the extreme arch of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Keach believed the distance may be approximately 30 feet. He spoke about the 4K area and explained they look for a demonstration there's at least one place on a lot that meets requirements for on-site wastewater disposal. He would be surprised if there was a home built on Lot 125-7 with the septic system situated in the location shown. He thought a better drawing to look at was sheet 8 (grading plan). He anticipated the actual leach field would be positioned along the edge of the right-of-way and the foundation for the home. Mr. MacGuire asked the Board to view sheet P1 (prototypical lot grade plan). He believed the leach field for the house would be placed in the front yard. To address Mr. Bergeron's concern, he indicated the intent of a topographical plan was just to show there was a 4K area that would meet the need for septic and have suitable soils. He stated they would be doing extra test pits and would do one in the area more likely to be the location of the septic system. Mr. Keach believed doing so would be a good thing, specifically near the house footprint on lot 7. Mr. Bergeron said he wanted to bring awareness to the issues he saw regarding lot shape and width being less than 5-ft. wide. Mr. MacGuire responded by saying he would look at the Regulations. He was under the impression that the concerns with lot width was when access came from frontage to get to the buildable rectangle. He said they put a good amount of thought and effort into how they laid the development out. He believed the lot was viable and plan sheet p1 substantiated that fact.

Mr. Gowan referenced page 26 of the Subdivision Regulations (last sentence of Section 203-1) '*...all lots platted under these regulations shall maintain a minimum lot width of 50 feet throughout*'. He said if there was any area narrower than 50 feet it would need a waiver. Mr. Bergeron recalled the last time a waiver was requested to that section it was denied. He didn't know how it would work this time around. He added that the regulation was in place for a reason.

Mr. MacGuire asked for feedback regarding the lot shape as he didn't feel it had an egregious shape. He didn't know how they wouldn't provide the shown lot shape given the cul-de-sac and the road not being a 'through' road. He felt the proposal was a reasonable standard subdivision and the lot was not unreasonable.

If voting, Mr. Culbert stated if he would deny it; he agreed with Mr. Bergeron's comments. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated she also agreed.

Mr. Cote inquired if all the lots contained 200 feet of frontage. Mr. MacGuire answered yes. Mr. Cote told Mr. MacGuire he had a hard time with having the extra driveway and wanted to know if there was another way to configure the proposal to still maintain the number of houses they were trying to achieve. Mr. MacGuire replied the natural shape of the development allowed for the frontage lot in the proposed location. He felt it would be a nice lot from an aesthetic standpoint. He referenced plan sheet p2 (prototypical plan) and explained the proposed home would have a garage-under setup allowing for a walk-out basement area; the lot sits at elevation 244 and the one next to it sits at elevation 235. He added the proposed lot would meet both intersection and stopping sight distances for the single-family driveway. Mr. MacGuire reminded the Board the original application lot 3 (on Bush Hill Road) at a different location; the proposal shows better sight distance than the previous proposal. He said the previous plan also showed lot 2 onto Bush Hill Road as well as another lot; they went from having four curb cuts onto Bush Hill Road down to having two curb cuts. He felt the Board needed to visualize the improvements that would be made to Bush Hill Road. He described the work that would be done to substantially open the area up and believed once it was opened up the Board would not have the same concerns.

Mr. Cote questioned if the single-family driveway should be moved further up Bush Hill Road to be within the curve. Mr. MacGuire replied they had the driveway in that location; however, when Mr. Keach requested the sight distance profile, they found the sight angle for a vehicle coming onto Bush Hill Road was unreasonable. He discussed the work they would do to substantially improve the visibility and sight distance onto Bush Hill

Road. Mr. Dadak wanted to know how much Bush Hill Road would need to be modified. Mr. MacGuire replied they would not have to adjust the grade of Bush Hill Road itself; they would not change the vertical or horizontal alignment. The road would maintain the existing geometry but would have more visibility and not feel as tight.

Mr. Sherman stated if the applicant had a lot that didn't meet the minimum width, they would have to put a waiver in.

Mr. Cote questioned if there had been comments regarding drainage near lots 6 and 7 were located. Mr. MacGuire referenced plans sheet 6 (grading/drainage plan) and noted they had taken a hard look at drainage given the concerns that were previously raised. He stated the drainage design was done assuming a fully wooded condition. They are accommodating the drainage and matching to the pre-development condition. He described the proposed drainage system. Mr. Culbert questioned where the interception was for lot 7. Mr. MacGuire replied they were not intercepting that runoff because they did not have to; they were modeling the property line edges in their analysis in both the pre- and post-analysis of the development.

## PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication.

Mr. Daniel Psoinos, Map 3 Lot 124-2 (abutting proposed lot 7) came forward in person. He told the Board the catch basin in that area was installed because the area floods out every fall/winter. He commented a tree buffer was maintained and questioned if any more trees would be cut down. He asked if the 'rectangle' shown on the plan was the buildable location. Mr. MacGuire answered yes. Mr. Psoinos replied according to that all the trees behind his home would be cut down; although according to plan p1, the proposed house was located more forward. Mr. MacGuire explained the buildable 'rectangle' was a criterion of the Board's regulations; they have to show achievable buildable areas on subdivision lots. He said in balancing the 'high side' of the project to the 'low side' they will be proposing to place a walk-up home (garage under) on the 'high side' to take advantage of the grade difference for the house and where a vehicle would drive in. He added there would be no need to cut additional trees from what had already been cut in that area as long as they could tie it into the existing grade. He said there was no need to go beyond the green space shown for the development. Mr. Psoinos said he appreciated the buffer remaining. He saw reference to a duplex (lot 3-125-12) and noticed all the drainage ended up on that lot. He saw the request was for a 12-lot subdivision and with that expected to see 12 single-family homes. He noticed lots 10 & 11 were each 2-family uses which he believed increased the number of units above was being proposed. Mr. MacGuire explained they placed the drainage in the shown location because it was the perfect location (low point of the site) to match the natural flow the site and discharge. He referenced the pre-development watershed plan and described the existing conditions.

Mr. Psoinos stated he objected to the duplexes. Mr. MacGuire explained they had eleven lots; two of which were duplex lots. There will be thirteen physical dwellings. He displayed a color rendering and noted there was an existing duplex as part of the development and one duplex being proposed. He noted the lot with the proposed duplex lot was previously two lots with access to Bush Hill Road; they were now combined together. He asked for the Board's feedback on the cul-de-sac waiver regarding the lot shape. If the Board wasn't inclined to grant a waiver for lot shape, he would consolidate another two lots into a duplex lot. He said the development couldn't afford to lose lots.

Mr. Psoinos was curious about the proposed size and selling price of the houses. Mr. Peterson asked for the location of Mr. Psoinos' lot. Mr. Psoinos replied he abutted lot 7. Mr. Peterson believed the houses would be similar in size to Mr. Psoinos' house. He added the proposed lots were conventional subdivision lots that could take any size house that could be built.

Mr. James Young, 497 Mammoth Road came forward in person. He told the Board his property was located to the left of the new duplex that had been built. He was concerned with the location of the detention pond being

located behind his house and would like to know more details about it. He explained he had water problems when the (existing) duplex lot was cleared and stumped. A trench was dug around the area after he contacted the Town. He wanted to know where water would go once the detention pond filled and what would stop his property from being flooded by the development. He asked who would correct a problem after the development was built.

Mr. MacGuire understood the concerns about drainage on the site and felt he had a good grasp regarding what was currently happening with drainage. He described the proposal for water flow, which was defined on the plan and would go through third-party review/inspection upon construction. He noted water would be going around Mr. Young's house and not toward his driveway. Mr. MacGuire believed Mr. Young would likely see less water because of the nature of the design and collection of water by the detention system.

Mr. Bilapka asked for confirmation that lot 3-125-11 contained the required square footage to be a duplex lot. Mr. Cote reviewed the dimensions and confirmed the lot (noted on the plan) contained 96,100SF.

Mr. Cote asked how many lots were proposed within the development. Mr. MacGuire replied there were eleven lots, including the (existing) duplex on Mammoth Road. Mr. Cote questioned if they had already started building the subdivision. Mr. MacGuire explained the existing duplex was done on the (approximate 16 acre) lot as a whole. He said there was nothing stopping the applicant from including it within the conventional subdivision as long as the lot met the Town's requirements. He noted the existing duplex frontage was 'a little shy' on the frontage requirement but had received relief from the Zoning Board. Mr. Keach noted the project started as a 12-lot development but had since lost one lot. Mr. Cote stated he had a serious problem including the existing duplex as part of the plan; he viewed it as the applicant starting the plan without receiving approval from the Board. Mr. MacGuire replied the duplex was properly permitted through all the Town's requirements. He said they could have subdivided the duplex lot off and then done a subdivision plan. Mr. Cote inquired if the main address for the entire property was the existing duplex on Mammoth Road. Mr. MacGuire answered yes. Mr. Cote understood the proposal was to subdivide the back side of the property. Mr. MacGuire answered yes.

Mr. Bergeron looked at the lot and inquired if the area dedicated for drainage was included in the parcel's calculation for usable land. Mr. Keach explained both the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations contained qualitative and quantitative requirements; the answer to the question was located in two sections. He referenced the table on plan sheet 5 and the calculation of the gross area compared to the buildable area showed the area that was either wet, had slopes greater than 15%, encumbered by easement etc. Because he was viewing the revised plan for the first time, Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Keach to confirm those areas are not included in the lot area. Mr. Keach then referenced plan sheet 4 that showed the calculations.

Mr. Doherty inquired about access to maintain the retention area once the development was completed. Mr. MacGuire stated they had created a restrictive drainage access easement down the property lines of lots 9 and 10.

Mr. Bergeron asked for the calculation of the required area for the proposed duplex. Mr. Gowan referenced and read aloud a portion of Section 307-13 of the Zoning Ordinance (page 7) that specified the required square footage of non-wetland area.

Mr. Cote asked why the existing duplex was constructed. Mr. Peterson replied he rented it out as an investment. He felt he had done a good job with the building. Mr. Cote felt it would have made sense to have a road in that location. Mr. Peterson didn't feel having a subdivision access a major highway (Mammoth Road) made sense in that location. Mr. MacGuire agreed with not having an access come down through Mammoth Road for a development. He pointed out it would be a very steep road to try to create access based on the topography. He said the proposed cul-de-sac road had the perfect balance between high and low (cut and fill) with a road in the middle. The proposed subdivision roadway was no more than 5% in any direction. Mr. Cote understood the original proposal was for a 62+ subdivision and wanted to know if the access for that development would have

been through Mammoth Road (at the location of the existing duplex). Mr. MacGuire said when they looked at the parcel from a 62+ or 55+ or conservation development, it always made sense from a grading and drainage standpoint to come in from Bush Hill Road to balance the site. Mr. Cote felt the existing duplex and associated drainage was part of the proposed plan currently in front of the Board. He said it seemed like the plan had already started without getting approval from the Board. Mr. MacGuire sensed several members of the Board shared that concern. He said the applicant had the right to develop the property within the Regulations. Originally, they looked at it as a 55+ development; however, the Town eliminated the 55+ Ordinance. At that point, the applicant decided to build a duplex and went through all the proper permits to do so. This was the owner's way to start developing the property. Mr. MacGuire did not believe there was any intention to circumvent a process or do something irresponsible; it was a business decision that made sense for the potential development of a property.

Mr. Gowan asked if the development would have cisterns or unit sprinklers (fire suppression). Mr. Peterson replied they would have to speak with the Fire Department. Mr. Gowan stated he would like Mr. Keach to review the plan but indicated it would be critical to have the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') review the plan very soon in the process. Mr. Gowan noted the road width should also be considered.

Ms. Kirkpatrick questioned if the land that was cleared was for the duplex being built. Mr. MacGuire answered no. He understood there were concerns about the clearing and told the Board he had clients all over the state who clear property making it easier for test pit work, surveying etc. He said the first step in developing a piece of land is to gain value through the wood. He added that Mr. Peterson typically cleared properties when he buys them because there was value in it. Mr. MacGuire noted there was nothing in the Regulations that would prohibit someone from cutting trees. Mr. Peterson told the Board he cut the trees approximately five years prior and built the duplex last year.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Montbleau if Pelham allowed mixed developments with single-family and duplex homes. Mr. Montbleau answered no, not to his recollection. Mr. Sherman was concerned with allowing the proposal containing two duplex units and single-family homes. Mr. Montbleau mentioned in good planning the Board had jurisdiction to decide if something like that would work. Mr. Culbert stated he had seen it occasionally, but not as a rule. Mr. Gowan agreed, although there were a couple cases in which it had occurred.

Mr. Doherty commented regarding duplex units being mixed with single-family units. He said it wasn't long ago the Board had a 4-5 lot subdivision in front of them. Through discussion the Board had the applicant re-design the drawings to have one less lot, which then became a duplex lot. Mr. MacGuire noted that development was on the corner of Spaulding Hill Road and Nicholas Lane.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board what action they wanted to take. Mr. MacGuire stated he had the plans ready to do an official submission with Mr. Keach to 'iron out' any remaining items. There was a brief discussion regarding the best date to continue the case.

The case was date specified to August 3, 2020.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Request to form Zoning Subcommittee to re-write the Conservation Subdivision Ordinance: Paul Gagnon, Conservation Commission Chairman**

Mr. Gagnon stated there had been a lot of discussion by the Board last fall. He said a citizen's petition was submitted that passed (during Town Meeting); the Town no longer had a conservation subdivision section in Zoning. He felt it would be worth putting it back in and he volunteered to be on the committee. He wanted to know if the Board would be willing to form a subcommittee.

Mr. Montbleau stated if the Board moved forward with forming a committee, he would like to be on it. Mr. Sherman volunteered. Mr. Cote thought it would be a great idea and would like to be on the committee; he will bring the topic up at the next Selectmen's meeting and give them the opportunity to join. Mr. Bergeron thought the Board should also recognize other areas of Zoning that need language changes, which would need to be part of any new conservation subdivision ordinance. He felt the underlying current in Town was to maintain a rural atmosphere. He wanted to see conservation subdivisions and open space continue to happen, but it would need to be completely different from what they previously had. Mr. Bergeron stated he would like to be part of the subcommittee.

There was no opposition to setting up a subcommittee. There was a discussion regarding the subcommittee membership and meeting structure. Mr. Sherman stated he would be an alternate subcommittee member. Membership will be open to other Town boards and interested public. The first meeting will be held July 23, 2020 beginning at 7pm. The meeting will be posted, and meeting minutes will be kept. It was noted there should be at least four Planning Board members present for the first meeting so they could then vote to appoint the remaining membership. Ms. Masse Quinn volunteered to be a member. Mr. Doherty asked the Board to consider allowing him to appoint members.

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Dadak) To authorize Chairman Tim Doherty to appoint subcommittee members.

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

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty appointed Mr. Gagnon as a member of the Zoning Subcommittee.

Mr. Gowan stated he would advertise the subcommittee to the public using the usual posting practices.

#### **DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S)**

##### **August 3, 2020:**

CASE #PL2020-00003 - Map 27 Lot 3-12- COREY CONSTRUCTION, LLC - 499 A & B Mammoth Road

##### **August 17, 2020:**

CASE #PL2020-00002 - PAWTUCKET ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC - 32 A & B Valley Hill Road

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

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

Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary