

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
March 5, 2018

Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

The Secretary Paul Dadak called the roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paul Dadak, Joseph Passamonte, Jim Bergeron, Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde, Alternate Paddy Culbert, Alternate Samuel Thomas, Alternate Richard Olsen, Alternate Bruce Bilapka, Alternate Derek Steele, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Tim Doherty

Mr. Culbert was appointed to vote in Mr. Doherty's absence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES REVIEW

February 5, 2018

MOTION: (Bergeron/Passamonte) To approve the February 5, 2018 non-public minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert abstained.

February 22, 2018

MOTION: (Montbleau/Passamonte) To approve the February 22, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert abstained.

March 3, 2018

MOTION: (Bergeron/Passamonte) To approve the March 3, 2018 site walk minutes as written.

VOTE: (5-0-2) The motion carried. Mr. Montbleau and Mr. Culbert abstained.

OLD BUSINESS

Case #PL2018-00006

Map 7 Lots 9-135, 9-135-1, 9-135-3, 9-135-11

MENDES, David - Katie Lane & Simpson Road - Wildwood Estates - Proposed Lot Line Adjustment

Representing the applicant was Peter Zohdi and Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates. Mr. Zohdi stated Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) had reviewed the plans and provided reports on the status. He said they had been answering the comments contained in such. He noted one of the main concerns was the proposal of a 22ft wide road with an open ditch drainage system, which they agreed to change it to a closed drainage-catch basin-curbed design. He noted additional land will be added to the open space under the power line. The total open space will be approximately 14 acres. Mr. Zohdi told the Board he submitted information and a narrative in support of a residential subdivision to Mr. Keach and the Board for review. Given their request for a conservation subdivision, he noted they were requesting a number of waivers; most of which had been accepted for consideration, except for the waiver of a traffic study.

Mr. McNamara went through the waiver requests and the Board took the following action:

MOTION: (Culbert/Passamonte) To accept for consideration, the waiver request for design radii – pavement curves and flares (northwest corner of the intersection between Katie Lane and Wildwood Road)

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom came forward to discuss the plan and waiver requests with the Board. He didn't find the requests regarding the road inappropriate (22ft pavement, centerline radius of 150ft, tangent length), given it would behave as a low-volume/low-travel speed street. He had no opposition to the Board granting the waivers for those three (geometric design) items.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To accept for consideration, the waiver request to Appendix I, BB.12 (tangent length).

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept for consideration, the waiver request to Appendix I, BB.17 (horizontal centerline curve radius).

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Lynde wanted to know if the Highway Agent would have a potential problem with the changes in the plan. Mr. Gowan commented that the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') had reviewed the plans with Mr. Zohdi. He noted for this type of street, it had been the Board's habit to accept the waivers with the understanding that wider and straighter isn't always a good thing. He noted the proposed was a small cul-de-sac street and a driver would be slowed down with the reduced width and road curvature.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To approve the waiver requests to: 1) design radii – pavement curves and flares, 2) Appendix I, BB.12 (tangent length), and 3) Appendix I, BB.17 (horizontal centerline curve radius).

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Lynde abstained.

Mr. McNamara noted there was a request for a note regarding the width and length of cistern turnout. Mr. Keach said he had made the request and the design engineer accommodated the request. He explained that because he requested curbing, the Fire Department will no longer have a gravel shoulder to pull-off the road at the cistern.

To give the Fire Department room for a vehicle, the applicant gave them a functioning area (8ft. platform) at the cistern.

Mr. McNamara asked if there was any comment regarding the requested waiver for road width. Mr. Zohdi replied when they designed the subdivision they met with the HSC, who didn't object to reduced pavement width (22ft travel way) because of the road length (1,100ft).

MOTION: (Culbert/Passamonte) To accept for consideration, the waiver request to Appendix I, BB.2 – reduced pavement width to 22ft.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Passamonte) To approve the waiver request to Appendix I, BB.2 – reduced pavement width to 22ft.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Zohdi told the Board they submitted a waiver request (Section 12.03 of Subdivision Regulations) to not provide a traffic study. He said it was a small subdivision that connected to a through-way.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept for consideration, the waiver request to Section 12.03 (Subdivision Regulations) – traffic study.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept for consideration, the waiver request to Section 12.03 (Subdivision Regulations) – traffic study.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To approve the waiver request to Section 12.03 (Subdivision Regulations) – traffic study.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Zohdi spoke regarding the waiver request for the 4K areas, and the State's requirements regarding such. He then discussed the waiver for well radius within 15ft. setback. Mr. Keach believed the Board understood the well radii request, because they deal with it in essentially 100% of the conservation subdivision plans. He spoke to Section 11.11(B)2, which effectively requires a 90ft. well radius to totally contain a well radius on a lot (in a conservation development). He noted that the applicant's proposal satisfies the 75ft. requirement. He then discussed the waiver of 4K areas (for four lots) and told the Board the applicant proposes to show the actual septic design and replacement area. He told the Board that lots 9-135-14 and 9-135-15 had no systems in the designated area and should the Board grant the waiver, he didn't want it to be misconstrued for not requiring suitable test pits. He said the test pit data showed a tremendous consistency of soil on the site with a high-water table. Based on the cluster of data he didn't believe there would be any issues, but still wanted to have the test pits. He reiterated that the granting of the waiver should not be construed as waiving the test pit requirement. Mr. Zohdi had no objection. He said if the plan was approved they would dig the test pits. Mr. Gowan noted that wells being entirely within the lots and setbacks was the result of past problems with well locations shifting when the wells were drilled. He suggested that the center of the lots be staked so the well driller knew where to

drill. Mr. Zohdi replied they always staked the center of the lot; it was the well driller's responsibility to maintain the location. He noted they were close lots with the radiuses going to the lot lines.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept for consideration the waiver request to Section 11.11 (C) 2 – 4K test pit regulation.

VOTE: (6-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Passamonte voted in opposition.

Mr. Bergeron understood that the septic areas were being shown without the 4K and questioned if they knew the loading for each. Mr. Zohdi replied every lot had to comply with the State of New Hampshire load. He said within an open space development they had to do a loading calculation for the whole site; not individual lots. Mr. Keach explained that the Department of Environmental Services ('DES') as well as Pelham has minimum lot sizing requirements. He doesn't review plans against the DES requirements; however, he believed the proposed lots would exceed those requirements. Mr. Bergeron understood that the soils on the lot were exceptionally good.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To approve the waiver request to Section 11.11 (C) 2 – 4K test pit regulation.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Passamonte) To accept for consideration the waiver request to Section 11.11 (B) 2 – well radii.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the waiver request to Section 11.11 (B) 2 – well radii.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Keach discussed the remaining items contained within his letter of March 2, 2018, highlighting the Zoning matters: 1) narrative supporting request for density offsets, 2) Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') impact requiring a Special Permit, and 3) address remaining items that are minor in nature.

Mr. Passamonte requested that the plan be site specific for the 4K areas and well radiuses. Mr. Zohdi had no objection. Mr. Keach felt it would have to be based on the tightness of the lots.

Mr. Lynde commented that he didn't see anything unique about the subdivision that qualified it for density offsets. He reviewed the criteria contained in Section 307-102. He felt the proposal met the criteria for 'cluster zoning' and was prepared to make a motion to deny the density bonus lots.

Mr. McNamara read aloud a letter submitted by the applicant dated March, 2018 titled: *Narrative in Support of Residential Conservation Subdivision Application*. The letter highlighted: A) Natural Features and Existing Features, B) Residential Use, C) Tabulation of Dedicated Areas, D) Density Offset, E) Summary & Conclusion.

In response to Mr. Lynde's comment regarding the criteria for density bonus lots, Mr. Zohdi stated they complied with everything in Section 307-102, except for having workforce housing. He noted that they were required to

have 1.998 acres of usable open space land and were providing 6.380 acres. In reference to frontage, they were dedicating over 200ft. frontage to open space on Simpson Road.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the Board received a letter from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Zohdi noted that the number of lots had not changed since they met with the commission, but the lot lines had changed. Mr. McNamara read aloud the Conservation Commission letter dated September 13, 2017. Mr. Zohdi told the Board one of the main things the commission wanted was access to the power lines. He outlined the area that would be added to the open space and noted the plan showed the existing and proposed trail systems. Mr. Bergeron said it appears that the intent of the commission had been satisfied, although they spoke to the 'tightness' of the development. He felt the proposal conformed to the existing regulations.

Mr. Lynde had a hard time accepting Mr. Zohdi's argument that they had complied with the requirements for bonus density. He said the proposal was not different from 'cluster' zoning and didn't offer anything unique. Mr. Culbert stated that he lived on Simpson Road and the land was beautiful farm land. He appreciated the farm land and was in favor of the proposal. Mr. Lynde said the proposal was no different than cluster zoning. Mr. Culbert commented that the applicant could pull the plan apart and submit a conventional plan.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion to public input. No one came forward.

Mr. Bergeron said he agreed with Mr. Lynde in theory, but not regarding the application in front of the Board. He believed they needed to make some changes to the mathematics for conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Lynde spoke about conservation developments and didn't feel the applicant had earned density lots. He said they weren't doing anything about affordable housing or recreational facilities. He made a motion to deny the request for the bonus lots. There was no second. Mr. Culbert made a motion to approve the two density offset lots. Mr. Bergeron seconded Mr. Lynde's motion (to deny the bonus lots) for discussion. He said the only way he would change the way he felt about the plan was if the Conservation Commission decided it was bad as proposed; however, he didn't see that happen. He pointed out that the commission wanted a conservation development more than they wanted a conventional development. He noted if they didn't give the applicant bonus lots they could then submit a conventional plan, which may destroy the property and not preserve it. Mr. Montbleau agreed with Mr. Bergeron. He was familiar with the land and noted that preserving the land was one of the main desires of the original owner. He believed the commission was seeking to preserve the open space for recreational and connectivity purposes. Mr. Lynde said it would be nice if someone created a community garden on the property and name it after the original owner. Mr. Bergeron understood that the land would be dedicated to the Town, so it could possibly be done.

Mr. Zohdi pointed out that one of the comments was regarding the covenant on the land. He understood that the Board of Selectmen would need to vote to decide whether or not to accept the land. He said when the land was being reviewed by the Selectmen the garden could be proposed. Mr. Gowan commented if the Selectmen accepted the land, there would be no reason to have homeowner's association documents because there would be nothing to maintain. Mr. Bergeron felt it would be a better benefit for the Town to own the land rather than have it go into a homeowner's association because an association could exclude the public and trail connectivity. He would want an approval condition that the Selectmen accept the land. Mr. Gowan said he would recommend that the Board send a letter to the Selectmen recommending that they accept the land. Mr. Bergeron wanted to know if the Board had the ability to condition their approval based on the Selectmen accepting the land. Mr. McNamara said were the land not accepted by the Selectmen, it would defeat the idea of the conservation subdivision. He said the Board could send a letter to the Selectmen strongly recommending that they accept the land as Town land.

Mr. Montbleau agreed with Mr. Bergeron and believed the Board could make an approval contingent on homeowner documents/bylaws indicating that the land couldn't be restricted for public use. Mr. Zohdi stated that the Conservation Commission's desire was to deed the land to the Town. Mr. Lynde understood that there

wouldn't be a homeowner's association if the land was accepted by the Selectmen. Mr. Zohdi said that was correct.

The Board then acted on Mr. Lynde's earlier motion that had been seconded by Mr. Bergeron for discussion.

MOTION: (Lynde/Bergeron) To deny the additional bonus density lots.

VOTE: (1-6-0) The motion failed. Mr. Lynde voted in favor; the other Board members voted in opposition.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the two additional density bonus lots.

VOTE: (6-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Lynde voted in opposition.

Mr. McNamara inquired if the Special Permit had been acted on. Mr. Gowan said it had been a convoluted review process of the plan and suggested the Board take another vote to be sure.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the Special Permit for Wetland Conservation District incursion.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The Board reviewed the approval conditions.

- 1) All State permits received;
- 2) A surety to be provided as recommended by Keach Nordstrom;
- 3) Letter of satisfaction received by Keach Nordstrom;
- 4) Site specific well radii and 4K areas to be documented in the field;
- 5) Open space will be proposed as a gift to the Town through the Board of Selectmen. In the event it is not accepted by the Selectmen, homeowner documents would have to be developed and approved by Town Counsel with language included to specifies access to the general public will be allowed in perpetuity.

Mr. Passamonte questioned if 'public access' would ensure that the trail system would remain. Mr. Zohdi noted the area under the power lines was all open land and they will create trails on portion outside the power lines to connect to existing trails. Mr. Keach said in the event the land wasn't accepted by the Selectmen, they might consider having the applicant create a 'public easement', which would go along with the points raised by Mr. Montbleau, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Passamonte. There was no objection by the Board to include Mr. Keach's suggestion as a condition for approval.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the plan with the stated conditions.

VOTE: (6-1-0) The motion carried. Mr. Lynde voted in opposition.

Case #PL2018-00008

Map 15 Lot 8-216

JAMES PETERSEN BUILT HOMES, LLC - Windham Road - Public discussion for a Proposed Elderly Housing Community

Mr. Dadak read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Representing the applicant was Peter Zohdi and Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates. He discussed the proposal for a 42-unit development for people aged 62+. He noted Gove Environmental had located and flagged the wetlands and done the soil classification. He told the Board that Bruce Lewis of Lewis Engineering had been hired to work with the State and create preliminary drilling for a private water system. Mr. Zohdi wanted to know if the Board was going to require side walks within the development and questioned if they would be in favor of a 22ft paved travel way. He inquired if the Board wanted a traffic study. The development will include a club house and associated parking.

Mr. McNamara explained to the public that the applicant had brought the plan in to the Board for review and feedback; no decision would be made at this time because the plan had not yet been submitted officially. When the plan is formally submitted the Board will conduct a thorough examination.

Mr. Culbert stated he would be in favor of a traffic study given the proposed density. Mr. Zohdi questioned if the Board would want a traffic study or a traffic count. Mr. Culbert replied he would want a traffic study given that the development would have one ingress/egress.

Mr. Gowan noted there was a Zoning question on the ballot and questioned if the plan would have to significantly change if it were to pass. Mr. Zohdi answered no; they already noted the computation on the plan. Mr. Gowan felt it would make sense for the plan to go in front of the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC'). Mr. McNamara noted the HSC may have some influence as to whether a traffic study would be a good thing.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Keach if he had any preliminary thoughts. Mr. Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) came forward. In response to the question about a traffic study, he felt seeking input from HSC was excellent. He suggested that the scope of the plan be determined after the HSC considered the plan. He raised questions about the condition of Claudine Drive (development's access), the function of the Simpson Road/Claudine Drive intersection, and the intersection of Simpson Road/Route 111 (Windham Road). He suggested Mr. Zohdi look at those two intersections both quantitatively and qualitatively. Mr. McNamara was a bit concerned about having one access.

Mr. Passamonte asked Mr. Zohdi to point out the open space. Using a displayed plan Mr. Zohdi located the open space areas for the Board and public. He noted that the applicant owned underneath the powerlines and although it wasn't computed as open space, it would remain so. Mr. Montbleau asked for the total open space acreage. Mr. Zohdi replied it was approximately 10 acres.

Mr. Bergeron said he couldn't recommend the plan without a second egress unless the Board heard from the Fire Department that it would be a safe development.

Mr. Thomas questioned if the open space interconnected with anything. Mr. Zohdi replied there were areas outside the wetland and buffer zone. He noted they weren't proposing a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Gowan saw that a portion of the road appeared to be at 6% after the cuts and fill were done. He thought the slope should be considered given the proposal was for an elderly development. Mr. Lynde asked if it would be a private road. Mr. Zohdi replied they were all private.

Mr. Passamonte stated he wanted the development to have sidewalks.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Nick Spanos 7-9 Claudine Drive said he and his fiancée moved to the neighborhood approximately two years ago, although his fiancée is a life-long resident. He was concerned about the road impact because Claudine Drive wasn't designed for 100 additional vehicles. He questioned what would happen if the Road collapsed.

Some of his neighbors were concerned with headlights shining into their windows from turning traffic. He noted with older people emergency response vehicles would be frequently accessing the development. Mr. Spanos discussed his concerns about the time during construction with noise, dust etc. He said there were children that play in the road, ride bikes and play tag football. With the additional traffic the children won't be able to ride bikes anymore. He said snow removal would be difficult and believed it would be plowed into his frontage once the cul-de-sac was put through. Mr. Spanos questioned why the development wasn't being accessed from Windham Road. In speaking with the neighbors, he said they didn't want the development accessed from both Windham Road and Claudine Drive.

Mr. Zohdi spoke about the geometry of the road. He said he would locate the houses in the neighborhood and see which may have headlights shine into their home so he could propose landscaping. In reference to access from Windham Road, he understood the Board may want access from both Claudine Drive and Windham Road; it would be the Board's decision.

Mr. Dave Goodridge, 7 Simpson Road, told the Board that his living room faced Claudine Drive. He said every evening the residents of the proposed community would have their headlights shine into his home. He discussed the history of his neighborhood. He thought it was ridiculous to bring the amount of traffic down the proposed access road without having a secondary entrance. He wanted to know why the development was coming off Claudine Drive and not Windham Road. He also noted their road was a playground for the neighborhood children. Mr. Goodridge said he wasn't objecting to the whole development, just the manner in which it was being 'thrown' at them. He stated it was the first meeting he had ever come to and appreciated the process.

Mr. Jason Gill, 8-10 Claudine Drive believed Mr. Spanos stated the points perfectly. He was concerned about the increased vehicles on Claudine Drive and believed a traffic study was important to do. He would like an explanation about why the access was proposed to come from Claudine Drive and not Windham Road.

Mr. Mark Getty, 7 Lemere Drive told the Board he lived across the power lines from the proposed community. He was alarmed by the density of having forty-two units on a small site. He explained that it was a very wet area that had water running through the property. He was concerned that the neighbors would have to contend with the wetland if it becomes a cesspool because of the forty-two units. He wanted to know if the Board could ensure that there would be a septic design that would ensure the wetland wouldn't become a cesspool. Mr. McNamara explained when the applicant brings in an engineered plan it would be sent to the Board's engineering review firm to fully review.

Mr. Alan Archer, 9 Lemere Drive spoke about the access to the power lines. He said it seemed that the access road was more on the easterly side of the setback and the new development wouldn't suffer any from the power line access roads. He said if the development was done it would put pressure on people living on the eastern side of the development. Mr. Archer explained that he owned just as much land under the power lines as the applicant, but he didn't think he'd have the right to do anything with his property because the power company needed access to the lines. He felt the development would close off access to the power lines from their side. Mr. Bergeron questioned if the access referred to came off Lemere Drive. Mr. Archer replied the access to the power lines was off Windham Road. Mr. Zohdi pointed out a wood road on the northwesterly side that the power company used, although they didn't own it.

Mr. Jennifer Kuilan, 2 Claudine Drive told the Board that a study should be done for the drainage on the roadway. She said the water currently settled down into her driveway and onto her side property. She also noted that the Town drainage system should be reviewed because the water flowed above the drain and wore away at her driveway. She was concerned with additional water flowing onto her property and causing more problems. Ms. Kuilan explained that the houses sit four feet above the road because there is so much water in the ground. She felt a study should be done on the whole road because there would be a severe impact to the water and properties. Mr. Zohdi told the Board they weren't proposing to send any additional water or drainage to Claudine Road. He referred to the proposed plan and pointed out they were proposing several catch basins and bio-retention area

toward their wetland. He noted that the plan would be submitted to Mr. Keach to ensure there was no change in drainage from pre-development to post-development.

Mr. Goodridge commented about the drainage and provided the Board with a brief history of the original development. Mr. McNamara replied when the plan was submitted he suspected the Board would conduct a site walk which would be open to the public.

Mr. Zohdi would like the opportunity to meet with the Highway Safety Committee to get a recommendation regarding the access. He said he didn't get an answer regarding sidewalks. Mr. McNamara asked the Board's opinion. There was a general consensus of the Board in favor of sidewalks. Mr. Petersen commented regarding the sidewalks. He explained that the houses would be twenty feet apart and have a twenty-foot long driveway. He said he had to make a slight increase from the road up the driveway and if sidewalks were added it would take 4ft-5ft away from the road which would create more of a slope on the driveways. He also noted that the sidewalks would have waves (because of the driveway cuts) making it so no one would want to use them. He said no one would maintain the sidewalks and they would mainly be used in the summer. He said adding sidewalks would take away from the green space in front of the units and believed the development should have as much green space as possible to absorb roof drainage. He asked the Board to consider those facts. Mr. Zohdi said they would meet with the Highway Safety Committee for advice.

Mr. Bergeron spoke about sidewalks and believed elderly developments didn't usually have sidewalks because they negatively affect drainage and create problems for maintenance and costs. He said he had been in many condominium and elderly associations and they were a bad idea. He said there were no examples of an elderly community with sidewalks that worked. Mr. Passamonte said if they didn't put sidewalks in the roadway width could be increased to 26ft. Mr. Bergeron said it would be wise to widen the road if there were no sidewalks. His comments were in relation to the topographical restraint of sidewalks within an elderly community. Mr. Passamonte was concerned with elderly people walking on narrow roads. Mr. Bergeron agreed.

Mr. Lynde had a basic problem with the proposal because it wasn't fulfilling a need that the Town had. He said it would import people who could afford to buy the homes and not take care of elderly people in Town who would like to down-size but had no affordable housing to go to. He believed the Town needed affordable housing for seniors and young families.

Mr. McNamara reiterated for the public that when the plan came back abutter would receive a certified notice.

NEW BUSINESS

Case #PL2018-00009

Map 33 Lots 1-161-10 & 1-161-11

MERRIMACK VALLEY HOMES, INC. - 124 & 132 Wyndridge Circle - Proposed Lot Line Adjustment

Mr. Dadak read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Representing the applicant was Mr. Richard Paquette of Maynard and Paquette Engineering. He explained that the proposal was a straight forward lot-line adjustment. When surveying to do as-built plot plans it was found that the house on lot 161-11 was too close to the setback line. They have re-configured the lot line between the homes to create an equal swap of the lot areas.

Mr. Gowan told the Board that the proposal was simple.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To accept the plan for consideration.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion to public input. No one came forward.

MOTION: (Bergeron/Montbleau) To approve the lot line adjustment.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Discussion of Zoning and Regulation amendment priorities, subcommittees, etc.

The Board discussed how they would proceed with review of Zoning and Regulations. Mr. McNamara suggested having representation from the other boards of authority in Town if a subcommittee is created. He wanted volunteers to have an open mind during discussions. Mr. Gowan spoke about the Master Plan and noted that the Master Plan Committee was nearly ready to bring in a chapter for the Board to review. He suggested adding additional members and having them bring a chapter at a time for review. He hoped the Board would consider establishing a Zoning Subcommittee and a Master Plan Subcommittee. He noted that the Board needed to think about how it would handle the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Bergeron agreed with setting priorities for a Zoning subcommittee; however, he felt the Board itself should review the Site Plan (Subdivision) Regulations because they were elected and responsible to the voters. He stated the Board needed to first set goals for the committees.

Mr. Dadak questioned if a person had to be a board member to be on a subcommittee. Mr. McNamara answered no. Mr. Dadak suggested an invitation should be extended to people interested in being involved. Anyone interested in being on a committee should contact Mr. Gowan at the Planning Department.

Mr. Bergeron suggested the Board draft a letter of invitation to be sent to the other Town boards and have it posted on the Town website.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Montbleau/Passamonte) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary