

**Pembroke Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
(ADOPTED)  
March 26, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Brian Seaworth, Vice Chairman; Kathy Cruson; Brent Edmonds; Robert Bourque; Timothy Goldthwaite; Selectman's Rep. Ann Bond

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Andrew Githmark

**EXCUSED:** Alan Topliff, Chairman

**STAFF PRESENT:** Carolyn Cronin, Town Planner; Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

Vice Chairman Seaworth called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and introduced the Board's new Alternate Member, Andy Githmark.

With regard to the agenda, the Board agreed to hear a conceptual presentation from a new applicant before continuing to the three previous items from the last meeting since conceptals are normally shorter.

Vice Chairman Seaworth reminded everyone that the conceptual plan is not a public hearing. It is an informal discussion between the potential applicant and the Board prior to filing their application. All comments are non-binding. The conceptual allows the applicant to get an idea of what the Board might think of their plans before they go through the process of submitting a full application. Public comments will not be appropriate.

**Discussion Item**

**1. Conceptual Subdivision Plan, William Evans and Steve Lewis, Tax Map 563, Lot 15 located at 225-229 Beacon Hill Road in the Medium Density Residential (R1) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District**

The Applicant requests general feedback, comments, and questions before making a formal application submittal to the Board.

**Present:** Steve Lewis (builder) and William Evans (land owner and engineer)

Mr. Lewis said that he has been building for 45 years. Mr. Evans will be his partner whom he has known for 45 years.

Mr. Lewis said that his expertise is affordable housing. He works very closely with the NH Housing Finance Authority (NHHFA). His business utilizes the 9% low income housing tax credit program which is a federal program that provides funding to build units that are truly affordable. The target is people on a fixed income such as social security.

A few years ago, he was approached by the Londonderry Town Administrator to build senior housing. The Town became Mr. Lewis' partner and offered him 12 acres of land for the project which they now are in the process of finishing.

Mr. Lewis said that Mr. Evan's Pembroke land would work well with the same type of building that was built in Londonderry. He intends to use only a small portion of the 45 acres. The remainder of the land will remain wooded open space.

As a comparison, Mr. Lewis said that the Londonderry project consists of 2 buildings on 12 acres. The buildings take up approximately 6-7% of the land, which is the same scenario as Pembroke would be.

He said that he was also finishing a phased project in Plaistow, NH.

The Pembroke project will be a phased project which the NHHFA prefers so that federal funds can be spread throughout the state.

The Pembroke project will consist of three buildings. NHHFA requires that a building must be totally completed and fully occupied before an applicant can apply for another funding phase. Funding phases take approximately 1-1/2 years.

Mr. Lewis passed around a photo of the exact building being proposed on Beacon Hill Road. The building in the photo was built in Londonderry and Salem and has won design awards. The Salem project also won a land-use award.

He said that the federal application process takes a long time and is very competitive. There is no guarantee that he will get funding. NHHFA tries to do about 5 projects per year throughout the State.

Mr. Lewis said that he is proud that he is a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provider. Everyone in his office is HUD trained and approved.

HUD provides third-party verifications through the life of the project and requires a 99-year land restriction.

He said that abutters and the communities want assurances that the housing will stay affordable and nice. Mr. Lewis said that HUD comes every year, unannounced, to his offices to check the files. They also interview the residents of the project.

He continued to say that this type of housing must provide services such as a community center and a service coordinator that takes care of problems and helps residents. Since the rents are 60% of a resident's median income, it must include everything such as energy and services on site. For Londonderry, Plaistow and Atkinson projects, they have a contract with the Rockingham County Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) to provide healthcare, aging-in-place, or whatever the service coordinator finds that the residents ask for. They also have a library and small business center to assist residents with tasks such as computers, sending emails, printing, etc.

In a nutshell, Mr. Lewis said that the project is rental housing administered by NHHFA.

Since he started building in 1980, he owns and manages every project.

Mr. Lewis said that he is required to do a very expensive market study but before doing so, he would like to hear from the community.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that during the presentation, Mr. Lewis spoke of low income, affordable housing, yet, at other times, he focused on “over 55” and elderly services. He asked if the Pembroke project was specifically targeted to the elderly.

Mr. Lewis said that he generally builds age-restricted housing. He has only built one workforce housing project. It was requested by the Town of Salem.

He prefers age-restricted housing because it is much easier to manage. He was told by NHHFA that there is a substantial need for age restricted housing in Pembroke.

Vice Chairman Seaworth asked what was involved in the federal process in terms of the application and the Planning Board.

Mr. Lewis said that it is a complete risk. When he applies for the funding, he is not guaranteed to receive it. If he does not have approved plans, he will not score well. Mr. Lewis said that he has never been turned down because, in his opinion, he does his homework. He does not approach NHHFA until everything is done and, by the same token, he does not come to the Planning Board unless everything is ready.

He said that he would bring the plan to the Planning Board, get it approved, and then submit the application for funding. The plan may be approved, for example, this fall and not be funded until a year later. The competition is steep. The projects are scored and his projects generally score well because NHHFA bases it on experience, whether the applicant is a HUD provider, and whether other projects completed by Mr. Lewis have ever come back to haunt them.

Member Cruson said that the proposed neighborhood is primarily duplexes. She said that the proposed building does not seem to meld into what the neighborhood currently has.

In a community such as this one, Mr. Lewis said that his project is usually the biggest building because it is the only way that affordable multi-family housing can be made. Because the piece of land is so large, there is plenty of room to buffer it.

He invited anyone interested to see his Salem project. It was built in an area of single-family residential units. He said that his units cannot be seen from the street. It is on a 1500 ft. curvilinear street.

Member Cruson said that the Beacon Hill Road area is not zoned for a large multi-unit building.

Lewis was aware that he would have to go before the Zoning Board. He said that his projects rarely meet the zoning.

Member Cruson said that it was her understanding that Pembroke has more than its fair share of affordable housing. She said that it would be an interesting thing for Mr. Lewis to investigate.

Mr. Lewis said that he will not proceed with the project until he has a market study. If the market study shows that there is not a need, then he would not get any money. He said that affordable housing with 50% of median income is considered deep low income housing which is the difference between what he is proposing and, perhaps, what Member Cruson is talking about.

Member Cruson said that if this project was for older people, she felt that Mr. Lewis would need an exit onto Pembroke Street. It is a long distance to get to the site off of Fourth Range Road. With a number of people in that area, she said that it may be important to have an easier route for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Lewis said that although these questions are premature, they all would have to be taken into account. HUD not only monitors the construction, but they also improve the site.

With regard to zoning, Ms. Cronin said that the present zoning for the site is single-family residential, two-family residential, or multifamily not to exceed 6 units. The project would require a variance.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked him to explain what NHHFA was.

Mr. Lewis explained that NHHFA is NH's agent for HUD. HUD does not have a large staff so NHHFA administers the money, provides for inspections, feedback, and engineers. They are a large non-profit organization in Bedford, NH that was created by the NH legislature.

Mr. Lewis said that if he does not have HUD funding, he will not do the project.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked how many bedrooms would be in each apartment.

Mr. Lewis said that since it is age-restricted, generally 60% of the units have 1 bedroom and 40% have 2 bedrooms.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond pointed out that Pembroke has no public transportation.

Mr. Lewis said that the project is designed for New Hampshire rural suburban communities. The residents have to be ambulatory. It is called "independent living" not "assisted-living" even though it has assistance such as a service coordinator and a community center.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond asked if Mr. Lewis thought about the direction of traffic flow.

Mr. Lewis said that he did not because he was waiting for input from the Board. The first step would be to initiate a market study which is approximately \$10,000-\$15,000.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that the Town has recently placed a \$2 million dollar bond on Beacon Hill Road, and she was concerned of the damage that would be done with construction vehicles on that road.

She was also concerned about the traffic on Fourth Range Road knowing that that road also has a 48-house project before the Board.

Mr. Lewis said that his construction equipment has to be weighted in size not to hurt existing road. His son is a State Trooper that is in truck enforcement for District 6. He said that if the trucks being used are adequate and legal, they will not hurt a road.

With regard to traffic, Mr. Lewis said that he is aware that he would have to have a traffic study done.

Member Bourque asked what the black marks represented on the plan.

Mr. Evans said that the black marks designate steep slopes.

Member Bourque asked what building would be built first.

Mr. Lewis said that the closest building to the road system would be built first, which is Building 3.

Member Bourque said that the Board has struggled with roads in small developments. He said that he would like to see a two-lane loop road into the project that would reconnect onto Beacon Hill Road forming two ways in and two ways out of the project. He explained that the Town has seen instances where emergency vehicles were not able to get out because the road was blocked.

Mr. Lewis said that most of the projects that he has built have that type of road configuration.

He also said that the project would take 6-10 years to complete. It would take 2 years just to start construction and usually 1-1/2 years between each building, times 3 buildings.

Member Bourque said that municipal water and sewer may be an issue.

Mr. Evans said that he has already spoken to the Sewer Commission. He said that the sewer would be available for the Town because it has to be. This project is federal dollars. At some point, Mr. Evans said, Allenstown will have to work out the sewer issue with Pembroke. He said that Allenstown has yet to see a septage truck that they have not loved. Mr. Evans said that his business was enforcement with the Department of Environmental Services for 30 years so he is aware of what they are doing in Allenstown. He said that Allenstown is nullifying the Town of Pembroke. He said that he would love to be at a meeting between Pembroke and the Allenstown Sewer Department because Allenstown is out of line. He said that Allenstown cannot squeeze the Town of Pembroke the way that they have been.

Mr. Evans said that every time he turns around, there is a moratorium on sewer in Pembroke.

He said that they are not doing anything without sewer capacity for the project. Allentown seems to be running the show. He said that Pembroke will find that this is federal dollars for construction grants. He mentioned that the Clean Water Act of 1972 provided federal money of 75% (20% from the State and 5% local) and that the Town of Pembroke should be careful not to be squeezed out of the game. He said that the money that has been spent is our tax dollars.

Member Bourque said that the Town has been to court several times on the subject and yet to win.

Member Cruson said that Mr. Evans was out of line. She said that this is not the place to discuss the sewer issue.

Mr. Evans said that the Board brought up the subject and that he would not get into it tonight. He said that the sewer issue would have to be worked out or the project would not move forward.

Mr. Lewis said that NHHFA would not approve the project without municipal water and sewer.

With regard to water, Mr. Evans said that the applicant would have to provide a booster pump.

Member Bourque asked if the open space on the remainder of the property would be controlled by the project or turned over to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Lewis said that will be at the pleasure of the town. There are no federal restrictions. If the Conservation Commission would like the property, it can be transferred to them. If not, the property can be held by the project.

He said that they just transferred 31 acres to the Salem Conservation Commission for the walking trail system. He said that Pembroke already has land behind this proposed property that is dedicated. His project will take up 3 to 4 acres of the 45 acre parcel.

With regard to drainage, Mr. Lewis said that they use innovative storm water management. They infiltrate everything. Nothing leaves the site. They use bioretention areas and rain gardens, to name a few.

With regard to porous pavement, Mr. Lewis said that he works with the University of New Hampshire. In Salem, they not only had porous pavement, they also had monitors and temperature meters to prove to engineers that stormwater infiltration works in New Hampshire. They tried to say that it did not because the ground freezes, but in bioretention areas there is biological activity which produces heat. They proved that it is possible to build a rain garden with indigenous plants that wick up salts. They use plants

that like to have their feet wet and can tolerate salt and can clean the water before it goes into the town water.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that the applicant created a yield plan to size the development. The plan was done by using quadri-plexes, which is only permitted in that zone by special exception. He wondered how the process would work because the yield plan is not allowable unless it was approved through zoning and then the development itself with the larger units is a variance from zoning. He wondered if the applicant would need both the exception to put in the quadri-plexes, and the variance to put in the high density.

Mr. Lewis said that they will do whatever is necessary. He does not know how else to analyze the soil and its carrying capacity in order to build this project affordably. The only way to determine density was to prepare an imaginary plan under the existing zoning regulations.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that one way would be to use only the duplexes which are permitted in the zone but he realized that it would cut the yield in half which is not appealing. He wondered about determining the yield by going through a process that is only allowed by special exception.

Mr. Lewis said that he would think that if they are going for a special exception and an adjustment, that it would be best to throw everything into it. Of course, he realized that it was an uneducated response and did not mean to represent his opinion as the right way.

Mr. Lewis thanked the Board and invited them to see his Salem project and how stormwater runoff is handled. The project is off Exit 1, off Interstate 93.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that the Board will review the following three applications all together and will continue the public hearing.

### **Old Business**

- 2. Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant proposes a 48-lot subdivision, including a new roadway and improvements to Fourth Range Road and Flagg Robinson Road. All lots will be served by private on-site septic and well. This plan is associated with Special Use Permits SUP-WP #18-318 and SUP-DW #18-319.

- 3. Special Use Permit Application SUP-WP #18-318, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit in accordance with Article 143-72.D., Wetlands Protection District, for construction of roadway resulting in impacts to the wetlands. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09.

**4. Special Use Permit Application SUP-DW #18-319, Jon Rokeh, Rokeh Consulting, LLC, acting as Applicant on behalf of San-Ken Homes, Inc. and SKRE Holdings, LLC, owners of Tax Map 262, Lots 43 & 45 located at 373 Fourth Range Road in the Rural/Agricultural-Residential (R3) Zone and the Wetlands Protection (WP) District.**

The Applicant requests a Special Use Permit in accordance with Article 143-53, Driveways, to permit three shared driveways in the development. This permit is associated with Major Subdivision Plan Application #18-09.

**Present:** Jon Rokeh of Rokeh Consulting, LLC and Ken Lehtonen, Vice President of San-Ken Homes, Inc.

Member Cruson recused herself.

Before the public hearing and presentation by the applicant, Vice Chairman Seaworth said that the Board had an administrative order of business to take care of. The issue was that, at the last meeting, Member Cruson recused herself because of the location of her property relative to the applicant's property. Based on some confusing advice, she recused herself after voting on a few items: (1) Whether the project was a Development of Regional Impact; (2) Whether to grant the waivers; and (3) Whether to accept the application as complete.

Legal advice obtained by the Town was to retake those votes with Member Cruson recusing herself first, so that there would be no implication of impropriety. Although her vote was not a deciding vote on the original motion, the Board felt that retaking the vote was still the right thing to do.

Vice Chairman Seaworth asked for a Board member who voted yes on each of the motions to make a motion to reconsider. He said that once the Board votes to reconsider, an additional vote will be taken on the original motion.

Vice Chairman Seaworth asked Alternate Member Githmark to vote in place of Chairman Topliff.

**MOTION: MEMBER EDMONDS MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT VOTE. SECONDED BY SELECTMEN'S REP. BOND. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**MOTION:** Member Bourque moved to declare the application as a Development of Regional Impact pursuant to Town of Pembroke Subdivision Regulations Section 205-12.A.(3) and RSA 36:55. Seconded by Member Goldthwaite.

Ms. Cronin said that the Towns that the Board felt should be notified were Concord, Epsom, Allenstown, and Central NH Regional Planning Commission.



**VOTE:**    B. Seaworth – Y                      A. Bond – Y                      T. Goldthwaite – Y  
              B. Bourque – Y                      B. Edmonds – Y                A. Githmark - Abstained

**MOTION TO DECLARE THE APPLICATION AS A DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT PURSUANT TO TOWN OF PEMBROKE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS SECTION 205-12.A.(3) AND RSA 36:55 PASSED ON A 5-0 VOTE AND ONE ABSTENTION.**

**MOTION: MEMBER GOLDTHWAITE MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE WAIVER REQUESTS VOTE ON CHECKLIST ITEMS PART A, ITEMS: S AND W. SECONDED BY MEMBER EDMONDS. THE VOTE PASSED ON A 4-1 VOTE WITH ONE “NO” VOTE BY MEMBER BOURQUE.**

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Seaworth moved to grant the waiver requests for checklist items Part A, Items: S and W. Seconded by Member Goldthwaite.

**VOTE:**    B. Seaworth – Y                      A. Bond – N                      T. Goldthwaite – Y  
              B. Bourque – N                      B. Edmonds – Y                A. Githmark - Abstained

**MOTION TO GRANT THE WAIVER REQUESTS FOR CHECKLIST ITEMS PART A, ITEMS: S AND W PASSED ON A 3-2 VOTE AND ONE ABSTENTION.**

Vice Chairman Seaworth instructed the Recording Secretary that whoever made and seconded the original vote would be the person to be listed as the ones making the reconsidered vote.

**MOTION: MEMBER GOLDTHWAITE MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE ON THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE. SECONDED BY MEMBER EDMONDS. THE VOTE PASSED ON A 4-1 VOTE WITH ONE “NO” VOTE BY MEMBER BOURQUE AND ONE ABSTENTION – ALTERNATE MEMBER GITHMARK.**

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Seaworth moved to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Member Goldthwaite.

Member Bourque said that the reason he felt that the Board should not be voting on completeness is because the procedures for changing a Class VI road to a Class V road are not being adhered to. The procedure says that the Planning Board and Zoning Board joint agreement says that the Board of Selectmen have to approve the opening of the road and also have to approve the layout which has to be part of the submission for the subdivision or site plan review. (Section 7, Page 3, Paragraph 3)

He continued to say that since the Planning Board has not, to his knowledge, received anything from the Board of Selectmen, he did not see the application as complete.

Member Bourque read aloud the following: (Under “Procedures for Changing a Class VI Road to a Class V Road As Part of a Subdivision or Site Plan Approval,” Page 3, under Planning Board, Paragraph 3)

“The Applicant files the application for Site Plan or Subdivision Review with the Planning Board, in accordance with the Planning Board’s regulations and schedules. The application must include the Board of Selectmen’s decision approving the layout, including the approved layout configuration.”

Ms. Cronin said that, procedurally for a project of this size, the applicant chose to file concurrently with the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen. They would not get Planning Board approval without Board of Selectmen approval.

Member Bourque said that, in his opinion, the Board is using up a lot of the Board’s time and the applicant’s time and money by proceeding through the plan as it is now which has not been approved by the Board of Selectmen. If the Board of Selectmen decide that they want a change, everyone will have to do it all over again.

Selectmen’s Rep. Bond said that the Board of Selectmen are having a site visit on May 4, 2019 and then will proceed to a public hearing on May 6, 2019.

Mr. Goldthwaite asked Ms. Cronin if this could be considered a condition of approval and yet be considered a complete application.

Ms. Cronin said that this topic was discussed among the staff about a month ago. The applicant filed with the Technical Review Committee, which is the first step of the process, which shakes out all the issues that need to be dealt with. It is at that first meeting, where they already filed for the Planning Board submittal, that it is brought up where they need to go – such as to the Board of Selectmen for the road opening.

She continued to say that, in this case, they are continuing with the same application. They will not have final approval of the plan unless the Board of Selectmen vote to open the road. If the Board of Selectmen vote to open only one road and not the other, or a portion of one or the other, which would change the design of the plan, the risk is completely on the applicant to redo their plans and engineering and refile a different plan. The risk is not to the Town. Therefore, Ms. Cronin said that the staff felt comfortable moving forward with the concurrent applications.

Member Goldthwaite said that it sounded like the Town was well-protected in that regard since the applicant is moving forward at their own risk. He said that he would feel comfortable moving forward with the application.

Member Bourque made one more point – he did not think that it was right for the Board to choose which procedures and regulations will be followed and which ones would be bypassed. By bypassing this regulation, Member Bourque said that he felt that that was what the Board was doing, and did not think that it was right.

**VOTE:** B. Seaworth – Y  
B. Bourque – N

A. Bond – N  
B. Edmonds – N

T. Goldthwaite – Y  
A. Githmark - Abstained

**THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETE WAS DENIED WITH A 3-2 VOTE AND ONE ABSTENTION.**

Ms. Cronin said that she spoke with Town Counsel when they found the error with the vote of the recused member. Town Counsel recommended that the Board retake the votes so that it would be on the record that everyone participating in the votes were suppose to be doing so. If the votes were the same as the original votes taken, then it was an opportunity for the Board to move on with the application. In this instance, which she did not anticipate and which Town Counsel did not comment on, Ms. Cronin felt that Town Counsel's opinion would be to not hold the hearing and have the applicant refile. Since she was not a land use attorney, Ms. Cronin said that she could not make that recommendation and would have to check with Town Counsel.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that Ms. Cronin's recommendation was valid.

He said that, what Member Bourque pointed out, and which had the support of the majority of the Board, is that unless the language changes, the application cannot be considered by the Planning Board without the Board of Selectmen's decision being part of it. Absent legal advice, Vice Chairman Seaworth said that he agreed with Ms. Cronin's statement, that, having failed this vote, the Board cannot continue with tonight's public hearing.

Vice Chairman Seaworth continued to say that this issue was missed in the original review. Usually it is all worked out before it comes to the Planning Board. He said that it was unfortunate but it may be that the way that the regulation is worded is not the way that the Board would prefer it to be worded.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that there are many things that allow applications to move in parallel as long as the applicant understands that it is at their own risk and decide to do so.

Ms. Cronin said that, with regard to the plan, nothing has changed in the plan and nothing new has been submitted since the last time the application was before the Board. The applicant has been filing with the Board of Selectmen to open the road. The Planning Board has not received any new information or any other letters from abutters with public comments.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that the site walk will be on May 4<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m. and the Board of Selectmen meeting will be suspended until Monday evening at Town Hall.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that the Board was talking about the Board of Selectmen site walk also being considered a site walk for the Planning Board and a Planning Board meeting. He said that that will only be possible if the application is before the Planning Board and open, which it does not seem to be at this point. As it stands, the Board can attend as members of the public but not convene as a Planning Board at the site.

Mr. Rokeh said that because of the change in the vote, the applicant's attorney will be contacting the Town. It is the start of a lawsuit.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that he understood. He said that this was all that could be done on the application at this time and apologized to the members of the public. He asked that they look at the Town website for postings of future agendas for the Planning Board to see if the public hearing is re-noticed for another night.

To the applicant, he said that he did not anticipate the vote going this way and apologized for bringing them out for a meeting that they are, unfortunately, unable to continue.

Ms. Cronin said that she would call Town Counsel first thing in the morning and would rely on Town Counsel's guidance.

Member Edmonds said that it is unfortunate to delay the proceedings and process, but the Board has been told many times that Planning Board decisions are overturned more on procedure than they are on poor decision-making. He said that the Board has to err on the side of caution before moving forward.

Vice Chairman Seaworth recessed the meeting at 8:10 pm.

Vice Chairman Seaworth continued the meeting at 8:20 pm.

Member Cruson returned to the Board.

Mr. Rokeh said that he would like copies of the minutes and video tapes of both meetings.

## **Miscellaneous**

### **1. Other Business**

Ms. Cronin said that she sent an email to Board members about trainings. She also said that the CNHRPC would like to begin on the Suncook Valley Rail Trail Plan. She will check the schedule.

### **2. Board Member Items**

Member Bourque said that he was sorry to upset the apple cart but that since the procedures were agreed upon, he felt that the Board should follow them.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that the Master Plan Transportation Committee was meeting on March 27, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

Member Bourque asked if the Board felt that a time limit should be made on audience items.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that it should be brought up again when Chairman Topliff returns. He said that it has generally not been a problem. He thought that if an individual

evening starts to run late, the Board might want to address a limit for that meeting but did not think that it was necessary to formalize it.

Member Cruson said that last year there was a woman in the audience who had extensive comments and went on and on. She said that it would be good to discuss it.

Alternate Member Andy Githmark introduced himself. He moved to Alexander Drive in 2016, has been married for 12 years, and has a 6 year old daughter. He is a financial adviser in Manchester and his wife is a teacher in Hooksett.

He said that the Board may want to put a time on people because it may eventually be a problem.

Selectmen's Rep. Bond said that she attended the School Board meeting last week and they are looking to do a study to accept Allenstown students at Three Rivers School.

Member Cruson said that she is aware that some of the Planning Board material is passed on to the school district so that they are aware of the influx of students. She asked Selectmen's Rep. Bond if she thought that the conceptual is also being passed on to them and at what point is the School Board informed.

Ms. Cronin said that she added Patty Sherman to the TRC distribution list. If a formal application goes to TRC for a new residential development, Ms. Sherman receives the plan and is asked to comment. She said that Ms. Sherman is aware of the Fourth Range Road project.

**MOTION:** Member Bourque moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Selectmen's Rep. Bond. Unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary