

**Pembroke Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 27, 2015
(ADOPTED)
Pembroke Academy Cafeteria**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Seaworth, Vice Chairman; Kevin Krebs; Larry Young, Sr.; Kathy Cruson

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Brent Edmonds

EXCUSED: Alan Topliff, Chairman; Robert Bourque; Fred Kline, Selectmen's Rep.

STAFF PRESENT: Stephanie Verdile, Town Planner; David Jodoin, Town Administrator; Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary

Vice Chairman Seaworth called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Alternate Member Edmonds agreed to vote in place of Member Bourque.

New Business

Vice Chairman Seaworth explained the meeting was a Design Review which is different from the usual application process although the meeting will be run in the same format as a normal application.

He stated the Design Review is not part of the approval. Even though there will be a discussion and public hearing, nothing said by the Planning Board or the Applicant is binding on the future application process.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said he would read the new business item, the Planner would give an introduction and then he would open a public hearing with a presentation by the Applicant along with discussions and questions by the Board members. He added that, before hearing from the audience, he would take a 15 minute break so that audience members could digest what had been said and review the plan drawings. After the break, Vice Chairman Seaworth would continue the public hearing for audience input.

He instructed the audience to stand and approach the microphone when making a comment and to state their name and address. He asked that they also limit comments to a reasonable length and not repeat already asked questions. If time allowed, he would allow more than one question or comment from the same person.

Vice Chairman Seaworth also said there would be no time for a Question and Answer session but would allow the Applicant to comment on some of the questions or comments and he would then close the public hearing.

He reiterated that no decisions would be made. It was just a chance for the Applicant and the Board to look at the design and make it available to the public.

Design Review Application, Subdivision #15-06, Pembroke Meadows, LLC. and DHB Homes, LLC. (c/o Bob Meissner), on Tax Maps 264, 266, and 567, Lots: 4 and 7, 25-4 and 26, and 1 located at 282 Pembroke Street, in the Medium Density-Residential (R1) Zone, Architectural Design (AD) District, and the Aquifer Conservation (AC) District. The applicant Patrick R. Colburn, P.E. of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., on behalf of the property owner Pembroke Meadows, LLC and DHB Homes, LLC (Bob Meissner) requests a Non-Binding Design Review Consultation with the Pembroke Planning Board for a subdivision proposal with 110 new residential building lots, construction of approximately 9,100 linear feet of new roadway, and connection to municipal water and sewer services. The Planning Board can discuss whether the project has the potential to qualify as a Development of Regional Impact.

Present: Patrick R. Colburn, Project Manager and Paul Chisholm, Project Engineer both of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. (KNA); John Cronin, Esq. of Cronin, Bisson, & Zalinsky P.C. on behalf of the property owners, Pembroke Meadows, LLC and DHB Homes, LLC.

Ms. Verdile said the application was submitted as a Design Review Application. The Applicant met with the Technical Review Committee (TRC) which includes all Town Department heads. The minutes of those meetings were made available to the Board and the Applicant.

Even though the application is not a formal one to the Planning Board, she said the Planning Department is treating it as a formal application by having a hearing and allowing abutters to speak. The Applicant is looking for input from the Board.

Member Cruson asked if the State had looked at the project in terms of driveway entrances onto state roads.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said the Applicant will comment on the question once the public hearing is open. He said that it was his understanding, the Applicant had not yet submitted the plan to the State for their driveway permits. The entrances onto Broadway and Pembroke Street would require State approval. To his knowledge, the State has not seen the plan.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board, Vice Chairman Seaworth opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Attorney Cronin introduced himself and Messrs. Colburn and Chisholm who created a comprehensive plan based on the Town's development criteria and regulations. He said that they are aware that the Design Review Phase is preliminary and acknowledged that concerns such as traffic, drainage, etc. will be fine-tuned later in the process.

He said the Applicant is aware the project is large and understand that the public and Board have concerns. He stated that the project, even without a growth control moratorium in place, will be done in phases. He said that, for Pembroke, it is a large project, but when compared to the available open land and the number of possible houses and additional people, it is a very small percentage.

Attorney Cronin said they do projects of this size in other communities and that the absorption in the market place controls the growth. They are happy to discuss with the Board what they believe would be a good phasing plan so it is done in increments which would allow people to get accustomed to the change.

He said the Applicant recognizes the style, manner, and goals for housing is changing because the population is aging. 15 years ago they would have considered building 3,500-4,000 sq. ft. homes. Now, they see that the demand is for smaller homes that are more efficient, have open floor plans and are approximately 1,800-2,500 sq. ft.

Attorney Cronin also said they are looking at how their project will affect the schools. He said that the number of children will be less than in the past since present households have fewer kids. They will also evaluate the traffic impact.

Mr. Colburn said he and Mr. Chisholm are the civil engineers and land surveyors representing the Applicant.

Beginning with the cover sheet on the plan set, Mr. Colburn pointed out that the project consisted of 5 existing lots of record from Pembroke Street to Broadway, which is approximately 125 acres. The 5 lots are presently undeveloped. A portion of the land is used for agriculture (a large corn field) and the remainder is undeveloped woodland. The Tennessee gas pipeline easement, with a width of 50 ft., runs North to South and cuts off 1/3 of the overall land area. The land is in the R1 District along Pembroke Street, the Architectural Design Overlay District, and the Aquifer Conservation District. Between the river and the property, Eversource owns a small piece of property.

On Page 1 of 24 of the Proposed Plan Sheet, it shows the intent to consolidate all 5 existing lots of record and to re-subdivide in order to make 110 new residential building lots. Although the Plan shows 111 lots, the last lot is a 33 acres nonbuildable lot. The nonbuildable lot is all of the land area West of and including the Tennessee Gas Easement. The proposed development is entirely on the East side of the Tennessee gas easement.

Mr. Colburn said they are proposing the construction of 9,100 linear feet of new public roadway that consists of a through road connecting Pembroke Street to Broadway and a few shorter dead-end cul-de-sacs and two loop-roads.

The roads have all been laid out on the present plan to conform with the Pembroke Development Regulations – 28 ft. of pavement with sidewalks on both sides, vertical granite curbing, etc. The stormwater will be collected in a series of catch basins and closed pipes. The stormwater will flow toward the river, and go under the Tennessee Gas Easement to 2 potential stormwater management areas on the West side of the Tennessee Gas Easement.

With regard to sewer, Mr. Colburn said Pembroke holds an easement over a portion of the Applicant's property. Part of the easement has an existing sewer main. The intend is to gravity-flow the new sewer main, collect sewerage from the new homes and run it downslope into the existing main at the Westerly edge of the property.

Mr. Colburn said the water will connect from Pembroke Street through the new development and to Broadway.

Referring to Sheet 23 of 24, Mr. Colburn said the stormwater improvements are above-ground which means that they are not proposing subsurface

treatment, infiltration, or devices for the land. These are above ground devices.

The Northerly side of the site has an infiltration pond thereby meeting groundwater recharge requirements. The overflow from that infiltration pond, as well as the proposed pond on the Southern end of the site, will discharge over the land and find existing stream channels that direct the flow from the ponds, downslope to the existing access road that provides the Town access to the sewer main. In the locations where the sewer goes under the sewer access road, there are existing cross culverts. This will ensure that there is no flooding for the Applicant's properties and downstream properties.

Mr. Colburn said this project will not be rushed. It will be taken slowly through the Design Review Application, and construction process.

The Applicant is proposing 7 phases (see Sheet 1). They estimate upwards of 10 years for full buildout. The 1st phase is the frontage lot along Pembroke Street. No road improvement is required to construct that home. The 2nd through the 7th phase will consist of short segments of proposed roadways and no more than 25 lots per phase which is pursuant to Pembroke's development regulations.

Mr. Colburn said they met with the TRC. They also met with the Roads Committee. He said the Fire Chief was interested in eliminating dead-end cul-de-sac streets. When they come forward with a more formal consideration, they will look at ways to potentially eliminate the 3 cul-de-sacs shown on the current plan.

He also said the Sewer Commission Office Manager, Paulette Malo, spoke with them regarding a situation with the deficiency of the capacity of the Wastewater Treatment Plant and the ongoing litigation between Pembroke and Allentown for additional capacity. It is Mr. Colburn's understanding the capacity exists and that it is a matter of who will enjoy rights to it. He said those agreements will be ironed out by the first of the year. It is not likely that much will happen between now and figuring out their sewer capacity. The plan could look different if it is changed from a project supported by municipal sewer to one which is not.

The Town Engineer raised the point that traditionally the Public Works Department "was not crazy about all the additional sidewalks in town". The zoning regulation in the R1 zone requires vertical granite curb and sidewalks along both sides of any public street which is what the proposed plan

outlines. The Town Engineer suggested the Applicant request a waiver for that requirement because the Public Works Department would prefer to not have the ongoing maintenance obligation. Mr. Colburn said he would like to hear whether the Applicant should consider a waiver. The change will affect the street widths and cross sections of both streets.

With regard to the access at Broadway and Pembroke Street, Mr. Colburn said that both streets fall under the jurisdiction of the NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT). The Applicant will hire a traffic consultant who will iron those topics out with NHDOT and come up with agreeable improvements for safe access in and out of the site.

Mr. Colburn said the NH Regional Planning Commission questioned a “handful” of lots that might not have adequate buildable area. He said that when he returns with a formal application, he will provide “nonbinding lot layout plans” that will show a traditional home with an attached garage and how it would lay on the site and be graded to support construction of the driveway, etc. in order to prove the lot can be built upon.

A Community Facility Study and an Economic Study will be done in order to evaluate the impact of the project on the Town.

Mr. Colburn said the Town Planner had a concern about phasing, and the fact there will be a considerable number of lots potentially constructed before the two means of access in and out of the site. Mr. Colburn has already reviewed ideas of how they can adjust phasing to address the concern.

The Roads Committee shared the same concerns heard at TRC.

With regard to State permits, Mr. Colburn said they had not submitted any State permits, however, the NH Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) will review the plan through the Alteration of Terrain Program, the Shoreland Protection Program, and the Wetlands Bureau. The Wetlands Bureau will be reviewing two required wetland crossings that they have to support construction of the proposed Ashwood Lane. They are proposed to be accommodated with reinforced concrete box culverts which create a natural stream bottom by submersing them in the low stream bed elevation and they are flagged on the inlet and outlet side with retaining walls which minimize the overall impact to the wetland and the wetland buffer.

Mr. Colburn said when he returns he will have, not only the special permit application for work in the Aquifer Conservation District but also a special permit application to work in the wetland and the wetland buffer which will be reviewed by NHDES.

NHDOT will review their current count permits through highway and traffic.

The Wastewater Engineer Bureau will also be consulted.

Mr. Colburn reminded everyone the proposed design is preliminary in nature and that they will do their best to answer any engineering questions.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said if the Design Review is continued to a future date, the public will not be renoticed. The public hearing would be continued with the Design Review. He suggested that the public stay to hear when the continuance will be or to use the Town's website to check the date of the continued hearing.

Member Cruson said even though the Department of Public Works does not support the concept of sidewalks on both sides of the street, she supported sidewalks on one side of the street in order to support children walking to school, etc.

Chairman Seaworth recalled a past subdivision review which proposed sidewalks on both sides of the streets and the Planning Board asked them to change it to one side.

Ms. Verdile said with regard to the sidewalks, the Applicant can apply for a waiver from that particular regulation. If the waiver is not approved by the Board, a homeowners association would be another option.

Member Krebs asked for the Engineer's thoughts on constructing all of the roads first and then creating the building lots. He asked the question because Mr. Colburn said the water was going to come from Pembroke Street but Phase 1 starts on the Broadway side.

Mr. Colburn said the road construction would happen only through binder grades - the first course of pavement for each individual phase proposed in that period. For example, Phase 2 shows the construction of Ashwood Lane from East or West of Broadway dead-ending at a hammerhead at Rosewell Lane and also the construction of Lancaster Lane which is a dead-end cul-de-sac. That phase of work would be serve with water from Broadway and they

would construct water to the terminus of the hammerhead and provide a blowoff hydrant at that location which would likely become a permanent hydrant when that water main is extended as the road is extended. Similarly, the sewer would have to be constructed under the new pavement to the new sewer main. Work would continue in an area that would not be run to binder pavement but maybe an area that is at gravel grade until it is permanent.

Vice Chairman Seaworth read a few questions from Member Bourque who could not be at the meeting. (1) With regard to the road frontage that is on Pembroke Street very close to the Broadway intersection (next to Lot 25), Mr. Bourque was wondering whether the Engineers had taken a look at making use of that road frontage and whether it was something that they would discuss with the State as an option, or if the Engineers had already ruled it out.

Mr. Colburn said that that particular location is quite narrow (Sheet 5 of 24). At Pembroke Street, there is 50 ft. of frontage at that location and then it narrows to approx. 40 ft. as it heads westerly. It is not enough width to accommodate a road. The only thing that could be proposed there would conceivably be a driveway. Mr. Colburn said he saw no sense in it since there would be inadequate frontage.

Vice Chairman Seaworth also said Mr. Bourque recalled on a previous application involving this property, a pedestrian walkway to provide access over Pembroke Street was discussed.

Member Young said it was considered as a pedestrian access to the schools.

Mr. Colburn said the read the same comment from the Town Engineer to the Planning Department. It is his understanding that Mr. Vignale is suggesting that, where Ashwood Lane is proposed to come out to Pembroke Street, they are approximately 325 ft. from Academy Road. He suggested that the Applicant connect to a new sidewalk along Route 3 to the signal and then wire the signal in such a way that it would accommodate pedestrian crossing across Route 3 to Academy Road. He said it was something that they would have to discuss with NHDOT.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said it had been past practice to encourage those suggestions made by the TRC and the Roads Committee.

There being no other questions from the Board, Vice Chairman Seaworth recessed the meeting at 7:40 p.m. to allow the audience to review the plan set and formulate questions for the engineer.

Vice Chairman Seaworth continued the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Vice Chairman Seaworth opened the hearing to members of the audience for comments. He reminded everyone to state their name and address and address any comments to the Board.

Karen Olsen, Beretta Court, said she received the notification letter on Saturday (October 24, 2015) which is less than 48 hours ago even though the letter is dated October 15, 2015. The letter indicates that if the abutters did not come and testify tonight that they would not be allowed to testify in the future. Because of the timeframe given to respond, she asked that the Board give the audience the opportunity to testify again in the future.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said a Design Review is separate from the application process. Although he does not know the exact language on the letter, he thought that it was making the point limited to the review tonight. At the application process, abutters will be noticed and will be able to speak at that time. The planner is also available to anyone who wants to come to the planning office to ask questions or discuss the planning process. He also said that the Applicants often have opportunities to meet with the abutters to discuss the planning process.

Karen Olsen, Beretta Court, said that it appears that the ultimate cost to the Town is significant (i.e. (a) the increase of schools and traffic at the school location, (b) the increase in overall traffic, and (c) the stress to the public water and sewer systems, police and fire departments). She said that the project is too aggressive even if it takes 10 years. She felt that the area was simply too aggressive -- not enough room for so many houses. Ms. Olsen said that the proposed site is clearly a migratory path for birds and mammals along the river. She hoped that Pembroke would continue to protect the area along the river and maintain it as a migratory path. She has seen various kinds of birds along the stretch of the Merrimack River of the proposed subdivision, not to mention the "huge blackberry patch at the end of the field".

Bruce Olinski, Winchester Court, said that Lot 7 on the proposed plan is currently an existing forested area that is behind his home. He asked if the forested area would be taken down. He also stated that the Town's Master

Plan should be taken into consideration along with the large impact that the influx of traffic and noise will have on Pembroke.

Cindy Thorell, Littlefield Condominiums, said that Hart Management received one abutter notice. Littlefield is a homeowner association where each homeowner pays taxes and, therefore, she asked why each homeowner did not get an abutter notice. By the time that the Management Association received the notice, copied it, and sent the notices to each Littlefield owner, there was very little time to look at the plans.

Ms. Verdile said Pembroke and the applicant follow the State law which requires the Applicant and the Town to notice the condominium association. They not responsible to notice each condominium owner. It is the Condominium Association's responsibility to notify the unit owners. The notices were sent 10 days in advance as required.

Ms. Thorell also said the project site contains many trees which will require removal for the project. There will be logging trucks and many construction vehicles which will add noise, not to mention the difficulty in getting onto Route 3 with the increased traffic.

Martin Priolo, 287 Pembroke Street, said it is very important to have a sidewalk on the Westerly side of Academy Road because of how busy it is with students. He also said it would be best to have the road come out at Academy Road with a crosswalk.

Nancy Mosier, 276 Pembroke Street, said the traffic light being discussed is on her property. When the Algeyers tried to develop the same parcel, NHDOT did not allow them to come out next to her home because it was too close to the light. She doubted that NHDOT would change their minds.

Ellen Gady, 7 Beretta Court, said that the main reason for everyone being present is the encroachment and invasion of everyone's personal privacy. She said that Route 3 is a very congested commuting road and she has watched the traffic increase for the past 30 years. If the project went through, the congestion would be absurd and privacy would be devastated.

Peter Campbell, 246 Pembroke Street, said that the prior proposed development to the site was deemed too much of a tax on the Town's septic and water systems. He has seen bald eagles fly around the river, and a mountain lion was once spotted in that area. He said the disruption of everyone's homes is an issue, but more importantly, he said the project was

not good for the Town and was only a way for the Applicant to make money. He would like to see less homes built so that it would fit the scale of the area and the Town.

Susan Burt, 215B Pembroke Street, said she had concerns of the general configuration of the development. She also asked if there would be access to the river and where the railroad tracks are located. She asked that the plan include a route or path to go to the proposed rail trail by the river.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said the Roads Committee also mentioned the area along the river. He asked that a note be made to address that concern.

Cindy Thorell, Littlefield Condominiums, said that the Condominium Association has been before the Board of Selectmen regarding a public trail along the Merrimack River. The Board of Selectmen sanctioned a public trail along the railroad through the Town. It is in the works.

Nathan Perez, 254 Pembroke Street, said he is concerned about the project taxing the water. He presently has low water pressure and wondered how it would be further down the line. He said the project is very large and puts the Town in a spot of not being able to commit to other economic projects throughout the Town.

Karen Olsen, Beretta Court, said the project site comes too close to some of the Littlefield Condominium homes. Their property values will decrease. She also felt it would be best if the project would wait until property values in Town rose before building additional homes.

Cindy Thorell, Littlefield Condominiums, said her property backs up to the border where the project will be built. She spoke with the engineers and they have agreed to meet with the condominium's board regarding some of their concerns. She said if the Applicant built a smaller community, the property values would not diminish. She strongly recommended that the Board walk the project site. She said that Brittany Circle would no longer have peace and quiet if the project goes in.

Wayne Burt, Pembroke Street, said that if each house was taxed \$7,500-\$8,000 x 110 homes, the result would be approximately \$800,000-\$900,000. He felt that the amount would not cover Pembroke's increase in costs such as water and sewer. Less than a year ago, his taxes increased 11%. He did not want to see it "mushroom to everyone else who lives" in Town.

Clint Hansen, 21 Broadway, said the number of kids that will result from the project would be marginal but the cost to the Town was a serious concern. What the Town will receive in tax revenue from the project in comparison to what the Town will spend will be “out of wack”. He also agreed that the project was out of scale and will cause a number of issues such as traffic. At the present time, the Broadway light is causing traffic to back up well beyond his home and further down Broadway. Looping the Phase 1 and 2 cul-de-sacs will add to that traffic without a light at the project entrance onto Broadway.

Mr. Hansen said by finishing the project as they propose, the water will not be taken off of Pembroke Street, but off of Broadway, because that is where he is getting his water. At times there is marginal water pressure. By adding Phase 1 and 2 homes onto the Broadway water line, the water pressure problem will worsen. He said if the phases were reversed and began at the other end, it would add congestion there. One way or another, 110 houses will not work realistically, not only with everyone’s lifestyle but the cost associated with that to the community and everyone involved in trying to get a fair return on that property.

Martin Priolo, 287 Pembroke Street, said he would like to see other options to the project that would be acceptable to everyone present.

Vice Chairman Seaworth asked for feedback on whether the development would be considered a Development of Regional Impact. He explained that a Development of Regional Impact is something that was set up by State law which formalizes the process of one town informing neighboring towns who may be affected by the development in the Planning Board review. It gives other communities a chance to get their comments to the Planning Board.

Member Cruson said she felt the project was a Development of Regional Impact because of the state roads that affect 2 sides of the project and the Merrimack River.

Member Krebs said the only area that he feels would be affected by the project would be Allenstown because of the sewer.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said water and sewer are the entities that presently cross Town lines. While sewer heavily impacts Allenstown, he said that the Board may want to consider that the Sewer Department may do a better job at coordinating that than Central NH Regional Planning.

Ms. Verdile said that if there are no large concerns by the Board or the Applicant, the Town was advised to have the Planning Board declare that the Design Review Phase be closed.

William Whitback, 2 Savage Court, asked if there would be gas work performed with the project since a large amount of natural gas work had already been done along Route 3.

Cindy Thorell, Littlefield Condominiums, asked who would be notified and what impact it would have on the project if the project was declared a Development of Regional Impact,

Vice Chairman Seaworth said the process of a Development of Regional Impact is informing abutting towns which goes through Central NH Regional Planning. They determine what other towns in the region would be impacted by the project and notify those town Planning Boards. It is then up to those towns to come to Pembroke's Planning Board meetings or send a letter to be read into the record.

Ms. Verdile offered to meet with Ms. Thorell after the meeting to go over the regulations that explain a Development of Regional Impact.

Mark Fuller, Brittany Circle, asked if the term "voting on a final design" means the present design.

Vice Chairman Seaworth explained the Design Review Process, unlike an application where at some point the Board either approves or denies the application, has the potential of going on forever as the Board and abutters continue to ask questions and the Applicant responds. In order to get the meeting to a close, the State gives the Planning Board the authority to determine that the Design Review is over. It does not approve anything or say that anything is good or bad about the proposed design, it merely says the Board is done with the process of reviewing and commenting on the design which then leaves the Applicant with the next step which includes revising the design and submitting it as a formal application to the Planning Board.

Mr. Fuller said that marker stakes are past the rock walls. They are also extremely close to all the property lines. He re-emphasized the fact that he is concerned because there are many trees in that area. He said that there is a pine tree where an eagle has been seen many times. He asked that they

rethink how much they will be affecting the land. He would asked that the Applicant bring multiple designs to the Planning Board.

Attorney Cronin thanked the members of the Board and the public for their input. He said they will take concerns seriously. He said the design was not something that was pulled out of the air. It was based on Pembroke's regulations pertaining to lot and parcel sizes. The Engineers looked at the regulations and came up with a design. The Applicant is looking at yield and parcel size.

He acknowledged the audience's concern over the size of the project. He also said the lot sizes of the proposed project are twice the size of those on Brittany Circle. He agreed that the project would be a Development of Regional Impact.

He continued to say in terms of the project and abutting properties, the layout will impact different abutters differently. In other subdivisions the Applicant has done, a number of concerned abutters came forward and the developer and the abutter were able to make other arrangements and, in some cases, the abutters bought the lots that were of concern. He said that if anyone has a specific impact that they are concerned about or does not want to have development abutting them, Attorney Cronin asked that they contact Mr. Colburn at 627-2881.

In terms of continuing the hearing for further comments or awaiting a sewer resolution, which is unclear as to the timing, he said that he had no objection to closing the Design Review.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board or the public, Vice Chairman Seaworth closed the public hearing at 8:42 p.m. He said if the Board continued the Design Review to another date, the public hearing would also be continued and the abutters would not be renoticed. He suggested that the audience stay and hear the resolution or refer to the Town's website for future hearing dates.

MOTION: Member Krebs moved to notify the applicant the Design Review stage for application Major Subdivision #15-06 is over and the applicant has the opportunity to submit a formal application for a subdivision review by the Planning Board. Seconded by Member Young.

VOTE: B. Edmonds – Y L. Young – Y B. Seaworth – Y
 K. Cruson – Y K. Krebs - Y

MOTION TO NOTIFY THE APPLICANT THE DESIGN REVIEW STAGE FOR APPLICATION MAJOR SUBDIVISION #15-06 IS OVER AND THE APPLICANT HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT A FORMAL APPLICATION FOR A SUBDIVISION REVIEW BY THE PLANNING BOARD PASSED ON A 5-0 VOTE.

Minutes- October 13, 2015

MOTION: Member Young moved to approve the October 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes as presented. Seconded by Alternate Member Edmonds. Approved with 2 abstentions – Members Kreb and Cruson

Miscellaneous

1. Committee Reports-

Hazard Mitigation Committee – Member Young said that the meetings have been well attended. There are 4 meetings left.

2. Planner Comments:

Ms. Verdile said the next meeting will be the first public hearing for zoning amendments -- the flea market definition and the TIF District noise ordinance. The Board will also discuss removing crematoriums from the downtown districts.

Vice Chairman Seaworth said that in the past work session, the Board preferred to create a definition of what needs to be regulated (such as flea markets) and leave yard sales untouched since it was previously regulated and did not work.

MOTION: Member Young moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Alternate Member Edmonds. Unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jocelyn Carlucci, Recording Secretary