



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PO Box 120, Windham, New Hampshire 03087
(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362
www.WindhamNewHampshire.com

Planning Board Minutes
June 20, 2012

Board Members:

Margaret Crisler, Chairman – Present
Ruth-Ellen Post, Vice-Chair– Excused
Pam Skinner, Member – Present
Kristi St. Laurent, Member – Excused
Jonathan Sycamore, Member – Present
Lee Maloney, Alternate Member – Excused

Carolyn Webber, Member – Present
Ross McLeod, Selectman Member – Present
Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate - Excused
Sy Wrenn, Alternate Member – Present
Vanessa Nysten, Alternate Member – Present

Staff:

Laura Scott, Community Development Director
Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner
Cathy Pinette, Planning Board Minute Taker

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Crisler called the meeting to order at 7: 01 pm, followed by attendance and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Seat Alternates

Ms. Nysten was appointed to sit for Ms. St. Laurent, Mr. Wrenn was appointed to sit for Ms. Post.

Design Review Subcommittee - Interview and Appoint Subcommittee Members

- The Chairman explained to the public that the Design Review Subcommittee's charge is to review Planning Board applications for conformance with the Regulations and provide guidance and recommendations on these applications to the Planning Board.
- Mr. Peter Griffin addressed the Board. He would like to be considered for a position on the Design Review Subcommittee. He has over 30 years of design project experience. He stated his many years of experience volunteering on town projects and other volunteer work. He stated he served on the Board of the Boston Center for the Arts and evaluated work of architects, he was a member of the Windham Historic Commission and worked on the Serles School and Chapel, he volunteered and facilitated the planning of the Windham Town Center, he was past Chairman of the Community Stewardship Program, and he was Windham's representative to the RPC among other volunteer work.

- Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Griffin what term he would like to be appointed for. Mr. Griffin stated he is willing to fill any of the terms the Board desires.

Mr. McLeod made a motion to appoint Mr. Griffin to the Design Review Subcommittee for a 3 year term, seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- The Chairman asked Mr. Griffin if he was acquainted with the regulations. Mr. Griffin stated he has read them and he thought the Town really needed a document like that.
- Mr. Sycamore stated Mr. Griffin is well known and he knows many residents. Mr. Sycamore suggested Mr. Griffin could possibly recruit others for the Committee.
- Mr. Sycamore stated that the Committee does not exist until it is fully staffed. The Chairman stated, yes, she has spoken to another candidate who might be interested.
- Ms. Scott stated that the Department will be re-advertising for volunteers. She stated that the Town does have an applicant that needs to go to the Design Review Subcommittee.
- Ms. Webber stated that there is a core group of people in Town who always volunteer and the more committees the Town creates, the more stretched those volunteers are.

Public Hearings

Planning Board Rules of Procedure

A public hearing is to be held in accordance with NH RSA 676.1 (Method of Adoption), to amend the “Windham Planning Board Rules of Procedure” to add “Article 11- Design Review Subcommittee” and to revise “Planning Department” and “Planning & Building Department” to “Community Development Department” throughout the document.

- Ms. Skinner read the Public Hearing Planning Board Rules of Procedures into the record.
- Ms. Scott stated that there were two issues related to the ROP that the Board needed to discuss. One was to add “Article 11, Design Review Subcommittee”, and secondly to change “Planning and Building Department” to “Community Development Department” throughout the document.
- The Chairman stated this is only to address these two issues.
- Ms. Webber stated she received the first draft on May 30th and compared it to the June 20th draft and they are totally different. Ms. Scott stated those changes will be on another agenda, the Board will just be adding Article 11 and changing the name of the Department tonight.
- Mr. McLeod asked to delete the word “permanent” in section 11.1, in section 11.2 add the words “up to” after “staggered terms of”, add the word “an” to Section 11.4 on the second line, and take

out the line in Section 11.4 that states “and whether or not the Subcommittee supports the granting of any waivers that are being requested”. Ms. Scott stated that the “waivers” are from the design review.

Mr. McLeod motioned to approve as amended, seconded by Mr. Sycamore. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Case#2012-18 Customary Home Occupation/Conditional Use Permit

A Customary Home Occupation/Conditional Use Permit Application has been submitted by Michael Pisiello on behalf of himself and co-owner of the property Michelle Harris, for 12 Collins Brook Road (16-L-354), which is located in the Rural District. The proposal is to extend the previously approved (May 16, 2012) hours of operation for a business selling American classic cars and motorcycles to also be open on Saturday’s from 9am-3pm.

- Ms. Skinner read Case#2012-18 into the record.
- The Chairman called this public hearing to order
- The Chairman asked Ms. Wood if this application was ready for acceptance. Ms. Wood stated yes.
- Ms. Wood stated this was originally approved by the Board on May 16, 2012 and the applicant also had to have it approved by the State. Due to state licensing requirements the business must be opened a set number of hours. In order to meet the requirements, the applicant is proposing the extension of hours.
- Ms. Michelle Harris, 12 Collins Brook Rd, addressed the Board. She stated that they need to extend the hours to meet State licensing requirements.
- Mr. Sycamore asked if this was necessary as the Board was told originally that the sales were by appointment only. Ms. Harris stated that it is by appointment only, but the business needs to be open 37.5 hours per week to receive a dealer license from the State. Mr. Sycamore stated it could be open M – F, 9 – 5.
- The Chairman opened the hearing to the public, hearing no comment; the public comment period was closed.

Ms. Webber motioned to grant the applicant to be open on Saturday’s from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm, seconded by Mr. McLeod. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Case#2012-15 Lot Line Adjustment and 2-lot Subdivision

A Subdivision proposal has been submitted for Lots 1-C-1900 & 1-C-2550 (Londonderry Road),

located in the Rural, Wetland and Watershed Protection, and 100-year Flood Plain Districts. The applicant, Peter Zohdi of Edward N. Herbert Associates, Inc. on behalf of the owners Mary Devlin and The Devlin Family Rev. Trust of 1997, is proposing to complete a lot line adjustment, moving 4.248 acres from Lot 1-C-2550 to Lot 1-C-1900, making the Lot 1-C-1900 11.223 acres and then to subdividing Lot 1-C-2550 into 2 building lots for single-family residences, one sized 11.781 acres, and another sized 2.4 acres. No new roads, utilities, or off-site improvements are proposed.

- Ms. Skinner read Case#2012-15 into the record.
- The Chairman asked Ms. Wood if this application was ready for acceptance. Ms. Wood stated yes.
- The Chairman entertained a motion to accept for public hearing Case#2012-15.

Motion by Ms. Skinner, seconded by Mr. McLeod. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- Ms. Wood stated that all the information for this case was in her June 20, 2012 memo to the Board. The Highway Safety Committee had no issues with the line of sight which she specifically asked for.
- Mr. Peter Zohdi, Herbert Associates, representing the owners, Mary Devlin and The Devlin Family Rev. Trust of 1997, addressed the Board. Mr. Zohdi stated that they are taking two parcels of land and combining them, and then re-subdividing them. There is currently a house on one lot. They will have two lots totaling 19 acres. They have received a variance from the ZBA for not having frontage on a town road. The variance was upheld by the Superior Court. They have been to the Conservation Committee. He stated that because there is no access to Foster Pond, the applicant will give the Town an easement to get to the pond. They also need to get DES approval. They have met with the Fire Chief and they are working together for the cistern and sprinklers.
- Mr. McLeod stated that conceptually he needs to understand why the applicant is doing this. Mr. Zohdi stated that the applicant has two sons and he wants to give them each a lot. Mr. McLeod stated that there is already a house there. Ms. Zohdi stated that the house belongs to Mr. Devlin's sister and she wants more land and will put it in current use.
- Ms. Zohdi stated that there is an existing bridge on the property and at one time they received a dredge and fill but he does not know when. He stated the driveway will go through the WWPD. There is currently a makeshift driveway now. He stated the driveway easement is on the recordable plan.
- The Chairman stated that Ms. Devlin's house is on Londonderry Rd and she asked Mr. Zohdi if they want 2 more lots, where is the third lot? Mr. Zohdi stated they have 2 lots now and will be changing it to 3 lots.
- Ms. Nysten asked Mr. Zohdi if they have a variance for three lots. Mr. Zohdi replied yes.

- Mr. Wrenn asked Mr. Zohdi if the purple lines on the plans are easement driveways. Mr. Zohdi replied yes.
- The Chairman asked Mr. Zohdi if the Town was still leasing the ballfield, Mr. Zohdi replied no.
- Mr. McLeod stated that it looks like they currently have 3 lots and they are just moving the lots around. Mr. Zohdi stated they are taking two parcels of land and combining them, and then re-subdividing them. Mr. McLeod asked if the 10' easement around Foster Pond will stay. Mr. Zohdi stated that it will stay, they went to the Conservation Committee and discussed that and it is also on the plans. Mr. McLeod questioned the current trail around the pond. Mr. Zohdi stated that it was never a "trail"; it was Mr. Devlin's land.
- The Chairman stated that "Note 13" states "a 10' trail for pedestrian use only", Mr. Zohdi stated that is correct.
- Mr. McLeod asked if the applicant would change it to say "passive recreation". The Chairman agreed with Mr. McLeod.
- Ms. Wood stated that Conservation did not review but TRC did.
- The Chairman stated that the Board did not want motorized vehicles and Mr. McLeod stated he would like passive. Mr. Zohdi stated they will amend the notes to state "passive recreation".
- The Chairman asked where the driveway would enter and how the applicant plans on dealing with the mound on Londonderry Rd. Mr. Zohdi stated that they will not have to take out the mound and he showed the Chair the driveway on the plan.
- Mr. Zohdi stated the special permit is for crossing the WWPD in two locations. Mr. Zohdi showed the Board the bridge and ballfield on his plan on the wall board.

The Chairman opened the hearing to the public at 7:44 pm.

- Mr. Andy Sullivan, Attorney for Peter Rokel, 107 Londonderry Rd, stated his client's driveway was adjacent to the proposed driveway. The major concern is that you cannot see around the corner. He doesn't know what the road agent is seeing, there is no way you get 200 feet of visibility and the standard is you have to have 200 feet of visibility. He stated the best place for the proposed driveway is 80' down. He stated the proposed driveway is a shared driveway and there will be lots of vehicles traveling on it. They would like it paved. He stated they know Mr. Devlin is in the construction business and they would like it restricted to regular motor vehicles and not construction vehicles. There should be no parking on this driveway. Also, he stated the easement for the driveway should be available now to see who is responsible for what. He stated the Board needs to review the easement. Same thing with the conservation easement. At the North East side the elevation is 4' – 5' higher than the Rokel

driveway. Drainage is very important here. Looking at the topo there is a 14' drop and there will be a lot of water run off. In terms of the design review, the water should be angled away from going to the Rokel lot. There is a problem with the frontage. There is still a problem with the sight line, your ordinance states 200'. The drainage on 500' of driveway is a huge issue and will flood the Rokel's basement. Regarding the trail system, he stated the Board should look at the conservation easement.

- Attorney Sullivan read RSA 674.41 He stated he looked at the RSA and the easement or right of way language No building should be erected on any lot unless street access is given to the lot. If the driveway doesn't meet the criteria of 674.41 he thinks they should comply with that. If the driveway doesn't fit the criteria, they have to go to the ZBA before they pull a building permit. He thinks they must comply with 674.41 as a condition of the subdivision. He pointed to the conservation easement on the plan. He stated Peter has been walking that trail since 1969, for 40 years. They are exploring an adverse possession. The Town easement went into effect in 1989. He recommended the Board review the driveway easement, the conservation easement, have the driveway more angled so more water doesn't go on the Rokel property or move it down so that it is safer. He stated that where the driveway is proposed there would be 8 lots coming into an unlit intersection. He thinks restrictions should be placed including no heavy equipment and he would like a buffer of vegetation of a fence. He also questioned the utilities and stated that there is more to consider than there is before the Board tonight.
- Ms. Webber questioned the sight distance on the proposed driveway. The Chairman stated they also have to look at the topography. Mr. Zohdi stated that he cannot tell the Board the sight distance. He stated that Mr. Devlin has 19 acres and he can build if he wants to.
- Mr. Zohdi stated that they can put a 20% pitch on the driveway so it does not go into the Rokel driveway. Regarding the easement, he stated that the Board usually has Attorney Campbell review that. He stated he would put in arborvitae 10' on center and at the time of the planting they will be 3'. Regarding adverse possession, he stated that is a civil issue. He stated the Board has always been in favor of less pavement and asked for the Board's decision on that. He stated Mr. Devlin will put in 12" of gravel and will pass the requirements of the Fire Department. He stated they have had many meetings with Town Officials and have done their due diligence.
- Attorney John Cronin, for the applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that he respectfully disagrees with 674.41; he stated Londonderry Rd is a Class V Road. He stated that Hollis has many lots like this. He stated adverse possession is a civil issue. Regarding restriction on the lot, parking, etc., Windham has ordinances that apply to that. Easements are usually reviewed by Town counsel. The applicant is willing to grant the easements with amendments by the Board.
- Mr. Peter Rokel stated that where the driveway is proposed it is only 30' from his house, he requests 50'. Mr. Zohdi stated he has a 30' driveway setback, he has moved the driveway 16' from the lot line, the driveway width is 14' and he could put the driveway right on the lot line but he isn't.

- Mr. Eric Priest, 95 Londonderry Rd, asked Mr. Zohdi where the driveway would be. Mr. Zohdi showed him on the plans. Mr. Zohdi told Mr. Priest that it wasn't even close to his property which is 180' from the new house. Mr. Priest asked if there was going to be any additional building happening. Mr. Zohdi replied no.

The Chairman closed the public hearing comment period at 8:13 pm.

- Mr. Wrenn stated that the ROW is parallel to the property line, but on the driveway it shows it on one side. Mr. Zohdi showed Mr. Wrenn on the plan where the driveway is going.
- Mr. Sycamore asked what is stopping Mr. Devlin from rotating the driveway for a safer way to access the property. Mr. Zohdi stated Mr. Devlin worked hard with his sister to come up with the plan and she did not want her property divided.
- Ms. Nysten asked Mr. Zohdi for clarification of the utilities. Mr. Zohdi stated that the utilities will be above ground, possibly 2 poles. He suggested the Chairman read the letter from the Fire Department. He stated that the cost to do underground utilities is \$30 a foot. The Chairman read the letter from the Fire Department into the record. The Chairman stated that Attorney Sullivan made some good points.
- Mr. McLeod stated that the adverse possession is beyond the scope of the Board. The more he looks at the driveway, it is the best solution getting it to align with Brentwood Rd. He understands Mr. Rokel's dilemma but Mr. Devlin is putting in 16'. As proposed it makes sense.
- The Chairman stated to Attorney Sullivan's points, pavement and drainage are valid, the buffer should be planted, the easements should be reviewed by Attorney Campbell, and she thinks there should be a maintenance agreement.
- Mr. McLeod and Ms. Webber both stated that the maintenance issues are the applicant's issues and not the Board's.
- The Chairman stated regarding the line of sight that our Road Agent has signed off on that and the topography of that road is very curvy.
- Mr. Wrenn asked about drainage. Mr. Zohdi stated the driveway will be pitched 2% pitch towards the Devlin's property, it is not on the plan but he will add that.
- The Chairman stated as a matter of record that the ordinance says "no increased drainage to abutter's property".
- Ms. Wood stated that if the Board adds the language, "that there will be no increased drainage to the neighbor's property" if there was a violation of that, it will be a code enforcement issues. Mr. Zohdi stated they agreed to put the note on the plan.

- Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Zohdi what exactly the WWPDP waiver was for that they are asking for. Mr. Zohdi spoke about the dredge and fill that was done before and the bridge. The area was already like a driveway. Mr. McLeod stated that the request only states you are asking for a waiver.
- The Chairman stated that the Board should look at the waiver form as it doesn't have a place for what exactly is needed. Mr. Zohdi pointed to the pictures on the computer screen showing the area. He explained that the pictures were provided to the Board in the application.
- Ms. Nysten asked if the applicant was going to fix the bridge. Mr. Zohdi stated that Mr. Devlin will make that decision. Ms. Nysten asked what the applicant was proposing for a buffer for the neighbor on the driveway. Mr. Zohdi stated 16'. They have a 30' easement along the property line. They are not doing anything for first 16', next 14' will be a driveway to those two houses. He stated he would put in arborvitaes 10' on center and at the time of the planting they will be 3'. Mr. Zohdi showed the lot and WWPDP area on the computer screen consisting of 16 pictures.

Mr. McLeod made a motion to grant the waiver of Case #2012-15 to construct the driveway and only fix the bridge only in the WWPDP with no other disturbances done, 601.4.8.1, seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- Mr. Sycamore asked if the Board could make a condition for the file from the road agent that the placement of the driveway is good. Ms. Wood stated that the Highway Committee signed off on it, and the Fire Chief and Highway Agent were also in agreement with the placement and is good for the line of sight. The Chairman stated that they could add as a condition that there is 200 feet.

Mr. McLeod made a motion to approve Case #2012-15 Lot Line Adjustment and 2-lot Subdivision on the condition that on Sheet 1 of 6 instead of "pedestrian" it be changed to "non motorized", have the trail easement reviewed by Town Counsel, and no drainage increases to the neighbors property, seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- The Chairman asked about the plantings.
- Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Zohdi for his comments. Mr. Zohdi stated they agreed to put in the arborvitaes along the property line of Mr. Rokel, starting 3' tall and they don't want to do anything to the first 20' for line of sight.

Motion Amendments made by Mr. McLeod.

Agreed to put in the arborvitaes along the property line of Mr. Rokel, starting 3' tall after the first line of site and they don't want to do anything to the first 20' for line of sight to the Approval of Case #2012-15 Lot Line Adjustment and 2-lot Subdivision per Mr. McLeod. Motion seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- Ms. Nysten asked if the Board needed to have the driveway easement reviewed. Mr. McLeod stated the driveway easement does not affect the Town. He is more concerned about the trail easement as that affects the public and the Town.

Additional Motion Amendments made by Mr. McLeod.

To include as Ms. Woods memo of 6/20/2012 Notes on Plans: Subdivision approval must be granted by the State prior to final PB approval. Indicate the permit number of the State Subdivision Approval on the plans, the property owners must date all signatures on the final plans, and per Section 501.4.2 subdivisions shall include base flood plain elevation data. Also included is the Fire Chief's comments in his memo of 6/13/12 previously read by the Chair. To allow the scale on the final recordable plan and the existing conditions plan to be 1" = 100' as opposed to the required 1" = 40' or 1" = 50' in order for the entire sight to show on one sheet. That the applicant agreed to put in arborvitaes 3 feet tall after the first 20 feet, there will be none in the first 20 feet to preserve the line of sight. Ms. Wrenn concurred with the amendments. Motion and Amended Motion passed 6 – 1 (Mr. Sycamore opposed)

The Board took a recess at 8:52 pm and was back in session at 8:58 pm.

Ms. Webber left at 8:52 pm.

Major Watershed Applications – Case#2012-16/43 Sawtelle Road (Lot 17-C-100)

An Application has been submitted for 43 Sawtelle Road (Lot 17-C-100), located in the Residence District A and Cobbett's Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Overlay Protection District. The applicant, Joseph Maynard of Benchmarking Engineering on behalf of Brian Tedesco, is proposing to raze the existing structure and remove the existing gravel driveway and then construct a new single family residence, driveway, walkway, steps, and install a new septic system and well. The amount of existing impervious surface is 2,445 sq. ft coving 52.6 percent of lot. The proposed development would reduce the impervious surface to 1,885 sq. ft. covering 40.5 percent of the lot.

- Ms. Skinner read Case#2012-16/43 into the record.
- The Chairman asked Ms. Wood if this application was ready for acceptance. Ms. Wood stated yes.
- Ms. Wood stated that all the information for this case was in her June 15, 2012 memo to the Board.
- Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmarking Engineering on behalf of Brian Tedesco, addressed the Board. He stated that the lot does not sit on Cobbett's Pond but is 100' from the pond. The existing impervious surface is 2,445 sq. ft coving 52.6 percent of lot. The proposed development would reduce the impervious surface to 1,885 sq. ft. covering 40.5 percent of the lot. They are proposing to construct a new single family residence, driveway, walkway, steps, and install a new septic system and well. The permits from Shoreline & DES are in the mail to him.

Mr. McLeod motioned to accept Case#2012-16/43 for public hearing, seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed 6 – 0.

- Mr. Maynard stated they are proposing to construct a new single family residence, driveway, walkway, steps, and install a new septic system and well
- The Chairman asked Mr. Maynard if he has seen Mr. Keach's memo of 6/17/12. Mr. Maynard stated no, but he spoke to Mr. Keach and he has added the information.
- The Chairman opened the hearing to the public at 9:05 pm, hearing no comments; the public comment period was closed.
- Mr. McLeod's stated that his observations were that the impervious areas are being reduced significantly; there is a nice upgrade to the septic, drainage and drywell. He asked Mr. Maynard to explain the topography.
- Mr. Maynard stated it is a retaining wall and that is a slab. The wall is 2-1/2' to 3' high. Mr. McLeod commented that with the wall in place there will be less run off into the pond.
- The Chairman asked if there were only two trees left on the property. Mr. Maynard stated that the remaining trees are for shading.

Mr. McLeod motioned to approve Case#2012-16/43 as presented with the recommendation in Mr. Keach's memo, seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed 6 – 0.

Amendment to Note #1 on Approved Subdivision Plans

- Case #2010-15 (Lot 14-B-2800)
- Case #2010-16 (Lot 20-D-2300)
- Ms. Scott stated in her memo of 6/12/12, the Planning Board approved these two subdivisions on August 4, 2010 with no conditions. At the time Note #1 was inadvertently added to the plan that stated "Residential lots for up to 4 bedroom single family homes". At that time, no one noticed the Note and it was approved and recorded. It was not the intent of the property owner to limit the number of bedrooms on these lots. The property owner is looking to amend Note #1 to read "Residential Lots for Single Family Homes".
- Mr. Peter Zohdi, representing the applicant stated that Ms. Scott's memo was correct in what they were seeking.

Ms. Nysten motioned to amend Note #1 on Woodside North and South to read "Single Family Homes", seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed 6 – 0.

NH DOT Crosswalk Input Request

- Ms. Scott stated that at the April 30th BOS meeting, NHDOT did a presentation about changes being proposed along Route 111/111A. NHDOT is looking for the Board's thoughts on 2 items: 1. is one crosswalk located across NH 111 at NH111A intersection adequate or should there be a second one located at Range Road? and 2. What are the Board's thoughts on the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon.
- The Chairman stated regarding the Hybrid Beacon that she thought the current light at Range Rd would be taken out.
- Ms. Nysten thought they were talking about when the new 111 – 111A goes in and also Range Rd. She stated she thinks this would be a good idea.
- Mr. Sycamore stated it would work with the sidewalks.
- The Chairman stated the Board was talking about crossing 111. The Chairman asked the Board if they wanted a crosswalk across 111. The Board had a discussion as to where the sidewalks were and if they wanted one or two crosswalks.
- The Chairman recommends putting it at the current Range Rd.
- Mr. Sycamore stated that where there will be the most traffic is where the crosswalk would be necessary. He promotes two crosswalks. The Chairman was not in favor of two. Ms. Nysten stated that the way she understands it, the beacon only stops traffic as long as necessary. If the person moves fast, then the cars can get moving along. The Chairman asked if the Board could get more information. Ms. Scott stated this would be the type of opportunity to use the beacon. Mr. Wrenn stated that he is concerned with having two crosswalks and the beacon as that would impede traffic. Mr. Sycamore stated the Board could propose two and if DOT doesn't support it then they won't do it.
- The Chairman asked if the Board could ask Peter Stamnas to come in and give his recommendation. Ms. Nysten suggested a letter from Mr. Stamnas asking him about the safety of the Beacons. Ms. Scott will ask Peter for a letter of recommendation if he is in favor of crosswalks, having two close together and the safety of the two options. Mr. Sycamore asked Ms. Scott if she could find out how many feet down the new 111 is the sidewalk.

Planning Board Member (1 year starting in July) Appointment to WEDC

- Mr. Wrenn is the currently the Planning Board member assigned to the WEDC.

Ms. Skinner motioned to appoint Mr. Wrenn to another year on the WEDC, seconded by Mr. Sycamore. Motion passed 5 - 0 -1 (1 abstaining)

Site Plan Regulations Workshop

- Ms. Scott stated that no language has been changed, she has reformatted the Regulations. There are some holes in the Regs. Mr. Keach is doing the parking, traffic and storm water sections. She asked if the Board wanted to use the new format and/or fill in the holes where no language exists and/or edit and/or update the regulations to reflect current RSA's.
- Ms. Nysten stated she thought Ms. Scott would redline the document. Ms. Scott stated she only copied and pasted to the new format. There would be no way to redline. She didn't take out any language just copied and pasted what the Board had and reformatted it. Ms. Nysten stated she compared the documents and it is not totally new. Mr. Sycamore stated that when changes are made, that is when redlining comes in. Ms. Nysten is worried about losing sections. Ms. Nysten asked how the Board would know if anything was missing. Ms. Scott stated that it took 4 hours to copy and paste because she made sure she had everything. Ms. Nysten watched a ZBA meeting and they were concerned that pieces of their regulations were missing and they didn't know why. She just doesn't want that to happen to the PB Regulations. Ms. Scott stated that if the Board wants to work on the Regulations, then "track changes" would come into play and things would be redlined. Mr. Wrenn asked where the new formatting came from. Ms. Scott stated OEP's website which had drafts of plans, she took bits and pieces from other towns, other RPC's and RPC. She tried to put it in the order of a site plan.
- The Chairman asked if the purpose of this was to have uniformity to our regulations. Ms. Scott stated yes. The Chairman stated that we would be reformatting them in a logical way. Ms. Scott stated yes. She is not looking to do major rewrites; she is looking at the cleanup language and perhaps adding some pieces that would be beneficial.
- Ms. Scott stated she is working with Ms. St. Laurent to clean up the language and streamline.
- The Chairman asked the Board if they wanted to change the formatting and do they want Ms. Scott and Ms. St. Laurent to work on this.
- Mr. Sycamore recommends moving forward with the changes. Ms. Skinner, the Chairman, Mr. McLeod and Mr. Wrenn agreed. Ms. Nysten can see the benefit and would like to see "track changes".

Member Binder Update

- Table of Contents
- Site Plan Regulations (Tab #7)
- WFH Final Application (Tab #10)
- Designer Review Regulations (Tab #21)

Old/New Business

- The Chairman reminded everyone to remember what subcommittees they were on. Ms. Scott will send out an email with the list.

- The Chairman has a suggestion for the minutes. If anyone has changes to the minutes after they are drafted, to email them to the Board and staff in advance of the meeting where the draft minutes are schedule to be reviewed and approved. No discussions, decisions, or debate is to take place over email of the suggested edits. At the meeting, the Board can use the emailed suggested edits, as well as any other edits provided at the meeting, in making their decision on the minutes.
- Ms. Nysten asked if this was allowed.
- Ms. Scott stated as long as a Board member sends out the edits 24 hours in advance. There can be no discussion or debate via email. The staff would not make changes, the Board would need to approve first in public meting.
- Ms. Nysten asked that minutes be sent out to the members for review prior to them being posted online and distributed within the department as approved minutes to make sure all the approved changes are captured properly.
- The Chairman stated that these emails will be in the public folder, there will be no debating via email but the Board will be able to comment at the meeting.
- Ms. Scott stated that if the Board wanted Ms. Pinette to send out the approved minutes with the changes to the members, they should get back to her within 48 hours from the time she sends them out with corrections. Regarding the time frame for the Board's review of the amended minutes to confirm accuracy, Chairman Crisler said 48 hours, 2 days.
- Mr. Sycamore stated the Planning Board is the only board that is doing this.
- Mr. McLeod stated that the Planning Board Minutes have a higher likelihood of ending up in court.

Adjournment

- Mr. McLeod motioned to adjourn at 9:55 pm, seconded by Sy. Motion passed 6 – 0.

These minutes were approved on 7/11/12 and respectfully submitted by Cathy Pinette, Planning Board Minute Taker.