

MINUTES

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

6:15 P.M.

JULY 20, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dexter Legg, Chairman; Elizabeth Moreau, Vice Chairman; Rebecca Perkins, City Council Representative; Nancy Colbert-Puff, Deputy City Manager; David Moore, Assistant City Manager; Colby Gamester; Jay Leduc; Jody Record; Jeffrey Kisiel, Jane Begala, Alternate and Corey Clark, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Juliet T.H. Walker, Planning Director

MEMBERS ABSENT:

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes from the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.
2. Approval of Minutes from the June 22, 2017 Planning Board Work Session.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to approve both sets of minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLETENESS

A. SITE REVIEW

1. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **160 Corporate Drive**.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to determine that the application for site plan approval is complete according to the site plan regulations and accept it for consideration, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins. The motion passed unanimously.

2. .The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and 19 Rye Street, LLC, c/o Two International Group, Applicant**, for property located at **19 Rye Street**.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to determine that the application for site plan approval is complete according to the site plan regulations and accept it for consideration, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Cate Street**.

This item was not read into the record as the Site Review Application was being postponed to the next Planning Board Meeting.

.....

B. SUBDIVISION

- 1. The application of **Alexander C. Garside and Nicole Outsen, Owners**, for property located at **212 Park Street**, and the **Trudy Gould Irrevocable Living Trust, Owner, William A. Gould, Trustee**, for property located at **226 Park Street**.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to determine that the application for subdivision approval is complete according to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and accept it for consideration, seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – OLD BUSINESS

The Board’s action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature. If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest, that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.

- A. The application of **Ryan A. and Adrienne A. Cress, Owners**, for property located at **185 Edmond Avenue**, and **the City of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located **off Edmond Avenue**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer to excavate (8’ x 55’) along the south and west side of the house, remove and replace the existing headwall and failing CMP culvert and install new RCP culvert, with 750 ± s.f. of temporary impact to the wetland buffer. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 220 as Lots 56 & 79 and lie within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Municipal (M) Districts. (This application was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

David Desfosses, Department of Public Works, City of Portsmouth, is working with the Cress’s on their property. The goal is to repair the culvert. It was originally built as a replacement for the myrtle culvert after that culvert was buried with 95 construction. The house was constructed as part of that effort. The City is requesting to replace the dog-leg and put in a manhole there. If there is ever an issue with the dog-leg, then the manhole will provide an easy access point to fix it. The section getting replaced is a 25 foot 36 inch frame line that will be replaced with a reinforced concrete pipe. At the

inlet of the wetlands the applicants have proposed a new head wall. The existing conditions consist of a pile of rocks holding up the metal, so the applicants are proposing to add in proper piping and wall.

Mr. Clark questioned if the culvert is properly sized. Mr. Mark Batchelder, Engineer, responded that the replacement pipe would be the same size as the existing pipe. A full analysis of the whole area was not completed. Mr. Clark questioned if this could be a good opportunity to ensure that a 36-inch pipe is equipped to handle this. Mr. Desfosses responded that they would be happy to do that analysis, and added that there has been no history of flooding in that area. The belief is that the existing pipe is oversized today.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to grant conditional use permit approval, seconded by Mr. Leduc with the following stipulations:

- *The existing woody vegetation along the bank of the wetland shall be set aside and replaced (with the exception of invasive species) upon completion of the project.*
- *If the project results in unintended wetland impacts an amended conditional use and state wetland permit shall be secured.*
- *An analysis of the culvert’s capacity shall be completed.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and City of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **135 Corporate Drive**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval, under Section 304.A.08 of the Pease Land Use Controls, for work within the inland wetland buffer to construct a 74’ 8” X 30’ 8” headworks building at the wastewater treatment facility, consisting of three levels (one above grade level and two below grade levels), with 23,790 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 303 as Lot 6 and lies within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) District. (This application was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

C. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and the City of Portsmouth, Applicant**, for property located at **135 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval, under Chapter 400 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Site Review Regulations, to construct a 74’ 8” X 30’ 8” headworks building consisting of three levels (one above grade level and two below grade levels) totaling 2,290 ± s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 303 as Lot 6, and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABC) District. (This application was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

Chairman Legg read the notices into the record.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to hear both Item B and Item C under Public Hearings – Old Business together and vote on the items separately, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Don Song, Project Manager with Department of Public Works City of Portsmouth, with Brian Ruoff, Stantec Consulting Services, gave a brief overview of the projects. The applicants would like to build a new building that would house the process equipment for wastewater treatment. The treatment plant currently flows half a million gallons per day, peaking at 1.3 million per day. Future development in the City could result in an increase to five million gallons per day. The replacement of the old head works building will include the addition of carbon filter systems, replacement of systems, and making drainage improvements to the site. The septic receiving in the new building will be on the opposite side of the building than where it happens today. This will allow for better gravity receiving. A large portion of the property is in the wetlands buffer. Part of the proposed project includes a 3x3 infiltration trench to prevent disturbance to the wetlands. The storm drain from the highway goes through where the new building is proposed, so the applicants are planning to reroute that piping. The city water supply will need to be rerouted as well. Additional catch basins will be added and tied into the draining.

Mr. Clark requested confirmation that the trench would only catch runoff from the road. Mr. Ruoff responded that is correct, and the catch basins will be cleaned out 4 times a year.

Mr. Clark questioned if the applicants looked into treating anything in the 30-inch pipe they would be rerouting around the site. Mr. Ruoff responded that treatment has not been explored the plan is to just reroute it. Mr. Clark further clarified that the applicants did not look into treating any of that discharge and pointed out another applicant in front of them that is doing a project across the street. Mr. Ruoff responded that treatment has not been considered because of the proximity to the building. There is a marine clay soil in that area too that would help with discharge.

Ms. Begala questioned if the gray area on the plans were pervious or impervious areas. Mr. Ruoff clarified the gray areas were impervious. Ms. Begala requested clarification on how the wetland impact was minimized. Mr. Ruoff responded that impervious areas were eliminated with the redesigning of the project. The minimization is a reduction from the original design.

Chairman Legg questioned if the applicants considered locating the new driveway to the north, which would run partially outside the buffer. Mr. Ruoff responded that driveway is placed where it is to allow for the septic receiving and to make the grades work.

Ms. Begala questioned if the 24,000 square feet would be permanent impact. Mr. Ruoff responded no that is for the construction portion. The permanent impact will be 10,000 square feet. The remaining would be the trench and existing grass that will be turned back to grass after the project.

Chairman Legg noted that it was his understanding that 24,000 square feet would be the permanent impact and requested the applicant clarify the permanent impact. Mr. Ruoff referred the board to a table explaining the permanent impacts, which would be the building and the paved impervious area.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to recommend approval for a wetland conditional use permit seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore with the following stipulations:

- *The stormwater catch basins shall be maintained bi-annually,*
- *The site contractor shall be prepared to conduct soil remediation of contaminated soils if encountered,*
- *Trees being cleared for the project shall be replaced with evergreen trees to screen the site,*
- *The dewatering basin necessary for construction shall be located outside of the wetland buffer.*

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gamester motioned to recommend site plan approval, seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities of MA, Owner**, for property located at **62 & 76 Northwest Street**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the tidal wetland buffer consisting of minor grading around the house, a new yard drain system, two new grass swales and a level spreader, with 3,400 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said properties are shown on Assessor Map 141 as Lot 29 and Assessor Map 122 as Lot 9 and lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District and the Historic District. (This application was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Sean Beckwith, Preservation Manager for Historic New England with Don Woods, Engineer, provided a brief overview of the project. The Jackson house is the oldest wood framed house in New Hampshire, and needs drainage maintenance. Over the years the grade has built up around the building. As a result, they are now adverse grades directing water into the building. The drainage is getting caught and flowing under the building and into the basement. This has resulted in problems with the foundation and moisture in the house. The proposal is to perform grating to create a shallow grass swale to drain down the slope. The applicants cannot excavate as deeply on the other side of the building due to an ongoing archaeology project. They are proposing to add four yard drains in that area. One more swale at the end that will flow into a level spreader, which will take all the concentrated runoff to spread out before it drains to existing grass. Applicants have already received state shoreland and wetlands permits.

Ms. Begala noted that the 4-inch deep drainage pipe that was installed in 2005 has already failed. Ms. Begala questioned if Mr. Woods was on the project in 2005 and if he knew why it was failing. Mr. Woods responded that he was not on the project in 2005. The pipe runs right under the lean to that runs into a dry well with no outlet. There were no cleanouts installed with the well. The purpose of this pipe was to alleviate ground water potential; it was not designed for surface water.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-puff questioned why the plans given to the planning board have been stamped, but the plans on the presentation were not. Mr. Beckwith responded that nothing has been altered from the plans, and they are the same.

Ms. Begala asked the applicants to briefly explain why this property is not part of Strawberry Bank. Mr. Beckwith responded that Jackson House was purchased the before Strawberry Bank and the properties are on opposite sides of town.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant conditional use permit approval, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins with the following stipulations:

- *The maintenance plan shall include cleaning of the swale and level spreader to remove any kind of sediment that accumulates.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Gary and Aerial Sillanpaa, Owners**, for property located at **4 Sylvester Street**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval to create a two-bedroom 676 ± s.f. detached accessory dwelling unit on the second story of a garage (to be constructed), with associated paving, lighting, and utilities. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 232 as Lot 36 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Ariel Sillinpaa gave a brief overview of the project. The applicants have a single family home built in 1900 that severely lacks storage. They are proposing to build a garage, and add a second story garage for extra living space. The addition would be 670 square feet. Originally the plan was to build on the right hand side of the house, but it makes more sense to build on the left side of the house. The property is the last house on a dead end street. The plans will include adding on to the driveway as

well, since there is only one driveway permit in Portsmouth. The addition meets the setback requirements.

Mr. Clark questioned if the applicants have an existing garage behind the proposed garage area. Ms. Sillinpaa clarified that they do not. That was a structure that was there when the property was purchased. The structure has since collapsed and been removed from the property.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant conditional use permit approval, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins with the following stipulations:

- *The applicant shall modify the architectural design of the proposed DADU according to the guidance provided by the Planning Department.*
- *The applicant shall work with the City’s Legal Department to secure necessary approvals for relocation of the existing sewer easement which shall be reviewed and approved by the DPW.*
- *The existing fence along the northwest property line shall be maintained in good repair and the existing mature tree closest to the fence shall be retained and appropriate protections shall be put in place during construction of the proposed DADU to minimize damage to the tree and root systems.*
- *In accordance with Sec. 10.814.70 of the Zoning Ordinance, the owner is required to obtain a certificate of use from the Planning Department verifying compliance with all standards of Sec. 10.814, including the owner-occupancy requirement, and shall renew the certificate of use annually.*

Chairman Legg pointed out that the applicants technically meet the planning board analysis for traffic and parking, but it will require cars to drive over existing spots. There would be concern if this were a through street. Chairman Legg noted that he will vote for this but the board needs to be thoughtful of this for future applications.

Vice Chairman Moreau echoed Chairman Legg’s comment and stated the only reason she is comfortable with this project is because the street is a dead end.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. Request of Debra Regan to transfer title to half of the “paper street” known as Oak Street that abuts 43 Mangrove Street. (City Council Referral) (This request was postponed at the June 15, 2017 Planning Board Meeting).

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

The current owner Jen Armstrong provided a brief overview of the application. The applicant lives on the corner of Oak Street and Mangrove Street, if the paper street had been created. The front yards abut where what would have been Oak Street and the back is not maintained. There is concern over where the property line is today because that is where the septic system is. The applicant is requesting the property line be moved a few feet, so that the septic system is not right on the line.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to recommend that the City release any interest it may have in the paper street known as Oak Street.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff noted that the city does not always know that there is interest. The responsibility is on the property owner to bring items like this to the assessment board to have the lot line moved.

Walker noted that a previous title research on this for a different project showed that the city actually does not have any ownership here. To verify this finally would require additional research. It is advised that the owner to research to determine who is the actual interest in this property.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....
IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

*The Board’s action in these matters has been deemed to be quasi-judicial in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. The application of **Thirty Maplewood, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Maplewood Avenue** (46-64 Maplewood Ave), for a Conditional Use Permit under Section 10.535.12 of the Zoning Ordinance (as adopted when the project was vested through Design Review approval in December 2013) to allow an increase in building height above the maximum height specified in Section 10.531. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 125 as Lot 2 and lies within Character District 4 (CD4) (Central Business District in December 2013), Downtown Overlay District and Historic District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon, Ambit Engineering, spoke on behalf of the applicant, and provided a brief overview of the project. The design review went through the Planning Board in 2013, and received approval. The

project now requires a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant is presenting to the Planning Board to get the feedback to translate to the Historic District Commission. Once that is completed the plan is to return to the planning board for a site review. The project is at the corner of Maplewood Ave. and Deer Street. The first floor will be commercial space and the second floor will be residential. The 46 Maplewood Ave. building will be on its own lot. One item required for the Conditional Use Permit is civic space. There will be widened sidewalks on the streets and an alleyway will connect the lot to Deer Street. The civic space is the public open space on the widened sidewalks and benches the commercial use space could spill out to the sidewalk as well. The second way the project is striving to get additional allowances is the parking. There would be an entrance to an under level parking garage. That will serve to hide all the parking in a low grade parking area. The third criteria is the use of building materials. The applicants have worked with the Historic District Commission to create the look of the building. The use of different building materials will provide interest. The fourth item is scale and massing techniques. One of the requests is to have the penthouse level and not step it back so far. Historic District Commission wanted the building to be more prominent which has led to this additional variance.

Chairman Legg noted that there is an inconsistency asking for a Conditional Use Permit for the penthouse setback and the height. However, the height has already been approved, so only looking at the penthouse setback. Ms. Walker confirmed that this is correct. The height is approved, but the penthouse doesn't meet the definition. This project has gone through substantial review with Historic Commission and the process has been very collaborative with them including the penthouse. Even though this did get approval in 2013 the applicants have spent a long time since then working with the Historic District Commission and Technical Advisory Committee.

Vice Chairman Moreau asked for clarification on what the entrance on Bridge Street is for. Mr. Chagnon replied that the site has a grade change from Maplewood Ave./Deer Street to Bridge Street. The Bridge Street side will just be street level parking. They are two separate distinct parking areas. Vice Chairman Moreau clarified that the benefit the city would be getting for the extra penthouse is the wider sidewalks and pathways. Mr. Chagnon confirmed this is correct.

Mr. Kisiel noted that 30 Maplewood Ave. was a parking lot, and questioned if the lot ever served as parking for the condos. Mr. Chagnon responded that 30 Maplewood has not, and that property is not part of the site.

Ms. Begala questioned if the penthouse would actually be a residence or will it be a rooftop restaurant. Mr. Chagnon responded that it will be residential. Ms. Begala then asked for clarification around the 0 setback, and questioned if this was referring to the roofline. Mr. Chagnon responded that the property would be right at the corner of Maplewood and Deer, so there is not setback there, but there will be on the sides. Ms. Begala questioned if snow and ice removal had been accounted for. Mr. Chagnon responded it had and that the snow and ice will be drained internally.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to forward a summary of the Planning Board comments to the Historic District Commission, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that the underground parking, the pathways through the property, and the penthouse would be a bonus to the city.

City Council Representative Perkins seconded a lot of what Vice Chairman Moreau said. She noted that the applicants had clearly paid attention to all four sides of the building and appreciates the architectural variety. The pedestrian way is an important part of the design.

Chairman Legg echoed the feedback above, and appreciates what the applicant has done.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Eversource Energy, Owner of a Right-of-Way**, for property located off **Ocean Road and Greenland Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland and inland wetland buffer for the reconstruction of 26 existing utility poles, with 222,124 ± s.f. of impact to the inland wetland and 64,714 ± s.f. of impact to the inland wetland buffer. Said properties are shown on Assessor Maps 281, 282 and 258 lie within the Municipal, Natural Resource Protection (NRP), Rural and Industrial Districts.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Ms. Begala recused herself because she has received and abutters notice on this.

Tracy Tarr wetlands scientist with GZA GeoEnvironmental provided a brief overview of the project. Kurt Nelson, permitting specialist with Eversource and Kevin Cluff a construction specialist with Eversource were also present. The project includes the replacement of existing 26 transmission line poles. The line is nearly 67 years old and the poles have shown serious signs of age including splitting, rotting and holes. The replacement poles will be steel poles. The access routes are through the wetlands and timber matting will be put down to prevent damage. The applicants have met with Conservation Commission, and it was requested they remove invasive plants. This request has been added into the plan. GZA will be monitoring the site daily and will remove turtles and snakes as needed as well as mapping rare plants. Another positive outcome of this project will include a new osprey platform, which has been approved by Fish and Game. There is a relatively large fee that will go paid for mitigation and anyone in the watershed can apply to use that money. Eversource has also offered to donate another fund to complete the mapping for the Banfield property to maintain existing infrastructure.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if there would be objections to using silt socks instead of silt fence. Ms. Tarr responded there are no objections, and if that's the preference of the board they are happy to do that.

Mr. Clark questioned if the timber matting was going to be used for all access points. Ms. Tarr responded that is correct because most of the area is wetland. Stabilized stone construction would be installed as temporary entrances off of matting as well.

Mr. Kisiel questioned if the timber matting would be similar to what was used on the project on Lovering Lane in North Hampton, NH. Ms. Tarr was not familiar with that project but confirmed that timber matting is standard of the industry.

Mr. Clark requested to reiterate what amount going into the fund would be. Ms. Tarr clarified it would be roughly 154,000.

City Council Representative Perkins questioned if the lines were part of the distribution system or transmission grid. Ms. Tarr confirmed they are part of the transmission grid. City Council Representative Perkins questioned if the new structures being built will be capable of handling any future upgrades Eversource may do. Mr. Cluff confirmed that they would be.

Mr. Leduc questioned after these poles are replaced, how many more in this area may need it. Is the majority of the poles wood? Will this be an ongoing improvement project? Mr. Cluff responded that all the wood frames are moving to metal. As the poles start to fail they will be replaced. Mr. Leduc clarified that this section of line was selected because the failure. Mr. Cluff responded that was correct. Mr. Leduc questioned what the life span of the metal poles would be. Mr. Cluff responded that they are not sure. The use of metal poles is relatively new.

Mr. Clark questioned if the planning board could be seeing this again in the future, as more poles need replacement in the bog. Mr. Cluff responded that the majority of the rest of the poles are in the uplands. Ms. Tarr noted that this project is an extensive effort and the goal is to not come back to the board with more wetland pole replacements. Mr. Clark identified 3-4 poles that are in wetlands, and not part of the current replacement project. Mr. Cluff confirmed there are no current plans to change those poles.

City Council Representative Perkins requested confirmation that there were no plans to upgrade the lines. Mr. Cluff confirmed that was correct.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant conditional use permit approval, seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff with the following stipulations:

- *The invasive species that are removed during installation of the new poles shall be disposed of properly so as to not allow the spread of those plants.*
- *The post construction monitoring report and any weekly progress reports which call out deviations from the plan due to spills or other impacts during project construction shall be provided to the Environmental Planner for distribution to the Conservation Commission.*
- *Silt socks will be used instead of silt fences.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Chance B. and Edward R. Allen, Owners**, for property located at **88 Sims Avenue**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer for the construction of a 208 s.f. addition to a single family residence, with 300 ± s.f. of impact to the inland wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 232, as Lot 131 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Clark recused himself because he has received and abutters notice on this.

Phelps Fullerton, Architect at Fullerton Associates provided a brief overview of the project. Fullerton The structure currently encroaches 10.4 feet into wetlands in the front and almost 80 feet into buffer in the back. The applicants are proposing 208 square foot addition with small Juliet deck. The addition would not encroach any more in the back of the house and only 3 feet in the front. The applicants have received approval from Conservation Commission and approval from the BOA for the encroachment. The zoning ordinance contains wetland buffer criteria. Criteria A states that an addition cannot be more than 25% of the existing first floor gross living area. The first floor living area is 890 square feet, which would allow a maximum addition of 225 square feet. For criteria B the property has been surveyed and the wetland boundary has been flagged in April of this year. The current existing living area of the house is about 21 feet from the edge of the delineated wetland. This allows the applicants to build an addition within the wetlands buffer, but the addition cannot be closer to the buffer than the existing property is today. The applicants did not initially meet compliance with criteria C, but has received the front yard variance from the BOA.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification about the purpose of the addition. Mr. Fullerton responded that it was to provide more living space. There is a modest first floor that does not have much common space.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant conditional use permit approval, seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

- *The applicant shall install a drip edge at the outer edge of the new addition to prevent erosion and allow infiltration of stormwater.*
- *The applicant shall install additional native plantings in the previously disturbed area inside the fence at the rear of the property.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **160 Corporate Drive**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer for the construction of a two story manufacturing and office building with a footprint of 85,500 s.f. and 190 parking spaces, with 178 ± s.f. of impact to the inland wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 313, as Lot 2 and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABS) District.

E. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Summit Land Development, LLC, Applicant**, for property located at **160 Corporate Drive**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a two-story manufacturing and office building with a footprint of 85,500 s.f., including 190 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 313 as Lot 2, and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABC) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to hear both Item D and Item E under Public Hearings – New Business together and vote on each item separately, seconded by City Councilor Representative Perkins. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Sean Tobey Engineer with Hoyle and Tanner provided a brief overview. The project is to construct a new manufacturing and office building for Revision Military. The Canadian company has won some large contracts with the army to produce helmets, body armor and eye wear protection. They are looking to expand into New Hampshire to work with the composite programs in the area. This will create 150 new jobs within the local community. The existing site is 8.67 acres that was air force housing all of the buildings have been removed. The plans have pushed the building toward the back as well as the parking and will provide bike racks and patio space with sidewalks. The plan for the site is to construct the building in two phases. The first phase will be in the front and the second would be the back part of the building. As part of the site design everything will be constructed at once and the addition will be added on the back in phase two. The applicants were required to get an alteration of terrain permit through the DES for the site drainage. All of the peak runoff rates are being reduced and the site will provide channel protection for the adjacent streams. The site will have all LED lighting. The landscaping will provide protection from the street with trees, arborvitaes and pines to screen the

sides. The conditional use permit is for the driveway connection to Corporate Drive. The first portion of the conditional use permit is for the driveway. Most of Corporate Drive is within the buffer on the opposite side of Hodgson Brook. In order to safely connect the driveway back into Corporate Drive it will need to cross through a small portion of the buffer. The second part of the Conditional Use Permits is for two existing drainage outfalls that were part of the existing road in the buffer. TAC has requested the applicants remove those and restore it back to the existing conditions. The applicants have worked with PDA and TAC and have addressed all comments.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification on the site building for phase one and two. Mr. Tobey confirmed that the whole site would be constructed as part of phase one. The phase two site will be brought to grade and grassed during phase one. When phase two begins there would be minimal disturbance to the site and the office would remain operational.

Ms. Begala noted that the applicant described the new plantings being put in, but questioned how the applicants are minimizing impact to the existing vegetation. Mr. Tobey responded that the most of the area is cleared. There is one pocket of trees, but the majority of the existing trees are not feasible to save.

Mr. Clark appreciated what the applicants have done to help satisfy the AOT requirements, and asked for clarification on the overflow for the subsurface infiltration system. What storm event can this system handle? Mr. Tobey responded that the two-year can handle all of that and infiltrate it and the 10-year begins to bleed a little bit off. The 25-year storm it starts to peak. This is designed for the 25 year. Mr. Clark questioned if the applicants had modeled the grate itself on the hydro cap model for the infiltration basin. Mr. Tobey yes, the 30 inch outlet pipe was modeled and all other orifices including the grate feed into that pipe. It has been accounted for.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to recommend conditional use permit approval, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins with the following stipulations:

- *That the invasive species that are removed during project construction be disposed of properly so as to not allow the spread of those plants*
- *That the applicant maintain the buffer enhancement area located on their property so that it remains free of invasive species.*

City Council Representative Perkins questioned that in the memo from staff under wetland conditional use permit stipulations were providing recommendations to the PDA. Then the PDA would work in the stipulations for their approval. Ms. Walker responded that the recommendations from the staff were incorporated into stipulations, and yes this is a recommendation to the PDA. Mr. Peter Brtiz confirmed this is correct and the stipulations have already been included.

The motion passed unanimously.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to recommend site plan approval, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....
F. The application of **Steven H. Lee, Owner**, for property located at **174 Dodge Avenue**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval to create a two-story 1,000 ± s.f. garden cottage in an existing building, with associated paving, lighting, and utilities. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 258 as Lot 43 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

It was voted to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting on August 17, 2017.

.....
G. The application of **Alexander C. Garside and Nicole Outsen, Owners**, for property located at **212 Park Street**, and the **Trudy Gould Irrevocable Living Trust, Owner, William A. Gould, Trustee**, for property located at **226 Park Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval (Lot Line Revision) between two lots as follows:

- (1) Map 149, Lot 50 decreasing in area from 13,218 ± s.f. (0.3034 acres) to 8,736 ± s.f. (0.2005 acres) with 47.69' of continuous street frontage on Park Street.
- (2) Map 149, Lot 51 increasing in area from 7,597 ± s.f. (0.1744 acres) to 12,079 ± s.f. (0.2773 acres) with 50' of continuous street frontage on Park Street.

Said lots lie within the Municipal (M) district and Character District 5 (CD5) which have no minimum requirements for lot area or street frontage.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Alexander Garside is the owner of 212 Park Street. The application is a fairly straightforward lot line adjustment. There is a small piece of land that wraps around from 226 Park Street to 212 Park Street. The applicant wishes to purchase the small piece of land from the neighbor.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval and to accept it for consideration, seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

- *Lot numbers as determined by the assessor shall be added to the final plat.*
- *Property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the plat.*

- *GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form as required by the City.*
- *The final plat and all easement deeds shall be recorded concurrently at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

H. The application of **Paul M. and Laura L. Mannle, Owners**, for property located at **1490 Islington Street**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval to create a one-bedroom 727 ± s.f. attached accessory dwelling unit on the first floor of an existing single family residence, with associated paving, lighting, and utilities. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 233 as Lot 108 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Bernie Pelech, Attorney, provided a brief overview of the project. The property, 1490 Islington Street was built in the 1890s and the applicants would like to put an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) inside. The zoning board has granted the necessary variance. The existing building was five feet from Islington, so now it's legal. All the other requirements have been met. There will be no exterior changes, only interior changes. There will be no business uses and the parking meets the requirements. Mr. Pelech presented a petition from abutters providing support for this project. There was a question at the ZBA meeting as to why the ADU wasn't proposed to be in the barn, but the barn is so old and in bad shape that the ADU in the house makes more financial sense.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to grant Conditional Use Permit, seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

- *In accordance with Sec. 10.814.70 of the Zoning Ordinance, the owner is required to obtain a certificate of use from the Planning Department verifying compliance with all standards of Sec. 10.814, including the owner-occupancy requirement, and shall renew the certificate of use annually.*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

I. The application of **Christopher L. and Anna D. Shultz, Owners**, for property located at **140 Orchard Street**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval to create a 2-story, one-bedroom, 584 ± s.f. garden cottage in an existing building, with associated paving, lighting, and utilities. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 149 as Lot 38 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Anna Schultz and Christopher Schultz provided a brief overview of the project. The property, 140 Orchard Street was built in 1910 with a detached barn. The applicants believe that they meet all the requirements and have the support of over 20 neighbors in a signed petition. The driveway can functionally fit 4 cars today, but legally with the right of way they can't park 4 cars there. The applicants can add pavers in the grass if needed to not change the look of the building. The barn will not change in form and currently has two floors today it would just be filling in the space. The goal is not to change the look of the property at all. There are very large pine trees near the barn and the plans have adjusted to make sure the foundation does not impact the trees. There will be foundation footings for half of the barn and the rest would be a slab.

Chairman Legg requested clarification on the reason why the applicant can't construct an ADU within the existing square feet. Ms. Schultz clarified that they would like to make it a little bit larger to accommodate a family to live there.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if the access to the driveway was on Ash Street. Ms. Schultz confirmed this explaining that they are on the corner. Ms. Schultz clarified that the grass area to the right of the barn is where parking would be available. Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification on where the right of way was. Ms. Schultz responded right along the road. Ash Street is a public street. Ms. Walker further clarified that the actual right of way line is further back than the street edge.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification because the application states 584 square feet for the ADU but then says the applicants are requesting 1,064 square feet. Chairman Legg clarified that the footprint of the garage is 584 square feet, but they are requesting two stories.

Ms. Begala requested further clarification that even though the request is for a little over 1,000 square feet it would be one residence. Ms. Schultz confirmed that is correct.

Vice Chairman Moreau questions how many bedrooms the ADU would have. Ms. Schultz responded there would be two bedrooms. Ms. Walker noted that the application says one bedroom. Chairman Legg noted that the application says one bedroom and an office, and requested the applicant to clarify that the intent was two bedrooms. Ms. Schultz confirmed that is correct.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff asked the applicants if they had considered putting parking on first floor of barn and just build on second floor. Jim Wakefield, Contractor, Architectural Builders explained that because of the way they are handling the foundation the slab part would only be 10 feet wide, and that would not be able to fit a car.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to approve conditional use permit, seconded by Mr. Gamester.

Assistant City Manager Moore requested to facilitate a discussion as the board reviewed the application as well as the intent of the ADU. The 600 square feet is what is permitted in the ADU ordinance, but the 1,064 square feet makes it bigger. Ms. Walker stated that the reason for setting a maximum square footage is to prevent the building of a unit that can house a large family that could have impact to the neighborhood. This is the one of the first times the planning board has had a request for an ADU it's worth thinking about that and the viable reasons to have this structure be that large.

Vice Chairman Moreau remembered the discussion of all the different ADUs, and the board wanted to have possibility having something detached in existing buildings. The concern was that the board didn't want the new ADU to affect the neighbors with more windows and lighting etc. The thought was that limiting the square footage would remedy this. If it were within the 750 square foot state law then there wouldn't be much concern, but 1000 feet does cause concern Vice Chairman Moreau about neighborhood impact.

City Council Representative Perkins agreed with why the criteria chosen, but pointed out that another goal is to preserve and restore historical buildings. This project would be putting the structure to it's highest and best use. If the zoning board has spoken and approved this project then City Council Representative Perkins will support this.

Chairman Legg noted that this project could be argued to either side. The building could be renovated and revitalized within the 600 square feet. The board was purposeful when they decided that size. This should be an accessory not primary unit. This project has potential to house a lot more people in it than the board envisioned. The problem is that it's a terrific renovation but it does not meet the ordinance, and Chairman Legg feels that he can't support it.

Mr. Kisiel questioned what the boards intent on amount of people living in the ADU was. Chairman Legg responded that the board didn't try to regulate it by number of people. The square footage was decided by referencing the state late then going from there.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff noted that the board should consider the difference between the ADU and a two family use. The difference between ADU and two-family use that there are no additional lot area requirements with the ADU. There would essentially be the same impact with a two-family use, but the ADU has to be smaller. The discussion of the difference between the intent on ADU and two-family use property would be worthwhile. The board needs to think carefully about the exemptions that it's granting.

Ms. Record stated agreement with Chairman Legg and Vice Chairman Moreau about the ordinance and concern about already making a change to the square footage. The building could be valuable as a one bedroom that fit into the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Gamester stated support of the applicants' proposed square footage. Mainly because the square footage parameters were added, but it's important to consider this application-by-application. A precedence would not be set if an exemption was granted for this application. The difference between a two-family use and the ADU is that the owner would always live on site with an ADU, where a two-family use can be fully rented out. Mr. Gamester suggested that if density was a concern, then the proposed ADU should be required to be a one bedroom with an office.

City Council Representative Perkins noted that this would be an interesting solution, and this would make an impact on helping to solve the housing crisis in the City. City Council Representative Perkins agreed that these applications should be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that no one from the public showed up to speak against the application and the applicants have neighbors supporting the project. Vice Chairman Moreau stated that the public should be aware that this would not be setting precedence for future applications because each one would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Legg questioned if the board can stipulate that the addition would be only 1 bedroom. Would the City have the ability to monitor this over time? Ms. Walker responded that this could be incorporated as a stipulation, and the City would be able to monitor this. However, keep in mind that sometimes it is hard to distinguish a bedroom space from another living space.

Assistant City Manager Moore noted that there is another process to accommodate a two unit structure that wouldn't go through planning board, so the board would have no say if the applicants went that route.

Chairman Legg stated that if this is application was not approved then the applicants were welcome to come back to get approval for 600 square foot ADU.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff questioned if the application noticed as a one bedroom. Ms. Walker confirmed that was correct. Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff stated that a multi-family is allowed in this district. The one bedroom solution could be a good option. Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff wondered if the incorrect notice was a problem, and suggested that the board to look more into this and vote on the application in the next meeting.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to postpone the approval.

Assistant City Manager Moore withdrew his motion and noted that the board should be making sure they are making the correct decision, seconded by Mr. Gamester.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that the application needs to be re-advertised as a two bedroom and correctly reflect the 1064 square feet if it's re-noticed and represented.

Mr. Kisiel stated that it did not make sense if an application for an ADU wants to go over the 600 square feet then the boars would only want to approve one bedroom, but if the ADU was under that

square footage then the ADU could be a two bedroom. Mr. Kisiel is comfortable with the size and the two bedrooms because it's an existing building.

Chairman Legg stated that he would be inclined to resolve this tonight.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to grant the conditional use permit as presented including the requested modifications to the parking and gross floor area requirements, seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

- *The garden cottage shall have no more than one bedroom.*
- *In accordance with Sec. 10.815.50 of the Zoning Ordinance, the owner is required to obtain a certificate of use from the Planning Department verifying compliance with all standards of Sec. 10.815, including the owner-occupancy requirement, and shall renew the certificate of use annually.*

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if this could come back negatively to the board because it improperly noticed. Ms. Walker stated that if the application was appealed that could be one area that was looked into. However, if there is a stipulation to make it a one bedroom then the issue has been addressed.

Mr. Kisiel request clarification on the definition of a one bedroom would one room not have a closet or would the ADU just be defined as a 1 bedroom.

Ms. Walker noted that it is difficult to define a bedroom and the City even has had trouble with inspections. It can be hard enforce always.

Vice Chairman Moreau noted that a closet doesn't always define a bedroom.

The motion passed by a vote (8-0-1)

.....

J. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and 19 Rye Street, LLC, c/o Two International Group, Applicant**, for property located at **19 Rye Street**, requesting Site Plan Approval to construct a two-story office building with a footprint of 14,859 s.f., including 146 parking spaces, with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 305 as Lot 4, and lies within the Pease Airport, Business, Commercial (ABC) District

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Sean Tobey, Engineer with Hoyle and Tanner provided a brief overview of the project. This project is for a new two-story office building for the Department of Health and Human Services. The existing site is 10.4 acres with three existing buildings. This project will be for one of the buildings, 19 Rye Street. The new building will go in roughly the same location of the old building that was removed. The Parking for the new building will be mostly in the rear. There is additional sidewalk connectivity

to the other buildings and along the site. The property will still maintain 51% open space. The majority of the drainage will be closed drainage. The utilities will be connected to old existing hookups except sewer and water. Trees were added in the front for more landscaping, and wetland plants will be added on the basin. The project will maintain existing trees. The applicants have worked closely with PDA, and have received approval from TAC. All of the TAC comments have been incorporated into the plan except the stipulation to add an island in the parking lot. This island is not required by the PDA. The intent was to push the area back 8 feet to add a berm. The applicants requested waiver from that TAC stipulation. The island will impede snow removal and reduce snow storage in the front.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification that the landscape that TAC was talking about was down the center in the parking area. Mr. Tobey confirmed that was correct. It has been added in the plan to satisfy the stipulation, but the request from the applicants is to remove it. Vice Chairman Moreau stated that it still appears that there is plenty of room in the lot with the island there. Mr. Tobey responded that this would still be an obstacle to push snow and adds curbing and irrigation costs. Vice Chairman Moreau clarified that if the island were to be removed then there would be no greenery in the parking lot. Mr. Tobey confirmed that is correct.

Chairman Legg noted that projects the board has seen lately have included islands to break up parking, so it is consistent with how they have been doing it. The island is just a recommendation the PDA would ultimately decide.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Legg asked if anyone was present from the public wishing to speak to, for, or against the application. Seeing no one rise; the Chair closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to recommend to the PDA to approve the site plan, seconded by Ms. Record with the following stipulations:

- *The Landscape Plan shall be revised to include an 8' landscaped island between the double bays in the parking lot fronting on Rye Street.*
- *The applicant shall add a detail for the drain manholes with inverts.*
- *The telephone pole at the edge of the sidewalk on Rye Street shall be moved back so that it does not impede the sidewalk.*
- *The following note shall be added to the Site Plan: "The applicant shall be responsible to perform a radio-strength test with a Motorola Service Shop to ensure sufficient signal strength within any structure included in the project to support adequate radio coverage for emergency personnel. The expense for the test shall be the responsibility of the applicant, whether or not the test indicates that amplifiers are necessary to ensure this communication. If the test indicates that amplifiers are required, that cost, too, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All testing and installations shall be coordinated between the applicant and the police/fire communications supervisor."*

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

K. The application of **Merton Alan Investments, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **30 Cate Street**, requesting Amended Site Plan Approval to remove the 10 foot wide walkthroughs in the center of the two 8-unit buildings and move the units together; to provide a 20 foot wide separation between the 6-unit building to create two 3-unit buildings; and the revision of grading and utilities to accommodate the new building locations. Said property is shown on Assessors Map 165 as Lot 1 and lie within Character District 4-W (CD-4W).

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Assistant City Manager Moore motioned to postpone this application, seconded by City Council Representative Perkins.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

V. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS/REQUESTS

*The Board's action in these matters has been deemed to be legislative in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. Request for a traffic signal and sidewalk easement from Richard Fusegni relative to property located at 1575 Woodbury Avenue.

Walker spoke to this request. This is related to a traffic signal and sidewalk easement that is and agreement related to the property and the City. The City has worked wit the applicant on this.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to recommend the city council approve the traffic signal and sidewalk easement, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Appointment of Jody Record as a Planning Board Representative to the Rockingham Planning Commission.

Chairman Legg suggested the board appoints Judy record.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to nominate Jody Record to the city council for appointment to the Rockingham Planning Commission, seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff.

The Motion passed unanimously.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to nominate Peter Britz to the City Council for appointment as an alternate.

The motion passed unanimously.

City Council Representative Perkins proposed the discussion of receiving smaller or electronic packets for future meetings.

Chairman Legg-requested that Ms. Walker discuss with each member can how they would like to receive their packets.

Ms. Walker confirmed that she would follow up and noted that the smaller packets would require applicants to submit materials a different way than they do now, so it should be voted on. Ms. Walker will poll the members' preferences, then make a recommendation at the next meeting for a vote.

Mr. Gamester verified that the smaller paper version would still show all the detail still needed. Mr. Clark confirmed that it would.

Chairman Legg clarified that each member could receive their packet how they would like.

.....

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*It was moved, seconded, and **passed** unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 p.m.*

.....

Respectfully Submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the August 17, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.