

MINUTES

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDARO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

7:00 PM

JULY 19, 2018

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

ALSO PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Planner Director

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jody Record; Jay Leduc

.....
I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of Minutes from the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting;

Mr. Gamester moved to approve the Minutes from the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

.....
II. DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLETENESS

A. Subdivision

1. The application of **Westwind Townhomes of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **1177 Sagamore Avenue**.

Mr. Gamester moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

- 2. The application of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, and **Ed Pac, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**.

Mr. Gamester moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. The application of **Bruce Osborn, Barry Osborn and C. Kevin Osborn, Owners**, for property located at **187 Woodbury Avenue** and **Frank Cavalieri, et al, Owners**, for property located at **179 Woodbury Avenue**.

Mr. Gamester moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Site Plan Review

The application of **Barbara R. Frankel, Owner**, and **Greengard Residences, Applicant**, for property located at **89 Brewery Lane**.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Mr. Gamester. 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 **Carolyn McCombe, Trustee; Elizabeth Barker Berdge, Trustee; and Tim Barker, Owners**, for property located on **Martine Cottage Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer to construct a 1,840 ± s.f. single family home with associated garage, septic system and driveway, with 14,022 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 202 as Lot 14 and lies within the Rural (R) District. (This application was postponed at the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.)

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to **postpone** to the next Planning Board Meeting on August 16, 2018, seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. The application of **Jon and Joan Dickinson, Owners**, for property located at **220 Walker Bungalow Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the tidal wetland buffer to demolish the existing home and detached garage, construct a new 1,968 ± s.f. single family residence with attached 756 ± s.f. garage, a new septic system and the relocation of the driveway, with 8,990 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 223 as Lot 21 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.)

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to **postpone** to the next Planning Board Meeting on August 16, 2018, seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Robert and Whitney Westhelle, Owners**, for property located at **198 Essex Avenue**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer to construct a wood 12' X 18' garden shed, on cement blocks, with 216 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 232 as Lot 128 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (This application was postponed at the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.)

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to **postpone** to the next Planning Board Meeting on August 16, 2018, seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Pease Development Authority, Owner, and Lonza Biologics, Inc., Applicant**, for property located at **70 and 80 Corporate Drive**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval, under Chapter 300 of the Pease Land Use Controls, Part 304-A Pease Wetlands Protection, for work within the inland wetland buffer for the construction of three proposed industrial buildings: Proposed Building #1 with a 132,000± s.f. footprint; Proposed Building

#2: 150,000 ± s.f. footprint; Proposed Building #3 with a 62,000± s.f. footprint; and two 4-story parking garages, with 55,555 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland, 66,852 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer and a 1,000± l.f. stream restoration for Hodgson Brook resulting in 42,500 s.f. of wetland creation. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 305 as Lots 1 &2 and lies within the Pease Airport Business Commercial (ABC) district. (This application was postponed at the June 21, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.)

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Gamester moved to **postpone** to the next Planning Board Meeting on August 16, 2018, seconded by Assistant City Manager Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Westwind Townhomes of Portsmouth, Owner**, for property located at **1177 Sagamore Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval to subdivide one lot into two lots as follows:

1. Proposed lot #1 having an area of 33,378 s.f. (0.7663 acres) and 121.75’ of continuous street frontage on Sagamore Avenue; and
2. Proposed lot #2 having an area of 22,628 s.f. (0.5194 acres) and 102’ of continuous street frontage on Sagamore Avenue;

Said property is shown on Assessors Map 224 as Lot 13 and is located in the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) district where the minimum lot area is 7,500 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage is 100’.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering spoke to the application. The application is to subdivide two lots that were recently merged with some land that was added on the south side. The purpose of the subdivision is procedural. The staff memo outlines any stipulations needed to make the process go smoothly.

Vice Chairman Moreau asked why the land was being subdivided. Mr. Chagnon responded that the existing condo association was created more than 10 years ago. It can’t be expanded. It has to go back a step and vote to expand and then add the land to it. Vice Chairman Moreau clarified that they didn’t get permissions to merge the land the way they were supposed to do it. Mr. Chagnon responded that they thought they could amend the condo documents a certain way, but they couldn’t. Vice Chairman Moreau questioned what the promises were that the lots will be merged back into one condo association. Mr. Chagnon responded that the conditions of the approval would make it painful for the applicant to keep it separate. Vice Chairman Moreau questioned what the timeframe would be. Mr. Chagnon responded that the approvals stipulate 90

days. The condo owners have all signed on and voted for the expansion. It will be as soon as the documents can be drafted.

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 determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

Assistant City Manager Moore moved to grant Preliminary & Final Subdivision Approval seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

1. Applicant shall modify existing manhole and pipe inlet as required by DPW.
2. Applicant shall work with the City’s Legal and Planning Departments to enter into a binding agreement to ensure no sewer connection or Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued until after the lots have been re-merged.
3. Property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the plat.
4. GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form as required by the City.
5. The final plat shall be recorded concurrently at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.

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 **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval pursuant to Section 10.1112.52 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a 64 residential units with 60 parking spaces, where 135 parking spaces are required. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 116 as Lot 38 and lies within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

City Council Representative Perkins recused herself.

Mr. Gamester moved to consider New Business Item A and New Business Item B together and voted on separately, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Chagnon from Ambit Engineering, John Bosen from Bosen & Associates, Carla Goodknight from CJ Architects, Randy Dunton from Gorrill-Palmer Consulting, and Craig Welch from Portsmouth Housing Authority were present to speak to the application. John Bosen spoke as the representative of Portsmouth Housing Authority (PHA.) The purpose of the project is to create much-needed workforce housing. The application has received approvals from the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Historic District Commission. PHA owns and manages 11 properties in the city of Portsmouth. The PHA house about 5% of the city's population and is the city's largest landowner. The proposed workforce housing together with the existing Feaster Apartments next door will require 135 parking spaces according to the ordinance. The project is only planning to provide 60 spaces, which is why a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is needed. The City has not been as successful in providing workforce housing in part because of the high cost of real estate and construction. That makes it difficult to build workforce housing. It's a little different for the PHA because it is a non-profit. The project will be financed using federal housing tax credits. The tax credits are competitive and only available one time a year. They are available in August 2018. If this CUP is approved tonight, then the project can move forward. If it is not approved, then the project is over. This project will address the critical need for workforce housing and aligns with the City's Master Plan.

Mr. Dunton spoke to the parking analysis. Mr. Dunton created a trip generation and parking assessment. The Feaster Apartments were looked at first. There are 100 apartments with 32 parking permits. A parking occupant study was performed on a Monday at 9:30 at night. There were 24 cars parked in the lot. Mr. Dunton was comfortable that 32 parking spaces was a good number. Mr. Dunton then looked at the parking and trip generation and looked at low and midrise parking buildings in the manual. The results were adjusted for the number of bedrooms and the fact that the building would be located in a central business district. The results called for 45 spaces for 60 units. That's a 0.7 parking ratio. The total demand for parking was 32 spaces for the Feaster Apartments and 45 spaces for the proposed workforce housing. That is 77 spaces total. The plans are proposing 60 parking spaces on site. That is a differential of 17 parking spaces. There are three PHA facilities within one mile of the area. Those three locations have a total of 16 unused spaces. They could be used as satellite parking spaces if it were necessary. There is also a shuttle to take residents on errands. That encourages people to not need a vehicle on site. This facility is ideally located in the downtown. There is an extensive sidewalk network, a proposed zagster unit on site. Bike storage and a transit bus stop in front of the site are available as well. There is also a proposal for a spot to be designated as short-term 15 minute parking. This would allow cars to pick up and drop off residents. The applicants felt that 60 proposed spaces were plenty for onsite parking.

Mr. Clark questioned if the 64th resident was to apply and get an apartment would they be able to get a parking permit for somewhere on PHA property? Mr. Bosen responded that the satellite parking was not guaranteed. Parking permits would be on a first come first serve basis.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if the shuttle for the Feaster Apartments would be available for all the units? Mr. Dunton responded that the shuttle would be for the Feaster Apartment residents.

Ms. Begala questioned how many workforce units were needed for the City. Mr. Bosen responded that the City has not created workforce housing. It's just a fact that it's hard to compete with high land costs. Ms. Begala questioned how many workforce housing units Portsmouth needed. How close to that goal is the City? Mr. Bosen responded that the City is not near the goal at all. PHA has a waiting list of 600 people just looking for housing. This will help, but it will not solve the problem. Portsmouth needs to begin somewhere. This is the first time PHA has made a run at it. PHA is in a unique position to accomplish the goal because they are not in it for a profit.

Ms. Begala questioned if there was data about workforce housing. Mr. Welch responded that the need for workforce housing is very well documented through a lot of work done throughout past years. The Business Retention Report, Portsmouth Round Table, and the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Commission all have documented it. Mr. Welch did not have specific data and not sure anyone has prescribed how many total workforce housing Portsmouth needed. There are a number of people who are cost burdened meaning they spend more than 30% of income on their property. Portsmouth has a higher percentage of multi-family housing than any other surrounding town. There are a large number of jobs in Portsmouth. Part of the goal here is to create housing that is close and walk-able to the jobs because transportation is part of the cost burden. This will be the first permanently affordable workforce housing ever in Portsmouth. Other buildings could be called workforce housing because of the rent they are offering. A non-profit is better. There is an affordability period those buildings have agreed to in order to get tax credits. After that period is over the apartments go to market pricing. This building will have a 99-year affordability covenant in it. PHA made a commitment to housing diversity in the City a long time ago. After 1973 the only new PHA development was a 60 unit senior housing building. PHA owns and operates 600 apartment units in the City. They have done a good job of offering options for people in the lowest income bracket. What is missing now in Portsmouth is opportunities for people who make just over that. Ms. Begala did not disagree about the philosophy around this, but was surprised at the lack of data.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff served on the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Housing Committee. Part of the Master Plan included the completion of a housing inventory. Workforce housing has a specific definition set forth by the state and fulfills the state requirements by PHA. The Master Plan inventories the gap, which compares income and the housing crisis. It's the gap that is being talked about now. That is the number that we are looking at. The number is quantified in the Master Plan as well. Anyone can go through it to understand what the gap is. It was a fairly compelling vision at how unaffordable this City is becoming. Currently 50% of residents would not be able to afford the house they live in now if they were going to buy it today. Chairman

Legg reminded the Board that tonight's application was for the lot revision and the variance for the parking. The discussion should be focused on that.

Mr. Gamester questioned if residents would be able to have more than one parking sticker. Mr. Gamester requested more details on the overflow parking. Mr. Welch responded that people request to live in the Feaster Apartments because they want to live without a car. People need to live close to their work place to live without a car. It has not been discussed if units want more than one sticker. Mr. Welch did not think they would be giving out more than one sticker. They were not in the business of incentivizing people to own cars because they provided free dedicated parking downtown.

Chairman Legg commented that he believed in the workforce housing, but parking is a sensitive topic in Portsmouth. The Chairman agreed that 135 spaces for the size and type of units was not appropriate. The traffic study does show that 77 spaces were needed. It is a conservative estimate. Have you thought about how to provide all 77 spots on site? Mr. Welch responded that the only way to add them would be to add another deck of parking. It was in the original plan. It was debated about using that space for more housing or more cars. In the end it was an economic decision. In order to build this project PHA needs the federal tax credits. There are 10 applications for the credits only 3-4 projects will be awarded them. Because of that, the size of the tax credit awards is not very large. Even with the maximum amount of credits it was not feasible to add that extra deck of parking. Chairman Legg understood the elimination of the second deck. The Planning Staff suggested a stipulation to provide a parking performance report. If there was not enough spaces, then PHA would take additional steps to mitigate that. Mr. Welch commented that there had been conversations with shared car companies like Zip Car. Currently it was not attractive enough for them because of size. PHA would be able to provide a shared car service space. PHA does own property in the City and will be able to provide offsite parking if needed. In the public housing portfolio there has never been a waitlist for parking at any of the properties.

Mr. Chagnon spoke about the lot line relocation part of the application. Currently the PHA lot is a horseshoe shaped lot. In the middle there is another property almost fully developed. PHA and the owner have agreed to relocate the property line to allow for the proposed public park which will help meet the 20% community space. The property will be square and meets all the dimensional requirements. It will stay a single-family use.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned what was in the existing building that will be taken down. Mr. Chagnon responded that they were offices that will be relocated.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mark Brighton of 285 Union St commented that this PHA project was not workforce housing. Mr. Brighton read the City of Portsmouth's definition of workforce housing. The new building would have 64 units. In order for this to be workforce housing 21 units need to be two bedroom units. The plan only has 16 two-bedroom units. They are 5 units short. How can a variance be granted on a workforce housing project if it is not workforce housing? This whole project is

based on the rubric for workforce housing. Every approval given so far is false. The project needs to be scraped and they need to start again.

Arthur Clough of 431 Pleasant St. agreed with Mr. Brighton's statements about the definition of workforce housing. 50% of the units need to be 2 bedroom or more. Mr. Clough has respect for the PHA, but pointed out that this was not workforce housing. The Boards should know the ordinances and statutes. All along the way people had been asking what the make up of the units would be. That information was just provided. This is a material misrepresentation of the facts. How can the Board consider parking when the project doesn't follow the ordinance? Mr. Clough understood that Portsmouth is looking to grow organically as a city, and encourage residents work and raise a family here. Both items up here tonight are invalid for consideration.

Brian Wyatt of 160 Wibird St. spoke in favor of the project. As a former developer in Massachusetts Mr. Wyatt assured the public that these projects are so regulated. It was definitely workforce housing. Mr. Wyatt liked the proposal. Cities are dense and don't have a lot of parking. It's a great project.

Nancy Andrews of 161 Sagamore Ave. spoke in favor of the project. The PHA knows what they are doing. There are many young and elderly workers downtown that don't have a place to live. It is a positive thing to make it possible for young people to come into the City. Ms. Andrews encouraged the Board to consider the proposal.

Jonathan Trace of 27 Hancock St. commented that it was apparent that the City needs more affordable housing for people who can't afford a house right now. There is an issue with how the State and Government define workforce housing vs. this project. The terminology of workforce housing is making everyone pay attention to what is going on. Why not attach a condition that the project satisfies the zoning ordinances and State's definition of workforce housing. Approve a project that everyone is happy with. People would feel comfortable with reduction of spaces from 135 to 60.

Eric Weinrieb lives on 9 Middle Road and owns a building on 133 Court St. In general Mr. Weinrieb had no objections to the overall project. He brought up a few design issues in TAC. Mr. Weinrieb was concerned with the two proposed parking spots that were backing out onto Court St. on the same side as the Fire Department. The building is on the sidewalk with parking on both sides. There is limited sight distance. It could cause issues with emergency vehicles. The spots are almost across from the bank. Mr. Weinrieb has parking across the street with similar conditions and it is a challenge. Eliminating those spaces give another public space back.

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington St. had concerns about the parking.

Mark Brighton 285 Union St. noted that the Board needed to seriously consider what had been said. At the very least this application should be postponed.

Arthur Clough of 431 Pleasant St. asked the Board to reject the request on the grounds that the given material was a misrepresentation of what the project is going to be. These residents will have automobiles. If the residents don't get on site parking, then they will be stuck with what

everyone has issues with already. They will have to look for off street parking, park in the Parrot Ave Lot, or the garage. That puts a burden on the City.

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington St. spoke as a resident of Portsmouth. There are issues with access to the parking at the Feaster Building today. This project will go through TAC and will be vetted. There is no stepping back once this is approved. Portwalk Place has 130 something fewer spaces than what was required. Look at the buildings around the City now and the problems they are creating. There is already need for a second garage maybe a third some day. The BOA allows a little chip here and there every day. This is 60 spaces. Mr. Beckstead did not think the BOA would have granted this exception. Now it's left to the Planning Board. This is probably one of the largest parking discrepancies. Mr. Beckstead asked the Board to deny the request.

John Bosen commented that the new parking code required 35 visitor spaces. That is not needed for this building. The applicants are not taking a density bonus from workforce housing. The applicants are meeting the requirements for workforce housing for funding. This project will address the need for the middle and that's a fact.

Rick Beckstead of 1395 Islington St. questioned why this didn't this go in front of the BOA. The Board should require the applicants to have the spaces that are required. It should not be allowed. They need to meet the requirements. The parking needs to be addressed. They can't go back if this is approved tonight.

John Chagnon corrected Mr. Bosen that it was 33 spaces not 35 spaces. That is under a recently enacted section of the parking ordinance. It requires 1 visitor space for every 5 units. It's a higher density project and there is plenty of parking in the downtown. People can come visit by various means. It is not unreasonable to discount that as part of the requirements.

Randy Dunton reiterated that when doing the parking evaluation at no time was the definition of workforce housing a factor. The results were based on low and midrise apartment buildings and number of bedrooms. At no time did workforce housing factor into the parking demand stated in the assessment.

Arthur Clough of 431 Pleasant St. reached out to the City's Attorney who said this concern was relevant. The City needs to hold standards. The zoning ordinances are up there and the City knows what the parking issues are. Anyone knows once you get a parking space you don't move especially if there is a concert or road race. Mr. Clough took the Coast Bus for 4 years and it was almost empty. No one uses it. People will need cars and families or couples will need two.

Carla Goodknight spoke about the workforce housing component. Ms. Goodknight was tasked to create housing units that complied with the NH housing and finance standards. That governing body finances low-income housing. The design was not based on workforce housing as much as it was the NH housing and finance authority. That is what they are answerable to. That was the criteria.

Mark Brighton 285 Union St. corrected Mr. Clough's statement. City Attorney Bob Sullivan did not want to speculate on the issue. He did not make a definitive statement on that.

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

Ms. Walker offered a few points of clarification. The conditional use permit was in front of the Planning Board for parking. There was no option for this to go to the BOA for a variance. There was a change last year to allow for parking waivers to go through the Planning Board. Despite how the term workforce housing has been used there is no density bonus from that. Any additional height is from the 20% community space.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff asked the Planning Director to explain the staff's recommendation. Ms. Walker responded that there were a number of measures alluded to in parking and traffic analysis. The applicants mentioned offsetting parking demand and smaller households not having 1 or 2 cars. There are alternative transportation options like the bus, bikes and shuttle. They are worthy offsets. The Planning Staff would like to track this to make sure they are appropriately offsetting demand and get an annual performance report. The report would be on an annual basis for 5 years. If the forecasts were not effective then the applicants would return to Planning for additional modifications for approval. This could result in additional shuttle services or other offsets.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to **grant** a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 10.1112.52 of the Portsmouth Zoning Ordinance to permit 60 parking spaces where 135 parking spaces are required (7-1 vote; Perkins recused), seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff with the following stipulation:

1. The applicant shall submit an annual performance report on the effectiveness of the proposed measures to off-set parking demand (including whether the measures have been implemented and overall usage) to the Planning Department beginning six months from initial occupancy and at one year intervals thereafter for a period of five years. If the measures have not been implemented or the usage of the measures is not meeting performance targets, the property owner will propose additional parking off-set actions to be approved by the Planning Board.

Ms. Begala requested clarification about whether the bonus incentive was relevant to whether this project was workforce housing or not. Ms. Walker responded that it was not relevant from a zoning perspective.

Vice Chairman Moreau commented that the project was making a lot of incentives to encourage people to not have cars. The site will promote bike use and a public transportation stop will be right there. They have addressed it many ways and the ability to look at it again every year for 5 years will be beneficial. The City wants to promote biking and walking. If there ever was a plan to push forward this is it, especially because there is opportunity to review how it's working.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff noted that Mr. Dunton did a good job to quantify the anticipated demand and parking requirements. The question here is whether or not it's enough. By their own standard they are 17 spots short. The Planning Board has been empowered to consider this to carry forward an objective of the Master Plan. It goes with the theme of diversity by promoting development of mixed income multi-housing developments in appropriate locations. Chairman Legg was in favor of approving the CUP.

Assistant City Manager Moore commented that the work done by the Blue Ribbon Committee helped to form the Master Plan. Assistant City Manager Moore planned to vote in favor of the motion.

Ms. Begala acknowledged how difficult this decision was including the discussion about workforce housing. Overall everyone in the room is in favor of low and middle-income opportunities for housing. The residents shouldn't be discriminated against with lack of parking because they are in federally supported housing. Ms. Begala was hesitant to grant a variance on a parking ordinance that was just recently passed. Residents will have visitors of all sorts. Ms. Begala was not going to vote in favor.

Mr. Gamester asked Ms. Walker to explain what would have been required in the past parking ordinance. Ms. Walker responded that it was two spaces per unit and no visitor spots. Any modifications would have needed a variance from the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Gamester questioned if that would have been required for both buildings combined? Ms. Walker responded that Feaster is pre-existing, so it may not have been required for all of it.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff commented that Cambridge and Boston developments are required to offset parking needs and demands through alternative measures. This will be the first time Portsmouth will put this type of approach to the test. Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff was requested that the applicants report back in 6 months instead of a year. That way they could get ahead of any potential problems. The motion was amended to include that stipulation.

Ms. Walker clarified that the old parking ordinance required 2 spaces per unit, but it was over a certain number then the parking was reduced to 1.5 spaces.

Mr. Gamester questioned if stacked parking would count as double or not. Ms. Walker responded that the ordinance does allow for stacked parking. It is fairly expensive.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff noted that the Blue Ribbon Committee worked extensively on strategies to consider housing. The Board should consider their actions on affordability in the City.

Mr. Gamester questioned if the Board granted a CUP, but the something changed in the garage or the site plan how would that impact the approved CUP be. Ms. Walker responded that overall this approval would be granting a number of spaces not the dimensions. If the overall space volume increased, then that is fine. If they decrease, then the applicants would have to come back.

Chairman Legg noted that the Board was not taking this application lightly. It is a difficult decision that focuses on two issues the City has been grappling with a long time. Parking and workforce housing are both important. The original plan had 77 spaces and they were cut back because it did not work economically. The City has been crying out for affordable housing and this plan is so consistent with the Master Plan. The Chairman was comfortable offsetting parking because the plan was providing affordable housing. This project would not be built if it needed to provide 135 or 77 parking spaces.

The motion passed by a vote (7-1.)

.....

B. The application of **Portsmouth Housing Authority, Owner**, for property located at **140 Court Street**, and **Ed Pac, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **152 Court Street**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval (Lot Line Revision) as follows:

1. Proposed Lot 38 as shown on Assessor Map 116 increasing in size from 59,976 s.f. to 62,500 s.f.; and
2. Proposed Lot 37 as shown on Assessor Map 116 decreasing in size from 4,587 s.f. to 2,113 s.f.

Said properties are shown on Assessors Map 116 as Lots 37 & 38 and are located within the Character District 4 (CD4) and the Historic District, where there is no minimum lot area and no minimum continuous street frontage.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff.

The motion passed unanimously.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to **grant** Preliminary & Final Subdivision Approval, seconded by Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff with the following stipulations:

1. Property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the plat.
2. GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form as required by the City.
3. The final plat shall be recorded concurrently at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

C. The application of **Mark J. and Marla P. Baldassare, Owner**, for property located at **191 Sagamore Avenue**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval pursuant to Section 10.815 of the Zoning Ordinance to create a one bedroom Garden Cottage in an existing building, with a gross floor area of 384 s.f. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 221 as Lot 21 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Property Owner Mark Baldassare spoke to the application. Mr. Baldassare was requesting a CUP for a cottage that exists on the property today. The cottage was there and has a bathroom and bedroom. The intention is to bring it up to code. The structure and landscaping will not be changed.

Deputy City Manager questioned what was required to bring it up to code. Have you talked to the Inspections Department? Mr. Baldassare responded that he had not gotten there yet

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Baldassare to explain the fencing around the property. Mr. Baldassare responded that there was a chain link fence in the back of the property between them and a neighbor. They would be willing to make it a privacy fence.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned if it would be long-term rentals. Mr. Baldassare responded that it would be a longer-term rental or available if family visited.

Mr. Clark noted that no windows faced the rear neighbor. Mr. Baldassare confirmed that was correct.

PUBLIC HEARING

Dan Flynn of 205 Sagamore Ave. was a neighbor of Mr. Baldassare. The property was purchased 2-3 years ago and has been in a constant state of improvement. Mr. Flynn had no question that this will enhance the lot.

Jamie Garneau of 517 Broad St. was a direct abutter in the back of the property. Ms. Garneau shared how they had been impacted in the past year. There has been an influx of people coming through. There is a chain link fence with arborvitaes between the properties. There have been beer bottles in her backyard. This was listed as a vacation rental. It was Ms. Garneau’s understanding that it could not be used for short-term rentals. This has been affecting them and their privacy. Ms. Garneau was not in the market to put another fence up. It has been an issue for them with people coming and going. The lights are often on all night.

Nancy Andrew of 161 Sagamore Ave lives two doors over from Mr. Baldassare's property. The backyards are pretty open between all of the properties. Ms. Andrew's bedroom is on that side of the house and she has never had an issue with noise. Mr. Baldassare has improved the property. The garden cottage looked kind of run down and is now very nice looking. Sagamore Ave has improved thanks to the City improving the street and sidewalk. Mr. Baldassare has also helped to improve the street. They turn the lights off around 11 p.m. Ms. Andrews was in support of the project.

Maria Elliot of 141 Sagamore Ave. reiterated what Mr. Flynn and Ms. Andrew said. Ms. Elliot came from Hampstead, NH, which was in the middle of the woods. Ms. Elliot loved being able to see the neighbors in Portsmouth. Ms. Elliot was in support of the project.

Mark Baldassare of 191 Sagamore Ave apologized to Ms. Garneau. Mr. Baldassare was unaware that there was a noise concern. Mr. Baldassare did not know there was a problem otherwise he would have tried to address it.

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

Chairman Legg noted that the staff letter said that Mr. Baldassare received a cease and desist order earlier this year. The Chairman wanted to confirm that the space had not been rented out since April. Mr. Baldassare confirmed that was correct. The property was taken down off the site and it has not been rented. It was his understanding that everyone in Portsmouth who had listed on Airbnb received a similar letter.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to find that the application satisfies the requirements of 10.815.40, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

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

1. 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. Prior to receiving the initial certificate of use, the applicant shall be required to obtain any permits required by the Inspections Department.
2. The conditional use permit approval shall expire unless the initial certificate of use is obtained within a period of one year from the date granted. The Board may, for good cause shown, extend such period by as much as one year if such extension is requested and acted upon prior to the expiration date. No other extensions may be requested.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Ivana and Mattias Verflova, Owners**, for property located at **639 Middle Road**, requesting Conditional Use Permit approval under Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for work within the inland wetland buffer to construct a 442 ± s.f. wooden deck, with 1’ of gravel skirting around the perimeter, with 442 ± s.f. of impact to the wetland buffer. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 232 as Lot 122 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Property owner Mattias Verflova spoke to the application. Mr. Verflova handed out additional paperwork that provided a better definition of what the deck would look like and how it would be constructed. It would be on southeast side and northeast side of the house. The second page of the plan showed the size of the deck and location. There was an explanation of additional plants and mulch in the area to mitigate the impact of the land. The third page of the plan showed the construction method. Instead of pouring the concrete Mr. Veraflova would be utilizing a posting system. Page four of the plan provided an explanation of the post method. The next page had a small sketch of what the deck would look like on the property. The last page of the plan showed continuing property improvement and the overall state of the property.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested an explanation about the about the post method. Would it be the same amount of posts as the concrete method? Mr. Veraflova responded that there would be a few more posts, but a lot less disturbance to the land.

Chairman Legg pointed out that the Board received a letter from an abutter living at 775 Middle Rd. It was put in the records.

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 **grant** Conditional Use Permit Approval, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau with the following stipulation:

1. Applicant to install crushed stone under the new deck.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

E. The application of **Bruce Osborn, Barry Osborn and C. Kevin Osborn, Owners**, for property located at **187 Woodbury Avenue** and **Frank Cavalieri, et al, Owners**, for property located at **179 Woodbury Avenue**, requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval (Lot Line Revision) between two lots as follows:

1. Map162, Lot 56 increasing in area from 11,246 ± s.f. to 11,366 ± s.f. with 113' ± of continuous street frontage along Woodbury Avenue; and
2. Map 162, Lot 57 decreasing in area from 5,587 ± s.f. to 5,467 ± s.f. with 56" ± of continuous street frontage along Woodbury Avenue.

Said lots lie within the General Residence A (GRA) District which requires a minimum lot area of 7,500 s.f. and minimum continuous street frontage of 100'.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Gamester recused himself.

Ms. Walker commented that the item 2 Lot decreased in area, so it is non-conforming for the zoned district. Typically an applicant is required to go to BOA to get a variance. The Planning Staff recommendation is that the subdivision should be approved with the stipulation that the application goes to zoning to get a variance. This is recommended in part because this wasn't caught ahead of time. Also due to scheduling for zoning and planning meetings, and it has been a long time dispute. It can be done in this order, but is not done very often.

Bruce Osborn noted that the property was for sale and he found out that a couple of feet of the driveway is on the neighbor's property. Mr. Osborn approached Frank Cavalier and found out that the property was in a trust owned by 16 people and one was a minor. It has taken two years to get approval. The plan is to swap part of the driveway with Woodbury Ave. There are no changes other than that.

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

VCM moved to grant sub approval with stip all subject to seconded clark. Motion passed.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to determine that the application is complete according to the Subdivision Review Regulations and to accept the application for consideration, seconded by Mr. Clark. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to **grant** Preliminary & Final Subdivision Approval, seconded by Mr. Clark with the following stipulations:

1. Applicant must apply for and receive required variance(s) for Lot 162-57 from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
2. Property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the plat.
3. GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form as required by the City.
4. The final plat shall be recorded concurrently at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

F. The application of **Barbara R. Frankel, Owner, and Greengard Residences, Applicant**, for property located at **89 Brewery Lane**, requesting Site Plan approval to construction of a 2-story assisted living home, with a footprint of 3,146 s.f. and gross floor area of 9,438 s.f. , with related paving, lighting, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 146 as Lot 263 and lies within the within the Character District-4 L2 (CD4-L2) District.

Chairman Legg read the notice into the record.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

John Lorden from MSC, Barbara Frankel Founder of Greengard and Brian Wyatt spoke to the application. Currently there is a single-family residence on a half-acre lot. The lot faces the Malt House Exchange. It's on a private road known as Albany St. The tax map doesn't reflect the name of the street. Part of the property has an easement for access to the Malt House Exchange. Greengard has a center in a unit within the Exchange. The long-term plan is to buy the property and convert it to a place where active members of the community can grow into adults. It has been a long haul due to regulations with the state. This went before zoning in August 2015. The application got a one-year extension. They received a variance for frontage because the address is on Brewery Lane. The application also received a special use exception. The building and site was designed during that time and then the zoning changed. That caused the need for a redesign and trip back to the ZBA for variances. All variances were granted. The proposal is for a two-story assisted living home with five residences and an apartment for a full

time provider. There will be a fenced in garden in the top right and four parking spaces with a small retaining wall. There is a condition of approval that a portion of the private road may become City property or have an easement. Runoff will go into three rain gardens and the buildings will be sprinkled with all new utilities. There is significant need for electricity because there will be an elevator in the building. Eversource will connect at Chevrolet Ave. This will require an easement from Malt House Exchange. The Exchange is agreeable.

Barbara Frankel has been a professor at UNH for 30 years. Ms. Frankel has been a resident of Portsmouth for 30 years and is the founder of the Greengard Center. Ms. Frankel's son was diagnosed with autism at 16 months. He is now 28 and still lives at home. He needs a residence outside his family home and needs a productive and meaningful life. The Greengard Center has made that happen for him and many others. The center serves adolescents and young adults. The dream is to prevent what has been historically true, which is that adults with disabilities have been excluded from the community. This residence is all about inclusion. Many of the businesses in the west end have embraced the Greengard Center. They allow adults with complicated disabilities to be a part of their businesses. This house is about inclusion for young people. It will allow them to age in the home, work, volunteer and live amongst people with differences. It is an opportunity to embrace differences in the community.

Mr. Clark commented that the storm water management looked great. Will the fenced in area affect abutters? Mr. Lorden responded that they will capture all roof runoff and no flow will go off the property. It's a reduction in the back corner because of the slope. It will be captured in the rain garden. Mr. Clark noted that it did not look like the POI changed in that corner. Mr. Lorden responded that no reduction means that it remains the same. Mr. Clark questioned if the retaining wall was for drainage? Mr. Lorden responded that it was just to make the garden area level. Mr. Clark questioned if the oak tree on the site plan would be removed. Mr. Lorden responded that one in front of the house has to be removed so construction equipment can access the site. It will be replaced.

Ms. Begala questioned if there would be sufficient parking. There are 6 units and only 4 spaces. Ms. Frankel responded that none of the residents own cars. The parking will just be for staff. It is sufficient.

PUBLIC HEARING

Nancy Clayburgh of 405 FW Hartford Drive spoke in favor of the application. Ms. Clayburgh has a son with downs syndrome named Michael. Ms. Clayburgh is hoping that Michael will be a resident at this home. Ms. Clayburgh was proud of the community and the treatment her son has experienced. Michael has three jobs and works 15 hours a week. Michael volunteers at the hospital and Police Department. He participates in the NH Special Olympics. He has a happy and fulfilling life. Michael participates in a day program funded by Medicaid and is provided with a job coach and lessons about living independently in the community. The State falls short in providing housing for adults with disabilities. Five families are hoping to develop this so that they will have a safe and happy residence. As parents we worry about what will happen to children with disabilities. The life expectancy for people with downs syndrome when Michael was born was 45 years old. It is now 65 years old. Michael will most likely outlive his parents.

The plan is to have staff in the house at all times. None of the residents drive. The location is perfect because it is within walking distance of downtown and had access to the bus and trolley. Ms. Frankel has had this dream several years ago and now the dream of making it a house for disabled adults will become a reality. Nancy was in favor of the application.

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 determine that the application is complete according to the Site Plan Review Regulations and to accept the applications for consideration, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff moved to **grant** Site Plan approval, seconded by Mr. Gamester with the following stipulations:

Conditions Precedent (to be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit):

- 1. A note shall be added to the site plan that the drainage system design shall be reviewed and approved by DPW at the time of excavation.
- 2. The pipe trench detail shall be reviewed and approved by DPW.
- 3. The Site Plans and any easement deeds and plans shall be recorded at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.

Conditions Subsequent:

- 1. The provision of an easement or ROW to the City for the portion of the road and/ or future sidewalk on the parcel to connect to the public portion of Albany Street shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Legal Department and approved by City Council.

Deputy City Manager Colbert-Puff noted that this was one of the most inspirational projects before the Board. Chairman Legg agreed.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

V. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS

- A. Osprey Landing Water Tank Property.

Ms. Walker noted that Spinnaker Point is interested in acquiring the parcel. The City decommissioned it and does not need it. Any acquisition or release of land goes through the Planning Board for recommendation to City Council.

Vice Chairman Moreau requested clarification that the City had no future interest in the land. Ms. Walker responded that was correct. The appropriate departments have reviewed the request.

Ms. Begala questioned if there was a price attached to the land. Ms. Walker responded not to her knowledge.

Mr. Gamester moved to recommend that the City Council release this land to the Spinnaker Point Condominium Association, seconded by Vice Chairman Moreau. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Review of Workforce Housing Covenant prepared by Attorney Peter Loughlin, as a condition of Site Review Approval granted on March 16, 2017, for property located at 3510 Lafayette Road.

Ms. Walker commented that this item was in front of the Board because it was a covenant binding the City to an agreement. The Planning Board has to make a recommendation to City Council. The reason is that when this went in front of the BOA it was agreed that two dwellings would be workforce housing per the zoning ordinance. The stipulation caught the staff and applicants off guard. It took some months to develop a covenant. It was a good exercise and it will probably be used going forward for properties with workforce housing rentals. The PHA will monitor the covenant to ensure the requirements are met. It has been a long and good process that resulted in the creation of a covenant that can be drawn from for future agreements. The covenant designates two units in the redevelopment to remain workforce housing for a period of 30 years. If the property changes owner units, then the covenant would have to be renegotiated.

City Council Representative Perkins thought it was good and strong covenant for the City. It noted that two specific units would be designated for workforce housing. Why can't it be any two units in the building? Then people would not know which two units were a different type of unit. It could be an easy language change. Ms. Walker responded that was talked about. It would be very challenging to do that for the owner in this case. It would be good to do in the future. It would be difficult for the owner to have it as a floating requirement. Chairman Legg commented that this was a good suggestion for future projects. City Council Representative Perking requested elaboration on how it was difficult. Property owner Mike Brown responded that this was a lengthy process. This was something offered up in the process and became cumbersome. It would be hard to manage as people move in and out who has workforce housing and who doesn't. How long would Mr. Brown have to refill an empty workforce-housing unit? It was easier to designate two units. Ms. Walker noted that it was a last minute addition. If it had

been known about earlier, then they would have thought it through differently from a developer perspective.

City Council Representative Perkins noted that section 4 talked about getting an annual report from PHA. Ms. Walker confirmed they would be reporting once a year. City Council Representative Perkins requested clarification on the regular transfer of title. Ms. Walker responded that they had a long conversation about foreclosure. Any foreclosure on the property would have to be by a legitimate institution. City Attorney Peter Loughlin commented that this has been an interesting process. The project was to convert a commercial building on Lafayette Road to be residential building. It almost met the Gateway District requirements. The old building didn't fall into LEED qualification. The chairman of the BOA inquired about workforce housing and Mr. Brown agreed to two units. The City didn't have a covenant. It was an extremely costly for the applicants wanted to have provisions to get financing. The City can demand anything, but if you want to get this project financed then you want to be able to get the bank put money on it. Banks and foreclosures very closely negotiated.

Vice Chairman Moreau moved to recommend that the City Council authorize the City Manager to negotiate and enter into the covenant as presented, seconded by Mr. Gamester. The motion passed unanimously.

.....

B. Proposed Zoning Amendments – Discussion and Scheduling.

1. Proposed Amendments to Sections 10.814 & 10.815 – Accessory Dwelling Units & Garden Cottages; and related amendments to Article 15 – Definitions;
2. Proposed Amendments to Article 12 – Signs;
3. Proposed New Sections 10.613.60 & 10.670; and Amendments to Article 15 – Highway Noise Overlay Ordinance;
4. Proposed New Section 10.240 – Conditional Use Permits.

Ms. Walker did not have a lot of detail to present. It was a teaser for the Board to look at. In the interest time Ms. Walker touched on them briefly. The sheet lists zoning and land amendments that the Planning Staff is working on. Priority one items are in front of the Board tonight. Second priority items include climate resiliency and modifying site plan revisions and parking to allow conditional use. Priority three items include minor amendments to clarify requirements for non-conforming structures, amendments to definitions, clarifying driveway requirements, table of use adjustments for assisted living, marinas and pub houses, chickens and food trucks. All of those items are on the radar. The first priority items include the highway noise overlay ordinance. It is recommended to get that on the public hearing next month. Other first priority items include adjustments to accessory dwelling units. After working with this ordinance for a

year staff has some suggestions on refining it. Staff recommends an entire replacement of Article 12 signs. It primarily relates to the national amendment to signs. The City is out of compliance with that. The highway noise overlay proposal is to create an overlay over the highway ordinance to allow some additional regulations. This would allow the City to become eligible for federal funding for sound barriers. There is a lot of community interest in this. There should be a public hearing on this next month. There is a new section on adding criteria and time periods for a CUP. Currently there are no time limits. If someone gets approval right now, then it is open until the project is completed. That's problematic because things change. Staff is open to moving priorities if the Board wishes. Zoning amendments start at the Planning Board, then it goes to City Council. There can be work sessions or special meetings for zoning as well.

Vice Chairman Moreau questioned how many items Ms. Walker wanted to attempt in a meeting. Ms. Walker responded that she was flexible. Vice Chairman Moreau noted that most of the items were housekeeping. Ms. Walker suggested that because the signs were not easy to explain they should be in their own meeting. Other items could be put together. Chairman Legg noted that a few were straightforward and a couple may need discussion. They should not be at the end of a long meeting if they need more discussion. There could be a second meeting to address the items to give plenty of time.

Vice Chairman Moreau was not opposed to a second meeting.

Ms. Begala commented that a second meeting would be a good idea. Out of the entire list climate resiliency could go to a higher priority. It's timely and important. Ms. Walker responded that the priority one items were ones that staff has done the background work on. Priority two items are what they are working on now. It's in then next area of work.

Ms. Walker suggested that the Board add the highway overlay to the agenda next month and if there is not a heavy agenda more could be added. There should not be a second meeting in August.

.....

VII. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:48 p.m.

.....

Respectfully Submitted,

Becky Frey,
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the August 16, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.