

**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

6:30 P.M.

SEPTEMBER 12, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ricci, Chairman; Nancy Novelline Clayburgh, City Council Representative; David Allen, Deputy City Manager; John Rice; William Gladhill; Karina Quintans; Colby Gamester; Richard Hopley, Elizabeth Moreau, Alternate and Jay Leduc, Alternate

MEMBERS EXCUSED: n/a

ALSO PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Planning Director; Nick Cracknell, Principal Planner

.....
I. WORK SESSION

A. Work Session on Form-Based Zoning Ordinance – Discussion Draft

Form Based Zoning

Brian Wright with Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative gave a level presentation on Form Based Zoning and said he would try to concentrate on the most important items. He hoped the presentation would provide a greater understanding of what the Planning Board had been asked to look at and review.

He said Form Based Zoning is being done

- to protect what people love the most about Portsmouth,
- to ensure that the redevelopment of the less-loved items can be supported and strengthened, and
- to maintain and expand the uniqueness that makes Portsmouth special.

Mr. Wright said one thing to note when reviewing a code is that it is not light reading and not fun. Zoning ordinances are not really meant to be read from front to back. He said this section is a work in progress, and one thing that was not included in the original draft was the ‘pretty picture version’ of all the steps

Mr. Wright presented the rules of how to review a code. He said at first, you read it with nothing in your hands. The next time, you use a highlighter and highlight the interesting points. The third time, you use a pencil and start taking notes. The last time, you use a pen and write down your actual questions. The code is written for the end user, not for the review process. In the end, there are things that sometime seem redundant when read from front to back, but it is because the first time was intended for someone with one situation and the second time for another situation, and it can be confusing. Mr. Wright said when they go through their review process of a draft ordinance they find it is the first time people have been asked to read an entire zoning document.

Mr. Wright gave the Board a pop quiz on the current Zoning Ordinance' and asked how much building coverage is allowed in the CBA and the CBB Districts? Chairman Ricci had the correct answer of 95%..

Mr. Wright then asked what are the FAR requirements for the buildings in the CBA District? He answered his own question by saying 3.5, which is really big.

He asked what does FAR mean and how would a recently approved project like Portwalk fare under its standards? The answer was that the FAR was 3.5 times the lot area.

He asked what that meant and said there was not a discussion of FAR in the Form Based Ordinance. He said it was just an abstract number and you can get variedcomes by applying a certain FAR.

He said that Portwalk, Phase 3, is 8,000 s. f. of land and 187,000 s. f. of gross floor area. It has a FAR of 2.2 and is still a 5-story building. A FAR of 3.5 would be allowed in a 300,000 s. f. building, 1.5 times larger than it currently is, so the FAR is sometimes not our friend.

He asked how much open space is required for new construction for Downtown Portsmouth and he responded "none". He said many people are surprised to know that. At the Charette, they studied open space, zone height, perceived height, number of building stories, frontage types, glazing percentages, ground floor use, building coverage, and frontage percentage build-out. He said, however, that the computer can only tell you so much and that it is all quantitative. They then did a qualitative analysis of the character of the places out in the field, and they walked every single street of the study area and documented, photographed and measured so they could explain why they put every number in the ordinance where they put it. They also cross-referenced it with Mr. Cracknell's spreadsheet to make sure everything came out the same. They did this for all the Character Districts.

He pointed out that the document is organized into different sections with a numbering system that ties it into the ordinance. The first section consists of the general provisions, the Regulating Plan (which is the Zoning Plan and how it works), different Character Districts, development plans, development standards, and definitions. He said architectural standards and guidelines were not included because they wanted to get more feedback from the HDC, and they knew the HDC would be creating a whole process for architectural standards and guidelines.

Mr. Wright outlined the three distinct Character Districts.

CD4 –L General Urban District – Limited. This District consists of a medium density transitional area that has a mix of medium to large residential house types with almost entirely residential uses; there are shallow front setbacks and shallow to medium to side setbacks. He said in other cities, normally buildings this large are set back further from the street, but in Portsmouth they pull them in closer to the street, so they took that into consideration and made sure the setbacks were right. The District has variable private landscaping and streets with curbs, sidewalks and street trees that define medium to large blocks. Mr. Wright showed the images of the areas and said they built a model that explains it in more crisp lines that could be easily seen. Each of the letters corresponds to one of the dimensional constraints.

In the CD4- L, there is a setback of 0-12' maximum in the principal frontage, and the secondary frontage is 0-12' maximum. The side setback is 5-20' maximum, the rear setback 3' minimum or 15' from the center line of the alley. He said the idea was bigger lots with bigger buildings are set back a little from the street but with a residential character.

Pertaining to the Yard Types category, he pointed out where it said "permitted and not permitted" and said there was a community they were working where one of the zones indicated 'rear yard is not permitted', and people thought they would take away their backyards. They did not understand that rear yard is a typology, and he said once you understand what a yard type actually means, it makes more sense as to where yards are and are not permitted.

He said Lot Occupation is how the building sits on the lot, the lot width, the percentage of building coverage and then the open space percentages.

Mr. Wright talked about the Building Form-Principal Building category and referred to the map at Illustration 10.6A20.1.2B, Special Requirements for Building Height Requirements. He talked about the ground floor height, upper floor height, percentage of façade glazing (façade with percentage of windows rather than solid wall), roof type, and roof pitches, and he said it all had to be calibrated as to what was local and reasonable in the City. He also talked about the view from the back, from the alley or rear of the property, and said there were additional metrics related to outbuildings and frontage types allowed. He said all three work together. If someone wanted to do what he could do to a property in a particular zone, these sheets would be handed to him.

The next zone Mr. Wright outlined is the regular CD4-L General Urban District. This District consists of a medium-to-high density transitional area and has a mix of building types and residential, retail and other commercial uses. It has shallow or no front setbacks and medium to no side setbacks. He said Portsmouth is always pushing the front lot line, so they had to calibrate for that. In most cases, the District has the appearance of sidewalk right up to the façade. It has variable private landscaping, and streets with curbs, sidewalks, and street trees that define small-to-medium blocks. He said this particular zone looks more intimate and fine-grained, and buildings are closer together. It looks completely residential and is one of the more diverse areas in terms of physical appearance. He said that going through the metrics would show that the setbacks are a little deeper, and that it was all laid out in the handout.

Mr. Wright then highlighted the CD5 Urban Center District (the Fifth Zone) and said it was the most urbane because it has a high density mix of building types and uses such as residential, retail and other commercial, and it has lots of diversity and overlap. No front or side setbacks are allowed, and it has limited landscaping and streets with curbs, sidewalks and street trees that define small-to-medium blocks. He said it is a really nice District and has the appearance of having been developed over time, just like a true historical city.

Mr. Wright showed the next set of diagrams, the concept of Civic Spaces, which he said were very specific areas designated for civic use that are owned and operated by a non-profit entity other than a city. Civic Spaces include parks, greenways, pedestrian alleys, squares, plazas, pocket parks, and playgrounds, and each of these is defined by zone. He pointed out that several Civic Space types are defined by the combination of certain physical constraint constants that include relationships among their intended uses, their size, their landscaping, and the buildings that front them. What intersects the space is important, but the way it is addressed and contained by buildings is equally important in

creating that space. He said that each of the images shown explained that relationship. Due to constraints of what is already built in the City, there are limitations as to what is possible, but in some cases where large-scale redevelopment happens, things may change.

Mr. Wright then talked about Yard Types and gave a general, high-level explanation of building placement. An Edgeward goes all the way around the building. A Sideyard is pushed to one side of a building or the other or is only in the front of the building. A Rearyard is the only available space behind the building when the building occupies full frontage, and this is seen more in urban areas.

He then talked about Lot Layers and said it was a new concept. The Lot Layers zoom in on a lot-by-lot basis, unlike the zoning map, which is the large-scale zoning piece. In a nutshell, the 1st Layer is the portion of the lot mounted by side lot lines, the front lot line, and the front setback. So, the 1st Layer is from the front of the building to the back of the sidewalk. The 2nd Layer is behind that for 20' back. The 3rd Layer is everything from that to the back of the property line. For example, the parking would be in the 3rd Layer.

Mr. Wright talked about Principal Buildings, Backbuildings, and Outbuildings, and also Setback Designations. The Principle Building is the main building on the lot. The Backbuilding might attach to it or be an Outbuilding. In New England, where people can just add on and add on, this concept is relevant. Setbacks consist of front, side and rear setbacks.

He then discussed Principal Frontage Types and Lot Lines. The Principal Frontage is the main thoroughfare that the building faces. The Frontage Line is the lot line bordering a public frontage. The area between the building façade is the vehicle lane. The Principal Frontage is described in more detail on the handout.

The Secondary and Third Façade is the exterior wall of a building set along the frontage line. Mr. Wright showed elevations and said that the side of a building is an elevation.

Mr. Wright talked about Private Frontages and said they are the most indicative signs of a community and what a pedestrian experiences. Private Frontage types consist of a Common Yard, a Porch, a Stoop, a Step, a Shopfront, an Officefront, and a Forecourt.

He showed an example of a Common Yard, which is a house set back some distance that has no fence around it, so the yard seems continuous. He also showed a Porch type that is common in Portsmouth. Mr. Wright said that Step Frontage is a special frontage that was developed for Portsmouth. It is seen in other New England cities but developers stopped doing it after a certain point, so now Step Frontage is usually seen in the most historic cities. A Step Frontage is one or two steps into the building, with no actual top landing, and sometimes there is a vestibule.

Mr. Wright mentioned that the Porch, Stoop and Shopfront Frontages were straightforward and the details were in the handout. Relating to the Officefront, he said not all commercial buildings have great front windows that are prevalent, but several Portsmouth buildings have wonderful front windows.

The Fourcourt is a building in which most of the façade is close to the frontage line, but the central portion is set back and looks like a courtyard. Mr. Wright said there were not many Fourcourt frontages in Portsmouth so they may eliminate that style, but he thought it was a great look and had functionality.

Mr. Wright then presented the Building Types category:

- House
- Duplex
- Rowhouse
- Live/Work
- Small Commercial Building
- Apartment
- Large Commercial Building

He said that Portsmouth has a few rowhouses and many commercial mixed-use buildings. He also said several mansions in Portsmouth had been turned into apartment houses and the only way to tell was by looking at the meters or mailboxes. He reminded people that it wasn't about the uses but about the form.

He said the large commercial buildings were mostly in the CCB.

He then spoke about Building Types and showed examples of Setbacks and Frontage Types and also talked about how they could calculate the percentage of glazing that would be allowed.

He said that the important thing about the number of stories in a building was the height concept, which was currently a hot topic in the City. He defined a story as the habitable level of a building below the lowest point of the cornerstone eave, and he said they worked with a local expert in Portsmouth to make sure they defined it correctly because Portsmouth had interesting little short stories, for example, the Federal buildings have tiny windows and it was unlikely that someone would build a 6-story building, but they wanted to show that it could be done or it could appear that they did.

He also showed a corner piece of property that was currently a parking lot and how it could be re-developed. He showed a building with a setback for a plaza and dining area and noted that, although the other buildings were set closer to the street, it was nice to break up the urbanism a little.

He said that a lot of communities they work in do not show the map until they are done talking about the "word and the pictures." He felt that, as soon as the maps were shown, people would zero in on a lot that they were interested in and try to find out what color code or zone it was in. He thought it could work better when kept in the abstract, but he was not using that approach here because he knew the Planning Board was detail-oriented and wanted to see the big picture. He showed a map with the Districts and pointed out that the CD5 was the darkest color, denoting the intensity and urbanity. He said the darker the color, the more intense the space is, but it doesn't mean what was happening in one place was happening in the other.

He said that, when dealing with a historic place, it is very tricky to code. They had to do some things to make sure certain characteristics were really explicit. In areas that have taller buildings, even though they are in the same general character zone, they would not necessarily be of the same height or frontage. Because of this, he had a Special Requirements Map that showed overlays on top of the Regulating Plan for Shopfronts, Step and Private Frontages and the percentage of Frontage build-out.

He used Sheafe Street as an example because he thought it had a special character of being in the middle of more intense things yet still retaining a residential feel to it with Stepfront frontage. On that street, there are commercial uses but no Storefronts, so they are required to carry on the Stepfrontage.

The quaint bookstore that is on the street has to be kept within the street's character. He said it was one of the quirky, unique examples that they wanted to maintain.

He showed the blue lines that were the Shopfront buildings, where the Shopfront had to be maintained so that a developer would not put in a stoop or something more commercial. He also showed an Officefront that was being retained.

Mr. Wright said there is no more than a 50% frontage build-out along the water, and they are trying to protect the last remaining water views. There is a possibility for development there, but it has a character to it and the views will be kept. He mentioned that wood siding is specifically required on buildings near the waterfront because it had a shipyard or industrial feeling to it and makes it unique, unlike masonry, which would not keep it in character.

He showed the Building Height Map and said they had never done one before. Every frontage line was color coded for building height because they knew they had to address that in a specific way. The map's middle area was color-coded Pink and showed a 4-story building with a short 5th story. The Orange area showed 3-story buildings with a short 4th story. The Blue area showed buildings with 2-4 stories with a short 5th story. They could go all the way down to 2-story buildings. One was 2-3 stories with a short 3rd, and then there were specific 2-story buildings. He said it was a challenge to figure it out, but once they went out there and started measuring and then heard the public input about it, it started to be easier.

He also showed a View Shed Map, which was a rough sketch because it was tricky to figure out. They had to determine how much of a view you have to protect and he used the North Church as an example, asking if the view would show all the way to the church foundation or just one inch of the steeple top. They looked at landmark buildings and identifying them on the map made it easier. He said that was a work in progress that he would discuss more with the Planning Board at a later date.

He said that Mr. Cracknell did some number crunching for them because he felt that, when looking at the entire 67 acres and thinking about a big change or a new zoning ordinance with lots of pages and words and numbers, it can be overwhelming, but when you start to boil it down, it makes more sense. He let Mr. Cracknell explain it in more detail.

Mr. Cracknell noted that the three Character Districts were about 87 acres. From that, 25 acres was right-of-way that the City owns, or about 32 streets. He said the remaining private and commercial property was about 62 acres. He said he had looked at the Regulating Plan to break it down and looked at the layers that were created from the Historically Significant Building Charette the Portsmouth advocates did back in the 1980s. He then broke down the 62 acres into subcategories.

He said the important thing was that the Historically Significant Buildings represented about 60% of the 62 acres, which he felt was a lot of material to still be here after 250 years. The goal was to preserve what they have historically. Most of those buildings are in 50' and 60' zoning districts today and have an average height of 30'-35', resulting in a big spread in differential between what the zoning currently says and these buildings that have stood the test of time in Portsmouth.

Mr. Cracknell said the Second Level was a smaller category with infill buildings that were built since the 1980s and were approximately 6 acres out of the 62 acres, or 10% of the District. He said he would leave it to everyone's judgment as to how well those buildings would fit in, that he thought some

would be excellent and others may be less positive, but they were here and likely to be here for the rest of their lifetimes.

The last 3 acres have been called out for new infill buildings that have already been through the approval process and are under construction or not yet started. Those 3 acres are 5% out of the 62 acres and are pretty much spoken for in the next 15-20 year and beyond.

Mr. Cracknell said that left the last two line items. One item was the 10 acres that are largely surface parking lots and make up 15% of the District. About 25% of the larger Downtown area is surface parking. The Form Based Zoning Character Districts only include the 62 acres, but the Downtown area is larger than that. So, out of the 62 acres, there are 10 acres of surface parking, some of which is municipal, but the goal of this project is to look at the opportunity to come up with infill projects that will compliment and strengthen the 60% that is the character of Downtown and the preservation goal.

In the last category, there are 6 acres with Historical Significant and Non-Contributing Structures, or 10% of the District that contain buildings similar to the Exxon gas station or the Rosa lot (which is not just a surface parking lot but has a non-contributing building) that present an opportunity for positive infill and redevelopment to strengthen the Downtown core.

Mr. Cracknell said he put these numbers together quickly to illustrate why they were here and what was at stake. There was a lot of Downtown and portions of the project that were not well protected or well mapped out for what they may want to see for new infill and redevelopment.

Mr. Wright said, in the end, they were essentially looking at the 16 acres, which was shocking because the 62 acres were not protected for the most part, but they could help control those areas and help carry on the historical traditions.

Mr. Wright concluded his presentation by saying that he kept it at a high level but that there was a lot more to it and he hoped it had been useful information.

Question and Answer Session:

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if she was correct in thinking that Mr. Wright recommended stories in a building as opposed to height. Mr. Wright said yes. She then asked if there was a maximum height to those stories. Mr. Wright said yes, those were included in the text.

Chairman Ricci thought the presentation was simple and easy to follow and hoped the folks at home found the same thing. He felt Form Based Zoning was the direction that the City should go. He told Mr. Wright that the presentation was very well done and very helpful.

Mr. Leduc asked if the numbers in the package were derived from an average that was found within the zone or if they were more of the ideal case.

Mr. Wright said it was like art and science. He said they do not take a pure statistical average but instead they go in and start looking at things, and that was the beauty of the ranges, They found that there will always be outliers, and in a place like Portsmouth, it was tricky. A building could be set back a lot further than the rest, which was great, but on the other hand, you would not want the range to fully encompass that because it meant that the entire street could be that one day, or would be something left to a variance. So they went in and made sure they understood what the essence was. For

something that is nearly always 12', but 30% of the time there is an extra foot, that is not a big deal. More often you push it forward rather than backwards. He said it was fun to figure out, that through the process they begin to understand the essence, but they also had to make some judgment calls. He told the Planning Board that if they studied the numbers and thought that a setback was strange, he could look at it with them.

Mr. Leduc verified that the numbers did not represent what was there but represented what might be derived from the feel of the area.

Mr. Wright said they tried to encompass everything. He said that 0-12' in an urban area is a big range. The next zone might be 0-15', so those 3 extra feet mean you can get a whole row of hedge planting, for example, so it starts to change the appearance of the numbers. When you just look at the numbers, GIS-wise, it may not make sense. However, when you go out and look at the buildings, it feels different because all of a sudden all these buildings have plantings in front of them, whereas everywhere else has sidewalk right up to the building.

Mr. Rice said he assumed that in the General Urban District (the layer system), the third layer is the rear of the property, so parking would always be in the rear of the property. Mr. Wright said it was the only way to do it in order to carry on what was already there. Parking had to be in the back of the building, or under the building.

Mr. Hopley said he was struggling with the tables and trying to figure out what frontage build-out meant and could not find the definition in the regulations. He asked if it was the amount of glazing.

Mr. Wright said it meant how much of the frontage line had to have building to it, and it allowed for breathing space (or not) between buildings.

Mr. Hopley said that it would then dovetail into the Side Setback and told Mr. Wright that he may want to define it.

Ms. Quintans mentioned the parking lot example that Mr. Wright gave, where they could put a new front layer in, and asked if that was a real example that they could do without losing parking.

Mr. Wright said they built a 3D model of it before they drew it to make sure that it all worked. They may have had to assume that, for redevelopment, it went underneath the building. In many cities, they would not make that assumption at all, but in Portsmouth, the property values allow that to happen. There was still some parking allowed. Depending on how you develop the buildings, they can be liner buildings 20' deep and still have a good bit of parking, or they could be built all the way out where the rear setback is located and have all the parking underneath. He said it was not one thing or the other, but it was measured and found to be dimensionally possible.

Ms. Quintans asked about the roll out process for reviewing this and what the other Work Sessions were going to entail. She asked how she should begin to evaluate this.

Mr. Taintor said in terms of the sequence and the timetable coming up, the Planning Board needed to do a review and submit comments back to the Planning Department and Mr. Wright and his team so they could complete a third and final draft by October 2. He said the first draft was an internal staff review draft where they would go through the issues and try to tweak things before it went out to the public. They did a lot of work with Mr. Wright to come to this second discussion draft. He said the

next Planning Board Work Session was scheduled for October 10 for the final draft. Mr. Taintor said they were going to bring it to the City Council for First Reading on October 21, and that the timeline was designed to get it adopted by the end of the year before the Council changed. He said that was challenging to do and he thought it was unlikely that it would happen and it would instead roll out in to the next Council. A public hearing was scheduled for early November, and the City Council Hearing was later in November, then they would have the final reading in early December. He said that was the ideal schedule and process. It did not give them a lot of time for review, so it may be extended.

Mr. Wright said it was not typical that they were asked to review an entire zoning document, that usually it is just a few lines. There is the tendency to want it to be perfect before it is adopted. He said there were several bars that the Planning Department could set for themselves in the review process. There has likely never been a zoning ordinance in the history of zoning ordinances ever written that did not need to be tweaked once it was implemented and used. In many communities, it goes through an amazingly quick process

He said they have seen communities literally arguing about a half-foot difference in a building. He said it never ends and you never have a new ordinance. In the meantime, everything is still unprotected. They recommend going with the first criteria, making sure that no harm is done, and then moving it forward and testing it in the field. He said that everyone would enjoy the process a lot more.

Mr. Wright expressed concern that if this was not approved by the current Council, there would be new people, and it would be back to 'square one'. If the new people had not participated in the Charette or seen the presentation, it would be a setback. He said he knew it was a challenge for the Planning Board but his team was committed to doing what they had to do to keep on schedule.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked whether there were limitations on the green areas called Municipal Civic Zones. She said the Worth Lot is in the green zone, and she asked if that could be a 5-story parking garage or would it have restrictions.

Mr. Cracknell said it was his understanding that the municipal properties were going to function the same way that they do now, where there are no restrictions on them. They are exempt from the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Moreau asked what happened if they were sold and if they would get zoned then. Mr. Cracknell said no, the Regulating Plan, or Zoning Map, would be amended.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked what the green areas on the bottom of the map were.

Mr. Cracknell told her what the various areas were and mentioned that the Governors Mansion was going to be redone in red because it was a civic space, not municipal. He pointed out all the civic buildings and parks on the map and said those places would be indicated in red, not green.

Mr. Rice asked if it was correct that there was no oversight on the civic sites. He felt that they went to all the trouble to detail something in layers, alphabetical areas, houses and so forth, and they had all this acreage that could be changed in a way that could harm the sense of place and real character with no oversight. It could open itself up to a disorderly process if moving it from a civic space to something else.

Mr. Taintor said this is the way it currently exists. Any disposition of municipal property has to go through the Planning Board and the City Council and is the same thing as doing a re-zoning. If they have a property that is leased by the City, it is automatically in a Municipal Zoning District and is not zoned, but if it transfers to a private owner, it is first re-zoned. They would amend the Regulating Plan and assign it to one of the Character Districts, one of the Frontage districts, or one of the Height Districts before disposing of it. He said that is what they did with the Connie Bean Building and the Lafayette Road Fire Station.

Mr. Rice said he realized that, but he wanted to know how a municipality polices itself. What if they want to do something that some people do not feel is in character. Mr. Taintor said they exempt themselves from their own ordinance.

Chairman Ricci said that, in the past, the City has always gone through the process but that they did not have to. He gave examples of the library and the middle school. He said he felt comfortable that Portsmouth does the right thing, whereas some municipality might not.

Mr. Wright said there would be instances where people may ask why they are doing it this way, but they're just carrying on what is currently being done. In most cities they work in, it's the same. They do not govern themselves and they just hope that they have the right people in the right place at the right time. He also wanted to say that he and his team could not take all the credit for the work that had been done because the Planning Department staff had also been very involved and hard at work on these drafts.

Ms. Quintans said it would be interesting to see the mega-map that shows the 16 acres and it would be good for the review process.

Mr. Wright said it would not go in the Ordinance but they could do it for the presentation.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if most municipalities did not have to follow their zoning regulations. She wanted to look at each of them and talk about whether they should have some restrictions put on them and she asked if that was something they could do.

Mr. Taintor said they could, but it came back to the two bodies, Planning Board and City Council, to make that regulation and the changes. It did not gain them anything from the regulatory point of view since they were going to have to construct something anyway and they had the ability to change the regulations to allow that to happen.

Chairman Ricci said he found the presentation very informative and thanked Mr. Wright and his staff. He said he has done work in various municipalities and thinks the City staff is the best around, and it was nice to hear from a consultant who works all over the country that he thinks they are as great as Chairman Ricci thinks they are.

Mr. Taintor said the Board members need to review and comment on the draft so that staff can work towards a final draft. He encouraged them and anyone from the City who was interested to review it carefully and send questions or comments to the Planning Department. They would assemble them and work with the consultant to get a better final draft. He said the documents were on the Planning Department website and could be downloaded for anyone to work with at home. He said they are on a fast track and have a lot of work to do between now and the next Work Session, which is scheduled for October 10. A good deadline for comments would be September 26.

Chairman Ricci asked Mr. Taintor if he could give them a summary of the timeline for this so that they could plan accordingly.

II. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn at 7:45 pm was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Breault
Temporary Secretary for the Planning Board.

These minutes were approved by the Planning Board on February 20, 2014.