



**BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD
BARRINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY
570 CALEF HIGHWAY
BARRINGTON, NH**

**THURSDAY, March 3, 2011
MEETING MINUTES**

PRESENT:

John Huckins, Chair
Edward Lemos, DVM; Vice Chair
Jacqueline Kessler, Ex-Officio
Alan Kelley
George Calef
Anthony Gaudiello-Alternate
Stephen Jeffery- Alternate

ABSENT:

Dawn Hatch-Alternate
Steve Oles
David Vincent

STAFF:

Connie Brawders, Town Planner
AuBriana Morency, Temporary Staff

GUESTS:

David Rousseau- 201 Deer Ridge Dr
David Sanford- 2 Meadow Wood Dr
Ed Disy- 159 Deer Ridge Dr
Paula Disy- 159 Deer Ridge Dr
Katie Moore- 149 Deer Ridge Dr
Christine Hamann- 216 Deer Ridge Dr
William Condon- 133 Deer Ridge Dr
Susan Rice- 409 Franklin Pierce Highway
James W Farmer- 209 Deer Ridge Dr
Gale Farmer- 209 Deer Ridge Dr
Wendy Rabor-179 Deer Ridge Dr

Roger Vincent- 41 Deer Ridge Dr
Kip Lachapelle- 67 Deer Ridge Dr
Richard Joan OBrian- 68 Deer Ridge Dr
Jason Barrows- 545 Franklin Pierce Hwy
Darla April- 192 Deer Ridge Dr.
Norm Houle- 168 Deer Ridge Dr
Kay Houle- 168 Deer Ridge Dr
George Tsoukalas– 575 Franklin Pierce Hwy
Amy Frazier– Quarters H-3, Kittery, ME 03904
Joe Samson- Franklin Pierce Hwy
Ralph Holmes- Franklin Pierce Hwy
David M. Roy- 35 Eastern Ave.
John Wallace- Barrington Conservation Commission
Stanley Franezall- 161 Deer Ridge Dr.
Heather Cole- 125 Deer Ridge Dr.
Amy Spainhower- 116 Deer Ridge Dr
Todd Spainhower- 116 Deer Ridge Dr
Susan Gaudiello- 528 Franklin Pierce Hwy
Jason Pohopsk, 42 Flagg Rd, Rochester, NH 03839
Michael Wieira- Hall Rd
John Dolmat- 99 Hall Rd
Gerald Cote- 80 Deer Ridge Dr
Patty O'Brian- 68 Deer Ridge Dr.
Scott Gove
Linda Reynolds- 441 Franklin Pierce Hwy
Joseph Falzone- Harbor Street Limited Partnership
Malcolm McNeill- Attorney for Harbor Street Limited Part.
Christian Smith- 70 Portsmouth Avenue Stratham, NH 03885
Scott Cole- DuSet Survey Inc. 76 Exeter St, P.O. Box 163,
Newmarket, NH 03857

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Planning Board Chair John Huckins at 7:01 PM

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above. Alternate member Anthony Guadiello is appointed for absent regular member Steve Oles. Alternate member Steven Jeffery is appointed for absent regular member David Vincent.

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

*Member Gaudiello moved to table the meeting minutes until the end of the meeting. Member Kelley seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

1. Approval of February 24, 2011 Regular Meeting Minutes.

The Planning Board discussed the February 24, 2011 draft.

PB Member Kelley moved approve February 24, 2011 Minutes. Ex-Officio Kessler seconded the motion. The motion carried, with a vote of five (5) to zero (0) in favor, with two (2) abstain.

CASES FOR CONTINUANCE

- 2. 10/528A (Gerrior Lane Trust) Request by applicant to amend a Site Plan to relocate and construct Detention Pond #2; amend Grading Plan; and review of surety for Phrase 2 of the development located at Gerrior Drive from Route 4 to St. Matthews Drive (Map 268/Lots 1.6 & 1.7) in the General Residential (GR) Zoning District. Applicant: Peter Daigle, Esq. 1550 Falmouth Road, Suite 10; Centerville, Ma 02632.**

Applicant requests a continuance to April 7, 2011

Vice- Chair Lemos moved to accept the continuance to April 7, 2011. Ex-Officio Kessler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

- 3. 10/610 (Fisheye Properties LLC) Request by applicant to develop a 12 lot Single-family subdivision on a 46.22 acre site located at Young Road (Map 240/Lot 15) in the Neighborhood Residential (NR) Zoning District. Applicant: Fisheye Properties LLC, Wayne Stocker; P.O. Box 250; Union, NH 03887.**

Applicant requests a continuance to April 7, 2011

Vice- Chair Lemos moved to accept the continuance to April 7, 2011. Ex-Officio Kessler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

- 4. SR10/383 (Aroma Joe's Coffee) Request by applicant to construct a drive through coffee shop within the northern most building on a 4.29 acre site located at 528 Calef Hwy (a/k/a 371 Route 125) (Map 238/Lot 49.1) in the Town Center (TC) & Stratified Drift Aquifer Overlay (SDA) Zoning Districts. Applicant: Marty McKenna; 63 Broadway; Dover, NH 03820.**

Applicant requests a continuance to April 7, 2011

Member Kelley moved to accept the continuance to April 7, 2011. Vice-Chair Lemos seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

ACTION ITEMS

Ex-Officio Kessler and Member Jeffery recused themselves from the Board.

- 5. LL10/232 (Boundary Line Adjustment for Harry E. & Jacqueline E. Kessler)
Request by applicant to adjust the boundary line between two existing, abutting lots of record, located at Kessler Way (Map 112/Lot 12.1 & Map 242/Lot 33) in the General Residential (GR) and Highway Commercial Overlay (HCO) Zoning District. Applicant: Harry E. & Jacqueline E. Kessler; 4 Kessler Way; Barrington, NH 03825**

The Board gave Bernard Cote the floor to represent the Kesslers. Cote addressed the Staff Response Letter, from January 24, 2011, and addressed the requests and additional materials.

1. NH State Subdivision Approval. Cote contacted the NH department, and the subdivision does not need a state subdivision approval.
2. Covered by number 1.
3. Revised plan must reflect Cell Tower Easement and Deed, which has been submitted.
4. Covered by number 3.
5. Previously addressed.
6. Easement for Jacob's Way and Deed, which has been submitted.
7. Clearly show the Conservation on the map, which has been submitted.
8. Draft copy of Deed Restriction, which has been submitted.
9. Previously addressed.
10. Show Neal Way on site plan, which has been submitted.
11. Abutters on map and right of way on Neal Way and show dimensions, each line is delineated.
12. Access roads show on site plan, which has been submitted.
13. Road name changes on locus, which has been submitted.
14. Wavers are not being submitted at this time.

15. Plans need to be signed by the Kesslers and a PDF submitted to the Town
The Board opened the floor to comments. No comments were posed regarding the subdivision.

Member Kelley moved to accept the application as complete, per conditional approval. Member Calef seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of five (5) to zero (0) in favor.

Ex-Officio Kessler and Member Jeffery returned to the Board.

**Member Kelley moved to table LL11/233 after Item 7, 11/612. Vice-Chair Lemos seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.*

6. LL11/233 (Dolmat Lot Line Adjustment) Request by applicants to adjust the boundary line between two existing, abutting lots of record, located at 99 Hall Road (Map 254/Lots 20 & 23) in the General Residential (GR) zoning district. Applicants: John & Susan Dolmat; 99 Hall Road; Barrington, NH 03825

Jason Pohopsk, 42 Flagg Rd, Rochester, NH 03839, agent representing the applicant as surveyor.

The intent of the owner of record, John & Susan Dolmat, is to adjust the existing boundary line that separates Tax Map 254 Lot 20, containing 9.82 acres, and Tax Map 254 Lot 23, containing 5.63 acres. Both lots are currently owned by the Dolmats'. The intent is to transfer 1.30 acres from lot 20 to lot 23. Since both lots contain more than 5 acres, before and after the adjustment, NHDES subdivision approval is not needed.

Earlier subdivision plans for Doris A. Saulnier and Ann Saulnier (Strafford County Registry of Deeds Plan D38A-65) and Ivan Fogarty (SCRD Plan 19A-80) for a lot merger and subdivision were discussed by the Board. Fogarty's December 1979 subdivision stated at Note #4 that, "There will be no further subdivision of Lot no. 4". As the current Planning Board considered this restriction unenforceable, based on previous legal opinion, and Saulnier had been granted approval for her subsequent subdivision in February 1991, the Planning Board was of the opinion that this application for Lot Line Adjustment could be approved.

Two Waivers were requested under Subdivision Rules and Regulations; 8.5-Waivers for Specific Plan Submission Requirements:

Under 8.3 Specific Plan Information-Existing Site Conditions, Paragraph 6)

Existing grades and topographic contours:

1. Topography encompassing 80,000 on each lot has been supplied and any additional topography that would be required would cause an undue burden to the applicant and would supply no additional information that the Planning Board would need to make an informed decision.

Under 8.3, Item 9, wetland delineation of entire lot, of the Subdivision Regulations:

1. The waiver is necessary for the purpose of not creating an undue burden to the applicant by supplying the board with information that is not pertinent in the decision making process of this application.
2. A wetland delineation was performed in December 2010 within the 80,000 sq ft of qualifying soils area shown on plan.

The Applicant is proposing residential development for family use for the lots. Lot 20 would decrease from 9.82 acres to 8.52 acres and the difference to be added to Lot 23. The lot-line adjustment plan reflects the developmental area on both lots, showing the lot line complies with the regulations. Lot 23 is not being sold by the applicant, and will remain in current use.

The Board reviewed the waivers submitted by the applicant.

Member Kelley moved to accept the first waiver by the applicant. Vice-Chair Lemos seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

Vice-chair Lemos moved to accept the second waiver by the applicant. Ex-officio Kessler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

Member Calef moved to accept the lot application. Vice-Chair Lemos moved to accept the application. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

Ex-officio Kessler moved to approve the application for a lot line adjustment. Vice-Chair Lemos seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with a vote of seven (7) to zero (0) in favor.

Preliminary Conceptual Review

PB Member Calef recused himself from the Board. PB Alternate Gaudiello recused himself from the Board.

7. 11/612 (Harbor Street Limited Partnership- Village Place) Request by applicant to present a proposal for a conservation subdivision on a 133.7 acre site located off Franklin Pierce Highway-a/k/a Route 9- (Map 238/Lots 9.1 & 14 (Lot 14 continues onto Map 235), Map 238/Lots 18 & 16 (Lot 16 continues onto Map 235). Applicant: Harbor Street Limited Partnership, Joseph Falzone; 123 Water Street, Unit 4SE; Exeter, NH 03833.

The Board recognized Atty. Malcolm McNeill, Jr., (180 Locust St; P.O. Box 815; Dover, NH 03820) representing the applicant, Christian Smith (70 Portsmouth Avenue Stratham, NH 03885), and Scott Cole (76 Exeter St, P.O. Box 163, Newmarket, NH 03857), the representing developer for the applicant. McNeill has prepared a summery of issues that can be addressed by the Board concerning the conceptual review of the proposal for a conservation subdivision on a 133.7 acre site.

The Attorney stated the applicant had requested a Public Hearing for the Preliminary Conceptual Review application, with nothing by the Board to be binding on the applicant. McNeill acknowledged this hearing as optional and the purpose is to receive feedback from the Board and the Public. McNeill has found some of the Zoning Regulations conflicting, and McNeill asked to appear before the Board for clarification. McNeill would also like to review the illustrative site plan with the Board. McNeill stated the applicant would be conducting soil, traffic, and other pertinent studies at the formal application process. The applicant wanted to bring the proposal to the Public, to show what is considered at the site for development.

Primary access is off Rt. 9. Concerns have been expressed regarding traffic access by Fire Chief Rick Walker, Police Chief Richard Conway, and public. There is a secondary means of ingress and egress off of Deer Ridge Drive Extension. On December 5, 1988 the Deer Ridge Drive Extension was approved by the Board of Selectmen as a Class VI road, which means it serves as a town right of way, but is unmaintained by the Town. The developers would fix the road into Class 5 standards.

This proposal consists of a conservation subdivision offering 65 single-family residential dwelling units with a Home Owners Association. A 100-foot buffer surrounds the site, totaling to 25.6 acres natural area open space. The developer intends to donate 20 acres to the Town for the construction of a new library for civic purposes.

Public input via e-mail sent to the Town Planner has been reviewed by Atty. McNeill, and largely regard traffic concerns. Traffic reports will be submitted as mentioned at a later date, as well as public access to the proposed donated land.

Christian Smith, PE- Engineer with Beal's Associates was given the floor by the Board.

Smith explained the soil conditions. Extensive area of the site is Charlton Series Soil, which is a well drained soil and good for construction purposes. There are some slopes on the property which will need to be addressed and minor areas of wetland, draining toward Drew's Pond. There is a natural draw also on the property. As the road shown on the conceptual plan, there is no impact on the wetlands. Under State septic soil review and approval, the site may handle up to 210 dwelling units.

Atty. Malcolm McNeill returned to the floor.

The applicant has presented a Letter of Intent in a meeting with Library Trustees and the Library Architect, addressing the donation of land for library use. The applicant also discussed the LOI with the Board of Selectmen. The applicant does not presume that the process before the Planning Board would be affected or influenced by the Selectmen's decision.

McNeill presented his Summary of Relevant Factors Relating to the 120-acre Parcel Proposed to be developed for a Conservation Subdivision in the Village District.

Under Zoning Ordinance Article 6-Conservation Subdivisions and the Table of Use, conservation subdivisions are permitted by right and single family dwellings are permitted, providing compliance with the stipulations set forth under the Article. The minimum size tract of land on which a conservation subdivision may be constructed in the Village District is 20 acres (Section 6.2.1). The subject parcel is 120 acres.

Section 6.2.3 permits for the creation of individual house lots for detached S.F dwellings as a conservation subdivision. Minimum lot size for a conservation subdivision is 20,000 sq feet. All lots in the proposal exceed 20,000 square feet (0.46 acres), ranging between 0.8 – 1.6 acres.

Chairman Huckins interjected comments. Zoning Ordinance 6.2.2: Common Open Space: The Village District is omitted in the Ordinance; the Chair clarified the intent was to include the Village District. Under 6.4.3 Section 2, a conventional subdivision is allowed in the Village District.

Zoning Ordinance, Article 18, Table 1, Table of Uses, shows a conservation subdivision in the Village District is a permitted use by right. 3.3.4: Village District, residential use is permitted, with the stipulation that the development be mixed

use and approved as a Planned Use Development (PUD). A conventional subdivision or a conservation subdivision is allowed under the Table of Uses on a parcel of land within the Village District.

Chairman Huckins clarified the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. Under Article 6.2 Density and Dimensional Standards; 6.2.2 Common Open Space, the Village District was not referenced, but there was intent to include the Village District in calculating Open Space. Chairman Huckins explained how the current Zoning Ordinance does indicate the intent; Atty. McNeill explained the developer could only read what the current Zoning permits, not the implied intent.

Discussion between the Board and the developer ensued. Under 6.2.6 Perimeter Buffer, the Conservation Subdivision must have a perimeter setback; the conceptual plan includes a 100 square feet perimeter buffer.

Under Zoning Ordinance, Article 18, Table 1, Table of Uses, the Town Center zone does not permit by right the development of a conservation subdivision. The Board agreed that the proposed subdivision could be presented as a conventional subdivision, with the stipulation that the lot sizes would conform to conventional subdivision requirements.

The Board discussed the presentation of a Yield Plan comparing a conventional subdivision with a conservation subdivision. Atty. McNeill has interpreted the Zoning Ordinance for a Yield Plan to be at the discretion of the Planning Board and not mandatory.

The proposed parcel is 120 acres, permitting 94.88 acres allowing for net development. The current site has a potential to permit a 103 lot conventional subdivisions. The proposed conservation subdivision shows 65 lots with 20 acres donated by the developer for civic use.

Atty. McNeill interpreted Zoning Ordinance 6.4.3-Calculating Net Density (in the Village District) at paragraph 2, as allowing for an increase in intensity incentives which may be provided by the community if the open space is dedicated for civic use. The Board disagreed with the interpretation, clarifying that the proposed open space would not be permitted to be developed in any fashion. The Planning Board agreed that the intent needs to be voted on, for the Board to proceed.

Ex-Officio Kessler clarified that the Selectmen agreed to accept any donation of land, and does not recall a density requirement being mentioned. The Selectmen meeting minutes will be reviewed for clarification.

The Planning Board opened the floor to public comment, with a 3 minute

limitation on time, as there were many interested parties present, stressing all comments were to be directed to the PB.

Summary of Public Comments:

John Wallace- Barrington Conservation Commission- Skeptical about the proposed subdivision being a conservation subdivision. When one looks at a conservation subdivision, what is worth conserving? Would like to see the natural features of the parcel and have the applicant work with the Conservation Commission regarding the proposed subdivision.

Jason Pohopek- 5000 ft of road included on the proposed subdivision. A cul-de-sac is proposed to be 1000 ft. What is the length of a cul-de-sac allowed in town by standards? Benefiting from a state highway and exiting off Deer Ridge Drive, to a Class 6. The subdivisions might spur some other roads, to the north and east? Rice Farm, if they are benefiting from another subdivision, might put a paper road or two, in case of another subdivision of another lot.

Gale Farmer- Resident of Deer Ridge- 1988, developed into a through rd., no one received a letter stating that it was a future through rd, let alone the traffic increase proposed by the development. The community would not be able to handle the increase of traffic from Rt. 9. and Rt 125 to Deer Ridge. The community is supporting the current traffic. Cutting through the development, speeding is an ongoing issue, from people wanting to avoid Calef Corner.

Jerry Cote- 80 Deer Ridge Dr-Concerns regarding cluster housing- Make small lots but had to make open space equal to two acres per dwelling. They would not be able to donate part of the land to the library. Conservation subdivision was intended for open space. When the Board talks to the attorney, a clarification will be submitted. If the subdivision was to connect with Deer Ridge Drive Extension, the road will be improved? Would also like clarification for density bonus of donated land.

Scarlet April- Deer Ridge- Expressed the same concerns as Gale Farmer. Deer Ridge is a quite, nice neighborhood. Kids, animals, and elderly walk the road. If the development is connected to Deer Ridge, the safety of the community is a concern for the by passers of Rt. 9 to avoid Calef Corner.

Christine Hamonn- 216 Deer Ridge Drive Extension- Agrees with Gale and Scarlet; a traffic study is not needed to know that people are going to use the through road to avoid the lights from Rt. 9 and Rt. 125. A cut through will make the road disastrous.

Deb Clough- Deer Ridge Dr- Been on Deer Ridge for 5 years, and came to Deer Ridge Dr. for a quieter neighborhood, and always sees people walking on Deer Ridge Rd, and expressed concerns for the safety of the pedestrians.

William Condon- Many homes would be impacted by the proposed Rd on Deer Ridge Dr, and to bypass that many for a through from Rt. 9 seems ridiculous.

Rodger Benson- 41 Deer Ridge Dr. Extension- Concerns about people cutting through the road from Rt. 9. Expressed concerns about confusion when driving on going left or right onto Deer Ridge Drive Extension, which poses a threat to the cul-de-sac safety.

Paula Dicy- 159 Deer Ridge Dr. Extension- Agree with the security and safety regarding the through road, and also drop the property value of the 48 homes on Deer Ridge Dr.

George Calef- 48 houses have been developed on the land by his property in the past.

Rodger Vincent- The development isn't the objection; it's the traffic and safety that is the concern.

Ed Dicy- Doesn't know why the cut through road has to be. The Board explained that, by law, there has to be two access roads for safety.

Gayle Farmer- Deer Ridge Drive Extension- The community has a safety issue, and property values decreasing, not a fault with the development.

Malcolm McNeill- Would be happy to put a crash gate to the connection to Deer Ridge Drive Extension, an emergency gate onto Deer Ridge Rd. The town accepted the road with the anticipation to upgrade the Rd to Class 6 by future development. The Board has regulations that they have to follow, and the Gate would have to go to the Fire Chief for a decision.

Christian Hamond- If the board does not accept a crash gate at the access rd, is there another way to exit instead of cutting through Deer Ridge Road? The plan is a preliminary subdivision, and the developer can change the plans to address the concerns of the community.

Joe Falzone- There has not been a town that does not allow a crash gate that he has been to. Information must be gathered before a crash gate can be considered.

Susan Rice- Agricultural Operations:

RSA 432:33 Immunity from Suit- No agricultural operation shall be found a public or private nuisance as a result of changed conditions in or around the locality of the agricultural operation is determined to be injurious to public health or safety under RSA 147:1 or RSA 147:2.

Since 409 Franklin Pierce Highway is the major abutter to this project (said project abuts on two complete boundaries) that said applicant be required to acknowledge on the recorded plan and in each new deed that abuts said land the following: "the owner/abutter of each newly formed lot acknowledges that an ongoing agricultural enterprise resides at 409 Franklin Pierce Highway and has been in existence for more than one year and it has not been deemed a nuisance since the time it began operation and it has not been determined to be injurious and will continue to proceed on such property. It is also acknowledged that the said property resides in the Village District and retains all rights and privileges granted to it under the terms of the Zoning Ordinance."

I have no issues with the proposed "Conservation Subdivision" theory. With regard to the 100' buffer zone, having spent over 25 years working with Planning Boards I would like to see some sort of permanent signage marking the 100' buffer zone at regular intervals so that it is clearly distinguished as such and that certain uses are prohibited. Further, it should not be used for the dumping of yard wastes, animal waste or household materials. Additional screening materials (plantings) are needed and should not be limited to young stock.

Jason Pohopek- Reducing the road frontage, and donating land, might be for a library, and might increase tax costs to the residences of Barrington, and should be considered.

Linda Reynolds- Mother lives by Rice Farm- Supports the notion the proposed subdivision be a conservation subdivision, as an ex-Conservation Commission, and explained that small clusters of homes promotes walking.

Susan Rice- Stated again that she agrees with a conservation subdivision.

George Calef took the floor. Deer Ridge Dr was intended to be a through Rd one day to take some traffic off Rt. 9 and Rt. 125.

The Board closed Public Comment regarding the proposed subdivision.

Planning Board Member Jeffery addressed a question to Atty. McNeill regarding

the consideration of access road via the Deer Ridge Drive Extension. Atty. McNeill responded that this was a conceptual plan and comments were being taken for consideration. He referred to the Board of Selectmen's acceptance of Deer Ridge Drive Extension as a Class VI road, serving as a town right of way.

Atty. McNeill stated that as the applicant will be requesting a continuance to the April 7, 2011 Public Hearing, the Attorney would like the questions brought forth by the public and Planning Board submitted in writing to the applicant for consideration and response. Additionally, McNeill requests that all abutters and legal notice be made upon formal application of the subdivision plan.

Atty. McNeill next requested that the Summery of Relevant Factors Relating to the 120-Acre Parcel Proposed to be Developed for a Conservation Subdivision in the Village District presented to the PB be sent to the Town Attorney, including clarification on the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, Atty. McNeill requested that the Town's Public Safety Officials outline the steps necessary for the consideration of a crash gate connecting to Deer Ridge Drive for the benefit of the Planning Board's review and consideration.

John Wallace, Chairman of the Barrington Conservation Commission, suggested the applicant present his proposal for conservation subdivision to the Barrington Conservation Commission.

Member Kelley moved to accept the continuance to April 7, 2011. Ex-Officio Kessler seconded the motion. The motion carried, with a vote of five (5) to zero (0).

PB Member Calef and PB Member Gaudiello returned to the Board.

The Board briefly discussed creating a reference binder for legal opinions.

The Board will begin review of the Site Plan and Subdivision Rules and Regulations March 11, 2011 for housekeeping purposes.

PB Member Calef recused himself from the Board.

The Board discussed what is to be sent to the Town Attorney regarding the interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance and comments by the applicant from the evening's presentation of the conceptual plan for Village Place.

Huckins is to create an outline and provide it to the Planner who will forward concerns to Town Administrator, Carol Reilly and Town Attorney, Atty. Jae Whitelaw of the Mitchell Municipal Group, PA (25 Beacon Street East; Laconia,

NH 03246). Town Planner Brawders will ask the Town Attorney to contact the Chairman to discuss the items of concern once this outline is received. The PB also would like to invite the Town Attorney to come meet with Board for a general discussion.

PB Member Calef returned to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, Ex-officio Member Kessler motioned to adjourn at 9:33 p.m.; PB Vice-Chair Lemos seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, seven (7) in favor to zero (0) opposed.

Respectfully submitted,
AuBriana Morency, Temporary Staff