

Moultonborough Planning Board
P.O. Box 139
Moultonborough, NH 03254

Regular Meeting

September 11, 2013

Minutes

Present: Members: Tom Howard, Chair; Peter Jensen, Josh Bartlett, Paul Punturieri, Judy Ryerson, Bob Goffredo; Russ Wakefield (Selectmen's Representative)
Alternates: Keith Nelson, Natt King
Staff Present: Town Planner, Bruce W. Woodruff; Administrative Assistant, Bonnie Whitney

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Howard opened the regular meeting to at 7:00 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance. In reference to the agenda, Mr. Howard suggested that the board defer the approval of minutes until after new submissions and the public hearings to allow the applicants to proceed first, addressing the approval of the minutes after Items III, IV & V. He then recused himself from the New Submissions and the Public Hearing for Moultonboro Airbase, LLC and Trey Wilson & Anthony Wilson. Mr. Jensen assumed role of Chair and seated Mr. King in place of Mr. Howard.

III. New Submissions

1. Moultonboro Airbase, LLC and Trey Wilson & Anthony Wilson
(18-18 & 23-15) 39 Airport Road & 1225 Whittier Highway
Boundary Line Adjustment

This was a request for a proposed Boundary Line Adjustment conveying 0.68 acres from the Moultonboro Airbase property to the Wilson property resulting in lots of 54.35 acres and 2.44 acres. Mr. Howard noted the Requests for Waiver dated August 19, 2013 from Hambrook Land Surveying, from Sections 4.3 (A) (3) and (10), relating to wetlands, topography and soils.

Motion: Ms. Ryerson moved to accept the application of **Moultonboro Airbase, LLC and Trey Wilson & Anthony Wilson (18-8 & 23-15)**, grant the waiver for the purposes of acceptance, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

Motion: Mr. King moved to schedule a hearing for this evening to be Boundary Line Adjustment #1, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, carried unanimously.

2. Linda S. & Martin M. Zarli and Sylvia J. Keyser, Trustee
(67-13 & 74-9) 37 Lee's Mill Road & 67 Lee's Mill Road
Boundary Line Adjustment

This was a request for a proposed Boundary Line Adjustment conveying 1.58 acres from TM 67 Lot 13 to TM 74 Lot 9 resulting in lots of 30.2 acres and 22.08 acres. Mr. Howard noted the Requests for Waiver dated August 19, 2013 from Hambrook Land Surveying, from Sections 4.3 (A) (3) and (10), relating to wetlands, topography and soils.

Motion: Ms. Ryerson moved to accept the application of **Linda S. & Martin M. Zarli and Sylvia J. Keyser, Trustee (67-13 & 74-9)**, grant the waiver for the purposes

of acceptance only and to schedule a hearing for this evening to be Boundary Line Adjustment #2, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

IV. Boundary Line Adjustments

1. Moultonboro Airbase, LLC and Trey Wilson & Anthony Wilson (18-18 & 23-15) 39 Airport Road & 1225 Whittier Highway
Boundary Line Adjustment

Jim Hambrook, of Hambrook Land Surveying presented the application for the Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA), briefly describing the location of the lots and the development of the properties. Mr. Hambrook stated that there is an approved site plan for the Wilson property. The Wilson property is 1.65 acres and the proposal is for the transfer of 0.68 acres from Tax Map 18, Lot 18 to Tax Map 23, Lot 15, making Lot 15 a total of 2.44 acres. The parcel to be adjusted contains a portion of a 50' access way to get onto the airport. The area to be conveyed will be subject to that access way. The area to be transferred is all open, partially graveled lot and lawn. The access way as constructed doesn't sit in the deeded location but crosses a portion of it and the hanger lot on the airport side. The residual area of the airport of 54.35 acres. Mr. Hambrook answered any questions from the board.

Mr. Hambrook reviewed the request for waivers for depicting wetlands, topography and for determining and calculating soils and slopes.

Mr. King questioned if the hangers were on separate lots. Mr. Hambrook stated yes, that there were three lots, one which was unbuildable and was merged back into the large lot for the airport.

Mr. Jensen questioned the purpose of the BLA. Mr. Hambrook stated the gravel lot is sort of a part of the Wilson lot. They would like to obtain the area up to the brook. The brook will still be on the airport lot. When Mr. Wilson originally purchased the property there was an existing non-conforming garage. Prior to site plan approval they got an equitable waiver to permit the garage. This BLA will eliminate the non-conformity of the garage.

Mr. Jensen opened the hearing to the public. Abutter Bob Hammond requested clarification of what he describes as a right of way he has on his property to the airport. This right of way is for the taxiway to the airport in an airplane. Mr. Hammond stated that Mr. Hambrook had completed a site plan of his property in 2011. Mr. Hammond gave his description of the creation of the lots and the right of way. Mr. Hammond does not want to lose his right of way to the airport. He would like that stated on the BLA that he has the right to access the airport across the Wilson property. Mr. Hambrook stated that Mr. Hammond does have a right to access the airport, but it is an unstipulated right because it was in his deed, and it was to be determined between Ralph Dale and Bob or Ralphs successors. When Mr. Hammonds lot was created, the 50' right of was wasn't even there. Mr. Hammond's lot was created in 1976. The road lots all existed. The 50' right of way never even came until 1980 when they did the subdivision on the hanger lots, so the only ones that have a written right to use the 50' right of way are the hanger lots. Mr. Hambrook reviewed Mr. Hammond's deeds and there isn't any place that specifically documents where his access way is. He has one, because it's in his deed and it says he has one, but in the deed it says it's undetermined, or to be determined by the grantors or their successors. When the prior BLA was done, Mr. Hammond bought to the brook and there is an access way the airport had reserved coming across the end of the Hammond lot. There isn't any documentation to where Mr. Hammond's access is.

Mr. Woodruff commented that if there is a deed instrument out there that affects this land, or could affect the land it needs to be added to the deed references and that's all you can do. It's not there currently and he had noted this in his staff memo. Mr. Hammond's deed references an access, it may not be pinned, but it could affect this land, so the board could require that that deed reference be placed in the notes on the plat.

After a lengthy discussion Mr. Hambrook stated that he would add a note to the BLA plan referencing Mr. Hammond's deed and that he may have a right over the 50' access way.

Motion: Mr. Punturieri moved to approve the waivers from the subdivision regulations Sections 4.3A. 3 and 10 to depict 2 & 5 ft. contours, for depicting wetlands, and for determining and calculating soils and slopes; and further move to approve the Boundary Line Adjustment Plat for Map 23, Lot 15 and Map 18, Lot 18 at 1225 Whittier Highway & 39 Airport Road, respectfully, for Trey & Anthony Wilson and Moultonboro Airbase, LLC which conveys an area of 0.68 acres from Tax Map 18, Lot 18 to adjacent parcel Tax Map 23, Lot 15, resulting in Lot 18 area becoming 54.35 acres and Lot 15 area becoming 2.44 acres, with the following conditions: 1. Add a note that references the access easement instrument and CCRD recording number. The new deed for Lot 15 shall add language for the 50 ft. wide access easement to others. 2. Add Owner's signatures to the plat. 3. The final plat be submitted to the Development Services Office in appropriate electronic format. 4. Submit executed deeds for recording with all recording costs at the time of recording the plat, seconded by Mr. King, carried unanimously.

Mr. Howard returned to the board as Chairman at this time.

2. Linda S. & Martin M. Zarli and Sylvia J. Keyser, Trustee
(67-13 & 74-9) 37 Lee's Mill Road & 67 Lee's Mill Road
Boundary Line Adjustment

Mr. Howard stated that this was a Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) conveying 1.58 acres from Tax Map 67, Lot 13 to Tax Map 74, Lot 9, resulting in Lot 13 being reduced from 31.78 ac. to 30.2 ac. and Lot 9 being increased from 20.58 ac. to 22.08 ac., located in the residential/agricultural zone.

Jim Hambrook, of Hambrook Land Surveying presented the application for the BLA, briefly describing the location of the lots and the development of the properties. Mr. Hambrook noted the area to be transferred from the Zarli Lot to the Keyser property is a small stand of pine, adjacent to the barn and corral on the Zarli property. Both properties are fully developed as residential. The conveyance of the property does not have an impact on the Zarli property. When the Hayes Lane subdivision was completed there was a High Intensity Soils mapping done on the site, for the portion of that lot the unit density was 1.88 units. The lots will be 30.2 acres and 22.08 acres. Mr. Hambrook answered any questions from the board.

Mr. Howard referred to the Planner's Staff Memo, noting that the BLA results in no zoning nonconformities as to lot area, soils calculations or setbacks. Regarding Subdivision Regulation issues the applicant has requested waivers as outline in their waive request letter, dated August 19, 2013, but also needs waivers from the requirement to depict 2 and 5 ft. contours, the requirement to show locations and dimensions of all property lines, and the requirement to show all lines and bearings as well. Staff recommend granting the five waivers.

There were no questions or comments from the Board of the public.

Motion: Mr. King moved to approve the waivers from the requirement to depict 2 & 5-ft. contours, for depicting wetlands, for determining and calculating soils and slopes, from the requirement to show locations and dimensions of all property lines, and the requirement to show all lines and bearings; and further move to approve the Boundary Line Adjustment Plat for 37 and 67 Lee's Mill Road (Tax Map 67, Lot 13 & Tax Map 74, Lot 9), for Linda S. & Martin M. Zarli and

Sylvia J. Keyser, Trustee, which conveys 1.58 acres of land from TM 67-13 to TM 74-9, resulting in Lot 13 being reduced from 31.78 acres to 30.2 acres, and Lot 9 being increased from 20.5 acres to 22.08 acres, with the following conditions: 1. Add Owners' signatures to the plat. 2. The final plat be submitted to the Development Services Office in appropriate electronic format. 3. Submit executed deeds for recording with all recording costs at the time of recording the plat, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

Mr. Nelson returned to the board at this time as an alternate member.

As a point of order, Mr. King stated that he erred in making the above motion as he is an alternate member of the board and was not seated as a voting member.

Motion: Mr. Jensen moved to reconsider the above motion for purposes of correcting the voting error, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Bartlett moved to restate the prior motion as erroneously stated by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

V. Hearings

1. Jonathan T. White Realty (143-5)(278 Whittier Highway) Site Plan Review

Mr. Howard stated that this was a continuation of a hearing for a site plan review for a Family Dollar store.

Ms. Ryerson asked the Planner what new material has come in since the last meeting. Mr. Woodruff stated that he hasn't received any new material with the exception of a Bollinger septic plan. He has no comments as he has had nothing to review. Ms. Ryerson commented that at the last hearing the board had agreed to hear the conceptual presentation pending the complete submission, but said that we would not go any further. She questioned if they should look at just the septic plan, or anything that's new?

Mr. Howard asked Mr. Carl Johnson if the plan he was using in the field, at the onsite today, was different than the one they in front of them. Mr. Johnson stated yes and explained why. He said when they came before them before, they had received many comments from the board and they were trying to incorporate into a revised plan set to have ready for tonight. So to have them submitted for staff to review prior to tonight, and have complete plan set, they weren't. When they make changes, those sometimes trigger other changes, and it is like a domino effect. They don't have all of the information. Knowing that they weren't going to be getting an approval tonight, what they decided to do was to submit the pdf. of a revised plan and septic plan, with the anticipation that when they went out for the site review they'd have a few more comments to work with and then they would submit to the board a complete set of plans that would incorporate the changes that were made subsequent to the meeting last time and any changes that the board may have as a result of the site walk this evening. Mr. Johnson would like to point out a few of the changes that were made subsequent to the board comments to demonstrate that they're working with staff towards that end and hopefully by the end of this week, or the beginning of next week, they will have a complete engineering set of plans that jive with a complete site plan to give staff and the board sufficient time to review those. They will have all of the information on one plan. He then asked to do a brief presentation to identify a few of the changes that they've made.

Mr. Howard commented that they would look at what they have this evening and make a determination of what the best course of action is to see if they can make some progress toward the end.

Mr. Bartlett asked if he should recuse himself this evening as he was not here for the original presentation. Mr. Nelson commented that part of the discussion at the last meeting was that it was a conceptual presentation and with the understanding that other members would be brought up to speed when they had a full board. Members were comfortable with Mr. Bartlett sitting for the hearing.

Mr. Punturieri commented that he was not comfortable with this being piecemealed. They were looking at a plan that was not the same as Mr. Johnson had on the board. He noted that they had received a pdf. this afternoon and was not able to review it. Mr. Woodruff stated that was a septic design. A brief presentation perhaps on what might be coming, but not anything in totality. He would like to see everything together at one time, and asked when would they get that? In time so they would have time to digest it.

Mr. Woodruff commented that the applicant not only has a responsibility to the board to get plans to them in a timely fashion but also to the office. Staff posts the plan on the board and makes the file available for the public to view what's proposed. What the board has this evening is not what they have and you really do not know what the end product is going to be. His recommendation in the staff memo stands, that the Board table the application and continue the public hearing to a date specific given the outstanding issues that need to be worked on.

Mr. Bartlett agreed with Mr. Punturieri's comment, noting the applicant is showing some courtesy to give us as much information as they can, but it would be a lot easier to understand and give them a fair hearing if they all the information at once.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that they were not asking for the board to make any determinations on anything tonight. Their reason for being there was to follow up with the site walk to see if there were any additional things as a result of the site walk that the board would like to have them add to the plan and simply point out to the board the things that they've added so they'll know that they have made progress and that they will submit things in a timely fashion for the next meeting so they can make a thorough review, staff can make a thorough review and then they can have a determination at a subsequent meeting. There were three major things, as a result of the conversation at the last meeting, that were done.

Mr. Howard stated when they were ready to move forward, hopefully they will cover those items and discuss the site walk. His opinion is that there were a couple of major issues that they have discussed that in reviewing materials have stood out. If they could get further information or express further concerns about those issues, one being the fire protection issue, another being the storm water. He felt this would be prudent for them to try and accomplish that this evening.

Carl Johnson, agent for the applicant, was present this evening, along with Jon White and Erin Darrow. Mr. Johnson stated they are not heading towards an approval or disapproval this evening. He felt it was important to give them the best direction they can as towards what they're hoping to see, so that they do come back with a plan that's acceptable to everyone.

Ms. Ryerson repeated that last week the Planner suggested that the board might not accept the plan because it was incomplete. They did accept it on the expectation that at the next meeting they would have everything they should have had in the first meeting. Mr. Johnson stated that was what they were hoping and trying for. Ms. Ryerson asked if they would be hoping the same thing next meeting. Mr. Johnson said they were going to be hoping, yes. If we're not prepared for the next meeting then we'll take what comes in, they're hoping since the septic plan has been completed and submitted to the state and the state is in the final review of the driveway permit, they have added significant things to the plan for the board to review that they will be in a good place next time.

Mr. Howard stated that the board has been struggling with this, getting applicants to get things in the process. Mr. Jensen asked if it would help if the board just reviewed the outstanding issues and got an

agreement on those. Mr. Howard replied that it was important to cover the issues that have been made since the last hearing. Mr. Punturieri noted the problem created with doing this in pieces is that the public hasn't seen the full presentation as to what the final plan is going to be, all the approvals, so the public can ask questions that are informed, and the board could ask questions that are informed. He doesn't think that they can do that when doing things in bits and pieces. There are concerns about traffic and storm water runoff. I would feel more comfortable if they opened the public hearing, continued it until they have a complete package in front of them. If there were one or two things that are missing that are not substantive, that's a different issue. There are some big pieces that they still don't have answers to or have not had time to digest. His feeling is that he would rather not go forward.

Mr. Wakefield stated he would like to go forward tonight so that they might ask questions relevant to the site walk. Mr. Howard commented that the hearing was reopened and they may limit it in whatever way the board determines. Mr. Wakefield would like to ask questions about the site visit and there are people in the audience that were on the site visit that might have questions as well.

Mr. Johnson stated that at the subsequent hearing he would be willing to give a comprehensive analysis of everything from the beginning, a wrap up of the project with all of the information on the plan. He feels any information they can get out to the board or the public would be useful. Members were in agreement to allow the applicant to proceed forward, and to allow members from the public to ask questions as well.

Mr. Johnson proceeded forward, noting at the last hearing there was a question on a few of the waivers they had requested and he referenced the site review check list. It was noted once again that that document was a checklist for the Planner's use in his review. It was not an inclusive site plan review checklist as used by his predecessor. It is the responsibility of the applicant or their agent to read the site plan regulations and either meet those requirements or submit any necessary waivers from those regulations. It was noted that this was discussed two weeks ago.

Mr. Johnson stated they have developed a north elevation and a west elevation rendering of the building and have provided a colored architectural drawing, and a detailed landscaping plan. Another concern was the location of the dumpsters relative to the buffer zone, so they have reduced the number of dumpster from 3 to 2, turned it 90 degrees, which will give an additional area to the buffer zone. He has started a lighting analysis which will be submitted subsequent to this hearing. The Planner had recommended they either post a bond or have the executed agreement for the cross connection between the two properties. A note has been added to the plan that they will grade and pave to the property line. Hopefully by the time of construction they will have an executed cross easement with the abutter to complete the cross through. The location of the proposed septic system was pointed out at the site walk. The design was completed by Chip Bollinger and will be submitted to the state for approval. Those were the major changes that were made based on the discussion they had at the prior hearing. Mr. Johnson answered any questions from the board.

Mr. Punturieri questioned the width of the driveway and asked if there would be a left hand turn from Route 25. Mr. Johnson stated it will be 30' wide and they have done a separate plan for NH DOT. What they have proposed, and was accepted by DOT, is a bypass lane. This will allow an area for traffic to pass by traffic turning left into the site. Mr. Howard questioned if they could consider widening the exit from the site to allow for a left and right turn lane. They had required that on the abutting property. Mr. Johnson stated that they would do that, but it would depend on what DOT would want as they control the driveway access. Ms. Darrow commented that she would bring to the attention of DOT. It was the consensus of the board that they would prefer to have the driveway channelization for two egress lanes, one to the left and the other to the right. If DOT would permit it, they want that. Ms. Ryerson asked if the driveway permit has been submitted to DOT. Ms. Darrow stated no. The Traffic Impact and Access Study has been submitted, reviewed and approved by the DOT. The final cross sections and plans have not. Ms. Ryerson then asked if the plans for the bypass shoulder have been submitted. Ms. Darrow stated no. A

preliminary plan for a bypass has been, but not a final. Ms. Ryerson questioned the time frame for DOT to review such a plan. Ms. Darrow commented it depends on what they have in their queue. It could be between 2 and 4 weeks.

Mr. Woodruff commented that the shoulder plan has not been submitted as of the date of his email. David Silvia, from DOT, favors the channelization stripping at the entrance, but they will not require the applicant to do it, as it is beyond the front property line and they leave it to the Planning Board.

Mr. Howard opened the hearing to the public limiting the comments and questions at this time to the driveway and lane issue on Route 25.

Michael Brooker, 38 Lee Road, noted his concerns with the location of the site and questioned if there was an incident report from the Police of traffic accidents at Redding Lane and Tedeschi? Mr. Woodruff commented they did not receive that type of information at the TRC, but that could be done and submitted to the board if they wish.

Kevin Kelley agreed with Mr. Brooker. He suggested the board look at the traffic concerns in Meredith in front of Dunkin Donuts and Hannaford's. This proposal will add to the traffic back up from the lights at Murphy's. Traffic lights or a turning lane would make a lot of sense.

Eric Taussig provided the board with a letter on the traffic issue dated September 11, 2013. Mr. Taussig read the letter into the record noting his concerns with the proposed access and egress for the proposed Family Dollar store. He gave a brief history of the hazards along that section of Route 25. Mr. Taussig has suggested the need for a professional traffic study.

Mr. Johnson stated they would have some comments from DOT regarding this. DOT does control the highway, but thinks they would be interested in what the Planning Board has to say. They have already reviewed the traffic trips per day and comparing Redding Lane and Tedeschi's is apples to oranges. The site distance coming out of those are significantly different than site distances coming out of the proposed entrance for Family Dollar.

Mr. Jensen stated that he would like to see a traffic incident report for that area, not just per year, but broken down by months or seasonally.

Mr. Wakefield noted his concerns with drainage, and sheet flowing downhill and questioned the area proposed for snow storage. Ms. Darrow will address this in her presentation.

Mr. Jensen had a question regarding headlights from the site noting his concerns about the lighting, headlights and stationary lighting. He asked if any changes had been made to the plan regarding the lighting. A discussion ensued regarding the lighting with members of the public, including Michael Brooker, Kurt Maloney and Jane Fairchild noting their concerns about light pollution across Lake Kanasatka. They also questioned the hours of operation and asked if the lighting would be turned off when the store was closed. Mr. White stated that Family Dollar is cost conscious and that the lights will be on as little as possible. The lights will be on a timer and the sign will go off when the store closes at 9 PM.

Erin Darrow gave an updated presentation of the drainage. She answered Mr. Wakefield's question stating that there will be a zero (0) percent increase in the runoff. There was additional discussion regarding drainage and storm water as well as concerns with the recent "50 year storm" events that we have had recently. It was noted that the board does have the option to request a peer review.

Mr. King questioned what the maintenance procedure was for the rain gardens. Ms. Darrow explained what they were and stated that this information would be detailed in her Operation and Maintenance Manual, which will be submitted as part of her final documents to the Planner.

Caleb Johnson, representing one of the abutters, the Church in the Valley, noted their concerns with snow removal and asked strongly that the board look at the storm water runoff for this site.

Jane Fairchild questioned how the parking lot was to be treated and noted her concerns with the proposed snow storage area and how that would be treated.

Kevin Kelley and Caleb Johnson noted their concerns with maintenance, asking how this would be enforced.

Cristina Ashjian commented that sodium chloride does not filter out and will go into the lake.

Mr. Howard stated at the prior meeting there was a question raised regarding the need for a fire cistern. In response to that question and subsequent conversations with the Fire Chief there has been further information regarding the fire protection. Mr. Woodruff stated that the Fire Chief had conferred with Mr. Heinrich and has reviewed the distance to the nearest hydrant, the elevation and the need for a large amount of fire hose. While his initial advice to the TRC was focused on the ability to fight a fire on all four sides of the building and that a sprinkler system was not required by fire code, he has come to a different opinion as to whether there should be additional firefighting capacity on the site. In an email to the Planner, the Fire Chief has made the recommendation that a 35,000 gallon cistern be constructed.

Mr. White stated that this was the first that he had heard of this recommendation, noting that this was not brought up at the TRC by the Fire Chief, and if it had been, he wouldn't be here now, as the cost would kill the deal. Mr. White questioned if he could install a sprinkler system instead of a cistern. Mr. Howard suggested that Mr. White speak with the Office of Development Services and meet with the Fire Chief regarding his recommendation.

Ms. Fairchild read a prepared statement into the record noting her questions and concerns regarding lot coverage, view of the site from Lake Kanasatka, size building and parking lot, signage, color of the logo, materials for of the building, a light colored brick with bright red roofing, hours of operation, lights from the site, lights from cars turning in and out of the site, and landscaping/buffering. This proposal will interfere with the rural, peaceful, scenic area of Lake Kanasatka. She feels that this proposal is in direct conflict with the Master Plan and possibly parts of the Zoning Ordinance.

At this time the board questioned when the applicant felt that they would be able get back to the board the outstanding information as well as the information requested this evening. It was noted that the deadline for the submittal for new submissions for the next meeting (September 25th) was September 5th. It was noted that the applicant has not submitted material in a reasonable time in order for Staff, board members and the public to review. It was noted that the "65 Day Clock" began at the acceptance of the application on August 28th. The board asked the applicant if they would waive the 65 day clock. They stated yes and that they would submit a letter to that affect. After further discussion it was the decision to continue the hearing to October 9th and to further set a date when the material shall be submitted to the board for proper review by staff, the board and the public.

Motion: Mr. Punturieri moved to table the application for Jonathan T. White (143-5) and to continue the public hearing until October 9, 2013, and to require that all revised plans, permits and documents be submitted to the Office of Development Services 10 days in advance of October 9th, seconded by Mr. Jensen, carried unanimously.

II. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Howard stated that at the last meeting the Board was provided with an amended copy of the minutes provided by Mr. Punturieri. Some members had concerns with approving minutes that evening as three members were not present, and they delayed the approval of them until this evening. After a brief discussion it was the decision of the board to approve the Amended Draft Minutes as presented.

Motion: Mr. Bartlett moved to approve the Amended Draft Planning Board Minutes of August 14, 2013, as presented this evening, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, motion passed 6 to 1 in favor, with Mr. Howard opposing.

Motion: Mr. Punturieri moved to approve the Planning Board Minutes of August 28, 2013, as amended, seconded by Mr. Wakefield, carried unanimously with Mr. Jensen and Mr. Bartlett abstaining.

VI. Informal Discussions

VII. Unfinished Business

1. Status update on Master Plan Survey

Mr. Woodruff provided the board with a hard copy of the final 2013 Master Plan Citizens Survey results. The members were sent a larger pdf. which show graphs, he did not print them out due to the size of the report. He asked that members review the results of the survey, keeping in mind that this is another tool for the preparation of a new master plan, the three chapters they have chosen. Mr. Woodruff asked if the board would like the results posted on the website. A discussion ensued regarding this and it was noted the importance in keeping the public informed and it was the decision to post the results of the survey, additional comments from the hand submitted surveys and comments from the Listening Sessions on the website. It was noted that the public should understand that the Master Plan is a guidance document that is an under pinning of zoning.

Motion: Mr. Punturieri moved that the results of the Master Plan Survey be posted on the Towns website with a disclaimer that the survey and its results were never intended to be certifiable and are to be used as a tool in preparation of a future master plan, seconded by Mr. Bartlett, carried unanimously.

2. Mr. Woodruff stated that he had erred during a previous discussion regarding the statute for Joint Meetings. He had said that the applicant could ask the board for a Joint Meeting. RSA 676:2. What he didn't do was read the entire statute which reads as follows: "An applicant seeking a local permit may petition 2 or more land use boards to hold a joint meeting or hearing when the subject matter of the requested permit is within the responsibilities of those land use boards. Each board shall adopt rules of procedure relative to joint meetings and hearings, and each board shall have the authority on its own initiative to request a joint meeting. Each land use board shall have the discretion as to whether or not to hold a joint meeting with any other land use board."

3. Mr. Jensen commented that he would like to have directions/instructions on how the board will act on future requests for Conditional Use Permits. He would like to discuss this at a future work session. Ms. Ryerson commented that she had questions about voting and asked if they could contact the NH Municipal Association for their recommendation. The Board asked Mr. Woodruff if he could prepare an outline for review at a work session on "Draft Procedures" for the board to follow or a process for the board to do that as well as to make a finding on the criteria or the performance of the CUP.

VIII. Other Business/Correspondence

Eric Taussig questioned the board regarding a comment made by Selectman Wakefield during the September 9th Public hearings regarding the removal of two board members that alluded to a meeting amongst Selectmen Wakefield, Chairman Howard, Mr. Bartlett and Town Planner, Bruce Woodruff on Rock Pile. He asked what the nature was of the alleged meeting that took place as there were no minutes or notice of said meeting. Mr. Taussig repeatedly asked about this meeting. Mr. Howard indicated that Mr. Taussig should file a formal 91:A request. Mr. Woodruff stated that this was a personal issue and that there was not any discussion pertaining to Rock Pile.

IX. Committee Reports

- X. Adjournment:** Mr. Jensen made the motion to adjourn at 10:17 PM, seconded by Mr. Punturieri, carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bonnie L. Whitney
Administrative Assistant