



Meeting Minutes
Work Session
North Hampton Planning Board
Tuesday, November 18, 2014 at 6:30pm
Town Hall, 231 Atlantic Avenue

7

8

9

10 These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a
11 transcription.

12

13 **Members present:** Shep Kroner, Chair; Tim Harned, Vice Chair; Dan Derby, Phil Wilson and
14 Jim Maggiore, Select Board Representative.

15

16 **Members absent:** Dr. Arena and Mr. Donohoe

17

18 **Alternates present:** Nancy Monaghan

19

20 **Others present:** Cliff Sinnott, RPC Circuit Rider, and Wendy Chase, Recording Secretary

21

22 Mr. Harned opened the Public Hearing at 6:36pm to consider the three (3) proposed Zoning Ordinance
23 changes.

24

25 1. The First Public Hearing on proposed amendments to Article V, Section 506.4.J – Political Signs. The
26 intent of the proposed amendment is to clarify that Political Signs are regulated by State and Federal
27 laws and not regulated by local laws.

28 Mr. Harned read the proposed amendment into the record.

29

30 Political signs. Political signs are regulated by RSA 664:17 and do not require permits. Political signs
31 should not be placed in areas where they will create a traffic safety hazard due to obstruction of the
32 sightlines at intersections or driveways. **Political signs are not otherwise regulated by this ordinance.**

33 **3/14/2015.**

34 Mr. Wilson explained that the intent of the proposed change is so that the Section reflects the State Law
35 and Town Counsel have reviewed it and agrees with the change.

36

37 There was no Public Comment.

38 Mr. Harned closed the Public Hearing on this particular change.

39

40 2. The First Public Hearing on proposed amendments to Article IV, Section 406.4.1 Duplex. The intent of
41 the proposed amendment is to add the required frontage of 175-feet in the R-1 Zone and 250-feet in the
42 I-B/R zone for a duplex and to clarify that the number of bedrooms allowed is 3 bedrooms per unit.

43 Mr. Harned read the proposed ordinance into the record.

44

45 406.4.1 Duplex Requirements: The minimum lot size for a duplex shall be 100,000 square feet and the
46 lot shall contain a minimum of 60,000 square feet of contiguous non-wetland area. No additional
47 frontage is required, other than that specified in Section 406. Any proposed duplex on an existing lot of
48 record must have 175 feet of frontage in the R-1 district, and 250 feet of frontage in the I/B/R. The
49 maximum number of bedrooms allowed per unit is three (3). Each dwelling unit shall have a minimum
50 living area of 720 square feet. An adequate septic system built to standards of the N.H. Department of
51 Environmental Services (NH DES) must be provided. *3/10/92, 3/11/2014, 3/14/2015.

52

53 David O'Hare, 18 Old Locke Road – asked how the proposed ordinance varied from the original.

54

55 Mr. Harned said that it now includes the frontage requirements in the R-1 and I-B/R zones so that
56 current vacant lots with little frontage will lose the “grandfathered” rights and would require a variance
57 to build a duplex if the lot doesn't have the required frontage.

58

59 Mr. Wilson said it also specifies that there will be three (3) bedrooms per unit instead of six (6) total,
60 eliminating the option to have 2 bedrooms on one side and 4 on another for example.

61

62 There was no further public comment.

63

64 Mr. Harned closed the Public Hearing on this particular change.

65

66 3. The First Public Hearing on proposed amendment to Article IV, Section 405 – Permitted Uses Table
67 under the R-2 Medium Density District, #7 - Duplexes. The intent of the proposed amendment is to
68 remove Duplexes from the Permitted Uses in the R-2 Medium Density District to minimize
69 circumventing the two acre requirement for single family dwellings by allowing duplexes (two single-
70 family dwellings) on 2 ¼ acre instead of the required 4 acres.

71 Mr. Harned explained that the intent of the proposed change is that duplexes will be stricken from the
72 table of permitted uses under the R-2 Zoning District.

73

74 George Lagassa, 26 Maple Road – said that he supports the proposed amendments and asked the Board
75 when they would take effect.

76

77 Mr. Wilson said that as soon as the Planning Board votes to put it on the ballot, everyone has to comply
78 with it until the election, and if the proposed amendment doesn't pass, it wouldn't be in effect.

79

80 *Secretary's Note: RSA 676:12.I – the Building Inspector shall not issue any building permit within the 120*
81 *days prior to the annual or special town meeting if: a. Application for such permit is made after the first*
82 *legal notice of proposed changes in the building code or zoning ordinance has been posted pursuant to*
83 *the provisions of RSA 675:7; and b. the proposed changes in the building code or the zoning ordinance*
84 *would, if adopted, justify refusal of such permit.*

85

86

87 There was no further public comment.

88 Mr. Harned closed the Public Hearing at 6:44pm.

89

90 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion that the first proposed zoning**
91 **amendment, Article V, Section 506.4.J – Political Signs, be posted first on the official Town Warrant**
92 **and then appear on the official Town Ballot as written.**

93 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

94

95 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion that the second proposed amendment to**
96 **Article IV, Section 406.4.1 – Duplex, be posted first on the official Town Warrant and then appear on**
97 **the official Town Ballot as written.**

98 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

99

100 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion that the third proposed amendment to**
101 **Article IV, Section 405 – permitted uses table under the R-2 medium density district, in particular,**
102 **number 7, referred to duplexes be posted first on the official Town Warrant and then appear on the**
103 **official Town Ballot in March 2015, as proposed.**

104

105 Mr. Wilson explained that when the Board was dealing with the question on how the Town would
106 calculate its available housing for the workforce housing inclusionary zoning amendment the R-3, low
107 density district was eliminated and consolidated it into R-1. There seems to be a lot of duplexes built in
108 the R-2 district and he believes, and he thought the Board believed when putting the inclusionary
109 ordinance forward, that it is not consistent with the medium density district.

110

111 **Mr. Maggiore made a friendly amendment that duplexes be removed from the permitted uses table in**
112 **the R-2 zoning district.**

113

114 **Mr. Wilson accepted the friendly amendment.**

115

116 **Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion.**

117 **The motion was unanimous in favor of the motion as amended, (6-0).**

118

119 The Work Session began at 7:53pm.

120 Mr. Harned noted for the record that there was a quorum, and seated Ms. Monaghan for Mr. Donohoe.

121

122 The Board discussed proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments:

123

124 **Article IV, Section 409.2 – Definition of District**

125

126 The suggested amendment is to add Section D – All Buffers and setbacks around all such wetlands as
127 described in this section (Section 409.2).

128

129 The purpose is to clarify that not only the wetlands, but all buffers and setbacks for wetlands, is
130 described earlier in this section.

131

132 **Article IV, Section 409.8 Prohibited Uses in the Wetlands Conservation District**

133

134 The proposed amendment:

135

136 **409.8 Prohibited Uses in the Wetlands Conservation District:**

137 The following uses are prohibited within the Wetlands Conservation District or within 75' of the district:

138

139 **A.** Septic systems, leach fields, or on site disposal systems.

140

141 **B.** Storage of gasoline, fuel oil, pesticides, hazardous agricultural and other materials or road salt
142 stockpiles.

143

144 **(Edits in red and blue)**

145

146 **409.8.a Prohibited Uses in the Wetlands Conservation District:**

147

148 The following uses are prohibited within the Wetlands **Conservation District Areas** or within 75ft' of **the**
149 **district Wetland Area Boundaries**. **If other portions of the North Hampton Zoning Ordinance specify**
150 **distances other than 75ft, the larger distance shall apply:**

151

152 **A.**Septic systems, leach fields, or on site disposal systems.

153

154 **B.Storage of gasoline, fuel oil, pesticides, hazardous agricultural and other materials or road salt**
155 **stockpiles.**

156

157 **409.8.b Prohibited Uses in the Wetlands Conservation District:**

158

159 The following uses are prohibited within the Wetlands Areas or within 100ft of Wetland Area
160 Boundaries:

161

162 Storage of gasoline, fuel oil, pesticides, hazardous agricultural and other materials or road salt
163 stockpiles.

164

165 Mr. Wilson suggested changing the word *portions* to *provisions*.

166

167 **Article IV, Section 409.9.A Undeveloped lots or record**

168

169 **A. Undeveloped lots of record**

170

171 **1. Undeveloped lots of record existing as of March 2003 or any**
172 **lot created subsequently:**

173

174 No structure or impermeable surface shall be permitted within 100' of Tidal Lands or within 100' of
175 Wetlands on any lot of record existing as of March 2003 or on any lot created subsequently. **Within the**
176 **wetlands buffer zone, the 25' closest to the wetland boundary shall be a Naturally Vegetated Buffer.**

177 ***3/08/2005**

178

179 **2. Undeveloped lots of record existing prior to March 2003:** If the imposition of 100' tidal and/or
180 freshwater wetland buffer setbacks causes the buildable upland acreage (this is, land that is not in the

181 wetlands buffer zone) to be less than 16,000 square feet, the prior wetlands buffer zone setback
182 requirements of 50' for Wetlands and 75' for Tidal Wetlands shall apply.
183 [Within the wetlands buffer zone, the 25' closest to the wetland boundary shall be a Naturally Vegetated](#)
184 [Buffer.](#) *3/08/2005

185
186 Mr. Harned explained that the addition to the Section is to add 25' of vegetated buffer within the
187 wetlands setback closest to the wetland boundary; it is not an additional 25' feet to the required 100-
188 feet; it is included in the 100-feet.

189
190 Mr. Derby inquired whether or not they had a definition of developed and undeveloped lots.

191
192 Mr. Kroner wondered whether the Board should try to define the terms.

193
194 Mr. Maggiore looked the definition of undeveloped lots and came up with 3 different definitions.

195
196 Proposed Ordinance – Naturally Vegetated Buffer –

197
198 **409.5 Naturally Vegetated Buffer**

199 A Naturally Vegetated Buffer strip shall be maintained from the boundary line of each wetland to
200 25ft upland from the wetland boundary line for all wetlands meeting the requirements of Section
201 409.2 of the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA). Where existing buildings, structures or other
202 developed areas preclude the maintenance of a vegetated buffer for the full width of the 25ft, a
203 buffer of the maximum possible width shall be provided.

204
205 Within the buffer strip, naturally occurring vegetation shall be maintained and encouraged. The
206 preservation of natural vegetation within the buffer is intended to stabilize banks to prevent
207 erosion, maintain wildlife habitats, minimize pollution of the water and preserve the scenic quality
208 of shoreline properties. No soil disturbance shall occur within the Naturally Vegetated Buffer.
209 Existing lawns within the Naturally Vegetative Buffer may remain but are encouraged to be allowed
210 to reestablish as naturally occurring vegetation. No new lawn, garden, or landscape areas shall be
211 created within the buffer strip.

212
213 Within the buffer, the following standards shall apply:

214 1. Selective cutting of trees and other vegetation greater than 3 ft in height shall be permitted
215 provided that a healthy, well distributed stand of trees and other vegetation is maintained. No trees
216 over 6 inches in diameter (19 inches in circumference, measured 4.5 ft above ground) shall be cut
217 within the natural vegetative buffer. Not more than 50 percent of the total number of saplings shall
218 be removed in any 20 year period. A healthy, well distributed stand of trees, saplings, shrubs and
219 ground covers and their living undamaged root systems shall be left in place.

220
221 2. Existing vegetation under 3 feet in height including ground cover shall not be removed except to
222 provide for a single point of access to the shoreline and in case of disease as provided for in Section
223 5 below.

224 4. Stumps and their root systems which are located within Naturally Vegetated Buffer shall be left

225 intact. The removal of stumps and roots in conjunction with beaches or docks may be permitted
226 with the approval of the Conservation Commission based upon a determination that the removal in
227 combination with mitigation activities will not increase the potential for erosion.

228

229 5. Dead, diseased, or damaged trees, saplings, or ground covers may be removed with prior
230 approval of the Conservation Commission, in consultation with the Tree Warden. The stumps and
231 root systems of the removed trees shall not be disturbed and shall remain in place. If such removal
232 results in the creation of cleared openings, these openings shall be replanted with native species
233 unless existing new growth is present.

234

235 6. Invasive species may be removed but must be replaced with another species that will meet and
236 perform the intended function of the vegetative buffer.

237

238 7. The application of fertilizers, pesticides, or herbicides within the buffer strip shall be prohibited
239 except in conjunction with allowed agricultural activities or as permitted by the New Hampshire
240 Department of Environmental Services.

241

242 Mr. Kroner suggested adding a provision in the first paragraph that only undeveloped lots or new
243 subdivisions will be affected by the naturally vegetated buffer.

244

245 The Board looked for the appropriate place to add the amendment in the Zoning Ordinance. It was
246 suggested to add it under Section 409.5 and change the existing section numbers sequentially by one.

247

248 It was decided to add it under Section 409.9.C – Naturally Vegetated Buffer

249

250 Mr. Wilson suggested changing paragraph numbered 5 – *Dead, diseased or damaged vegetation –*
251 *including , but not limiting to, trees, saplings, or ground covers – may.....*

252

253 The Board agreed with Mr. Kroner and Mr. Wilson’s proposed changes.

254

255 **Article IV, Section 409.12 – Conditional Use Permits by the Planning Board**

256

257 **409.12 Conditional Use Permits by the Planning Board:**

258 Upon application to the Planning Board, a Conditional Use Permit may be granted to permit the erection
259 of a new structure **on vacant lots of record** or the expansion of an existing structure located within the
260 Wetlands Conservation District, or any buffer zones, provided that all of the
261 following conditions are found to exist:

262

263 **A.** The lot upon which an exception is sought was an official lot of record, as recorded in the Rockingham
264 County Registry of Deeds prior to March 8, 1988.

265 **B.** The new structure or expansion is not otherwise prohibited under the zoning ordinance.

266 **C.** The use for which the exception is sought cannot feasibly be carried out on a portion or portions of
267 the lot, which are outside the Wetlands Conservation District or the buffer zone.

268 **D.** Due to the provisions of the Wetlands Conservation District, no reasonable and economically viable
269 use of the lot can be made without the exception.

270 E. The design and construction of the proposed use will, to the extent practicable, be undertaken in such
271 a manner as to be consistent with the purposes and spirit of this ordinance and shall not diminish the
272 natural resource values of affected wetlands in any appreciable way. March 10, 2009.

273
274 Mr. Harned explained that the proposed change to 409.12 is to strike "vacant lots of record" from the
275 first sentence. The intent is that new structures will apply to all lots, not just vacant lots of record, in the
276 Wetlands Conservation District and buffer zones.

277
278 Example: if someone has a house on a lot and they wants to build a barn in the buffer zone, do they go
279 to the ZBA for a variance of to the Planning Board for a Conditional Use Permit? The new language
280 would require them to go to the Planning Board for a Conditional Use Permit.

281
282 Article IV, Section 409.12 was changed from a Special Exception process with the Zoning Board to a
283 Conditional Use permit process through the Planning Board because at the time all variance requests
284 were being granted and the Planning Board thought it would be best to retain the responsibility through
285 a Conditional Use Permit when dealing with development in the Wetlands Conservation District, or any
286 buffer zones as long as the applicant met all of the criteria. If the Permit is denied the Applicant could
287 only appeal to Superior Court; not the ZBA.

288
289 Mr. Wilson said that the substantive question is whether to keep it as a Conditional Use Permit through
290 the Planning Board, or change it back to a Special Exception process through the ZBA.

291
292 The Board took action on the proposed amendment changes separately.

293
294 **Mr. Kroner moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to bring the proposed Zoning Ordinance**
295 **Amendment to the first Public Hearing on December 16, 2014 to consider the addition of section**
296 **409.2.D.**

297 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

298
299 **Mr. Kroner moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to bring the proposed Zoning Ordinance**
300 **Amendment to Article IV, Section 409.8 to the first Public Hearing on December 16, 2014.**

301 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

302
303 **Mr. Kroner moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to bring the proposed Zoning Ordinance**
304 **Amendment to Article IV, Section 409.A.1 and Section 409.A.2 to the first Public Hearing on December**
305 **16, 2014.**

306 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

307
308 **Mr. Kroner moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to bring the proposed definition of**
309 **Naturally Vegetated Buffer to the first Public Hearing held on December 16, 2014 with the following**
310 **changes:**

311 **1. change the Section number to 409.9.C.**

312 **2. strike the sentence in the first paragraph - Where existing buildings, structures or other**
313 **developed areas preclude the maintenance of a vegetated buffer for the full width of the 25ft, a**
314 **buffer of the maximum possible width shall be provided.**

315 **3. change the first sentence in paragraph numbered 5 to – *Dead, diseased or damaged vegetation –***
316 ***including, but not limiting to, trees, saplings, or ground covers – may.....***

317 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

318

319 **Mr. Kroner moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to bring the proposed Zoning Ordinance**
320 **amendment to Article IV, Section 409.12 Conditional Use Permits by the Planning Board to the first**
321 **Public Hearing on December 16, 2014 with the following changes:**

322 **1. strike from the first sentence, *on vacant lots of record.***

323

324 It was explained that the Section refers to lots created on or before March 8, 1988.

325

326 Mr. Kroner pointed out that if after 2005 a new proposal to build in the wetland buffer would not fall
327 under the Condition Use Permit process; it would require a variance.

328

329 Discussion ensued on the proposed amendment to Article IV, Section 409.12.

330

331 It was suggested to strike "A" in its entirety and change "exception" under C to "Conditional Use
332 Permit".

333

334 It was determined that there was a typographical error in sections A and C, and it was suggested they be
335 corrected by replacing the word "exception" with "conditional use permit".

336

337 Mr. Sinnott referred to condition "A" and said that the reason for "A" is to essentially allow a structure
338 in the Wetlands Conservation District, and that's something the Zoning Ordinance is meant to allow, so
339 this section is saying you can only do it if it was a preexisting lot when the ordinance was initially passed.
340 He explained that all applicants that want to build a structure in the Wetlands Conservation District will
341 have to go through this process, and if condition "A" cannot be met, then the application is denied and
342 the applicant would have to appeal to Superior Court; not the ZBA because it is a conditional use
343 process.

344

345 Mr. Wilson explained that the wetlands setbacks were established in 1988, and Section 409.12 was put
346 in to protect the existing lots of record when the changes were made.

347

348 Mr. Kroner said that he thinks applicants should be able to appeal to a local board rather than Superior
349 Court.

350

351 The Board agreed that there was work to do on the proposed amendment to 409.12; the motion failed.

352

353 **Mr. Wilson moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to table discussions on Article IV, Section**
354 **409.12.**

355 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

356

357 Ms. Monaghan volunteered to work on possible amendments to it and bring her suggestions back to the
358 Board for review and discussion.

359

360 **I. Old Business**

361

362

363

364 **Article IV, Section 411 –**

365

366 Ms. Monaghan said that she contacted the Planner from Middleboro, MA and said that she explained
367 that with hourglass shaped lots the developer can only consider the area at each end of the hourglass.
368 The Board voiced concern over that at the last meeting.

369

370 Discussion ensued on how to get away from allowing “finger” shaped portions of upland when
371 calculating the required one acre of contiguous upland.

372

373 The Board decided to change the ordinance by adding the requirement that a building envelope of ¼
374 acre that would include all required building setbacks, as well as the one (1) acre of contiguous upland.

375

376 **Mr. Monaghan moved and Mr. Derby seconded the motion to take the proposed Amendment to**
377 **Article IV, Section 411 to the first Public Hearing on December 16, 2014 with the following changes:**
378 **There shall be one (1) contiguous acre of non-wetland soils, and a building envelope of ¼ acre for the**
379 **site of a house.**

380 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

381

382 **Article IV, Section 415 – Wireless**

383

384 Mr. Maggiore said that he has not heard back from Town Counsel regarding the updates to the Wireless
385 Telecommunication Ordinance pertaining to the new law, RSA 12-K. He asked whether the changes
386 were substantive and would require a town vote.

387

388 Mr. Sinnott said he believed that the proposed changes to the Wireless Ordinance would be required to
389 be placed on the Town Ballot. Mr. Maggiore said that he would double check.

390

391 Mr. Maggiore said that a freshman from UVM is looking for municipal work on an interim basis and the
392 Select Board is working on that.

393

394 **II. New Business**

395

396 **1. Proposed amendment to definition of “Structures”.**

397

398 Mr. Wilson wrote a proposed change to the definition of “structures” that would include septic fields,
399 and tanks, swimming pools, and tennis courts.

400

401 Mr. Kroner said that he intent of proposed amendment is to eliminate situations, such as, a house on
402 Mill Road that has a septic system 10-feet to the edge of the road. He also said that he didn’t see how a
403 variance could be denied if someone needed one for a septic.

404

405 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Derby seconded the motion to take the proposed amendment to the**
406 **definition of Structures, Section 302.39 to a first Public Hearing on December 16, 2014.**

407 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

408

409 **2. Committee Updates**

- 410
411 a. Long Range Planning (LRP) – no update
412 b. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) – no update
413 c. Rules and Regulations/Procedures – no update
414 d. Application Review Committee (ARC) – Will touch base with wend
415 e. Economic Development Committee – Mr. Kroner suggested the Planning Board and the Economic
416 Development Committee meet to discuss looking into assisted living facilities. He said that it
417 comes up on the town surveys each time the Planning Board has done them.
418 f. Select Board – Jim Maggiore said that the Town has engaged with a Provider for a cell tower on
419 Mill Road and the proposal is currently being reviewed by Town Counsel to look into issues such as
420 the fact that the access crosses over private property. He said any proposal for a cell tower will go
421 to a Town Vote.
422

423 **III. Other Business**

- 424
425 1. **Roy Mattucci, 83 Woodland Road, North Hampton, NH.** Mr. Roy Mattucci requests a change to the
426 Town Wetlands Map pursuant to Article IV, Section 409.3 regarding his property at 83 Woodland
427 Road, Map/Lot 006-136-000 and portions of Map 006, lots 133 and 137.
428

429 Mr. Mattucci said he was before the Board to request that the Board remove an incorrect designation of
430 wetlands as it pertains to his lot, pursuant to Article IV, Section 409.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. He
431 explained that he applied for a building permit and the Building Inspector reviewed the Normandeau
432 wetlands map and required that Mr. Mattucci have a wetlands scientist delineate the wetlands on his
433 property before he could issue a building permit because he may be required to seek a variance to the
434 wetlands setbacks. Mr. Mattucci attended the October 14th Conservation Commission meeting and the
435 Conservation Commission Chair, Chris Ganotis inspected his property on October 15, 2014, as required
436 under Section 409.3. Mr. Ganotis determined that the lot did not have wetlands and wrote a letter to the
437 Planning Board explaining this. The Board was in receipt of copy of Mr. Ganotis' letter. Mr. Ganotis
438 stated that he is not a wetlands scientist, but based on his 12+ years experience on the Conservation
439 Commission, he concluded that the proposed small addition to the house would have minimal, if any,
440 impacts the wetlands.
441

442 Mr. Sinnott said that there is a misunderstanding of what role the Normandeau map plays in the
443 Ordinance. He said that wetlands are defined by the conditions on the ground; not on a map. He
444 suggested to the Board that they may want to look at that section of the ordinance.
445

446 Mr. Harned visited the site and said he agreed that the house is sited high and dry. He said that there is
447 a culvert under the road and water is flowing through it.
448

449 Mr. Wilson said that the lots across the road are wet and even if the Board did change the wetlands map
450 it still would not allow the Building Inspector to give Mr. Mattucci a building permit because they don't
451 know where the wetland setbacks are. He said if the Normandeau map is eliminated it has to be
452 replaced by something.
453

454 Mr. Wilson said the immediate thing to do is for Mr. Mattucci to apply for a Conditional Use Permit
455 under Article IV, Section 409.12.

456 Mr. Mattucci said that he would go through the Conditional Use Permit process.

457

458 Mr. Wilson said that the Board can vote to accept the report of the Chair of the Conservation
459 Commission; however they cannot amend the wetland map until they find a delineation of the wetlands
460 by someone qualified to do that. He asked Ms. Chase to look for the Boulders subdivision plan; it will
461 have the delineated wetlands on the plan.

462

463 **Mr. Wilson moved and Mr. Maggiore seconded the motion that the Board accept the letter from the**
464 **Conservation Commission that lot, 006-136-000 is uplands.**

465 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

466

467 2. ¹ **Items laid on the table**

468 a. **Proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments/additions and/or Regulation**
469 **amendments/additions Discussion.**

470 i. **Recommended changes from OEP to the Floodplain Ordinances, Article V,**

471 **Section 514.** – Mr. Sinnott and Ms. Rowden read the amendments and strongly
472 recommend the Board accept the recommended changes from OEP.

473 **Mr. Wilson moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to take the proposed zoning**
474 **amendments to Article V, Section 514 to the first Public Hearing on December 16, 2014.**

475 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

476

477 b. **Minutes**

478 i. October 21, 2014 Work Session

479 ii. November 4, 2014

480

481 **Mr. Wilson moved and Ms. Monaghan seconded the motion to approve the October 21, 2014 and**
482 **November 4, 2014 meeting minutes as written.**

483 **The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (6-0).**

484

485 The Board was in receipt of a thank you letter from Jenn Rowden for her baby gifts from the Board and
486 Staff. Mr. Harned read it into the record.

487

488 The meeting adjourned at 10:45pm without objection.

489

490 Respectfully submitted,

491

492 Wendy V. Chase

493 Recording Secretary

494

495 Approved January 20, 2015