



1
2
3
4
5 **Stratham Planning Board**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **October 21, 2015**
8 **Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room**
9 10 Bunker Hill Avenue
10 Time: 7:00 PM
11

12
13 Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman
14 Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
15 David Canada, Selectmen's Representative
16 Jameson Paine, Member
17 Christopher Merrick, Alternate
18 Nancy Ober, Alternate
19
20 Members Absent: Tom House, Member
21
22 Staff Present: Lincoln Daley, Town Planner
23

24
25 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call.**

26 The Chairman took roll call and asked Ms. Ober if she would be a full voting member in place of Mr.
27 House. Ms. Ober agreed to do so.
28

29 **2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

30 a. October 7, 2015

31 Mr. Daley suggested tabling the minutes until the next meeting.

32 **2. Public Hearing(s).**

33 a. **Rollins Hill Development, LLC. P.O. Box 432, Stratham, NH for the property located at 20**
34 **Rollins Farm Drive, Stratham, NH, Tax Map 3 Lot 24, Tax Map 3 Lot 7, and Town of North**
35 **Hampton, NH Tax Map 15 Lot 24.** Subdivision Application to construct a 43-lot, over 55
36 Retirement Planned Community Development.

37 The Chairman said tonight they will talk about the looped access road, cisterns, touch on the
38 subdivision operation and management plan, homeowner association covenants and off-site
39 improvements on Stratham Heights and Rollins Farm road.

40 Mr. Stevens started by sharing some plans that showed the proposed signage. He moved to
41 improvements on Stratham Heights Road next; he said there are trees in the Town's right of way
42 that will affect the sight distance so they are proposing to make a contribution to the Town to
43 remove those trees. Mr. Paine asked if the physical alignment of their road requires the trees to
44 be cut down. Mr. Stevens said it didn't.

1 The next item to be discussed was the loop road. Mr. Daley asked how the access road would be
2 treated for 911 responses and details of mail boxes. Mr. Stevens said he would like to make it
3 simple; make it a driveway and one way road; with individual mailboxes. He feels he can do a
4 better job on the field rather than on a plan. Once it is laid out and reciprocal easements exist so
5 people can get from one point to another, they would go ahead and do the documentation for that.

6 Mr. Baskerville asked about trash pick-up. Mr. Stevens said the Town collect the trash from the
7 over 55 development in the Vineyards development so he assumes they will do the same for this
8 development also. Mr. Daley said they should check that first.

9 Mr. Daley said the Town had received a letter from Civilworks which gives the development a
10 clean bill of health with the exception of the connector driveway; porous pavement is being used
11 on a 10% slope, roadway drainage is required as part of the overall design, and due to the design,
12 there may be steep cuts required. Mr. Stevens said he would like to avoid that and could eliminate
13 the loop road if he wanted to alter the terrain of all the lots there, but he wants to avoid that too.
14 He would like it to be understood they are going to put a loop road in there and then go off and
15 do it. He doesn't want to have to come back to the Board to explain he moved the loop road
16 because he wanted to save a tree. He is happy to put in a porous pavement section too if it can
17 be worked out. Mr. Daley commented there was concern about the single driveways connecting
18 from the main roadway to the houses, being on a 10% slope as well and concern that one of the
19 driveways enters onto a curve which could present some safety issues. Mr. Stevens the whole
20 point of the loop road is so they don't have steep driveways. Mr. Houghton asked what he would
21 like the driveways to be. Mr. Stevens replied hopefully 5% – 7%, but he can't guarantee that
22 until they go and lay it out in the field. He wants as minimal impact on the ground as he can
23 have. Mr. Paine asked if there is a maximum number. Mr. Stevens said they won't go over 10%.
24 Mr. Daley asked if this had been incorporated into the covenants. Mr. Stevens said there was a
25 clause in there that gives them the ability to amend. If there is a material change, he understands
26 he has to come back before the Board. Mr. Paine asked what the minimum width of the looped
27 driveway was. Mr. Stevens said between 15' and 18'. There will be larger access for vehicles
28 such as trash vehicles and he will review it with the fire chief for fire trucks. Mr. Baskerville
29 summarized what information needed tidying up for the next meeting.

30 Mr. Stevens said it would be nice if the conditions could be listed as subsequent so they could
31 get a stamped plan.

32 Mr. Houghton asked about cisterns. Mr. Stevens said they would put in the fiber glass cisterns.
33 Mr. Daley reminded the Board that Mr. Stevens was originally looking to use the concrete design
34 as approved by the Town for behind CVS and O'Reilly Auto parts.

35 Mr. Stevens asked if there were any concerns about the operation and management plan. Mr.
36 Daley said he thinks it's been vetted pretty well including by the Conservation Committee, so
37 apart from a few minor grammatical errors, the Town is satisfied by what has been laid out.

38 Mr. Stevens asked about the Homeowners documents and covenants. Mr. Daley said there is a
39 meeting next week with Town Counsel to finalize those documents.

40 Mr. Daley reminded the Board they were going to choose specific lots that the applicant would
41 have to provide septic designs for prior to the signing of the Mylar for approval from the State.
42 Mr. Baskerville asked if they had received State Subdivision approval yet. Mr. Graham said not
43 yet. Mr. Daley asked for the status of the lot line adjustment and variance applications with North
44 Hampton. Mr. Stevens said it is still on hold. Mr. Daley commented that the resolution of that is
45 also a condition of final approval. He thanked the applicant for all the work they did to survey
46 the land and the sharing of that information with assessing so records could be updated. Mr.

1 Stevens suggested making the final conditions of approval a discussion point for the next
2 meeting.

3 Ms. Breslin, abutter referred to the survey that had been done and asked if it affected the open
4 land that abuts her land. Mr. Daley said it didn't and the changes made were to the Town's tax
5 maps. Ms. Breslin said in regard to the open land, she wanted confirmation that it would stay as
6 open land and not be put into conservation land. Mr. Daley said it would be preserved as open
7 space. Ms. Breslin asked if the part about it being put into perpetuity had been completed and
8 settled as of now. Mr. Daley said with speaking with the Town's counsel, the answer is yes. Ms.
9 Breslin asked if that would be written in the deed. Mr. Daley said it would be put into the
10 covenants and the deed. Ms. Breslin asked about the uses and non uses on the open land for
11 confirmation that only homeowners will be allowed to access it. She wanted to make sure that
12 no buildings, vehicles, drilling, dumping, or clearing would be permitted. Mr. Daley and Mr.
13 Stevens said Ms. Breslin was correct. Mr. Stevens said that basically the only use of that land
14 available to homeowners is to use it for walking. Ms. Breslin inquired about hunting. Mr.
15 Stevens said the residents could do that.

16 Ms. Breslin mentioned that at the previous meeting, there were changes discussed which the
17 Conservation Commission didn't know about. She asked if they know about the changes now.
18 Mr. Daley said they will be aware of them at the next Conservation Commission meeting which
19 is next Wednesday. He added that the changes are to improve the connections between the
20 wetland resource areas. Ms. Breslin asked if the Board was satisfied with the condo documents
21 and covenants now. Mr. Houghton said they are still being reviewed. Ms. Breslin then asked
22 about the septic designs. Mr. Baskerville said the plans he has don't have grades on them; the
23 Board had asked the applicant to submit the designs early on to give the Town time to review
24 them. Mr. Baskerville said he would like to look at the plans over the weekend and then speak
25 to Mr. Daley to let them know which lots he has chosen for septic designs.

26 Mr. Paine made a motion to continue the Rollins Hill Development proposal to the November 4,
27 2015 meeting. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

28 b. **Verizon Wireless, represented by McLane Law Firm, 900 Elm Street, Manchester, NH**
29 **03101 for the property located at 28 Bunker Hill Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 51.** Conditional
30 Use Permit application, Site Plan Review Application, and Special Exception Permit application
31 pursuant to Sections 19.4.2 and 19.7 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to construct a 90' tall
32 monopole wireless service facility, associated antennas and cabling, and installation of ground
33 based telecommunications equipment and fencing.

34 Mr. Tom Hildreth, attorney for the applicant gave a brief presentation showing a few changes
35 that had been made since the last meeting. He gave copies of the revised plans to the Board
36 which included the Town-owned access point which runs parallel to Mr. and Mrs. Foss's
37 driveway. He said they had met with D.O.T. at a site meeting last week and they have requested
38 detailed drawings of the driveway including drainage. The signs from D.O.T. have been
39 encouraging. Mr. Paine asked if they had any idea what the slope of the access would be. Mr.
40 Fredette said it would match the existing driveway. Mr. Daley said that the Board will require a
41 detailed design of this also because drainage could be an issue. Mr. Baskerville said he would
42 like to see grading and topography as well. Mr. Hildreth said another change is that Verizon will
43 use the utilities that are existing on site now. The fencing around the equipment shelter has now
44 been changed to stockade fencing to reflect the request of the Zoning Board and plantings have
45 been added too. The final page of the plans details the schedule for the construction of the tower
46 and the accessory equipment. Generally speaking the project takes about 5 weeks.

47 The next discussion item was the waiver request to have a mono-pine. The Town's ordinance
48 states a minimum of 10 acres is required for such a design which the applicant does not have.

1 Mr. Canada asked how the 10 acres regulation came about. Mr. Daley said it is really meant to
2 prevent a mono-pine being located in the middle of a field; it is meant to blend in. and provides
3 additional area to hide a mono-pine. Mr. Hildreth added that although the Town doesn't own 10
4 acres of the site, it is surrounded by open space owned by the homeowners association. Mr.
5 Merrick said he's OK with the mono-pine, but it has the top cut off which he doesn't like. Mr.
6 Hildreth said the top is cut off for illustration purposes only and to show it is designed to be
7 extendable; there will be a triangular cap on top of it. Mr. Paine asked if another carrier wants
8 to co-locate on a mono-pine can it be done internally. Mr. Fredette said not with this type of
9 tower design; they would be expected to put branches out as well. Mr. Hildreth said ultimately
10 the Board could decide at the time if it wanted a flush mounted antenna or a branch.

11 Mr. Daley asked Mr. Hildreth to address the National Environmental Protection Act (N.E.P.A.).
12 Mr. Hildreth said there are a variety of criteria that need to be screened as part of this such as
13 endangered species, fauna, flora, historical resources and a couple of others. The most significant
14 one is historical resources which requires a submission to the State Historic Preservation Office
15 in Concord. The applicant hasn't completed that yet; they are waiting until they know the
16 outcome of their application. Mr. Canada added that the Heritage Commission has discussed this
17 too and it determined there are no impacts on historical resources.

18 The access was discussed. Mr. Canada said he thought it was the D.O.T. who determined if
19 something was an intensification of use and thought it would be prudent to consult them to see if
20 it would be possible to use the Foss's driveway instead. Mr. Hildreth said the Foss's right to veto
21 the use of the driveway is a separate thing and if the D.O.T. said it wasn't an intensification of
22 use, it would have no impact on the right of the Foss's to veto this use. Mr. Houghton said he'd
23 be inclined to put the resolution of ingress and egress as a condition of approval.

24 Mr. Houghton suggested going through Mr. Daley's staff review to see what still needed to be
25 addressed. Mr. Daley asked if D.O.T. had commented about the number of trips that would be
26 made on this site as part of the permit application. Mr. Hildreth said they told them the same
27 information they have given to the Planning and Zoning Boards that there will only be 1 or 2
28 trips per carrier per month post construction and they haven't had any concerns.

29 The Board discussed the waiver request requiring a minimum lot size of 10 acres for a mono-
30 pine structure. Mr. Daley suggested the Board look at Section 19.8.1. which lays out the criteria
31 for the waivers for the Board to consider. Mr. Baskerville said he doesn't see any logic behind
32 one pole needing 10 acres, but another not needing it for this site. Mr. Merrick said he has no
33 issue because of the setting. Mr. Baskerville said he preferred the mono-pine; Mr. Paine agreed.
34 No board members found that granting this waiver would not be detrimental to the public safety,
35 health, or welfare or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest; Mr. Paine
36 added he thought the design criteria shows consideration has been taken of the surrounding area.

37 As the Zoning Board voted in favor of granting a special exception for this use, the Board agreed
38 that the waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance,
39 Stratham Master Plan, or Official Maps;

40 The Board felt that granting this waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and
41 requirements of these regulations. Mr. Baskerville said especially as they agreed to the stockade
42 fence. Mr. Daley said the Board might want to consider the siting of facilities also.

43 The Board discussed whether a particular and identifiable hardship exists or a specific
44 circumstance warrants the granting of a waiver. They agreed the topography and the vegetation
45 lends itself toward a mono-pine which is what the Board would prefer.

46 Mr. Houghton asked the public for their input before the motion was made.

1 Mr. Fred Hutton, abutter said he has no problem with the tower; the problem for him relates to
2 the driveway. If another driveway is put in alongside the Foss driveway, his driveway goes across
3 the driveway that Verizon want to put in. He would like to know the details such as grading and
4 drainage because he knows from experience that the water comes off the hill during heavy rains,
5 goes across his driveway right now and it is at least an inch and a half flow. He redid his driveway
6 last year so he would like to know what they are going to do if his driveway gets damaged.

7 Mr. Houghton said they would return to that issue. He wondered if there was any public comment
8 specific to the waiver request.

9 A resident asked if the mono-pine will be strong enough to support the branches.

10 Mr. Fredette, said the site will be designed to the relevant safety standards. Soil borings will be
11 analyzed and results sent to the actual tower manufacturer's engineer who design the tower for
12 the specific site. It will be designed for that location and nowhere else. The branches have to
13 meet standards too. Mr. Paine asked if the operations and management plan included restoration
14 of the branches. Mr. Fredette said as part of the 1 or 2 visits per month, the site is reviewed. Mr.
15 Paine said he wanted to address the concern of the resident; Mr. Fredette confirmed that if
16 anything should fall off the tower, they would take care of it. Mr. Merrick asked what the
17 branches were made of. Mr. Fredette replied they are made of fiber glass.

18 Ms. Ormeci Matoglu, abutter said as far as she understands it the mono-pine will be about 95'
19 tall, but the application is for 90'. She pointed out that some of the trees have lost their leaves
20 now too which could impact the vision. Mr. Fredette said their antennas need to maintain a
21 certain center line and they are as low as they can go. The cap will be about 3' or 4' tall on top
22 of that pole. Mr. Houghton asked how high the balloon test was. Mr. Fredette said 90' although
23 the simulation does show the capping above. The bottom of the balloon is at 90', the top of the
24 balloon was 97'. Mr. Canada said the depiction was taller than the mono-pine will be. Mr.
25 Fredette showed the simulation photos for everybody to see with the mono-pine and the balloon
26 and observed neither were visible from the nearby homes.

27 Mr. Matoglu asked the Board why they don't put a condition on the approval that the tower must
28 never exceed 90'. Mr. Houghton said that would not be Verizon, but another carrier that would
29 come before the Board. It would be up to the Board at that stage to decide whether or not another
30 carrier would be approved. Mr. Canada said a zoning amendment at a Town meeting would be
31 required as well. Mr. Matoglu said it should be considered and that the community needs
32 protection. Mr. Daley reminded Mr. Matoglu of the Federal Telecommunications Act from 1996.
33 Mr. Deschaine said it could be done, but it would be a hollow victory because a future Board
34 couldn't be handcuffed. He added also that the lease agreement is between the carrier and the
35 Board of Selectmen. Another carrier would have to come before the Planning Board for site plan
36 approval and potentially a Town Meeting vote to approve a modified lease agreement.

37 Mr. Brian Ward, resident confirmed that if another carrier wants to co-locate on this tower and
38 be higher than 90', then the whole approval process starts over. Mr. Houghton said that was the
39 case.

40 The discussion returned to the waiver from the 10 acres requirement for the mono-pine.

41 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve the waiver to Section 19.4.2. Note 4.3 to allow a mono-
42 pine to be installed on a lot less than 10 acres and to allow a decorative cone on top of the 90'
43 tower. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

44 Mr. Houghton addressed Mr. Hutton's earlier comments about his driveway. Mr. Hutton
45 confirmed he would like to see a grading plan and asked about the walking trail that would be

1 part of that access driveway. Verizon said people could walk the trails using the access driveway
2 to the tower site. Mr. Daley said they would need to work something out with the association.

3 Mr. Hutton observed that Verizon will need to lower his driveway by 4” to do what they want to
4 do. Mr. Fredette said the surveyor will be going out in a couple of weeks to look at the location
5 and they will do a grading plan once they have that information. Mr. Daley advised the Board
6 that there should be a condition of approval referring to Mr. Hutton’s driveway to make sure it is
7 protected. Mr. Hutton said what he knows about drainage in the area, he thinks Verizon would
8 be better coming from Bunker Hill back 200’ or 300’ with asphalt and then go to dirt.

9 A resident asked who would be plowing the driveway when it snows. Verizon said maintenance
10 guys do not visit during winter; the site is managed remotely. If there is an emergency, the tech
11 can go up there with snow shoes.

12 Ms. Ormecci Matoglu asked who was liable if the tower should fall down. Mr. Daley said the
13 Town would be.

14 After some discussion, Mr. Paine made a motion to continue the application until November 18,
15 2015 to allow enough time for the applicant to provide a driveway plan and to meet with Mr.
16 Hutton and work with staff. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

17

18 c. **Cabernet Builders, P.O. Box 291, Stratham, NH 03885 for the property located at 109 High**
19 **Street, Tax Map 19 Lot 44.** Subdivision Application to construct a 9-Lot conventional
20 subdivision.

21 Mr. Houghton asked the applicant to take the floor.

22 Mr. Scott Cole, engineer for the project updated the Board on what had happened since the last
23 meeting. He said there was a site walk on October 15, 2015 and they have one waiver waiting to
24 be approved; the Board decided they wanted to review the grades on site before making a decision
25 on that.

26 Mr. Daley said it was worth noting that the applicant is putting in a 20’ no cut zone which abuts
27 the property of Mr. Jeffrey Wilson, abutter. He continued that the applicant has worked out a
28 situation with Mr. Wilson by planting trees on the abutting property to address the concern of
29 head lights. The Conservation Commission did comment at their meeting that there are several
30 wetland resource areas located on the property; they recommended some physical demarcation
31 to inform future property owners not to throw anything into those areas or disturb it in any way.
32 Mr. Gove said the applicant was amenable to doing that.

33 Mr. Baskerville asked if the applicant had State Subdivision approval and an Alteration of Terrain
34 permit. Mr. Cole said they did have the State Subdivision approval, but an A.O.T. permit wasn’t
35 required for this project; they are a few hundred feet below the required threshold but are still
36 required to design the drainage. Mr. Cole said he had spoken with Mr. Connelly from Civilworks
37 as well. Mr. Baskerville asked if there was a copy of an email from Mr. Connelly stating that
38 there is no requirement. Mr. Cole said they didn’t have such an email. Mr. Daley said he would
39 contact Mr. Connelly so that the Town has something on file.

40 Mr. Daley said that during the site walk they discussed the entrance into the subdivision and Mr.
41 Mason’s, Cabernet Builders, re-use of rocks from the existing stone walls to build that. He
42 wanted to state for the record that the Town is very appreciative that he is doing that. Mr. Daley
43 said they observed the site distance along Willowbrook Avenue which was deemed to be
44 sufficient heading north and south.

1 Mr. Daley asked Mr. Cole to explain about the drainage and detention pond. Mr. Cole said the
2 majority of the drainage system comes down the road by swales to a pool. He showed a proposed
3 wet pond on the plan to be used as a primary device for treatment and then to meet A.O.T., they
4 have a secondary device which is a natural 75' filter strip and an area that is supposed to be left
5 unmaintained. Mr. Daley said that eventually the Town will be responsible for the road and he
6 confirmed that included maintaining the drainage. He asked how the Town would access that
7 drainage pond. Mr. Cole said there is a 20' easement along the property lines of Lots 95 and 96.
8 Mr. Paine asked how deep the swale was behind the residence. Mr. Cole said about 3' and it is
9 intended as vegetation not open water.

10 Mr. Baskerville asked how the easement was going to be paved. Mr. Mason replied they were
11 planning to use gravel and then put 4" or 5" of top soil on top of it. He said at the most they
12 might need to use a little bob cat vehicle down there.

13 Mr. Jeff Wilson, abutter said his understanding was that the applicant had received the State
14 Subdivision approval, and that they need subdivision approval from the Board. He is being told
15 the house on the abutting lot will be about 260' from his house, but he would like to know how
16 he knows that that is where the house is going to be. There is nothing on the plan showing where
17 the houses are going to be located on the individual lots, and a buyer could ask for their house to
18 be built wherever they want on the lot. Mr. Mason said that was true, but he couldn't imagine
19 the person buying that particular lot would want the house to be squeezed into the narrowest part
20 of the lot. Mr. Wilson said he didn't like the idea of being surrounded by road on 3 sides and
21 asked Mr. Mason if he would consider widening the 20' no cut zone. Mr. Mason replied that
22 was tough to commit to and if 2 trees needed to be cut down to put in the leach field, he didn't
23 want to be getting phone calls about it. Mr. Wilson said could they look at extending out where
24 the triangular area is above the septic location. Mr. Mason said he was willing to do 30' with the
25 public comment that if there's a tree that needs need to be cut in that area, for practical reasons,
26 he doesn't want to be answering to someone.

27 Mr. Baskerville referred to the outlet structure for the wet pond on the plans and asked for
28 clarification as there appeared to be a discrepancy in the elevation information. Mr. Cole said he
29 would verify the information.

30 Mr. Wilson asked about Mr. and Mrs. Davis, abutters. Mr. Mason said Mr. David Short has been
31 authorized to work with them; they have a choice of 2 plans and Mr. Mason doesn't mind which
32 one they choose. Mr. Mason addressed Mr. Wilson and said time is money and they take great
33 pride in getting all the documentation together quickly. This application has appeared to move
34 quickly, because everybody did their job.

35 Mr. Mike Donahue, attorney for Cabernet Builders said they had already submitted the proposed
36 road deed that anticipates the need for the maintenance of the drainage facility by the Town.
37 They added language after comments made at the site walk which he has with him to be passed
38 to Town Counsel for review. The deed includes the buffer also which he is happy to hand out
39 and he represented that they will promptly revise it tomorrow with the width agreed tonight. The
40 other legal documentation that is needed for the subdivision is an agreement with the easement
41 holder in the situation that there is a pre-existing utility easement that the road runs under. That
42 has been negotiated with Eversource who have already looked at the easement language and
43 agreed to it. Mr. Donahue said he was happy to share that too.

44 Mr. Wilson said there is a little bit of a concern about people entering the subdivision from the
45 right in winter time, as headlights will go into their family room and master bedroom. Once the
46 road is laid out and they find that the headlights are disturbing, he wanted to know if there was
47 any possibility to put an evergreen or two in there. Mr. Mason said he will buy one if Mr. Wilson
48 buys one. Mr. Wilson agreed.

1 Mr. Baskerville said it would be good if somewhere in the approval there was evidence
2 concerning the mitigation agreements with Mr. and Mrs. Davis. Mr. Mason said Mr. Short would
3 be providing a sketch. Mr. Donahue suggested putting a note on the plan.

4 Mr. Baskerville made a motion that the Board approves the applicant's waiver request to allow a
5 6% maximum road grade as shown on the plan in the cul-de-sac where the normal maximum
6 road grade is 2%. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

7 The Board discussed conditions that need to be attached to the approval.

8 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine.
9 Motion carried unanimously.

10 Mr. Baskerville made a motion that the Planning Board approve this subdivision submitted by
11 Cabernet Builders for the property located at 109 High Street, Tax Map 19 Lot 44, conventional
12 9-Lot subdivision with the following conditions:

13 Bonding will be coordinated with staff and the DPW department

14 Front bounds will be set and bounded later and coordinated with staff and the DPW department.

15 The no-cut buffer along Lot 19-44 will be widened from a 20' no cut buffer to a 30' no cut buffer
16 with the statement made by the applicant that trees cut as questioned by the forester.

17 The applicant will set wetland markers as requested by the Conservation Commission per their
18 standards.

19 The joint use agreement between Eversource and the applicant will be submitted to the Town and
20 reviewed by staff and Town Counsel and changed as necessary.

21 That some type of letter or agreement will be submitted stating that the owners of Lot 19-34,
22 Jeffrey R. and K. A. Davis have agreed to the mitigation of landscaping as proposed for the
23 entrance road.

24 The drainage outlet elevations will be clarified.

25 The resolution of the utility and access easement associated with the drainage structure in the rear
26 of the property will be reviewed and resolved.

27 Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

28 **3. Miscellaneous.**

29 c. Other.

30 Mr. Daley informed the Board that he was resigning from his position of Town Planner to take
31 up another position in the Town of Milford. He said it has been a pleasure working with the
32 Board. The Board congratulated Mr. Daley.

33 **4. Adjournment.**

34 Mr. Paine made a motion to adjourn at 9:56 pm. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried
35 unanimously.

36