



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

PO Box 120, Windham, New Hampshire 03087  
(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362  
[www.WindhamNewHampshire.com](http://www.WindhamNewHampshire.com)

**Planning Board Minutes  
October 2, 2013**

**Board Members:**

Kristi St. Laurent, Chairman – Present	Ross McLeod, Selectman – Excused
Margaret Crisler, Vice Chair – Present	Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate, Excused
Pam Skinner, Member – Excused	Vanessa Nysten, Member – Present
Jonathan Sycamore, Member – Arrived at 8:12	Alan Carpenter, Alternate Member – Excused
Sy Wrenn, Member – Present	Jim Fricchione, Alternate Member – Present

**Staff:**

Laura Scott, Community Development Director  
Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant

**Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair St. Laurent called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, member attendance and gave a brief synopsis of the agenda.

The Chair appointed Mr. Fricchione to sit for the vacant seat.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned to re-order the agenda to allow the Fence Permit Application to be heard before the Public Hearings. Seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed: 5-0.**

**Alternate Planning Board Member(s) Interview and Appointments:**

Two candidates had expressed interest in the Alternate Planning Board positions, Mr. Steven Bookless and Mr. Paul Gosselin. Both were invited to speak on their own behalf and fielded questions for Board Members.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned to enter non-public session under RSA 91A-C-3 - Reputations. Mr. Wrenn seconded and the Chair called out the members: Ms. Nysten, yes; Mr. Wrenn, yes; Mr. Fricchione, yes; Vice-Chair Crisler, yes; and the Chair, yes. Motion passed 5-0.**

The Board entered non-public session at 7:18pm and re-opened the public meeting at 7:30pm.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned to appoint Mr. Bookless as an Alternate Planning Board member for a 3-year term and Mr. Gosselin to an Alternate position for a 1-year term. Mr. Wrenn seconded. The motion passed: 5-0.**

**Fence Permit Application – Batting Cages at Griffin Park**

Mr. Jay Yennaco speaking on behalf of the applicant, The Windham Baseball Association, walked the Board through handouts of the design and placement of a batting cage proposed for Griffin Park. He has received approval from the Board of Selectmen and Recreation. The chain link fencing is to be 28ft W X 70ft L X 12ft H. It will run 6ft off the multi-purpose building at Griffin Park. Its location was planned so as to be equidistant from the 3 baseball fields, allow sufficient space for maintenance equipment, and to be close to two building doors that access baseball storage space. He explained he has received a Fence Permit, and in accordance with Section 710.3.4 of the Town Zoning Ordinances and Land Use Regulations, the fence

requires Planning Board approval. This is required for any fence over 6ft in height. He is looking to complete construction this fall for use in the spring.

**Questions/Comments from the Board:**

- The Board inquired about the cage's nearness to the septic system. Ms. Scott stated the septic system is in another location on the field.
- There were several questions about the 6ft swing radius of the gate and the nearness of its location to the maintenance building kitchen doors and emergency access availability. Mr. Yennaco agreed to consider moving the gate to another side of the cage and possibly moving the cage farther from the building, gates swinging in. Ms Scott stated that moving the fence would mean re-seeking Recreation and Board of Selectman approval.
- The fence will have no lighting. There are safety lights on the multi-purpose building. The hours of operation will be weekends during baseball season and some weekday evenings and hours are posted on their web site. There have been no problems with the other cage in Town.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to approve the application as presented with a request that the applicant moves the fence between 6ft and 10ft from the multi-purpose building. Motion passed: 5-0.**

**Public Hearings:**

**Minor Site Plan Application (2-A-600) Case # 2013-28**

A Minor Site Plan/Change of Use Application has been submitted for 117 North Lowell Road (2-A-600) in the Rural District. The applicant, Susan and Andrew Dickinson, are proposing operate a retail vintage furniture store where a retail chocolate business had been previously approved. No site changes are being proposed except for the addition of a 3 sqft freestanding sign. Per Section 303.5 of the Site Plan Regulations, if the application does not qualify as a Minor Site Plan then it will be deemed a Major Site Plan and the application will be heard as a Preliminary Major Site Plan Application.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Case # 2013-28 into the record.

Ms. Scott stated that the application is complete.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to accept Case #2013-28 as a minor site plan application. Motion passed: 5-0.**

Ms. Scott explained that this is a retail to retail site and the Planning Board needs to approve the hours of operation. The site was previously approved as a seasonal and by appointment only site and the present applicant will be running a full retail business. Additionally, the DOT driveway permit needs to be updated with the State. Also, Fire and Building inspections will be needed for a Certificate of Occupancy prior to the business opening. (See 9/17/13 memo from Ms. Scott)

The applicant, Mr. Dickinson, spoke and said he may be adding 1 additional part-time employee. He explained that he had made \$14,000 in improvements since April for improved access, repaving, and reroofing. He is currently asking for a 3sqft sign.

**Questions/Comments from the Board:**

- Ms. Crisler asked for clarification on the location of the parking; The applicant said there was about 100ft of driveway from the street that takes a sharp right turn towards the house

- How much traffic does the applicant expect? The applicant expects little impact. It would be just two people producing their product and it would also depend on advertising. He thinks there would possibly be 3-4 customers at a time. No traffic study is needed.
- Mr. Wrenn asked about lighting and hours of operation. They will be open until 6pm. The applicant says the retail area at the front of the house has lighting, there is double lighting over the barn and he will add an additional light at the Barn. He will make sure there is enough light for customer safety.
- The Chair inquired about parking spaces. The applicant said he is not planning on adding additional spaces. It currently supports 10 parking spaces.
- Ms. Nysten asked about chemical usage. The applicant said there would sanding and painting without the use of chemicals.

The Chair opened the Hearing the Public.

John Blanchard of 115 North Lowell Road, whose driveway abuts the Applicant's yard, has been a neighbor for 13 years. He stated that the applicant is a pretty decent neighbor and does not think the business will hurt him or his family.

The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

- Ms. Crisler confirmed that there would be only 1 part-time employee at this time.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to approve the minor site plan application Case #2013-28 with the following conditions:**

- **That the applicant apply for and receive a new driveway permit from the DOT;**
- **That the applicant receive a Fire and Building inspection for Certificate of Occupancy before the business opening; and**
- **That no more than one (1) full-time employee be hired.**

**Motion passed: 5-0**

**Final Major Site Plan and Major Watershed Application (18-L-450) Case #2013-22**

A Final Major Site Plan Application and Major Watershed Application for 43 Range Road (18-L-450) in the Professional, Business and Technology District and the Cobbetts Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Protection District. The proposal has been submitted by Edward N. Herbert Associates, Inc on behalf of Cafua Realty Trust LIV, LLC, to demolish the three existing buildings on the site and construct a 7,308 sqft building, which will be comprised of a Dunkin Donuts Restaurant (2,928 sqft) and 2 office/retail spaces (2,190 sqft each), as well as associated parking, landscaping, signage and lighting. This application is subject to the provisions of Section 719.6 of the Historic Building/Structure Demolition/Substantial Modification Delay Ordinance. Waiver requests have been submitted for Section 604.1, Section 502.3 and 504.2.1 of the Site Plan Regulations.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Application Case #2013-22 into the record.

Ms. Scott said the application is complete, but noted that two additional waivers were requested after the Public Hearing Notice went into the paper. They are waivers from Parking Requirements Sections 703.1.2 and 703.1.4 dated 9/24/13 and included in the Board's packets. Ms. Scott stated that these waiver requests are supported by Mr. Keach in his review, and the Design Review Committee did not receive the waiver requests but they saw the design and liked it.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to accept Case #2013-22 for Public Hearing. Motion passed: 5-0.**

Ms. Scott explained the history of the project reviews. The Planning Board voted 6-0 to end the preliminary review on 9/4/2013, to the Heritage Commission (two times), Conservation Commission, the Fire Department; at TRC (2 meetings), Design Review Committee (3 meetings), the Assessor, the Highway agent, the Highway Safety Committee, Keach-Nordstrom (KNA), and her own review. DOT has received copies of the Plans, and the Traffic Study and Mr. Keach's review. DOT has yet to responded.

Ms. Scott said that the goose-neck lights on the wall signs have to be added back into the plans. KNA's outstanding comments are included in the Board's packet, and 5 of 7 concerns on page two of Ms. Scott's 9/27/13 memo to the Board have yet to be addressed. The Board must also make a decision to accept either Wall Art or Faux Windows for the side of the building.

Member John Sycamore was seated at 8:12pm.

Comments/Questions from the Board:

- Mr. Wrenn asked for clarification of the 2 waivers that did not make the paper. Ms. Scott explained these 2 parking issues.
- Mr. Fricchione asked about retail Sales and office space allowed in this zoning area. Ms. Scott, reading from Note 22 on page one of the Plans which references our Zoning Ordinance Section 614.2.10, read: "Retail sales of merchandise which is manufactured or assembled on site provided that the sales area is limited to be no more than 33% of the building's total area."
- Ms. Nysten caught an omission of the word "Board" in Item #25 on page 1 of the Plan Set which will be corrected.
- In Mr. Zohdi's waiver request of 7/26/2013, Ms. Scott and Ms. Crisler clarified that only items 2 and 3 need to be addressed.

Having not other questions, the meeting was turned over to the applicant.

- Mr. Peter Zohdi, the applicant, agrees with all the reports the Board has in their packet and will edit the Plan set to add the word "Board" to item #25. Mr. Zohdi stated that Mr. Keach doesn't see any problems with traffic. Mr. Zohdi will work with NH DOT.
- Delahunty Rd is now a Town Road and because it touches Route 111, a State road, a plan set has been forwarded to DOT.
- He clarified a Goose Neck lighting question. Page 7 of 15 on the Plan Set explains that "F-lighting" means there are 3 lights per sign. Each "F:" means 3 lights. The picture is on the next page.
- Jim Smith, architect, displayed a color architect rendering on the television screen and explained that the rendering of the tenant entrances had been corrected to reflect that they are not bumped out as much as the Dunkin entrance.
- There was discussion of the size and shape of the stone façade. The owner, Mr. Cafua, replied that the stone blocks on the building towers are 12in X 18in. and are similar to a limestone. The rest of the building is a fieldstone designed to look like Searles Castle. They are not manufactured stone. They are Natural Stone. The towers have a larger, smoother stone that is shown on the rendition. There was some preference for rectangular stone on the main body of the building as shown on the color rendering versus a rounder fieldstone shown on the black and white drawings. The stone samples were not provided to the Board. The owner described a rectangular stone that he could use for the main body.
- Ms. Scott made a note to have the architectural rendering be accurate and call out the Natural Stone.

- The Board began a lengthy and thorough discussion about the wall and standing signage - in particular the background color(s). Attorney Cronin, speaking for Mr. Cafua, stated that the owner would prefer a white background. The Board agreed that the background of the wall sign and freestanding sign should be consistent so as to maintain integrity, give a unified look, and not destroy the corporate identity. Attorney Cronin stated that there is a fine line between regulation and First Amendment rights. The Board has broad authority over many aspects of the sign, but when the Board wants to regulate content and color they may want to consider Mr. Cafua's choice of white.
- Mr. Sycamore talked about compatibility of abutting properties, parking, pedestrian access and outdoor seating. Attorney Cronin talked about over-regulating and respecting the intelligence of the business owner. Chair St. Laurent explained that Mr. Sycamore's suggestions were just suggestions, not meant to be conditions of approval. The Board discussed sidewalks, the lighting of them, and location of the bike rack.
- The Board brought up discussion about the porous pavement and its maintenance. Ms. Crisler would like a note on the plans regarding maintenance of the porous pavement. Ms. Scott noted #5 of Mr. Keach's memo which requested that language be agreed upon which satisfies Mr. Keach's and Ms. Scott's concerns regarding the pavement maintenance.
- Ms. Crisler asked that the specifications for the use and maintenance of porous pavement be noted on the plan. Mr. Zohdi directed the Board to Item #23 on page 1 of the plan. Ms. Crisler asked for specifications for owner maintenance of the porous pavement, which includes the owner to vacuum and clean the site yearly, be noted on the plan itself. Mr. Zohdi agreed.
- Chair St. Laurent asked if there was to be any refrigeration or rooftop units. Mr. Zohdi said there are no outside refrigeration units proposed.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about retaining some of the bushes and trees. Mr. Zohdi said that any trees or bushes that are not within the parking area are to be left alone.
- Chair St. Laurent had several drainage questions. Mr. Zohdi explained that drainage studies had been submitted and collector pipes were appropriately assigned. Chair St. Laurent asked about slope difference between the front and rear of the building and the foundation exposure (2.5ft). Mr. Zohdi drew Chair St. Laurent's attention to the grading plan.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about the bump outs in the front of the building. Mr. Zohdi stated again that Dunkin Donuts had a larger bump out, 6ft X 15ft. Chair St. Laurent clarified that some detail on the plan was landscaping area, not bump out area. The bump outs of the other businesses are 1ft.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about truck deliveries. Keach's traffic report stated that the space allows for a B50 (School bus size) vehicle to easily maneuver. Ms. Scott stated that the last page of Keach's 9/13/13 memo says that it wasn't designed for a tractor trailer but could accommodate it.
- Ms. Nysten inquired about the depicted outdoor patio area. It is on the design. Mr. Cafua will decide at a later date.
- Ms. Nysten asked about the color of the front window/door frames. The color is Bronze.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about the front sidewalk ramps. Mr. Zohdi said that on Page 11 of the plans the detail of the ramps indicates ADA required slopeage.
- Chair St. Laurent noticed that the rendering does not show details that are on the other rendering. Mr. Zohdi explained that there are two architects doing the renderings, and he cannot answer why that detail was missed.
- Ms. Nysten remembered there had been a past question about striping on Delahunty Drive. Mr. Zohdi said there would be one lane coming in (from Rt. 111) and 2 lanes going out (to Rt.111). Ms. Nysten asked about a sign as you enter the parking lot that regulates a left turn because left turns are not allowed. Mr. Zohdi asked the Board to turn to Page 5 of 50 and he explained the parking lot signage.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about the width of the driving area along the right side of the building. Mr. Zohdi explained it is 24ft, the Town's requirement.

- Mr. Wrenn asked about the mulch berms depicted around the building. Mr. Zohdi said they are a temporary construction detail to prevent impacting erosion control. Mulch berm is a bit less expensive than silt fencing.
- Mr. Wrenn asked about the 4ft drop to the abutting property. Mr. Zohdi agreed, and said it is a 2 to 1 slope and did not present a problem to Keach-Nordstrom.
- Chair St. Laurent asked if the 4ft to 6.5ft drop between properties would cause drainage problems. Mr. Zohdi said that seasonal high water table rules apply and explained some of the engineering regulations. There will be no retaining wall; they will be grade a 2 to 1 slope.
- Mr. Wrenn brought the discussion back to the Wall Art vs Faux Window. The Board would like to see a rendition before making a decision.
- Mr. Cafua has no preference on wall art vs. faux window.

**Chair St. Laurent opened the hearing to the Public.**

Ms. Betty Dunn’s major concern was about the Public Noticed term “Office/Retail.” She asked the Board to consider the Allowed Usage; that the underlying assumption is “retail” when retail is not allowed in this zone. She is bothered that the hearing was again noticed as “Office/Retail.” Ms. Scott said it was noticed as such, because that was what the applicant had submitted on his application and it is not Ms. Scott’s purview to change that. Ms. Dunn said the Traffic Study made reference to retail, which is not an allowed use. Ms. Dunn said that access onto Route 111 is a major issue to all Route 111 travelers as well as Dunkin Donuts’ customers. She is aware that DOT has not responded to the Traffic Study. Ms. Dunn asks the Planning Board not take action on this project until DOT responds. She also suggested having an outside traffic study done and asked if there are off site improvements needed. She questioned the maneuverability of a B-50 vehicle. The consultant said a B-50 is a tractor trailer truck. Ms. Scott said that the Site Plan and Traffic Study were forwarded to DOT and KNA on 9/19 and they were aware of tonight’s meeting. Ms. Nysten thinks there is going to be a traffic light installed at this intersection eventually. Ms. Scott said there is no DOT light planned at this sight, although the conduit for it is present. The Town cannot require a light on a State road. Ms. Nysten stated that she finds it very difficult at times to exit Delahunty Dr. and thinks a traffic light may be necessary for the project.

Mr. Ficchione explained the Ordinance for retail at this site and said the Ms. Dunn’s point had been recognized.

Mr. Cafua explained the loss due to the Rt. 93 project, the effort and the expense he has expended on this site. He takes great pride in the care of all his properties.

**Chair St. Laurent closed the Public Hearing.**

Steven Pernaw, traffic engineer and President of Pernaw and Company, whose company prepared the Traffic Assessment Report dated 7/20/12 for a previous project that was slightly larger in size on this site, walked the Board through the Traffic Assessment and answered Board questions.

Mr. Pernaw stated that morning peak hour traffic is 1852 cars/hr and evening peak hour traffic is 2,300 cars/hr. He made two recommendations: 1. Widen Delahunty Drive to have two full lanes out. 2. Regarding site distance, median plantings need to be kept trim.

Mr. Sycamore asked if a traffic light is needed at the Delahunty’s Dr./Rt. 111 intersection. Mr. Pernaw replied no. Mr. Pernaw stated that in order to justify a traffic light, there needs to be over 100 cars per hour for 8 hours to meet the warrant. For this development, he cited 80 cars to exit at peak hour in the morning

and 53 cars to exit at peak hour in the evening not meeting the 100 cars per hour needed for 8 hours to warrant a light. He also stated that the number of cars decline in the non-peak hours.

The Board asked if Mr. Pernaw's projections consider the Rt. 93 project. He said that he uses a 10 year design life. The Board asked about any other traffic control options there are for the difficult left hand turn. Mr. Pernaw stated no, until you meet the threshold for a signal, the best that can be done is the two approach lanes discussed. Also, there is another coffee shop in area which will reduce some traffic at this intersection.

Chair St. Laurent clarified the Ordinance for the Allowed Uses in this zone and provided examples of the various businesses that may be interested in such a site. She stated that parking should be adequate for the allowed uses. Ms. Nysten suggested the possibility of a restaurant. Ms. Scott said the septic was not sized for a restaurant and doubted whether Mr. Cafua would entertain a competing business.

The Board returned to the Wall Art vs Faux Window discussion. Mr. Cafua stated that the Dunkin Donuts side wall is lined with equipment on the inside and thinks the mural would be a better choice. Ms. Scott said that the Design Review Committee had recommended the Faux Windows.

Ms. Scott presented a wrap up of the various issues that had been decided and needed yet to be decided.

Ms. Crisler asked Mr. Zohdi to explain justification for the two Parking Requirement waivers. Mr. Zohdi explained that he is bringing the paved surface within 10ft of the property line to create a wide enough access on all sides of the building for emergency vehicles as thoroughly discussed previously with the Fire Department. Subsection 703.1.4 addresses a 20 parking space requirement. He does not have in one place 20 parking spaces; they are not all connected.

Mr Wrenn noted an inconsistency between the Plan and #3 of page 2 of Keach-Nordstrom's 9/13/13 memo. Ms. Scott stated that the Plan is correct.

Mr. Zohdi added that the Septic System approval had been received as of yesterday.

Chair St. Laurent polled the Board on the choice for the Wall Art or the Faux Windows. Chair St. Laurent, Ms. Crisler, Mr. Wrenn and Ms. Nysten opted for the Faux Windows; Mr. Fricchione preferred Wall Art; and Mr. Sycamore would like to see Wall Art on one side and Faux Windows on the other. A majority of the Board opted for Faux Windows.

Ms. Scott said that in the Design Review meeting, Wall Art would be considered signage, needing approval, and what would be the impact if other businesses want the same type of signage.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded:**

- **to grant the waiver request from Section 604.1 of the Windham Site Plan Regulations. Waiver to not show soil type certified by soil scientists because there are no Wetlands on the site and the entire lot is 29B-Woodbridge soil and also**
- **to grant a waiver from Section 502.3 and 504.2.1 of the Design Regulations to allow for more than 20 parking places in front of the building and between the building and the main public road due to the size of the lot which is bordered on 2 side by roadway and the location of the proposed leach field and bio-retention areas leaving limited space for parking; and**
- **to grant a waiver from Section 703 of the Parking Requirements, subsection 703.1.2 that all parking spaces and aisles and other paved surfaces shall be situated no closer than 15ft to a side property line, but rather be 10ft because the Fire Department would like a 24ft to accommodate Fire Truck access on all sides, and**

- to grant a waiver from Section 703 Parking Requirements, Subsection 703.1.4 which discusses the need for interior green space constructed within the island for parking of more than 20 spaces, because these spaces are not connected and there is adequate green space at the rear of the lot. Motion passed: 6-0.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to approve the plan as presented with the following conditions:

- That the applicant add a note to the Plan that the dumpster enclosure is to be the same color as the building;
- That if NH DOT has any concerns or requirements after reviewing this site, that the plan be required to come back to the Planning Board;
- That the applicant add the gooseneck lights back into the Plan sheets for the 3 wall signs on the architectural plans;
- Revise the address on the Plans per the Assessors comments;
- Revise Note #25 on page 1 of the plans to add the word “Board”;
- Revise the Plans to show faux windows and not public art on the side of the building;
- Revise the architectural plan sheets and renderings to ensure that the façade color and stone material are consistent with what the Planning Board was told they would be;
- The freestanding sign panels and wall signs are to have a consistent background color;
- Provide detailed information about the cleaning and maintenance plan and schedule for the porous pavement and bio-retention area as a note on the plan; and
- That final sign off from KNA that all items outlined in his memo of 9/13/13 and item #2 in the 9/3/13 memo have been addressed Motion passed: 6-0.

Ms. Nysten said that when exiting from Delahunty Drive to take a left onto Rte 111, the growth on the islands often is so high good vision is impaired. Ms. Scott said the Selectmen make sure that it is taken care of.

### **Miscellaneous**

#### **Active & Substantial Extension Request (Section 1101 of Site Plan Regulations)**

Major Site Plan Plan/WWPD Special Permit/Watershed Application  
91 Indian Rock Road (11-C-13), Case #2012-19

Ms. Nysten thinks that she needs to recuse herself because she previously recused herself from this case. Ms. Scott stated that Ms. Nysten does not have to. Ms. Nysten asked if anyone objected to her sitting for this extension request. No one objected.

Ms. Scott explained that Mr. Al Letizio is asking for an Active and Substantial Extension Request from Case #2012-19 located at his property on 91 Indian Rock Rd. Ms. Scott stated that Mr. Letizio provided a very thorough memo in the Board’s packet for their review so she did not provide the Board with a memo.

Mr. Letizio explained that the I-93 NH DOT widening project is blocking his project’s progress. The State has a large number of heavy equipment pieces in use at the site and the expected I-93 completion date is now towards the end of 2015. The State has an easement over his property until one year after the date of completion. When he bought the property in 2000 the State was talking an I-93 completion date of 2008. He is asking for a 5-year extension in hopes that he can start the project in 2017. He has posted signs and installed lighting to alleviate theft which has occurred and promote safety.

Ms. Scott said that Mr. Letizio’s request is allowed under the Town’s Site Plan Regulations and protects the applicant from changes in other regulations. Ms. Scott stated that there is nothing in the regulations that limit the time frame.



**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to grant the Active and Substantial Extension Request for Case #2012-19 because of circumstances beyond his control – NH DOT project. .. Motion passed: 6-0.**

#### **2014 Town Meeting Workshop - Cell Towers (Section 701.3)**

Ms. Scott stated in her 9/26/13 memo that there has been new legislation regarding Personal Wireless Service Facilities that will require the Town to amend their Zoning Ordinance. The Board was given a copy of the Ordinance in which edits had been made by Ms. Scott that will allow the Town to come into compliance with State law per recommendation from Town Counsel. In addition, Bonds, which were previously required, are now no longer required. Ms. Scott will ask Attorney Campbell for advice on this, because the Bonds were a Condition of Approval.

Ms. Nysten recused herself.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Fricchione seconded to move the amendments to the Town Zoning Ordinance regarding Personal Wireless Service Facilities to Public Hearing. Motion passed: 5 – 0.**

**Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve - Meeting Minute approval was moved to a future meeting.**

- September 4, 2013
- September 18, 2013

#### **Financial Guarantee Release**

- Cricket Ridge

Ms. Scott explained that the Cricket Ridge Subdivision developer is requesting a partial release of his Letter of Credit in the amount of \$54,589.50. The Request has been supported by Keach-Nordstrom and the Town's Highway Agent. Ms. Scott suggests the Planning Board support this recommendation to the Board of Selectmen.

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Sycamore seconded to recommend to the Board of Selectmen to reduce the Letter of Credit on Cricket Ridge Subdivision from \$387,001.26 to \$332,411.76, which is a reduction of \$54,589.50. Motion passed: 5-0-1. Mr. Fricchione abstained.**

#### **Liaison Reports**

- Board of Selectmen
- WEDC
- Conservation Commission
- CIP
- Southern NH Planning Commission

#### **September Staff Update**

#### **Staff Binder Update – Table of Contents**

**Old/New Business** (Not to include discussion of pending applications or decisions on matters requiring public notice)

#### **Adjournment**

**Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to adjourn the October 2, 2013 Planning Board Meeting at 11:08pm. Motion passed: 6-0.**

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant.

**NEXT MEETINGS:**

**October 16<sup>th</sup>**

**October 30<sup>th</sup>**