



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

3 North Lowell Rd., Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

[www.WindhamNewHampshire.com](http://www.WindhamNewHampshire.com)

### Approved Planning Board Minutes

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

7:00pm @ Community Development Department

#### Board

##### Members:

|                    |            |         |                    |                     |                                       |
|--------------------|------------|---------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alan Carpenter     | Chairman   | Present | Joel Desilets      | Alternate/Selectman | Excused                               |
| Paul Gosselin      | Vice Chair | Present | Kathleen Difruscia | Alternate           | Excused                               |
| Kristi St. Laurent | Member     | Excused | Matt Rounds        | Alternate           | Present                               |
| Ruth-Ellen Post    | Member     | Present | Gabe Toubia        | Alternate           | Present/seated for<br>Ms. Crisler     |
| Margaret Crisler   | Member     | Excused | David Oliver       | Alternate           | Present/seated for<br>Ms. St. Laurent |
| Dan Guttman        | Member     | Present |                    |                     |                                       |

#### Staff:

Laura Scott, Director

Suzanne Whiteford, Minute Taker

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

#### Design Review Subcommittee Interviews and Appointments

**Ms. Scott:** One applicant unable to attend meeting in person, letter of interested submitted to the PB.

**Mr. Guttman** spoke to Mr. Griffin's fine character and good applicant for the role

**Ms. Post** concurs with Mr. Guttman

#### Motion by Ms. Post to appoint Peter J. Griffin to Chairman for Design Review committee

Second Mr. Gosselin

Vote 6-0-0, motion carries

#### Public Hearings:

##### Timber Harvest in the Town Forest (Lots 25-R-103, 25-R-6000A, 25-R-6500, 25-R-7010, 25-R-7025, 25-R-8000)

Per Section 712 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board will hold a non-binding public hearing on the Town Forestry Committee proposed Timber Harvest. The access will be from Marblehead Road, through the old Town landfill (39 Marblehead Road 25-R-300) per the approval of the Board of Selectmen, to the Town Forest (Lots 25-R-103, 25-R-6000A, 25-R-6500, 25-R-7010, 25-R-7025, 25-R-8000). The harvest will be in accordance with the 2012 Management Plan and will be conducted by a Licensed Forester. Approximately 116 acres (total forest is 203 acres) will be harvested in a thinning

operation. An access road and staging area will be constructed for this harvest.

**Chairman Carpenter** clarified tonight's hearing is a nonbinding hearing. Confirmed by Ms. Scott

**Wanda Rice**, Chair of the Forest Committee

Explained the plan and process for Timber Harvest

**Mr. Guttman** commented the plan was thoughtful, is supportive of the initial plan for dealing with lower quality, inquired about prioritizing invasive in the area

**Ms. Rice:** Have not identified any invasive species yet.

**Mr. Oliver** asked about the benefits of thinning the town forest

**Ms. Rice:** Remove trees small not growing well, larger trees that are over mature and starting to decline leave more growing space for better quality trees and get regeneration

**Mr. Oliver** inquired about Town forest and abutters

**Ms. Rice:** One resident on Osgood abuts the forest, working with the abutter to come up with a buffer acceptable to the abutter

**Mr. Oliver:** What language is protecting town from trees coming down on resident property and causing damage to property or person

**Chairman Carpenter:** The town has limited liability under RSA's

**Mr. Toubia:** How long does the process take

**Ms. Rice:** 6-10 weeks after a contractor is hired, dependent on the size of the contracting company

**Mr. Toubia:** What is the negative impact on traffic flow from Marblehead Rd.

**Ms. Rice:** 10-20 trucks per day

**Chairman Carpenter** asked about access and route of the trucks

**Ms. Rice** replied they plan to use the driveway that goes in and around the old landfill

**Ms. Post** comments and concerns:

- Impressed with the thoroughness and openness and responsiveness to public comment
- Concerned about traffic and trucks, and impact on neighborhoods nearby, and effect on traffic on 111
- Inquired about a photo that shows a totally cleared area
- Inquired about some of the abutting properties and abutter notification. Ms. Scott confirmed all abutters were notified

**Ms. Rice:** Trucks will be in and out of Marblehead road, and will go up range road and onto 93.

The photo (Ms. Post asked about) represents a processing area, not a representation of the thinning planned for the forest.

**Chairman Carpenter** Commented that the tree cutters have a tendency to cut unplanned trees. Will the trees for thinning be marked? Will references be checked of previous work of potential contractors? Chairman voiced his concern that once trees are cut down there is no recourse. Chairman Carpenter is not in favor of this process. The benefit is not outweighing the cost, and it will be less enjoyable to walk after the areas are cut/thinned.

**Ms. Rice:** The trees are marked in two places, one up high and one on the stump. Bids are available with select loggers that have worked successfully in the past.

**Ms. Post:** How does this benefit the wildlife?

**Ms. Rice:** Many wild life are endangered in New England due to a lack of Lack of small bushy habitat, not a lot of new growth forest and there are many species that benefit from different kinds of growth.

**Andrea Alexander, Bayberry Road:**

- Who is benefitting from it
- Why are we paying for this

**Ms. Rice and Board Members** clarified the town is not paying for the thinning the town is actually receiving money to put away and used for future forestry needs.

Opposed to the project

**Mr. Gosselin:** The Board of Selectman made recommendations, but the forestry committee is Autonomous.

**Ken Baretta, 21 Osgood Rd. Windham**

- Asked about hours of operation
- Will weekends be involved
- 7 is too early, would like to start at 8 and no weekends
- Asking if the forest outside of his window will look any different
- Asked about a fellow neighbor abutter

**Ms. Rice**

- Planning on working during the hours of 7a -5p, no weekends for the most part
- The committee is working with Mr. Baretta's neighboring abutter

**Ms. Post** asked why the Timber Harvest is necessary and what problems can be anticipated if it is not done.

**Ms. Rice** replied the Timber Harvest is necessary to improve the vigor of the forest. Trees are currently stagnant and removing them will make more space for trees to grow better. The committee intends to use some of the money for future recreation. There are no trails on the back of the property.

**Mr. Rounds** asked if there any perceived negatives.

**Ms. Rice** responded there are not any negatives.

**Mr. Guttman** sited various sources supportive of the cutting/thinning process. Much of the existing growth is not necessarily old growth, southern NH was clear cut in the 1800's**Ms. Rice** there is no old growth.

**Wayne Morris:**

- member of the Conservation Commission
- three cellar holes
- Historic District

- Maclaven foundation in the middle of the forest, would like to rename the forest to MacLaven Forest
- Second foundation ( not named)
- Plan to connect the town foundations with a trail network through the wood meadows subdivision.
- Benefit to create a trail network to create three cellar holes

**Mr. Oliver:** This is the town forest, the town voted on it, the thinning process would remove trees that are at risk for fire, negligent of the town not to remove the trees that are potential fire hazards. The town voted on it and it is a good plan

**Norm Babott,** Vice Chair Forest Committee explained there is a forestry fund set aside to manage the town forest and act on a species of trees that are potentially invasive.

**Motion by Ms. Post to recommend the forestry committee go forward with their proposal with 3 conditions: hours of operation be limited between 8-5 rather than 7-5, no weekends involved, any cellar holes and stone walls and old foundations be left undisturbed**

**Second Mr. Oliver**

**Mr. Guttman asked if Ms. Post is amenable to modifying the second term, to every effort made to avoid weekends, but a weekend or two may be necessary.**

**No amendment made to the motion**

**Vote 5-1-0 Chairman Carpenter opposed for reasons previously stated**

**Motion carries**

**Elizabeth Wood replaced Laura Scott**

**Two confidential memos from Attorney Campbell distributed to the Board**

**Case#2015 -3/Final Review/Major Open Subdivision/WWPD Special Permit (continued from June 3rd)**

A Final Subdivision Application for a Major Open Space Subdivision, Wetland and Watershed Protection District Special Permit Application (WWPD), and Cobbetts Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Land Development Application have been submitted for property that is accessible by Settlers Ridge and Glendenin Roads (Lots 25-R-6000, 6250, 6260, 7000, 7050, 8002, 8005, 8010, and 9000), located in the Rural District Zone, Wetland and Watershed Protection District, and Cobbetts Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Overlay Protection District. The applicant, Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc., on behalf of the property owner, Wood Meadow Land Development, LLC, is proposing to merge the eight (8) existing lots and then to subdivide them into thirty-nine (39) lots for single-family development and twelve (12) open space lots. The proposal includes the creation of new roads. The WWPD Special Permit is for several proposed road crossings and driveways for a total permanent impact of 92,293 sq. ft. for the Open Space Subdivision proposal. Individual well and septic systems are proposed for service of each lot. A written waiver request has been submitted from Section 605.5 of the Subdivision Regulations.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked if there are any changes to the plan?

**Ms. Wood** confirmed there are no changes to the yield plan. A new road design was submitted to Mr. Keach for review. Mr. Keach addresses the most recent design review in his memo on file dated June 12, 2015.

**Mr. Zohdi** explained that since the last meeting he has produced a new road design for Glendenin. Mr. Zohdi got permission to send the new road design to Ms. Wood so that she can send it to Mr. Keach for review. The new road design was for the benefit of less ledge cut but still comply with the subdivision regulations. Mr. Zohdi gave details on the slopes of the road contained within the design. Mr. Zohdi referred to a letter he received from the trail committee for a trail design this morning. Mr. Zohdi has prepared a trail design for the PB review. The trail design was not submitted for review because Mr. Zohdi did not have time to do so before tonight's meeting.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked Mr. Zohdi for confirmation that the only changes made since the last PB meeting are: redesign of the road coming off Glendenin, and a new trail map. Mr. Zohdi confirmed the changes mentioned above. Chairman Carpenter asked if there is anything else different from what was presented to the PB two weeks ago. Mr. Zohdi told Chairman Carpenter there is an additional change to the plan since the last PB meeting and that is about the community well.

**Ms. Wood** explained the subdivision regulations require that the PB find the yield plan acceptable prior to considering the open space plan. Previous meetings were (nonbinding) design review. The PB is required to make a binding motion regarding the yield plan.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked the PB if they agree with Mr. Keach's review of the yield plan; and if so a motion may be entertained.

**Ms. Post has the following concerns and comments regarding the yield plan:**

- Ms. Post was not on the Board when the yield plan and saw it for the first time this past Monday
- Acknowledges that Mr. Keach assures the Board the 39 lots on the yield plan meet 3 criteria:  
1. achieves the minimum 8000sq feet with buildable area, 2. with proper soil, 3. with proper road frontage.
- Ms. Post requested to present the yield plan, outlined in colors by Ms. Post and Ms. Wood while reviewing the yield plan, showing the total impact to WWPD. Green represents WWPD.
- Chairman Carpenter explained the concept and process of a yield plan and how it gets presented and approved for the benefit of the new PB members and public.
- Extensive waivers would be involved for a standard yield plan.
- As illustrated by Ms. Post, there is extensive encroachment into WWPD and wetland crossings.
- There are some lots that no driveway access exists without wetland crossing.
- The sheet with lot #40 on it, never seen on any kind of conventional subdivision plan, there is a 24 acre parcel on the yield plan as a conventional subdivision with no information. The 24 acres has undisclosed condition, which she has never seen on a subdivision plan.
- The loop road is over approximately 5000 feet in length without access, which is not customarily seen in a standard subdivision. Chairman Carpenter disagreed with Ms. Post regarding road length.
- Mr. Gosselin explained there are two areas of entry and egress and that is the reason why the loop road is not identified as a cul-de-sac.
- 3 Violations of the normal subdivision ordinances as listed above.
- If these are irrelevant, what will we see next?
- How seriously do we take these violations?
- Ms. Wood referred the Board to section 604, regarding block length should not be greater than 1200 feet

**Chairman Carpenter** explained an open space yield plan to new alternate Board members

**Mr. Gosselin:** WWPD and wetlands are two different classifications.

WWPD is 30% impervious maximum, the yield plan does not exceed the 30% or less threshold  
Not sure about the road, and wetland crossing requires further investigation, not concerned about 24 acres not being used

**Chairman Carpenter** commented that the first design review was March 4 where the PB took a consensus to accept the yield plan and gave the applicant direction. The Board has a long history of not being overly concerned about wetland crossings. A precedence has been set and how do we change the process for this applicant? The PB hired an engineer to review the yield plan and the engineer agrees with the yield plan. How do we tell an applicant that the submitted yield plan was approved by the hired engineer and we don't agree with it.

**Ms. Post** verbalized that what she is hearing is that all these things (as previously pointed out) are essentially irrelevant. She would like to have Mr. Keach address the PB and explain what it took to achieve 39 lots beyond the 3 criteria he outlined.

**Ms. Wood** replied that in 2010 the yield plan ordinance was changed during town meeting , and a vote is required.

**Mr. Oliver** agrees with Ms. Post

**Mr. Guttman** trouble reconciling the guidance Mr. Keach has provided and asking him to come and provide additional guidance. We are asking Mr. Keach what his method for identification was; and does not understand what is the benefit to having Mr. Keach come back? Mr. Keach's comments reflect that Mr. Keach did take additional circumstances into consideration.

**Ms. Post:** Mr. Keach answered 3 questions; he did not look at what it took to get there with regards to road design, wetland crossings, etc. Mr. Keach's feedback is limited. Would like to comment on the surrounding circumstances that it took to get the 39 lots meet the criteria.

**Mr. Gosselin** commented we effectively as a Board agreed with the plan and the engineer agreed with the plan and it has already been ok'd.

**Mr. Toubia** would like to hear from Mr. Keach and get more insight to his perspective.

**Mr. Rounds** agree with Ms. Post in spirit, it is more of a process issue; the ship has already sailed on this particular issue.

**Chairman Carpenter** will entertain a motion

**Motion by Ms. Post we invite Mr. Keach and look at the context of the subdivision regulations and ordinances in term of achieving the result he said was achieved how much in the way of liberty can the PB take with regards to achieving 39 lots**

**Second Mr. Oliver**

**Chairman Carpenter believes meeting with Mr. Keach will better establish the PB expectations of him for the future.**

**4-2-0 Mr. Guttman and Mr. Gosselin opposed due to reasons already stated**

**Chairman Carpenter** clarified for staff that after hearing from Mr. Keach the PB will take a binding vote on the yield plan.

Mr. Cronin was denied comment on the above issues and decisions made. He requested meeting minutes from any meeting between Ms. Wood and Ms. Post

**Mr. Zohdi** presented the location of the houses as requested by Mr. Gosselin. The Plan displayed and reviewed representing distance between existing houses and proposed subdivision houses and the road.

**Chairman Carpenter** commented that the ordinance changed last march. The setback from the road and the maximum width of the building lot has changed, and that is why the house lots appear different.

**Mr. Zohdi** redesigned the road, gave the plan to Ms. Wood, and sent it to Mr. Keach, and resolved the situation of ledge; 3-4 feet of ledge could possibly exist. That small amount of ledge can be managed with a hammer.

**Chairman Carpenter** inquired about test pit from the edge of the subdivision property line to the road.

**Mr. Zohdi** there is not much cut in that area and test pits were not done.

**Chairman Carpenter** believes it may be worth additional test pits due to the 200 feet proximity to the two existing houses. Would like to know where the existing wells are.

**Mr. Zohdi** has the location of the two houses in question wells and will present them to the PB.

**Mr. Gosselin** asked if additional test pits could help prove there will be less blasting on the road.

**Mr. Guttman and Ms. Post:** would be in favor of additional test pits if it showed blasting would not be necessary.

**Mr. Zohdi** does not have the exact location of the well. Needs permission to go to the lots and locate the wells. Mr. Zohdi only has what is on file with the town.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked if staff has a copy of the drawing being presented by Mr. Zohdi.

**Ms. Wood** does not have the drawing as part of the plan; it is being presented for the first time right now.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked applicant, based on concerns from regarding changes to their property landscaping, would he be open to basic landscaping to their lots that will become road frontage.

**Mr. Zohdi** would like to agree with the Board regarding landscaping, would like to have a proposal from Delahunty sent to the PB and have an agreed proposal.

**Mr. Gosselin** is aware that the residents on settlers ridge have concerns regarding blasting. Mr. Gosselin asked the applicant if he has blasting concerns for that area.

**Mr. Zohdi** does not have any concerns for blasting in the Settlers Ridge area, it is fill area.

**Ms. Post** clarified that blasting is being mitigated, but not eliminated?

**Mr. Zohdi** confirmed blasting is not being eliminated.

**Mr. Zohdi** outlined on the plan the trails shown to be on the back of the lot and connections. As of this morning, the trails are coming off Settlers Ridge, and leading up to the Cul-De-Sac, and proposing a new trail that has not been proposed to the Board yet. Mr. Zohdi would like to present the new trail proposal tonight.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked who owns the corner of land near the cul-de-sac.

**Mr. Zohdi** explained the land in question is Johnson's land, and it belongs to conservation commission.

**Wayne Morris, Conservation Commission** confirmed the trails recommendations were made last night. An email was sent to Ms. Wood acknowledging it is a better plan than previously submitted.

Ms. Post asked paving of the trails. Mr. Morris explained there is no paving involved.

**Mr. Zohdi** is proposing a common well system, per state guidelines, a minimum two wells. Mr. Zohdi showed locations of proposed wells on the map displayed.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked what can be inside the 200 feet radius of the wells.

**Mr. Zohdi** explained the only thing allowed in the well radius is a pump house and only a gravel (cannot be paved) driveway.

**Mr. Oliver** asked where the pencahuck access roads would be located.

**Mr. Zohdi** explained the access road location Depends on where they get water and dig wells.

**Mr. Zohdi:** his client is willing to put the community well subject that we get 34,000gallons/day each well. If not, there will be individual wells. The well radius has to be 200 feet, but you can get it by 180 feet. Scheduled to meet with Mr. Wayne Morris

**Wayne Morris:** The easement for proposed community wells are located on town forest, it is up to forestry committee to grant an easement.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked Mr. Zohdi if making approval conditional on a community well system, the applicant would engineer it and come back to the Board with an approved well system or report that it cannot be done. Mr. Zohdi agreed

**Mr. Guttman** clarified well requirements come to under 24 gallons/minute

**Chairman Carpenter**

- requested Mr. Zohdi speak to the subdivision proposed at Settlers ridge, the easement, and the cul-de-sac
- Concerned about residents impacted by the subdivision
- Ms. Duncan is the most impacted as she lives on the side of the cul-de-sac where the subdivision is proposed.



Mr. Zohdi would prefer to Look at the driveway, get a price for where the driveway is proposed, and give a check to Ms. Duncan and she takes care of the driveway.

Paige. Duncan, 21 Settlers Ridge Road

- Asked for more conditions
- Getting an unwanted extra ½ acre of land requiring extensive landscaping so the acquired land looks seamless
- Requesting landscaping at the entrance of settlers ridge as proposed at Glendenin Rd.

**Chairman Carpenter** asked if Mr. Zohdi is willing to have Delahunty landscape Settlers Ridge the same as being done at the entrance of Glendenin, and can you get a quote from Delahunty for the landscaping at the Glendenin and settlers ridge entrances. Mr. Zohdi agreed to get a quote on the landscaping and bring it back to the PB.

**Ms. Post** pleasantly surprised and commending the applicant that a community well is being considered and investigated. Asked Chair if the PB wants to make the confidential letters from attorney Campbell Dated June 10, 2015 public?

**Ms. Wood** would is not ready to release the confidential letter from Attorney Campbell to the public

**Mr. Zohdi** clarifies the road is 32688 sq feet of WWPD is being impacted, PB voted 5-0 to close the conventional subdivision during the March 4, 2015 meeting.

**Ms. Wood** reviewed that the vote was nonbinding as it was for design review.

Minutes from March 4, 2015 are reviewed by PB members.

**Chairman Carpenter** clarified the vote in question during March 4, 2015 meeting, the vote was to end the design review phase, not approve a yield plan

**Mr. Zohdi**

- Percentage of lot sizing less than required
- The yield plan, total crossing of wetland 3726 sq. ft. if the wetland crossing is less than 3000 sq. ft. can get approval from Wetland Bureau within 30 days
- Total crossing of WWPD for roadways 60851 sq. feet,
- Total WWPD crossing for driveways 5957 sq. ft.

**Attorney Calan**

- Letter on file requesting two issues be addressed
- Confirmed the email was distributed to the Planning Board
- What the study should encompass regarding adequate water for the subdivision lots
- Planning Board has authority to require a study and a community well system
- The applicant proposed an open space subdivision that includes a community well system if feasible.
- Asked the PB to amending its application for an open space subdivision with a community well system, if it is not doable would the applicant have to come back to PB and resubmit

**Chairman Carpenter** clarified that Mr. Zohdi would proceed with investigating the feasibility of a community well system if conditioned to do so by the Planning Board

Attorney Calan requesting the Planing Board to make a condition of approval dependent on a community well system.

Chairman Carpenter polled the board

The consensus of the Board to condition approval based on a community well:

- Oliver yes
- Guttman yes
- Gosselin would like to see the results of the study if it is feasible
- Rounds yes
- Toubia yes
- Post, yes. Concern about the fall back plan to conventional wells. If the community well does not prove feasible the capacity to provide 39 working wells is in question.

Andrea Alexander, Bayberry Road

- 674 sections 23, empowers the PB to recommend to the selectman a temporary moratorium on unusual circumstances. This is applicable to this situation. The residents are willing to do the work and present to the selectman.
- Minutes of the board of selectman from October 5 to be included in the record. The minutes have been included in past meetings.
- This is an unusual situation with regards to water

**Chairman Carpenter** clarified if the applicant does a study for a community well, and can produce adequate water, why would the PB impose a moratorium.

**Mr. Gosselin** from a legal perspective, regardless of the number of houses, if you own the land you have the right to drill for a well. A community well is a good idea. However, the owner has the right to drill on their land for a well regardless of the impact on neighbors.

Paige Duncan, 21 Settlers Ridge Road

Calming mechanism on Settlers Ridge proposed by Mr. Zohdi was denied by the fire chief and police chief.

**Ms. Wood** received a memo from fire and police chiefs and road agent not supporting Mr. Zohdi's proposed calming mechanism plan, fire and police do not believe it will effectively calm traffic, and road agent did not support the design due to maintenance issues.

Al Syracuse, 20 Settlers Ridge RD

Concerned about new proposed trails creating a loop around his property and essentially becoming a race loop for 4 wheelers

Concerned about blasting impact on his existing well

**Chairman Carpenter** questioned the concern as the trails are non motorized trails on conservation land.

**Wayne morris** clarified the proposed trail would not come out from settlers ridge and create a loop around his house.

Bill Bailey, 19 settler's ridge road

When you start looking for water can you look furthest away from Settlers Ridge Rd.

Martin, 16 Settlers ridge

Voicing concerns about putting a community well close to existing residents

The conclusion on the calming mechanism proposal,

Ms. Wood clarified the chiefs did not suggest traffic calming for this subdivision.

Paige Duncan

How will the cost for the maintenance of a calming mechanism be different from the cost for the existing Cul-De-Sac that will be removed

Chairman Carpenter explained how the cost could be prohibitive

Mr. Zohdi understands from the Chiefs that the calming mechanism is not needed based on the width of the road.

**Motion by Ms. Post to continue on July 1, 2015, with input from Mr. Keach**

**Second by Mr. Gosselin**

**Vote 6-0-0 Motion carries**

**Motion to start a new hearing after 10pm by Ms. Post**

**Second Mr. Gosselin**

**Vote 6-0-0, motion carries**

### **Rules of Procedure**

Per NH RSA 675:1 notice is hereby given that the Windham Planning Board will hold a public hearing to adopt amendments to "Windham Planning Board Rules of Procedure". Changes included grammatical edits and updates to the most relevant section of State law and have no bearing on the meaning or intent of the language.

**Motion by Mr. Guttman to accept the RSA as presented**

**Second by Mr. Gosselin**

**Vote 6-0-0, motion carries**

### **Subdivision Regulations**

Ms. Post asking for clarification of Mr. Keach's comments regarding Cul-De-Sac and Cul-De-Sac Street definitions.

Tom Case

- Agrees with Mr. Keach
- There has to be a way to limit Cul-De-Sacs along a road. Cited example: Squire Armour Road has 5 Cul-De-Sacs (Daisy Chaining)

- 610.3.7 asked about Mr. Keach's comments regarding this.
- Doesn't understand why a resident can't have a street name on their driveway. Board explained it is an EMS issue.
- 405.2 commercial condominiums and staff authorization is a good idea; however believes "staff" should be specified.
- Section 405.2 and Section 501 are conflicting
- Chairman Carpenter recommend to revise based on Mr. Keach's comments
- Mr. Gosselin agrees, to revise the language to prevent one Cul-De-Sac after another (Daisy Chaining)
- Chairman Carpenter and Mr. Guttman volunteered to revise the language of the subdivision regulations in collaboration with staff and present the revision to the PB for review before posting to a public hearing.

**Motion by Mr. Gosselin to adjourn**

**Second by Mr. Guttman**

**Vote 6-0-0 Motion carries**

Meeting adjourned 10:38pm

Meetings submitted by Suzanne Whiteford