



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

Planning Board Minutes 12/1/10

Roll Call Planning Board:

Phil LoChiatto, Chairman – Present	Rick Okerman, Member – Excused
Pam Skinner, Member – Present	Ruth-Ellen Post, Member - Present
Louis Hersch, Alternate – Excused	Bruce Breton, Selectman Member - Present
Bruce Richardson, Alternate – Present	Lee Maloney, Alternate – Present
Kristi St. Laurent, Member – Arrived at 7:03	Sy Wren, Alternate – Excused
	Ross McLeod, Selectman Alternate Member - Excused

Staff:

Laura Scott, Community Development Director – Present
Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner – Present
Mimi Kolodziej, Temporary Minute Taker - Present

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair LoChiatto opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Hearings for Zoning Amendments for the 2011 Town Meeting:

Section 602.1.10 Home-Based Day Care

Mr. Richardson read the proposed zoning amendments into the record.

Delete the current 602.1.6.2 Family Day Care and add Section 602.1.10 Home-Based Day Care which will contain definitions for “Family Group Day Care Home” and “Family Day Care Home” that are consistent with State definitions; clarify that Home-Based Day Care is considered a Customary Home Occupation permitted by Conditional Use Permits; and outlines which Customary Home Occupation criteria must be followed. Add Section 603.1.8 to allow Home-Based Day Care in the Residence A District.

Ms. Scott addressed the Board and said this was the second public hearing on these proposed zoning changes, and she noted the Board had wanted to clarify which conditions the Home-Based Day Care would have to follow for Home Occupation. She added these in, caught a typo under 602.1.10 which does not change the intent, and listed all the criteria which would need to be followed for Home-Based Day Care for Customary Home Occupation. The typo is in line six where 603.1.6.7 should read 602.1.6.7. She explained that the Board had asked that the purpose and criteria be the same for Customary Home Occupation and clarifying that the two types of Home-Based Day Care are defined below. Nothing else had changed but the formatting and the layout.

Ms. St. Laurent was seated at 7:03 p.m.

Chair LoChiatto asked for questions from the Board. There were no questions.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public.

Chair LoChiatto closed the hearing to the public.

Motion by Mr. Breton to move Section 602.1.10 Home-Based Day Care as amended to Town Warrant. Seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed 6-0.

Section 602 Agricultural Uses and Regulations & Section 200 Definitions

Mr. Richardson read the proposed zoning amendment into the record.

Amend Section 200 Definitions to add a definition of “Agriculture” and delete the definition “Piggeries and Mink Farms”. Amend Section 601 Wetland and Watershed Protection District to clarify that agriculture is an allowed use when done in accordance with certain practices. Amend Section 602 Rural District by deleting Section 602.1.1.1 and Section 602.1.8 clarifying that agriculture is an allowed use in WWPD and as an accessory use to a residence when done in accordance with certain practices; and add Section 602.2.6 to state that Site Plan Review is required if “Farm, Agriculture, Farming” is the primary use of the property. Amend Section 603 Residence District A, B, and C that agriculture, as accessory use to a residence use, is allowed when done in accordance with certain practices. Amend Section 604 Neighborhood Business District to add Section 604.1.10 to state that Site Plan Review is required if “Farm, Agriculture, Farming” is the primary use of the property. Delete 711 and add regulations and requirements for “Roadside Farm Stands”.

Ms. Scott said that at the last Planning Board meeting the Board requested language changes which have been made: Specifically, that setbacks for agricultural uses be changed to reference setbacks in best management practices; and add Rockingham County Conservation District which was a recommendation from the Rockingham Planning Commission.

Chair Lociatto opened it up to questions from the Board.

Chair Lo Chiatto asked what would happen if there was a difference of opinion between Rockingham County Conservation District and UNH Cooperative Extension? Ms. Scott stated that Theresa Walker from the Rockingham Planning Commission said that these bodies coordinate with each other regularly and she has never witnessed a conflict in practices and had recommended putting all those groups in together.

Chair LoChiatto asked if there were a conflict, would it default to the more restrictive. Ms. Scott replied that usually in any type of regulation, it always defaults to the more restrictive.

Ms. Post inquired about Section 711 – Roadside Farm Stand Provision- Are we creating problems by restricting roadside farm stands from supplementing their produce offerings with goods not raised on their property? Chair LoChiatto clarified that this is specifically about something that is an accessory use, not a primary use, to a residence property. This is not directed to a commercial operation. The benefit of this is to prevent a home farm stand from turning into a commercial farmers’ market in a rural area. Ms. Scott emphasized that a site variance would have to be obtained if the home farm stand wanted to become a commercial business at their residence.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public. There were no questions. Chair LoChiatto closed the hearing to the public.

Ms. Maloney made a motion to move this to the Town Warrant. Second by Ms. Post. Motion passed 7-0.

Section 701.3 Commercial Antenna Structures & Section 200 Definitions

Ms. Maloney read the proposed zoning amendment into the record.

Amend Section 701.3 to clarify that commercial antenna structures are only allowed in Commercial A, Limited Industrial, and the Professional, Business, and Technology Zoning Districts; be consistent with the terminology within the Section to reference “commercial antenna structure”; delete the provision that no guy wires can be in the building setback areas; and Amend Section 200 to add a definition of “commercial antenna structure.”

Ms. Scott explained that this is the second public hearing on this, and it is primarily to clean up the height regulations section of the zoning, to define commercial antenna structure, to list what zoning districts they were allowed in and change the language from “antenna” and “tower” to “commercial antenna structure” to be consistent. At the last meeting 701.3.3 was deleted.

Ms. Maloney asked that if 701.3.3 was deleted, would that cause a re-numbering of the following sections. Ms. Scott explained that they would not be renumbered; that it would remain vacant. When the rezoning packet is re-done that vacancy will be explained and referenced.

Mr. Richardson questioned that the spelling of re transmission on the second line of the 200 definition should include a hyphen. Ms. Scott will correct.

Mr. Richardson drew attention to 701.3.2 and the inconsistency in the meaning of maximum plan view area. This term refers to the totality of the structure which would, of course, be more than the stated 25 square feet. Chair LoChiatto explained that the intent was to show the footprint or the base of the antenna. Mr. Richardson explained that “plan view” as he researched it is the design of the entire antenna, not just the footprint. He suggested removing it or changing the wording to reference what was intended.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public.

Bob Skinner from Governor Dinsmore Rd. approached the podium and wanted to know why the board struck the guy wires section from the ordinance. The commercial antenna near where he lives has guy wires that are on the road edge lot line. Should the guy wire lie right on the road edge there would be a safety need for a surrounding fence. This fence would then project into the road itself. He suggested placing the guy wires in the area of the setback requirements. Also, he expressed concern about the unknown amount of ERP’s or radiation being emitted by the tower and how many services are using the tower. He further suggested that plan view should show where the antenna and guy wires are located and also topography to be more accurate. Ms. Scott clarified that the 2012 town meeting will include the creation of a complete commercial antenna ordinance. This current intent was to fix a couple of loop holes under height regulations.

Ms. Jean Schipelliti approached the podium. She wondered what happens when a 30’ concrete slab is constructed by the developer, like they did in Plaistow, and more antennas are added later. Does the height regulation apply to the later added antennas? Ms. Scott confirmed that the 150 foot regulation would apply to all current and future antennae on the structure. In the future, a more robust ordinance will be developed.

Chair LoChiatti closed the hearing to the public and asked the Board to make a decision about Mr. Richardson’s comments concerning the definition of plan view.

Ms. Post said that the Board’s use of language in this ordinance is clear, but unreasonable. According to the current definition, the entire commercial antenna structure must be 120 square feet. Ms. Scott said there was never before a definition of “commercial antenna structure” and now that there is the 120 square feet does not work. The intent was to address the size of the upper antenna itself.

Discussion about 701.3.2 language continued.

Ms. Scott inquired about guy wire discussion. Ms. St. Laurent expressed concern about the guy wires being close to the lot line and road. Chair LoChiatto said that typically there is another 10-12 feet of right-of-way off the edge of the pavement so this may not be an issue. Mr. Richardson mentioned that the Planning Board would not approve any request that was too close to the road anyway.

Mr. Richardson suggested removing Section 701.3.2 as not applicable under 701 which deals with Height Regulations.

**Ms. Post made a motion to move “Commercial Antenna Structures” to another Public Hearing and to strike 701.3.2. Seconded by Mr. Richardson.
Motion passed 7-0.**

Ms Post asked why 703.3.3 (Guy wires shall not extend into the required building setback areas.) was stricken. Mr. Richardson explained that a guy wire is not a building and is not harming anything and is not dangerous. There is no reason why you cannot have a guy wire on your land. Ms. Post said that with our new definition of structures, guy wires are already allowed. Chair LoChiatto does not think this will ever be an issue because the new antenna designs do not having guy wires.

Section 710 Fences

Ms. Maloney read the ordinance into the minutes.

Delete the existing Section 710 Fences and replace it in its entirety. Outlines fence height requirements for both residential and commercial properties. In residential properties fences may be a maximum of four feet (4') along front of lines and six feet (6') along side lot lines and rear lot lines, and a maximum of eight feet (8') in properties where commercial use is the primary use. Details exceptions to height requirement; but fences higher than eight feet (8') in any district require Planning Board approval. Added definition section; includes regulations relating to public safety and aesthetics; references fence requirements for in-ground and above ground swimming pools.

Ms. Wood said there had been two public workshops and one public hearing on this ordinance. This is a complete re-write of the ordinance including legal council's comments. Also, the definition of fence has been modified to “man-made barrier” so that a hedge or other vegetative barrier could not be considered a fence.

Chair LoChiatto clarified that in 710.3.1 fences can be higher than 8' with Planning Board approval in residential and commercially zoned areas. Ms. Wood acknowledged that to be true.

Chair LoChiatto asked for questions from the Board.

Ms. Post asked if the reference to “private roads” in 710.4.3 include driveways. Ms. Wood clarified that it did not include driveways so that snowplows, for example, would not damage existing fences.

Mr. Richardson commented that this ordinance has greatly improved.

Chair LoChiatto focusing on 710.3.3 where it reads, “and any other location where a commercial use exists as primary use” asked if it needed amending to add “...legally exists.” Ms. Wood said that legal council would probably catch that, but it would not hurt to add it.

Chair LoChiatto opened discussion to the public. There were no questions. Chair LoChiatto closed discussion. Chair LoChiatto opened discussion to the Board.

Ms. Post made a motion to move Section 710 Fences to Public Hearing with the amendment to add the word “legally” to 710.3.3. Seconded by Ms. Maloney.

Vote passed: 7-0

Section 708 Junkyards

Ms. Maloney read Section 708 into the minutes.

This is a creation of a new ordinance. It provides for the regulation and licensing of junkyards under the authority granted by RSA 236:115 to municipalities. The ordinance includes a definitions section; regulates the location of junkyards; details fencing/screening requirements and; outlines the process for obtaining a junk yard license and for renewing a junk yard license. To obtain a junk yard license, the ordinance requires the applicant to receive a Certificate of Approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment; to receive the site Plan Approval form the Planning Board and; to receive approval for a license from the Board of Selectman. A license is valid for the maximum of one (1) year and must be renewed every April 1st by the Board of Selectman. A provision for re-hearing is outlined as well as a provision for the pre-existing junk yard uses and antique motor vehicle use.

Ms. Wood explained that there had been a November 3rd workshop on this section; this is the first public hearing for this ordinance and this is the Town’s first attempt at a junk yard ordinance. There is currently no ordinance in the books. At the last meeting, the suggestion was made to add a provision for a re-hearing; which was done. Also, there was discussion about the location of junk yards and state standards. Our ordinance is based on state standards. In 708.4.2 there are some standards the state mandates which the Town cannot change; however, Windham can provide lesser standards. Ms. Wood recommended we keep state standards, and the Board of Adjustment may allow for an application for a variance.

Mr. Breton wanted clarification on licensing. From this ordinance he understood that if one wanted to open a junk yard for the first time, one would have to get a license. How can you satisfy 708.6.2.1.3 of licensing if you have never had a license before? Ms. Wood explained that if you never had a license before, you would have to go through the process outlined in this ordinance starting with the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Breton wondered how you could go to the Board of Adjustment and get a Certificate of Approval if the Certificate of Approval assumes you have operated a junk yard with best management practices. Ms. Wood said the applicant would sign a form stating they will adhere to best management once they open their junk yard. The renewal process would catch their non-compliance.

Discussion continued the clarification of the licensing processing.

Chair. LoChiatto asked for further questions and then moved to proceed through the Legal communication.

Ms. Wood drew attention to legal council’s recommendation to remove the definition for a “non commercial junk yard.” Ms. Wood recommended keeping the definition so as to be user friendly to the public and assist code enforcement when they address the homeowner who has more than two vehicles in their yard for whatever reason.

Chair LoChiatto recommended going through 708 from the beginning starting with legal council’s first observation that “...the Zoning Ordinance does not specifically address this use as a permitted use in any current zoning district.” Mr. Richardson countered that this location issue is covered in 708.3. Ms. Wood said that a variance would allow an acceptable location.

Ms. Wood also asked if anyone had an issue leaving in the wording ‘non commercial junk yard.’ Ms. Post said it added clarity and was fine. Chair LoChiatto recommended leaving it in.

Ms. Wood drew the Board's attention to the top of page 2 of legal council's comments about location. Ms. Wood said that council was concerned that if the town mandated all the stated setbacks, there would be few places in town available for junk yards. Mr. Richardson asked if non commercial junk yards would be subject to the same setbacks. Ms. Wood said they would; clarifying that antique cars have their own section and need to be garaged or behind a fence.

Mr. Richardson questioned if this process will work. Ms. Wood noted that this ordinance puts in place a process that was previously non-existent. It allows for town input where the state requirements do not allow for town say. Chair LoChiatto spoke to Mr. Richardson's concerns about the more rural town homeowner who has an old tractor and a few other vehicles that now has to be regulated by a complicated ordinance. Also, there may be other assorted situations that the town cannot predict. Ms. Wood said that these people would then be asked to remove their vehicles or obtain a junk yard license. The more recent homeowners who have been contacted chose to remove their vehicles. Chair LoChiatto explained that if a town does not have a junk yard ordinance, it would then be gotten at the state level.

Mr. Breton asked what the difference is between a junk yard and a salvage yard. Ms. Wood clarified that a salvage yard is a type of junk yard.

Ms. Wood stated that legal council took issue with the word "work" in 708.5.1. Chair LoChiatto and the Board recognized no problem with that word and moved on.

Ms. Wood referred to council's suggestion to remove Section 708.6.2.1.3 because it deals with licensing not land use which is the Zoning Board of Approval's function. Ms. Wood referred to the official book which states that the ZBA has to issue the Certificate of Compliance with best management practices which deals with operating. Chair LoChiatto noted that council is not suggesting deleting this section, but suggests moving it to the licensing section, not the operational section.

Board discussion continued regarding council's advice and state requirement of licensing.

Chair LoChiatto clarified that council's suggestions regarding 708.6.2 does not apply because the Town is mandated by state law to give it to the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Wood noted that council suggests that language from RSA 236:117 be incorporated into our existing language. Ms Wood does not think this is necessary because of the town's current background check for larceny and the applicant's signed document stating they will follow best practices. Chair LoChiatto asked the Board if they are in agreement not to incorporate council's suggested changes offered on page 2, second to last paragraph of council's document. All agreed.

Chair LoChiatto directed the Board's attention to the last paragraph on page two (2) which deals with the appeal process. Ms. Post took issue with the number of days the person has to request a rehearing. Council's language states thirty (30); in our version it is 20 days. Discussion began regarding business days vs. calendar days. Chair LoChiatto accepted the board's pleasure to change the language to say thirty (30) days.

Mr. Richardson brought the Board's attention to 708.7.3 regarding the re-hearing process. He recommended that the re-hearing discussion be moved from the license renewal portion to the regular application for license portion (708.6.4.2). He presumed it is the Board's intention to allow a new applicant who is denied an application an opportunity for an appeal.

Discussion regarding this issue continued.

Chair LoChiatto summarized discussed amendments: Create a new Section 708.8 Appeals, re-number 708.8 to be 708.9; and 708.9 to be 708.10, strike the reference to Community Development Department from 708.7.3, and change 20 days to read 30 days.

Mr. Breton inquired about a fee. Ms. Scott clarified that there would be a fee of no more than \$250 which would be established by the Board of Selectman and abutters would have to be notified that a junk yard license is being applied for.

Mr. Richardson expressed concern that there appeared to be no grandfather clause for the little guy with a tractor and something that puts him over the edge. Ms. Wood explained that the law is designed to approve legitimate junk yard business and also to remove nuisances in residential areas. The state provides for grandfathering for the business which has been in operation since 1965 and has had an active license every year since. There are no such businesses in town. Ms. Scott offered that to date the Board of Selectman have been required to issue annual licenses which they have never done. Chair LoChiatto speaking for Mr. Richardson offered the scenario that there may be situations that have not been a problem with abutters or anyone else; the homeowner has been in town forever and now the town is intruding on them with a law. Mr. Richardson said that previously the town dealt with these situations on an individual basis and was concerned that townspeople from our more rural past may be steamrolled over with this new ordinance which he thinks no one will apply for because no one starts junkyards these days. Ms. Scott explained that most towns have such an ordinance in place and with an ordinance, long standing situations would have a process of appeal and could take issue with the fact the Board of Selectman had never required a license. Also, because of local development causing tree and land clearing, more and more calls are being received complaining about junk in yards. This would allow the town to deal effectively and give the landowner a process of licensing and appeal.

Mr. Richardson questioned the meaning of the passage "...the safeguarding of their material rights against unwarrantable invasion." in 708.2 Intent. Ms. Wood explained that while researching ordinances from other towns regarding junk yards, they borrowed this language. Chair LoChiatto explained that essentially it means you have to put a fence around it.

Mr. Richardson questioned word use in paragraph 3 under 708.2. Is the use of the word "manage" appropriate? Do we want to manage junk yards? Ms. Scott offered the word "regulate."

Mr. Richardson questioned 708.3, item 4, where there seemed to be a contradiction between something that is "worthless, meaningless, or contemptible" and two lines later where the sale of these items is considered of value.

Discussion about this passage continued.

Mr. Richardson drew the Board's attention to 708.4.4 and suggested moving it to 708.1 because it is the number one location criteria, and the first sentence should be eliminated or edited to state where they are allowed.

Discussion about this issue continued.

Mr. Breton questioned the use of the words "reasonably" and "offensive" in 708.4.1 as being too subjective.

Discussion about this issue continued.

Chair LoChiattio summarized saying 708.4.4 will be moved to 708.4.1 and the following sections will be renumbered, the first sentence, "The proposed location of a junk yard must be:" will be stricken, 708.4.2 and 708.4.3 will be modified to flow with the changes, and "Shall not create a public nuisance or affect the public health or safety by reason of offensive ..." will be added to 708.4.1.

Ms. Wood noted that junk yard was also spelled as one word on occasion. The Board decided to be consistent with the State and use the two word spelling.

Chair LoChiatto recapped recommended amendments: in 708.2 Intent change “manage” to “regulate”; 708.7.3 to be re-numbered to 708.8; create a new Section 708.8 Appeals; re-number 708.8 to be 708.9; and 708.9 to be 708.10; strike the reference to Community Development Department from 708.7.3; change 20 days to read 30 days; use the two word spelling of junk yard.

Chair LoChiatto opened discussion to the public. There was no discussion. Chair LoChiatto closed discussion to the public.

**Mr. Richardson made a motion to move Warrant 708 Junk Yards as amended to another public hearing.
Mr. Breton seconded.
Motion passed 7-0.**

Public Hearing

Case #2010-32/Minor Site Plan Application, 33 Rockingham Road (13-A-31) has been postponed to the December 29th meeting.

Case #2010-43 Customary Home Occupation Application/Conditional Use Permit 45 Heritage Hill (24-F-167) has been postponed to the December 15th meeting.

The Board took a recess from 9:50 – 9:55.

2010 Town Meeting Workshop

Zoning Map Amendments

Ms. Scott said this is the last workshop. There will be a public hearing on Commercial B next week. She has addressed wetlands, ownership, and zoning issues. Lots 4 and 5 are town owned. State owned parcels are 12, 10, 9, and 8. Number 11 is privately owned. Number 1 is not wet; number 2 is wet. 16 and 7 are not wet. The wet/not wet characteristics were determined from aerial photos. Ms. Scott said parcels 16 and 7 are not wet. Parcels 13, 14, and 15 are currently zoned Commercial B and, per board request at the last meeting, will be re-zoned Residential A. 15, 14 and 6 are proposed to be re-zoned to Residential A at next week’s meeting. 13 which is state-owned will also be considered for re-zoning to Commercial A. The announcement was in the paper last Friday. Moving up route 28 there is quite a bit of wetness on 8 and across the bottom of 10; they are currently zoned rural. 11 and 3 has some wet; 4, and 5, has some wet and are town owned. 1, 16, 7, the Commercial B lots could be developable if they were ever re-zoned.

Chair LoChiatto noted that #2 should be 17 acres and #1 should be 42 acres. Ms. Scott noted the corrections

Chair LoChiatto asked why the map had returned to a cross-hatching method. This method will make it impossible for someone else to understand it. Mr. Scott said if the Board decides to go through with a second public hearing, she will make sure it corrected.

Discussion continued about some confusing aspects of the maps.

Chair LoChiatto asked the Board’s pleasure with regard to map changes this year.

Mr. Breton requested tackling the lots on the 28 side of town. This corridor - including 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 has Route 111 going right by them. Mr. Richardson suggested 1 and 2; Chair LoChiatto suggested 16. Ms. Scott noted that 3 is proposed to be changed from rural and neighborhood business to all neighborhood business.

Ms. Post mentioned that currently there is a public opinion survey on economic and business development. The results have not yet been assessed, and they could be helpful in the planning process before we start making

changes. Ms. Scott said the survey will be compiled by the end of the month. The survey was planned to be done by the end of November; however, one of the committee members had to leave.

Chair LoChiatto tried to determine whether to move forward at the late hour of 10 p.m. and surveyed the wishes of the Board: Mr. Richardson who was on the sub-committee for these changes and is in favor of them wanted to move forward; Mr. Breton wanted to move forward with the lots along the 28/111 corridor; Ms. St. Laurent is concerned about those homeowners who have had residential property along the area that has Salem Rd. through their backyard, and now we are looking to change the remaining surrounding property to Commercial A. She would like to wait for the results of the survey; Miss Skinner would like to move it to a Public Hearing; Ms. Maloney would like to wait for the survey results; Ms. Post will wait for the survey results; Chair LoChiatto would like move it forward. Final tally is 3 to wait; 4 to move it.

#1- neighborhood business - at the west end of town. Will be a separate ballot. A majority of the Board chose to move this to a Public Hearing.

#2 - rural and is mostly water - leave it.

#16 land-locked, on a hill –Mr. Richardson offered that because it is land-locked, it's only value would be to merge it with another lot and make it Limited Industrial. Move to Public Hearing

#7 - wooded lot across from Shaw's with deep slopes to the pond – leave it.

Ms. Scott recapped those lots which will move to a Public Hearing as: 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 16.

Mr. Breton made a motion to move the aforementioned lots to a Public Hearing. Seconded by Ms. Maloney.

Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Richardson made a motion to wave the by-laws to continue the meeting after 10 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Skinner.

Motions passed 7-0.

Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve

The November 3rd minutes were reviewed. Mr. Richardson asked if a motion for approval had been forgotten on page 3. Ms. Wood thought it might be a typo. Chair LoChiatto suggested tabling these minutes for later amendment if needed. The video will be checked.

The November 10 minutes were reviewed. A typo on page 3 was noted by Ms. St. Laurent and will be corrected.

Ms. Maloney made a motion to approve the November 10 minutes as amended. Seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed 6-0-1 Ms. Maloney abstained.

The November 17 minutes were reviewed.

Ms. Skinner made a motion to accept the November 17 minutes as presented. Ms. Maloney seconded.

Motion passed 6-0-1 Mr. Richardson abstained.

Miscellaneous

Ms. Scott reminded the Board about a 9 a.m. site walk for a Meetinghouse Road development. She asked the Board if they would like to meet at 6 p.m. on December 8 considering the number of agenda items. The Board decided to meet at 7 p.m. Does the Board want to meet at 6 p.m. on the December 15th meeting. The Board decided to meet at 7 p.m. Chair LoChiatto read correspondence from the Kelley Street cell tower in Londonderry.

Mr. Breton made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Richardson.

Motion passed 7-0. Meeting ended at 10:32 p.m.

