



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 12/8/10

Roll Call Planning Board:

Phil LoChiatto, Chairman – Present	Rick Okerman, Member – Excused
Kristi St. Laurent – Arrived at 9:22pm	Ruth-Ellen Post, Member - Present
Pam Skinner, Member – Present	Sy Wrenn, Alternate - Excused
Louis Hersch, Alternate – Present	Bruce Breton, Selectman Member - Present
Bruce Richardson, Alternate – Present	Ross McLeod, Selectman Alt. Member - Excused
Louis Hersch is seated for Rick Okerman.	Lee Maloney is seated for Kristi St. Laurent.

Staff:

Laura Scott, Community Development Director – Arrived at 9:22 p.m.
Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner – Present
Mimi Kolodziej, Temporary Minute Taker - Present

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

Public Hearing Continued

Case #2010-44 Design Review Workforce Housing Open Space Subdivision

A Design Review Application for a 12-lot Workforce Housing Open Space Subdivision has been submitted for Lot 11-A-1418 on Meetinghouse Road in the Rural, Aquifer, and WWPD Districts. The applicant, Karl Dubay, of the Dubay Group, on behalf of AWAC Realty Trust, is proposing a mixed-use Workforce Housing (WFH) Open Space Development with 3 WFH homes and 9 market-rate homes on individual lots (fee simple) and a new Town Road. A WWPD Special Permit is required for drainage ways, wells, and open space.

Chair LoChiatto read the hearing notice into the record.

Karl Dubay reviewed the Saturday, December 4, Meetinghouse Rd. site walk. This public hearing is a continuation from the previous Design Review hearing held on November 17th. At the site walk the Board had asked Mr. Dubay to follow-up on some key issues and address abutters' questions at this meeting. He has done both of these items and explained them to the Board.

- Ongoing work since the previous hearing;
 1. There was a joint Board site walk - Completed
 2. Finalized testing and HISS calculations – Finalized
 3. Road systems design and drainage study – Nearing completion
 - Abutters' concerns from site walk have been integrated
 4. Subdivision & Registry Plans - Finalizing
 5. Application Checklist and State permits - Finalizing
 6. Fire Department / Cistern – In Review –
 - a. Includes a 10,000 gal. cistern and plan location.

- Key items requested by the Board at that hearing and the 12/4 site walk;
 1. Topographical Limitations
 - from the top of the ridge to the bottom is a 16% road grade which is double the maximum road grade allowed
 2. Will be a permanent cul de sac
 3. Will increase the widths and depths of natural buffers between abutters' properties and discontinued Old Butterfield Rock Rd and other abutting properties
 4. Will supplement existing buffers per abutters' requests
 5. Meetinghouse Rd. drainage will be improved
 6. Mr. Plistkin, in order to avoid 911 emergency response confusion between Meetinghouse Rd. and Meetinghouse Village, has asked the development or the road be called Cricket Ridge in honor of his late father.
- Final Application Phase Coordination;
 1. The Workforce Housing fiscal study is being compiled and will be submitted for Board review
 2. An Easement Document is being compiled and will be submitted for Board review
 3. Planning and Zoning Board reviews and the TRC process will be finalized
 4. Project Density requirements will be dovetailed into the Workforce Housing Fiscal Review Study
 5. The Lot Size Standard and Open Space required for Workforce Housing is detailed by the State and DES regulations. Our town and this project conform to these regulations.

Mr. Dubay explained that Workforce Housing criteria from the state suggests a sale price of approximately \$260,000 with a yearly income of \$85,000.

Ms. Maloney inquired about a wetlands area on the map. Mr. Dubay explained that the two wetlands areas on the map are small, isolated areas and are not subject to WWPD. Ms. Maloney asked if the nearest house's driveway is far enough away from the closest wetland. Mr. Dubay said it meets all the criteria, and the related septic system meets the setback criteria. There is a grading plan available.

Ms. Post expressed concern about drainage to the cul de sac because it is at a lower elevation to the houses above. Slow and gradual drainage from snow melts in shaded areas and creates ice at night. Mr. Dubay explained that the cul de sac has a full perimeter drainage system including catch basins and swales which connect to under drains and direct run-of into a wooded area.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. Maloof of 82 Meetinghouse Rd. is shocked how close the nearest house will be to him. He does not think a 10' buffer will be sufficient. He would like a row of fluffy hemlocks which would help his visual privacy and create a sound buffer. He thinks the ridge may create an amphitheater effect and create an echo which the trees would help buffer. He would also like to see trees camouflaging the catch basin and help maintain the rural character of the road. The open drainage basin and pipes may create a hazard for the local children.

Mr. Dubay explained that the basin is now a shallow, vegetated extended swale of 36" drained from the bottom with a 12-15" pipe. There will only be sloping within the slope easement. The buffers have been increased to 40+ feet off the Butterfield Rock Rd. and in other locations; however, there is one small area with a 10' buffer though the requirements are 0'. Mr. Dubay offered to replant the site slope along the basin and within the slope easement so the vegetation comes back. The updated design shows a very small impact to slope easement which will be replanted with regard to Mr. Maloof's property.

Mr. and Mrs. Call's property is impacted very little, and the applicant will work with them to create a vegetative privacy and noise barrier. The new design impacts the slope easement very little. Existing vegetation in the middle of the cul de sac has been kept and throughout pockets around so the amphitheater effect will be minimal. Mr. Dubay continues to be willing to work with abutters.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson asked about the elevation of a drainage swale and the impact on Mr. Maloof's house. Mr. Dubay said he will be intercepting that drainage and redirecting it. It is his intent to improve the drainage along this area and put it back together so that it looks even better than before.

Chair LoChiatto asked Mr. Dubay to address the size of the open space. Mr. Dubay said the open space will be a bit over 2 acres which meets Town and State ordinances and calculations for an open space Workforce Housing subdivision.

Mr. Richardson asked about the 35% requirement for Workforce Housing units in a mixed development. Mr. Dubay explained that of the 12 three-quarter acre lots, 25% is Workforce Housing. This application was made when there was no 35% rule. At that time, the Board was discussing 25%, so that was the percentage used. This project does meet the Town's other Workforce Housing criteria.

Mr. Richardson asked about the location of the Workforce Housing lots which now appear to be clustered together. Mr. Dubay said he would be willing to work with the Board to locate them in a more scattered arrangement.

Mr. Richardson asked about the Town's Open Space Requirements and that there appears to be a lot of other land available. He suggested including that other land in order to come closer to the Town's Open Space Requirement without using prime land. Mr. Dubay will work on that for the final design.

Ms. Post made a motion to close the Design Review portion of this application. Seconded by Mr. Breton. Vote passed: 7-0.

Public Hearings for Zoning Amendments for the 2011 Town Meeting:

Section 616 Cobbetts Pond Watershed Protection District

Chair LoChiatto read the hearing notice into the record.

The ordinance was reformatted to follow the numbering format of other Town ordinances; definitions section was alphabetized and modified. All documents that are referenced by the ordinance were

updated to reflect the most recent versions available. Changes were made to ensure that the ordinance is not in conflict with State Law or other Town Ordinances. Unenforceable language was removed. Provision added provide for emergency exceptions to this ordinance.

Ms. Wood explained there had been two workshops and this is the second public hearing on this item. The revised draft presented tonight reflects the changes made from the currently existing ordinance and was posted to the Town website, has been available at the Community Development office and there are copies at the door. Ms. Wood went over the comments provided by Town's legal counsel. Town's legal counsel, Bernie Campbell, noted that the current revised ordinance is not in warrant format for the Town Warrant, and he noted a typo. Both these will be amended.

Counsel referenced the boundaries of the Cobbetts Pond Watershed Protection District; and mentioned that if a property owner wants to prove they are not in this district, the Town should spell out the process in an ordinance. Ms. Wood thinks this is unnecessary. If the property owner's engineer can prove they are not in the district, and the Town's engineer confirms it; that should be sufficient for the Planning Board and staff. Counsel further noted that the language requiring the Planning Board to modify the boundaries was removed. Ms. Wood explained that this was an administrative move. The Planning Board cannot modify any zoning ordinances without going through the Town Meeting process. If a property owner did prove they were not in the boundary for the purpose of that application, they could be exempt for the provisions of the ordinance. The actual map could not be amended until Town Meeting. Chair LoChaitto clarified that if 1 inch of the property was in the district the entire lot would be considered in the district. Mr. Richardson asked about property where the house was not on the portion within the district. Ms. Wood suggested they might request a variance. Counsel recommended outlining this process.

Counsel noted a process change on how the application will be reviewed. In the past, it states the Planning Board will review all development proposals. The current revised draft proposal moves some of this to staff.

Counsel noted that the revised definition of development has been scaled back. He suggests the Town include a definition of vegetable garden as a landscaping activity that does not disturb 100 sq. ft. and is not considered a development. Ms. Wood said the definition as it stands states that commercial agriculture would be a development, and a vegetable garden is not included in the definition of development. Counsel says that 616.6.3 is problematic where it states that "All development within the Watershed Protection Overlay District will be evaluated by the Planning Board..."

Over the next three paragraphs, Ms. Wood states that Counsel noted formatting changes and makes no other recommendations.

Chair LoChaitto opened the public hearing.

Ms. Kathleen DeFruscia of the Cobbet's Pond Improvement Association thanked the Board for their work on this much improved ordinance.

Chair LoChaitto agreed with Ms. Wood that the definition of "vegetable garden" is protected by the language of "commercial" and initiated discussion about 616.6.3. Ms. Wood suggested removing"

“...by the Planning Board...” from 616.6.3. This would transfer many minor requests to the staff who could then could transfer problematic ones to the Board. Ms. Post offered that this is not a substantive change and is consistent with 616.3.1, “The Planning Board shall have authority to create processes and procedures...”

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Breton made a motion to place Section 616 Cobbetts Pond Watershed Protection District on the March ballot as amended. Seconded by Ms. Post. Vote passed: 7-0

Section 706 Signs

Chair LoChiatto read the hearing notice into the minutes.

Modified definitions section. Added a provision stating that the Planning Board must review all free-standing signs. Added sections on prohibited signs and signs that do not require a permit. Added provisions regulating A-frame sandwich board signs, electronic “open” signs, and political signs. Clarified temporary sign regulations and proposed a maximum size requirement. Reworded Section 706.4.2.2 regarding wall signs on building facades. Reworded Section 706.5.4 to require all free-standing signs to include 8” high street numbers.

The proposed amendments to this ordinance represent several Planning Board workshops and a public hearing.

Ms. Wood read Ms. Scott’s memo which indicated that at the last meeting it seemed apparent that the intent of the Planning Board was to not regulate window signs at this time. Ms. Scott said that by removing all language about window signs that it was not exempting the regulation of them. Chair LoChiatto clarified that currently we do not have an ordinance regulating window signs. Ms. Post asked if we have no regulation allowing signs under what authority are we regulating them. How can we enforce an ordinance which is unworkable and restrictive? Discussion continued. Chair LoChiatto said that window signs are allowed without a permit as long as they comply with a couple of small requirements.

Ms. Post recalled that the Board had decided to remove 706.7.4, “Existing non conforming signs shall be removed or brought into compliance prior to granting of any site plan, subdivision approval, or change of use.” Chiatto was concerned that if 706.7.4 was removed, the Town would leave themselves open to a proliferation of electronic signs.

Ms. Wood reviewed Counsel’s suggestions. He cautioned the Town against prohibiting electronic leader board signs. Counsel noted that language regarding civic organizations and right-of-ways was moved to temporary signs for community organizations and non-profit. Counsel noted that this was not intended for temporary signs but for small signs; such as, Rotary or Kiwanis at the entrance to a town. He cautioned against logo signs which may need a variance for setbacks. Ms. Wood did not see this as an issue.

Chair LoChiatto inquired about the reference to electronic reader board signs. Was Counsel referring to temporary signs? Ms. Wood clarified that it fell under general signs not temporary signs.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. Al Letizio, Jr. stated he has an existing non-conforming sign with a small electronic reader board on his business property. According to 706.5.8 he will have to remove his sign. He has made efforts toward safety and aesthetics to reflect the character of the town. An all-out ban goes too far. He thinks Counsel's letter agrees with him on this point. Rather than an all-out ban of electronic reader board signs, he suggests the Town regulate the usage that fits in with the character of the community, is aesthetically pleasing, and conforms to public safety concerns. Mr. Letizio made some specific recommendations. About 80% of his sign usage is taken up by local organizations and public service announcements. He asks the Town to please regulate, but not prohibit.

Robert Wright asked the Board to define what a window is. He offered the scenario of a business which has no window signs yet has a large screen TV inside which advertises and can be seen clearly from the street.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Chair LoChiatto acknowledged Mr. Letizio, Jr's remarks regarding electronic reader boards and their regulations.

Mr. Richardson noted that 706.5.8 is a problematic section for businesses which had signs pre-existing the ordinance and would like to see this section of the ordinance stricken. Chair LoChiatto was on the Board at the time when that section was added to the ordinance. He stated that the reasoning was that reader boards would be difficult to partially regulate, so the Board decided not to allow them at all. Ms. Wood explained that the existing electronic reader board signs have received variances. So that if someone did want to do one, and this language is kept, they would have to go to the Zoning Board of Approval and prove the need for a variance. From there, the plan would have to be presented to the Planning Board for review. This has been done on a case by case basis.

Chair LoChiatto asked if Mr. Letizio would like to offer some assistance for language on electronic reader boards to be added to the sign ordinance.

Ms. Scott stated that if the Board would like to schedule a public hearing for this ordinance for December 22, then the language must be changed now so the public can be properly notified.

Ms. Scott said that if it is the Board's intent not to regulate window signs, then it must state that in the Ordinance.

Chair LoChiatto summarized the amendments to be made for the next hearing: Strike the entirety of 706.7.4 to reflect the Board's intention to not regulate window signs; strike 706.5.8. He asked Ms. Wood to make those changes plus any necessary language changes including Mr. Letizio's suggestions about reader board sizes and illumination levels. Once these changes are made, the hearing will be scheduled for 12/29.

Motion by Mr. Breton to move the proposed Ordinance to public hearing on 12/29 with the noted amendments. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 6-0

The Board recessed at 9:10 p.m. and returned at 9:15 p.m.

Section 604. Neighborhood Business District

Chair LoChiatto read the amendment into the record.

Amend 604.1 Uses Permitted to delete “parking areas or garages”, “signs”, “assembly and banquet halls”, “banks”, and “overnight parking”; add “museums”, “daycares”, and “preschools”; add section 604.2 Uses permitted without Site Plan Review to allow accessory apartment Ms. Scott noted that the Board’s packet included a memo from legal council, several letters from the public and one letter received tonight Letters were from Eliza Baldrige, Tom MacLain, Troy Heath Carla Ducas and some for the map changes which would not be on tonight’s agenda. This meeting will address language changes and limited map changes for the Commercial B district. In the Neighborhood Business District, Legal council pointed made the point that the Town is allowing accessory apartments. Ms. Scott clarified that accessory apartments are for existing, non-conforming homes which are only allowed in business district.. Ms. Scott read through the proposed changes: 604.1.2 clarifies language to be a consistent template language throughout; 604.1.3 makes language consistent and underscores there will be no “drive- throughs” allowed; deleting 604.1.4 parking areas and garages as they are accessory uses; deleting 604.1.6 signs as a duplicate and accessory use; deleting 604.1.7 assembly halls, banquet halls and renaming nursery schools to daycares; deleting 604.1.9 overnight parking; adding the section 604.2 Uses Permitted which do not need site plan review; allowing overnight parking at existing residential property of a commercial vehicle company truck that is used by the homeowner for their occupation. Council noted a numbering error at the very end of the Business District section. It reads 709 and should read 704.4.5.1.

Chair LoChiatto asked Ms. Scott to further clarify accessory apartment use. Ms. Scott explained that currently there are several homes in the Neighborhood Business District that would need a variance in order to allow an accessory apartment; the proposed language would allow this by right.

Chair LoChiatto opened the hearing to the public.

Patrick Poore commented that definitions in Section 200 are sadly lacking and affect all recommended amendments throughout all the areas of tonight’s discussion. Mr. Poore commented that there are five definitions that he feels are lacking in the proposed ordinance changes. They are definitions for:

- 1 wholesale distribution center
- 2 warehouse facility
- 3 manufacturing
- 4 business services
- 5 retail and wholesale establishments

Mr. Poore felt that no changes to the proposed zoning should be considered until definitions are put in place; specifically for 605.1; 605.2; 605.3; 606; 612; and 614. Should the Town move forward without

creating clear definition, it could leave itself open to numerous legal cases. Many of these changes go against the long-standing Master Plan.

John McStravock would like to consider the proposed changes to the Zoning map tonight. He wondered how the Board could consider definitions this week and the map next week when it's unclear to them and the public what the map references are. He recommended a collective discussion about everything in one meeting. Ms. Scott explained that the reason these items were scheduled for different nights was simply the timing of the Planning Board deciding when they were going to move them to Public Hearing. The Board decided to move forward on the zoning language amendments a week before they decided on addressed the zoning map changes.

Ms. Kathleen DiFruscia agreed with Mr. McStravock and asked whether the Board had time to reschedule the discussions on these language changes so they can be done at the same time as the map discussions.

Ms DiFruscia felt there was confusion about the definition of 1 commercial vehicle and where exactly on the map this is allowed. She also wanted to know who the "we" was that Ms. Scott referred to as making these changes and if there were minutes available to refer to assess the basis for the changes. Ms. Scott explained the "outdoor commercial vehicle" is weight limited (26,000 GVW and 2 or less axles). The group that worked on the non-residential proposed changes was not a subcommittee of the Planning Board; so it was not subject to the "Right to Know Law." The group was composed of Bruce Richardson and Sy Wrenn from the Planning Board, Ralph Valentine and Jay Yennaco from the Windham Economic Development Committee, as well as Ms. Scott. The file and all the documents are public and have been available at the Community Development Department. The work that was done by this group was presented to the Planning Board at public meetings and is reflected in their minutes.

Ms. DeFruscia asked if the map changes and zoning changes could be looked at together. Ms. Scott explained that that could be done if the Planning Board postponed all the discussion tonight for next week. Each agenda item would need to be opened, a motion made to continue, and then closed.

Mr. Poore recommended that the Board postpone tonight's discussion until the map and definitions are together in one seating. That would help the voters make an informed decision about some very important items.

Chair LoChiatto expressed concern for the various speakers' points of view. He said that every year no one comes to the workshops but jumps on the Board in the eleventh hour at the Public Hearings. He thinks there could be something accomplished tonight. Ms. Scott suggested looking at the proposed language changes for Districts for which there were no map changes scheduled for the next week.

Mr. Poore again emphasized that without the definitions in place nothing should move forward. He considered it would be disingenuous and that a full public disclosure should be made to the public. He said it is not the right thing to do in such a vast and undefined way. Ms. Scott explained the process for amending definitions, publishing them, and then reconsidering them at another meeting.

David Riese read 2 letters from the public which were included in the public file. Both letters cautioned the re-zoning of some portions of town land to Commercial status. Mr. Riese also wants clearer definitions. Ms. Scott placed the letters into the file.

Patrick Nyston asked if there were any zones that would not be impacted by definitions and the map with which the Board and the public could proceed forward this evening. Ms. Scott listed the zones that she felt could be worked on tonight because there were no map changes proposed for those specific districts.

Mr. Poore emphasized the need for definitions.

Chair LoChiatto polled the Board and offered the following districts as ones that could be worked at this meeting: PBT, Gateway, Commercial B, Rural and Village Center District.

Carol Pynn asked about taking into consideration the current Public Survey. Ms. Scott explained it is not the Planning Board but the Economic Development Committee that is doing the survey with the results expected by mid-January. Miss Pynn does not understand the big rush. PBT to Commercial has been voted down in the past. Ms. Pynn wants to be assured that historical buildings are being protected. Ms. Scott emphasized that there were no recommended changes to the design guidelines or standards.

Mr. McStravoch asked who had input into tonight's agenda. Ms. Scott explained that in April the Planning Board divided up the list of items to be looked at for Town Meeting. Each Planning Board member was assigned to work with staff on the different proposed changes. For these particular changes being discussed tonight the Planning Board members were Bruce Richardson and Sy Wrenn from the Planning Board and Ralph Valentine and Jay Yenacco from the Economic Development Committee. Mr. McStravoch would like input from the Survey, the public, and the Boards and Committees to coordinate these changes.

Ginny Campiolla explained Canobie Lake has many districts in its watershed; PBT, Gateway, and Rural. Ms. Campiolla would like to look at the entire map and its recommended changes and definitions which might affect the water quality of the Lake. Mr. Richardson explained that the process is to make suggestions and ask for in-put, and hopes the rest of the meeting will allow for movement forward with specific recommendations.

Mr. Riece suggested that traffic patterns should be a consideration, and that road layover with exit placements should also be considered before the next meeting.

John Carpenter thinks the Planning Board should look at the Economic Development Committee Survey results before making final decisions.

Ms. DiFruscia, referring to Neighborhood Business District, explained that we need a vision with regulations, not just guidelines, that defines architectural design, size, and material use. Ms. Scott explained that the Planning Board had expressed an interest in developing more specific design guidelines so she had this item in the Department 2011 budget, but Selectman cut it out. She will still attempt to find funding for this.

Ms. Scott focused Board's attention to the recommended language changes in Neighborhood Business District that could be done without touching on the concerns brought up by members of the public tonight. These Items include: Definitions, The Economic Development Committee Survey, Design guidelines, Traffic patterns and exit placement, and rezoning.

Mr. Dubay agrees with the proposed Neighborhood Business District changes as outlined by Ms. Scott.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Ms. Post made a motion to reopen the public hearing. Seconded by Ms. St. Laurent. Motion carried: 7-0.

William Shroeder asked about 604.2.2 and the intention of the article. Ms. Scott explained that this refers to a residential house which happens to be located in a Neighborhood Business District and the homeowner has a commercial vehicle that is used for work and would like to be able to park it in their driveway overnight.

Ms. St. Laurent suggested removing 26,000 G.V.W. and simply referring to a vehicle having no more than two axles.

Chair LoChiatto reviewed the recommended amendments in 604: edit the language in 604.1.2 and 604.1.7; delete 604.1.4, 604.1.6, 604.1.9, and renumber 604.2.2 with the removal of the phrase "26,000 G.V.W." and an additional language change to read "no more than two axles."

Ms. Post made a motion to move the proposed amendments to the Neighborhood Business District to a second public hearing on 12/22. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0.

Mr. Breton made a motion to wave the by-laws to hear new business after 10 p.m. Seconded by Ms. St. Laurent. Motion passed: 6-1 with Mr. Richardson opposed.

Section 602. Rural District

Amend the purpose section of the Rural District to reference the allowed uses and amend Section 602.1 to allow the outdoor overnight parking of one commercial vehicle and one unregistered motor vehicle.

Ms. Scott read the amendment into the minutes.

Mr. Breton made a motion to open the amendments to Section 602 to Public Hearing. Seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed: 7-0

Ms. Scott suggested accepting amendment changes to 602 that reference "no more than two (2) axles."

Mr. McStravoch cautioned that the change of language and removal of "26,000 G.V.W." would continue to confuse voters.

Ralph Valentine explained why 26,000 G.V.W. was accepted. This weight class would allow a Verizon employee who uses his truck for work daily to park it on his property. The ballot, however, does not allow us to use this specific language which would offer a very clear example to voters.

Chair LoChiatto explained there will be a motion to reconsider the “26,000 G.W.V. and the two axle” language at some further point.

Mr. Shroeder asked what the difference between limited commercial and noncommercial is in the purpose section. Ms. Scott explained that because Commercial uses are currently allowed in the Rural District, the language that states “Rural District is for Rural, Residential, and Non-Commercial” was not accurate. “Limited Commercial” is a more accurate and honest purpose statement. Mr. Shroeder asked what is permitted under 602.1. Chair LoChiatto listed them. Mr. Shroeder offered that some of the list does not sound very rural, and we should reconsider them.

Chair LoChiatto recapped the amendments: Change the language to say “limited commercial” to be more consistent with what is already allowed under 601 and 602 and to allow the overnight parking of a vehicle weighing 26,000 G.V.W. and no more than 2 axles.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson made a motion to move Section 602 to Town Meeting with noted amendments. Seconded by Mr. Breton. Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. Post made a motion to reconsider the previous motion regarding Neighborhood Business District changes. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Ms. Post asked that we restore the language “26,000 G.W.V. and no more than 2 axles.”

Chair LoChiatto asked the Board to reconsider the other motions within 604: 604.1.3, 604.1.4, 604.1.6, 604.1.7, 604.1.9, and 604.2.2.

Ms. Post made a motion to accept the amendments to 604 as noted. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Ms. Skinner made a motion to open for public hearing 605.1 Business Commercial A District Uses Permitted. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passes: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Ms. Skinner made a motion to continue 605.1 1 Business Commercial A District Uses Permitted to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Ms. Skinner made a motion to open for public hearing 605.2 Business Commercial B District and Zoning Map. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.
Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson made a motion to continue 605.2 Business Commercial B District and Zoning Map to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0

Mr. Hersch made a motion to open for public hearing 605.3 Gateway Commercial District. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.
Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Richardson made a motion to continue 605.3 Gateway Commercial District to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0

Mr. Hersch made a motion to open for public hearing 606 Limited Industrial District. Seconded by Ms. St. Laurent. Motion passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.
Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hersch made a motion to continue 606 Limited Industrial District to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Ms. St. Laurent. Motion passed: 7-0

Mr. Hersch made a motion to open for public hearing 614 Professional, Business, and Technology District. Seconded by Mr. Breton. Motion Passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened discussion to the public.
Chair LoChiatto closed discussion to the public

Mr. Breton made a motion to continue 614 Professional, Business, and Technology to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Hirsch. Motion passed: 7-0

Mr. Breton made a motion to open 612 Village Center District to Public Hearing. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.
Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Breton made a motion to continue 612 Village Center District to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed 7-0

Mr. Breton made a motion to open for public hearing Section 200 Definitions to Public Hearing. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0

Chair LoChiatto opened the public hearing.

Chair LoChiatto closed the public hearing.

Mr. Breton made a motion to continue Section 200 Definitions to the 12/15 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Hersch. Motion passed: 7-0

Rockingham Planning Commission Appointment

Ms. Skinner made a recommendation to the Board of Selectman that they appoint Mr. Griffin to fulfill the remaining term of Ms. Stoller, who has resigned her position on the Rockingham Planning Commission. Seconded by Mr. Richardson. Motion passed: 7-0

Mr. Richardson made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed: 7-0

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Submitted
Mimi Kolodziej