



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
December 14, 2011

Roll Call:

Ruth-Ellen Post, Chairwoman-Excused	Ross McLeod, Selectman Member, Excused
Margaret Crisler, Vice-Chair-Present	Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate, Present
Pam Skinner, Member-Present	Lee Maloney, Alternate- Present
Carolyn Webber, Member-Present	Vanessa Nysten, Alternate-Present
Jonathan Sycamore, Member-Present	Sy Wrenn, Alternate-Present
Kristi St. Laurent, Member-Seated at 10:02 pm	

Staff:

Laura Scott, Director of Community Development
Elizabeth Wood, Town Planner
Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance:

Vice-Chair Crisler called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. followed by attendance and the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Wrenn was appointed to sit for Ms. St. Laurent and Ms. Nysten to sit for Chairwoman Post.

Public Hearing - 2012 Town Meeting Zoning Amendments:

Purpose Sections for Gateway Commercial District (Section 605.3.1), Limited Industrial District (Section 606), and Professional, Business and Technology District (Section 614.1).

- Delete the list of purposes in the Gateway Commercial District (Section 605.3.1) and replace it with (1) Provide for an area of commercial development, including mixed use of retail, service, and professional offices, all of which are designed to reflect its proximity to the I-93 interchange, (2) Ensure that the entrance of the Town reflects and/or compliments the architectural style of New England, maintains the historical character of Windham, and will be of architectural merit, and (3) Minimize sprawl, promote pedestrian-friendly design and maintain efficient traffic circulation and safety.
- Amend the Limited Industrial District (Section 606) Purpose to be “The Limited Industrial District is intended for uses, such as research laboratories, office buildings and light manufacturing industries where such uses are compatible and transitional with neighboring uses.”
- Delete the Professional, Business and Technology District (Section 614.1) Purpose and replace it with “This District is intended to function as an employment center for Windham and surrounding communities featuring business and professional offices, research and development facilities, light industry and complementary educational uses. The District is intended to be compatible and transitional with the neighboring uses.”

Ms. Skinner read the Purpose Sections for the Gateway Commercial District (Section 605.3.1), Limited Industrial District (Section 606), and the Professional, Business and Technology District (Section 614.1) into the record.'

Ms. Scott explained that this is the second Public Hearing on the Purpose Sections. Edits have been made according to the Board's wishes.

Board comments/questions included:

- Confusion was expressed about reformatting edits and changes to the Gateway Purpose section; Ms. Scott explained that these edits are two separate edits that are independent of each other;
- The Board may decide how to cluster the Warrant Articles for the ballot;
- The possibility of having more than one (1) Gateway District was brought up; Ms. Scott explained that, for the purpose of the Gateway District, only the I-93 Interchange was considered. To consider other Gateway Districts, a map change would be needed, and it is late in the year. This suggestion will be added to next year's workshop topics;
- Why was the last sentence was crossed out, Ms. Scott explained that because it did not relate to the new Design Regulations, but to the Performance Standards addressed in the Zoning Ordinance for this District, it was deleted.

Vice-Chair Crisler opened the Hearing to the Public. Hearing none, she closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed amendments to the Purpose Sections; Section 605.3.1, Section 606, and Section 614.1. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Building Code Board of Appeals.

As is authorized under NH RSA 673:1(V), the Zoning Board of Adjustment is to act as the Building Code Board of Appeals.

Ms. Skinner read the Building Code of Appeals amendment into the record.

Ms. Scott reviewed the history of the Board never having established a Building Code Board of Appeal. Two weeks ago, the Planning Board had decided to propose that the Zoning Board perform this function and not create another Board. Additionally, Attorney Campbell, in his memo, suggested combining the three (3) separate Building Code Hearing items into one question for the ballot. In order to do this, the Board needs to hold a formality hearing to combine them into one question. Ms. Scott recommends this and would post the Hearing Notice for the meeting of the Board on the 28th.

Board comments/questions included:

- A question about what "local modifications" means and have they been implemented. "Local modifications" means the amendments to the Building Code.

Vice-Chair Crisler opened the Hearing to the Public.

Ms. Nancy Pendergast, 35 Sharon Road, asked where she could find the amendments to the Building Code. Does it appear in zoning? Ms. Scott explained that it would not appear in Zoning, but it does go through the same process as a Planning Board Warrant Article. If approved, it will be come part of the Zoning Board processes.

Vice-Chair Crisler closed the Hearing to the Public.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed amendments to the Purpose Section for the Limited Industrial District (Section 606) and to hold another Public Hearing for the purpose of combining the three (3) Building Code items as one question on the ballot. Ms. Webber seconded.

- Ms. Nysten asked if Attorney Campbell will review these changes for correctness, before it goes to Town Meeting, or will it be staff; Ms. Scott explained that Attorney Campbell will work with staff on the ballot questions and will review any substantive changes, but staff will address any minor ones.

Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to reconsider the earlier motion to move to Town Warrant the Purpose Sections. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed rewording to the Purpose Section for the Gateway Commercial District (Section 605.3.1). Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed rewording of the Limited Industrial District (Section 606). Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. DiFruscial motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed rewording to the Professional, Business and Technology District (Section 614.1). Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Reformatting Commercial B & Gateway Commercial Districts.

Move/renumber the Commercial B District from Section 605 and Section 605.2 to Section 617;
Move/renumber Gateway Commercial District from Section 605 and Section 605.3 to Section 618;
Include the provisions from Section 605.4 into both the moved/reformatted Commercial B District Section 617 and Gateway Commercial District Section 618.

Ms. Skinner read the Reformatting of the Commercial B & Gateway Districts into the Record.

Ms. Scott explained that this reformatting does not include the proposed amendments to the Gateway Commercial District Purpose Section. She did not want to presume that if the Purpose Section was declined, so would the Reformatting be declined. The purpose is to clean up the Ordinance for clarity. This amendment re-words and rennumbers two sections and takes the

provision from Section 605.4 and adds it to the two re-numbered sections. The Board may choose to make this one question along with the revised purpose section to help eliminate confusion for the Voters.

Vice-Chair Crisler opened the Hearing to the Public. Hearing none, she closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Webber motioned to move to Town Warrant the proposed reformatting to the Commercial B & Gateway Commercial Districts. Seconded by Ms. DiFruscia. Motion passed: 7-0.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to combine the reformatting of and the proposed amendments to the Gateway Commercial District Purpose Section for the Warrant Article and to post them to Public Hearing. Mr. Wrenn Seconded. Motion passed: 7-0.

2012 Town Meeting Zoning Amendment Workshops:

Workforce Housing

Vice-Chair Crisler reviewed the changes made to the Sub-committee's previous proposed Ordinance, noting that much of the new language of the Purpose Section came from the Amherst, NH's WFH Ordinance.

Board comments/questions included:

- There was concern expressed that on page 6 of the report, in Section 617.7.4.1.1, the language is unclear whether proposed dwellings on "new and private" roads need to adhere to the required frontage setbacks that existing dwellings adhere to.

Ms. Nancy Pendergast noted that at the previous Sunday's sub-committee's meeting this concern was addressed. The intent of the language and layout of the projects was to use the underlying District as far as the frontage, setbacks, and yard requirements; and to allow development internally. She quoted Section 617.7.4.1 and noted the intent of that was to allow the developer to develop their tract and project and to build within their area to create a feeling that each building has its own yard. The intent was to allow the developer to utilize their land as is best for their development.

- Mr. Wrenn clarified that the sub-committee's intent was to keep the required District frontage setback on existing roads and allow the developer the ability to veer from that internally within the new development;
- Vice-Chair Crisler stated that her understanding was that the sub-committee had decided that the only way a project would not adhere to the required setbacks and frontages in Rural was to have an Open Space development;
- Ms. Scott explained that a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), which is under Planning Board control, allows for relief from any section of zoning, for the most part. The developer could ask for a CUP to allow for more than one building per lot, which would allow for the internal layout and the meeting of existing street dimensions. A variance would be needed only when a CUP is not allowed. If the Developer does not ask for a CUP, then all requirements apply; they have to meet the underlying District zoning. It is up to the Board to control this Permit;
- Ms. Nysten does not read it that way. She claimed the language does not take into consideration that new and private roads need to meet dimensional requirements.

Ms. Pendergarst noted that the intent of the Ordinance is to put control at the Board level. The developer's biggest concern that prevents WFH is density. This allows the developers to have density and the Board to have control of how the development looks.

Ms. St. Laurent arrived at 7:56 p.m.

- Ms. DiFruscia finds the new language in 617.1 Purpose Section apologetic and thinks it should be very simple; the Town is doing this because it is required by the State. She would like to go back to the previous wording; **The Board agreed to keep the language from the 2011 proposed amendment;**
- Ms. DiFruscia thinks the reference to "density bonus" in the Inclusionary Bonus definition may not be well understood by the voter; **The Board decided to delete the definition of Inclusionary Zoning;**
- Mr. Sycamore noticed a sentence in 617.5.1 that is typed again and numbered as Section 617.5.2.1; Ms. Scott noted that each sentence is needed because one is under the Conceptual Section and the other is under the Design Review Section; **she will fix the numbering; as there are two 617.5.2.1's;**
- Section 617.5.2.4 makes a reference to variances that are addressed in the following Section 617.5.2.5; **the phrase "and variances needed" will be deleted;**
- Ms. Nysten asked that the Ordinance include the lot sizing standards for WFH and not just reference Appendix A-1 and the RSA so as to be less disjointed and confusing; **The Board decided it is sufficient to reference the Table in Appendix A-1.**

Ms. Scott highlighted the changes to the proposed WFH Ordinance that the Board had just discussed:

- 1. Keep the previous Purpose Section 617.1;**
- 2. Delete the definition of Inclusionary Zoning;**
- 3. In Section 617.5.2.4, delete the phrase "and variances needed;"**
- 4. Fix the numbering of 617.5.2.1;**
- 5. Add the words 'and private' after the word public in 617.7.4.1.1.**

Mr. Pat Nysten of 4 Edgewood Road asked if the Board's intent is to place single and multi family dwellings in the Rural District on individual lots. He thinks it is unclear in the Ordinance and suggested changing Section 617.3.3 to read: "Dwelling types allowed in the Rural District are limited to one single family detached or one duplex per lot, unless otherwise permitted by Conditional Use Permit."

- Ms. Scott asked the Board, if the minimum lot size is five acres for WFH, why is the Board considering soil based lot sizing. Is this not a conflict?

Mr. Phil Lochiatto, 5 Faith Rd, is confused with the 5 acre minimum; 1 unit per lot; and the State's soil-requirement. If the intent is to encourage WFH in the Rural District, then it becomes WFH becomes economically unfeasible unless the Ordinance allow more than 1 duplex on a 5 acre lot. Mr. LoChiatto recommended allowing condominium form of ownership in the Rural Zone.

Vice-Chair Crisler clarified that this was for the initial parcel size, not the lot size. A minimum of 5 acres is required for a WFH project.

Ms. Pendergast thinks people and the Board are mixing land ownership and development.

Mr. Nysten thinks that even a minimum 5 acre lot can tap into acreage for soils/density and can potentially get 2-4 buildings on 5 acres, if it meets dimensional requirements. Five acres is roughly 200,000+ sq ft. The State matrix for soils is 30,000 sq ft/lot. If a developer can get 2 units per 30,000 to 40,000 sq ft, he has a reasonable density on 5 acres.

Mr. Peter Zohdi, Herbert Engineering, agreed with Mr. Sycamore when he stated WFH would be creating a village with its own District. The proposed Ordinance cannot be done, unless it is a condominium form of ownership. The Board should look at the Residential C District which allows 20 ft between units, not the 30 ft required in Rural. Why does the Board worry about the cost of construction? The Ordinance is making it more difficult for the Board. Let the building business rest with the Building Department and others. Mr. Zohdi explained that the WFH units will be condominiums regardless of what zone they are in. He agrees that the setbacks should be from abutting lots. If the dwelling is in Rural, the side and rear lot lines should be 30 ft and 50 ft from the front. The Board should read its Open Space subdivision requirements; the setbacks are specified. Section 617.5.2.5, takes it out of the jurisdiction of the Planning Board and places it with ZBA. He recommends Planning Board approval and support before going to ZBA.

- Attorney Campbell was clear that the Board cannot accept an application that does not have a variance. **The decision was to move Section 617.5.2.5 from the Design Review heading to be under the Final Application heading and to replace the phrase “and variances needed” back into Section 617.5.2.4.**

Mr. Zohdi continued: Section 617.5.3.6-does the Board want to be involved in assessing construction costs. Ms. Scott answered that there is already a requirement for a Fiscal Impact study. Section 617.5.3.8 –Ms. Scott noted that the applicant may not be the developer or the seller or the builder. Ms. Scott said the Board had always envisioned that the development would be a condominium with homeowners association, rarely a stand alone, fee simple dwelling. Vice-Chair Crisler explained that the Board was concerned that management would fall on the taxpayer; although, the Board did not know how it would be done.

Ms. Pendergast stated there is a section in a publication called, “Meeting the Work Force Housing Challenge” that addresses affordability. The Town might utilize much of the language. She suggested the Board and Legal review the language.

- Ms. DiFruscia suggested that the cost associated with the ongoing monitoring could be placed in the deed restrictions. The affordability would also be placed in the deed. The cost would be between the buyer and the seller.

Mr. Karl Dubay of The Dubay Group informed the Board that the Work Force Housing Workbook has a section on 3rd party monitoring with different models. Its intent is to be a reference document.

Mr. Zohdi explained that usually when about 75% of the units are sold, the developer in charge hands off the responsibility to the Association. Whomver is in charge pays for it.

- Ms. DiFruscia suggested changing Section 617.5.3.8 to reference the 3rd party monitoring language in the WFH Workbook.

Mr. LoChiatto noted that with an owned unit, as opposed to a rental unit, the monitoring is relatively easy.

Ms. Pendergast suggested a language change of Section 617.5.3.8 that the Board agreed with: **“Ongoing responsibility for monitoring the compliance with resale and rental restrictions on workforce housing units shall be the responsibility of a 3rd party as referenced in the June, 2010 publication, “Meeting the Workforce Housing Challenge-a Guidebook for New Hampshire.”**

Mr. Nysten noted that opening up multi-family throughout the Town by eliminating lot lines, creates exponential density. If WFH development is solely governed by soils, there could be a 500% density throughout the Town. How will this impact the tax base and infrastructure? He cautioned the Board about removing lot lines in the Rural District which is most of Windham. The Board would be opening up the Town to dense villages. He supports a responsible WFH Ordinance.

- Ms DiFruscia asked Mr. Nysten if the language changes he recommended to 617.3.3 satisfied his concerns. He stated, if the changes were accepted, he would be satisfied.

Ms. Scott addressed 2 questions Mr. Nysten had raised:

1. Multi-family is 5 units in one structure, not multiple buildings on a lot;
2. The Village Center District has no set back requirements except 50 ft from route 111.

Mr. Nysten said if the Town eliminates lot lines, the Town is essentially allowing projects in Town to have exponential density. The Rural District comprises the vast majority of our Town. Allowing projects by Conditional Use Permit, maybe even limiting it on a per year basis, or some governing factor, is very much needed.

Mr. Dubay thinks that Section 617.7.4.1.3 should go back to 20 ft separation for single family dwellings to create an ambiance.

Mr. Zohdi noted that the Zoning for Residence C is 20 ft, and Windham Meadows II, and 80 Mammoth Rd. are a minimum of 20 ft separation.

Mr. LoChiatto suggested deleting Section 617.7.4.1.3, because it is governed by Fire Code and is redundant.

- Ms. DiFruscia asked what the Fire Code is on multi-family units; Mr. Dubay said it depends on the construction type and the cisterns.

Ms. Scott said the language in this Section was determined by Fire Code minimums. She offered that the wording could be deleted and the Board could defer to Fire Code through the Technical Review Committee.

- Vice-Chair Crisler recommended leaving the language in, have staff check with the Fire Department, and, if need be, take it out at the Public Hearing. **Mr. Wrenn suggested, and the Board agreed, to change Section 617.7.4.1.3 to read 20 ft separation between single family units.**

Mr. Zohdi, referring to Section 617.7.4, noted on a wall map that, although most of the Town is zoned Rural, what’s left undeveloped is on State roads. He suggested leaving lot lines alone. Stay with Zoning, and the Board has the right to approve or deny.

Mr. Dubay said that there will never be WFH in the Village Center District; Residential B & C are already developed; so the Board is only really talking about Rural. He claimed that WFH/Inclusionary housing

makes sense to locate on State controlled roads. Also, placing a 4 unit residential building behind a Commercial building is a good idea, but difficult to put into writing.

Mr. LoChiatto questioned how the Town would enforce Section 617.7.4.1.1 when it is a “private road? How is the Town going to enforce zoning frontage on a private lot? Referring to Section 617.7.5.2, he cautioned the Board about using the phrase “Complete floor plans.” Should the owner want a different floor plan, the developer would have to return to the Board for approval. Using the words “Representative floor plans,” would avoid that. The number of bedrooms would be spelled out by septic loading. He underscored not having individual lots on the 5 acres.

Ms. Scott noted the Hearing Notice will be posted Friday, and the next Hearing will be December 28.

Vice-Chair Crisler closed the Hearing to the Public and called a recess with the Board reconvening at 10:02 pm. At that time, the Board decided to address the multi-zone lots for those who were present.

Ms. St. Laurent was seated at 10:02 p.m.

Multi-Zoned Parcels:

Ms. Wood explained that this is the 5th workshop and went through a brief history of the effort to clarify and clean-up the 96 multi-zoned parcels.

Lot #21-D-107 (4 Cobbetts Pond Rd) (CDA, NBD, & RDA; recommendation to zone NBD)

- This zone is already developed commercially with restaurants which might have regulation difficulties if the zoning changes;
- The owner asks to leave it zoned as it is;
- Bank financing is for Commercially zoned land;

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to leave the zoning of Lot 21-D-107 (4 Cobbetts Pond Rd) as it is currently zoned - CDA, NBD, and RDA. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

Lot #21-U-202AH (6 Pine Brook Road) (RDA & RD; recommendation to zone RDA)

- The owner, Mr. John Osborne, would like to keep the zoning as it is;
- He does not like change; He is interested in possibly purchasing part of the lot behind him, which is for sale to keep as it is.

Lot #21-U-202E (5 Pine Brook Road) (RDA & RD) recommendations to zone RDA)

- Mr. Rich Ward, owner, would like to keep it zoned as it is.
- He likes wildlife and does not want to see development.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to leave the zoning of Lots #21-U-202A (31 Ministerial Rd); #21-U-202E (5 Pine Brook Road) and #21-U-202H (6 Pine Brook Road) as they are currently zoned – RDA and RD. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.

The Board was polled and agreed to leave the rest of the lots presented by Ms. Wood at this meeting as they are currently zoned and reconsider them in the new year. Ms. Nysten expressed concern about parcels that have already been addressed.

Ms. Scott expressed concern about the recent Kennels Hearing Notice, and asked if the Hearing Notice for December 21 was correct. The Board noted that the previous Hearing Notice may have been confusing to the Public and may need to be re-Noticed. Ms. Scott asked if the Board could make

whatever changes need to be made at the next week's meeting and re-notice it for the second hearing on January 4; It was technically properly posted

The Board reviewed the various amendments agreed to in the Work Force Housing portion of the meeting for a finalizing motion:

- Purpose Section – revert to and keep last year's language;
- Section 617.3.3 will read "Dwelling types allowed in the Rural District are limited to one single family detached or one duplex per lot, unless otherwise permitted by the Conditional Use Permit;"
- Delete the definition of Inclusionary Zoning;
- Move Section 617.7.5.2.5 to be placed under the Final Application heading;
- Fix the numbering of the two Sections 617.5.2.1;
- Section 617.5.3.6 – Delete all the words in the last sentence after the word "fiscal" and replace them with the word "analysis."
- Section 617.5.3.8 – Shall read: "The responsibility for monitoring the compliance with resale and rental restrictions on workforce housing units shall be the responsibility of a 3rd party as referenced in "The New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority" June, 2010 publication or as may be amended –*Meeting the Workforce Housing Challenge – A Guidebook for New Hampshire Municipalities*.
- Section 617.5.3.7 – Delete the word "applicant" and change the first sentence to read: "Assurance of continued affordability shall be provided for at least 30 years...;"
- Delete the term "Mixed income development" and, wherever it is used, replace it with "Work force housing development."
- Section 617.7.4.1.1 – After the word "public" add the term, "and private;"
- Section 617.7.5.2 – Replace the word "Complete" with the word "Representative;"
- Section 617.7.4.1.3 – Return to 20 ft the minimal horizontal separation; with Ms. Scott to check with the Fire Department and get comments for the Public Hearing;

Ms. Webber motioned to move to Public Hearing the proposed Work Force Housing Ordinance with the above bulleted amendments. Seconded by Ms. DiFruscia. Motion passed: 7-0.

Financial Guarantee Release:

Financial Guarantee Release - Spruce Pond – Phase I:

Project Name: Spruce Pond I Subdivision ((3-B-600)
Location: Duston Road – Station 0+00 to 24+00
Northland Road – Station 0+00 to 38+00

Engineer: Benchmark Engineering
Owner: H& B Homes
Letter of Credit – Duston Road - \$13,000
Northland Road - \$17,000

Release amount requested: Full amount: \$30,000

Ms. Scott summarized:

- There have been multiple, partial releases over the years;
- A year ago the Town established a one-year maintenance bond, which is being asked to be released;
- Keach-Nordstrom, Attorney Campbell, and Jack McCartney have signed off on it;

- Catch basins will be cleaned out by April 15, 2012;
- There is a deed with a Declaration of Open Space. Originally, there was to be a homeowners' association, which was never created. So, the Open Space was divided between the homeowners, each receiving and being taxed on 1/48th ownership of the Open Space.
- The declaration will be changed.

Ms. Webber motioned to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that the Town accept Northland Road (Station 0+00 to 38+00) and Duston Road (Station 0+00 to 24+00) as Town roads and that the Letters of Credit totaling \$30,000 be released. Seconded by Ms. Skinner. Motion passed: 6-0-1. Ms. DiFruscia, as a Selectman, abstained.

Financial Guarantee Release - Common Man Landscaping:

Project name: Common Man Landscaping Site Plan
 Location: 86 Range Rd (17-G-26 and 17-G-40)

Engineer: MHF Engineering
 Owner: Mr. Alex Ray
 Performance Bond: \$4,500

Ms Scott summarized:

- The Board has been holding \$4,500 since 2008 for the completion of landscaping;
- The Board has a letter from Mr. Alex Ray;
- The Mr. Ray and Delahunty's nursery has modified and improved the landscaping;
- Delahunty's has completed the landscaping.

Ms. Webber motioned to recommend to the Board of Selectman that they release the current \$4,500 performance guarantee as the landscaping has been completed. Seconded by Mr. Sycamore. Motion passed: 6-0-1. Ms. DiFruscia abstained.

Meeting Minutes – Review & Approve

October 26, 2011

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to approve the minutes of October 26, 2011, as amended. Ms. Webber seconded. Motion passed: 6-0-1. Vice-Chair Crisler abstained.

November 2, 2011

Ms. Webber motioned to approve the minutes of November 2, 2011, as amended. Mr. Sycamore seconded. Motion passed: 5-0-2. Ms. Skinner and Ms. DiFruscia abstained.

Miscellaneous Items

2012 Board Meeting Schedule

- Ms. Scott reviewed the 2012 calendar and added no new meetings.

Member Binder Update – Tab #16

Community Development Director November Staff Report

Old/New Business

- The Board was asked to read the Residential C zone and consider the number of multi-zoned parcels that were re-zoned Res C which allows manufactured homes;
- Citizens Petitions: Have received 4 to date
- Kennels, sheds, and multi-zoned on future agendas

Adjournment

Ms. Webber motioned to adjourn. Ms. St. Laurent seconded. Motion passed: 7-0. .

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Mimi Kolodziej.