



*OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS*  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

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

**Planning Board Minutes**  
**January 4, 2012**

**Roll Call:**

Ruth-Ellen Post, Chairwoman-Present	Ross McLeod, Selectman Member, Present
Margaret Crisler, Vice-Chair-Excused	Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate, Present
Pam Skinner, Member-Excused	Lee Maloney, Alternate- Present
Carolyn Webber, Member-Present	Vanessa Nysten, Alternate-Present
Jonathan Sycamore, Member-Present	Sy Wrenn, Alternate-Arrived 7:06 pm
Kristi St. Laurent, Member-Seated 7:21 pm	

**Staff:**

Laura Scott, Director of Community Development  
Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant

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

Chairwoman Post called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm followed by the attendance and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Nysten was appointed to sit for Ms. Skinner. Mr. Wrenn arrived at 7:06 pm and was appointed to sit for Vice Chair Crisler.

**Public Hearing –Citizen Petitions 2012 Town Meeting Zoning Amendments**

Citizen's Petition #1: To amend Section 616.6.2 of the Cobbetts Pond Watershed Protection Ordinance to state that for applications that have received NH DES Shoreland approval are not required to have outside engineering review of an erosion and sedimentation control plan prepared by an engineer licensed in the State of New Hampshire or a qualified professional familiar with erosion control measures and acceptable to the Town Engineer.

Ms. Webber read Petition #1 into the record and recused herself.

**Mr. Sycamore motioned to open the Public Hearing and was seconded by Mr. McLeod. Motion passed: 5-0.**

Mr. Maynard of Benchmark Engineering is requesting the Board to change the regulation which requires an additional level of costly review of a plan that has already paid for review at the State level, and been reviewed by the TRC and then has come back to the Planning Board for major review. He is only looking for the change for projects that have been reviewed by a State agency; Shoreline plans within 250 ft of the pond, specifically.

Board comments/questions included:

- Mr. McLeod asked if the NH DES Shoreland approval requires an erosion and sedimentation control plan? Mr Maynard said that according to their application, it does.

- Does the State review cover 100% what the Town is looking to review in their process? Mr. Maynard says that it does when he presents the application. They have, on occasion, sent his plans back, because he has forgotten something.
- Ms. DiFruscia noted that when she and a committee were working on this Town Ordinance, the NH DES encouraged the Town to include this section, because they no longer actually review the plans themselves. Sometimes the applicant does not have a plan in place when they apply for the permit. The DES often does not know this until there is a violation reported. Mr Chapman of the NH DES Watershed Management Bureau emphasized that Shoreland is not reviewing erosion and sedimentation control. Also, DES told her there is no redundancy of review. Mr. Maynard said that, in his experience, it is an additional step for those who are trying to redevelop; they lose about a month's time.
- Mr. Derek Munson was surprised that DES sends back permits that need erosion control. He said the problem is that even if someone is looking at the plans, are they making sure they are implemented. He concurred with what Ms. DiFruscia had been told - that DES does not review sedimentation control. The State is inconsistent.

Ms. St. Laurent was seated at 7:21 pm.

- Ms. Scott explained that all this is doing is not having the outside review for the Town because it is done at the State level. If the office received a site plan approval that was missing a Shoreland piece, they would call the State. All the same Shoreland information is on the same plan that the State sees. There are not 2 sets of plans. Mr. McGuire, the building inspector, does inspection as part of the building permit process.
- Mr. Wrenn asked what the extra cost is, if the erosion control plan is already being prepared; Mr. Maynard said that as the Ordinance is written it says, "...shall be reviewed by the Town engineer." On a major application, the Town engineer has an escrow fee of \$500. The applicant must still come before the Board where it can be decided there is not enough erosion control measures. This petition is requesting relief from this outside review and the fee.
- Mr. Sycamore recalled that in the past the ZBA would issue a variance for this step; Mr. Maynard said that Mr. Corwin has since determined that there is no allowance for a waiver, as it is written.

Chairwoman Post opened the hearing to the Public.

Mr. Alan Carpenter, 8 Glenn Wood Rd, asked what constitutes a major application. Ms. Scott replied that unlike a minor application which is defined in Section 616.4, a major application must go through the Planning Board process and have outside engineering review with the Town engineer. Mr. Carpenter noted that the Town will no longer do local engineering review of any applications that are built on the great ponds in town as they are all within 250 ft of the shoreline. Ms. Scott explained that it is specifically for the Cobbetts Pond major application piece – for new home construction and additions. Site plans and subdivisions would still have outside engineering review through the site plan and subdivision process. This is specifically for new home construction and reconstruction and would be required to go through Shoreland. Mr. Carpenter was unsure what the benefit to the community would be. It seems like a small fee when significant money is already being spent on the project. How do we enforce more stringent standards when there is no engineering drawing on record? He thinks the risk to reward ratio is not favorable to the community.

Ms. Maloney arrived at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Maynard stated that a seasonal to year-round conversion where the building is not being torn down does not have to go to the Planning Board. The Ordinance is written requiring only soil and erosion control measures that are put in place to control the temporary impact of ground water run-off. Once the area is

stabilized, it's gone. This is not a 5-year out thing; it is for 4-6 months while the house is being constructed. Not all the Lake homes are six-figure homes, especially those not directly on the water. A deck would require the engineering review.

Ms. DiFruscia confirmed that if a home adding a deck is within 250 ft of the shoreline, they must go to DES, and DES claims they are only reviewing the plans when there is a complaint. She is concerned that if a problem arises, there will be no plan in place. Ms. DiFruscia said the burden is on the applicant to guarantee that what is on the application is done.

Chairwoman Post closed the Hearing to the Public.

Board comments/questions included:

- Ms. St. Laurent asked whether the erosion and sedimentation control plan covered just the construction period or did it continue permanently; Mr. Maynard responded that they are temporary, and the outside review by KNA confirms that it is being done. Mr. Wrenn stated that the erosion control plan stays in place for about 6-months to a year while permanent vegetation takes hold.
- Chairwoman Post asked hypothetically, if this Petition passes, what safeguard reviews remain in place; Ms. Scott said the applications would arrive to the Board quicker. The plans that get submitted to DES are the same plans that get submitted to the Town for Board review and end up in the Building files. The difference is that they would not go to Keach-Nordstrom for outside review.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked who prepares the plans; Mr. Maynard responded that a qualified professional does. He noted that the Board still has the final decision.
- Ms. DiFruscia is unsure what is going before DES; has a qualified professional reviewed and prepared the plans. Mr. Maynard stated that the applicant pays a lot of money to the State to review these plans.
- Ms. Nysten stated that she has no training in sedimentation control and would not feel comfortable performing that role. If the State is not doing it, then someone has to.
- Chairwoman Post said she finds this a difficult decision, but values the Keach-Nordstrom reports the Board has received in the past and has found them helpful.

**Mr. McLeod motioned to not recommend Citizen's Petition #1. Mr. Wrenn seconded.**

Mr. McLeod is concerned that erosion and sedimentation control is key to the integrity of the Town's water bodies and thinks that local control is crucial. Ms. DiFruscia reminded the Board that Cobbetts Pond is an impaired water body and that is why that language was put in place. Mr. Wrenn feels better that Keach-Nordstrom is looking at it from an engineering perspective.

**Motion passed: 5-1. Mr. Sycamore opposed.**

Citizen's Petition #2: To delete Section 601.4.5 of the zoning ordinance which states the "W.W. P.D. shall be increased by 100 feet under the following conditions: when that 100 feet has an upward slope of 12% or more and a minimum width of 100 feet."

Ms. Webber read Citizen's Petition #2 into the record and recused herself. Ms. Maloney was appointed to sit for Ms. Webber.

**Mr. McLeod motioned to open to Public Hearing Citizen's Petition #2. Seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Mr. Maynard stated that if he could have withdrawn this request, he would have. He hopes there can be a joint meeting between the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board this summer.

Mr. McLeod noted that a 12% slope is very steep and adds velocity to the run-off which will result in it going further into the water body. The 100 ft increase adds a layer of protection. He does not recommend this Petition.

Ms. DiFruscia discussed this with Andy Chapman of Stormwater Management and DES and would also not recommend this Petition.

Chairwoman Post opened this to the Public.

Mr. Derek Munson of 18 Turtle Rock Rd does not recommend that the Board support this change. He recommended sitting with the Boards and Conservation and determine a reasonable calculation.

Chairwoman Post closed the Public Hearing.

**Mr. McLeod moved to not recommend Citizen's Petition #2. Seconded by Mr. Sycamore. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Ms. Webber was re-seated.

Citizen's Petition #3: To amend Section 616 to extend the Cobbetts Pond Watershed Protection Ordinance to include the Canobie Lake Watershed by adding the words "and Canobie Lake" everywhere the words "Cobbetts Pond" appear, by changing the words of Section 616 from singular to plural as needed, and by adding the words "and Canobie Lake Watershed Overlay District Parcel Map dated 11/15/11" at the end of Section 616.2.1

Ms. Webber read Citizen's Petition #3 into the record.

**Mr. McLeod motioned to open Citizen's Petition #3 for Public Hearing. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Chairwoman Post explained that this petition is identical to the proposal offered by the Planning Board which was recently withdrawn. Ms. Nysten asked if anyone had any objections to her remaining seated because she lives in the Canobie Lake Watershed. No one objected.

Ms. Ginny Campiola representing the petitioners and the Canobie Lake Protection Association thanked the Board for their support and encouragement. She continued to document, with various letters of support, the Public Health, Safety, and Welfare of this Petition. She hopes the people of Windham will support this with a two-thirds majority, as well as receiving Board support. She continued to detail the extensive scientific report by Nick Skagel that was performed in advance of this petition.

Mr. Wrenn asked why the study was done and who it was done for; Ms. Campiola stated that Mr. Skagel, Source Protection Specialist, did it for the Granite State Rural Water Association who had received a grant.

Ms. Betty Dunn explained the history of the grant and explained that 78% of the watershed is in Windham.

Mr. Wrenn asked what Salem is doing to their part of the Watershed. Ms. Dunn stated that there is an upcoming meeting in February. They do not, however, have a similar Ordinance to the CPWP Ordinance.

Ms. Campiola noted that Mr. Rick Russell, Salem's Director of Public Works, is in strong support of the Ordinance. Ms. Nysten noted that Mr. Russell's letter made a reference to using Arlington Pond as a

secondary water source during off-season periods. Ms. Campiola mentioned that Canobie Lake is a Class A body of water and the Association wants to maintain that and prevent dumping Arlington Pond into it. Mr. Wrenn asked if there was a study and any effort to protect Arlington Pond; Ms. Dunn explained that in October, Salem switches to Arlington Pond use which goes directly to the treatment plant. DES does not allow Arlington water to go directly to Canobie. Ms. Nysten stated that it is cheaper to maintain and protect the water quality of Canobie than to have the water degrease and then clean it up. Ms. Campiola made a distinction between the Shoreland Protection Act and the Watershed Ordinances which covers every bit of land that feeds water into the Lake.

Mr. Carpenter asked if the CPWP, which has been in place for almost 2 years, is working; Ms. Scott said it is implemented and it is difficult to measure. Ms. DiFruscia thinks it has helped prevent degradation of the Lake.

Chairwoman Post closed the Hearing to the Public.

Mr. McLeod thinks it is a matter of local control to keep our bodies of water vibrant and keep our property values up. He is in full support. Ms. DiFruscia noted that that our bodies of water are irreplaceable. Ms. Nysten offered that of all the water on Earth, less than 1% is drinking water. Mr. Wrenn feels bad for the property owners who have 2% of their lot in the defining Watershed line. Chairwoman Post said they could apply for a variance.

**Mr. McLeod motioned to recommend Citizen's Petition #3. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Citizen's Petition #4: To Amend the current zoning of the following parcels from Rural to Residential A:

- |                                      |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. 24-F-165 (41 Heritage Hill Road)  | 27. 24-F-200 (80 Heritage Hill Road) |
| 2. 24-F-164 (44 Heritage Hill Road)  | 28. 24-F-199 (81 Heritage Hill Road) |
| 3. 24-F-166 (43 Heritage Hill Road)  | 29. 24-F-198 (79 Heritage Hill Road) |
| 4. 24-F-163 (48 Heritage Hill Road)  | 30. 24-F-197 (77 Heritage Hill Road) |
| 5. 24-F-162 (50 Heritage Hill Road)  | 31. 24-F-188 (2 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 6. 24-F-167 (45 Heritage Hill Road)  | 32. 24-F-178 (3 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 7. 24-F-161 (52 Heritage Hill Road)  | 33. 24-F-185 (4 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 8. 24-F-168 (47 Heritage Hill Road)  | 34. 24-F-179 (5 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 9. 24-F-160 (54 Heritage Hill Road)  | 35. 24-F-180 (7 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 10. 24-F-170 (51 Heritage Hill Road) | 36. 24-F-182 (9 Ryan Farm Road)      |
| 11. 24-F-159 (56 Heritage Hill Road) | 37. 24-F-155 (1 Timberlane Road)     |
| 12. 24-F-158 (58 Heritage Hill Road) | 38. 24-F-156 (3 Timberlane Road)     |
| 13. 24-F-150 (62 Heritage Hill Road) | 39. 24-F-157 (5 Timberlane Road)     |
| 14. 24-F-188 (57 Heritage Hill Road) | 40. 24-F-158 (7 Timberlane Road)     |
| 15. 24-F-208 (64 Heritage Hill Road) | 41. 24-F-188 (12 Timberlane Road)    |
| 16. 24-F-207 (66 Heritage Hill Road) | 42. 24-F-172 (15 Timberlane Road)    |
| 17. 24-F-190 (61 Heritage Hill Road) | 43. 24-F-173 (17 Timberlane Road)    |
| 18. 24-F-191 (63 Heritage Hill Road) | 44. 24-F-174 (19 Timberlane Road)    |
| 19. 24-F-192 (65 Heritage Hill Road) | 45. 24-F-176 (20 Timberlane Road)    |
| 20. 24-F-193 (67 Heritage Hill Road) | 46. 24-F-178 (18 Timberlane Road)    |
| 21. 24-F-203 (74 Heritage Hill Road) | 47. 24-F-186 (14 Timberlane Road)    |
| 22. 24-F-194 (71 Heritage Hill Road) | 48. 24-F-188 (12 Timberlane Road)    |
| 23. 24-F-202 (76 Heritage Hill Road) | 49. 19-B-767 (8 Karen Road)          |
| 24. 24-F-195 (73 Heritage Hill Road) | 50. 19-B-749 (7 Karen Road)          |
| 25. 24-F-196 (75 Heritage Hill Road) | 51. 19-B-766 (10 Karen Road)         |
| 26. 24-F-201 (78 Heritage Hill Road) | 52. 19-B-750 (9 Karen Road)          |

- |                                      |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 53. 19-B-765 (12 Karen Road)         | 83. 19-B-2011 (122 Castle Hill Road) |
| 54. 19-B-751 (8 Karen Road)          | 84. 24-F-143 (125 Castle Hill Road)  |
| 55. 19-B-764 (14 Karen Road)         | 85. 19-B-2012 (124 Castle Hill Road) |
| 56. 19-B-763 (13 Karen Road)         | 86. 19-B-2952 (130 Castle Hill Road) |
| 57. 19-B-2027 (16 Karen Road)        | 87. 24-F-142 (129 Castle Hill Road)  |
| 58. 19-B-2025 (18 Karen Road)        | 88. 14-B-2900 (85 Castle Hill Road)  |
| 59. 19-B-2029 (20 Karen Road)        | 89. 14-B-2902 (81 Castle Hill Road)  |
| 60. 19-B-2028 (22 Karen Road)        | 90. 19-B-2020 (82 Castle Hill Road)  |
| 61. 19-B-2014 (1 Lancaster Road)     | 91. 24-F-183 (1 Bennington Road)     |
| 62. 19-B-2015 (3 Lancaster Road)     | 92. 24-F-184 (2 Bennington Road)     |
| 63. 19-B-2016 (5 Lancaster Road)     | 93. 20-D-3003 (3 Bennington Road)    |
| 64. 19-B-2017 (9 Lancaster Road)     | 94. 20-D-3030 (4 Bennington Road)    |
| 65. 19-B-2018 (11 Lancaster Road)    | 95. 20-D-3004 (5 Bennington Road)    |
| 66. 19-B-2019 (15 Lancaster Road)    | 96. 20-D-3029 (6 Bennington Road)    |
| 67. 19-B-2000 (98 Castle Hill Road)  | 97. 20-D-3005 (7 Bennington Road)    |
| 68. 19-B-2001 (102 Castle Hill Road) | 98. 20-D-3028 (8 Bennington Road)    |
| 69. 19-B-2002 (104 Castle Hill Road) | 99. 20-D-3006 (9 Bennington Road)    |
| 70. 24-F-153 (107 Castle Hill Road)  | 100. 20-D-3027 (10 Bennington Road)  |
| 71. 24-F-152 (109 Castle Hill Road)  | 101. 20-D-3024 (14 Bennington Road)  |
| 72. 24-F-151 (111 Castle Hill Road)  | 102. 20-D-3008 (15 Bennington Road)  |
| 73. 19-B-2003 (106 Castle Hill Road) | 103. 20-D-3009 (17 Bennington Road)  |
| 74. 24-F-147 (113 Castle Hill Road)  | 104. 20-D-3023 (18 Bennington Road)  |
| 75. 19-B-2004 (108 Castle Hill Road) | 105. 20-D-3010 (19 Bennington Road)  |
| 76. 19-B-2005 (110 Castle Hill Road) | 106. 20-D-3022 (20 Bennington Road)  |
| 77. 24-F-148 (115 Castle Hill Road)  | 107. 20-D-3011 (21 Bennington Road)  |
| 78. 19-B-2007 (114 Castle Hill Road) | 108. 20-D-3021 (22 Bennington Road)  |
| 79. 19-B-2008 (116 Castle Hill Road) | 109. 20-D-3012 (40 Bennington Road)  |
| 80. 19-B-2009 (118 Castle Hill Road) | 110. 20-D-3014 (38 Bennington Road)  |
| 81. 24-F-144 (121 Castle Hill Road)  | 111. 20-D-3015 (36 Bennington Road)  |
| 82. 19-B-2010 (120 Castle Hill Road) | 112. 20-D-3016 (34 Bennington Road)  |

Chairwoman Post read the first line of the 112 parcels of Citizen Petition #4 into the record and then called a recess. Ms. DiFruscia was excused. The meeting reconvened at 8:51 p.m.

**Mr. McLeod motioned to open Citizen’s Peition #4 for Public Hearing. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Mr. Evert Ryan is the developer of the area in question and is seeking Planning board approval for this Petition. He summarized the various streets and roads included in the petition. He would like to change the zoning from Rural to Residential A. Many of the residents are in support of this. He is concerned that the large houses which comprise these lots may be broken up into multi-family, apartments, and/or boarding houses which are allowed in the Rural District, but not in Res A. This is what he is hoping to avoid.

Ms. Scott highlighted that: Boarding houses are allowed in Rural, but not Residential A; Accessory apartments are allowed in both zones; and Multi-family is not allowed in either. Mr. Ryan thinks the large homes with dual entrances, implies multi family and wants to protect from that. Chairwoman Post explained that if WFH passes, the duplex would be allowed in the Rural District.

Mr. Sycamore asked of the 112 parcels, how many are developed; Mr. Ryan stated about 85 homes.

Ms. Webber noted that the Rural District allows for 13 things; such as, wildlife refuges, open space, overnight parking etc. She thinks it would be doing the Town a disservice if it gave up what's allowed if all those parcels are moved to Res A; Mr. Ryan said that no one he asked voiced those concerns because they are not doing those things now.

Ms. Nysten asked Ms. Scott: If a subdivision has covenants in place that end and WFH is approved, could a WFH project be built in a subdivision with single family covenants; Ms. Scott replied that if the covenants were put in place by the developer of their own initiative and not part of an Open Space development where the Planning Board has approved the covenants, the Town has no authority. The Town would have no copies of the covenants or enforcement authority. The Planning Board could approve a WFH development that violates privately instituted homeowner restrictions, because they are not part of the Planning Board's land use regulations. Chairwoman Post further explained that covenants are part of a private agreement and the private homeowners could take issue with that.

Chairwoman Post asked whether the 80-90 homeowners are aware of this change; Mr. Ryan said that the vast majority know, because it has been talked about for the past year and a half. Chairwoman Post said that what Mr. Ryan is asking to do is something the Planning Board could not lawfully do. Mr. Ryan said that regulations did not require him to get every signature, and there are some owners who do not know.

Chairwoman Post opened discussion to the Public.

Mr. Henry Danis, 85 Castle Hill Road, lives across the street from Mr. Ryan and was not notified. He discovered the change from the Planning Board notice on 12/22. Mr. Danis went through an extensive history of his 14 acre purchase from Mr. Ryan. He bought it because it was Rural. Except for his house and right around it, it remains in its natural state and is protected. His 1800 sq ft house should not have been included in Mr. Ryan's plan. He would lose 10,000's of dollars if it was changed to Res. A. It appears that Mr. Ryan has spot targeted the lots to re-zone. He feels like he has been singled out and discriminated against. Mr. Danis thinks Mr. Ryan has overstepped his boundaries. He claimed that when he bought the lot 23 years ago, Mr. Ryan stated that he would like to keep the farm because he liked a rural atmosphere.

Mr. Danis said that of the 112 parcels, 30 of the petition signers represent 15 of the lots in question. Mr. Ryan said that he was up against a deadline and there was no underhanded effort. Also, the sale to Mr. Danis was done by his mother. Mr. Ryan had some involvement and wanted to hold up on the sale.

Mr. Jonathan Derrick owns property on Johnny Hill Rd. He was not notified; he found out in the paper. He is happy to remain Rural.

Ms. Betty Dunn asked that there be a map made available to voters on voting day.

Ms. Maloney suggested that because the petition involves over 100 lots, the Board should look at it next year. The Board would be remiss to support this Petition at this time. There is no map and information is missing.

Mr. Sycamore asked what the acreage magnitude involved is. Mr. Ryan said about 300 acres.

Mr. Wrenn said that the Multi-zone committee went to the trouble to notify every owner and abutter to Public Hearing. He is concerned about who has actually been notified. He is not comfortable supporting this.

Mr. McLeod is concerned about spot zoning; also, there is no real pressing need to make the change at this time; maybe the Board could look at it later in a workshop mode; and there's no good reason to include Mr.

Danis' property. It would have been ripe for consideration as a site plan consideration for Great Mt. View. In general, he does not support the Petition.

Chairwoman Post agreed with the Board's comments. She sees that there is a wide swath to be rezoned and is concerned there may be some policy considerations involving a Planning Board function. Also, she is concerned about property owner notification and due process.

**Mr. McLeod made a motion to not recommend Citizen's Petition #4. Seconded by Mr. Wrenn.**

**Motion passed: 7-0.**

### **Meeting Minutes Review & Approve:**

December 21, 2011

**Mr. McLeod motioned to accept the minutes of December 21, 2011 as amended. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed: 6-0-1 Mr. Wrenn abstained.**

### **2012 Town Meeting:**

#### **Review Warrant Order and Language**

Ms. Scott noted that she had emailed the Board the revised Warrant language in which she incorporated the changes from legal counsel. She mentioned that there were 8 e-mails back and forth between her and Attorney Campbell to arrive at the final version. Chairwoman Post would like to see the final version. Ms. Nysten requested an immediate copy of the 8 e-mails, because there are many errors in the Warrant. Ms. Nysten requested a vote/poll whether the Board needs to see all the 8 e-mails immediately. Ms. Webber, Mr. McLeod, Mr. Wrenn, Mr. Sycamore, Chairwoman Post, and Ms. St. Laurent are pleased with the final version at this time. They would like to see the e-mails soon, but not immediately; then Ms. Scott provided Ms. Nysten with some, but not all, of the e-mails. Ms. Scott then provided Ms. Nysten with some, but not all, of the emails.

A lengthy discussion ensued involving numerous questions and concerns regarding inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the Warrant's text that Ms. Scott presented to the Board.

Ms. Scott highlighted the changes Attorney Campbell recommended.

The Board requested the following:

- Change the "Supported by the Planning Board" to "Recommended by the Planning Board"
- Amendment 4 - Separate PB & T and the Limited Industrial into 2 separate Amendments (The 11/30/11 minutes need to be reconsidered because of the 6/1 Public Hearing vote and other errors.)
- Use consistent language throughout when referring to the various Districts: "Gateway Commercial District" and "Business Commercial District B"
- Amendment #5 in the title, put "Gateway Commercial District" before "Purpose Section"
- Amendment #9 – Collector Roads: change 302 to 300; and under 619.5.3.2.3 (f) change 617.7 to 619.7
- Ms. Scott to ask legal counsel about removing "secondary roads" definition
- Page 10 Section 720.7.2 add the words "of the Windham Zoning Ordinance" after Section 714
- Page 12, Section 702.8 (F) change Notes 5 to Notes 4
- Delete 702 and the following language
- Delete 703 and the following language
- Color maps will be provided for all the multi-zone amendments
- If Amendment #7 and Amendment #8 receive different results, the numbering will be amiss until edited next year

Amendment #8 – the Board raised concern about a potential lapse in parking regulations. Ms. Scott assured the Board there would be no lapse.



**Outreach/Public Education Ideas/Discussion**

Ms. Scott said there are 8 weeks left, and she will propose a list of topics and deadlines for the Board and Staff to write clarifying articles for the local papers.

**2012 Planning Board Work List & Schedule**

Ms. Scott will provide a break out of 2013 Town Meeting items for Board consideration. Chairwoman Post would like to see a site plan review checklist created. Staff will create one.

**December Staff Reports – Community Planner & Community Development Director**

Staff reports were accepted.

**Adjournment:**

**Ms. Webber motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McLeod seconded. Motion passed: 7-0.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 p.m..

These minutes are respectfully submitted for your consideration by Mimi Kolodziej.