



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
May 30, 2012

Board Members:

Margaret Crisler, Chairwoman – Present
Ruth-Ellen Post, Vice-Chair– Present
Pam Skinner, Member – Excused
Kristi St. Laurent, Member – Present
Jonathan Sycamore, Member – Excused
Lee Maloney, Alternate Member – Excused

Carolyn Webber, Member – Arrived at 6:56 pm
Ross McLeod, Selectman Alternate – Excused
Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Member- Present
Sy Wrenn, Alternate Member – Present
Vanessa Nysten, Alternate Member – Present

Staff:

Laura Scott, Community Development Director
Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner
Cathy Pinette – Planning Board Minute Taker

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance:

Chairwoman Crisler called the meeting to order at 6:37 pm followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and attendance.

Seat Alternates

Ms. Nysten was appointed to sit for Mr. Sycamore. Mr. Wrenn was appointed to sit for Ms. Skinner.

Village Center Project – Subcommittee Interviews and Appointments

- Ms. Wood stated there were four candidates in the audience that would like to be appointed to the Village Center Subcommittee.
- Ms. Tracey Partington introduced herself to the Board. Ms. Partington stated she has been a resident for 10 years with no financial ties to any business in town which makes her a good candidate. As a taxpayer she is a major investor in our town. She stated there are trends in real estate, older and younger residents moving into our town for a small town feel.
- Ms. Nysten asked Ms. Partington what she does for a living. Ms. Partington stated she was a sales representative for a bio pharmaceutical company.
- Ms. DiFruscia stated that this will be time-consuming. She asked Ms. Partington if she was willing to put in the time. Ms. Partington stated yes, she has an interest in her home and

May30, 2012 Approved Planning Board Minutes

community. Ms. DiFruscia asked if she had any preconceived ideas on the Village District. Ms. Partington stated that she did not, but was excited about the potential and didn't see any limitations.

- Ms. Post thanked Ms. Partington for her interest. Ms. Post stated that it was a heavy commitment and asked Ms. Partington if she had looked at the Village Center Guidelines. This Partington stated she has a little, but not a lot. There is room for lots of opportunities.
- Chairwoman Crisler asked Ms. Partington if she had any education or professional skills to bring to the Committee. Ms. Partington stated she is in sales and has been successful, she works well with others, she is a good voice of the people, and also has relationships in town with neighbors and others for input.

The Chairwoman thanked Ms. Partington.

- Mr. Chris McCarthy introduced himself to the Board. Mr. McCarthy stated he owned the property at 13 Indian Rock Rd. and is also a town resident and real estate investor. He believes this is a great opportunity to make something great in town. He is familiar with the Village District Center, Zoning Wall Street Corridor Study and other studies in town. He believes he would be an asset to the Committee and to the town at large in the planning process.
- Mr. Wrenn asked Mr. McCarthy where 13 Indian Rock Rd. was located. Mr. McCarthy stated it was near the Center School.
- The Chairwoman asked Mr. McCarthy what he would bring to the Committee. Mr. McCarthy stated he is a financial analyst and asset manager; he has an MBA and undergraduate degree, and also has experience in marketing and financing. The Chairwoman asked the Mr. McCarthy what his vision was for the Village Center. Mr. McCarthy stated the overlay of traffic and the ability to mitigate that is a big concern. Landowners need to come together for some sort of access points. This needed to be done before any development.

The Chairwoman thanked Mr. McCarthy.

- Mr. Chris Nickerson introduced himself to the Board. He stated he is familiar with the Board, he has been in town 20 years, professionally he has represented numerous applicants in front of the Board and he is a resident.
- Ms. Post stated she is grateful that Mr. Nickerson has stepped up and thanked him. Ms. Post asked Mr. Nickerson if he was aware of the conflict of interest law. Mr. Nickerson stated that he is a developer and if the Board thinks the ordinance would affect him, he wouldn't be able to serve. Ms. Post stated she was concerned for people finding themselves in this position. Mr. Nickerson stated professionally he thinks he has a lot to contribute.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked Mr. Nickerson if he was applying on behalf of Cordell Development and what his position was with the firm. Mr. Nickerson stated he is not a formal member and

has no interest in 1 – 7 Indian Rock Rd. Ms. DiFruscia asked who Cordell Development was. Mr. Nickerson stated they were the owners of the property.

- Ms. Post stated that this was a land owner seat and asked Mr. Nickerson how he qualified. Mr. Nickerson stated that he doesn't, he just represents the development. Ms. Post asked if Mr. Nickerson was part owner. Mr. Nickerson stated no.

Ms. Weber arrived at 6:56 PM.

- Ms. DiFruscia stated the idea was to look for an ownership in a business property.
- Ms. Nysten asked Mr. Nickerson if he was a business owner. Mr. Nickerson stated he wouldn't commit to that.
- Ms. Webber asked Mr. Nickerson what other committees or boards he has served on in town. Mr. Nickerson stated the Master Plan. Ms. Webber asked Mr. Nickerson why he wanted to be on this Committee. Mr. Nickerson stated that he grew up here and the village district will be an important part of town. Ms. Webber asked Mr. Nickerson if history was important to him for the town and why. Mr. Nickerson stated history was important and he believed no one wanted to see a synthetic town.
- Mr. Wrenn stated that Mr. Nickerson was representing owners of these properties.
- The Chairwoman asked Mr. Nickerson what professional or educational experience he had to bring to the Committee. Mr. Nickerson stated that he has handled developments of properties in town and he has a professional engineering license in New Hampshire

The Chairwoman thanked Mr. Nickerson

- Mr. Karl Dubay introduced himself to the Board. He stated he was a 14 year resident of Windham. He has a business in town, is a licensed engineer, and has done quite a bit of work in Windham over the years. In business his clients come first and the town of Windham is right there with them. He is creative and thinks outside the box. The Village Center District will be where people want to go to eat, drink, and take their family. There are challenging pieces of properties and historic items that we would like to save. It will be a challenge. Good planning is important. He has the time and energy to be part of the Committee and it's very important to him. He is not concerned with the conflict of interest law, he has always done the right thing and he will do what is right for the town.
- Ms. DiFruscia thanked Mr. Dubay for volunteering.
- The Chairwoman asked Mr. Dubay if he has done other projects in town like the Depot. Mr. Dubay stated he volunteered to do the grant on the Depot and he enjoyed it. He has volunteered on lots of committees. Professionally he has done the veterinarian clinics and lots of small shops in town. He stated he believed the village center will be challenging, with water, septic issues, and traffic but there are lots of opportunities. The Chairwoman thanked Mr. Dubay for volunteering.

May30, 2012 Approved Planning Board Minutes

The Board discussed going into non-public session to discuss the candidates per RSA 91-A: 3 II (c)

Ms. Post moved and Mrs. DiFruscia seconded to enter into Nonpublic Session in accordance with RSA 91-A: 3 II c at 7:17 pm. Roll call vote all “yes”.

The Board returned from Nonpublic Session at 7:28 pm.

Mr. DiFruscia motioned to expand the citizen at-large position to two candidates, seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Ms. Post motioned to appoint to the land owner/business owner position, Mr. Chris McCarthy and Mr. Chris Nickerson, under the condition if ownership is not personal, written authorization must be supplied by the land owner, seconded by Ms. DiFruscia. Motion passed 7 -0.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned to appoint Ms. Partington and Mr. Dubay to the citizen at-large positions, seconded by Mr. Wrenn. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Presentation on Soils Based Lot Sizing

- Mr. Steve Keach, president of Keach Nordstrom Associates, passed out a brief outline on soil based lot sizing and gave an overview. He stated this would be good for Windham because Windham has fragile soils. As part of this presentation he stated that the future of soil based lot sizing is likely here to stay in areas like Windham not serviced by public sewers.
- Ms. Post asked Mr. Keach when comparing the old system of soil based lot sizing and the new system, would there be different outcomes on the same lot. Mr. Keach stated not really.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked Mr. Keach if you would recommend we make any changes to our ordinance. Mr. Keach replied at some point it will be necessary. He stated that the standard on our ordinance will disappear at some point. He stated some lots do not appear to be compatible with the HIS system. Mr. DiFruscia asked what kind of table we would need. Mr. Keach stated the Board could call Rockingham County Services. He believes we would need to engage the services of a soil scientist. Ms. St. Laurent asked if we would need a new table and have it tailored to fit. Mr. Keach stated yes.
- Ms. Nysten asked Mr. Keach to clarify some of his earlier points. Mr. Keach stated Windham took the model HIS and ratcheted it up on the lot sizes to make it fit to Windham. A soil scientist would have to make equivalent adjustments to the table.
- Mr. Wrenn asked Mr. Keach how they do HIS or site-specific surveys. Mr. Keach stated the old data was done with a very limited amount of on ground verification. Mr. Keach stated that a soil scientist is transecting. Mr. Wrenn asked if they were boring into the ground. Mr. Keach stated yes they bore into the ground and look at the upper 48 inches. Mr. Wrenn asked if on a site specific it is done by hand. Mr. Keach stated yes it takes approximately one day to

May30, 2012 Approved Planning Board Minutes

do it by hand. Mr. Keach stated on a site-specific there is a narrative, on an HIS standard there is no narrative.

- Ms. Webber asked Mr. Keach if boring replaces test pits. Mr. Keach replied no, but there will be more and more mechanicals doing test pits. Mr. Keach stated that Windham was in good shape. He stated in a couple of years the Board should think about site specific soil survey mapping in lieu of high-intensity sampling. He will give the Board a link from the people who maintain the standards.
- The Chairwoman asked Mr. Keach, on a 50 acre parcel with 10 acres underwater, what you look at. Mr. Keach stated that is addressed in the Windham zoning ordinances.
- Ms. Scott stated once she received the link from Mr. Keach she would send it to the Board. She would also contact the Rockingham County services.

The Chairwoman asked if the Board should go to the public hearing first and then have Mr. Keach speak on Site Plan Amendments. The Board agreed.

The Board took a five-minute recess at 8:30 PM. The Board was back in session at 8:37 PM

Public Hearing on Design Regulations

This DiFruscia motion to open the public hearing on the Design Regulations, seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 7 – 0.

The Chairwoman stated they had received a letter from Attorney Campbell regarding the Design review Regulations.

- Ms. Scott read the public hearing notice into the record. ” A public hearing is to be held in accordance with NH RSA 675:6 (method of adoption), to amend section 1202 “applicability” of the site plan Regulations and to adopt Design review Regulations the Gateway commercial district, neighborhood business districts, and the professional, business, and technology district into the existing site plan Regulations, as allowed under NH RSA 674:42 (Power To Review Site Plans) and NH RSA 674:44 (Site Plan Review Regulations).
- Ms. Scott stated that Attorney Campbell made several recommendations for some language, he rewrote the waiver section and he questioned the potential conflict with the Site Plan Regulations and the Zoning Regulations. He stated that if there is a conflict with the Design Review and zoning, zoning takes precedence. The Chairwoman stated if the Board makes any significant changes to the Regulations they will need a new public hearing. Ms. Webber stated she feels clarification is needed. Ms. DiFruscia agreed with Ms. Webber and would like to clarify issues with respect to waivers.
- Ms. Nysten stated on page 2 of the Design Regulations, section 100, paragraph 4, stated the ordinance/regulations which provides of the greater regulation shall apply, in the case of regulation overlap. She believed it would go with what the zoning ordinance states.

- Ms. Scott stated that in Attorney Campbell's memo, he stated if there is a conflict between the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and the provisions of the Design Review Regulations, it is general principle that the applicant must comply with the most restrictive applicable Regulations. Ms. Nysten asked if the Board would like more verbiage in the Regulations to clarify. Ms. DiFruscia, Ms. Webber and the Chairwoman believe it is fine. Ms. Post's stated when there is a real conflict she thinks zoning trumps the regulations.
- Ms. Nysten question Mr. Wrenn as she was confused about the cinderblock on buildings. Someone stated that you could paint cinderblock. Since then she has seen painted cinderblock on buildings and she didn't think what the Board meant. Mr. Wrenn stated CMU's are allowed in places not visible to the public. Ms. Nysten questioned if the Board wanted it stained at the factory. Ms. Webber read section 706.3, stating you cannot use plain cinderblock. Ms. DiFruscia stated the first sentence is causing confusion. The word "primary façade" is causing the confusion. Ms. Nysten stated she has seen plain concrete block painted. Ms. Webber stated you cannot use plain concrete block on the front. Ms. Nysten asked about seeing it from a house. Ms. Webber stated the Design Review Subcommittee will have discretion on that. Ms. DiFruscia stated this would add in the flexibility for warehouses, etc.
- Ms. Nysten questioned section 707.2 and the word "should". The Chairwoman thinks it should be "should", Ms. St. Laurent agrees with the Chairwoman.
- Section 707.3 the word complementing is spelled wrong. And the word "insure", should be "ensure".

The Chairwoman opened the hearing to the public.

- Ms. Eileen Mashimo, a resident, spoke regarding sections 707.3 .1, and 707.3 .2 on page 16 and 17. She asked the Board where the colors came from. The Chairwoman stated they came from our consultant. Ms. Mashimo asked who the consultant was and stated these colors were taken from a city in Washington's building codes. She stated these are North Pacific colors not New England colors. She showed the Board paint swatches from the hardware store with traditional New England colors. According to the Design Regulations, New England colors are not allowed. She is concerned that every building would have the same colors. She is very upset that the consultant copied these colors from the Washington codes.
- Ms. DiFruscia stated we are talking about commercial buildings. Ms. Mashimo is concerned people are going to use these colors.
- Ms. Scott asked the Board if they are taking all public comment and then Board comments. The Chairwoman stated she would like to discuss the colors now.
- Ms. Post stated these Regulations are not for homes but commercial buildings. The Board was concern regarding "corporate" colors. She stated our consultant told the Board that she used colors from other places. She stated the Board has gone over this numerous times. Ms. Mashimo is concerned she will only see unhappy colors.

- Ms. Mashimo spoke to section 506.2 .4, green roofs, and is concerned grass should not be on roofs. She stated she doesn't know why that is in the Regulations. Ms. St. Laurent stated the section stated "maybe" incorporated. Ms. Mashimo stated she doesn't see why that is applicable in Windham. She is also worried that most of the information is copied and pasted from other towns and does not reflect well on Windham.
- Ms. Webber stated that in section 707, you can use historical colors.
- Ms. DiFruscia took exception to Ms. Mashimo's comments regarding that this does not pertain to Windham. She stated we have had many sessions working with the Economic Development Committee and the Development Committee and we share your concerns because we wanted to make it look nice for the Town. The Board has had developers step up and incorporate the Design Regulations even though they are not in place yet. The Board has had many public workshops on this since 4/27/11.
- Ms. Mashimo is also concerned about elaborate buildings. Ms. Webber stated that years ago they wanted to put turrets on the Armstrong Building. The Historic Commission shot it down and some people were upset, but turrets did not fit in the historic district in this colonial are of Town.
- Mr. Wrenn stated in section 707.3 .2, at one point that section had" but not bright" and in a later version the Board took it out.
- Mr. Bob Young, Chairman of the Economic Development Committee, spoke to the Board. He appreciated the concern and consideration the Board gave the Design Regulations. There was lots of input from the public and Economic Development Committee. He wanted to thank the Board for their time. He stated that the EDC had a presentation regarding parking but it was not done in time for the last meeting.
- Mr. Ralph Valentine, Economic Development Committee, stated that in many meetings 25 Indian Rock Road has come up as an example. He showed a photo of the property on the computer screen. He asked the Board where their eyes were drawn, to the building, parking or landscaping. He stated the small building has 31,000 square feet, and 31 parking spaces. The second building has 26,300 ft. and 92 parking spaces. He thinks this development shows that a parking area can be bigger than 20 spaces. Ms. Nysten stated this property works with parking because of the landscaping. The Chairwoman stated much of the green space in front of this property is state property. Ms. Webber asked Mr. Valentine if he was saying that this building should only have 20 spaces. Mr. Valentine stated no. Ms. St. Laurent stated by having only 20 spaces it would be safer for pedestrians. Mr. Valentine stated Design Regulations planned for sidewalks. Ms. Maloney stated the parking is hidden by the landscaping. Mr. Valentine stated the EDC has recommended landscaping. Mr. Valentine would like the Board to could consider the EDC recommendations in the memo provided dated May 24, 2012. He stated these would be major changes. He spoke regarding Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design guidelines (CPTED). He looked at the four principles and made his recommendations in his memo of May 24, 2012.

- Mr. Wrenn stated Dunkin' Donuts has less than 20 parking spaces and it looks horrible. He agreed with Ms. St. Laurent's point regarding parking and pedestrian traffic being a safety concern. The Chairwoman is concerned that the area in front of 25 Indian Rock Rd. could be taken back by the state at a future date.
- Ms. DiFruscia suggested changing 'parking lot' to 'parking area'. She suggested some of the language in the EDC memo "parking areas should provide for the safe, functional and efficient passage of both vehicles and pedestrians" would address the issues. She also suggested "parking areas should be shared by multiple owners whenever possible. Parking areas which are in the front shall incorporate landscape design elements which enhance the view into the parking area, but which elements to not appear visibility". Ms. Nysten stated in Section 504.2.6 safety and parking areas are already in the Regulation. Mr. Valentine stated maybe the numbers of spaces need to be related to the size of the building. Ms. Webber stated 20 parking spaces to each unit should be adequate. The Chairwoman and Ms. DiFruscia stated that is not what the Regulations state. Ms. DiFruscia stated maybe the Board should change "shall" to "should" regarding parking. Ms. Post stated the goal of the Board is to avoid a Route 111 that is parking lot, after parking lot; the Board wanted the "green". Ms. Nysten stated the Board should allow a certain number of parking spaces in front, perhaps 20%.
- Ms. St. Laurent stated this is the general parking design. She has read the Town of Wayland's parking and also read the CPTED guidelines and stated as long as you keep parking visible it is good. She recommends taking parking out of section 502.3.
- Ms. Bev Donovan, Economic Development Committee, addressed the Board. Ms. Donovan stated she had spoken to people and businesses in town about parking. She is worried about putting an arbitrary number or percentage. Some comments she heard from people were; there are not enough spaces at the time, parking in the back is used by employees, they don't want to drive around the building, they don't trust parking out back, groups at the Village Bean do not meet there anymore due to parking issues, other businesses take their spots, not kid friendly, if they had more spots out front they would have more business, and it feels unsafe to park out back in the dark. She stated Windham needs to make businesses successful.
- Ms. Nysten stated that section 504.2.1 talks about parking on the side of the building. Ms. Donovan stated that in Salem she has a hard time finding tenants due to parking as it is very compact. They do have assigned parking now and have parking issues. Ms. Nysten stated the parking is in the back of that property and the door is also in the back.
- Mr. Pat Nysten, a resident, stated he has attended a lot of these meetings and the Board has worked hard. He stated it would be very hard to meet all of the objectives with parking. He believes this is a living document. There is confusion in the wording for screening. With screening you can still see the building. He would encourage the Board to minimize coverage with asphalt. He thinks this is a case-by-case situation. He stated maybe the language should say to try and minimize large asphalt where feasible. He also said he recommended changing shall to should replacement of parking areas to provide more flexibility.

- The Chairwoman asked the Board if they wanted to change the section on parking. She stated they have heard compelling information on the number of spaces. Ms. DiFruscia stated the simplest answer would be to change "shall" to "should". There is enough flexibility to look at each situation, keeping in mind that we want to minimize asphalt in front.
- Ms. Webber agrees with Ms. DiFruscia. She stated architects are creative and can deal with this. We can also change this in the future.
- Ms. Post stated this is for new construction. She would like to keep the word "shall" and try that, there are waivers is necessary.
- Ms. Nysten stated she would also like to keep the word "shall" with the waiver provisions.
- Ms. St. Laurent stated she would also like to keep the word "shall".
- Mr. Wrenn stated he believes the word "should" be used. He stated when you talk about having a public entrance in the back of the business it would not be very effective; it is a very challenging situation.
- The Chairwoman stated the word "should" be used and agreed with Ms. Donovan and thinks it is site-specific and will need to take in human nature and safety.
- Ms. Scott stated the following changes were made to the regulations: change section 502.3 to "should" and section 504.2.1 to "should". Change the wording "parking lot" to "parking area".
- Mr. Valentine thanked the board for allowing the EDC to present their information and he stated the changes to the wording help the developers.

The hearing was closed to the public at 10:05 PM.

Ms. DiFruscia made a motion to adopt the Design Regulations with the following changes: change section 502.3 to "should" and section 504.2.1 to "should", and change the wording "parking lot" to "parking area", and to add to Section 400 Attorney Campbell's suggested language on waivers, seconded by Ms. Post. Motion passed 7 – 0

Ms. Post made a motion to adopt the proposed language in Section 1202. as provided by staff. Seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Ms. Scott stated that the Town would be looking for members for the Design Review Subcommittee.

Site Plan Regulation Workshop – Roads, Parking, and Stormwater

- Mr. Steve Keach, president of Keach Nordstrom Associates, addressed the Board. He stated that the current Site Plan Regulations as they exist today do not address stormwater, parking and traffic. He stated he would like to follow what was done in the Subdivision Regulations. Basically it would be industry standards that would be captured into Windham's Regulations. From what he has heard at the meeting tonight he can begin drafts of those sections.
- Ms. Post stated that in some cases, for commercial uses, we are allowing too much parking and in some cases we do not need that much asphalt.
- Mr. Keach stated that the Regulations have an array of parking standards that are very dated. He would like to update what the uses will be and expand the array. He spoke regarding the uses in the commercial district stating there are different hours for different tenants so parking spots are freed up.
- The Chairwoman stated that for multiple tenants you design parking for the current tenants but you need to have flexibility. Ms. DiFruscia stated that another example of too much asphalt is CVS.
- Ms. Scott's memo of May 22, 2012, recommends the proposed Site Plan Amendments.

Ms. Maloney left at 10:27 pm.

- Mr. Keach stated that since Windham's regulations were done the RSA has changed (RSA 676.4). He also stated that the waiver process needs to be included (RSA 674.4.3)
- #9 of Ms. Scott's memo (Post Approval Procedures) the Regulations needs to be tweaked.
- #10 - 674.39 Active And Substantial Construction Regulations
- #11 - Revocation Of Site Plan Process – needs to take advantage of what the Legislature has given to you. Currently we have nothing in our regulations.
- #13 - Appeals – there have been changes
- #14 and #15 are good to have (Severability and Amendments)
- Ms Scott stated that a lot has been updated and we have some holes in our Regulations. We can do some tweaking and formatting. She would like to take the existing language and add the correct information.
- The Chairwoman stated we may need to clarify home occupation and mixed use. She stated the Site Regulations are not clear to everyone. Ms. Scott asked The Board if they would like her to reformat and add the necessary information.
- Ms. DiFruscia stated there have certainly been changes to the RSA's and we need to incorporate them into our Site Regulations.

- Ms. Nysten stated she does not want Ms. Scott to make vast changes. Ms. Nysten has spent countless hours comparing and correcting documents with major discrepancies.
- Ms. Scott will be taking existing language and put it in this outline. She will not be changing, deleting or adding language,
- The Chairwoman stated that Ms. Scott can look and see where the holes are and what needs to be done. She asked for cross-references.
- Ms. St. Laurent's biggest concern is the General Standards.
- Ms. St. Laurent stated she would like Ms. Scott to look at the Regulations, Mr. Wrenn, and the Chairwoman agreed. Ms. Scott will start the reformatting of the regulations.

Rules of Procedure Workshop

- Ms. Scott stated the Rules and Procedures have not been updated since 2009. They need to be amended to account for the establishment of the Design Review Subcommittee.

Motion by Ms. DiFruscia for new business for Article 11 after 10:30 pm, seconded by Ms. Webber. Motion passed 7 – 0.

- Ms. Scott stated that on 11.2 of the Rules of Procedures the Board needs to add the number of members (5).
- Ms. Post suggested an apostrophe on 11.4 “applications” and to remove the language” which are applicable as” in Section 11.3
- Ms. St. Laurent asked if this Subcommittee needed a quorum. Yes Ms Scott stated.

The Chairwoman opened the hearing to the public, hearing no comment; public comment was closed at 10:55 pm.

Ms. Webber motioned to adopt amending the Rules of Procedures to include 5 member, correcting a spelling error, and to remove the language” which are applicable as” in Section 11.3, seconded by Ms. DiFruscia. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Member Binder Update

Updated were provided to the Board in their packages which included: Community Development Department Application Fees (Tab #9), School Impact Fee Methodology (Tab #20) and Law Update (Tab #16)

Old/New Business

- Ms. Scott asked that she be able to change the name of the Department on documents to reflect the correct name of “Community Development”. The Board agreed.

May30, 2012 Approved Planning Board Minutes

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by Ms. Post, seconded by Ms. DiFruscia. Motion passed 7 – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 pm.

These minutes were amended and approved by the Board at the June 27, 2012 meeting and respectfully submitted for your approval by Cathy Pinette, Planning Board Minute Taker.