



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

October 16, 2013

Board Members:

Kristi St. Laurent, Chairman – Present

Margaret Crisler, Vice Chair – Present

Pam Skinner, Member – Excused

Vanessa Nysten, – Present

Sy Wrenn, Member – Present

Paul Gosselin, Alternate, Present

Ross McLeod, Selectman – Excused

Kathleen DiFruscia, Selectman Alternate, Present

Jonathan Sycamore, Member – Excused

Alan Carpenter, Alternate – Excused

Jim Fricchione, Alternate – Excused

Steve Bookless, Alternate - Excused

Staff:

Elizabeth Wood, Community Planner

Nancy Prendergast, ZBA Code Enforcement

Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant

Call to Order/Attendance/Pledge of Allegiance:

Chair St. Laurent called the meeting to order at 6:07 pm, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, member attendance and a brief synopsis of the agenda.

Public Hearing for 2014-2021 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP):

Notice is hereby given that the Windham Planning Board will hold a public hearing to review and adopt the “Capital Improvements Program 2014-2021”.

Vice-Chair Crisler, in the interest of time, requested that the Chair set a time limit for presentations and proceeded to read the CIP Public Hearing notice into the record.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to open the Public Hearing. Motion passed: 6-0.

Chair St. Laurent requested that Rob Gustafson, chair of the CIP subcommittee, make his PowerPoint presentation available on-line and proceed quickly through the introductory background slides.

Mr. Gustafson walked through the Capitol Improvement requests department by department and explained the grading assessment matrix. The only unfunded request this year was the Heritage Commission’s “Continuing Windham History” book. Mr. Gustafson’s only concern is the one request coming forth from Solid Waste for next year. He would like to see requests covering future years to factor them into the CIP Plan. Mr. Sullivan replied that Solid Waste had considered other requests, but the requests were very close to the \$40,000 limit. Leasing may be a more economical solution for them, than buying. Also, Mr. Gustafson explained that there was \$24,875 in a CRF fund for the library. Mr. Sullivan explained that the sum was specifically designated for future expansion and cannot be used for anything else.

Questions/Comments from the Board:

- Vice-Chair Crisler confirmed that there was no request from Police. Mr. Gustafson hoped that Police would have offered some projected expenses.
- Ms. Nysten confirmed that School is requesting only a roof replacement The Chair asked about the various pieces of equipment and were they new pieces or replacement pieces. Fire

is requesting all replacement vehicles and Highway is asking for a new excavator and replacement of others.

- The Vice-Chair asked about money that the Town receives yearly from the State for roads. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Town currently receives about \$309,000/year which is used to offset the budget.
- Mr. Dave Sullivan, Town Manager, asked about the \$250,000 received for the Recreation Committee from the Spruce Pond Article for Town field engineering and upkeep. That money has already been secured and is not part of the current proposal for a \$275,000 Spruce Pond field CIP budget item.

The Chair opened the Hearing to the Public. Hearing none, the Public Hearing was closed.

The Chair asked Ms. Wood about the CIP Budget adoption process. Mr. Sullivan said that the Planning Board adopts the CIP Program and submits it to the Board of Selectmen who adopt the budget and use it for first year Capitol expenses. From there it moves to the Town Meeting and any needed adjustments will be made at next year's budget process.

The Board thanked the Committee for their outstanding effort.

Vice Chair Crisler motioned and Ms. Nysten seconded to adopt the recommended CIP Budget for 2014-2021. Motion passed: 5-0-1. Ms DiFruscia, the BOS representative, abstained.

Public Hearings for Applications:

Case#2013-30/Minor Site Plan/Town Parking Lot

A Minor Site Plan Application has been submitted for 2 & 4 North Lowell Road (11-C-1200, 1300), located in the Historic District. The applicant, the Town of Windham is proposing to modify the existing parking area fronting North Lowell Road by paving an area sized 18' X 18' to increase the number of parking spaces from two (2) handicapped spaces, sized 18' X 15', and two (2) standard spaces, sized 9' X 18', to two (2) handicapped spaces and four (4) standard spaces with the same standard dimensions.

The Vice Chair read Case#2013-30/Minor Site Plan/Town Parking Lot into the record.

The Chair said that this is considered a Town Government application and the Planning Board is considered advisory only.

Vice Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to open the hearing to the public. Motion passed: 6-0.

Ms. Wood said there was new information gathered that did not make it into the Board's packet and was handed out in a memo from Dave Sullivan to the Planning Board dated 10/16/13 at the beginning of the meeting. They addressed two points that were not addressed by the applicant for which he will need waivers. Although the Town is encouraged to meet regulations, they are not required to. The Vice-Chair said that if the Board is only advisory, then they are not able to approve waivers.

The applicant, Mr. David Sullivan, Town Administrator, speaking for the Town of Windham is proposing to modify the existing parking area fronting North Lowell Road by paving an area sized 18ft X 18ft to increase the number of parking spaces from two (2) handicapped spaces, sized at 18ft X 15ft, and two (2) standard spaces, sized 9ft X 18ft, to two (2) handicapped spaces and four (4) standard spaces with the same standard compliant dimensions. A 10ft buffer of grass and shrubbery will be maintained between the two buildings. These changes will help to alleviate parking congestion along the street.

Mr. Sullivan, addressing the waiver request from Section 602.1.2.4, asked forgiveness for not drawing the diagram to scale. For a waiver from Section 703.1.2 which requires parking spaces to be located not closer than 20ft to a front property line, Mr. Sullivan explained that new spaces will not exceed the current 4 lot spacing which is 10ft. The Historic District Commission, Board of Selectman, and NH DOT District 5 are in full support of the proposal. The Town does have to file a permit for excavation because of the location of a State road. There are no drainage issues. He asked the Planning Board for their support.

Questions/Comments from the Board:

- Ms. Nysten asked if there will be any signage. There will be ground striping and the typical, required Handicapped signs and stenciling for two spots. Ms. Wood asked that the sign dimensions for the handicapped signs be supplied for the file. Mr. Sullivan agreed.
- Mr. Wrenn asked if the additional parking spaces and parallel parking on No Lowell created a safety concern and what could be done to allay that. Mr. Sullivan said that a no parking sign along the right of way may help. But the seniors may object. Mr. Sullivan and the DOT do not consider it a hazard for the 3 hours 2 days a week that the Senior Center is used.
- Ms. Nysten agrees with the safety concern and would like something to slow traffic down. Mr. Sullivan has asked the State four (4) times in twelve (12) years for alleviation of speed. The State has denied the requests. The Town cannot regulate speed on a State road. The speed limit is 30 mph.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked if there was sufficient lighting. Mr. Sullivan said there was.
- Ms. Nysten inquired if the elevation of the parking spots and the buildings are the same. Mr. Sullivan said the parking spots and the buildings are level.
- Ms. Nysten asked if there was anything that would prevent the cars parking in the spots from overshooting them and going too close to the building. Mr. Sullivan said there is one space that is closer than the others, and there is a concrete ramp to prevent that.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public.

- Ms. Barbara Coish, said that there are more and more seniors with walkers who have difficulty moving up from the rear, lower level parking lot. The additional top spaces will be a great help, and she supports the proposal.

The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to support the application as presented. Motion passed: 5-0-1. Ms. DiFruscia, Board of Selectman member, abstained.

Ms. Nysten inquired and Ms. Prendergast confirmed that the Notice of Decision information about the variance is printed on the plan set and also mentioned in her memo of 10/9/13.

Case#2013-25/WWPD Special Permit:

A Wetland and Watershed Protection District Special Permit Application has been submitted for 11 Lowell Road (Lot 21-U-2), located in the Rural District, Wetland and Watershed Protection, and Flood Plain District. The applicant, Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, Inc., on behalf of the property owner, Marie Johnson, is proposing to construct a new single family home, driveway, and septic system on the currently vacant lot. The temporary impact to the WWPD would be 9,500 sq. ft. with a permanent impact of 4,500 sq. ft.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Case #2013-25 into the record. Chair St. Laurent asked Staff member, Nancy Prendergast, if the application was complete.

Ms Prendergast said the application was complete and informed the Board that a pending variance application had been approved by the ZBA.

Mr. Joe Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing Mrs. Marie Johnson of 11 Lowell Road, said that Mrs. Johnson had purchased the land in 1970 which had been previously subdivided in 1967 with a brook bisecting the lot. Mrs. Johnson has been paying on the lot for a number of years and is now interested in trying to make it a buildable lot. Mr. Maynard walked the Board through the lengthy Zoning Board variance history and TRC comments. He explained the 3 possible options that would impact bordering Wetlands to different degrees. At one of the ZBA meetings, a wetland scientist recommended one option that she believed would impact the wetlands the least. She further recommended "armoring" at the embankment at the bend in the brook. Benchmark Engineering decided on a vegetative solution and this was the design that was granted a variance. The vegetative solution would improve visibility on this difficult portion of the road and would be self governing vegetation. If the owners want their clear view to the road, they will keep the vegetation in check.

Mr. Maynard is here tonight to ask for the Board to grant the WWPDP Special Permit.

Questions/Comments from the Board:

- Mr. Wrenn asked about the location of the Flood Plain mitigation area and the difficult visibility at the bend in the road. Mr. Maynard explained the additional excavation that will occur will clean up the site and improve drivers' visibility on that bend in the road. Mr. Wrenn asked who would be responsible for maintaining the vegetation in check. Mr. Maynard said it would self monitor; the property owners, who would now enjoy an improved view, will keep it in check to keep their improved view.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked how steep the slope is from the applicant's house to the plantings along Collins Brook. Mr. Maynard said it is flat just behind the house, but drops to about 70 degrees at the banking.
- Ms. DiFruscia asked how much impervious surface there would be. Mr. Maynard said about 12% of the entire lot. Aside from the paved driveway, there is no other pavement.
- Mr. Maynard explained the storm water runoff mitigation efforts that will be used. After construction plantings and shrubs will have taken root.
- Ms. Nysten asked where Center School is in relation to the site and expressed concern about school traffic which may be a problem. Mr. Maynard said the applicant's site is 3 houses after Center School has not had a problem in the past.
- Chair St. Laurent asked about a plan for floodwater mitigation. Mr. Maynard explained that the excavation on the property will create a low spot that will collect storm water and prevent it from running onto neighboring lowland property. Chair St. Laurent asked that a note for flood plan mitigation at that area be added to the plan. This will be a condition of approval.
- Mr. Gosselin asked about a possible vernal pool. Mr. Maynard said there is no vernal pool present.
- Ms. Nysten asked if there will be a basement and a drainage system around the foundation. Mr. Maynard said it is a split-level design and there will be a foundation drain running water off the back corner of the house toward the brook.

Chair St. Laurent opened the hearing to the public. Hearing none, she closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. DiFruscia motioned and Mr. Gosselin seconded to grant the WWPDP Special Permit with the condition that the flood plain mitigation area be noted on the Plan. Motion passed 5-1-0. Vice-Chair Crisler opposed.

Administrative Review:

Case#2013-27/MAJOR Watershed Application

A MAJOR Cobbetts Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Development proposal has been submitted for 20 Ash Street (16-F-2), located in the Residence District A Zone and Cobbetts Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed

Overlay Protection District. The Applicant, Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, Inc., on behalf of the Property Owner, Paula A. Jones Rev. Trust, is proposing to construct a detached garage, sized 790 sq. ft. on the property. The existing impervious surface coverage is 5,196 sq. ft. or 24.9% and is proposed to be 5,896 sq. ft. or 28.3%.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Case # 2013-27 into the record.

Ms Wood said the application is complete and there are no further reports.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to accept the application of Case #2013-27 for Public Hearing. Motion passed: 6-0.

Mr. Joe Maynard of Benchmark Engineering Inc. representing the owner explained the history of the house and that he had previously received a variance to construct a detached garage over an existing paved surface. Consequently, the amount of impervious surface is almost a wash. Run off from neighboring yards will be mitigated by the installation of a rain garden to collect water before it becomes run-off to downstream neighbors.

Comments/Questions from the Board:

- The Board asked about special plantings. Mr. Maynard said there is a whole schedule of plantings noted on the plan to prevent and detain run-off.
- Ms. DiFruscia confirmed that there will be less driveway when the project is complete.
- Ms. Nysten asked for the Keach-Nordstrom's letter. Ms. Wood passed around her copy dated 10/10/13.
- Mr. Gosselin asked if the Shoreline Permit had been received. Yes, it had and the permit number will be added to the plan.

Chair St. Laurent opened the hearing to the public. Hearing none, she closed the Public Hearing.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to grant the application with the condition that a copy of the NH DES shoreline permit be placed in the file and the permit number be added to the plan. Motion passed: 6-0.

Public Hearings for Applications:

Case#2013-29/Minor Site Plan/Free-Standing Sign

A Minor Site Plan for a Free Standing Sign has been submitted for 5 Industrial Drive (13-A-196), located in the Limited Industrial District. The applicant, Jutras Signs, on behalf of Simsbury Partners, LLC., is proposing to replace the existing external sign lighting on the peak of the building with interior illuminated individual lettering. The proposal is also to replace the 24" X 53.5" (8.9 sq. ft.) freestanding sign, and retain the existing up-lit lighting.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Case #2013-29 into the record.

Ms. Wood stated the application is complete for the wall sign, but the Board will need to decide about the free-standing sign which was previously approved as a directional sign. The applicant wants to change that into a complex free-standing sign because business names and logos are being added to the sign. The Board will need to examine the definition of a free standing sign as defined in the Town Ordinance. Per the Ordinance, a directional sign cannot have logos unless the business is not visible from the public way. The two pieces of this application, the wall sign and the free-standing sign, can be reviewed separately. If the Board deems that the free standing sign does not meet zoning, then the applicant would need to get a variance and alter the directional sign. However, the Board could review and approve the wall sign today. Some signage has been installed, and the applicant has applied for a temporary sign permit. Photos of this sign are available.

Comments/Questions from the Board:

- Vice-Chair Crisler recommended continuing the application to give the Board time to review the information. She also said that she did not think that one application could be split into two parts.
- Mr. Gosselin questioned whether the sign in front of the Board was actually a directional sign because of the address with street number and tenant names present. Also, because the property abuts two different roadways and could have 2 different signs on 2 different sides of the building, then does this represent a third sign? Vice-Chair Crisler agreed that this is not a directional sign, but a free-standing sign. Ms. Wood maintained that a property may have as many directional signs as they want, as long as the building is not visible from the street.
- Vice-Chair Crisler spoke to the intent of the Ordinance and stated that the Planning Board ~~has~~ does not have the authority to grant a variance. This is a second free-standing sign announcing the presence of the businesses. It needs ZBA authority.
- The applicant, Kathy Champagne from Jutras Signs representing Michael Greenburg and Elliot Hospital, explained that when you turn in, the building is actually behind you. And so this free-standing sign has been modified to help people and steer traffic in the right direction.
- Vice-Chair Crisler clarified the ordinance and said that if you cannot see the “building” from the road then the exception is allowed; providing Happy Feet Dance School as an example. Ms. Champagne said that the building can be seen from the road, but the businesses in the building cannot be seen.
- The Board and Ms. Champagne had a thorough discussion about the spirit of the Sign Ordinance and its intent. They also discussed the background color change that was made without a variance and regard for Design Standards. The existing sign is noted as a directional sign on the plan. The business can be seen when standing at the road/driveway. Only one free-standing sign is allowed by right.
- Several Board members agreed that a sign was needed, but that the sign in front of the Board was not legal and needed ZBA approval.
- Chair St. Laurent decided to poll the Board:
 - Ms. DiFruscia supports the necessity of a sign, but thinks the sign seeking approval needs a variance. She feels if the Planning Board were to approve this sign, they would be usurping the authority of the ZBA and setting a cautionary precedence;
 - Mr. Wrenn commented on the change of background color and lettering color. The Board has tried to be consistent with the background signage color for pleasing aesthetics and to avoid a carnival appearance. Ms. Champagne said that the colors were dictated by Elliot with their message, content and corporate standards. She looks to Elliot for guidance on how they want their identity displayed.
 - Vice-Chair Crisler noted that it is the purview of the Planning Board to decide on sign color and suggested the applicant refer to the Design Review Committee;
 - Ms. Nysten confirmed she believes that the sign would be more attractive with a lighter background with blue lettering and agrees with what Mr. Wrenn stated;
 - Chair St. Laurent asked how many signs were in place at the site. Ms. Champagne replied there is a large panel sign, a small sign with the company name and a banner with Elliot Pediatric on it. Ms. Champagne acknowledged the panels are in and had thought the temporary sign permit was in place. An application is currently in process.
- Chair St. Laurent continued polling the Board:
 - Ms. DiFruscia underscored the need for ZBA approval;
 - Vice-Chair Crisler stood on her previous decision that the application needs to go before the ZBA;
 - Mr. Wrenn thinks the application needs a variance;
 - Ms. Nysten agreed with Mr. Wrenn’s decision;
 - Mr. Gosselin said he did not think the stand alone sign is a directional sign does not think the Planning Board can accept it without a variance;
 - Chair. St. Laurent also thinks the applicant needs to receive ZBA variance approval;

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Ms. DiFruscia seconded to not accept Case #2013-29 as complete. Motion passed: 6-0.

Staff will work with the applicant to prepare a complete application for future acceptance. The applicant asked about the status of the wall sign application which seemed to be complete. Ms. Wood explained that the 3 sign applications could not be considered separately because they were tied together in the one application in front of the Board, a procedural piece that Vice Chair Crisler pointed out.

Case#2013-26/Granite Woods Open Space Subdivision/WWPD Special Permit

An Open Space Subdivision Application has been submitted for Wilson Road (24-F-1100, 1120), located in the Rural District Zone and Wetland and Watershed Protection District. The applicant, Peter Zohdi of Edward N. Hebert Associates, Inc., on behalf of the property owner, DHB Homes, LLC, is proposing to merge Lots 24-F-1100, and 1120 and then to subdivide the property into twenty-one (21) lots for single-family residential development to be served by separate wells and septic systems, and three (3) open space lots, sized 20.665 acres (900,167.4 sq. ft.), 10.588 acres (461,213.28 sq. ft.), and 5.674 acres (247,159.44 sq. ft.) for a total of 36.927 acres (1,608,540.12 sq. ft.) or 62.6% dedicated to open space. Included in this proposal is the extension of Wilson Road and the creation of a new road ending in a cul-de-sac to access the lots. A Special Permit Application has also been submitted for a wetland and WWPD crossing for access to the 21-lot subdivision and associated wells within the WWPD.

Vice-Chair Crisler read Case #2013-26 into the record.

Ms. Wood said the application is complete

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to accept for Public Hearing Case #2013-26. Motion passed: 5-0.

Ms. Wood asked the Board to decide whether to open this application in the Design Review application phase with comments being non-binding or in the Final Phase with binding comments and the beginning of a 65 day time limit for the Board to act.

Ms. Wood recommended that the Board focus on the four (4) items she has listed on her 10/16/13 staff review. The Highway Safety Committee is present to make comments. There is also a nine page memo from Steven Keach dated 9/30/13.

Comments/Questions by the Board:

- Chair St. Laurent asked if the application is a Subdivision or a Site Plan Application. Ms. Wood explained it is a subdivision and explained the differences between a Design Review Application and a Subdivision Final Phase application.
- Vice-Chair Crisler made the observation that a complete application was not submitted until October 1, 2013 and so the applicant is well within the 65 day clock,

Mr. Peter Zohdi of Herbert Associates, would like the Board to take jurisdiction tonight. He has never before held the Board to a 65 day restriction and has always worked with the Board until the project was complete and all plans comply. He needs some binding answers tonight to go forward with the project.

- Vice Chair Crisler asked if the plan is the same plan that's been available in the department and TRC for the past 15 days. Yes it is. Vice-Chair Crisler said it could be accepted as a Final
- The Board discussed the need for a site walk, the appropriateness of making binding or non-binding comments, and setting precedence.
- Chair St. Laurent summarized the decision before of the Board:

- Ms. DiFruscia has no problem accepting the application as a Final Plan. She thinks the Board is prepared to give guidance and a site walk is needed. Ms. Wood's 4 points are important basic information and need to be heard. The Board is prepared to give guidance;
- Vice-Chair Crisler said Mr. Zohdi has met the legal requirements for a Final Application and an extension can be requested for the 65 day requirement. A Design Review application cannot be foreced;
- Mr. Wrenn thinks a Final Application is correct for the reasons previously stated;
- Both Mr. Gosselin and the Chair think a Final is correct at this point;
- Ms. Nysten wants to be assured of a site walk and then she is comfortable accepting it as a Final Application.

Mr. Zohdi provided a brief overview of the project emphasizing the four points outlined in Ms. Wood's 10/16/13 memo for which he is looking for guidance.

The Board looked to the Town Safety Officials for their input.

Tom McPherson, Chairman of the Highway Safety Committee, reviewed the plan in detail.

- He has worked with Mr. Zohdi over the years and thinks that the cistern locations will find a resolution.
- Fire Department recommended 28ft road width out of concern for winter maintenance, car parking, and emergency access, and will work with the applicant on this.
- He will work with Mr. Zohdi on cul de sac radius to keep it as wide as possible for emergency and winter vehicle access.
- The importance of connectivity by eliminating the cul de sac and connecting two roads is important and he will continue to work with the applicant on that;
- The requirement for no more that an 8% grade in winter is a concern from a Safety and Highway stand point. He wants to keep that as a consideration as the plan moves forward.
- He wants to keep Stop sign at intersections.

Jack McCartney from the Highway Department is hopeful for the connectivity between Jefferson and Washington.

- 28ft of road lasts longer that a 24ft road. It stands up better and is easier to maintain.
- He emphasized the need to keep the grade at no more than 8%. It is a regulation.
- Guard rails should be 36inches beyond the curbing.
- Stop signs should be done; it's a good safety issue.

Ms. Wood asked about the 700ft driveways on two northerly lots; does this add to the concern? Jack said it would be a concern of cistern location for the Fire Dept. Mr. McPherson said a hammerhead driveway will needed for vehicle turn around. Mr. Zohdi and he will work together on that.

Ms. DiFruscia asked for an explanation of closed vs. open drainage. Mr. McCartney gave a thorough and comprehensive explanation of which style works best in what location and terrain.

Mr. Zohdi assured the Board that there is no road grade that is more than 8%. He can design the long driveway to be 8%; it is currently 9%. He has no problem with a 28ft road width. The drainage is currently closed, but will defer to the Board's decisions on that. His client does not own the land that the connectivity road would go through. In his opinion, crossing 17,000 sqft of land is a lot. He does not think Conservation will agree with the plan. He will work with Fire, Police, and Highway to determine an agreeable cul de sac design.

The Board discussed the connectivity issues, the topographical impact, the cul de sac radius, and are determined to do a site walk.

Ms. Wood said the Mr. Sullivan is doing research on how the land was acquired. It could make a difference on crossing it with a road.

The Chair opened the hearing to the Public.

Peter Stamnas of 7 Jefferson Rd, an abutter, believes that everybody has a right to develop their land and the development needs to be within the rules of the land. He believes connectivity is a good thing. Maybe the lot cannot support the number of homes proposed. Maybe there is an effort to trying to make it work. He has not had an opportunity to speak with his neighbors and thinks the connectivity piece was a surprise to him because it was not on the plan. He thinks his neighbors will be surprised also. The traffic impact will be on Wilson and Washington Rds; those residents will be concerned.

Ms. Wood explained that the applicant had to provide a yield plan that supports the number of lots on the land which must be engineer approved. This also included the length of road²

- Ms. Nysten asked about Section 602.2.4 of the Subdivision Regulations which allows for cul de sac streets longer than 1200 ft. Ms Wood explained the Planning Board would have to decide it meets all the required criteria.

Wendy Stamnas asked about the size of the intended bridge over the wetland. Mr. Zohdi said it is 36in high by 50" by 105". It is not a bridge; it is a box culvert. She asked about a driveway which seemed to her to be in the wetlands. Mr. Zohdi said it is not in the wetlands, it is in the WWPD and-with a special permit, a driveway is allowed in the WWPD. The Planning Board has not made that determination yet. There are other special permits required as well.

A site walk was scheduled for 9am on Saturday, October 26 at the Wilson Rd. cul de sac.

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn seconded to continue the Public Hearing to date certain on November 6, 2013, at 7pm and also to schedule the site walk for October 26 at 9am.

Motion passed: 6-0.

The Chair called a recess at 9:03pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:15pm.

Ms. DiFruscia was excused at 9:03pm.

2014 Town Meeting

Zoning District Boundaries Subcommittee Discussion

- Mr. Wrenn confirmed that the Board will be discussing the format of notices.
- The subcommittee is asking the Board's permission to notify property owners and abutters regarding rezoning of property in their area.
- Mr. Wrenn said the subcommittee has met 4 times and determined what properties and the rational for the rezoning or no rezoning decisions.
- Ms Wood said the letter will include a link to the minutes and CTAP WEDC Survey results

The Board supported the mailing effort.

Mr. Wrenn motioned and Ms. Nysten seconded to approve the Zoning District Boundaries Subcommittee minutes of 9/24/13 and 10/1/13 as amended. Motion passed: 2-0.

Meeting Minutes – Review and Approve :

- September 4, 2013

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn Seconded to approve the minutes of September 4, 2013 as

amended. Motion passed: 4-0-1. Mr. Gosselin abstained.

-September 18, 2013

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Mr. Wrenn Seconded to approve the minutes of September 18, 2013 as amended. Motion passed: 4-0-1. Mr. Gosselin abstained.

The Chair reminded the Board to keep minutes succinct, to the point, and to make an effort not to have word for word quoting. The Chair recommended striking a middle ground. Also, if the message is repeated at some other place in the document/meeting, it does not need to be repeated.

September Planner's Report:

Ms. Wood presented a verbal accounting of her monthly's accomplishments.

Old/New Business:

Mr. Wrenn spoke about the WEDC's recent water study and meeting that is being publicized. Mr. Gosselin added that part of the purpose of the water study meeting and publicity is let Town people know who the Committee is composed of and what they do for the Town.

Member Binder Updates:

-2013 PB Member Contact Info

Adjournment:

Vice-Chair Crisler motioned and Ms. Nysten seconded to adjourn the October 16, 2013 meeting. Motion passed: 5-0.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Mimi Kolodziej, Planning Assistant.