

CITY OF LACONIA PLANNING BOARD
6:30 PM City Hall - Conference Room 200A
Draft Minutes

10/2/2018 - Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair: P. Brunette: Calls the meeting to order at 6:33 PM

2. ROLL CALL

R. Mora: Conducts roll call with the following present: B. Beliveau, D. Broughton, C. St Clair, D. Bownes, G. Denio, M. DellaVecchia, C. Marchesseault, and P. Brunette.

Chair: P. Brunette: States that B. Beliveau will be a voting member of the board this evening.

3. RECORDING SECRETARY

Robert Mora

4. STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Dean Trefethen, Planning Director and Brandee Loughlin, Assistant Planning Director

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone has any changes requested from the previous minutes. No changes were requested and the minutes were considered accepted as presented.

Chair: P. Brunette: Explains that the application for Trail Haven will not be heard tonight due to it not being properly noticed and it must be re-noticed. Also 37 Leighton Avenue will not be heard this evening.

6. PRESENTATIONS

None

7. EXTENSIONS

7.1. Extension - Awka Vista Meredith Bay Mid-rise/The Lodges (PDF)

D. Broughton: Notes that Akwa is spelled incorrectly.

B. Loughlin: States it will be corrected on the NOA.

Applicant: Chris Duprey: Explains that this is located off of Scenic Road, and was started towards 2010 when they received their first occupancy permit. Details the construction plan and the economics of how they have developed so far and the course of time on how they will continue to develop the subdivision. Details how they are trying to time sales with what is being purchased with the market, with how that factors in with lead times during construction. Also that they have had to value engineer with the changing variables in the market. Notes that he has gone before the Zoning Board for an extension already for this project.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks staff on their opinion for this project.

D. Trefethen: States it's good to go.

Chair: P. Brunette: Explains that there was an extension that was passed last year according to the records that he has. Asks if anyone would like to make a motion or discuss the extension. Explains that extensions are 6 months from the Zoning Board of Adjustment and one year from the Planning Board.

D. Broughton: Makes a motion to grant the extension for one year to October 1, 2019.

Chair: P. Brunette: Notes this is for Application PL2010-0010SP.

C. St. Clair: Seconds motion.

All voted in favor for the extension 8-0.

7.II. Extension - The Gardens at Winnepesaukee (PDF)

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks applicant if there is another application that he is here for this evening and if he will be asking for a continuance for that application?

Agent: Patrick Wood, from Patrick Wood Law Offices: States that he will be asking for a continuation for New Hope Drive.

Chair: P. Brunette: States that New Hope Drive PL2018-0080SU.

Agent: Patrick Wood: States that they are looking for a continuance of the application acceptance meeting.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for the reason they would like to continue the acceptance?

Agent: Patrick Wood: Explains that those that are purchasing the project are still working on new plans and having a wetlands study performed. So they feel that they are not yet ready to go forward, but will be ready for the November meeting.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for staff recommendations.

D. Trefethen: Supports the continuance of the acceptance.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if any board members have any questions.

C. Marchesseault: Motions to continue PL2018-0080SU New Hope Drive to the November Planning Board meeting.

Agent: Patrick Wood: Asks about November meeting date because it lands on Election Day.

Board and Staff discuss changing the date of the next Planning Board meeting so that it will not fall on Election Day. No date is established. Staff states that they will find a date that works and will make sure all notifications are properly made.

D. Broughton: Seconds motion to continue application PL2018-0080SU to the next Planning Board meeting.

All voted in favor 8-0 for application PL2018-0080SU.

Agent: Patrick Wood: States that he is representing Phoenix Capital and looking for an extension for the Gardens for one year due to finance issues that are still being worked out. Looking for an extension to October 2019. Also details that they have all of the required state permits just working on financing.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for staff recommendation.

D. Trefethen: States he supports the extension.

C. St. Clair: Makes a motion to approve the extension for Winnepesaukee Gardens, application PL2016-0120SP, 0121SU, 0122CUP, 0123CUP, PL2017-0002CUP, and 0068CUP. (Corrected by amendment made by Chair)

D. Broughton: Seconds motion.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks to amend motion for correct applications numbers.

All voted in favor 8-0 to grant an extension for the above mentioned applications and those referenced in the agenda.

7.III. Extension - Governor's Crossing (PDF)

Applicant: Dick Letendre: States that he would like an extension for one year for the project. That there are lot of houses to develop and would like an extension until October 2019.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for a reason why he would like the extension.

Applicant: Dick Letendre: Explains the market issues that they have been having with the development, also people are looking at tax rates. People are doing more research on tax rates and are going to other communities that have lower tax rates than Laconia. Also that they have closed on three houses within the development and are looking to get some more permits to continue building.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for staff recommendation.

D. Trefethen: States that staff recommends the extension.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if there are any questions for the applicant and if anyone would like to make a motion for the application.

C. St. Clair: Makes a motion to grant the extension for one year to October 1, 2019 for application 04-031SP for Governor's crossing.

B. Beliveau: Seconds motion.

All voted in favor to grant the extension 8-0.

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is for the Board to continue the Public Hearing for the applicant and the public to provide input. The Board may also deliberate the application, decide and conduct a final vote at this time.

8.1. PL2018-0075CUP - Woodvale (PDF)

Chair: P. Brunette: Opens the application at 6:55 PM.

Applicant: Richie Homs: Explains that this lot was part of a master plan known as Wentworth Cove Estates adopted in 1972. That this was developed a long time ago. That they are looking to make this lot useable and that there was a curb cut already on the lot when he purchased it. This was developed before there was a wetlands buffer, goes over the history of wetlands buffer. Continues that the state does not require a wetlands buffer but the city does. Also the state came out and inspected the property due to a complaint of a violation and nothing was found. Continues on that he has given all the information from the state to the Laconia Conservation Commission. Explains that this is not a prime wetlands as defined by the State and does not require a buffer according to NH DES. Also that he has not seen any erosion on the property since he purchased it and Evan from the planning department can validate that. Details that he would like to fill some of the property and grade the property. Creating a wall that would keep the water on the lot and create a 10 foot wetlands buffer on the lot. Describes that in the future he would like to develop the lot, leaving all of the rain water on the lot, which would not cause flooding on the street.

D. Bownes: Asks if staff have received a letter before making a recommendation.

B. Loughlin: States that this is not a prime wetlands as defined by the state of NH however it is a wetlands, which a wetlands scientist has identified.

D. Bownes: Asks if we have made a recommendation based off of the letter that was received as the Conservation has made a recommendation. Which led them not to support the CUP for 46 Woodvale Ave. So did the conservation commission have the letter that has been referenced before it made its recommendation?

Applicant: R. Homs: States that the commission did have the letter prior to the meeting. Continues on that the conservation commission is a recommending board only. States that this is not a prime wetland it's a wetland because the property is wet. Describes that the board did not recommend it because they did not want to set a precedence because if they approved something it would affect future applications. States that he has already implemented their recommendation and that their recommendation were his recommendations. Also that if they are allowed to add their wall and drainage it will serve to protect the wetlands that is on the lot even though it is not a prime wetlands.

D. Bownes: Asks the applicant if he has already complied with the recommendations of the conservation board.

Applicant: R. Homs: States that he already has.

D. Broughton: Asks if they have already combined the two lots.

Applicant: R. Homs: Explains that they have already combined the two lots in question. That the lots combined are about .97 acres.

C. St. Clair: Asks where the water will be going and whether it will be staying on the lot.

Applicant: States that it was misstated in the application and they will be building a trench on the property to retain the water. Explains that this trench should be able to keep all of the water on the lot looking at the history of the lot and how much rain we have had. Also that he is not a drainage expert however believes it should be sufficient.

D. Bownes: Asks staff if they have had a chance to review the plans and if they feel it will be sufficient to safe guard the wetlands.

D. Trefethen: States that staff have not reviewed the plans and whether or not these changes would be affective.

Chair: P. Brunette: States that the plan that he is reviewing show that all of the water would drain to a currently non-existent dry well.

Applicant: States: States that his wordage was incorrect and it's listed as a dry well however he is wanting to create a trench that will go all the way across the old lot four. Details where the trenches will be dug and then crush stone laid down.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks about where the drainage ditch will lead the water as it's not shown on the plan, and where this water will go.

Applicant: R. Homs: States that the water will be staying on the lot that for how this is designed this will then filter then back into the ground.

Chair: P. Brunette: Remind the applicant that should he wish to develop this in the future he would still need to come back to the board for a CUP and might be required to produce more drainage.

Applicant: R. Homs: Acknowledges that he would have to come back to the board should he want to develop this parcel in the future. Continues on to describe his future plans and time tables of where he wants to go in the future with this lot. Perhaps creating a pond on the lot.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks about rail road ties and other materials on the lot and if they will be used for this project.

Applicant: R. Homs: Explains that those materials are just being stored on the lot at the moment and will not be used in this project in any way.

Chair: P. Brunette: Explains his last question for him is in regard to the memo from the staff about this project that details the timeline for the development of the lot. That the application was received on June 6, and that work has already been started on the lot. Asks if the applicant was aware at that point that they needed a permit to do this kind of work?

Applicant: R. Homs: Explains that when he started his work he called down to the City and spoke with Evan who told him he was allowed to cut some of the bushes and do the fill, then it was discovered that he needed a CUP. Continuing on he states that he went to TRC two times, then to conservation two times, which then brought him here to the Planning Board.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks when the state came through did their walk through.

Applicant: R. Homs: The state came through June 20, 2018. I have a copy of the original copy with me tonight. I had given a copy to Evan who was supposed to give it to conservation.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if it was previously given to the Planning Dept.

Applicant: States that he had given it to Evan but will provide a copy now to the board.

D. Bownes: Asks the Planning Director Dean Trefethen if the plans that have been submitted with the drainage ditch and retaining walls should be researched to ascertain whether or not they would provide protection and be able to fulfill the needs of this application.

Applicant: R. Homs: Asks if he can interject before Dean answers. Explains that he is not looking to build anything and that everything is just open space as of now. That nothing is changing on the lot that for example if it was to rain this evening 10,000 gallons all of those 10,000 gallons would stay on the lot. Nothing can or will change.

D. Trefethen: Explains that you notice that you do not have a set of staff recommendations for this project but have given a timeline of what has gone for this project and to see the timeline. If it's likely that you would approve a CUP for this application then we ask that you allow staff to make a recommendation. However, to answer your question the proposed drainage ditch solve any of the problems on the parcel we have not evaluated that yet. It could but we have not evaluated it.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if they evaluated it with the plans with the dry well.

D. Trefethen: States we haven't. That the complaint was received for this property was from one of the abutters which is what triggered DES going out to evaluate the property. The work that has been done so far does not violate any of the DES regulations and is not in any of the wetlands. DES has different definitions of kinds of wetlands unlike the city that just has a wetland and doesn't have different categories. The wetland that is on that lot has been delineated by a wetland scientist and we have not questioned the scientist that did the evaluation. It is acknowledged by the Planning Dept. that this lot is very difficult as it is all in the wetlands and some of the wetlands actually overlap. There is a reason why this lot has not been developed and that is not to say that this property cannot be developed. It is up to the board to decide what they are comfortable with for how much you want to establish as a buffer. This project has unfolded in a very unfortunate way, and went fast than we could respond to in any sort of enforcement manor. So nothing has been done for almost four months now.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if this could be approved tonight with some plan revisions.

D. Trefethen: States that you could, I would caution you as we don't have any sort of staff recommendation as of yet for this project. However, if the board would like to provide some guidance to us we would be happy to do in that direction.

D. Bownes: I don't want to just say no to this project or just say a 10 ft. or a 20 ft. buffer. Explains that he would like to listen to recommendations to what the proposal is and what the staff would like to recommend, with how we address issues on this lot. Asks staff how long they would need to make a recommendation?

D. Trefethen: Thinks that we can most likely be ready for the November meeting.

D. Bownes: Asks staff to gather information on how far the buffer should be in that area and whether or not the proposed plans would be sufficient to protect property owners in the area.

G. Denio: Asks applicant how flexible he is with the buffer space.

Applicant: R. Homs: Explains there is not a lot of space here and would like to protect the buffer but would like some space and it's a tough call. I want to gain the max space with the minimal permitting. Also talks about whether or not sewer will be added to this lot and how that will affect any development there in the future.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if the reason he combined the two lots was that in the future the owner would have a better chance of being able to develop something.

Applicant: States that when he combined the lots he lost the side setbacks that was in the middle of the lot. Explains the wetlands also take up about 60% of a portion of the lot. That lot four would be developed if it could be in the future. Then discusses that he has thought to make a pond on a portion of the lot in the future.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone from the Public would like to speak.

Chair of the Conservation Commission: Dean Anson: Explains that the commission has seen this project twice now. That the conservation commission has voted unanimously to not support this project. That this is the first time that we have all decided to support the unanimously not support a project because we think this starts a dangerous precedent. Explains that he understands where the applicant is coming from because he has had to deal a similar instance with his own property. The commission visited this property in June, there is work that was done on the lot. When we established the 50 foot buffer it was to protect the wetlands.

C. St. Clair: Asks if there is ever a time where they feel that one size does not fit all.

D. Anson: That's a good question, and when people come before our board we don't have any teeth. We advise people on what they should do. We advise applicants on how they can have less environmental impact. To preserve the natural resources of the city. Not to deny, that's what this board does. Gives an example of the board making recommendations to another person and that their suggestions did not hold that applicant up.

C. St. Clair: Asks if there are any recommendations that can be made for this applicant?

D. Anson: The answer is yes, if you are going to ask the Planning Department to look at this the next Conservation meeting could be an opportunity for us to review Staff's recommendations and make some recommendations.

D. Broughton: Asks if the Conservation Board gave the applicant recommendations?

D. Anson: Explains that the applicant is going to take the stand that he has taken tonight because of the constraints of the wetlands surrounding the area that he would like to fill. That they are not compatible with the designs that he is trying to do.

D. Bownes: Asks if staff can develop some sort of recommendation for this property in regard to it being a type of wetland.

D. Trefethen: Explains that we don't have multiple types of wetlands.

Chair: P. Brunette: Explains that he understands that there is a need for the board to make certain circumstances for people to make a maximum use of their land. On the board needs to understand and take into consideration the cost benefits going in each direction? Provides a hypothetical question in that if the board were to approve this application would he (Dean Anson) as a citizen be happy with the compromise that was made?

D. Anson: States that it would be really based on what kind of compromise was achieved. Explains that he has a lot of experience in environmental work and that there is a need to come to a compromise and not just approve an application. That options need to be looked at so that we don't have to draw a line in the sand. Which is much like this application where the applicant came to us and stated that this is my line that I can't cross and as a board we were unable to support that decision.

B. Beliveau: Asks why he is concerned with the creation of a precedence with this property because as it seems there is no water run-off from the property. Also that apparently there is no animal life or vegetation that is living in this area. If there are no adverse effects in this project why should we not support it?

D. Anson: Explains that there are wetland species that are living in this wetland. Explains that he is a wetland scientist and that he knows there is life in that wetland and that there is certain criteria in how you determine what a wetland is. For this application we did not have the study information that was done showing what was or wasn't in the wetland, all we had were flags placed on the property showing us where the wetland was. That they would have been happier and been able to make a better decision if they had more information.

C. Marchesseault: States that she would like to table the application until Planning Staff can make a recommendation.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if he feels this is going to set a legal precedence.

D. Anson: No he does not.

Chair: P. Brunette: Want to make sure that there was not going to a legal precedence set that would affect future developers.

Abutter: Christopher Cost, 45 Woodvale Dr: Explains that history of the neighborhood and how the water levels of the wetlands change over time and throughout the seasons. Also that he is disturbed that the city has allowed this property be used as a junk yard. Provides quotes from several RSA's and Zoning Ordinance tables for how he sees that the use of the property is not allowed. Continues on and describes how a couple of other lots on the property are often flooded when the snow begins to melt.

D. Broughton: Asks how long the storage trailers have been on the lot.

Abutter: C. Cost: States four months.

D. Broughton: Asks if residents are required to obtain permits to keep trailers on lots in the city.

D. Trefethen: States that they are not and it comes down to where the property is zoned. Details this property and how it is zoned as SFR and that these types of trailers are allowed to be stored on the lot and that they must be stored in the rear of the lot. Also that what makes this property unique is that there is no residence on the lot so it makes it difficult to delineate where the front and rear of the lots would be.

D. Broughton: Asks if there is a limit to how many trailers and such can be allowed on a single lot?

D. Trefethen: States that the city does not put a limit on how many of these types of assets you can have on a lot. The only thing that would matter is if it was a commercial use however in this instance there is no commercial use.

Abutter: Steve Smith, 245 Shore Dr: Explains that the city has no prime wetlands, and that the state really doesn't have prime wetlands. That there is a process for how wetlands become prime wetlands. Also states that he has done CUP's in the City before and the ordinance details what must be included in these applications and is concerned that the board doesn't have this information.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone else would like to speak tonight. Closes the public meeting at 7:57.

Applicant: R. Homs: Asks if he may speak.

Chair: P. Brunette: States he may speak.

Applicant: R. Homs: States that he provided Conservation commission with the information they requested and that Dean was in error when he stated that he did not provide information to the board. Discusses water quality.

Chair: P. Brunette: Discusses that the water quality is important and discusses how the water flows and becomes the drinking water for the community. States that he would like to hear about the storage containers and the boats.

Applicant: R. Homs: States that Planning has not told him that he needed to provide more information, he was never asked for any sort of environmental study. States that his abutter Chris Cost is concerned with his wetland impact when he is not impacting the property. Explains that his intentions for the property are for short term to store his trailers on the property. That in the future maybe not in one or two years but to build a house or a garage on the property. Continues on that he wants to talk about how his property is not a junkyard and that it is a work in progress. States that he thinks that board and the city have made bad decision in allowing extensions of projects to go through leaving properties around the city with construction equipment and sitting in them. Begins to talk about Dick Letendre and Governor's Crossing.

Chair: P. Brunette: States that he let the applicant come back up as a courtesy. That now he would like him to stop talking for a minute. Asks the board if they have any more questions.

Board did not have any further questions.

D. Bownes: Motions that he would like to have the Planning staff evaluate the drainage on the property and the retaining wall. Along with any other issues the Planning Department deems appropriate. Does not need an evaluation of the wetlands but would like to know what kind of impact this will be on the wetlands. That the board does not have enough information and he moves to table this until the November meeting so that staff can come up with a recommendation for this application.

C. Marchesseault: Seconds motion.

C. St. Clair: Asks if this can be done in a month.

D. Trefethen: States that he believes there is enough time to evaluate this property. He has been to the property several times and knows where the water is.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if they could do it before the next conservation commission meeting.

D. Trefethen: States that he does not know however it is possible.

All voted in favor 8-0

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS, POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION AND VOTE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is for the Board to have a presentation from the applicant and open a Public Hearing for the public to provide input. The Board may also deliberate the application, decide and conduct a final vote at this time.

9.I. PL2018-0084SU - Messer Street (PDF)

Chair: P. Brunette: Opens the public hearing at 8:11 PM

Agent: Philip Brouillard: Explains that he would like to create two 10,000 SF lots. Explains the lots and that they will have city services and that he agrees with the staff recommendations for this application. Details when services will be installed on the lots and when plans will be required if this is passed.

C. St. Clair: Asks about connections to city services.

Agent: P. Brouillard: States that it will be done in the spring and there will not be a gas connections.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks for staff recommendations.

B. Loughlin: States that this meets all of the zoning requirements and that the applicant is aware that they need to have services installed to both of the parcels before the plans can be recorded.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone from the public would like to speak.

No one from the public wished to speak for or against the application.

Chair: P. Brunette: Closes the public hearing at 8:14 PM.

C. St Clair: Asks to see the plans to see where the driveways will come out.

D. Broughton: Asks if they need driveway permits.

D. Trefethen: States that is part of the building permit process.

D. Brought: Makes a motion to approve the two lot subdivision PL2018-0084SU

C. St. Clair: Seconds motion.

D. Bownes: Asks to amend the motion to add in with staff recommendations.

All voted in favor of the application 8-0.

- 9.II. PL2018-0089CUP (wetland buffer) Trail Haven (Barbara Blvd) (PDF)
Not heard due to not being properly noticed.

9.III. PL2018-0093SU - 19 Warren Street (PDF)

Chair: P. Brunette: Opens the application at 8:17 PM

Agent: Steven Smith: Steve Smith and Associates: Explains details of the property and the zoning district. Describes the lot and how it will have two road frontages and meets all of the zoning requirements. Also explains that there is currently road construction around the lot and water connections have been made and there is currently a contact with Busby to connect sewer to the lot.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks board if there are any questions.

No questions from the board.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone would like to speak from the Public in regard to this project.

Abutter: Tammy Ryan of 29 Warren St: Asks which end of the property any development will be done.

Agent: S. Smith: States that the vacant lot will be accessed from Warren St from his understanding. Explains that the current owner is remodeling the current house and will build the new house on the newly created lot.

Abutter: Teresa Bair of 24 Warren St: States she wants to make sure this property will not be rented out to Laconia residents. Explains she has been there 24 years and would really hate a rental property there.

Agent: S. Smith: Explains that he doesn't think his client will be renting the property.

Abutter: Tim Martin of 28 Warren St: Explains that he is concerned with property values of the surrounding area and that there is another subdivision down the street already.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks if anyone else would like to speak.

No one else from the public wished to speak.

Chair: P. Brunette: Closes the application to the public at 8:24 PM.

B. Loughlin: Explains that this subdivision is very similar to the last project that was previous heard. It's very basic, that one lot currently has a structure on it and that both lots will meet all of the zoning requirements. Explains that there really are not too many options that to build a single family residence on the lots and that the city cannot put any provision about whether the property is rented or not. Lastly, states that staff recommend approval of the application.

D. Broughton: Asks what makes a single family a home or a multifamily.

B. Loughlin: Explains the definitions of single family, two family, and multifamily. Also explains that the city does not govern how many bedrooms are in each different kind of residential unit.

D. Broughton: Asks if the number of bedrooms affects the sewer line that is put in.

B. Loughlin: Explains that she does not know that and perhaps Public works would know and suggest that when they look at the building plans.

D. Broughton: Motions to approve the application PL2018-0093SU on 19 Warren St with staff's recommendations and that it be used as a single family home.

C. St. Clair: Seconds motion.

Chair: P. Brunette: Asks the person who made the motion to amend the motion to remove the use as a single family home.

D. Broughton: Accepts the amended motion.

All voted in favor 8-0 to accept the application PL2018-0093SU with staff recommendations.

10. APPLICATION ACCEPTANCE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is to publicize that a Planning Board application has been submitted AND for the Planning Board to determine if the application is complete enough to begin the review process.

PUBLIC INPUT IS NOT TAKEN AT THIS TIME. If the application is accepted the Planning Board will schedule a Public Hearing at which time the application will be heard and public comments will be accepted. Information about applications can be obtained on the city's web site or by calling the Planning office.

10.I. PL2018-0080SU - New Hope Drive (PDF)

Applicant: Asked for a continuance, which was granted during the extension of The Gardens at Winnepesaukee.

10.II. PL2018-0094CUP - 37 Leighton Ave South (PDF)

Not heard because it was not noticed.

11. NEW BUSINESS

Chair: P. Brunette: States that he has been discussing with Dean about the master plan steering committee and appointing members to the board. Discusses Bill Contardo and that he would like to stay on the board and committee. Discusses the process of removing people from the board for non-attendance. That he would like Mr. Contardo to state whether he would like to stay on the board and the committee because he has not attended any meetings for the last few months.

D. Bownes: Describes his history with Mr. Contardo on the board and that he would prefer not to get into attendance records of the board. Explains that as long as two members of the Planning Board are attending these meetings he does not see any issue.

D. Trefethen: States that it is the Chairs responsibility to appoint members to the Master Plan Steering Committee.

Chair: P. Brunette and D. Trefethen: Discuss who people that can plausibly be appointed to the Master Plan Steering Committee such as Gary Dione and himself (Peter Brunette).

Chair: P. Brunette: Appoints Gary Dione and Peter Brunette to the Master Steering Committee.

12. OLD BUSINESS

13. PLANNING DEPT REPORT

D. Trefethen: Explains that there has not been a Planning Board liaison to the Conservation Board and that there should be discussion about appointing a liaison to that board. That Conservation is requesting that Planning Board appoint someone so that information can be transferred from the Conversation Board to the Planning Board.

C. St. Clair: Asks how often that board meets.

D. Trefethen: States that they meet two times a month for short meetings.

D. Broughton: Asks about term expirations and how the process is managed.

D. Trefethen: Explains that you stay on the board and the City does the paperwork.

Board discusses: Residency requirements of board members.

Chair: P. Brunette: States that the CIP committee has had their first meeting and will meet two times this month.

D. Trefethen: Also states that unfortunately Brandee Loughlin will be leaving the Planning Department as she has taken a job with the State doing preservation.

14. LIAISON REPORTS

City Council Report by D. Bownes: States that the City Council is looking to make changes with Code Enforcement and the lack there of in enforcement. That it is still being discussed and that there are no formal changes as of yet however they could affect this board.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

None

16. ADJOURNMENT

D. Bownes: Motions to adjourn.

G. Denio: Seconds

All voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:47 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Robert Mora, Zoning Technician

Draft