

1. Chairman Ken Knowles called the meeting to order at 7:01pm in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Offices on the above date.
2. BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Aaron Brown, Kathy Corson, Anne Surman, Langdon Plumer, Ken Knowles (Chair), Kelly Bergeron, Katherine Woolhouse, Gwen English  
STAFF PRESENT: Sylvia von Aulock(Town Planner), Sarah McGraw (Recording Secretary)

Mr. Plumer, Ms. Bergeron, and Mr. Brown were designated voting members.

1. **Amend Article 5, Section 5.6 Off Street Parking (subsection B.) by adding new language to allow for flexibility in providing and calculating the required number of parking spaces for a proposed use.**

*Mr. Plumer motioned to open the public hearing, second by Ms. Bergeron. VOTE: Unanimous*

Ms von Aulock described the amendment as created from the previous All Boards Meeting. Ms. von Aulock noted that all amendments have gone before legal counsel except for Article 9.4.

BOARD COMMENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

*Mr. Plumer motioned to close the public hearing, second by Ms. Bergeron. VOTE: Unanimous*

*Mr. Plumer motioned to support the amendment to Article 5, as written second by VOTE: Unanimous*

2. **Amend Article 6 Supplementary Use Regulations by adding a new section entitled “ 6.19 Portsmouth Ave. Flexible Zoning Overlay District” . The purpose of this section is to develop an alternative permitting process that allows for flexibility within Exeter’s regulations. It would create an overlay district along Portsmouth Avenue’s commercial districts (C-1 and C-2) in which the Planning Board would have the authority to grant a Conditional Use Permit for building and/or site improvements. The process will be outlined in Exeter’s Site and Subdivision Regulations and in supplementary documents. Flexibility includes allowance for an Applicant to bypass the typical zoning variance process (if needed) in regards to building height and internal dimensional requirements.**

*Mr. Plumer moved to open the public hearing, second by Ms. Surman. VOTE: Unanimous*

Ms. von Aulock said the subcommittee met with a lawyer, town engineer and town staff and came to the conclusion that the plan needs work. Ms. von Aulock said the amendment is withdrawn for the year and will come back the next year.

*Mr. Plumer motioned to close the public hearing, second by Ms. English. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

*Ms. English motioned to not put Article 6 on the 2015 warrant, second by Ms. Bergeron. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

**3. Amend Article 9, Section 9.1 Wetlands Conservation District, Subsection 9.1.5 Permitted Uses by adding allowances for reductions to impervious surfaces and re-vegetation within the wetland buffer.**

Ms. von Aulock said the recent example for the use of this amendment with the Great Bay Kids Company. Ms. von Aulock asked why an applicant would need a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) when there would be a reduction in impervious surface near the wetland buffer. The only changes made to the amendment were editorial changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

*Mr. Plumer motioned to close the public hearing, second by Ms. Bergeron. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

*Ms. English motioned to place Article 9 on the 2015 warrant, second by Mr. Plumer. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

**4. Amend Article 9, Section 9.1 Wetlands Conservation District, Subsection 9.1.6 Conditional Uses by adding the following language to section B. Conditions:**  
**3. The proposed impact has been evaluated in the context of the relative “value” of the wetland including its ecological sensitivity, as well as its function within the greater hydrologic system. To the extent feasible, the proposed impact is not detrimental to the value and function of the wetland(s). (Renumber sections accordingly)**

After a question from the public, Ms. von Aulock explained Article 9.1.6 , number 4 on the handout had already been passed and was not listed on the agenda.

*Mr. Plumer motioned to open the public hearing, second by Ms. Woolhouse. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bev Tappan of Exeter and the Environmental Sustainability Committee of her housing community, commented that she was concerned on behalf of the Committee about article 5. She said the estuaries are dying and rivers are carrying nitrogen to the ocean. Ms. Tappan said any increase in nitrogen is bad.

Mr. Knowles commented that that the article adds to the Conditional Use Permit. Ms von Aulock said the Planning Board considers a CUP , it is used as a ruler if development

has detrimental impacts. Ms. von Aulock said no changes to the buffer width will be made.

Brian Griset of Exeter spoke in favor of the article. Mr. Griset said the current wetland overlay district bases wetlands on soil surveys with no examination on the values of the wetland.

*Mr. Plumer moved to close the public hearing, second by Ms. Bergeron. VOTE: Unanimous*

*Ms. English motioned to place article 9, Section 9.1 on the 2015 warrant as worded, second by Mr. Plumer. VOTE: Unanimous*

5. **Amend Article 9, Section 9.1 Wetlands Conservation District, Subsection 9.1.6 Conditional Uses by adding a new subsection entitled: “ D. Alternate Procedure for Subdivision and Site Plan Applications.” The intent of this section is to eliminate the duplication between the Conditional Use Permit process in the zoning ordinance and waivers for wetland buffers in Site and Subdivision Regulations.**

*Ms. English motioned to open the public hearing, second by Ms. Surman. VOTE: Unanimous*

Mr. Knowles commented that the reason for this article was to eliminate duplications in the site and subdivision regulations.

Ms. von Aulock said the town had surveyed various professionals; engineers, lawyers and they had said the wetlands regulations were duplicative.

BOARD COMMENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

*Ms. English motioned to close the public hearing, second by Mr. Plumer. VOTE: Unanimous*

*Ms. Bergeron motioned to approve the article to place on the 2015 warrant, second by Ms. Surman. VOTE: Unanimous*

6. **Amend Article 9, Section 9.1.3 Wetlands Conservation District Boundaries by adding a new subsection “G” to encourage commercial development along the Epping Road Corridor. New wetland setbacks are being proposed on the basis of functions and values in C-3, CT-1, and I zoning districts by the Economic Development Director.**

*Mr. Plumer motioned to open the public session, second by Ms. Bergeron. VOTE: Unanimous*

Darren Winham, Economic Director of Exeter described the zoning amendment. Mr. Winham said two problems were inhibiting development to the three zoning districts proposed above, no water or sewer and the wetland setbacks. Mr. Winham said the

setbacks are more stringent than what the State requires. Mr. Knowles read a letter by Julie Gilman, Chair of the Board of Selectman in support of the zoning amendment (included in the minutes).

Mr. Jim Gove of Gove Environmental spoke about his analysis of the wetlands. Mr. Gove said wetlands are in a limited area of the town and zoned for commercial use. Mr. Gove explained his results of the functions of the wetland through a graph which can be found in zoning amendments attached to these minutes under number 8. Article 9.1.3 Wetland Conservation District Boundaries. From his results he said that the wetlands within the boundaries of the proposed area are of low functional value.

Mr. Winham commented the design for the proposed area will allow for development. He said the value is diminished if that did not happen.

Ms. Surman commented on the Board of Selectman public hearing on Tuesday. She said the area was a small part of town. Ms. Surman added Mr. Winham was tasked with creating business to decrease the tax rate.

Mr. Plumer said he was now more comfortable with moving forward.

Ms. Woolhouse commented about nutrient loading of the wetland and asked about the scientific method for evaluating it.

Mr. Gove said there are two methods for evaluation, the New Hampshire Method and the Highway Method which determines where function exists, and asks a series of questions to determine the values. Mr. Gove said the system was not for anyone to change and certified by the state of New Hampshire. Mr. Gove said there are penalties for someone to misrepresent results of scientific information.

Ms. Woolhouse asked if there was an impact on ignoring all the low, non-functioning wetlands.

Mr. Gove said it would have an impact if every "finger" was considered not functional. Mr. Gove added the idea was not to remove buffer but to lessen it.

Mr. Knowles commented that he did vet the language of the wetland assessment with other consultants and said it was not unique to assign function to wetlands.

Joanna Pelorin\* of Exeter commented she was against changes to the overlay district. She said it was too sudden and she did not know until the past week about the proposal, that there was not enough time for input or understanding. Ms. Pelorin said people worked hard to get the overlay district and the new concept was moving fast. Ms. Pelorin said she listened to the TIFF presentation and she felt the proposal was backing up on what is protected.

Mr. Knowles said it was up to the boards to hire independent consultants and have ability to set functions and values.

Ms. Pelorin said it should be a standard.

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

Frank Ferraro, of Exeter commented he was in support of the amendment and added different wetlands have different values. Mr. Ferraro said the proposed amendment had a certified scientist to show the facts and findings who put his reputation on the line.

David Wilson of Exeter commented that he did not know if many people could understand the graphic that Mr. Gove explained. He continued there seems to be so many things wrong with the proposed amendment that he wants businesses to go into the corridor and encourage business development. He said there was a right way to create a tax base and there were ten new businesses during the recession. Mr. Wilson said he understood that the reason why businesses won't develop in the area is because of rock shelf inhibiting development. Mr. Wilson commented on the amount of traffic that would be added if housing units were added to the proposed area. Mr. Wilson said he attended the Conservation Commission meeting and saw other questions about the numbers included in the scientific assessment. Mr. Wilson said he called other towns with similar issues. Mr. Wilson continued that Durham has a similar population with 40 % conservation land and expanded their wetland buffers. Mr. Wilson added that with TIFF districts he has seen business grow. The proposal seems pushed through and rushed and with the definition of the terms with the numbers included there is no going back and fixing the numbers. Mr. Wilson said once the door is opened to changes than it is hard to close the door.

Alyson Eberhardt of 11 Kossuth Street, Exeter, gave comments on the proposal which are included with this set of minutes.

Ginny Raub of Exeter commented and gave thanks to Ms Pelorin for her long history of service to Conservation efforts in Exeter. Ms. Raub said with the Conditional Use Permit, hands were tied. Ms. Raub continued, with a decrease in wetland setbacks there will be an increase in cost for treating storm water. Ms. Raub thought that the process was too quick and not enough input. Ms. Raub noted even if the proposed amendment does not pass it will not affect the TIFF proposal.

Robert Mike Mayer from Mill Stream Drive , Exeter, commented that he would not vote for the amendment. He said he was in favor of development but it was a different issue with regulation. Mr. Mike noted the process was too rushed and he had watched town hall streams of previous meetings on the issue and was concerned with the presentation. He also had problems understanding the table presented by Mr. Gove. Mr. Mike thought it too easy for future developers. Mr. Mayer quoted Planning Board Chair having said, "Make the process easier and streamlined." Mr. Mayer urged not to pass amendment.

Sue Ratinoff \* of Exeter asked if it were possible to poll the room on those of the opinion of the audience.

Mr. Knowles said he will allow for the public to speak but was not in favor of taking a hand vote.

Bill Campell 111 High Street, Exeter, said he was in favor of a TIFF district and that he was concerned about the wetland regulations. In 2009 the new wetland regulations were passed. Mr. Campbell said he received information right before the Conservation Commission meeting. Mr. Campbell said he looked at Kingston wetland regulations. They have scores of 1-3. Mr. Campbell said the buffer standards begin at 30 feet and don't

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

have anything about separating the “fingers” from the wetlands. He said they were part of a system and need to be evaluated. He said if the system is damaged now then where the water will go. Mr. Campbell asked the Planning Board to hold off on a decision and whether the scale was good for the town now.

Jane Capill\* of Mill stream drive Exeter, commented that she was against the amendment.

Sue Ratinoff commented that she was against not because against economic development but the speed of the process. She asked if this was only for Epping Road or all of Exeter.

Mr. Knowles said the specific change is for the three proposed districts and not for modifying anything else.

Pete Richardson of White Oak Drive, Exeter, and member of the Conservation Commission commented that the comparison of numbers is day and night. He said you will not have functional buffers with the current calculation. Mr. Richardson continued, at a 30 foot buffer is where you begin to add value to the wetland and they overlooked the fact that the Kingston program is different with different answers. Mr. Richardson asked to give the town a chance to review the proposal. Mr. Richardson said about 10 years ago people were looking at impervious surface with the results of the collective studies. He said if you only have 6% impervious surface you begin to detect it in the water by measuring the quality of the water. If you get to 10 %, water begins to be impaired. Mr. Richardson said Exeter is at 12- 15 % impervious surface. He concluded if you don't protect the wetlands they we are in deep trouble.

Tony Hall from 30 Brentwood Road, Exeter, commented he is interested in reducing residential taxes and said his opinion would be nay.

Mr. Mayer commented on the proposed districts that they are actually a significant portion of Exeter. He wanted to reiterate the flooding and pollution effects and as much as he wants to have commercial development but small buffers would do nothing for a commercial area. Mr. Mayer said whatever water goes into the system effects the town. He added, he did not want a town that was no longer desirable to live in because of something they should have thought about more carefully.

Mr. Knowles said the reduction of a buffer zone means the water sheet flows into the body of water, nor does give development rights to a specific developer. He said there is still a process with engineers involved, town staff and peer review. The Planning Board has the right to go to a 0 foot buffer. They evaluate functions and values on case by case basis. Mr. Knowles said the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) granted a waiver on Tan Lane.

Meg Foley of 65 Court Street, Exeter, commented she was perplexed by how something safe and judicious could be changed. She asked why the Conservation Commission wasn't a part of it. Ms. Foley assumed a continual dialogue with the Planning Board. Ms. Foley urged the Planning Board to wait on the decision.

Kris Vaughn of 348 Water Street, Exeter commented he had several concerns and noticed the amendment in the newspaper. Ms. Vaughn said she was concerned for the

process. The news paper article showed the decrease in the tax rate. She said with an important town project should stand behind and trust. Ms Vaughn said with lack of transparency that was alluded to developers could leap-frog over work done several years ago to establish healthy boundaries. Ms Vaughn said she wanted to know data for the area involved how including how much protected wetland. She added to look at setbacks involving terms of area protected and how would it be with these guidelines. She said this would make a profound difference in area. Looks like this type of determination leap frogging over conservation, compared to the Great Dam that had several open meetings. She said she hopes the town can do better.

Ms. Pelorin reminded the group that we were on a trajectory for more extreme weather conditions . She said the kind of rain we have been getting is like the Caribbean. Ms. Pelorin added to look at a time when we have to defend ourselves against these problems.

Russell Dean, Town Manager and citizen commented that when Exeter hired Mr. Winham they went through a process for how to devote resources to the effort. He said the same issues were dealt with historically for more than 30 years. Mr. Dean said Epping road looks the same as when he was a kid. In the Master plan from the year 2000, growth was a big concern to the Town. Mr. Dean continued, Epping Road was going to change with development but that has not occurred. Mr. Dean said one of Darren's charges was to figure out why development was not occurring. He said the TIFF was vetted by the Board of Selectmen and has unanimous support over the three warrant articles to determine whether they will go forward. Mr. Dean added the site has issues. Mr. Dean reiterated the area was determined a commercial corridor. Mr. Dean said they need the conversation to develop along Epping road and to be proactive. Mr. Dean suggested it may be a good idea to propose the wetland changes for the Town to vote on.

Mr. Wilson commented on the traffic conditions of the road even without new development.

Mr. Mayer said several opponents to the amendment said they were in favor of development and said he was irritated this was treated as an "either-or" issue. He said this amendment was to make development easier and stream lined process to bypass wetland buffers.

Michael Schidlovsky with the Exeter Chamber of Commerce commented that the Chamber Board of directors was fully supportive of the TIFF. He added, if the current amendment was not voted on and approved it was unlikely the TIFF would proceed. Mr. Schidlovsky said he believes Mr. Winham was chartered to put together solutions for tax payers and that he does an excellent job at that.

Ms. von Aulock noted the "all or nothing" comment was a misnomer. Ms. von Aulock said the buffers range from 25 feet and a man made wetland was not considered an issue and doesn't require a CUP or have a buffer. Ms. von Aulock cited earlier, the Board supported an amendment that allowed for if Mr. King came with a site development plan that the requirement for a CUP would be forgone. She stated the Board has never said no to a waiver. Ms. von Aulock said if there is criticism of the process then they should criticize her as well. Ms. von Aulock said Mr. Winham was new with an ad-hoc committee . She said the previous amendment voted on came out of her

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

office and was worked on with professionals. She said it was difficult for town staff to know when to let someone in on a process. The Planning Board heard from the All Boards meeting that wetland regulations were difficult. She noted they have been very open and no matter the regulations the Planning Board will work with developers and try to balance everything.

Brian Griset, said he was pleased to be at a zoning amendment meeting and have citizens present. Mr. Griset said he is an independent environmental land use and planning consultant. He is at meetings to give advice and he was familiar with the process. Mr. Griset said Darren came to Town four months ago and worked to address issues of economic development. He said Mr. Winham did a thorough job on what impediments people ran into for development. He said the wetlands zoning regulations from the year 2000 were initially discussed as Site and Subdivision regulations and were changed to add 25 foot buffers. He suggested the wetlands regulations should be site plan regulations not zoning that would allow for flexibility to change. Mr. Griset spoke against it because it was strictly soils based and nothing to do with wetlands. He said there was a push regarding buffers and the Town voted to spend millions conserving open space. Mr. Griset noted Exeter has 24 % of its property under conservation easement which does not include buffers. He commented this chased away future economic growth. He said now looking at the current proposal he agrees it been rushed. The scientific method was used to determine the functions and values. Development hasn't occurred in that part of town because of fragmented wetlands. Isolated wetlands still need 40-50 foot setback. Mr. Griset noted the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), state laws and town zoning do not allow the discharge of nutrients into bodies of water. Mr. Griset agreed he would like to have had more time to study the issue. The effort is to take a limited area of town and centralize the development for economic purposes and get in one location in town adjacent to Route 101. In doing so maximizing development will take pressure off of expanding areas of town. Mr. Griset explained if a "finger" of the wetland is of poorly drained soil, the wetlands could not be filled which would equate to 1% of an entire acre of land. He said that example is what developers are looking at. He added that buffer zones are not mandated by state law and are not scientifically based. The Planning Board knows they can hire counter independent soil scientists to verify data. Mr. Griset said he was comfortable with what he has seen regarding this zoning amendment. He said he has reservations about the TIFF and three warrant articles. If doesn't go on ballot hopes somehow can pull TIFF district off ballot.

Mr. Knowles asked to keep comments to current article.

Mr. Mayer commented on the size of the three zoning districts that they looked much larger. And the buffers shall be determined by the table created.

Mr. Knowles said the map present showed the entire TIFF district not the proposed districts.

Mr. Winham responded to the comments made. He noted there are currently 2,400 acres in conservation in Exeter. Mr. Winham said Kevin King owns 60 acres of the proposed property. He said he took offence to comments about lack of transparency and he had been in Exeter for 4 months. He said anyone can call him on his cell phone. He noted he did say "strike while the irons hot" meaning that rates change. Mr.

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

continued that while the Planning Board is flexible , developers cannot be sure after spending money that they will get the waivers needed. Mr. Winham added the proposed districts are  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the TIFF district area and the entire district is 4 % of the community. He said he was not trying to look like Portsmouth Avenue. The plan is to sustain and find what's fitting for the community and will not go after development un-sustainable for the community. Mr. Winham also noted that the proposed amendment is not for tax incentive use but used to develop infrastructure. He said he wants the Town to move forward economically and ecologically. He apologized to Jim Gove about comments made to the science used. To the comment about developers not running away. That they have already run away. The developers want to develop properties and the wetlands set back are a challenge. In response to the Kingston comments Mr. Winham replied they did change Kingston's numbers and did what he thought was responsible. Mr. Winham said he was not advocating for the entire community but the three zones chosen by community to enhance Economic Development. He commented the benefit to the tax rate was a conservative estimate of \$2.00 per \$1000.

Kevin King commented that he owns land on Epping Road. He said wetlands were always an issue in the Town. He has dealt with other properties and goes through boards to get approvals and receives the approvals. Mr. King stated he goes through the town not around the town for approval. Mr. King commented the on the Epping Road comment going from industrial to commercial was an opinion of town. Mr. King said the town wanted industrial for a restaurant and the town needs restaurant. In relation to Water runoff, Mr. King said that is nature and it is going to happen but the Town has to mix the two. Mr. King added he would like to sell his land so he made it look like a park. A distribution center for a water company wanted to buy it but Mr. King said he did not want all those trucks running through the area. Mr. King commented the land will not warrant development like Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. King talked about the potential revenue from the buildable land and what improvements need to be made to infrastructure.

Mr. Stated either do it and get something done or let another five years go by but to let the town make that decision. He commented the buffer zone has hurt developers.

Chris Vaughn asked if there is a provision to have another public meeting. She said it was not enough to see just one example of a chart.

Mr. Winham because of short period of time and one vote a year then he was not able to hold more public sessions earlier but if the warrant is passed he will be holding public discussions to explain the proposal in detail.

Emma Grazic from Warren Avenue, Exeter, commented that she supports economic development. Ms Grazic was concerned about the Town maintaining a sustainable policy and plan for preserving the ecological system. She said she wants her kids to enjoy the ecology and economic development. Ms. Grazic said she wants to vote in support of a different buffer width determination table.

Ms. Eberhardt commented she was glad everyone relied on the science. She said the science works because of the peer review process. Always painful always time consuming more work and makes for better result. If the public is going to rely on a scientific base then it needs to be done right.

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

Ms. Pelorin asked if the board votes to put the amendment on the ballot then there is still no opportunity to amend what goes on ballot.

Mr. Knowles responded because Exeter is an SB- 2 town, the Board doesn't have time to revise language.

BOARD COMMENT:

*Mr. Plumer motioned to close the public hearing second by Ms. Bergeron. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

Mr. Brown said he wondered if Jim Gove would be comfortable explaining difference between Kingston and Exeter.

Mr. Knowles said he would hold off on Jim Gove's answer to the end of the

Mr. Brown said he was not familiar with wetlands studies potentially affected by change. He asked if it was normal to study a parcel ahead of time.

Mr. Knowles said the difference between Exeter and Kingston was that Kingston did not quantify the functions and values.

Ms. Surman commented to work with wetlands for community development.

Ms English commented that she had not seen an amendment that had not given her so much worry. She said she went to the Conservation Commission meeting where Jim Gove was only available for a small meeting before the Conservation Commission meeting. The public did not have a chance to see the presentation two times. Ms. English stated she did some background research at the Rockingham Planning Commission. State of New Hampshire Documents shows a minimum buffer width of 100 feet as being necessary. She said she was also worried there was no recourse to change the amendment if passed. She asked the Board to consider the amendment carefully and she would not be voting in favor.

Mr. Plumer said he appreciates the comments made tonight.

Mr. Knowles said the scenarios are different with Kingston and Exeter.

Mr. Brown said the challenge is with the buffers not pushing projects forward. Mr. Brown asked who Jim Gove worked for. Mr. Knowles said Jim Gove did the assessment as a favor.

*Mr. Plumer motioned for the Planning Board to support article 9.1.3, second by Ms. Surman. **VOTE:** 5 Yays: 2 Nays*

The meeting went to recess at 10:10

**7. Citizen's Petition: On the petition of Christopher Gilroy and other registered voters of the Town of Exeter, to see if the town will vote to " Amend Article 42 Schedule I: Permitted Uses by deleting the present " Community Buildings" as a use permitted by Special Exception in the R-1, R-2, R-3, & R-4 districts."**

*Ms. Bergeron motioned to open the public hearing, second by Ms. Surman **VOTE:**  
Unanimous*

Mr. Knowles said the vote was to support or not to support the article that will go onto the town meeting warrant, as a disclaimer the Planning Board only says not that says support or not support.

Mr. Knowles had a letter of support of the citizen's petition from Melinda Virkaitis and another letter from Kurtis Virkaitis in support of the citizen's petition.

Mr. Knowles explained the process of the citizen's petition went to the Board of Selectman and the Town Manager then to Planning Board for recommendation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Chris Gilroy of 25 Hampton Road number A3 commented for on petition to close the loophole to the amendment for a Community Building to be a special exemption. The goal is to close the loophole and to change the language of the amendment. Mr. Gilroy said the majority of abutters relate to the issue for the special exemption blending business office and community building together. Mr. Gilroy said in this case community building can have a number of different uses with the special exemption citing some examples. Mr. Gilroy said he wants to help preserve rights to endorse passing warrant the article as presented.

Mr. Knowles said for the record the article will be placed on ballot whether supported or not.

Susan Stagnone ,secretary of the Home Owners Association at Exeter Farms read a letter into record. She spoke in relation to a current case at Hampton and Guinea Road. She said the HOA Board has voted unanimously in opposing with a ZBA case. Ms. Stagnone continued to read Mr. Virkaitis's letter (included in minutes).

Ms. Stagnone commented t this was put in front of the Town when the zoning code came in front of Planning Board. She said it went through what was then the Zoning Ordinance Review Committee (ZORC) and Planning Board. Ms. Stagnone said the zoning code went through and became part of code. Ms. Stagnone said they are asking to expand the definition and that voters were mislead by the original design.

Ms. Stagnone cited the zoning code 2.2.20 Community Building Definition read into the record. Ms. Stagnone commented the word social services were translated into human services. Ms. Stagnone said the community is further expanded than the town. Ms. Stagnone said that a homeless shelter 1% of the population being served in the town which is not representative of the community. She said she believes if there had been time to go through process the definition of community building would be revised. Ms. Stagnone said there was no time to do that before the citizen's petition. She said property values will be impacted and those that share lot line impacted.

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

Ms. Stagnone said there was not enough time during the process to create change in definition of community building.

Matt Carbone from Exeter Farms Road commented about the reasons stated from the letter. He stated he was in support of the warrant article. He said he was also in support of social , recreation services. Likes living in the Town and wants to retire in Exeter. He asked if Planning Board was responsible for writing the master plan.

Mr. Knowles responded the Planning Board is responsible for its creation.

Mr. Carbone said he lives in Exeter because of what the town represents. He said the 2010 master plan identified criteria for growth support in residential neighborhoods. He said his expectation is to follow the master plan. Mr. Carbone asked to support Mr. Gilroy's petition.

Sharron Summer representing Seacoast Family Promise, commented on the general opposition to the petition and request recommend disapproving petition specifically with the application in front of the Zoning Board. The ZBA case with Seacoast Family Promise will go in front of the ZBA for a rehearing. Ms. Summer said the outcome of approval of the amendment could affect the outcome of the ZBA case. Ms. Summer commented on the impacts of taking community buildings out of the community. Ms Summer outlined the implications and stated there is a broader issue than the expressed concern. She said instead of changing the definition of what is presented that would wipe out access to residential zones. Ms. Summer encouraged not recommend ordinance.

Susan did not want to speak about Seacoast Family Promise as it was an example of impact. Ms. Stagnone said she did not want to go through similar situation. She said the Board failed to interpret , deliberate and failed to vote on a definition of community building..

Karey Kelly President and on the Board of Directors of Seacoast Family Promise said the language was designed to impede special exeption which is the correct format to go after. Rather than major change in policy, will affect current and future centers profit or non –profit or Town of Exeter . Ms. Kelly said she was not in favor of the amendment.

Fran Berman Exeter Resident, on the Board of Seacoast Family Promise spoke on a community building providing “ building services”. Ms. Berman said the community has a range of needs. She said she would not want to segregate out parts of community beyond residential zone.

Teff Shafer resident of Exeter said she opposed amending article and feels that on specific level Seacoast Family Promise effort will be worthy. Ms. Shafer said eliminating community buildings is a bad idea. Hopes do not recommend amending the article.

Ms. von Aulock commented on the definition of Community Buildings and the ZBA case. She was concerned about the discussion when present to discuss zoning amendment. She said the Planning Board had not been asked to check in with Town Council to see what a change in the zoning would do to the ZBA case. Ms. Von Aulock asked Barbara McEvoy , code enforcement officer about the effects of changes made and the YMCA is only case would not be conforming. Ms. von Aulock said she was concerned with community buildings not being allowed in town. She said there were many definitions looked at.

Mr. Knowles commented the Planning Board was tasked with supporting or not.

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

Mr. Carbone said community building definition to get more clarity behind the definition.

Ms. Summer commented the process for a community building was remembered from residential districts. Ms. Summer said not to turn process remove or reinsert language.

Mr. Gilroy asked why Town Council wasn't notified.

Mr. Knowles said a citizen's petition is to be accepted in acceptable form to select board to the Planning Board.

Ms. Stagnone said she understood this but the definition needs more time. She said they are there to protect the neighborhoods.

*Mr. Plumer motioned to close the public hearing, second by Ms. Bergeron. **VOTE:**  
Unanimous*

Mr. Brown said he was sympathetic to what the citizens brought forward.. The interpretation didn't think to use as special exception use. Mr. Brown said he was in favor of the amendment.

Ms. Surman said there were compelling arguments on both sides. The key is in the definition of community buildings. Could re-examine definition over the next year.

Ms. Bergeron asked what exactly was the use of the building of Seacoast Family Promise.

Mr. Knowles said they were in support of removing community buildings in residential zones. He requested don't there doesn't need to be an answer to the question.

Ms. Bergeron said she agrees the definition needs to be explored.

Ms English said she was sympathetic and noted what Planning Board members would do in the shoes of the concerned citizens.

Mr. Knowles said his concern was removing it completely. From a planning policy standpoint concerned about removing it.

Mr. Brown said this has lain dormant until this case. If taken out it can come back in.

*Mr. Plumer motioned to not support the citizen's petition, second by Ms. Surman. **VOTE:** 6  
Yays : 1 Nay*

*Mr. Plumer motioned to adjourn, second by Ms. Bergeron. **VOTE:** Unanimous*

The meeting was adjourned at 11: 25 pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Sarah McGraw

These minutes are subject to possible corrections/revision at a subsequent Exeter  
Planning Board Meeting

Recording Secretary

\* These residents did not sign in and may not be the proper spelling of the named person.