

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**EXETER PLANNING BOARD**  
**May 26, 2016**  
*(revised 6/17/16)*

**1. Call to Order:**

Chair Kelly Bergeron called the session to order at 7:00 pm.

**2. Introduction of Members And Staff:**

Present were Kathy Corson, Alternate, Don Clement (BOS Representative), Pete Cameron (Clerk)[arrived at 7:12 pm], Chair Kelly Bergeron, Vice Chair Katherine Woolhouse, Langdon Plumer and Gwen English. The Chair stated that all members will be voting this evening.

Staff present were Dave Sharples, Planner; and David Pancoast, Recording Secretary. Members of the public were present for various matters as well.

**3. New Business: Public Hearings**

Continued public hearing on the application of 2 Hampton Road LLC for a non-residential site plan review for the proposed construction of an 8,000 square foot professional office building and associated site improvements on property located off of Windsor Lane (former 2 Hampton Road). The subject property is located in the PP-Professional/Technology Park zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #69 3. Case #21605.

Christopher Berry of Berry Engineering presented. “They met last time to discuss the project, which is 8,000+ sq ft of office space. At the last meeting there were a few revisions the board asked for, and the applicant was still working on them. Underwood Engineers had concerns/comments that were all addressed. Suggestions from boardmembers were made for landscaping that were put into plan in the packets-it was enhanced at corner and along breadth of parking area. Additional signage was added to Sheet 5 and an entrance sign. They want to discuss the location of an actual Donahue,

Tucker, & Ciandella (attorneys) sign at the northwesterly corner and another on the building. Those aren't on the plans the board has for this evening.”

“The applicant staked out centerline of proposed parking, roadway and extent of grading in the area. They did a site walk with boardmembers and the public and answered questions but nothing there changed the plan set. They are asking for approval this evening. State permitting has been filed for and an Alteration of Terrain permit is the only one outstanding and they are waiting for that.”

Mr. Sharples gave the status, recapped prior board comments, and all review letters. He addressed TRC's comments. He had hoped to have Underwood Engineering's second review comments by this meeting but did not get it yet, so has addressed that in proposed approval conditions. Applicant provided colored plans of linear planting plan. Additional comments re: proposed signage and revised draft language for parking agreement with 5 spots shared and agreement will go into Condominium Documents after Town review. It is not the board's standard practice to require them prior to approval. There are two waiver requests: first is for 18 ft parking stalls instead of 19 ft, and the applicant is proposing parking blocks to prevent wheel edging into landscaping. The second one is to ID trees greater than 16" in diameter. All of this is addressed in his board memo. A site walk was conducted on Thursday, 5/19, and though no quorum was present, they did walk the site with the engineer. There were two outstanding comments in the TRC letter: regarding bonding for prior project. Letter was received about releasing first bond to use that money for the second bond. They will appear at the next meeting in June to cover that. He said he has suggested conditions of approval if board decides to take action this evening.

Chair asks members for comments: Ms. Corson initiated discussion on the condominium association and other tenants being aware of the office building going in there, which was responded to by Mr. Berry and the developer to the board's satisfaction that no tenant had raised any objections and have had adequate time to review the project plans and any tenant can get out of the project if they are unhappy.

Mr. Clement stated that last time discussed changing curve angle radius, has that been adjusted Dave? Mr. Sharples said yes, all set. Mr. Clement then asked for clarification about shared parking spots. At site walk, the group discussed a sidewalk access from parking area to sidewalk along Hampton Road. Mr. Sharples indicated that the TRC commented on that too. There's a connection in this project for that. Mr. Clement added that the entrance off Hampton Rd, due to island in middle, is kind of too tight to get in there comfortably-difficult to maneuver. Mr. Sharples responded that by the time you get to that point, you're into the site.[discussion on aspects of that, as it was mentioned at the site walk].

Mr. Cameron raised the issue of large vehicles/trucks negotiating that property, like 18-wheelers for instance. Mr. Berry said that big trucks will deliver up to the front only, but a fire truck can get into the site. Nothing larger will be going in there.

Ms. Woolhouse asked Mr. Sharples about the site walk, that she was not sure about planting specificity there. Mr. Sharples responded that he looked at it, it's a mix, and poison ivy is in there in the town right-of-way. He doesn't expect the entire area would be re-landscaped. Ms. Woolhouse added that there will be no visual buffer left after this work. There is an opportunity to put in some sort of shrubs that will screen the area. Mr. Sharples said that he will add appropriate plantings to include shrubs to the conditions. Mr. Clement said that flowering shrubs would be good but he is comfortable with the Planner taking care of it. Mr. Sharples suggested that 8-10 ft of natural vegetation will cover the area up to road for screening. They are only landscaping what they disturb, not the entire area. It's all within the right-of-way. Mr. Berry agreed with Mr. Sharples.

Mr. Plumer discussed the site walk he did on his own. Lots of poison ivy in there. Not sure who will take care of that. Mr. Sharples said that in the Town right-of-way, the DPW will take care of it. Mr. Plumer asked if the large trees there are going to be gone? Mr. Berry said yes, to which Mr. Plumer asked if they could modify the plan on that? Mr. Berry said that due to needs there, they can't modify it to avoid impact to the large trees, but they can install 4-5 ornamental style mid-size tree well-positioned in the rear to assist the visual aspects there. [There was discussion on the curve entry and having trouble

with negotiating it-Mr. Berry stated that higher speed drivers are the only ones having trouble with the entry, no one else does].

Ms. English stated that she wished the applicant could reconfigure the parking to save the large trees there. She realized it was not an option but at least 5 tree replacements is better than nothing. She asked if the shared spaces are going to be physically marked or will residents know where to go? Mr. Berry said that the owners and tenants are working all that out. Because of that interaction, he wouldn't want to mark those spaces. It would confuse the Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella patrons if they were marked.

Ms. English then asked how a fire truck compares with a large moving van re: that entry. Mr. Berry responded that a fire truck is 40 ft long, and a regular moving van would operate the same way or better than a fire truck. Other larger vehicles, are not supposed to be in this project site. UPS can get in and moving vans. Ms. English asked about the proposed parking blocks, and where they have designated snow storage, how do plow trucks get over those parking blocks? Mr. Berry said that there are two ways: a small plow truck will bring snow to areas where larger trucks can handle it. That takes more time and diligence. But the blocks are bolted down and can be removed seasonally and that's their preference, but that's unlikely to happen on this site.

Ms. English then addressed the buffer area. She was concerned that river birch, blueberries, azaleas, dogwoods, and such, are not protecting the area vis-à-vis screening, and she is not sure those will do what the applicant is hoping it will do re: lighting control. Mr. Berry said those plants are the rain garden plants, not the buffer plants. Mr. Berry said he thought the board was trying to distinguish the two areas, have them broken up visually. Ms. Bergeron said they were trying to minimize the headlight effects on residential units.

Ms. Corson asked about total spaces, of the 34, 4 are for the physically handicapped. What happens when the 30 regular spaces are filled? Mr. Berry said the law firm requires 30-32 spaces, but there is additional parking nearby. They can, at some future time, add those 4-5 spaces back in and the design drainage will handle it, they would just need to stripe it.

Mr. Berry said that to add them back in, they would have to come back to the board. [discussion on headlight effects, that they will fall on the garage doors of units so not an issue on that ]

There were no other board comments at that point.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Sharples had no further comments at that time.

Ms. Bergeron stated that there were two waiver requests: first one for parking spaces reduced from 19 ft to 18 ft to be worded by Mr. Sharples. Mr. Clement moved approval of the waiver from Section 9.13 of the Site Plan Review Regulations and Ms. Corson seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Ms. Bergeron said that the second waiver request was for a waiver from the requirement to show trees larger than 16” on the plan. Mr. Plumer read Mr. Sharples’ proposed approval language, Mr. Cameron seconded and there was unanimous approval.

Mr. Sharples went over his proposed conditions of approval, adding a condition for 4-5 ornamental trees as discussed. There was discussion on that condition, including setting dates for that work and assigning a site address by the Assessors prior to any building permits being issued.

Ms. Bergeron stated that Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella signs would be dealt with in the special conditions as well as the Alternation of Terrain permit. Mr. Sharples responded that all applicable state approval #'s will be placed on the final plans before signature.

Mr. Berry raised the aspect of the DTC signs, that he needs to put approximate locations on the plan and it must be acceptable to the Code Enforcement Officer (“CEO”), can’t be sure of final locations yet due to that. Mr. Sharples stated that they must meet sign regulation requirements and a sign permit is required from CEO, which will address size, height, location, etc., so it will take care of all that. Ms. Bergeron agreed.

Ms. Plumer stated that he thought the special conditions should be read into the record. Mr. Sharples proceeded to read them into the record with his changes per this session. The conditions are hereby incorporated herein as read into the record.

Mr. Cameron asked a question on item #7, regarding copies of condo docs, stating that those should include all amendments and modifications to the documents to assure they are getting the whole package accurately. Mr. Sharples agreed.

There were no other comments of board.

Mr. Plumer moved approval of the special conditions as read into the record, as presented, which was seconded by Ms. English. The vote for approval was unanimous.

Next matter:

The application of the Town of Exeter Housing Authority for a design review of a conceptual lot line adjustment and yield plan for the proposed construction of a 20-unit multi-family open space development. The subject properties are located at 82 Linden Street and 98 Linden Street in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcels #95-56 and #104-70. Case #21601.

Mr. Sharples went over the proposal for the board. Raymond Sheaffer of Sanford Surveying said that “the proposal is to adjust the lines between the two properties and create a 20 unit building on 8.8 acres south of the existing facility. On 2/11/16 they presented to board. Preliminary yield plan back then showing the ‘two unit’ lots. They had to take into account 50 ft buffer perimeter, and inside of curve issue with site distance. They shortened cul-de-sac. Yield plans are a reasonable and valid method to determine whether and what to approve. The plan is showing 14 units with the 15% bonus for affordable housing, so 16 lots on the northerly lot plus 4 units on the southerly lot, which would bring it up to 20 units total, which the applicant has been looking for, to be built in one building on the newly combined lots.

Abutters' concerns have been helpful. The applicant would like to get the density nailed down tonight before they can do any more technical design. DPW has let them know that they can tie into the drainage lines if we meet the technical requirements onsite. They also needed to adequately address quality/quantity of drainage onsite. One other issue is number of units: it's zoned multifamily 8.8 acres, so the normal maximum is 3 units/building, but this board can allow more if it is beneficial to the site. There are benefits to having larger buildings, less land used for them. If they were all 3-unit buildings, w/40 ft between, would reach much farther back into site. They hope to get approval for the proposed yield plan so the applicant can do the technical plans. The use has been allowed by the Zoning Board."

Mr. Sharples said this is in design review phase for yield plan and lot line adjustment. ZBA approved the conditional multifamily use and its approval letter is in packets. Main reason of design review request is for yield plan and the lot line adjustments. Plan shows adequate land for this. No TRC because it's design review. Ms. Bergeron stated that nothing is binding tonight, it's just for the board's opinions and comments.

Ms. English's only concern was drainage, there are abutters downslope of this so she is concerned. Mr. Plumer said he is thinking similarly to Ms. English: ZBA is asking Planning Board to address drainage. Must take care of drainage with engineering. Plan seems reasonable. Mr. Cameron stated that he is troubled with yield plan but not sure why. Mr. Clement said the he had a question on the yield plan, regarding lots 4a and 5a-are they viable as buildable lots? Wetlands offsite there may affect that. Saw ZBA session and decision-and is a little troubled with ZBA locking the Planning Board into this lot line adjustment, which is Planning Board's purview to decide. Kind of tied our hands like on Epping Rd. Difficult to adjust plans and work with the developer. ZBA does a great job, but leery about this approach. Can Planning Board adjust this lot line? ZBA members here tonight. Mr. Cameron then added that if lots 4a and 5a are not viable, doesn't the yield plan fail? Ms. Corson said that the applicant has to do a formal yield plan. She questioned Lot 4a, but not 5a. Mr. Sheaffer said they can do site lines for those two lots so the board can see them and what's involved. Ms. Corson said that she thinks it is manageable.

Mr. Sheaffer asked if there are any comments on the number of units per building.

Mr. Cameron repeated that the yield plan is an issue, need to go through that step. Ms. Bergeron stated that this session is about the yield plan so if it's a certain number, that affects the number of buildings.

Mr. Sheaffer said that we think this is the way to go, keeps things together and closer to the road.

Kevin Baum, ZBA member, was present and addressed the board, saying it was fair criticism about its hands being tied. ZBA only could base their decision on issue/plan in front of them at their session. Sometimes Planning Board redesigns approved plans and it becomes confusing. Not trying to handcuff this board. The lot line adjustment was important to ZBA-needed to grant it as presented. Ms. Bergeron asked if the only way the Special Exception could be approved is with this lot line adjustment as presented. Mr. Baum said yes. This board could look at ZBA minutes to clarify it.

Ms. Bergeron said that in interpreting the ZBA's first paragraph, it's not to exceed total of 20 units in a maximum of 3 buildings. Mr. Clement said that he understands that spreading things out here does create more difficulties. Substantial need in this Town for such housing and the Housing Authority efforts are a tremendous asset to the Town. Want to balance with abutters' concerns. Need to resolve drainage issues-important. Ms. Corson asked if the plan could move things farther from abutters? Mr. Sheaffer said have to be 50 ft from the lot line and from abutters. Can 'play' with it once the applicant knows the density. There was discussion on this aspect of the matter.

Mr. Plumer said that larger buildings are more economical to heat and to build. He stated it would help address the water problems there if the applicant can disturb less land and manage the wetlands situation better.

Public Comments:

Gary Morrisette said he "owns whole south side of that development at 102 Linden St and brother owns some land in the rest of woods. Can't discuss



water tonight but he is concerned. Also has safety concerns. Owns a masonry business and this proposal is for three buildings 50 ft from the property lines. Little kids come through there and some with diapers on a nature walk. They are sometimes barefooted and there are broken bottles and such down in there. Masonry business is very active so this needs a fence or something. Have a 12 ft dug well, contaminated now, 40 yrs old-can't use it-has chloroform in it. There are no catch basins on Linden St at all. [There was discussion on possible impacts on rivers]. Should be the responsibility of Exeter Housing Authority to construct a drainage system, or Town. Lots of water issues, once they cut those big trees, where will water go? Safety issues are my biggest concern, plus drainage plan when it's presented."

Deborah Morrisette, wife of Gary, stated that "the building will be smack in front of their house-whose value is in having 2.5 acres with wooded views. She believes it will devalue their property with development right in front of the house. She said they will be impacted the most."

Nick Morrisette: son of the prior two speakers, then said that "for the property surrounding Morrisette, one is an uncle to east and one to west, are both single family properties as is the one to the north. Another one to the west is two family. Numbers going up from 3 to 8 units per building is a big jump. 20 units is a lot to allow there."

There were no other public comments.

Mr. Sharples had no comments at that time. Ms. Bergeron said that the drainage will be huge there. Maybe jog it all farther back to minimize impact. Privacy of neighbors and driveway are at issue here. [Board discusses abutter comments from tonight.] Mr. Clement asked why it is done in two lots, why not one? Mr. Sheaffer said it must be separate entities in order to do it at all.

Mr. Sharples offered that it seemed to him like design review commentary had ended tonight and the applicant now can come back with its formal application, and the board should advise them not to come back for design review again. Benefits abutters to see a formal plan and know what is proposed to actually happen, for finality.

Ms. Bergeron stated for the record that the board consensus is that design review is over and there will be no more such review, the applicant must now come back with a formal application. A letter on that will be forthcoming from the board. There are no motions necessary on this advisory matter.

Next matter:

Ms. Bergeron opened the next matter, which was the application of Soja Park-Bennett Revocable Trust for two lot line adjustments to reconfigure the three (3) existing lots located at 153 High Street and Folsom Way to create three conforming building lots. The subject properties are located in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #70-144, #70-145 and #71-72. Case #21526.

Ms. Corson recused herself from this matter and went into the audience.

Ms. Bergeron asked the Planner if the application is complete to accept for jurisdiction and the Planner advised yes. Ms. English moved that the board accept the completed application for deliberation this evening. Mr. Plumer seconded and there was unanimous approval

Corey Belton of Altus Engineering presented and stated that “Gerry Hamel is here as well. They were here in January to discuss the project. Three properties are on High St and Folsom Way. The first property, on High St, has a residence on in, the second one is landlocked and the third one abuts both. Application in January was proposal for subdivision into 5 lots with private roadway access. After that session, with neighbor concerns, the applicant tabled it and now has proposed a lot line adjustment to form three conforming buildable lots. Driveway access easement over part of third lot and serves the middle lot too. Driveway easement is 50 ft wide. Utilities, municipal sewer and water, and natural gas are all underground, as is electric. Stormwater on site is handled via rain gardens and swales in the applicant’s plan. There has been a reduction in peak runoff. The southeast corner of the property has wetlands, and will have 40 ft no cut buffer to wetlands. No construction in aquifer protection area here. Did get comments from staff: to show limits of disturbance for project. Comments from engineering, grading ended that required a waiver, but we revised grading to avoid that area within

5 ft of property lines. The plan shows limits of disturbance. Fire Dept commented on building separation, if 30 ft apart-sprinklers required, but they are 40 ft apart so no issue there. Trees labeled per engineering as to significant trees to remain. A topographic survey was done and field survey. The applicant will verify engineering design with Unitil prior to final plan. Waiver requests are required for grading within 5 ft of property line-revised it so don't need one. Waiver: all proposed roadways, access points, fire lanes and utility improvements shall be constructed in accordance with requirements for Exeter. We are proposing a 14 ft wide shared driveway used by two single family dwellings. Not sure if that means we need a waiver. He discussed gravel drive instead of paved drive, which the waiver request covers."

Mr. Sharples stated that the applicant seeks a lot line adjustment. There are three lots of record and it remains three. All R-2 zoning district. Lot 1 is Historic District, but house is there and will remain. Small portion of lot 3 is in Aquifer Protection District and show no disturbance of the area, but board could require a aquifer protection plan per the regulations. TRC not scheduled but did receive department head comments: relatively minor. DPW does not distinguish between roads or driveways. Can drop the width down on a driveway. The shared maintenance features of shared driveway are of concern to Planning. Two rain gardens and rip rap outlets are all outside the easement. Sheet D5 shows ongoing maintenance per the plans. Need to see a written agreement between the two lots for this maintenance. Want to see an agreement before final approval. Planning Ddoesn't recommend final approval until the maintenance agreement is submitted for Town counsel review. Trees inside 40 ft buffer to remain or not is a question. It's all wooded right now. The applicant addressed it with Limits of Cut shown on the plan. Conditions of approval to clearly mark that no cut zone in the field. Have proposed Conditions, but don't know where board wants to go with this.

Ms. English suggested that the board needs a site walk on this. Mr. Plumer, said they have water there going downhill, need to look at it. He wants an explanation of stormwater management planning aspects of this matter. Ms. Woolhouse said that she is concerned about comments from abutters about access on the hill. Can they address drainage components in more

detail. Mr. Belton directed the board to Sheet 2, drainage lots are downslope from High St, and Folsom Way, all comes to these lots. Had to account for all of it-for collection and treatment of it. Along the north side of roadway, a swale to collect runoff from Folsom Way diverted to a cross culvert, down to a buffer area. Drainage swale to east of driveway, collects all flows from northerly lots and back of the three lots on Folsom Way, and collects some of new impervious areas on lot 2, draining to a catch basin then to a rain garden for treatment before wetlands buffer. Rain Garden on lot 3, conceptual only as don't know footprint of residential house on that lot. Water from that one will be treated and discharged prior to the wetland buffer area.

Mr. Cameron said it's a steep area, needs to look at it. Other lots on Folsom Way to north, is there anything showing steepness of those lots? [There was board discussion of that aspect]. Mr. Cameron is hard pressed to comment on this without a visual feel for it. [There was more discussion on the drop in terrain of about 50 ft].

Mr. Clement said he did go last winter to look at it, it's very steep. Question on drainage system, it's going to fail. Rain gardens are fantastic for water quality but do nothing for water quantity. Swales will wash out. For lot 2, they need to handle water there, rather than on lot 3. As designed it's going to fail. Driveway will be affected and driveway to south will be impacted as well. Reconfiguring lots good, but need to address the drainage. There was discussion on review of drainage of this and having Underwood Engineering look at it, even though just a lot line adjustment, if authorized by board.

There were no other board comments.

Public comments:

Kevin Baum said he is "here representing 6 Folsom St owner, the one most affected by this development, who is Paula Perry, Trustee. It's much closer to a minor subdivision so additional drainage is good start, but need additional protections as if a minor subdivision. Mr. Baum encouraged the board to go look at it-it's an incredibly steep street. Concerns about drainage, calculations based on 3,000 sq ft of impervious surface. Lot 2 is at 10%, lot 3 at 5%. The board needs to base drainage requirements on worst case

scenarios here. Not sure if properly maintained rain gardens are the answer. We hope the board will require review of maintenance agreement with a third party enforcement provision. Realistic and long term, need enforcement. At a site walk, please take a look at very large old oak on this property, it's an impressive tree. His client has concerns about middle lot. They will follow up with letter on his letterhead, later. Asks the board to incorporate the expressed concerns as conditions on any final approval. Paula Perry of 6 Folsom St added that "the large tree is in the middle of back of lot."

Mr. Baum also asked "for the board to push driveway down as far as possible to protect Ms. Perry's lot. Headlights shine into neighbor across the street. Moving it will protect two lots without harm. Also asks that a landscaping and vegetated buffer be incorporated with any approval."

A resident of 7 Holly Ct. said that "if someone is standing on High St, they can see roof and tops of windows of houses below. Should be water studies done on this, there's a lot of water there, including from High St. This driveway is in the middle of the hill. Buffer area proposed to take the water is already wet, so that's not going to help. In reality this is not appropriate. Maintenance processes to manage the water are important. The proposed driveway is in middle of hill around a blind curve. Winter adds even more problems, like snow management issues."

Paula Perry of 6 Folsom St. said that "when she pulls out of her driveway, she must go into cul-de-sac across to get up the hill. Needs a running start to go up that hill in winter. Engineer peer review is needed." Kathy Corson, of 3 Folsom St said that this applicant may do lot line adjustment but when houses are designed, the applicant should come back in with drainage for each house. Wetlands are very wet there. The gas line in the street was replaced not long ago. Water runs so fast down street, that the gas line along edge of road all washed out. She asked who's in charge of that drainage, it will be a safety hazard. The board should look at it to decide if it is truly doable. Should be a site walk and should require the applicant to come back with responses to concerns of abutters."

Jeff Sonnoborn of 5 Drinkwater Rd, said he is “very concerned with water and soggy yards year round. Heavily wooded now, hope to keep wooded as buffer to abutters.”

Garvin Lilly, who has property on High St for sale, said his buyer will be responsible, just wants to be sure that drainage is handled best.”

Barbara Cox #9 Folsom St, at bottom of hill, said “it’s horribly wet there. The Kerkels had trouble with their toilets backing up. She has had an underground drainage system installed and it’s helping somewhat, but the problem is not cured. Fearful this project will make her life hell. Hoping that the board does a site walk and checks out the cul-de-sac properties, especially her at #9, at very bottom.

Gerry Hamel said he has been associated with the Bennetts for 20 years, stated that they do very responsible work. This is on a slope but it’s a lot of record, and taxed as such. Need to be able to build on it. Changed it from four houses down to three. Trying to take care of a lot of water problems. This is not an ultimatum, but it is buildable, so trying to do right thing. Design team has done a good job. Can’t solve everyone’s problems, but at least they are not increasing the problems.”

Jeff Sonoborn added that “area hydrology has changed. Sump pumps run constantly now-11 to 12 months per year.”

Mr. Belton said that they “welcome a site walk. Significant concerns downstream re: wetlands in that area. Welcome review of our drainage plan. Rain gardens provide retention as well as water quality. Design is to treat and handle up to a 50 year storm event. We’ll work with DPW and this board on drainage. Mr. Cameron said that if a hydrological study is warranted, and if Underwood looks at it, isn’t it the same? Mr. Sharples responded that a water drainage study differs from hydrological study regarding the water table issues. Mr. Cameron said that a good drainage study that the applicant pays for is worthwhile.

Ms. English asked if a 50 year storm design ok for this project? Or need to plan to handle a higher volume storm? Should the board step it up? Mr.

Belton responded that they “can include 100 year storm event in their analysis with no problem. They can model it and show results.”

Ms. Bergeron scheduled a board site walk for Wednesday 6/1 at 8 am.

Mr. Plumber moved to table case #21526 until June 9, 2016 meeting with a site walk on June 1st at 8 am, seconded by Ms. English and the vote was unanimous for approval. Site walk is a public meeting, anyone can come.

#### **4. Other Business:**

Great Bay Kids Project-Epping Road Planning Board Case #21411 (pending DPW memo). Request for bond release

Memo from DPW/Jen Mates that all site work completed. The amount of \$321,789 is being held and DPW recommends release of full bond amount. Mr. Plumer moved approval of release of that amount , Mr. Cameron seconded it. and the vote was for unanimous approval of bond release.

#### **5. Approval of Minutes: May 12, 2016**

At Chair’s prerogative, due to time, she tabled the May 12<sup>th</sup> Minutes again, until June 9, 2016. The March 24, 2016 Minutes will be considered on June 9<sup>th</sup> too.

#### **6. Town Planner’s Items:**

Mr. Sharples stated that the Master Plan Steering Committee met and it went well. An RFQ for consultant proposals went out this week, with a June 30, 2016 response date. An interview session was set up. Hopefully they will get a lot of proposals.

Construction updates: Sterling Hill, last building done and is being sided now.

As for the site plan regulations amendment, he keeps revising it re: the stormwater agreement, but it's nearly complete and the board will have it in the packets for June 9<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Bergeron stated that Ian Smith from EDC is now on the MPSC.

### **7. Member's Reports on "Other Committee" Activity:**

Ms. English reported that the May 14<sup>th</sup> Swazey Park session went great but was not as well attended as was hoped.

Mr. Clement said he had attended a seminar on climate adaptation by Steve Miller of UNH, which was excellent, as are all their programs. He intends to get on mailing list so he can let the board members know about future programs as they are very well done, and cover excellent Planning Board issues and concerns.

Mr. Sharples added that the Historic District Commission is updating its guidelines and he has reviewed them and made comments to make it more user friendly for compliance. He reports that they are excellent in the draft.

### **8. Adjournment:**

There being no further business, Mr. Clement moved to adjourn the session, it was seconded by Ms. English, and the vote was unanimous. The session was adjourned at 9:58 pm.

Revised minutes for this session hereinabove are respectfully submitted by David Pancoast, Recording Secretary.