

PLANNING BOARD

12/29/16

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Call To Order:

Chair Kelly Bergeron called the session to order at 7:07 pm (due to technical difficulties with the tv broadcast).

Members present were Aaron Brown, Don Clement, BOS Representative, Pete Cameron, Kelly Bergeron, Chair, Kathy Corson, Alternate Member, Gwen English, and Langdon Plumer. The Chair announced that all would be voting this evening.

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

The Chair took some agenda matters out of order for quick resolution.

2. Kathleen Mahoney, (d/b/a “The Porches at Exeter”), 20 Franklin St – Case #21320- Waiver request for relief from bonding requirements:

Mr. Sharples reported the applicant is asking to be relieved of the bonding requirement from the original approval, which was \$90,000. They had wanted a foundation-only permit a few weeks ago and got that on posting of erosion control bond, but needed the bond issue resolved before they can get a building permit. Current regulations have no bonding requirement other than erosion control and restoration bond, which they’ve posted. Can’t get building permit until they bond the site or ask for a waiver under Section 12.1.2 of the revised regulations.

Mr. Clement asked if erosion control bonding was still in place-he was worried about problems to the river. Discussion was that the amount of \$3500 had been bonded for erosion control and problem resolution. Steve

Wilson, contractor on the job, representing the owner, said that there is erosion control in place and only 120 linear ft between site and river. If Town had to come in to plant grass etc., he thought \$3500 is enough, but thought the owner would be ok if had to revisit it by DPW for further consideration. His contractor indemnification and liability insurance is in place and would cover that eventuality.

Ms. English moved to approve the request for waiver from the prior version of Sect 12.1.2 of Site Plan Review Regs in effect at the time of decision on case #21320 with condition that Erosion Control and Restoration Bond is required. Mr. Cameron seconded it. After discussion the roll call vote was unanimous for approval.

3. Public Hearings-Zoning Amendments for the Town Warrant

Mr. Clement moved to open the Zoning Amendments public hearing, seconded by Ms. English and unanimously approved.

a. Amendment No. 3-16: Exeter Zoning Ordinance regarding Lot Frontage, dated 11/3/16. Amend Article 2, Section 2.2 Definitions and Article 4, Section 4.3 Schedule II: Density and Dimensional Regulations-Residential by adding new definitions, deleting and replacing definition of 'lot width,' and revising the schedule of density and dimensional requirements for residential development.

Mr. Sharples gave a summary of the zoning amendments being considered. For the Road Frontage Amendment, he polled ten local towns/cities and all required frontage on a public street, but Exeter did not have that. Whether it's a small strip or whatever that connects to a public street of the Town, for access. This adds a definition of frontage and street and it deletes lot width entirely. This promoted infilling of lots. Could have allowed a smaller frontage but the Board didn't want to go there at this point. Probably limit it to areas where sewer and water are in place. In his Board memo, Attorney review stated that the definition of street is a) formally accepted

by the Town: prescription, b) layout and c) acceptance. Language now says “a public way.” There needs to be a public hearing on it, which he scheduled for the January 12th session, which is in place for the notice on this revised language. There were no comments from the Board on these.

Public Comments:

Darius Thompson of Exeter asked what the process was to approve this and wanted to know what example could be used to explain to public what this does and how it works, so the public understands what it is to decide. Mr. Sharples replied that he usually adds a Statement of Intent on the drafts but he didn't do it for this one, so he will highlight that on this one. An article in paper a week ago was about all 3 revisions. Mr. Sharples will figure out if the Statement of Intent can go onto the Warrant or not. Ms. Corson said posting it on the website would be good. Ms. Bergeron said the Statement of Intent in agenda items would help. Mr. Plumer said that this is a deliberative session and if go to the last hearing, audience members won't hear any discussion because it will all have been worked out before.

Mr. Sharples said that the Board could close this hearing on this amendment and then open one on 3-16 as amended on 12/21/16.

Mr. Cameron moved to close the public hearing on this amendment, seconded by Mr. Plumer and the vote to close the public hearing on this item was unanimous. It was unanimously approved.

Ms. Corson then moved to hold a public hearing on January 12, 2017 for Amendment 3-16, seconded by Mr. Brown, and the vote was unanimous. There was discussion on procedure for opening public hearings for each or all amendments and it was concluded that the Amendments public hearing was opened and is still open, only matter 3-16 was closed and reopened for later review.

b. Amendment No. 4-16: Exeter Zoning Ordinance regarding Epping Road Setbacks, dated 11/3/16. Amend Article 6, Section 6.8 Epping Road Strip Management Ordinance, C-3 District by deleting subsection 6.8.3 Setback Requirements from Right-of-Way in its entirety. Amend Article 4, Section 4.4 Schedule III by deleting Note #14 in its entirety and deleting references to Note #14 found in the Density and Dimensional Regulations-Non-residential table 3.

Mr. Sharples summarized that setbacks on Epping Road are currently 75 ft for parking and 85 ft for building setbacks, currently there are setback violations there. Ordinance already puts parking back 50 ft. If this passes, 75 ft becomes 50 ft and 85 ft becomes 50 ft, so could have situation with _____, Statement of intent was to eliminate 85 ft building setback and 75 ft parking setback from Epping Road and rely on current 50 ft setback. The Board had no comments and there was no public input. The Board was fine with the language and it was approved unanimously.

c. Amendment No. 5-16: Exeter Zoning Ordinance regarding Accessory Dwelling Units, dated 11/11/2016. Amend Article 4, Section 4.2 Schedule I: Permitted Uses by adding “Accessory Dwelling Units” to the Special Exception column of the R-4, Multi-Family Residential District. Amend Article 4, Section 4.2 Schedule I Notes by deleting subsection (e) in its entirety and replacing with specific language relative to allowable square foot area of the accessory dwelling unit (in accordance with NHRSA 674:71 to 73).

Size of accessory dwelling units: Mr. Sharples looked at it and the state law differed from the Exeter ordinance on it. There were only two issues to resolve: the State law is that we can't restrict to less than 750 sq ft (720 becomes 750). There had been prior discussion of a larger area based on the size of the house. So now this amendment revision allows for 750 or up to 900 sq ft, if have appropriate area of finished floor area, up to 1/3 of the finished floor area. He did an analysis of this issue and reported it to the Board.

Must allow them in any district where single family homes are allowed, state says must allow accessory dwellings in that district. There was one by Rose Farm and it was done by Special Exception, as consistent with all accessory dwelling units in Exeter. Boardmembers all said they were fine. There were no public comments offered.

Mr. Clement moved to approve both amendments 4-16 and 5-16 and move them onto the Warrant, seconded by Ms. English and the roll call vote was unanimously approved. Mr. Clement then asked about whether there was another amendment on fertilizer. Mr. Sharples said the deadline was today, and he had talked to Kristen Murphy but there was no language forthcoming in time for this year. Ultimately it will be put off for a year.

4. Request by Baker Properties LLC for a design review of a yield plan for a proposed open space development on the properties located at 1 Forest Street, 22 Oak Street and 24 Oak Street Extension (Dagostino/Rose Farm properties). The subject properties are located in the R-1, Low Density Residential, R-2, Single Family Residential and R-4, Multi-Family Residential zoning districts. Tax Map Parcels #54-5, #54-6, #54-7 and #63-205. Case #21603.

The Chair said this is design review so nothing is binding. This is only a yield plan discussion on the proposal.

Mr. Sharples gave a synopsis of process. At a prior Board meeting, there were some concerns. One was where capped area would be located, not completely decided yet because DES has to approve it. There are revised plans and the area of contamination is shown on the revision. Lined area on plan is identified as existing contamination on the site. There are no houses shown on the potential cap area. That could change with more testing. Other comments were related to wetlands, particularly the eastern corner of the site, the plan missed the “hourglass” points of least impact. They adjusted the roadways to meet the concerns. The Board had mentioned housing being shown on buffer lines, and applicant moved them out where could. There is a 75 ft structural setback from wetlands but 50 ft is no cut

no disturb and that's hard to do right at that line. Hundred foot perimeter setback is not no build in entirety, can put in lawns and such.

Another issue was where driveways cross wetlands and they revised that. The Board can allow one driveway crossing of another's lot, if a hardship exists, which in this case would be to avoid crossing wetlands.

Mr. Sharples said he had requested a table and they provided that. He is satisfied with that table on lot size and frontage requirement, re: percentage of lots in wetlands.

Oak St Extension was an issue, but the applicant did away with that.

Lastly, originally then showed 42 lots, now 39 lots, so 3 less. Barring any additional Planning Board comments, staff is fine with numbers at this point and the Board could end the design review process.

Mr. Plumer mentioned steep roadway to the wetlands crossing by DPW's concerns. Mr. Sharples called the Town Engineer but didn't hear from him. It doesn't exceed 6% slope per applicant's engineer. Even if Town Engineer had issues, it wouldn't stop this design review.

Tim Phoenix, Esq., for the applicant, said this is design review for a yield plan, which is intended to show how many house lots could be put on this property in a traditional subdivision without any variances. So they have to figure out how many can do in a conventional subdivision, then do the open space plan after that. A future formal plan will show all matters finalized. Exeter Rose Farm LLC, is represented by Todd Baker and Keith Paterson for the developer, Corey Caldwell from TF Moran did the plan, Jason Plourde from Tighe and Bond is the traffic engineer, Mark Jacobs is the wetlands scientist and Tim Stone is the environmental consultant on environmental and hazardous materials issues. He summarized the late October session: intend to save the spring and maintain it for public use in

perpetuity. Have to meet the environmental requirements and the Board's issues. Traffic will be addressed. They are aiming for minimal wetlands impacts.

Corey Caldwell of MSC/TF Moran then presented. There was concern over the wetlands crossing, so now it is a 5% slope going in and 3% coming out, due to a large arch culvert being used. The Board was also concerned about readability of plans and color of plans. Now combined all onto 6 sheets, the Overall sheet is in color and the rest are details of various matters. He explained color coding. The remaining 5 sheets are 40 scale drawings and are more readable. We are confident the road can be built to Exeter's standards and that 39 lots can be built with homes on them. The two environmentally sensitive areas of the site are shown on the plan and there is a dark dashed area in former Greenhouse location which has lead in the soil and must be removed to a disposal facility off site. Another area is solid waste also to be removed. Coal ash "klinker" is to be capped there and an activity use restriction will be placed on it. Tim Stone is the environmental consultant and will address those issues. [He used the display plan to describe the contamination area]. He said that the lead area is about 80,000 sq ft in area. Second area where coal ash klinker is also located will be capped and no homes will be sited in that area.

Tim Stone, Stone Hill Environmental said this site has been under review since 2012 via Brownfield grants from Rockingham Planning Commission. They have been in regular contact with DES/State on this-for a remedial action plan. They will have oversight. Primarily lead and coal ash klinker. They do not migrate, but direct contact with them isn't good. Those soils will be removed or capped. Concentrations are shallow, 6" to a foot in depth, due to it not migrating. DES standards 400 mg/kg. They will remove all soils that exceed that standard. Worst case scenario is about 3700+ cubic yards of material to be removed, but ongoing sampling will reveal the actual number. The coal ash klinker area will be consolidated and some soils will be removed from the site. There will be an activity use restriction

on the area as well. DES agrees that full removal would be more damaging than capping. Issues with dust will be managed per state requirements. This currently uncontrolled contaminated site will come under control.

Mark Jacobs, wetlands scientist said there was concern over the number of lots that needed a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") for access (8), but that is now down to 2 lots: #20 and 24. A portion of the Lot 20 driveway would be in pavement for Oak St Extension that already exists and is an impact now, he did not mean to imply that it would be all of Oak St Extension. Lots #29 and 30 were combined to reduce the CUP lots. Some lots were renumbered so it's confusing, but now no driveway crossings of wetlands. There are no vernal pools and no endangered species on site.

Jason Plourde, of Tighe and Bond, traffic the, said they did the traffic study said they did a method in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. They used it to generate the study for 39 single family homes. Now there are only 4 active houses on the site. So we take the difference between that (existing and this new proposal. Mornings are the highest use: 7 am to 9 am: 26 trips. Evenings (4 pm to 6 pm): 35 trips. Saturday midday 11 am to 1 pm: 32 trips. The times correspond to folks going to work/school, ten returning and on weekends, doing errands. If there are 100 trips per hour, you need a formal traffic study that might lead to improvements possibly being required, but the current predicted total is below that number. They feel it will be a negligible impact on the existing roadway system.

Board questions and comments:

Mr. Plumer asked if monitoring wells will be required. Tim Stone said there is no groundwater contamination found so far and its likelihood is remote due to materials they have onsite. No wells needed or intended at this time, but coal ash klinker site might lead to some going in later for post construction monitoring. Driven by materials that are present. Klinker looks like lava stone material. On traffic, Mr. Plumer asked how far out the study goes. How will traffic disperse? Mr. Plourde said it will be vetted out as go

forward and DPW/Town will be involved. Mr. Plumer then said that it appears Oak St Extension will still exist and although narrow, it's still wide enough for fire trucks and such, so it could be a means of ingress and egress for emergency access. He encouraged that the applicant plan to maintain some sort of access through the property, although tricky.

Ms. English said given the nature of the property, she would have expected a fair amount of pesticides and such due to past uses. Mr. Stone said that part of the initial study, pesticides were looked at but they found only low concentrations, below the thresholds for them. That is probably due to the fact that they do degrade, but it was a surprising finding there.

Ms. English then asked if the roadways will have sidewalks. This Board would expect sidewalks for walkers and kids, etc. So you would need to add an additional 5 ft to roadway for them. If add 5 ft, many lots become a problem on this plan. Mr. Sharples explained that it's a 50 ft right-of-way shown, not a 50 ft road, so there is plenty of room to add sidewalks, curbs, etc., this plan. She mentioned the "lollipop" nature of the cul-de-sacs for access and she doesn't feel comfortable about them.

Ms. Corson mentioned that Lot #15's garage shows a right-of-way ("ROW") going through it. Mr. Caldwell said it's an existing building that hasn't been discussed yet.

Ms. Corson then asked about the traffic trips, how many vehicles is that? Mr. Plourde said it would be 334 total vehicle trips on a weekday and _____ on a Saturday. Low volume roadway is 400 vehicles per day or less, which this is. Ms. Corson said it changes the whole nature of the neighborhood on that point. Believes right to develop the property, but this puts a lot onto the neighborhood. She said it's a sensitive area and need to walk it. Difficult area with steep slopes. All the lots are square on adjoining streets. This is a lollipop, single entry subdivision and how can that happen? How does the cul-de-sac meet the fire truck needs? Proposed 600+ ft road goes through

the wetlands area and buffer zones. Looks like $\frac{3}{4}$ of the roadway is in those protected areas. Yield plan is supposed to reveal that everything is fine for the yield plan to work.

Mr. Caldwell said the lots aren't all rectangular on this plan. Yield plan complies with the written regulations. Length measured from terminus to intersection of streets. Longest one is 803 ft, shortest one is 300 ft. She thought that Board should have clarified this before. This proposal is not in line with the intent of the Town. Cul-de-sac is one in and one out. Mr. Sharples said he looked at other cul-de-sacs in Town. There is only one that loops on itself which is Captain's Way-a mile long, loops on itself. Discussion was held that example. He said the Fire Dept said it loves Captain's Way as it loops on itself, so they don't have to back up and all their equipment fits.

Ms. Corson said that Blackbird Lane (27 houses or so) was a prior issue for the Board, comes out on large roadways. Connectivity is an important issue here. The other subdivision roads all come out on large roads, this one doesn't. It's very small. Ms. Corson added that she can't tell where most of the houses are going to be but they will have to add many roadways to get to them.

Ms. Corson: The cul-de-sac loop lollipop is in buffer and wetlands area, so the Board could eliminate several lots here. Mr. Caldwell said _____ . Ms. Corson wanted explanation of Lot #28, all slope, not really buildable. How is that buildable? Mr. Caldwell said the four parameters to be met are frontage, home, size and yard. They can put a house, yards and such there and meets the other numbers, so it's a buildable lot per the regs. Does comply with the regs, but it is not an optimal lot. Ms. Corson then questioned the lollipop in the sensitive areas. Mr. Caldwell said that's a conditional use situation and is allowed in regs. On further discussion he said that Lot #25 would be a walk out situation. Lots 10 and 11 are questionable to her. Corey said 11 is pretty flat, can

make yard up to 50 ft no cut buffer. Ms. Corson concluded that 12 lots are very questionable for her.

Mr. Cameron revisited the traffic issue: cars in and out does not take into consideration of trips of the neighborhood as it now exist? Mr. Plourde said no traffic studies were done on the existing traffic for the neighborhood yet, but will do them later on with Town input. Mr. Cameron then asked that no migration of any other issues environmentally? Mr. Stone said that refrigerants are airborne and probably dissipated long ago.

Mr. Clement asked about trip generations. Are you counting in any and all trips or just homeowner trips? Mr. Plourde said it accounts for all trips, no separation out of any types of vehicles. The loop road is a connector only, no driveways off it. In order to make this project work, the applicant had to create two shared driveways? He said it looks like the applicant is creating ways to make a certain number of lots. Lots 37 and 38 in R- 1 Zone, have high percentages of wetlands on them, but a margin of a few hundred feet might change everything. Some lots have high % of wetlands on the lots. When the wetlands are reviewed it might be questionable as to what lots have what percentage of wetlands on them.

Mr. Caldwell said that there are two common driveways, but 17 and 18 could be accessed from Oak St Extension. Their intentions were to avoid wetlands crossing impacts. Common driveways are allowed under the regs. Mr. Sharples said that they don't need the common driveway on #29/30 since they have the room to put the driveway in without any impacts.

Mr. Brown said that traffic is of concern at 26 additional trips per hour. Mr. Plourde said if we don't count the existing houses, it's a total of 29 in the morning, 39 in the afternoon and 36 on weekends.

Mr. Brown then commented on the plan. He said they should put sidewalks on the plan as it wouldn't be approved without them. He wants to see a

yield plan that is close to approval for conventional subdivision purposes. He asked for further explanation of the 300 ft cul-de-sac. Mr. Caldwell explained that the length of the cul-de-sacs relates to sizes of lots, as they differ from R-1 to R-4. There was significant discussion on cul-de-sacs coming off the loop road and where they start

The Chair opened it up for public comments, asking for brief comments.

Joan Gallagher, owns 5 and 7 Wadleigh Rd, at the entrance to Rose Farm, there are two driveways. There are three houses at entrance. Traffic patterns in neighborhood, with folks coming to the spring, at least a 100 cars a day go there. Fly up the driveway at the end of Forest St. They drive way too fast. Sharp corner sign is not respected. She wants to see buffer from her property line to this road. Needs fencing or plantings and she has no room for it, only 12 ft wide there. Water drainage is huge issue, comes down her driveway. This needs a porous pavement requirement. The Board needs to look at water drainage. The height of the roadway above grade is also an issue, might flow water onto her property. She proposes that no houses go into the field at the entrance. Lots of wildlife in that field and a 'living' pond is there.

Jason Rimers, representing the Westside Neighborhood Coalition said this project is in the wrong place for a quiet family neighborhood. He is not sure if Oak St Extension will be physically blocked off and if not, the residents will use it, it's human nature. The regulations are intended to prevent undue congestion and traffic problems. Another 334 trips every day will not necessarily be reasonable for this location-have to consider the impacts of that. Got a table of lot areas but it only addresses 30 lots, not 39 lots. Mr. Caldwell responded saying the table covers only lots with wetlands impacts.

Jennifer Brecht said the Yield Plan for 39 houses and improvements will bring sediment load into Norris Brook and an alteration of terrain permit will be required and all stormwater will have to remain onsite. EPA has

identified Exeter as an MS4 community with impaired water quality. The Jailhouse Spring goes back to 1800's of record. She initiated a rainwater discussion as to source of spring water that will be impacted by the loss of pervious surfaces due to this development. Water and sewer pipe hookups to neighboring streets, all 4 inch pipes. This applicant needs to bring in a larger pipe system and water pressure will be reduced in houses and streets will have to be ripped up to install larger piping, leading to many risks.

Paul Degrandis of 24 Oak St, said the traffic study info seems incomplete, should be a range or a distribution that results. Wildlife species discussed are for this parcel only, not the region or area. Mr. Plourde responded that equation is based on similar facilities, not a range or equation of any sort at this point.

Suzanne Stone of 21 Forest St asked if trail access will be maintained. Mr. Caldwell said access will exist off Oak St, but cul-de-sac almost touches it. She wants present access to remain. Chair said it's private property and the owner has the right to change it at any point. Mr. Caldwell said that the Developer represents that it won't be blocked and he will work with the neighbors to try to make it work with their concerns.

Chair explains that this is a conceptual proposal at this point.

Darius Thompson of Drinkwater Road asked that when folks come before the Board, does it all go onto the website and can it be streamed by viewers at home? Mr. Sharples said they have everything electronically but would inundate the website with it. Will provide anything anyone asks for. Not sure about getting it onto a small screen. [Discussion on viewing materials]. Wants presenters to use the large screen for presentations.

Joe O'Donnell said the most current info can be found on the Westside Neighborhood Coalition website: "NoRoseFarmDevelopment.com."

Todd Piskovitz of 22 Forest St, said that contamination of lead in soil, worst case is 3700 cu ft to be removed, that's about 185 trucks of bad stuff coming out-worst case scenario, so even if half, 90 would be a lot. DES said some coal ash has to come out and it will come through neighborhood as well. Lead is also above thresholds in water on the site, which DES will deal with later, but applicant must present the plan to clean it up. ACOE may weigh in on this. Elevations across the site, disposal of sewer might require one or two pumping stations for this site. Should they be so close to Norris Brook? He spoke to an engineer that said at least one is likely to have to be built and possibly two.

Eileen Flockhardt, 62 Park Court said there should be a study on what's valuable about an existing neighborhood, how to view old one and new one and how they will mesh. She is concerned about children and possible interaction with the contaminants.

[Public comments ended]

Mr. Plumer commented that Exeter Farms was similar and wondered if the developer would review that with the Board. Mr. Caldwell said there is a density bonus of 10%, maximum with 39 lots would be 4 more lots so 44 lots. But the Board pointed out that 3.9% does not equal 4%, and his math was wrong, so have to go with 3 additional lots on the density bonus. Affordable housing was not pursued, so only 10% due to that. Mr. Sharples said the total lot count would be 42, and then only if ConCom accepted a Conservation Easement on this, not automatic. Discussion was held on whether had to be Exeter ConCom or not and it was concluded that it did.

Mr. Cameron mentioned that Blackbird Lane dumps into a cul-de-sac at Riverwoods.

Tim Phoenix said appreciated the comments and concerns expressed and trying to work with everyone on issues. Have to do drainage studies and planning. And also going to clean up a contaminated site. More detailed traffic study will be forthcoming. Property owner has rights too. This is only a yield plan, not what we are going to pursue for certain. Want comments to come out so that they can plan better. Don't need any variances so would like marching orders from the Board tonight if possible.

Mr. Sharples said that the Board should decide where it is at regarding going forward from this hearing.

Ms. Corson said that 39 houses is too much here. Purposes 5, 6 and 9 make for problems here. How will water and sewer affect the current neighbors? Mr. Sharples said this is non-binding, so don't have to lock into it. Number of units is key due to planning requirement.

Mr. Clement said that if the yield plan is accepted tonight, then has to present a conventional plan with this number of houses, are they bound to accept those lots? Mr. Sharples said that if have reasons for disputing lots, can dispute them.

Mr. Cameron said the Board has to move forward, have to fish or cut bait here. Mr. Clement said they don't have to approve anything tonight.

Mr. Brown asked if no issues with two cul-de-sacs? Mr. Sharples said all other projects got waivers and density was increased accordingly. There was discussion on tweaking plans and plan issues and the message that the number of lots (39) sends for future planning purposes.

Mr. Cameron moved that design review process for case #21603, Baker Properties LLC, has concluded and for the Planner to notify the applicant accordingly. Ms. Bergeron seconded it. On discussion the applicant said that they are confused and don't know where to go with it. Ms. Corson

said past votes on design review have given a number. Mr. Brown said this way is best, no commitment. A roll call vote was taken by the Chair: 5 aye and 2 nay (Ms. Corson and Mr. Clement), so the motion passed.

5. Other Business:

Kathleen Mahoney (d/b/a "The Porches at Exeter) 20 Franklin Street – PB Case #21320. Waiver Request for relief from bonding requirements

[This matter was taken out of order by the Chair, per above]

Minor Field Modifications

There were none.

Planner's Report:

The MacFarland Ford project had some problems with damages due to winds, but have overcome them and are getting going, timed now for a spring addition.

Certificate of Occupancy was issued to Aroma Joe's and it is open.

The building Permit for 20 Franklin St can issue now, based on the decision tonight.

There is a Master Plan public session on Jan 25th at the High School at 6 pm.

Jan 26th is a regular meeting date, but due to the meeting the preceding evening, there is no Planning Board meeting that night.

Mr. Sharples asked the Board if it wanted the consultant workshop before a regular meeting, which would take about 45 minutes to an hour. If so, he would recommend the Board start at 6 pm, to enable it to wrap up for the

regular meeting at 7 pm. Wright Pearce will present. The first meeting in February would be best. The Chair asked him to check if that agenda is light, it might be doable during the regular session or if it's long, then 6 pm. Chair told him to set the workshop for that evening for 6:30 pm.

Wed, Jan 11th is the next scheduled All Boards Meeting, at Library at 7 pm.

6. Approval of Minutes: December 8, 2016

The subject minutes weren't available for review yet, so this was tabled.

7. Adjournment:

There being no other business before the Board for this session, Mr. Cameron moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Plumer, and the vote was unanimous, The Chair adjourned the session at 10:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David Pancoast, Recording Secretary.