

**Kingston Planning Board
Public Hearing
June 21, 2016**

The Chairman called the hearing to order at 6:45 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair
Chris Bashaw
Ernie Landry (Alternate)

Carol Croteau
Peter Bakie
Ellen Faulconer (Alternate)

Members absent: Adam Pope, Peter Coffin, Mark Heitz, Richard St. Hilaire (Alternate)

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer.

Mr. Coppelman announced that Mr. Landry and Ms. Faulconer would be voting members for tonight's hearing; he introduced the Board members and Board representatives.

George and Paula Demers
32 Exeter Road
Tax Map R35-5

Terry Trudell of SEC and Associates and Mr. Demers appeared before the Board. Mr. Trudel noted the revised comments from Mr. Quintal; he added that the Fire Chief had reviewed the proposal and had no new comments. Mr. Trudel said that three waiver requests had been submitted. Mr. Coppelman noted the documents available for the hearing. Mr. Trudel started reviewing the Town Engineer's comments; he noted the driveways within the setbacks explaining that keeping the driveways out of the setbacks would push the houses closer to wetlands and make the buildable area smaller for some of the lots. He stated that they are requesting a waiver for that specific article. Mr. Trudel began reviewing Mr. Quintal's next comment about no more than two driveways to anyone parcel; he was told that this was an acceptable scenario. Ms. Faulconer said it was not voted on which was why Mr. Quintal probably included it in his comments; waiver requests were not available at the last meeting.

Mr. Quintal reviewed his comments; his interpretation of Article 905.11 (F) prohibiting more than two driveways on any one parcel of land would require a waiver due to the proposed configuration. There was a lot of discussion on this issue. Mr. Greenwood stated that he understood Mr. Quintal's concerns but felt that the proposal did fit the intent of the article. There was discussion about entrances and egresses; the Board determined that these were to Class V roads and not to adjacent parcels. Mr. Quintal said that it could be determined to be one entrance that branches off and therefore is not two driveways on one parcel of land. The Board agreed with this interpretation and determined that a waiver for 905.11 (F) was not required.

Mr. Quintal discussed the site specific soil mapping requirement. Mr. Trudel said that the next set of plans that would be submitted would include the High Intensity Soil Survey map. Mr. Quintal said that would be sufficient so a waiver on the soil mapping was not necessary.

Mr. Quintal continued reviewing his comments including notations regarding appropriate monumentation and notations about their easements; easements should be considered about locations for putting snow, due to the driveway locations near lot lines. Mr. Trudell agreed that this could be added to the documents/agreements. Mr. Quintal continued that the Board would need to have the driveway maintenance agreements for review. He stated that there was a dry well that needs to have appropriate run-off provided. Mr. Trudell explained that the seasonal high water table will vary and more area above the seasonal high water table can be provided; he suggested adding a note to the plan that any dry well will be out of the seasonal high water table adding that he could use infiltrators that might be better. Mr. Quintal said that this type of thing could be done but it should be clear on the plan and not be a burden on the Building Inspector. Mr. Quintal suggested that the applicant think about the design they prefer and it needs to be shown on the plan; modifications can be shown later on during development. Mr. Quintal said that the Stormwater Management plan needs to be addressed prior to getting a building permit and also be shown on the proposed septic design; this should be reviewed by the Town Engineer to make sure it meets the sizing requirements and make sure it complies with the intent of the plan; it should be reviewed during construction and prior to back-filling; he could work with the Health Officer in reviewing the septic as he has done in the past and on inspections. Mr. Quintal said it is really two parts: the design to make sure it meets the requirements of Stormwater and to make sure it is constructed properly. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that the design would need to be shown on the plan and inspected during the process to make sure it is done correctly. Mr. Trudell said the design would be shown on the septic plans and would be done individually as each site is analyzed. Mr. Quintal said that a note on the plan near the detail needs to be added that says that the bottom of the leaching area will be above the water table. Ms. Faulconer said that she is comfortable with this as long as Mr. Quintal is reviewing it. Mr. Quintal said that a note regarding the compliance with Stormwater Management regulations needs to be added to the plan which should read "subject to all Stormwater Management regulations". He ended his comments noting that there were State subdivision and driveway permits required, bounds need to be set and a final mylar required.

Mr. Greenwood reviewed his comments; he noted that the Board had not invoked jurisdiction but it would be reasonable to hold off as there was going to be another update coming in to the Board. He continued with his comments including the need for the Planning Board's attorney's review of the easement language; a letter from the Fire Chief that the turnaround has the correct gravel to support emergency vehicles; there needs to be a notation that the entrance to the roadway is paved. Mr. Trudel confirmed that they had not received the permit from the NHDOT yet. Mr. Greenwood said that the note regarding Impact Fees had to appear on the plan. Mr. Coppelman read the Building Inspectors comments questioning driveway setbacks and a cluster development; the Fire Department had not comments; Mr. Coppelman re-iterated that the applicant would get further information from the Fire Department. Mr. Greenwood stated that the plan appeared to be complete enough to accept for jurisdiction; Mr. Bashaw agreed. Mr. Landry said that the Board was still looking for additional information. Ms. Faulconer noted that while the applicant previously stated that the agreements would not be available for review prior to tonight's hearing, they would be provided tonight. Mr. Coppelman said that jurisdiction does start the 65 day clock but the applicant also needed to continue forward with information in a

timely manner; the Board was still looking for the Homeowner's Agreement, easements and information from the Fire Department.

MM&S to invoke jurisdiction on the plan. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Ms. Croteau) **Motion carries 4-2** with Mr. Landry and Ms. Faulconer opposed.

The waiver request for 905.14 (C) 6 requiring topo. for the entire site was read. Mr. Bakie noted that the plan will show the topography around the area involved with the development of the site but will not include the area not being built on or disturbed.

MM&S to approve the waiver for the requirements of Article 905.14 (C) 6 based on the supporting information in the submitted waiver request and due to area not being impacted by the development. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Bakie) **PUNA**

The Board reviewed the next waiver request from the requirements of Article 905.11 D and F regarding driveway requirements of being 20 ft. from the side lot lines and each lot being serviced by its own driveway except where shared driveways are deemed appropriate by the Planning Board. A revised waiver, dated June 3rd, was read.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to grant the waiver for 905.11 D and F based on the description in the waiver request (not seconded). Discussion on the motion: Ms. Faulconer asked if the Board would be granting waivers for each driveway request or just issuing a blanket waiver for the driveways. She said that she is not in favor of blanket waivers as she thinks it is vague but that was up to the Board. Mr. Bakie and Mr. Greenwood confirmed that the letter addressed all of the driveways as needing waivers. Mr. Bashaw asked if the motion could include "as shown on the current plan". Mr. Coppelman suggested referencing the date of the plan.

Revised motion: **MM&S to grant the waiver for 905.11 D and F based on the description and based on the plan dated 6/6/2016 with current driveway configurations as shown on the plan.** (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie) Ms. Faulconer stated that while she won't be voting next month, she needed to note on the record that she thinks this is an awful configuration and 5 lots with one driveway is terrible. . Mr. Bashaw thought this just came down to personal preference. Ms. Faulconer said she understood concerns about the safety issue but said that this proposal just screams to have a cul-de-sac which would allow the one entrance for safety. She continued that five properties off of one driveway was a nightmare. She stated that she is not criticizing anyone for liking it; she just wanted to put it on the record. Mr. Coppelman said he would make a statement after the vote. Ms. Croteau agreed with Ms. Faulconer. Mr. Bashaw stated that normally he wouldn't like to see shared driveways especially down the road as it came to neighbor dispute issues and dealing with them but he didn't like the other configuration of the lots and the more dramatic impact it would have on everything and it would have been much worse than this configuration. Mr. Bakie explained that the other proposal shown to the Board has more run-off and impact to the neighbors; it impacts more of the wetlands and takes away from the traditional look of Rte. 111 with the houses along the road. Mr. Bakie continued that this is an exception where the applicant has the frontage but the Board is doing it for a reason; the Town's safety officials have reviewed it; they wanted one entrance onto the road for public safety and this development goes in that direction.

Vote on the motion: 3-3 with Mr. Bakie, Mr. Bashaw, Mr. Landry in favor; Ms. Faulconer, Ms. Croteau and Mr. Coppelman opposed. **Motion does not pass.**

Mr. Coppelman stated that he had previously expressed his opinion on setbacks to lot lines; he believes that a cul-de-sac proposal would meet the safety officials' needs for one entrance onto the highway. He said that the Board had been given three designs to look at; he believed that two of them did not require waivers and were able to meet design regulations and that should have some weight when the Board makes its decision. Mr. Bashaw said the Board should take into consideration the "weight" of the abutters that are mostly affected; he believes the consensus is that the multiple driveway plan has the least impact and least eyesore to them. He thinks it is selfish to take his own personal preference to something that may not affect him as much of those people with more of a vested interest. He said that the wishes of the owner of the land need to be taken into account. Mr. Coppelman said it was not just personal preference, it was how he believed the Board was supposed to function in its process and why abutters are invited to make public comment. He re-iterated that the other two designs were not more impactful and kept the development closer to the center with more room around the outer edges. Mr. Bakie stated that the other two plans would also require waivers. Mr. Coppelman said that the cul-de-sac could be a private road so not maintained by the Town. Mr. Greenwood said it would require a waiver from 7 lots for the subdivision. Mr. Coppelman said it would not require waivers for the driveways and setbacks for lot lines. Ms. Faulconer said it would probably also require a waiver for the size of the cul-de-sac as the Board talked about allowing a smaller radius. Ms. Faulconer clarified that the Board had not previously voted on any plan. Mr. Bakie noted that waivers would be required for any plans which might cause issues. Mr. Bashaw said that being an elected official comes into play but asked if the votes were based on the personal preferences or voting based on the circumstances to grant the waiver based on the information provided. He re-iterated that he is not a big fan of shared driveways; he added that being in law enforcement he deals with neighbor disputes all the time and it stinks but in this situation, he thinks the Board should defer to what the property owner wants, what the abutters may want and it is more appropriate to vote along on whether the situation is appropriate for waivers.

Ms. Faulconer explained that if the Town did not have in its ordinances and regulations an option that would allow the applicant to develop his property and get the five lots that he wants with the one entrance for safety issues, she might feel differently about the waivers; she stated that the Town does provide that ability through Innovative Zoning and the cul-de-sac proposal that would grant the applicant an approval. Ms. Faulconer said that she does not find the proposal to be in the Town's best interest by having 5 houses off of one driveway; if there was no other option then waivers might be granted but if there is another legitimate option that provides the same safety features and the same number of lots, it is more appropriate; she finds the other two waivers for the cul-de-sac more appropriate due to the safety accommodations. Mr. Bashaw wished the Board members voting in the negative had voiced these concerns at the previous meeting to better help the applicant. There was discussion about possibilities of re-voting the waivers; re-stating the motion, etc. Mr. Greenwood clarified that currently the motion to grant the waiver is denied. Mr. Primo, asking to make public comment, questioned whether Ms. Faulconer was an alternate. It was confirmed that she was and Mr. Coppelman announced that at the beginning of the meeting. He said he was disappointed in the Board vote. He said he would

have liked to have voiced his comments prior to the vote. Mr. Coppelman explained that the public comment section hadn't been reached yet but thanked him for his comments.

The Board reviewed one more waiver request for Article 905.13 A to reduce the engineering review bond from \$5000 to \$2500. Mr. Quintal noted that the Board can request the bond be re-established during the review process if more is needed.

MM&S to waive the requirements of Article 905.13 (A) 2 from \$5000 to \$2500 for the engineering bond based on the Town Engineer's recommendation and the Board's ability to request more funds as needed. (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman asked if there was any public comment; there was none.

There was continued Board discussion on the proposal. Ms. Faulconer asked Board members if it was possible for the run-off to be properly contained without impacting the abutters and wetlands if this would be a consideration for a different proposal. Mr. Bakie said that the run-off was not the only issue with the other plan. Mr. Bashaw said if waivers were being granted in either case, it should defer to the property owner's preference.

Mr. Coppelman asked if there was additional public comment on any of the issues or plans presented. There was none. Mr. Trudel expressed his frustration stating that Mr. Demers had been very patient; NHDOT allows three entrances for the property and they made revisions to address the safety issues with the proposed lay-out; he asked what the next step would be. Mr. Greenwood explained that re-stating the same waiver request with different language would not be feasible; he suggested they might reconfigure the driveways to be out of the 20 foot setbacks. Mr. Bashaw asked why the Board would ignore the safety concerns. Mr. Greenwood explained that the safety issues are also addressed by the alternate plans as they also have just one access point onto Rte. 111. Mr. Coppelman said a different plan or different waiver request would have to be worked out for the next hearing.

MM&S to continue to July 19th at 6:45. (Motion by Mr. Landry, second by Ms. Faulconer) **PUNA**

Richard Russman
18 Beach Drive
Tax Map U12 Lot 36

Mr. Russman appeared before the Board requesting a Conditional Use Permit for an 8 x 12 shed; Mr. Greenwood read his comments, referring the Board to Article 205.6. Mr. Russman reviewed the placement of the shed which would actually be used as a kid's clubhouse; it would be placed on blocks. Mr. Greenwood noted that a sketch had been provided; there was no requirement for a more formal plan. Mr. Bashaw said that based off what he is saying about this being a playhouse, he thinks this is kind of one of those things that we have talked about in previous meetings with unintended consequences through inconsistencies, through town's rules and regulations 'cause if he didn't fall in Aquifer Protection Zone, a playhouse up on blocks wouldn't even meet the definition of a structure and they wouldn't even require a building permit

to build a playhouse and this is kind of one of those things, he just thinks it is absurd that they even had to come and ask for an exception to build a playhouse for their children. Mr. Coppelman said just to be clear, you said Aquifer Protection; this is not Aquifer Protection; this is the Shoreland Protection. Mr. Bashaw said Shoreland Protection but the only reason, even under Shoreline that this classifies as a structure is because they fall in the Aquifer Protection overlay where the definition of structure and building is different than that of properties not located in the Aquifer Protection overlay because we have so many definitions throughout the Town that actually are different from each other for the same exact thing. Mr. Greenwood said that no, the Shoreland Protection District requires that any accessory structures less than 400 feet requires a special exception. Mr. Bashaw said that the definition of a structure, not in the Aquifer Protection overlay, is anything that requires permanent placement on the ground or anything requiring placement on something with permanent placement on the ground; while in the Aquifer Protection Overlay it states that anything occupying space on the ground; so if you had a nice, nosy neighbor dispute and they wanted to argue that pretty much anything you put up could qualify as a structure and you would need a permit including, like a wood pile or an easy-up canopy. Ms. Faulconer said that tool shed is under the requirement. Mr. Bashaw said that but, his initial intention, he is just saying that he can clearly state that the playhouse at his house that his kids play in is not a tool shed or accessory storage building, so, it is one of those things, you know, that we have so many inconsistencies and it seems very difficult to do anything that he thinks that this is why a lot of times people just feel like they are going to be punished for doing the right thing; yeah, they go to the Building Inspector and now they are put through hoops and who knows how long they have now been delayed in giving a child a playhouse; but, other than that, if they are looking for the exception on it, I think based off of what the Conditional Use allows, he does not think that putting a playhouse or a shed will adversely affect, impact anything on sections 1 through 5 and I think we should grant the exception. There was no public comment.

Mr. Quintal asked how far the structure would be from the Shoreland; Mr. Russman said it was about 150 feet from the water, 15 to 20 feet from the marsh adding that it will be built so water will run under it. Mr. Bakie said he believed that all the requirements of the article could be met. Mr. Greenwood suggested the Board review and vote on each requirement.

MM&S that Article 205.6 (B) 1 can be met. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie)
PUNA

MM&S that Article 205.6 (B) 2 can be met. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie)
PUNA

MM&S that Article 205.6 (B) 3 can be met. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie)
PUNA

MM&S that Article 205.6 (B) 4 can be met. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie)
PUNA

MM&S that Article 205.6 (B) 5 can be met. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Bakie)
PUNA

MM&S to grant the Conditional Use Permit as it meets the conditions outlined in the ordinance. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

<The Board took a five minute recess at this time.>

Steven A. Bartlett
3 and 3A Country Lane
Tax Map U10 Lots 30-B-1 and 30-B-2

Mr. Coppelman recused himself from this hearing explaining that the applicant's representative had spoken with him about the proposal and as he had engaged in the discussion felt that it was appropriate for him to step down for this review. Carol Croteau continued as the acting Chair.

Ms. Croteau read the notice and invited the applicant to explain the proposal. Mr. Bartlett explained the ownership of the property and the use that has existed for 17 years. He said that one lot will be being sold and the lot line adjustment as proposed would allow him to continue with the use. He said that the lot line adjustment keeps a 50 foot wide swath of land between the property lines. Mr. Greenwood said that both lots will remain conforming; he added that the zoning note on the plan was incorrect; the RR-Agricultural designation needed to be changed to Rural Residential. Mr. Greenwood said that he would normally not like this lot change but the developed part of the property takes place way up front on the property and already exists and unlikely to change; he added that the back land isn't the best land on the lot. Mr. Greenwood stated that the Parcel A lot corners need to be "true" lot corners and need granite markers and not iron pipes; it is especially important to keep this lot lines clear. He clarified that just the new lot line markers need to be granite.

Ms. Croteau asked for public comment. Selma Gould, abutter, asked to review the plan. Mr. Quintal asked about the utility easement; Mr. Bartlett confirmed it existed. Mr. Ken Gould, abutter, agreed with requiring the granite markers and asked if this meant the rolling stock would be kept on Mr. Bartlett's property. Mr. Bartlett confirmed this was the intent. Ms. Faulconer stated that normally she would not be in favor of this configuration but it does allow enough area for equipment to get to the back of the property; she continued that since the back of the property is primarily wet, it would be unlikely that it would be used for a developable purpose.

MM&S to grant the waiver request from Article 905.6 D, allowing for a 51.40 width between property lines instead of the 100 ft. requirement, as proposed. (Motion by Ms. Faulconer, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**

MM&S to conditionally approve the lot line adjustment as requested with the addition of the granite markers and corrected zoning note to Rural Residential instead of RR-Agricultural. (Motion by Ms. Faulconer, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**

Mr. Greenwood notified the applicant that the conditions need to be met within 90 days. Ms. Croteau closed the public hearing for this application.

Board Business

Correspondence:

- SPE pit site (the Early site on the south end of Rte. 125); Mr. Quintal's review of the site was distributed to the Board; he said that the site is basically in compliance noting that some of the plants aren't growing but "mother nature" will take care of that adding that everything is draining properly.

MM&S to consider the pit controlled and closed and no longer an active gravel pit.

(Motion by Mr. Landry, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

- Mr. Coppelman signed escrow account information
- Town Engineer invoices for Kings Landing, Pernokas, ECSI, SPE reviews were approved and signed.
- Bond list reviewed
- Budget received
- Escrow release for Pernokas subdivision/Sal Ragonese was approved pending review of any outstanding invoices.
- OPE memo re: land use regulations update; Ms. Faulconer will complete.
- NHPR tape request reviewed; the reporter had called after the meeting to ask to come to make a copy of the tape; since they were being destroyed once the minutes were approved, could he just come pick them up instead; this request was tabled to later in the meeting.
- Letter asking for clarification of CIII requirements in Article 110.3; the Board confirmed that "vehicles" include motorcycles.
- Letter from Bolton's Lake House describing an additional use of outside entertainment; the letter had been provided to the Board; Ms. Faulconer noted that the Fire Department did not have an issue with the use as it was primarily for outside the building; Mr. Bashaw clarified that it said it would be outside, weather permitting and had provisions to have it inside with bad weather. Mr. Coppelman said there was an approved site plan on file for this property; it was confirmed that outside entertainment was not an approved activity on the site. Ms. Faulconer noted that she would not be commenting or voting on this proposal; she was just giving the Board information she had received; she did want to clarify that the owner provided additional licensing paperwork signed by the Chief of Police who had approved entertainment on the property for both this owner and the previous owner. She continued that the owner was relying on this information that entertainment was permitted. Mr. Bakie confirmed that the information was provided by the current owners; Ms. Faulconer said a similar permit was attached for the previous owner; it was a liquor license signed by the Chief who also checked off entertainment. They felt this permit allowed entertainment. Ms. Faulconer stated that she could not find any approval for this activity upon review of either application. Mr. Bakie said that the site plan is where the Board would get input from the abutters. Mr. Coppelman said the letter specifies entertainment outside, one day a week. Ms. Faulconer re-iterated that the Fire Department has no safety concerns with outside entertainment; that comment was received today. Mr. Coppelman said that the letter was actually a notification to the Board regarding the activity. Ms. Faulconer explained that, in fairness to the owner, they were aware that compliance questions had been raised and while they felt they had the appropriate approval, wanted to contact the Planning Board in case any other review was required. Mr. Greenwood stated that the Chief of Police has no land use review or authority. Ms. Croteau thought the owner should know this information. Ms. Faulconer

said, again in fairness to the owner, she had been told he intended to come to this meeting but circumstances at work changed that intent. Mr. Bakie said the owner would need to provide an amended site plan; Mr. Greenwood agreed that it was an amendment to the approved use. Ms. Faulconer asked if the Board was requiring an amended site plan or an expedited site plan. Mr. Bakie asked what the guidelines were for expedited and if someone else could also ask for that. Mr. Coppelman said it was available for anyone; it was related to the size of the expansion. Mr. Greenwood reviewed the requirements for an expedited review.

Mr. Coppelman asked Tammy Bakie if she had a question. Ms. Bakie said that she thought abutters should be able to comment. Mr. Coppelman explained that was the purpose of the amended site plan; it would be a public process and abutters would be notified and have a chance to comment. Ms. Bakie said that abutters, though limited, should be notified. Requirements of expedited review were discussed. Mr. Bashaw said that he is aware that the Police Department has dealt, over the past couple of years, with a lot of noise issues with entertainment at restaurants. Mr. Coppelman did say that sound can carry over water unbelievably. Ms. Croteau did note that the letter included a time restriction. Mr. Coppelman read the information: one or two person singers with small equipment and a guitar; the times would be from 5:30 to 8:30 PM. Mr. Bashaw noted that it didn't say that it wouldn't specifically be inside due to the "weather permitting" notation. Mr. Greenwood read the requirements for expedited review; number "b" said it would not constitute a change of use; Mr. Greenwood said this did constitute a change of use, outdoor entertainment that was not part of the approval of the restaurant. He said the Board could still determine that it didn't need a new engineered site plan but that would be done upon a request of an applicant. He said that the Board could also determine that this didn't constitute a change of use regardless of his perspective of approval. Mr. Coppelman said it was at least an expansion of use. Mr. Greenwood said that an expansion could not include a change and that determination would be up to the Board. Mr. Coppelman said it is an additional use and questioned whether that meant it was a change of use. Mr. Greenwood said it was up to the Board but he felt that it was. Mr. Bakie said when the Board gets into a situation when the abutters may have an issue, which official would get the first call. Ms. Croteau agreed it was a change of use and needed an amended site plan. Mr. Greenwood added that the approval included a patio area so conversation was a known issue but that is different from live entertainment. Ms. Faulconer asked if anyone else wanted to review the file in case she missed something. Mr. Greenwood said he remembers the approval and live entertainment wasn't discussed. Ms. Bakie noted that they were also advertising "corn-hole" tossing tournaments. Mr. Coppelman said that Board will deal with the letter before them and not other possible activities at this time.

MM&S that the request for live entertainment requires an amended site plan and the applicant can request any waivers or reductions in requirements as appropriate. (Motion by Ms. Croteau, second by Mr. Landry) **Motion carries 5-0-1** with Ms. Faulconer abstaining. Ms. Faulconer was asked to contact the owner about the Board's decision.

- No letter will be sent to Landscapers Depot; the minutes will suffice.
- Targeted Block Grant update: Mr. Landry explained that the Inventory necessary for the grant is a function of the Conservation Commission and they were not able to work on this at this time so the Town won't be going forward with the grant opportunity; hopefully it can be worked on for next year.
- Wetlands Permit application for 61 North Road; Mr. Greenwood is meeting with the Conservation Chairperson to go over this on Monday; if he feels there are concerns for the Planning Board he will let the Board know.

MM&S to approve the April 19, 2016 minutes as presented. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Landry) **Motion passed 5-0-1** with Ms. Croteau abstaining.

MM&S to approve the May 3, 2016 minutes as presented. (Motion by Ms. Faulconer, second by Ms. Croteau) **Motion passed 5-0-1** with Ms. Bashaw abstaining.

MM&S to allow NHPR to have the tapes that were being destroyed instead of requiring them to make a copy. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Mr. Landry) **PUNA**

Plan Review: plans received from Allied Clearwater and William Pellerin will be added to the July public hearing.

Mr. Bashaw stated that during the Board's break, in regards to multiple board membership, Ms. Faulconer had informed him that she had resigned from the ZBA months ago. He asked if she had received this information from the Selectmen. She said she asked but there was not an answer and rather expend Town funds with lawyers or cause potential issues, she resigned from the ZBA sometime in March or April.

MM&S to adjourn at 9:59 PM. (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**