

**Kingston Planning Board
Public Meeting
June 5, 2012**

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

Members in attendance:

Richard Wilson, Chairman	Adam Pope
Peter Coffin	Ernie Landry
Mark Heitz, BOS rep.	Stanley Shalett
Glenn Coppelman, V. Chair	

Absent: Ellen Faulconer, Alternate, Administrative Assistant, Richard St. Hilaire, Alternate, Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider/Planner.

Board Business

Correspondence:

- Letter from Kingston Self Storage explaining that they would take care of the run-off problem and report back once it is done; the Board can send a representative out after the third week of June to confirm that the issue had been addressed.
- The Budget Schedule was received; submissions are due Sept. 27th; the Planning Board's review is November 18th. Mr. Wilson suggested Board members think about anything that needed to be included in the budget proposal.
- Wetland's Dredge and Fill permit received.
- Letter from Epping Well regarding water quality protection at and around Storybook Play School. Mr. Heitz explained that there is a program from the State where a waiver can be granted for testing requirements for a public water supply for a three-year period if public education is done.

Water District Discussion:

Mr. Heitz introduced Attorney John Ratigan as being instrumental to the Town's adoption of the Water Utility Article; he reviewed some past history regarding the Town's pursuit of protecting its water resources and Aquifer. He continued that due to previous Board discussion, Attorney Ratigan was invited to re-iterate what the Town had accomplished, the purpose of that accomplishment and direction for what the Town can and should do for the future. Mr. Heitz talked about water rights on the Golf Course development and the resources of the Town; he wanted Attorney Ratigan to speak with the Board about possible recommendations for the Town in general. Mr. Coppelman added that there was some information from that applicant that once the well source was developed for that Community that it would be turned over to a private operator and the Board didn't know how the position with the Town in regard with Water Utility might be affected. Mr. Heitz added that some of the language had been amended to clarify that the water would not go off-site and he questioned if it might be beneficial to the Town for the

future and due to some of the leeway that had been granted, if an easement for the Town might be possible. He wanted Attorney Ratigan's input, in general terms, not specifically for a particular application, so the Town would know how to proceed. Mr. Wilson added that at the Golf Course there were two issues: the Large Water Withdrawal and the Condos. that want to set up a water development; he said the Town may want an easement on all of it.

Attorney John Ratigan addressed the Board and referenced his June 6, 2011 letter that had been addressed to the Board of Selectmen concerning the Town's authorization to establish a municipal water utility; managing water resources is a very important issue for all of the communities in the Seacoast. He discussed regional water issues being reviewed and proposed by the State of NH including wetland mitigation requirements. He explained that when thinking of the Planning Board, it begins with the Master Plan and Water Resources has become a more important chapter within the Master Plan over the years. He suggested that the Planning Board might want to take a look at the Water Resources Chapter; he agreed with Mr. Heitz's comments that the Town has been very forward-thinking over the years in trying to identify where the important water Aquifers are and to zone and manage in such a way for those resources to be protected. He gave examples of others trying to take advantage of all of the hard work taken by a municipality to protect these resources. He suggested reviewing the Water Resources chapter; think about what the Town's goals and objectives might be and how to better protect those resources; once that is accomplished, the Ordinances need to be reviewed to see if the tools are in place that allows the Town to achieve the goals and review the list of uses that have a high contamination such as auto body shops and garages and either change the zoning or change the site plan regulations to adopt Best Management Practices and take steps to insure that these uses are operating in such a way as to minimize any possible contamination to water resources. He talked about the increase in the protection of Open Space; he explained that what is often overlooked in land protection is the identification of water rights, often at a fraction of the cost of purchasing the entire property. He continued that the water rights can be written in such a way that does not prohibit development of low-water usage such as residential or some traditional commercial or municipal uses but does allow the municipality to gain control over the excess capacity that such land has.

Attorney Ratigan discussed the possible strategies to achieve some of the goals he mentioned such as writing an easement to transfer and conserve water rights just like a conservation easement is obtained; that becomes another tool in the Board's tool box. He continued that another possibility is for the Board to identify properties that have water resource values, some of which may already have conservation easements or not be amenable to development for various reasons, and to prioritize those properties which the logical places being those near municipalities; properties near highways. He said his goal was to try to provoke some thinking about these ideas and answer the Board's questions.

Mr. Heitz said that his initial thoughts on this issue was specific to applicants that were looking for waivers and other flexibility and considerations from the Planning Board with large tracts of land and avenues for the Town to secure rights beneficial to the Town, which might never be developed, but would at least allow for the future opportunity. Attorney Ratigan agreed with Mr. Heitz; he noted the Town asking for slope or drainage easements for the maintenance of a proposed culvert and he thinks it is possible for the Board to be comfortable with introducing,

into the discussion with Land owners, a request in consideration to make a “public-good” contribution in exchange for other benefits being given to the applicant that they might not necessarily be entitled to receiving. He continued that this might be written into the Special Exception criteria and work with the ZBA to put in these types of requests as a condition of approval because the Board can reasonably conditional approval on certain things. He said there were a number of different ways that this could be done and he thinks that most people, when assured that they are going to be able to develop the land for the purpose they are proposing, will not object to the Town asking for the delta between what is needed for their development and what could be produced above what is needed. He explained that once it is written into the regulations, the Town is usually dealing with the same local engineers who will tell their clients at the beginning that the Town will be looking to see this as part of the proposal; he added that this type of “donation” could be tax-deductible which would be another incentive for a developer/owner. Attorney Ratigan suggested a meeting with the Conservation Commission to discuss these issues and work with them on this approach.

Mr. Coppelman asked if it was possible for Attorney Ratigan to talk about, based on previous issues with Hampstead Area Water company if once the Town has declared itself as a Water Utility, does the Town then have the ability or right to determine who will manage the resource and what kind of price structure and associated items is determined. Attorney Ratigan remembered this as a previous discussion which was on the heels of an unsettling situation where the Town did not have any control over the development of a well within the Town’s boundaries; one of the thoughts at the time was for the Town to set up a municipality water company to get in the discussion as a competitor and take title to the water rights and water management responsibilities of properties that had been determined to be “high value”, as an attempt to head off a repeat of that previous situation. He said that this could still be done but the time to do that would be at the beginning of the application process although he added that the better route would be to work with people with easements and even trading these easements for other waivers and things they might need. He continued that the water business has become a more tightly regulated business and the regulatory burden on people who manage these types of water systems is more complicated than it was when the issue was first taken up here ten years ago; condo. associations now, with more than a specific amount of people, need a licensed water operator; with the licenses dependent on the threshold amount of people; taking over the management of the resource would require people who could execute the necessary responsibilities. Attorney Ratigan suggested that preserving the resources over the next 10 or 20 years puts the Town in a different position allowing terms that are satisfactory to the Town for municipal use only; as water resources become more regional, it places the Town in a position to be more of a seller and not just a protector. Mr. Coppelman stated that he believes that the Town has recognized that this is a position that it might want to be in, at some point. Mr. Wilson said that basically, at this point, there is no way that the Town can stop anyone from coming in and pumping water out of Town. Mr. Ratigan explained that regulation over a certain gallonage is pre-empted by the State and their regulations would apply. Mr. Wilson said that this article was sold to the voters as a way to protect the Town’s water and it doesn’t sound like this accomplished that. Mr. Heitz stated that this article gave the Town a “seat at the table” which it didn’t have previously; without this article the Town wasn’t even included in the conversation with the PUC. Mr. Ratigan agreed; he continued that if there was repetition of a similar issue as with Hampstead Water Supply or if a large water supply company wanted to come to Town to

make bottled water, the Town would now have a “seat at the table” because Kingston has determined that within its municipal boundaries, if it chooses, it can operate a water system; with that, for instance, comes the power of eminent domain. He explained that there were other reasons why it made sense to adopt the article, especially in the longer term as resources around Kingston gets more and more pressure in other communities that might not have been as proactive and Kingston in protecting its water resources. He gave examples of other communities with wells in adjoining communities due to contamination. He suggested that the way for the Board to prepare against this possibility is to work on easements and continue to protect the Town’s water resources; adding the Board should make it a priority.

Mr. Shalett asked how a Town like Kingston could protect its water resources when property owners have certain property rights including resources under the ground. Attorney Ratigan answered that the State will tell you that they think that they own all the subterranean waters but he stated that there is a general principal that what you own is the right to draw water and not to affect the recharge of people who own property near you; courts have ordered limitations on water withdrawal that negatively affected property owners. He suggested that when looking at protection look at large properties either over an Aquifer or with a large recharge potential and preserve those water resources; done in a planned way would protect the most important resources. He said to have the proper recharge capacity would require at least 10 acres; protecting the larger tracts would have a real impact on protecting the water resources.

Mr. Heitz suggested that large parcels of land being developed were often proposed by a developer who did the work and then left, they weren’t interested in the future development; he stated that those asking for some type of consideration of the Town would not probably care about future water rights above what they needed for the development.

Attorney Ratigan asked if the zoning ordinance directed people to Conservation or Open Space subdivisions. Mr. Coppelman stated that for large tracts, it requires that both options be presented to the Board. Attorney Ratigan said that if subdivisions were being approved with 10 or more acres of Open Space, keeping areas that are undeveloped, keep them near each other which would allow the Town to put in an access road and put in a municipal well without disturbing anyone in the developments. Mr. Heitz cited an example of a community well that had been approved in the past that would have been a perfect example of this discussion. Mr. Coppelman asked if there was sample language available; standards in the industry that the Town could look at. Attorney Ratigan said that it was not complicated and he could provide the Board with some model language that was used in other documents. He cited examples of other easements that had not initially referenced municipal water rights that had to be re-written for the municipality’s benefit. Mr. Heitz believed that some of the rights or properties purchased by the Town did include water rights; he will double check. Attorney Ratigan suggested that when the Board is presented with purchasing these types of land or rights, the Town should talk with the landowner to make sure the Town holds the water rights for the future.

Mr. Landry asked if, the ability for the Town to have a “seat at the table” was available simply due to the fact that the article was passed; Mr. Ratigan confirmed that it was and that no other formal action was required; he explained that once that was passed, the Town received a lot of the authority set forth in RSA 38, including setting up a water utility, acquire land by eminent

domain, set rates, etc. Mr. Wilson stated that this was a big step in informing the Board what is needed to be done and was looking forward to Attorney Ratigan providing the model language for the Board humorously adding that the Board was reserving the right to recall him at a future date.

Danna Truslow
Hydrogeologist

Ms. Truslow introduced herself to the Board. She asked to meet with the Board to update them on a few things that had come up regarding water quality at the recent Groundwater Protection Conference; some new topics that might create an opportunity to address ordinance work in the future or simply affect the way the Board might look at future development. She added that she was also here to answer any questions that the Board might have regarding the Granite Fields review letter. She handed out information to the Board members.

Ms. Truslow stated that there were three topics addressed at the Groundwater Protection Conference that would be of interest to the Board; one was the presence of arsenic in water; a new contaminant of concern, 1,4 Dioxane; and salt contamination. She had put together a summary regarding the issues of each which she had given to the Board members; copies of the discussion at the conference was also handed out to the Board.

Ms. Truslow reviewed arsenic; a semi-metal that can be found in groundwater and surface water. She explained that it is something that is heard about since it is a common poison; she discussed “chronic health effects”, low doses over time, exposure at low levels, and the health effects. A maximum level of 50 ppb (parts per billion) was reduced in 2006 to 10 ppb because of seeing more toxicity/health effects from arsenic. She was bringing this to the Board’s attention because there is a lot of arsenic that occurs naturally in the bedrock in NH and in Kingston, in particular, there is 10 – 20% of the wells that have been tested as of 4 or 5 years ago that have concentrations greater than the current health limit; folks in Town with bedrock wells that tap a formation that tends to have high arsenic could be taking in low doses of arsenic and not realize it. She said that public water supplies do test for arsenic but private wells don’t necessarily have to do this. Ms. Truslow noted that the Town has an occupancy permit and a well test is required but if there is not a new home, wells are not tested on a regular basis. She continued that this was just an advisory from the DES through the EPA and others that people should start thinking of sampling their wells more often to be aware of the levels in the wells in case treatment systems are needed. She added that the Planning Board might not be able to do anything about this but they are one of the first lines of defense regarding water quality in the Town so she wanted to inform the Board who could pass the information on to the Health Officer and hopefully the Town would think about public education on this topic. She noted that there might be some grants available for public outreach. Mr. Heitz noted that people were under the assumption that bottled water is safe; he asked if the State had any requirement on bottled water sold in this State that they have to have been tested for a number of things. Ms. Truslow answered that if it is produced in this State then there is some required criteria but it is not very rigorous; she is not sure of out-of-state sources of water. Mr. Shalett referenced the map and noted the safe levels; Ms. Truslow explained that the EPA and that adopted by the State of NH as a safe level is .001 mg/liter, which is the concentration that is the regulatory limit. Mr.

Coppelman confirmed that this is based on recorded well data so it can't be assumed that the entire Town falls within these limits, which is why each well should be tested for accurate levels. Ms. Truslow noted that when some of the water levels are low, the arsenic levels that are exposed and dissolved in the wells could change. Ms. Truslow stated that the State of NH has a testing program at a reasonable price; she will forward this information to Ms. Faulconer for the Board's information.

The next topic is an organic chemical, 1,4 Dioxane; she explained that the hand-outs explained where the chemical comes from; it is a break-down product of chemicals included in solvents but can also be found in paint strippers, dyes, degreasers and varnishes. She reminded the Board when reviewing the Aquifer Protection Ordinance a number of uses of this type were looked at; she added that a number of regular household or commercial products can contain this. She explained that the EPA and State of NH are beginning to focus on this is because more and more of this chemical is being found at hazardous waste sites and landfills; it moves very quickly in the groundwater and there are fairly large plumes of this being detected at a number of sites. She explained that this is also found in several personal care products; when people use these, especially with home septic systems, this can be discharged to the groundwater. She said that this is something to be aware of; she noted that the Granite Fields permit, as an example, now requires that this particular contaminant be tested. She said that this would be an item for public education; the State of NH has suggested that all public water supplies be tested for this; community water supply providers should be encouraged to test for this especially where there are community septic systems in association with community water supplies.

Ms. Truslow addressed the last topic which is salt. She said that this is a common contaminant from road salting and parking lots and septic systems are beginning to be a source since water softeners use salt within the systems. She said there is a lot of movement to reduce overall salt usage, to make people more aware of the need to limit this kind of use especially in large public spaces with large parking lots and surface areas; a lot of work has been done at the Stormwater Center at UNH and through NHDES to try to inform landscapers and snowplowers to try to reduce salt usage; training for municipalities and they are trying to convince people to have lower winter driving expectations. She said there are salt alternatives being considered but added that there is still a lot of work to do on the long term impacts of the alternatives. The NH USGS put out the report cited at the workshop but the final report is not available yet; she will send the link to the Planning Board office for the Board's information. Ms. Truslow stated that a Planning Board initiative to address this contaminant could be reviewing parking lot size in reviewing the number of spaces actually needed so a proposal would not be overbuilt.

The Board asked Ms. Truslow to review the Granite Fields application. She stated that Granite Fields had applied for an amendment to the Large Groundwater Withdrawal permit that they currently have; right now there are two wells permitted for irrigation use on the Golf Course and they are looking for an addition to allow the installation of a water supply well for the over-55 development that is adjacent to the Golf Course. She explained that there had been a water use prediction made during the original application; DES wanted to have a better idea of what the irrigation water supply predication was and their consultant came up with a much larger number than the original number which means that the volume of water needed was much larger than the original volume which increases the total well usage that they will be asking for. She continued

that they were up to 23,475 gallons per day, which is the design flow for the subdivision's irrigation water use, the per unit water use, the water use for the Golf Course pro shop and one other shop associated with that development; that is the base water use and there is a multiplication that is required to get to the source capacity which get the number up to 32,000 gallons per day so the applicant has asked for a total of 36,000 gallons per day or 25 gallons per minute which is almost double what their original predication was. She explained that this has required DES to enlarge the sanitary protection radius from 175 to 200 feet which means that some of the area of the Golf Course is included within that sanitary protection radius. Mr. Coppelman asked what this meant for the Golf Course with regard to maintenance of the grass and pesticides. Ms. Truslow answered that they are going to have to test for some of those typical golf course chemicals. Mr. Heitz asked if this requirement was just on the new well; Ms. Truslow answered that it was; when the pumping test is done, some water quality constituents will be looked for to see if they come into the well and would be added to the permit as a requirement for future testing which was above and beyond what is usually tested for a public water supply. Ms. Truslow stated that the DES also required that they increase the length of time for their pumping test by two more days to consider the larger area of withdrawal; they also asked that they test for meth tert-butyl ether which was detected at the ASAP auto site that is next to the Golf Course to make sure that there is not cross-contamination between the new bedrock well and the detection of that same vein in an adjacent site. She explained that DES did not specifically address several of the abutter comments at the meeting in October; these will be addressed once the pump test result is received from the applicant, however, she noted that a couple of the comments regarded the existing monitoring program and some of the deficiencies in the wells that are being used for this program; the consultant for Granite Fields has gone back and made some modifications to the existing wells and monitoring program to fix some of the problems that they were having. Ms. Truslow gave an example where the water level monitoring wasn't taking place because the water levels were dropping below the points where they could be measured from; this was addressed. She noted that the pump test is planned to take place in mid to late June. Mr. Wilson thanked Ms. Truslow; she will let the Board know if any further information comes forward.

Aquifer Protection Amendment

The proposal was distributed to the Board; Mr. Wilson explained that this was being reviewed to begin to address the priority list established by the Board for next March's election. Mr. Coppelman said that as long as the proposal was consistent to the larger version that had been previously distributed, he was fine with the proposal. The Planning Board priority list was also distributed; Mr. Wilson added that an issue that Board should consider is the amount of items being put before the voters for an election. He suggested getting as much done as possible and then deciding how much to put on the ballot. Mr. Coppelman added that the Board could decide what to put on the ballot at the end of the year; both agreed that a number of the amendments were not going to be huge changes or add a lot of pages to the ballot. The Priority List was reviewed again. Mr. Wilson said that it sounded like the Board might need to work on Water issues, too. Mr. Pope noted that Item #4, the Master Plan, is not a ballot issue. Mr. Heitz asked to clarify "Global Issues"; Mr. Wilson explained that Mr. Landry had suggested that the Board take a look at the "whole picture" rather than address bits and pieces. Mr. Landry suggested that rather than looking at non-commercial along Rte, 125, as an example, it would be also looking at

the Master Plan and access roads, rather than just take the one issue, look at the whole global issue on the corridor. His initial thought regarding the global issue was regarding commercial development and whether the Board was interested in identifying the types of businesses that the Board would like to come into Kingston and determine ways to attract them or enhance their coming in; enhance the Town and enhance employment. Mr. Coffin commented it was a process of not treating each issue as a “spot” item and using the Master Plan to address items in an integrated fashion. Mr. Coppelman stated that he agreed that Mr. Landry’s point was a good one and the Board should probably spend some more time thinking about it and the available land and resources. He continued that without municipal water and sewer, there were a lot of potential businesses that get eliminated as possibly being attracted to Town.

MM&S to bring Item #1, the suggested changes to the Aquifer Protection Ordinance, to a public hearing later in the year; the definition of small quantity generator needs to be added to the language. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman) Mr. Wilson opened this up for discussion.

Lynn Merrill addressed the Board and wanted to talk about a couple of parcels of land in the Aquifer Protection that are zoned residential and they are large enough to put a small housing development on but can’t be done with the three-acre zoning; she said that residential use has less impact than businesses do when it comes to actual groundwater adding that some would make ideal cluster areas but it was not economically feasible for the properties to be developed because of the three-acre zoning. She discussed the economic impact of a specific parcel; she was asking that the Town might want to consider smaller lots based on possible community systems and soil type. Mr. Heitz said that the size of residential lots in the Aquifer was discussed; Mr. Wilson some of the restrictions were relaxed to encourage business development with the prospect that the water was still protected due to the residential acreage. Mr. Heitz said the Board actually reduced the size for commercial which went against the recommendation of the Board’s professional in order to attract business; Ms. Truslow addressed the Board’s wish to encourage commercial growth by recommending that the size for residential lots remain at three acres. Mr. Pope agreed with this assessment. Mr. Wilson said that the Board had to try to reach a balance; he noted that the three acre minimum for residential has been in existence for at least twenty years, there were no recent changes that would have impacted a property owner’s property value. Ms. Merrill agreed.

Ms. Merrill also told the Board that Home Inspectors for new home sales are the number one interface when it comes to Water Testing; it is the Home Inspector that generally recommends the type of water testing. Types of water testing and home inspection testing was reviewed. She continued that Home Inspector’s now need training; much of which is being given from NH DES as it pertains to water with continuous recommendations that the water be tested for arsenic; she has not had any tests turn up positive for arsenic yet in Kingston but added that Newton has had some heavy pockets of arsenic.

She re-iterated that she would like the Board to reconsider lot size and agreed with Mr. Coppelman about businesses preferring water and sewer when deciding where to locate. She suggested the Town look at actions taken by Pembroke, as an example. Mr. Coppelman said this discussion did come up last year regarding the possibility of the Town eventually putting in some infrastructure for the purpose of attracting certain types of business. Ms. Merrill suggested

reviewing an area in Town with a significant amount of acreage, near the Kingston/Brentwood line for this purpose.

Mr. Wilson returned to the motion; Mr. Coppelman and Mr. Heitz both suggested that the small generator definition could be added for the public hearing and during the discussion. The definition itself is in the report that had been given to the Board. Mr. Pope said it was standard.

RETURN TO THE MOTION: (Motion made by Mr. Coppelman, Second by Mr. Heitz.)
PUNA

Mr. Wilson continued with the Priority List. **Water District** was next; Mr. Wilson said that the Board needed to review a model ordinance. Mr. Coppelman suggested that once Attorney Ratigan returned to the Board with some sample language, the Board could review it and work on it at that time. Mr. Coppelman added that easement language needed to be reviewed for that. Mr. Wilson said that the third item is being worked on by the “subcommittee” but the Enforcement section would need to be addressed and the Business Licensing would be the method to pay for enforcement and inspections; the Board needed to decide if it was this method or some other way. Mr. Heitz said that this was being looked at with Rich and a company, GeoInsights, was going to give the Town a proposal.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Heitz to return to the Board next month with further information on GeoInsights proposal.

Master Plan: Mr. Coppelman suggested that someone on the Board, in conjunction with Mr. Greenwood, should take a look at the Master Plan and pick a chapter that would be appropriate; Mr. Wilson thought that Mr. Landry and Mr. Greenwood said that they would look at this. Mr. Landry said that this had been a previous project; Mr. Wilson asked if he would review with Mr. Greenwood and come back to the Board. Mr. Landry said that issues had been discussed, not a specific chapter; he would work with Mr. Greenwood on this. Mr. Wilson asked if he could return to the Board with a timeframe or amount of work required and any help that would be needed.

Paving Clarification: Mr. Wilson suggested that the Board either change it to what the Board had thought it was which was paving all parking lots or leave it as it actually is written; Mr. Coppelman says that he thinks it goes hand-in-hand with Stormwater Management as the pavement affects stormwater management; infiltration and alternative methods might need to be discussed. Mr. Wilson suggested that there be a recommendation from the group reviewing the Stormwater Management language. Mr. Wilson agreed with Mr. Coppelman that they go together; he thought this might also impact the Watershed discussion. Mr. Coppelman added that Watershed would also be a global issue.

Watershed: Mr. Landry said that the Master Plan talks about the Town considering expanding the Wetlands Protection Ordinance to a Wetlands Ordinance. Mr. Wilson suggested that this be the Chapter addressed this year; Mr. Coppelman added that this may be significant enough to be the chapter addressed. Mr. Landry and Mr. Greenwood will review this possibility. Mr. Heitz said that maybe they would both come up with a few items that needed to be addressed and the

Board could then prioritize them and determine what the Board wanted to do. Mr. Pope then noted that the Board was expanding Item #4 to include not only an update but a review of items that should be attacked. Mr. Coffin asked if it was a particular Watershed being discussed. Mr. Landry explained that the Master Plan talks about a Watershed Ordinance for the Town; he noted several watersheds within the Town and said it was not necessarily looking at them independently but what are the types of things to be concerned about a watershed. There was discussion as to the impact of a watershed ordinance; watersheds; wetlands; broader review of the natural resources. The Board discussed issues that would need to be discussed during the review.

Mr. Wilson said that the Board had already determined that Items 8 and 9 should be easy to address; #10 would need to be “sold” better. Mr. Pope returned to the Watershed and asked if another Town’s ordinance could be reviewed as a starting point so the Board could get a better understanding of the Watershed and get a better idea of what is being evaluated.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Greenwood will be asked to bring Watershed language from other towns for the Board to review.

The Rural Residential Agriculture zone would need to be discussed with Mr. Greenwood present; Mr. Wilson reviewed past discussions regarding this possibility.

Board Business, continued:

- Updated Ordinance pages were distributed.

MM&S to approve May 1, 2012 minutes as written. (Motion by Mr. Landry, second by Mr. Pope) **Motion carries 5-0-2 with Mr. Coppelman and Mr. Heitz abstaining.**

Mrs. Merrill asked to speak with the Board about shared driveways in the Commercial zones. She said Plaistow and Brentwood are now promoting shared driveways and she suggested the Board look at this for fewer curb cuts with fewer accidents and better safety. Mr. Coppelman thought this might be in the access management section which has interconnecting parcels but he was not sure about shared driveways.

ACTION ITEM: The Board to look at existing ordinances and regulations regarding shared driveways.

Mr. Wilson said there are pros and cons associated with shared driveways.

MM&S to adjourn at 8:31. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Pope) **PUNA**