

**Kingston Planning Board  
Public Hearing  
Minutes**

**December 12, 2017**

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 6:47 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair	Carol Croteau
Peter Coffin, V. Chair	Lynne Merrill
Peter Bakie	Robert Pellegrino, alternate
Chris Bashaw	Ernie Landry, alternate
Ellen Faulconer, alternate/admin. assist.	

Members absent: Mark Heitz, BoS rep.

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

Mr. Coppelman noted that there was a full board with the exception of the Selectmen's representative; he introduced the Board members, Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Quintal.

**Sal Ragonese  
Bluestone Investment Group, LLC  
4 Marshall Road  
Kingston, NH 03848  
Tax Map R33 Lots 21, 21-3, 21-4, 21-5**

Mr. Coppelman explained the hearing process and the public comment process. He also explained that this hearing was for a design review and was therefore a non-binding discussion between the Board and the applicant; the purpose was to get some feedback from the Board. Mr. Ragonese and Mr. Barry Gier from Jones and Beach appeared before the Board for the hearing. Mr. Gier reviewed the particulars of the site for the Board including the property location, acreage, the proposed use for a market rate age-restricted project per Article 208.5. Mr. Gier confirmed that the applicant had received a variance from the ZBA for the acreage which was 17.93 versus the required 20 acres for the zone. He continued that the proposal was for 8 four-plex units with individual septic per unit, proposed community water and 7.27 acres for open space; there will be a loop road connected to Marshall Road in two spots. Mr. Coppelman questioned whether the lots had been merged back to one lot. Mr. Gier said the plan would be to merge them.

Mr. Coppelman read department comments: Highway – no impact to a Town road; Fire referenced the water supply requirements and the need for a fire alarm system in accordance with

NFPA 72. Mr. Gier said that the development could be condos, but that wasn't confirmed yet. The Building Inspector's comments were read that included questions regarding RV storage, guest parking, snow storage, mailboxes, 24 foot roadway requirement; Health Department: not enough information at this time to comment; there were no comments from the Police Department. Peter Coffin commented on the road width and number of parking places.

Town Engineer's comments: Mr. Quintal read his comments supplied to the Board that included building separation requirements, storm water management, sight distance, buildings were shown encroaching into the well protection zone, a hydrogeologic study may be required. He asked if the association would be responsible for maintaining the proposed trail to the library. Mr. Gier answered yes; he questioned the minimum separation of 60 ft. per the regulation. Mr. Quintal said that it barely met the requirement and once the profiles are done and double-checked, it may need the 80. Mr. Greenwood said that the requirements are for fronting on the roadway; the side to side is okay. Mr. Greenwood said his comments did not reflect that the variance had already been granted and the applicant is aware that the lots would need to be merged. He added that he was happy to see the pedestrian framework to the library and other sections of Town; there is a concentration of services in the area so a walkway is admirable.

Mr. Gier said they are still looking into the profile for the buildings but it could be a story and a half; Mr. Greenwood said it would be nice to break up the roof line as it would be preferable to not look monotonous but rather look like traditional New England architecture; he continued that some architectural detail would be good to give it some personality because the lay-out as shown is monotonous and design detail could soften that appearance. Mr. Coppelman added that landscape treatment could also help with that issue; he like the walk-able aspects of the design. He said that this use was added to this area mainly due to the concentration of services. Ms. Merrill asked about garage details. Mr. Gier said it would have an attached single garage with space out front. Ms. Merrill asked why a septic for each building. Mr. Gier explained that it was due to ease and timing of construction of the site. She echoed the need for exterior aesthetics adding that it was a huge difference when selling them. Mr. Gier said these were good comments to work on.

Mr. Coppelman opened up the discussion for public comment.

Susan Dehart of Monarch Way likes the proximity of their development to Carriage Towne Plaza but would like better access by walking; she thought it would be great to connect to the proposed trail; there was discussion as to whether the properties could connect. Mr. Bakie, who was familiar with the property, thought that they may connect and the suggestion might not be out of the question. Mr. Coppelman thought it would be good if there was a way to wrap in the other development with this walking path.

There were no other public comments.

Mr. Greenwood suggested it would be good to have ITE traffic generated rated for age-restricted housing. He suggested that the Board would need to think about the hydro study requirement telling Mr. Gier that he may need to provide this. Mr. Ragonese asked about suggestions for the

design of the building. Mr. Coppelman said that as presented they were monotonous; he suggested that they were altered so they were not all in a row. Ms. Merrill suggested looking at Rowell Estates/Ash Drive development. Mr. Gier clarified that they just showed a “box” as a footprint for the design but it is not intended to stay as a simply box design. Mr. Coppelman suggested offsetting or angling a bit. Mr. Greenwood reminded Mr. Gier that the ordinance asks they be set-up to give consideration to the privacy aspects of the buildings because due to clustering, it could become oppressive. Mr. Greenwood continued that this area of town is going to become a center of Kingston so he would love it to be a good impact adding that there may be some significant changes in this area of the town. Ms. Merrill noted that 55 year-old couples are still both driving cars and suggested they consider two-car garages as more desirable. Mr. Bakie asked about the green line separating the bottom half of the plan. Mr. Gier answered that this indicated the open-space area. There were no other comments. Mr. Coppelman ended the review by noting that the Board would be happy to meet with the applicant again if they needed further preliminary discussions.

**Hawk Ridge of South Kingston**  
**Bent Grass Circle**  
**Tax Map R3 Lot 4 Land Unit 4**

Mr. Coppelman read the legal notice. Steven Zaharias and Steve Cummings introduced themselves as representing the applicant. Mr. Cummings said it was pretty much the same plan on Sheet 2; there were changes on Sheet 1 which showed the new proposed locations being moved from the original site plan. He explained that that were keeping units #4 and #20 tied into the same septic system as shown on the original plan; this was shown on sheet 3; #20 goes to #2 and #4 goes into #1. He said this addressed one of the issues. He showed revised drainage calculations; he stated that he thinks the plan conforms and is able to be accepted.

Mr. Quintal read his comments dated Dec. 12, 2017 that had been distributed to the Board. These comments included noting that this was a dense development and the original plan showed uniform dimensions between dwellings for limited common use (LCU) and the recommendation that the Limited Common (LC) lines be changed to be as uniform a distance between buildings as possible to help minimize conflict between neighbors. Additional comments included relocation of buildings causing required trenches across the new roadway to septic design for the relocated structures; storm water run-off and additional impervious surface concerns with a recommendation to provide contour lines and spot elevations to justify the proposed drainage patterns for the area. He added that he was provided some of the information prior to the hearing. There were issues with storm water run-off due to the roadway swales not being constructed properly. Questions were raised due to the LC areas and future repair/maintenance of the disposal areas and possible impact of the heavy equipment to existing foundations. Mr. Greenwood would like the line limitation removed from the plan since it is going to system 2. Mr. Quintal confirmed that Septic Area 1 is for units 1-17 and Septic 2 is for units 18-34; building #20 goes into Manhole 7 which goes to Septic 2. Mr. Greenwood explained that there is a line shown on the plan with a separation that seems to separate and they don't so they should remove the line or add a note of explanation. Mr. Cummings noted that they may be able to tie into the manhole without digging up the road.

Department Comments were read. Health: sewer covers are wrong and odor is coming from them; vent pipes need to be installed; vent pipes on the pump chamber; lot loading; septic system. Mr. Cummings said the covers were fixed with a bolt and it has either been done or will be done as will the vent pipes; adding a house doesn't go to the different system so that was addressed, there are 17 per system. Mr. Coppelman asked why there were these lingering items. Mr. Cummings said they were overlooked due to having multiple contractors; the issues will be taken care of. Mr. Cummings said they could be put on as conditions of approval. Mr. Coppelman explained that when the Board is being asked to consider an amendment to a plan, the original plan has to be in conformance. Mr. Cummings said that the items will be done soon and can be a condition of approval. Mr. Coppelman explained that these items were supposed to be done already.

Highway Department comments: No impact to Town roads.

A letter from David Layne was read aloud which included multiple concerns such as minimizing common land, drainage basins not properly working, required gutters not in place, safety fences at detention basins missing, covers not properly replaced, vent pipes missing, street lights shown on the plan not installed, questions regarding slab foundations versus basements. Mr. Cummings replied to the concerns: street lights were included on the plan utilizing overhead lighting and since underground services went in, they decided not to do the street lighting; Mr. Cummings agreed that the original plan showed the street lighting and it needs to be done. Mr. Pellegrino noted that underground services are more expensive. Mr. Coppelman explained that if the applicant wanted to make a change to the plan they needed to submit a revised plan for Board approval. Ms. Faulconer asked Mr. Quintal if the gutters and roof run-off was tied into Stormwater Management and without them, wouldn't that need to be revised. Mr. Quintal agreed that it would. Mr. Cummings said they will install them as required. Mr. Cummings said it was not required to have a fence at the detention basin. He explained that Mr. Layne's reference to "slab" was slab elevation for the first floor but all units as originally proposed had basements. Mr. Coffin asked if required items needed to have been complete prior to issuing occupancy permits. There was discussion regarding the inspection/permitting process. Mr. Coffin said that there should be an amended site plan with amended elevations and that slopes are changed and storm water is changed; the applicant needs to refer to the State to use the extreme rainfall numbers that exist in 2017 and the evaluation should be done in accordance with the current plan; they want to amend the original site plan and those changes are proposed in 2017. Mr. Cummings explained that they are amending an approved site plan. Mr. Coffin noted that the site plan was not in compliance with the original approval. He added that storm water run-off and swales need to comply with current regulations; if the project was built according to the approved plan those original values could be used but coming in today means that there needs to be a revised storm water plan that complies with 2017 regulations. He stated that plan needs to comply with current numbers for an amendment. Mr. Cummings said that there was no problem with the storm water adding that some of the drains, and the pitch lines needed to be looked at and two catch basins need to be properly built for drainage adding that he doesn't agree with the need for compliance with 2017.

Mr. Quintal stated that the septic systems were installed and approvals were granted with having everything in place; if the vents weren't put in then they are not functioning properly and that needs to be done prior to the Board granting any approvals. Mr. Quintal noted that the calculations for #20 say that it won't impact the detention basin and will be collected so that would be okay but the roadway swales are not done properly and that is not correct; it is supposed to meet Town requirements so the water doesn't pond on the street. He continued that the roof run-off needs to be put in and if not a new Stormwater plan is required with new calculations that would need to be evaluated; he noted that none of the structures on Bent Grass Circle needed gutters. He stated that the roadside swales need to be done for the people living there and they should not wait for them to be done. He noted the street lights were required. Mr. Coppelman asked how the Board would get a list. Ms. Faulconer read a note on the approved plan regarding the gutters and a safety fence note on page 7A. Mr. Quintal said that an existing conditions or plan was needed; these need to be addressed before approval by the Board.

Public comment: Karen Layne said the retention basin was behind units 21 and 22. Mr. Quintal said the slab notation references those elevations but the notes do specify whether there is a walk-out basement. Mr. Cummings explained that all the units were intended to have basements with some being a walk-out based on the grading. Mr. Coppelman said that the way Mr. Quintal is reading the plan, the units would have basements. Mr. Quintal confirmed that. Ms. Layne asked if there was a way to get reimbursed for putting on the gutters. Mr. Coppelman said that was not a Board issue. Mr. Quintal said it was an issue for Stormwater. Mr. Coppelman agreed but added that the issue of reimbursement is a discussion with the developer not the Board.

Dwayne Brown of 13 Bent Grass and Don Aubert of 4 Mulligan Way/Unit 19 addressed the Board. Mr. Brown said that they have put together a good conversation with the developer who is correcting the issues; it was noted that there would probably never be a clubhouse. Mr. Brown commented on the fencing requirement behind units 21 and 22 suggesting that the people at those units should be asked if they want a fence and while it may be on the plan, it may not be aesthetically pleasing to people at those units. He re-iterated that they are working with the developer; they are creating a punch list as an association to work with the developer; they are trying to get some things done and they want to work with the developer to get the rest of the properties sold and get the contractor's out. Mr. Coppelman explained that if they are working out arrangements with the developer those items need to show up on a plan for the Board to take a vote on; he said that the Board needs to go by what was approved, for the plans to be in compliance and then the Board can deal with changes on an amended site plan; the association can work with the developer and then get the Board the plan for review.

Mr. Aubert said it is not their intent to change the plan; they intend to work with the builder with a list to get done; he noted the gutters are an issue and he has to work with the developer; they want to be able to help and participate to make sure that plans are met and make sure the community is good and able to be sold. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the gutters fixed the drainage for his unit. Mr. Aubert said it did. Mr. Pellegrino noted that the units that are supposed to have gutters should do that. Mr. Quintal explained that all the roofs go into the subsurface for leaching purposed and if not done there will be a conflict with the original design and could compromise the detention basins; storm water detention could be affected. Mr. Coppelman

suggested that it would be fine for the Association to provide the Board with a list of items not agreeing with the original approval. He said the Board needs to get something concrete to deal with and get an itemized list. Mr. Brown said they would be happy to work with Mr. Quintal and get on the same page. Mr. Coppelman suggested it would be good to have a single point of contact. Mr. Brown gave his contact information to Mr. Quintal. Mr. Coffin asked how much compliance will be required with the original site plan; there is a lot to come into compliance; there should be a timeline and no occupancy permits issued until the site is in compliance; there needs to be a list of items needing to come into compliance before moving people into new houses. Mr. Coffin continued that there needs to be a list of deficiencies that need to come into general compliance with prior to reviewing an amended site plan.

Public comment, continued:

Nancy Valenti, 16 Bent Grass Circle asked if construction can continue without a new plan being approved. Mr. Coppelman answered that when the site has met the Conditions of Approval, it can proceed; when it is not, it is not supposed to proceed. Mr. Greenwood said that historically, it depended on what the cease and desist says; if working on items that meet the approved plan, work can be done on compliant buildings. Ms. Valenti said that it has been moved from what was shown; the building was moved as close as possible and now the deck is 15 ft. from the new foundation; she added that she is the only owner directly affected as no one is living in the other houses; the original plan showed her deck on the other side. Mr. Quintal confirmed that there is a difference of 10 ft. She suggested that they move the deck on the new building to the other side of the house. Mr. Quintal said the original plan had 30 ft. from foundation to foundation, the new plan shows 25 feet. Mr. Pellegrino noted it was within the building envelope. Mr. Quintal said the abutting house has slid closer to Ms. Valenti's house at the edge of the common land. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the idea was that with the plan, there was no room for skewing the house at all. Mr. Quintal said that he understanding was that the LCA was to be equidistance to have similar LCA's between two dwellings; now Ms. Valenti is right up the edge. She showed pictures of the foundation close to her deck.

Jim Scarpone spoke to the change of location of the house saying that he concern is that he doesn't know what has been done correctly; he would like someone to get out there to verify that is the way it is supposed to be; he said that he didn't know that there were supposed to be street lights and gutters; a lot seems to be done wrong. He continued that appreciates what the Homeowner's Association (HOA) is doing but anything he can't see, he doesn't trust; storm water is wrong and the septic is wrong. He said that until in conformance, nothing should go forward; it should be done the way it is supposed to be done.

Kate MacEachern, 11 Bent Grass Circle, questioned the septic in her backyard as she just found out that it won't function without electricity; she said that it would cost extra money to get generators; she continued that nothing was said to them about needing this. She stated that the developer was very slow in getting things done adding that only 2 of 6 vents had been put in.

There was no further public comment.

Ms. Merrill had a question for the HOA and compliance with the age restriction; she explained that there are rules and regulations that no one is supposed to be under the age of 55 unless a spouse, etc. and if this is not in compliance, it needs to be addressed ASAP.

Mr. Bashaw explained that certain things, the Board has control over but some of the enforcement goes to another Board; there is a lot of flexibility in condo. associations but sometimes the Board can't control and you may have to tackle as an association. Mr. Brown said that a concern to people who live there is the re-sale value and how this all pans out; as a 55+ community there is concern with re-sale value. Mr. Bashaw asked what level of compliance the Board was looking for; need to know what was strictly prohibited; looking at swales, gutters and a punch list. Mr. Greenwood said there are things that an owner has a right to request; this is a private road and we don't require street lights but the applicant can give us a proposed plan removing them but the Board needs to have a plan; some things the Board can act on, some it can't. Ms. Croteau wants a copy of the Cease and Desist and questioned why the Board wouldn't automatically be getting copies of them. Mr. Bakie said they moved the one building and now moved the other buildings in the wrong spot and the Board needs to look at that.

**ACTION ITEM:** Ms. Faulconer will get a copy of the Cease and Desist for the Board.

Mr. Coffin said the Board may be putting too much emphasis on the Cease and Desist. Ms. Croteau said that all the houses have been moved so they are violating the site plan; numbers 1,2,3, 24 and 7 should not be worked on.

Ms. Merrill spoke to assure the current homeowners that the Board doesn't want to not see the project come to completion; it is not the Board's intent to stop the project forever, just to make sure it is done properly and move on. Mr. Pelletier stated that he knew that #20 was the problem and asked if it affected the septic and drainage. Mr. Quintal said that it can be done and tie in to the septic and flow to the right septic; he agreed with the storm water run-off. He said that concern with the roof drains is another factor and being added to the equations may need an amendment. Mr. Bashaw stated the convertible land allows flexibility. Mr. Cummings asked if the buildings can be moved at all, shifted slightly; what is the determination as to what can be moved and how much; he didn't believe it is the case in site work that things can't be shifted slightly. Mr. Coffin said that that there is required space between the buildings; the density of this development was a lot of discussion during the review; there is now a transition on Bent Grass now having 9 units instead of 8; 4 units on the northerly side are close to the original design with the other 5 units closer together; creates an issue with density and distance between the buildings; the sewer and storm water is not a problem for this one additional unit; swales and ditches are a big issue; storm water run-off is an issue regarding being in compliance. He said that if there is latitude in moving the buildings, they had to come in to the Board. Mr. Quintal said that when moving things around, it is okay to move the foundations slightly but not when these changes and additions would impact the abutting property; the density here was approved for 8 units, now it has 9 units and that triggers the site plan. Mr. Greenwood said the guidance is to go with reasonableness; not having a shared driveway and changing it into two separate driveways is a change that requires Planning Board approval; while there is not a standard, there is a reasonableness type of standard; now there is a scrutiny to the plan. Mr. Quintal noted that

fire code needs to be met. Mr. Pellegrino said that it doesn't seem fair if they moved it just 5 feet. Mr. Cummings asked if shifting 5 or 6 feet was a problem. Mr. Quintal asked why they would be moved. Mr. Cummings answered due to ledge or aesthetics. Mr. Quintal suggested that in that case, they should adjust the LCA; lot 17 is tight to the lot; the LCAs can be adjusted and recorded as an as-built plan at the registry. Mr. Cummings asked if it would be okay to tweak them a little; he said they do have an amended plan and would like to get on with the amended plan. He said that anything on the approved plan is still in effect and if it hasn't been done, it will be done; it can be done and move forward with the amended plan. He stated that they have to go by the approved plan and they have to go with that. Ms. Faulconer asked why Mr. Cummings continues to suggest that unit #20 will go back to the original location if not approved at the new location. Mr. Cummings said they have to go by the approved plan. Ms. Faulconer said that at some point, they got rid of unit #20 when they eliminated the shared driveway for two singles; there is a deed that says that unit#20 will not go back to the original location so it is not realistic to continue to suggest that unit #20 may need to go back to the original location. Mr. Cummings said he was unaware that there is a deed with that restriction. Mr. Quintal suggested that #20 could go where the clubhouse was proposed. Ms. Merrill noted that the clubhouse location was not in the residential zone. Mr. Cummings asked the Board to just look at the amended plan; they are bound by the original plan and it needs to be done, it is not completed and it will be done. Mr. Coppelman said that any amended activities should not go forward until the items are complete. Mr. Cummings suggested not the vents. Mr. Coppelman said they are part of the plan. Mr. Cummings replied that the plan was still in process. Mr. Coppelman noted that they would not agree on this point. Mr. Cummings said that he wants to find out about 4 and 20. Mr. Bakie asked the HOA if the developer is willing to work with them to complete the development. There was not a unanimous answer from the HOA at this point. Mr. Coppelman said the Board needed to see the Cease and Desist and the current state of the site and did not feel the Board had enough information. Ms. Merrill suggested the Board might need to do a site walk. Mr. Coppelman suggested the Town Engineer do a comparison of the original plan. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the Board was going to allow unit 20. Mr. Coppelman said he didn't think the Board was in the position to answer that yet. Mr. Bashaw stated that no one was saying anything about punishing and ripping up foundations at this point; he questioned why occupancy permits were issued; he said the Board is looking for compliance; storm water management needs to be addressed; quality of life issues needed to be addressed. Mr. Pellegrino noted that there were issues concerning drainage, gutters and grading. Mr. Cummings agreed there were water issues along the roadway where swales could be built better. Mr. Bashaw said he liked the idea of empowering Mr. Quintal to do an intensive review of compliance with the site plan; get a list from the HOA; need to reach out to the Building Inspector about issues. He added that the Board would need a timeline. Mr. Quintal said that typically, to move along, he would do an inspection and make a list; some things need to be done right away prior to continuation of construction of units #20 and #4 and then follow-up with another list needed to finish up the project, some before any further construction and then up to the Planning Board to proceed with the units; he would prioritize these items; he would go out soon before there was much more snow and report back to the Board. Mr. Cummings said the big concern is Units 4 and 20. Mr. Bashaw said that is what triggered this. Ms. Faulconer suggested that until Mr. Quintal's review, it may not be wise to issue permits on 1-4 and 20.



MM&S to authorize the Town Engineer to go out and make a more detailed inspection as it complies with the current site plan and report back with recommendations and items needing to be completed; timing on the items needing to be completed and prioritizing the issues. Mr. Quintal is also authorized to speak with the Homeowner's Association and Steve Cummings. (Motion by Mr. Bashaw, second by Ms. Croteau) PUNA (Passed unanimously)

Mr. Cummings asked about taking jurisdiction of the plan. Mr. Greenwood stated that he felt there was enough information to consider the application.

**MM&S to accept jurisdiction of the plan.** (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Ms. Merrill)  
**Motion failed 3-0-3** with Mr. Coppelman, Mr. Coffin and Ms. Croteau opposed.

Jurisdiction requirements were reviewed. Mr. Quintal questioned that by ultimately accepting this if it superseded the original plan as this plan did not show the roof drain and other items. Mr. Coppelman said that usually the amended plan supersedes the original plan. Mr. Coffin said the new plan has to be complete; it has to be changed. Mr. Cummings said it is just a formality, they are willing to wait. Mr. Quintal confirmed that he would do the review in the next couple of weeks. Mr. Pellegrino suggested that the applicant needs to know what he needs to do to the plan so it can be accepted for jurisdiction. There was discussion regarding possible requirements and possible implications by invoking jurisdiction. Mr. Greenwood clarified that by invoking jurisdiction, the Board was not then eliminating the approved plan. Mr. Coffin said that it was not a full set of plan. Mr. Greenwood said it was legitimate to say that the plan was not complete enough to invoke and that the Board was requiring a full set of plans. Mr. Coffin said that was what he was saying. Mr. Greenwood said that gave the applicant the required guidance for not accepting jurisdiction.

**MM&S to continue to February 6, 2017 at 6:45.** (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bashaw) PUNA

*<Board note: The Board took a five-minute break.>*

### **Board Business**

#### **Correspondence:**

- Conditional approval for AAAL about to expire; Ms. Faulconer contacted Mr. Chadwick who submitted a request for a 90-day extension to the Conditional Approval.

**MM&S to grant the 90-day extension to the Conditional Approval of AAAL as requested.**  
(Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Ms. Croteau) PUNA

- Bond Balance received
- Request for escrow return from Amoroso; Board approved pending charges for Circuit Rider review
- Email received requesting forwarding of bills to Mr. Pellegrino for charges to Solar Hills escrow account,
- Email received from HOA re: issues at Kings Landing; Mr. Quintal stated that there is no bond as it is a private road so it is up to the Association; while not really a plan issue, the

Board authorized Mr. Quintal to review and let the Board know if there is anything pertinent to the plan. Mr. Greenwood and Ms. Faulconer will respond to the association.

- Letter to owner of CT Plaza signed
- Letter from Mrs. Faulconer to the Board re: mention of a letter from 2013 that the Board at the time found to be without merit and asked that the letter will be added to the record.

**MM&S to approve the November 21, 2017 minutes as written.** (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Mr. Pellegrino questioned the accuracy of the minutes suggesting that they should have been done verbatim from the tape. Ms. Faulconer said that it was done by the tape. Ms. Merrill moved the question. **Motion passed 3-0-3** with Mr. Bakie, Mr. Bashaw and Ms. Croteau abstaining.

Mr. Greenwood said that he had been speaking with Danna Truslow as AAAL (All American Assisted Living) was looking to amend the septic by using an alternative septic system; he told them that it re-open the hearing. Mr. Coffin said it would still be necessary to have the review by the State.

**MM&S to authorize AAAL to discuss the alternative septic design with Danna Truslow and utilize existing escrow funds to cover the cost.** (Motion by Ms. Croteau, second by Ms. Merrill) **PUNA** Ms. Faulconer noted that the Board would need authorization to use the escrow funds; Mr. Greenwood will contact the applicant and let them know.

Mr. Bakie referred to the discussion about septic systems for a community losing power and asked about recommending a generator for a public septic system; Mr. Coppelman said that the Board can't force anyone to do it but could encourage it. Mr. Quintal said the power system would be needed for the well, too because without water, toilets couldn't flush anyway.

### **Proposed Ordinance Changes Review**

#### **107.3 Permitted Uses:**

A. No comments B. Okay as presented/amended C. Okay as presented/amended D. Okay as presented/amended E. Same as last meeting F. Ok K. Ok N. change to "Industrial Agribusinesses"

#### **108.5 :**

C. Okay as presented/amended D. The Board discussed the word "facilities"; add the intent is to provide a smaller scale; "small scale" – "the intent is that the scale will be compatible with the surrounding businesses in the zone" N. Okay as amended

Ms. Faulconer will double check the lettering on all of the proposals to account for additions and deletions.

Regarding lettering: Replace "F" with "N".

**109.5:** Okay as presented/amended.

**109.6:** no changes/discussion

**MM&S to bring these proposals as amended to the public hearing on January 2, 2017 with the approved numbering and administrative changes.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Bashaw) **PUNA**

Mr. Landry reminded the Board of the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting at the Library beginning at 7:00 to review the draft Historic Resource Master Plan Chapter. Mr. Coppelman added that it is important to have Planning Board representation and it also counts toward the Town's match for the grant.

**MM&S to adjourn at 10:55.** (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Mr. Coffin) **PUNA**