

KINGSTON PLANNING BOARD
September 15, 2020
Public Hearing

Minutes

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM; he noted a quorum present through the Zoom platform for a remote hearing; there were no challenges to the validity of the meeting. Mr. Coppelman began the hearing by reading the Right-to-Know checklist explaining the requirements, workings and access information for the remote hearing via the Zoom platform; contacting the Planning Board through emails and phone during the meeting was also noted as available. Mr. Coppelman explained that Glenn Greenwood was the host for the meeting.

A roll call vote of the Board members present occurred; each member noted whether any one was present with them in the room while attending this meeting.

Members present:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair; alone	Peter Coffin; alone
Lynne Merrill, V.Chair, alone	Robin Duguay, alone
Richard Wilson, Board of Selectmen (BOS) rep., alone	
Peter Bakie, alone with spouse, Tammy Bakie occasionally in the room	
Ellen Faulconer, alternate/admin. asst., alone in the room	

Members absent: Chris Bashaw, Steve Padfield, alternate.

Also present: Glenn Greenwood, Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer

Mr. Coppelman announced that Ms. Faulconer would be a voting member for this hearing as Mr. Bashaw would not be able to attend due to a work commitment.

Robert Pothier
129 Main Street
Tax Map U9 Lot 49

The Chairman noted that the Board had received notification from the applicant that the proposal was withdrawn.

While there was time before the rest of the agenda he noted that Mr. Pascoe, while not on the agenda, had asked to address the Board. Mr. Coppelman stated that if it was a brief item, it could be heard now but Mr. Pascoe was “frozen” on the screen. While there was some time before starting the posted agenda, Mr. Coppelman moved on to Board Business.

Board Business

Correspondence:

- Notification from Hooksett regarding a telecommunication proposal.
- Auto Dealership licensing – re: AJA Auto and Nationwide Recovery Service; this item had been previously reviewed by the Board with approval pending review of the site and notification to the owners by Mr. Greenwood. Mr. Greenwood informed the Board that the site was all set except for some paving around plantings; he recommended approving the two applications.

MM&S to authorize Mr. Coppelman to sign the licensing requests. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bakie) Roll Call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes

Ms. Merrill – yes

Mr. Coffin - yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Ms. Duguay – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Coppelman returned to the published agenda at this time.

Jill and Jason Rego

109 Exeter Road

Tax Map R37 Lot 25

Mr. Coppelman, as an abutter, recused himself at this time. Ms. Merrill assumed the role of Acting Chairperson for this hearing. The public notice was read.

Ms. Merrill explained that this was the first time that the Board would be reviewing an ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) and asked the applicant for their patience; she asked Mr. Jason Rego, the applicant, to share the screen with the proposal for the Board. Dennis Quintal, engineer for the project reviewed the plan. He explained that initially he was asked to do a septic plan for the Regos and at the time he did not know that it would be used before the Planning Board; the needed a bigger septic system for a 4-bedroom house with a 2-bedroom apartment; the current garage would be lost for the ADU with a proposed garage in another area of the property. Mr. Quintal noted that the second page of the plan adds dimensions to the first page of the plan. He reviewed the distances from wetlands and the pond with its existing wetlands.

Mr. Greenwood read his comments: the Board should invoke jurisdiction; the Board needs to determine actions such as a recordable Facts and Findings as a recordable plan is not required. He explained that there was an abutter notice error; the abutter was notified and sent a letter that they waived the required notice. He continued that the total square footage of 1,132 sq. ft. did not include 300 sq. ft. of an unheated utility room; there needs to be a distinction that the area is unheated or it does not meet the ADU requirements. He

added that photos showing the elevations were sent; all other requirements for Article 206.4 are met.

Mr. Quintal read his comments. He re-iterated the information that when he prepared the septic design, he was unaware that it would be coming to the Planning Board for the ADU. He reviewed the functional wetlands classification and conforming setbacks; he noted that the disposal system was 100 ft. from all the wetlands. He stated that Sediment Control Devices should be installed prior to construction and remain until all is stabilized. He stated that the proposed new garage needed to be at least 20 feet from property lines; due to wetland setbacks and their functions, the proposed garage needs have a 50-foot buffer. He re-iterated that sediment control devices need to be installed and maintained until stabilized for the proposed garage as well.

Ms. Merrill reviewed the Department comments: Fire Department – must comply with NFPA; Building – no comment; Health – no comment.

Ms. Merrill noted receipt of the affidavit from the abutter regarding notification.

Mr. Coffin stated that an important factor would be that the garage for the ADU continue to look like a garage and not a second house on the property per the ordinance requirements. He suggested looking at the photos that were provided as necessary to rule on the request. Mr. Greenwood shared the photos on the screen. <Board note: Dave Clements, as an interested party with Mr. Rego, noted that he was having difficulty staying connected via the internet. > Mr. Coffin stated that he was presuming that the addition is to the back of the structure.

Ms. Merrill read the letter received by an abutter, Glenn Coppelman. Mr. Rego and Mr. Clements asked to receive a copy of the letter which was sent to Mr. Clements via email at this time by Ms. Faulconer.

Mr. Wilson noted that several people in Town were having trouble with Comcast. It was suggested that the Board continue this review at this time and come back to it during the meeting with the applicant had a change to reconnect.

Mr. Coppelman returned as Chairperson at this time.

Erin Cammarata and Ken Cornell
3 New Boston Road
Tax Map R19 Lot 10

The public notice was read. Ms. Spechuilli, Director of Human Resources and Business Development of CBS, represented the applicant. She read a statement describing the company which employs 45 team members with most working at home; there will be 4 team members on-site with others being in the building sporadically during the month; the use is minimal compared with other uses.

Mr. Coppelman read Department comments: Fire – require NFPA compliance, update existing fire alarms and Knox box keys; Highway – all trees/plantings need to be removed from the Town ROW (right-of-way), there needs to be a maximum of two 30-foot curb cuts entering onto New Boston Road. Mr. Coffin stated that there had been issues with one large curb cut. Mr. Wilson noted that the curb cut had been narrowed due to requirements made by the Planning Board for “Archangel Woodworking”. Mr. Bakie explained that to make the correct curb cuts, the previous business had put in large planters which are close to the ROW. There were no other Department comments.

Mr. Quintal reviewed his comments. He stated that he reviewed the proposed plan and the Archangel approval. He said that the changes that were previously required were made and there are no proposed changes so there are no Engineering comments. He added that the Board might question Signage and Lighting; he noted that the planters can probably be moved to adapt the entrance per the Road Agent’s request.

Mr. Greenwood read his comments. He confirmed that the required variance for the use was secured through the ZBA; he suggested the Board invoke jurisdiction and he would return to his comments.

MM&S to invoke jurisdiction. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Ms. Duguay

Ms. Merrill – yes

Mr. Coffin – yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion carries unanimously.

Mr. Greenwood continued with his comments: offices for medical billing; could be up to 45 people for a staff meeting but the current parking can handle this; there are easements for water and septic; there are not changes proposed to the existing plan; there is a note on the plan that the hours will be 7 AM to 6 PM; the buffers are as previously existing. He stated that the dumpster is in the approved location but questioned whether it is enclosed. He asked if the sign location will be changed. He added that the existing impervious lot coverage should be noted on the plan to comply with MS4 requirements. It was clarified that the woodworking company will no longer function at this location. Ms. Spechuilli said that there will be no changes to the existing 2 ft. x 4 ft. sign except the changes to reflect the new business. She stated that the current light meets the lighting ordinance but may be changed to be not as strong, as it is a little strong for their needs. Mr. Coppelman suggested that they try to keep the lumens and glare down for the residential neighbors. He added

that they would need to get a Business Occupancy Permit (BOP) as a new business. There was no further Board comment; there was no public comment.

MM&S to approve the proposed change of use for 3 New Boston Road, Tax Map R19-10 with conditions as noted: move plantings out of the ROW, add the impervious lot coverage amount on the plan; a note regarding Lighting Ordinance compliance.

(Motion by Ms. Duguay, second by Ms. Merrill) Discussion: Mr. Coffin questioned the buffers; Mr. Greenwood explained that they were previously approved and all set; Mr. Greenwood asked if the Board needed to add a statement regarding meeting the Fire Department comments. Ms. Merrill said that they will be part of the BOP. Roll Call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes

Ms. Duguay – yes

Ms. Merrill – yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Mr. Coffin – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion carries unanimously.

Jill and Jason Rego

109 Exeter Road

Tax Map R37 Lot 25 (Continued)

The Board noted that Mr. Rego and Linda and Dave Clements connection to the internet returned and re-joined the hearing. Mr. Coppelman stepped down from the Board, as an abutter and Ms. Merrill returned to acting chairperson for this hearing. Mr. Coffin reminded the Board that Ms. Merrill had just been about to read the abutter letter.

MM&S to invoke jurisdiction. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Mr. Bakie) Roll Call vote:

Ms. Merrill – yes

Ms. Duguay – yes

Mr. Coffin – yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion carries unanimously (6-0)

Ms. Merrill read the abutter letter from Mr. Coppelman into the record; the letter stated that the abutter was not writing in favor or opposition but to just bring certain issues before the Board: zoning is Single Family Residential-Agriculture and the proposal should conform with the zone; the existing building looks like a garage and the proposal could look like an additional house, it should retain the SFR appearance per the ordinance; a question was raised as to whether the proposed garage was being used for business and if it was, it would need to comply with the In-home Occupation ordinance; questioned multiple businesses and residences on the site.

Mr. Rego explained that he had a permit for the garage and there would be trailers, currently on the property, being stored in the new garage. He added that he would keep the appearance of a garage on the building used for the ADU, one garage door will change to a window. Mr. Clements said that there won't be much of a change in appearance; it will be spruced up but no other structural differences; there will be new siding. Ms. Merrill

asked that the applicant address the question of another business on the property. Mr. Clements said the he only has one vehicle; most of his business happens at Logan Airport; there will be nothing showing anything as a business.

Public comment: Justine Morse of 110 Exeter Road asked if the ADU was for in-law only or if it could be “tenant-use” in the future. Ms. Merrill explained that any ADU could be rented per State law; the Town’s requirements were changed to comply with the State. She continued that requirements for compliance are available on-line. Public comment was closed.

Article 206 was reviewed for conditions for the Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Ms. Merrill noted that the appropriate dimensions had been confirmed. Ms. Duguay asked for clarification of the square footage and 300 ft. of unheated space. Mr. Greenwood explained that there is a portion of the detached structure that, as unheated, would not be part of the apartment; it is not counted in the square footage; it is considered a separate space. Ms. Faulconer suggested that the note on the plan that the area is “unheated” should be changed to “remain unheated” as clarification for the future that the area must remain unheated to meet the requirements.

Ms. Merrill continued with the CUP requirements: b and c are not the case, d – remain looking like a single family structure. Mr. Coffin stated that as long as there is still a garage door and the structure looks like a garage it is okay as the key factor in an approval is keeping the structure looking like a garage. He added that the door need not be functional, it could be a faux garage or barn door and there should be a note on the plan about keeping this door. Ms. Merrill read section “e” - shall be or continue to be owner occupied; there should be a note on the plan; she read the remaining bullet points which the Board felt were all met. Mr. Coffin said that keeping the garage or barn door to eliminate the possibility of it looking like 2 houses on the property should be a condition of approval.

Ms. Merrill asked the Board’s opinion of requiring a recorded Facts and Findings document. Mr. Coffin thought it was a good idea. Ms. Faulconer said that it protects the property owner. Ms. Merrill agreed adding that it protects the future sale of the property.

MM&S to grant the CUP conditional upon: on the existing garage being converted to the ADU – keep one garage/barn door on the outside, add note to the plan that the “unheated” 300 sq. ft. area is to “remain unheated”, not livable space and not part of the approved ADU, a letter of Facts and Findings will be prepared and recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Duguay) Roll Call vote:

Ms. Merrill – yes

Ms. Duguay – yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Mr. Coffin – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Coffin noted that any questions regarding the Home Occupancy Ordinance can be addressed separately from this CUP application if it becomes an issue.

Mr. Coppelman returned as Chairperson at the end of this hearing.

NH Sustainable Communities, LLC
225, 229, 231 Rte. 125
Tax Map R29 Lots 2,4,6

Mr. Coppelman read the legal notice for the Design Review; he explained that this was a conceptual discussion to give feedback and guidance to the applicant; no decisions are made and the discussion is non-binding and can't be continued.

Scott Frankiewicz, Engineer showed a compilation that had been prepared that is representative, not specific, to the wetlands as a conceptual design. He stated that the property was 78 acres, 50 acres are upland; there is a 50-foot strip for access that is classified as a Class VI road; this would need to be upgraded. He reviewed Concept 1: 3-8 units per building to comply with current regulations; Limited Access ROW would need to be addressed with the State to even entertain the proposal; 120 units as each lot could handle 40 units for a combined number of 120. Mr. Frankiewicz reviewed Concept 2: he stated that this concept would require variances and a CUP; it showed five 3-storied buildings with 24 units per building totally 120 units; he said that the NHDOT (New Hampshire Department of Transportation) process will be at least a year; he would be asking if the Town would support the emergency access onto Rte. 125. He briefly reviewed the other proposed plans as they did not meet the requirements of the zone. He noted that Donna Carter and Heidi Ray, realtors, were also present.

Mr. Greenwood reviewed his comments: review of multi-family in the CI zone; this is a non-binding discussion; the ordinance allows for 8 units per structure; single-family is not allowed; multi-family requires 3 or more units so duplexes don't comply with the zone; he reviewed frontage requirements; he explained that building permits cannot be granted on a Class VI road; the requirements for a ROW is 60 feet and the current ROW is 50 feet. Mr. Greenwood explained that the zone only allows for a 40 units per lot and the density allowance is limited regardless of acreage; there would need to be discussion regarding merging the three lots into one and whether that would invoke the limitations for a single lot; he continued that ½ of the housing must be work-force housing with the associated deed restrictions which adds another level of review requirements. Mr. Greenwood confirmed that the applicant is aware of these requirements.

There was discussion about the width of the ROW; the applicant would need to address this. Mr. Coppelman stated that there would be a fair amount of traffic generated coming out to one point very near the existing intersection that did not allow for a lot of queuing space; he suggested that the Board would want to see a traffic analysis.

Mr. Quintal said that there was not much in the way of engineering work done at this point so he didn't do a full review, however, he noted that previous work done on the property noting possible issues with the wetlands. He suggested investigating vernal pools as the assumed upland could have marginal wetlands and areas that would be considered vernal pools; he explained that the wetlands need to comply with the setbacks in the wetlands function table. He stated that the cul-de-sac regulations need to be met; he is not sure how emergency access can be met. Mr. Quintal continued that the maximum density is a concern with the waivers and zoning issues; he said that he would need more complete plans for additional review and comment.

Mr. Coppelman read Department comments: Fire – Need to comply with NFPA, comply with Fire Protection Regulations – Article 1008, comply with NFPA for Fire access, monitored Fire Alarms are required, a pre-construction meeting is required; Highway – ROW is only 50 ft. and must be 60 feet, all roads must end in a 150 ft. radius cul-de-sac; Health – no comment.

Mr. Coffin asked what Concept 2 (three-stories) would look like; Mr. Frankiewicz answered that there was a development in Hooksett with three-stories that it would look like. Ms. Merrill asked if the units would be apartments or condos; Mr. Frankiewicz said that had not been decided yet. Ms. Merrill asked Mr. Greenwood if detached condo. units are considered multi-family housing referencing detached condos. in over 55 housing. Mr. Greenwood said that multi-family housing is 3 or more units per structure so the answer was no. Mr. Coppelman agreed. Ms. Faulconer asked what the height requirement would be for the zone and suggested that the Fire Department might have concerns with three-storied buildings. Ms. Merrill noted that there is a 45 ft. height restriction in the C-I zone.

There was no public comment.

There was discussion regarding the density and viability as it concerned the three lots and merging into one lot; zoning and variance requests. Mr. Quintal suggested the possibility of keeping as three separate lots in one development with three owners and an association. Mr. Frankiewicz suggested that would initiate setbacks within the lots and limit flexibility. Mr. Coppelman stated the traffic would need to be addressed; Ms. Faulconer added that adding in the required cul-de-sac could be an issue. Mr. Coppelman noted that the length of the road is an issue but as a regulation could be requested to be waived. Mr. Bakie reiterated that traffic seems to be an issue for this site. Mr. Coppelman assumed that NHDOT would need to see a traffic study as well as the roadway exits on a State route next to another State route. Mr. Frankiewicz said they are having preliminary discussion with NHDOT regarding the 50 ft. strip of ROW and how to apply for emergency access in the Limited Access highway. The emergency access and its location was briefly reviewed. There were no further comments.

Board Business, continued

- Steve Pascoe, re: previous approval for 6 Spruce Lane – Mr. Pascoe said he was assured he would get a quick turnover once the plan was approved and re-submitted with the required Board changes. He expressed concern that this approval and signing of the mylar had not yet occurred; he said he had placed multiple calls without a response with the mylar still not signed. Mr. Greenwood asked if Mr. Pascoe had contacted his own engineer regarding the plan; he stated that he had been in discussion with Mr. Pascoe's engineer as of last Thursday and the proposed final plan was still missing the required well radius. Mr. Pascoe questioned whether that had been on the list prepared by Mr. Greenwood that listed the requirements; Mr. Greenwood answered that it was. The missing item was described for Mr. Pascoe. Mr. Pascoe was not pleased that Mr. Greenwood had also not contacted him. Ms. Faulconer suggested that any emails sent to the Board from Mr. Pascoe and his engineer could be sent to the Board if any Board member wanted to see them; Mr. Pascoe asked to be included in any of these emails that were sent to the Board.
- Upstreet Food Truck (USFT) – the Board reviewed previous discussions regarding review of this proposal which included a previous decision that this activity at the VFW would require a site plan as an expansion of a commercial use. Selectperson Coombs, at the Board's last meeting, asked that the Board review the letter sent to the BOS regarding the activity; the letter to the applicant from the BOS would not be sent pending the Board's review at this meeting. Mr. Wilson noted that the BOS were aware of the PB decision requiring site review and he had actually contacted the applicant and the VFW about this decision. Mr. Coppelman read the letter from USFT; it had been sent to the Board members prior to this meeting; the letter explained that it would operate Saturday and Sundays from 12:00 – 8:00 beginning in October/November with 50 – 100 visits per day with a possible increase in number of days. Mr. Coppelman asked the Board if, after reading the letter, if there were any changes to the Board's decision; he noted the Board's need for consistency. Mr. Wilson stated that the main reason for the original decision was to be consistent; he added that Mr. Coombs told the applicant that they may require Planning Board review. He added that there was a concern with a review versus a major site plan review. Mr. Coppelman said the applicant could request and have the Board consider it. Mr. Wilson asked about the possibility of an expedited review. Mr. Coppelman explained that it didn't meet the requirements for an expedited review but they could request that an engineered site plan not be required and it would be up to the Board. Mr. Greenwood said that his interpretation of the Board's previous discussion was needing a full site plan. Ms. Merrill said that the person across from Carriage Towne Plaza had to do a full site plan and the Board needs to be consistent; if there is a requirement for one, it must be the same requirement for another. Mr. Bakie said that consistency is important for the Planning Board as the public needs to see the consistency. Ms. Faulconer

stated that there shouldn't be a possibility of 100 extra cars entering onto Rte. 125 without some type of public discussion. Mr. Coffin said the Board made the same decision when a taco truck wanted to be on the Bayberry Variety site. Ms. Duguay said that the only distinction between the two was that there is an operational kitchen at the VFW. Ms. Merrill said that the proposal is walking a fine line and if the kitchen is part of the proposal then the food truck is an expansion of use. Mr. Coppelman said that there is a link between the truck and the building and the site and the activity creating an expansion of use. Ms. Faulconer stated that the problem is that the Board is trying to come up with regulations to allow for a food truck and those regulations don't exist; the Board can only review under current regulations and must be consistent with answers given to previous requests.

Mr. Coppelman confirmed that there was unanimous consensus that this requires site plan review. Mr. Wilson agreed adding that he doesn't like the decision but the Board does not have any other choice. Mr. Coffin suggested that there may need to be a Food Truck Ordinance. Mr. Wilson will tell the BOS. There was discussion on how to get information from other Towns as Ms. Duguay had not heard back from any of the Towns she had contacted. Mr. Greenwood will set this up and funnel the responses back to Ms. Duguay.

Review of Aug. 18, 2020 minutes: Ms. Duguay noted a correction of p. 10, 2nd paragraph – the word “corned” should be corner; Ms. Merrill added a change to p. 6, last sentence – should be Mr. Morrill not Mr. Merrell. She suggested that, in the future, it might be helpful to add the organization being represented by the engineers; Ms. Faulconer stated that that information needed to be said at the meeting to be included; Mr. Coppelman will try to ask for that information during the meetings.

MM&S to accept the August 18, 2020 minutes as amended. (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Merrill) Roll Call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes	Ms. Merrill – yes	Ms. Duguay
Mr. Wilson – yes	Mr. Bakie – abstained	Mr. Coffin – yes
Ms. Faulconer – yes		

Motion carries 6-0-1 with Mr. Bakie abstaining

Ms. Duguay commented that in her research for food trucks, she had read other Towns' minutes and our Board's minutes are more complete and easier to read.

The Board reviewed the possibility of another discussion about adding more time to the Planner's hours due to the large proposals coming before the Board. Mr. Greenwood felt the additional hours added in this year's budget were enough.

The Board discussed the issues faced today by the Town regarding intermittent internet service.

Mr. Greenwood asked the Board for ratification of the decision for regional impact declaration for the 266 Rte. 125, LLC proposal. Mr. Bakie asked if the Town had received a new set of plans. Mr. Greenwood explained that a new, full application had been received and distributed to the Board members. Ms. Merrill said that she was in favor of the declaration based on the information received from Mr. Greenwood that the applicant requested it. Mr. Greenwood reviewed the statute adding that there was no question due to the amount of traffic generated. Mr. Coppelman said that not declaring it, based on the size and impact, would have the Board falling short of their duties.

MM&S to re-confirm the Board's decision regarding the regional impact declaration for the 266 Rte. 125, LLC application. (Motion by Mr. Wilson, second by Ms. Merrill) Roll

Call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes

Ms. Merrill – yes

Ms. Duguay – yes

Mr. Wilson – yes

Mr. Coffin – yes

Mr. Bakie – yes

Ms. Faulconer – yes

Motion carries unanimously.

On-site Meetings:

Mr. Coppelman reminded the Board that it was requested to talk about having on-site meetings instead of virtual meetings. He noted that Ms. Faulconer had sent out some information from the State and NHMA (New Hampshire Municipal Association). Mr. Coppelman said that he spoke with Steve Buckley, attorney at the NHMA, and there were no updates at this point. Mr. Coffin said that the only change since the Board last reviewed the issue was that the Governor's Emergency Order had been extended again; there has been an up-tick in the number of positive Covid cases in Rockingham County; nothing has changed in the Emergency Order or guidance. He added that he meets in person with the ZBA which is a much smaller group with just a couple of people in the hall. Mr. Coffin continued that this group is too big and the Zoom meeting is working well; he doesn't think we should change yet and the decision can always be re-evaluated as things change. Mr. Bakie stated that during the last two or three months, there have been quite a bit of issues with the remote hearings; he suggested that there weren't that many people attending the Zoom meetings to cause an issue with on-site meetings suggesting there were no more than 5. He questioned Mr. Coffin's opinion as he saw him working the election that had 1000 people throughout the day and didn't know what the difference was. Mr. Coffin answered that he volunteered as he knew that there were few people volunteering and he was aware of the precautions taken, such as Plexiglas and required masking, creating a safer environment. He noted that masks were not worn at the ZBA meetings. Mr. Coffin continued that if social distancing couldn't be maintained then the PB would have to cancel the meeting; unfortunately, hybrid meetings don't work well at the Town Hall at this point. Mr. Wilson stated it is horrible. Mr. Coppelman said that until the Town can make a hybrid work, it isn't an option – it doesn't work. Mr. Greenwood clarified that there were 27 people on the Zoom meeting this evening; during the 266 Rte. 125 review, there were 47

people. Mr. Coffin stated that the hearing for that went smoothly; he said the Zoom meetings were working well and better than the BOS “hybrid” meetings. Mr. Wilson agreed “absolutely”. Ms. Merrill said that she felt that the Town leadership has no energy/incentive/desire to communicate with the public; it has been 6 or 7 years since there was a request for a projector and nothing has changed. Ms. Merrill continued that comments received from the public regarding the 266 Rte. 125 hearing were positive as the public was able to see the plans and hear what was being talked about. She added that the questions that were asked were better than when the meeting was held in person as the hearing room acoustics are bad; there were not questions due to not understanding what had been described. Ms. Merrill stated that because of the lack of technology, the only way to get the general public in is through Zoom. There was a short discussion on available viewing through Zoom, YouTube and the cable channel. Ms. Duguay said that the Board has to consider guidance from the CDC and risk mitigation strategies; opening windows, etc. becomes problematic as the weather gets colder. She stated that she can’t make a decision for an employee or people attending a meeting as 30% of the population fall into the high risk category simply due to age; she can’t make decisions for others based on her personal decisions. Ms. Duguay stated that it would be nice if the Town had a solid policy. Mr. Wilson said that initially he was dead-set against Zoom meetings, but this works – he can see better, hear better and see the plans. Ms. Faulconer stated that the Board has a responsibility to the public, regardless of personal issues and decisions, a public Board has a responsibility to follow guidelines to protect the public and still provide participation. Mr. Wilson said that the Board members have a responsibility to their families, also. Mr. Coppelman read item #8 of the Governor’s Executive Order that Boards are “permitted and encouraged” to conduct electronic meetings. He stated that the public is able to participate and able to maintain the structure of the meetings.

MM&S to continue the Planning Board meetings via the Zoom platform. (Motion by Ms. Faulconer, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll Call vote:

Mr. Coppelman – yes
Mr. Wilson – abstain
Ms. Faulconer – yes

Ms. Merrill – yes
Mr. Coffin – yes

Ms. Duguay - yes
Mr. Bakie – yes

Motion carries, 6-0-1 (with Mr. Wilson abstaining)

Mr. Coppelman said the Board will follow the guidance and re-evaluate as needed.

The Chairperson declared the meeting adjourned at 10:05 PM.