

**CITY OF CONCORD PLANNING BOARD
April 17, 2013 MEETING**

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on April 17, 2013, in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, 37 Green Street at 7:00 PM.

Present at the meeting were Chair Drypolcher and Members Hicks, Regan, Lavers, Smith-Meyer and Kenison, City Planner McPherson, Mr. Henninger, Ms. Hebert and Ms. Parmele of the City's Planning Division were also present.

At 7:04 pm, a quorum was present and the Chair called the meeting to order.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Architectural Design Review Applications

1. Applications by the following for Design Review Approval for signs, buildings and/or site plans at the noted locations, under the provisions of Section 28-9-4(f), Architectural Design Review, of the Code of Ordinances:
 - **Application by CFA Corporation/Freifuels, Inc., requesting Design Review Approval for installation of a skid-mounted 2000 gallon propane tank, located at 112 Hall Street, within the Industrial (IN) District. (2013-0015)**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger stated that the proposal was to install a single propane tank to an existing self-service fueling facility that has operated for approximately 15 years. He said the tank would be located on an existing paved area on the existing self-service fueling area on Hall St. He explained that the application went to Design Review because the use is no longer allowed in the IN district. It was noted that variances were granted by the ZBA on March 6, 2013 to permit the expansion of a retail fuel facility which is no longer a permitted use in the IN Zoning District, and to allow the storage of hazardous materials (propane) in the F1 Flood Hazard (FH) Overlay District.

He said the existing screening was appropriate. He said the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) reviewed the application and recommended approval, with the condition that a traffic impact fee shall be assessed.

There were no comments from members of the public. The applicant hadn't yet arrived at the meeting. The Chair closed the public hearing.

It was noted that there was a playground across the street. There was discussion that the tank would be almost 100 ft from the right of way, so was substantially set back. Mr. Henninger said a gasoline station could be within 25 ft of a property line. He also noted that propane leaks dissipated relatively quickly.

Ms. Smith Meyer moved to grant Design Review approval to allow for the installation of a propane fueling facility at 112 Commercial Street by Freifuels, Inc. as submitted by the applicant and subject to the following conditions: that the existing vegetative buffer will not be altered; and that traffic impact fees shall be assessed for any non-residential construction contained within the limits of the approved site plan.

Dan Freihofer, the applicant, arrived at the meeting and said the Architectural Design Review Committee did a good job with the application. The Chair noted a condition added to the motion that the vegetative buffer would not be altered. Mr. Freihofer said he had no plans to disturb any of the vegetation, stating that the company had done a good job of vegetative buffering on 3 sides of the site 15 years ago. He said the additional tank would be barely visible from Hall Street. It was noted that the tank would be placed on existing asphalt.

Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

- **Application by Concord Area Trust for Community Housing (CATCH), requesting Design Review Approval for exterior renovations to the Endicott Hotel, located at 1-5 South Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2013-0016)**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hebert said the application involved the renovation of two commercial storefronts facing South Main Street, at the Endicott Hotel. She noted that the Planning Board had reviewed the architectural design review application for the rest of the building in June of 2012, as part of the renovation of the rest of the Endicott Hotel in order to convert the building to market rate housing.

Mike Reed, Director of Real Estate for Concord Area Trust for Community Housing (CATCH), said photos had been found representing the 1900-1920 vintage of the frontage and storefronts. He said they were modified in the 1940's to have art deco elements with Carrera Glass, and said 6-7 years ago they were redone with black metal in a way to recreate that look. He said CATCH was looking to bring the storefronts back to the 1900-1910 look based on the historic photos. He provided details on the proposed work to be done.

Ms. Hebert said the Architectural Design Review Committee's recommendation was to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Smith-Meyer moved to grant Design Review approval to allow the proposed renovations to the storefronts facing South Main Street at the Endicott Hotel, as presented by Concord Area Trust for

Community Housing. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

- **Application by ConvenientMD, requesting Design Review Approval for a new panel in an existing freestanding sign and a new affixed sign, located at 8 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said what was proposed was a new affixed sign and the installation of an insert panel into an already approved free standing sign that had yet to be installed.

Max Puyanich of ConvenientMD Urgent Care said they would be opening soon in Concord, and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

The Chair said the application was pretty straightforward. No members of the public came forward to speak, and he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said the ADR Committee had no concerns about the signs. There was discussion that all of the panels of the free standing sign taken together would exceed the allowable signage area, but the sign and panel proposed now met the requirements.

Ms. SmithMeyer MOVED to grant Architectural Design Review approval of the new freestanding sign and new affixed sign as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Lavers SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Kenison arrived at the meeting at 7:16 pm. He did not vote on the above motion. The Chair sat Alternate Member Kenison for Member Foss.

- **Application by Konstandinos Luzis/Unfranchised Auto Care, requesting Design Review Approval for a replacement freestanding sign, located at 193 Loudon Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said a copy of the color version of the sign was in the packet. He said the top of the sign had been reduced to be 20 ft above grade, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. He said the discussion at the ADR meeting was on the 4 separate elements. He said the committee looked at the signage at the other facility on South Main Street, whose signage had been approved. He said they recommended approval of the proposed signage with one of the design elements being eliminated. He said the Committee also recommended that the Auto Care portion of the sign should be expanded.

The applicant said the ADR Committee wanted the signage to be bolder. He said everything asked for was easily achievable. He said he would eliminate the website verbiage, and make the signage a little bolder.

There were no comments from members of the public.

Mr. Henninger said the existing temporary sign was too high, but said the proposed sign as seen on the drawing conformed to the Zoning Ordinance.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Smith-Meyer noted that the sign on South Main St. had the website on it but no phone number. She said she found the phone number and where it was on the sign was distracting, and also said people liked to see websites on signs. The applicant said he was asked to eliminate one or the other, and said he would prefer to eliminate the website. Ms. McPherson said the ADR Committee was fine with that. He noted that at the previous meeting, he was told to eliminate the bottom element, which was the website. Ms. Smith-Meyer said the sign on South Main St looked less cluttered than this sign. There was further discussion. Mr. Hicks said he was fine with what was proposed.

Mr. Hicks MOVED to grant Architectural Design Review approval of the replacement freestanding sign as submitted by the applicant, subject to the condition that the applicant removes from the four design elements from the sign the internet address, and that the applicant strengthens the words "Auto Care", as was done on the South Main Street sign. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried 5-1, with Ms. Smith-Meyer voting against it.

- **Application by Nicolas Harriman/Dips Frozen Yogurt, requesting Design Review Approval for a replacement awning sign, located at 138 North Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said a replacement striped fabric awning sign was proposed. He said the ADR Committee saw the sample, thought it was attractive, and recommended approval.

The applicant, Nicolas Harriman, said he had nothing to add. No members of the public came forward to speak on the application. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to grant Architectural Design Review approval of the replacement fabric awning sign as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried Unanimously 6-0.

- **Application by Michael Baron/Baron's Appliances requesting Design Review Approval for a new changeable copy sign over a portion of an existing time and temperature freestanding sign located at 350 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said several changes to the existing free standing sign were proposed. He noted that the business was located near the entrance to Walmart on Loudon Road. He said the ADR Committee had recommended approval, with a number of stipulations for the changes to the sign.

Tim Sullivan of Barlo Signs represented the applicant. He said what was proposed was the installation of two lines of manual changeable copy tracks to the bottom two thirds of the existing electronic messaging center, similar to what had been done at the Carlson's location. He said the lines of changeable copy would have a black background with translucent white lettering, and explained that the existing LED lights would provide the illumination for the manual changeable letters at night but would not be directly visible. He said they asked that the illumination be of three colors: amber, white or red. He said the Architectural Design Review Board requested that there be one color per message, and noted that the original proposal was to have two different colors. He said the time and temperature signs did not have to be the same color as the message below, but had to be red, amber or white. He said the applicant was fine with what had been requested.

The Chair asked if the color would stay the same for the time and temperature portions of the sign, and Mr. Sullivan said it would not blink, and said the color might change when the bottom two lines of manual copy were changed. The Chair noted that there was an as yet undetermined Zoning issue, regarding what made a sign a changeable sign. He said this went back to the issue of lighted signs for anything other than time and temperature, and he noted that a Zoning provision had been established to address this. He said right now was a transition period in regarding to applying this provision, which the Baron's application had gotten caught up in. He said the Board had hoped to have something on that tonight. Ms. McPherson said while the Board didn't have this, they could still act on the design review aspects of this.

Ms. McPherson said the text would be the white translucent lettering that would be slid in manually and backlit by the LED. She asked how the colors were changed. Mr. Sullivan explained that there was a controller inside the building that allowed the colors to be changed. He said instead of putting messages up on the board electronically, they would put up the full banks of color, and the individual letters would be slid in manually in front of this. He said it was much like illuminating letters with an LED. Ms. McPherson asked if this would be programmed so there would be a set time period when the colors would change and when the manual copy would change. Mr. Sullivan said a manual change would take place when the new message went up, and said this could happen weekly, daily, or something else. He said when they changed the message, they would go in and manually change the color.

The Chair said he didn't think that approving what the applicant wanted to do was a problem, but said the Planning Board needed to defer to Zoning Administrator Craig Walker on this. Ms. McPherson explained that the Planning Board could grant Design Review approval, but said Mr. Walker might decide not to grant the sign permit. The Chair noted that if the Planning Board approved the application now and Mr. Walker then granted the sign permit, the applicant wouldn't have to come back to the Planning Board.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the chronology of the review process, but said he was fine with the Planning Board acting on the application.

No members of the public came forward to speak, and the Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kenison asked if the Board needed to fashion the motion so it included permission from the Zoning Administrator as well as a condition about the signage not changing color. Ms. McPherson said the motion would need to include a condition regarding changing the color if the Board chose to impose this condition. But she said she didn't think there needed to be anything in the motion regarding the Zoning Administrator's decision, because it wasn't the Planning Board's role to grant the sign permit.

Mr. Kenison asked if the ADR Committee recommendations were enforceable. Ms. McPherson said yes, and provided details on this. Mr. Kenison asked if the applicant could change the sign every hour if he wanted to. Ms. McPherson said the ADR Committee didn't say anything about this, and was told that the maximum change per day would be once. She said the Board could impose a condition concerning this.

Ms. Smith Meyer said the applicant's original intent seemed to be to have a moveable sign by changing the colors behind the static lettering, which was unacceptable. Ms. McPherson said she didn't think that was the applicant's intention, but said Zoning Administrator Craig Walker thought this potentially might happen. There was discussion. Ms. Smith-Meyer said she thought the application was fine as long as the colors didn't change. Ms. McPherson said there was a letter from the applicant that their intention was not to have flashing lights behind the letters. She said the plan was to back-light changeable copy.

Mr. Henninger noted that the manual lettering hadn't been installed yet, since the applicant still needed to get the sign permit.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to grant Architectural Design Review approval of the new changeable copy sign over a portion of an existing time and temperature freestanding sign, with the stipulations set by the Architectural Design Review Committee that: (1) all the manual lettering be back-lighted the same color, (2) that the time and temperature display could be a different color from the changeable copy portion of the sign, but that it would also have to be a single color, (3) there could be no more than two colors on the overall sign at a time, one for the changeable copy and one for the time/temp portion of the sign, (4) the colors would be allowed to change among red, amber or white when the changeable copy message was changed, and (5) no blinking or color change would otherwise be allowed. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

- **Application by Carlson's MotorCorp requesting Design Review Approval for a replacement time and temperature sign and a replacement changeable copy sign both on an existing freestanding sign located at 13 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Henninger said the only difference between this application and the Baron's application was that three lines of changeable copy were proposed, two of which were already installed. He said the stipulations from the Architectural Design Review Committee were the same as those for the Barons application.

No members of the public came forward to speak. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lavers MOVED to grant Architectural Design Review approval of the new changeable copy sign over a portion of an existing time and temperature freestanding sign, with the stipulations set by the ADR Committee that: (1) all the manual lettering be back lighted the same color, (2) that the time and temperature display be could be a different color from the changeable copy portion of the sign, but that it would also have to be a single color, (3) there could be no more than two colors on the overall sign at a time, one for the changeable copy and one for the time/temp portion of the sign, (4) the colors would be allowed to change among red, amber or white when the changeable copy message was changed, and (5) no blinking or color change would otherwise be allowed. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

The Chair said the same issue applied with this application, concerning the Code Administrator issuing the sign permit.

Subdivision Applications

- 2. Application by Apple Hill Properties, LLC and the Judith A. Iversen 2001 Revocable Trust, for property located at 118 & 128 Elm Street, requesting Minor Subdivision Approval and a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-4-3(d), Disturbance to a Wetland Buffer, to create two new building lots in Boscawen with frontage in Concord. (2013-0014)**

- a. Determination of Completeness

Mr. Henninger said staff recommended that the application was complete and ready for public hearing.

- b. Public Hearing

Ms. Smith Meyer MOVED to open the Public Hearing. Mr. Lavers SECONDED the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Henninger said the applicant had obtained subdivision approval from Boscawen, and was now before the Concord Planning Board for minor subdivision approval. He said a Conditional Use Permit had also been requested to allow disturbance of approximately 1,100 square feet of wetlands buffer, in order to widen the existing unpaved driveway to the requested width to make it into a common drive. He said there was an existing house on one of the lots, and said a new lot of about 5 acres would be created in Boscawen. He said there was also some backland.

The applicant's agent, surveyor Joe Wichert said the first part of the application was to subdivide the property, which contained 29 acres, 28.5 acres of which was located in Boscawen. He said the subdivision would reduce the size of the lot with the existing residence from 29 acres to 5.6 acres, and would create a new lot with 5 acres. He said lot one would have about 11,000 sf in Concord, and the second lot would have 13,850 sf in Concord. He said the remainder of the acreage (18.4 acres) would be annexed onto a lot owned by the Judith A. Iverson 2001 Revocable Trust property, located in Boscawen. It was noted that although approval of the subdivision by the Concord Planning Board was required, no new construction would occur on either lot 1 or 2 in the City of Concord.

Mr. Wichert said there was an existing 10 ft gravel driveway running to the east of the wetlands. He said the proposal would avoid doing a wetland crossing, and would stay consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. He said the CUP was being requested to allow wetland buffer disturbance of approximately 1100 sf. He said all expansion would be on the east side of the driveway so there would be no reduction to the existing setback to the wetlands. He said a waiver was submitted to allow a common private drive with a width of 14 feet of asphalt with two ft gravel shoulders on each side. He noted that the photos indicated that it was a flat area that was wide open, so oncoming traffic would be visible. He noted that a condition of the recent subdivision approval from Boscawen was approval by the Concord Planning Board.

The Chair asked if members of the public had any comments or questions on the application.

Mr. Henninger said staff recommended approval of the subdivision application, and also recommended that the waiver be granted to allow the reduction of the driveway to a width of 14 feet of pavement with two-foot gravel shoulders on each side. He said the drive would serve 2-4 additional homes, noting that duplexes were allowed at that location in Boscawen by special exception. He said this was in keeping with the intent of the subdivision regulations, for a project of this size. He said that concerning the CUP to allow wetland buffer disturbance, he didn't think this would seriously impact the existing wetlands. He said the existing driveway was in the wetland buffer and would be expanded away from the wetland. Concerning runoff, he said there

had been substantial improvement to the culverts in the area in recent years, and he provided details on this.

Mr. Henninger recommended conditional approval of the application, and said the standard conditions would be included in the approval, along with an additional condition, that any structures built would be in the town of Boscawen. He said with that in effect, there was no need for impact fees or building permits from Concord.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to grant a Waiver to Table 20-1, Standards for Residential Common Private Drives, to allow a common private drive with a width of 14 feet of pavement with two-foot gravel shoulders on each side instead of a common private drive with a width of 18 feet with a one-foot gravel shoulder on each side. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to grant a Condition Use Permit for a disturbance to a Wetland Buffer pursuant to Article 28-4-3(d) of the Zoning Ordinance to construct a common private residential drive. The impact is the minimum disturbance needed to reconstruct the existing driveway. Mr. Lavers SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to Grant final subdivision approval for the "Lot Line Adjustment & Resubdivision Plan for Apple Hill Properties LLC, Boscawen Tax Map 83, Lot 63, Concord Tax Map 15P, Lot 35; 118 Elm Street and The Judith A. Iverson 2001 Rev. Trust, Concord Tax Map 15P, Lot 30; 128 Elm Street, Boscawen & Concord, New Hampshire" subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant shall revise the plat drawings to address the minor corrections and omissions noted by City staff.
2. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the following easement documents, in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor and suitable for recording in the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, will be provided to the Planning Division:
 - a) Agreement to convey an easement for the common driveway.
3. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, approvals of construction drawings and specifications for the common private drive shall be obtained from the City Planner and City Engineer.
4. No construction activity may commence prior to the payment of inspection fees in an amount approved by the City Engineer.

5. Prior to the final plat being signed by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, the applicant will obtain subdivision approval from the Town of Boscawen and submit documentation to the Concord Planning Division.
6. No building or development, with the exception of the common private drive, shall occur on that portion of proposed Lots 1 and 2 within the City of Concord.

Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Site Plan Review Applications

3. **Application by Havenwood-Heritage Heights, for property located at 149 East Side Drive, requesting Site Plan Approval, Design Review Approval, a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-4-4(d), Disturbance to Bluffs and Buffers to Bluffs, and a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 28-2-4(j) and 28-8-2(c), Modification of an Existing Residential Social Service Center, of the Zoning Ordinance, for the redevelopment of the north end of the property, including the demolition of 65 residential dwelling units, construction of 34 new residential dwelling units, construction of a new private road, driveways, sidewalks, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and related site improvements. (2013-0008)**

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Ms. Hebert said this was a major site plan application. She said there were also two Conditional Use Permit requests, one of which was to allow for disturbance to the buffer to bluff along the Merrimack River. She explained that there was an existing paved driveway that ran along the western perimeter of the project area, along the top of the bluff, and it was partially located within the 50-foot buffer to the bluff. She said there was a second Conditional Use Permit application, for the modification of an existing Residential Social Service Center. She said there were also two waiver requests regarding the layout of the residential drive and the layout of the cul de sacs on the site.

Attorney Richard Uchida, Hinckley, Allen & Snyder, LLP said the applicants wanted to renovate the north end of the Heritage Heights campus, and said the intention with this project was to allow the community to evolve into a 21st century care community. He said 18 of the 24 existing buildings on the site would be taken down, which involved the demolition of 62 units. He said there would be 20 new

buildings, containing 34 units comprised of singles and duplexes that fit better with what the retirement- community was seeking these days.

He noted that with the acquisition of the Somes parcel, the project site would contain almost 40 acres. He reviewed the various zones the property was located in, and said related to the second CUP request was the fact that a variance was received to extend the Residential Social Service Center use onto 175 East Side Drive (the Somes Lot), into an RS Residential Single Family District. He said a variance was also received to permit more than 1 single family dwelling and more than 1 two-family dwelling on a single lot for a development that was neither a Cluster Development or a PUD.

Mr. Uchida said a variance was received to permit building separations within the Heritage Heights campus of not less than 30 ft, as shown on the proposed site plan, where 40 ft building separation was required. He also said a variance was approved to permit lot coverage of 48%, when a maximum lot coverage of 40% was permitted. He said as a result of the project, there would be fewer units than existed on the site today, and a larger amount of land area for each unit, which was more in keeping with what the market demanded today.

Mike Palmieri, CEO of Havenwood Heritage Heights, said his organization, the United Church of Christ Retirement Community, Inc., was mission driven. He said Havenwood right now was a modest retirement community, and explained that the units were not of a style that people wanted to rent these days, so there had been vacancies. He said they were looking to add construction features and services that would allow them to remain competitive. He said the units would be homelike, modernized and accessible and so would be appropriate for aging in place. He said this would include wellness features, promotion of socially engaging opportunities, and a secure environment.

He reviewed the renovations to the development over the last 10 years or so. He said right now, they were looking to make the units the right size so they would feel like homes, which involved reducing the overall density, going from 85 units down to 54. He said there would also be curbside appeal improvements, such as the car ports that were designed to fit into the development.

He said the organization believed that regarding sidewalks, narrow paths were no longer the right way to go, for people in wheelchairs, people walking side by side, people walking their dogs, etc. He said the pathways throughout the development would provide accessibility, would promote a walkable community, and also would provide a safe campus. He said the design would promote the Eden Alternative, which reflected a philosophy of how to build retirement communities into the future. He said this design would provide some great outdoor space for gardening, biking, etc. He noted the new project on Ormond St., where the units were oriented around a cul-de-sac, and said this had been a huge success with residents. He said the cul-de-sac gave people the opportunity to engage socially and watch out for each other, while also providing privacy.

Richard Pizzi, architect with Lavallee Brensinger Architects, noted that 6 of the existing buildings would remain, and explained that this was because extensive improvements had been made to them in recent years, including combining some 2 units to become 1 larger unit. He noted that these buildings were located toward the center of the site. He said the existing special events house would also remain. He said there would be 6 new single residential buildings, and said the balance of new buildings would be duplexes. He explained that there would be 4 architectural styles that were similar in character, and provided details on this.

He explained that the north side of the Havenwood campus was difficult to navigate, and said a goal with the project was to extend the existing south roadway and create one continuous spine throughout the development for residents. He said from this, 6-7 cul-de-sac pods would be created. He said every new unit would have a garage, and said there would be enough space in front of the garage for an additional car. He also said the cul-de-sacs would have room for additional parking if residents had visitors, and said this design reduced the need to build parking lots. He also said the only traffic on the cul-de-sacs would be residents. He said the socialization aspect of the pods was evidence based, given the experience at Ormond St. He explained that each new unit would be accessed by a private driveway, and parking would be provided in single and/or double stall garages. He said parking for the existing buildings, which didn't have garages, would be provided in 3 covered parking structures that would be in character with the overall building design for the project.

Erin Lambert, Nobis Engineering, said the development was on city water and sewer, and said gas would be brought in. She noted that the buildings would be fully sprinklered. She said while the project would increase the impervious cover percentage beyond what was there today, some great stormwater management measures were proposed to achieve groundwater recharge on the site, including drip edges around buildings, underground infiltration galleries and rain gardens.

She provided details on the internal driveways to be constructed, including cul-de-sacs, and also provided details on a network of walking paths that would be constructed throughout the development. She said all walking paths and access to units would be full accessible, and said the walkways to residences would be 5 ft in width. She said the sidewalks adjacent to the internal driveways and cul-de-sacs would be 6 ft.

Ms. Lambert said after receiving the staff report, the plan had been revised to show which trees could realistically be saved. She provided details on this, and said 180 trees in the site would be preserved, 120 of which would be deciduous. She said this would be sufficiently above the 116 trees required. She also noted that 97 additional trees would be planted. She said at the north end of the campus, surface parking would be constructed for the Special events home. She noted that the proposed lilac plantings had been changed to arborvitae to provide year round screening. She said they had reached out to the abutter to say that if additional screening was needed, the applicant was willing to continue the conversation. She said there would be six outdoor gathering spaces on the property.

Ms. Lambert reviewed the two waiver requests:

- Permission to construct a residential driveway serving more than 7 units with a width of 22 ft, where 24 ft is required for 8 or more lots.
- Permission to construct of cul-de-sacs with an at the end of common private driveways, with dimensions (outer diameter of 80 ft and a center diameter of 36 ft) that are different from the city's standard cul-de-sac dimension.

She said the purpose of this was to limit impervious area while still providing sufficient access for residents and emergency vehicles.

Ms. Lambert said that concerning the CUP request to disturb 5,200 sf of buffer to the bluff, they were not proposing any additional clearing, and said mostly there would be removal of existing pavement. She provided details on this. She said after the work was done, the buffer would be restored. She said there would also be some clearing and grading to construct a retaining wall, and said the area behind the wall would be restored with vegetation. She also spoke briefly concerning the CUP Request to modify the existing residential social services center.

Ms. Smith-Meyer asked for the rationale for the 6 ft wide sidewalks. She said this seemed excessive in a very residential zone and could add up to a lot of pavement that might not be necessary. Ms. Lambert said the 6 ft wide sidewalks were the main walking paths, and said the side paths and paths up to doors of the houses would be 5 ft in width. Mr. Pizzi explained that the width was needed for two people crossing at the same time, some of whom might be in wheelchairs. He noted that the standard wheelchair was bigger than it was 20 years ago. He said the 6 ft width was for sidewalks along the main road, where they anticipated there would be the most pedestrian traffic.

There was discussion about the width of the road, with Ms. Lambert noting that the main road was 24 ft wide and the side drives were 22 ft wide. Ms. Smith-Meyer said there wouldn't be a lot of traffic, and asked if the road could be narrowed since it was a private road, with a wider sidewalk on one side and a narrower sidewalk on the other. She said it seemed like a lot of pavement to address the chance that 3 people would be passing each other on the sidewalk. Ms. Lambert said it was felt that a 24 ft wide road was needed, and said the 6 ft sidewalk came from some thoughtful planning, and related to the livability principle.

Ms. Smith-Meyer said it still seem like a lot of roads, and said a lot of attention was being paid to vehicles with the project. She also said she didn't see a lot of open space. She said she appreciated that more trees than were required had been included, but said there were some units that didn't have trees. She said having shade trees would over time make residents feel more comfortable, and would also reduce cooling costs in the summer.

Ms. Smith-Meyer questioned the architecture of the carport, stating that the full expanse of the asphalt roof was visible, which made the structure look less residential. She also said with the slope that was proposed, there would be issues with water and snow. There was discussion with Mr. Pizzi about this

and other possible options. Mr. Hicks said the beauty of the campus now was the cottages, with no expanse of wall on East Side Drive. He said he appreciated the architect's attempt to break up the façade of the garages, but said there would still be these walls.

Mr. Pizzi said the building elevation they were looking at was deceiving, and said as one drove by on East Side Dr., it wouldn't look like such an expanse of wall. He said the carport was the same size as the other proposed buildings, with a similar roof pitch. He also said with the new landscaping, it wouldn't be seen as a wall. There was discussion about the length of the building. Ms. McPherson said the façade of the garage was somewhat less articulated than the other structures. Ms. Lambert noted that the 30 ft of undisturbed buffer didn't show on the building elevation. Ms. Smith-Meyer said the building would still look like a very large garage. Ms. Hebert noted that the garage length had been reduced, but was still a concern. There was further discussion.

Mr. Palmieri said with the existing development, one could see a lot of cars and parking lots. Ms. McPherson said what was there now had a residential feel. Mr. Palmieri said when the current plan was done, the development would have more of a residential feel than it had now. He said the design would hide the cars and would give residents an opportunity to park their vehicles in locations other than out in parking lots that they had to walk to. There was further discussion on this.

There was discussion on the cul-de-sac design. Ms. Smith-Meyer said they didn't seem to be places people would gather. Mr. Pizzi spoke about the success of the cul-de-sac design at the Ormond St. development, and said that design had therefore been applied to the Havenwood Heritage Heights project. Ms. Smith-Meyer said it seemed that they could get rid of some of the road area and provide more green space. There was discussion.

Mr. Pizzi noted that the goal was to create 34 marketable units, and said there was the reality of the space needed for this. Mr. Palmieri spoke about the importance of not having connected buildings with this development, as compared to the existing development, and said this would feel more normal. He also said an important feature was that residences would have a back and front door, which was a reason why sidewalks were needed there. He said the sidewalks provided safe access to these one story buildings.

Ms. Smith-Meyer said the issue she had with the project was the site layout, and suggested that the team might be able to do something more creative. Mr. Palmieri said there would be some special areas for sitting along the bluff, and also said there was a walking path.

Ms. Hebert said staff had made several of these comments as they had reviewed the plan, but said the applicant was very set on the layout that was currently proposed. She said it did meet the City's standards, with the exception of the waivers, but said the development would have a completely different feel from what was there today. She said the layout around the cul-de-sac introduced a lot of pavement. Ms. Smith-Meyer said she thought a more open feel could be created without so much road.

She said a lot of room was being made for vehicles. She also suggested that it was more important to plant trees than to plant foundation plantings.

Mr. Palmieri said a goal with this project was to create a development that was sustainable, to make sure they would be here 50 years from now.

The Chair asked if there were any public comments.

Sarah Norberg, Christian Ave, said she and her husband were residents of the Ormond Street development, and said there was a wonderful living experience there, with a lot of social support. She said the dwellings were interconnected by the cul-de-sac, and said this area had become a lovely gathering place. She said it didn't feel like a paved area and said there was greenery around. She said she and her husband felt strongly that the proposed development should also have a cul-de-sac design.

Leo Van Beaver, Christian Ave. said he and his wife Gloria felt the same way, and said the cul-de-sac was an important part of the experience where they lived. He noted that there were 5 couples living along the cul-de-sac, as well as 7 widows/widowers looking to them for support. He spoke about the importance of having a wider sidewalk, including for wheelchairs.

Debra Naylor, Housing Services Vice President for Havenwood Heritage Heights, said this arrangement with the cul-de-sac was more than one could have hoped for. She said it allowed residents to engage in healthy active lifestyles as they grew older.

Attorney Uchida noted that there was agreement on the impervious surface issue. He said the cul-de-sacs were created because not as much open space was needed, stating that he hoped the Planning Board would take into account the fact that this was a special community the development was being designed for. He noted that the project would meet the open space requirements.

Ms. Smith-Meyer said the idea for the development was great, but said there were things that hadn't been thought of, such as a median strip between the sidewalk and street, which could create a better pedestrian experience for residents. She spoke in some detail on this. She also said the cul-de-sacs could feel like a place rather than a traffic element if there were more plantings, etc. She said the area could have less asphalt and still be accessible. She noted that this was the first time the Board had seen this layout, so it wasn't unreasonable for the applicant to take some comments and tweak the design.

Attorney Uchida said the team was taking the comments very constructively. He said there might be an opportunity for a landscape median, and some upgrades to the cul-de-sacs to make them more inviting. But he said he hoped the Board wasn't talking about walking away from the cul-de-sac concept and the size it needed to be in order to accommodate the social activities and also get emergency vehicles in. He said there were some instances where the building was close enough so the sidewalk couldn't be

moved to create the landscaped median, but said there were other places where that might be possible.

Ms. Hebert said staff had made several of those types of comments, and said because the applicant was so set on the location of the buildings, there wasn't enough flexibility. Ms. Lambert spoke about the site constraints that limited them in terms of putting the landscape median in, including the bluff buffer and the shoreland setback. She also said there wasn't enough room to provide the road width they needed and also put in a sidewalk panel. She said the numbers were what they were, and said there were a certain number of units they needed to fit on the site. She said they could look at putting trees in for gathering spaces that currently didn't have them in the plan, and where utilities wouldn't constrain this.

Ms. Smith-Meyers said the cul-de-sacs were a traffic solution, and said the applicant could achieve the goal of being able to see the neighbors with another design that would address the traffic differently. Ms. Lambert spoke about the attractiveness of the cul-de-sac design for residents.

Ms. McPherson asked if residents had a choice of other gathering spots at Ormond Street. She said she thought it was the gathering space people liked and not the fact that it was on a cul-de-sac, and said empirical evidence would be needed to indicate otherwise. Mr. Uchida said the cul-de-sac helped in a different way because it created the opportunity for people to get vehicles close to their units. Ms. McPherson said the quality of open space became less important if it was the only area available. She said there were models of development that instead focused on a traditional New England common, which was true open space, with pedestrian access around it. She said with such a design, the vehicular access would be in the back. She said she thought this would be a better quality open space.

Ms. Hebert said the Ormond St. layout was a fundamentally different situation because it was located at the end of a dead end road, running parallel to Hazen Drive. She said it was wonderful that the cul-de-sac design had been so successful, but said it was the only option there. She spoke further on this. Ms. Lambert said they had explored other layouts, including a loop road approach, and spoke about the constraints that worked against this, including snow removal issues. She also spoke about the improved way-finding and safety aspects for residents with the cul-de-sacs as compared to the loop road approach.

Mr. Kenison asked for clarification concerning the fact that there would be removal of pavement from the buffer as well as construction of a paved trail along the buffer. Ms. Lambert said the trail was just outside of the buffer to the bluff. She said the trail would go where the paved area had been.

Mr. Lavers asked why there was the self-imposed constraint of keeping the 6 existing buildings. Mr. Pizzi said a significant amount of money had been invested to upgrade them over the last decade. Mr. Lavers said there seemed to be no choice regarding some elements of the layout such as the parking garage because the applicant was keeping the existing residential buildings. Mr. Pizzi said that was

correct, and noted that the ADRC had approved the design for the garages, which he said fit with the other buildings. He said the cul-de-sac concept was for vehicles, but said it had turned out to have other advantages for residents. He noted that the average age of residents was 82, and said their requirements concerning open space were different. He said it was a flat campus, and said the design team was taking advantage of that in making it such a walkable campus. He said the pavement for this project was deliberate, and said it would benefit the residents.

The Chair asked if any other members of the public wished to speak. Hearing no response, he closed the public hearing.

b. Deliberations and Action on the application

Ms. Hebert said because of the decrease in the number of units, there was no impact fee. She said staff recommended granting both the Site Plan waivers. She also said staff recommended approving both of the Conditional Use Permits. She said staff recommended granting Design Review Approval for the site plan, building elevations, landscape plan and lighting plan for the redevelopment as proposed. She said there were a series of standard conditions for granting Conditional Site Plan Approval, but said 4 of the conditions for this application were a bit different than the standard conditions:

- Ms. Hebert said the plans on file overestimated the number of trees to be preserved, so there was a Condition #2: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the construction drawings shall be amended to accurately depict which trees will be preserved onsite using the tree protection methods noted on the landscape plan.
- She said Condition #3 was something the Engineering department had asked for: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, the drainage system in the vicinity of DMH 9111 shall be investigated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer including possible video inspection of the system. The plans shall be amended to include any necessary changes to ensure the drainage system is working to satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- She said Condition #4 reflected respecting the extension of the development into the neighborhood, and said it was important to make sure that the entire buffer strip was effective and the neighbors were happy: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval by the Planning Board Chair and the issuance of any building permits for construction activity on the site, a note shall be added to the landscape plan to indicate that additional plantings shall be provided along the north side property line within the 30-foot buffer, to provide an effective year-round screen between the campus and the residential property to the north. The type, quantity and placement of plantings shall be approved by the City Planner after clearing has been completed.

- Condition #11 - Prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval, the applicant shall file a voluntary merger application with the City to merge parcel 114H/1/13 with parcel 114G/1/1.

Mr. Hicks noted that while there had been conversations with the applicant about the various design issues, the staff recommendations didn't reflect this. Ms. Hebert said it got to the point where it was the Planning Board's responsibility to indicate if there were aspects of the site plan that they weren't happy with, and wanted to see changes to. Mr. Hicks spoke about the success of the cul-de-sac at the Ormond Street location, but said who was to say it would be successful at this location. He said there was also the question of whether an alternative gathering space would be better. He said he had to trust the residents of Ormond St, but said he thought the design could be better. He said it was currently a beautiful campus, and said the design changed it completely.

The Chair said he didn't see any space in the bluff area for gathering spaces.

In answer to a question from Ms. Smith-Meyer concerning proposed bulkheads, Mr. Pizzi noting that there would be sidewalks that connected to the bulkheads, so maintenance people could go through the basement instead of tracking through a unit. He said this had worked very well at Ormond Street.

Ms. Smith-Meyer said she would like more consideration given to the road profile and the sidewalks, and said the design didn't have to be so linear. She said they were creating a city street through the campus and said she would like to see some revisions that took Board and staff comments into consideration. She said such details would strengthen the concept of the community aspect without changing it radically, and would improve the project.

Mr. Lavers said he shared these concerns, and said while the concept was wonderful, the plan was deceptive in terms of how much pavement was in the project. He said there was too much pavement. He said the suggestion that the reason for this was the safety requirements was not entirely true, because a lot of the layout was required because the applicant was retaining 6 of the existing buildings. He spoke further on this.

The Chair said he thought there were some changes the applicant could make, but said given the recent investment in the 6 units, he didn't see why someone would want to tear them down. He suggested that segments of sidewalks could be more meandering than linear, and said there could then be some plantings between the street and the sidewalk.

Mr. Kenison said he was receptive to the idea that this development was different than a normal subdivision because there were different needs, so more paved surfaces would be needed. But he asked if there was room to change the design and still meet the needs of the community.

The Chair agreed with this, and said the Planning Board could see that there were some things the applicant could do. But he said he perceived a barrier on the applicant's part to accepting that.

There was discussion that approving the recommendations, up to the point of the granting of Design Review Approval would move the project forward even if there were reservations about the overall design, and the design could perhaps be tweaked. The Chair said that would be a good way to proceed with approval.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to Grant a Waiver to Section 19.03 of the Site Plan Regulations to permit the construction of a residential driveway serving more than eight units with a width of 22 feet where 24 feet is required. Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Regarding the second waiver request, The Chair said he appreciated the fire truck issues.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to Grant a Waiver to Section 19.09 of the Site Plan Regulations to permit the construction of cul-de-sacs with an outside pavement diameter of 80 feet and a center island diameter of 36 feet at the terminus of a residential common private driveway. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

There was discussion about the Conditional Use Permit application concerning disturbance of the buffer. Ms. Hebert said the area would be re-seeded after the pavement was removed and the other work was done. Ms. Smith-Meyer asked that the motion state that the disturbed area would be restored.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to Grant a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Section 28-4-4(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for disturbance to the buffer to bluff along the Merrimack River for the removal of existing pavement and for the construction of a retaining wall and grading associated with the construction of a 6-foot wide paved walkway along the edge of the buffer to the bluff within the vicinity of buildings #15 & 18, with the condition that the disturbed area will be restored. Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to Grant a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Section 28-2-4(j) and 28-8-2(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, for the modification of an existing Residential Social Service Center in the Medium Residential (RM) District. The majority of the site is located in this district and a CUP is required when alterations occur. Mr. Lavers SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

There was discussion about granting Design Review Approval. The Chair said he was inclined to table this and revisit next month, in order for the applicant to address the concerns that had been brought forward. Other Board members agreed with this. Ms. Hebert recommended that the Board table both the Design Review Approval as well as the Conditional Site Plan Approval, stating that the site plan might change. Ms. McPherson said they weren't really tabling the application, and simply weren't acting on it.

The Chair said the Planning Board would like the applicant to consider their comments concerning sidewalk location, road width, etc. Ms. McPherson summarized that the Planning Board was asking for plan revisions to address the following concerns they had raised. The following issues were noted:

- sidewalk locations relative to the road
- green space between road and sidewalk
- possible meandering approach, with more street side plantings

- other places where plantings can go
- eliminate sidewalks that don't need to be there
- look at the use of cul-de-sacs for gatherings, and the design of the cul-de-sacs
- eliminate some accesses
- reduce what is not necessary

The Chair asked if the sidewalk for building #22 was needed, and said perhaps a tree could go there. He said what was odd about the project was that more units were being taken out than would be put in, yet more pavement was proposed. It was noted again that this was the first time the Board was seeing the plans, and that this was the first time they had seen anything like this. The Chair said they would proceed carefully and try to figure it out.

Attorney Uchida said the team had a good sense of what the Planning Board was saying.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to continue the Public Hearing until May 15, 2013 at 7 pm. Mr. Lavers SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

4. Application by Concord-Merrimack County SPCA, for property located at 254 Clinton Street, requesting Site Plan Approval and Design Review Approval for the construction of a

a. Public Hearing

Mr. Regan MOVED to open the Public Hearing and continue it to May 15, 2013 at 7 pm. Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

- 5. Consideration of proposed amendments to Article 28-4, Development Design Standards, which would add a new development type, Continuing Care Retirement Community, and design and performance standards; and corollary amendments to Section 28-2-4(j), Table of Principal Uses, Section 28-9-4(f), Decisions by the Planning Board, Architectural Design Review, and Section 28-7-2(e)(A), Table of Off-Street Parking Requirements, Principal Uses, Residential.**

Continued to the May 15, 2013 meeting

Amendments to the Site Plan Regulations

- 6. Consideration of proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Site Plan Regulations**

Ms. McPherson said the new fees were vetted last month, and said the only feedback they got was to coordinate the sign fees with Code, which was done.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to approve the proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Site Plan Regulations. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

7. Consideration of proposed amendments to Section 10.02, Design Review Phase, Process, and Section 10.07, Design Review Phase, Design Review Phase Consideration, of the Site Plan Regulations, that would allow public testimony during the Design Review Phase.

Ms. McPherson noted the language that had been stricken, and said the purpose of the new language was to allow public testimony during the Design Review phase of a project. She said it was a reasonable response to the Board's comments at the March meeting.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to approve proposed amendments to Section 10.02, Design Review Phase, Process, and Section 10.07 Design Review Phase, Design Review Phase Consideration, of the Site Plan Regulations, that would allow public testimony during the Design Review Phase. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Amendments to the Subdivision Regulations

8. Consideration of proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Subdivision Regulations

Ms. McPherson said the new fees were vetted last month, and said the only feedback they got was to coordinate the sign fees with Code, which was done.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to approve the proposed amendments to Appendix A: Fees, of the Subdivision Regulations. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

9. Consideration of proposed amendments to Section 8.02, Design Review Phase, Process, and Section 8.07, Design Review Phase, Design Review Phase Consideration, of the Subdivision Regulations, that would allow public testimony during the Design Review Phase.

Ms. McPherson noted the language that had been stricken, and said the purpose of the new language was to allow public testimony during the Design Review phase of a project. She said it was a reasonable response to the Board's comments at the March meeting. She also said a goal for the future was to have a consolidated code for the Subdivision and Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to approve proposed amendments to Section 10.02, Design Review Phase, Process, and Section 10.07 Design Review Phase, Design Review Phase Consideration, of the Site Plan

Regulations, that would allow public testimony during the Design Review Phase. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Amendments to the Master Plan

10. Consideration of proposed amendments that would add a new Section XII, Energy Chapter; and corollary amendments to renumber the subsequent chapters of the Master Plan as necessary.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Herbert said the Energy Committee had started the Energy chapter about two years ago, and said the Planning Division had worked on it with them. She said other energy Master Plan chapters developed in the State had been looked at as part of developing the chapter. She said the chapter tied energy use in Concord to land use and sustainability issues. She said procedurally, the chapter would be adopted as part of the Master Plan 2030 that was adopted in June of 2008.

Energy Committee member Roger Hawk said Ms. Hebert had provided a lot of help to the Committee in developing the Energy chapter. He provided a slide presentation that covered the following information that was covered in the chapter:

- Energy Goals
- State Actions related to Energy and Climate Change
- Energy Use in NH/Energy Use in Concord
- Municipal Energy and Conservation
- Planning for Energy Reduction and Sustainability – through land use and transportation planning; land conservation; site and building design; renewable energy sources for small scale production; waste management; and sustainable food systems
- Public Education and Outreach

Energy Committee member Jonathan Gregory said this was a practical, flexible chapter that had been developed. He spoke in detail about the Energy Objectives and Actions that were included in the chapter, under the following headings:

- General Energy Use and Efficiency
- Municipal Energy Use
- Land Use Planning to Reduce Vehicle Trips
- Transportation to Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled and Dependence on Fossil Fuels
- Site and Building Design
- Renewable Energy Sources for Small Scale Production
- Waste Management
- Sustainable Foods as a Means of Conserving Energy
- Public Education and Outreach

Among other things, Mr. Gregory said the Energy Committee was trying to change the culture of Concord concerning energy issues. As an example, he said it was important that the School Board had an understanding of energy issues. He said it was important to make the effort to get energy information into the schools so they would become part of peoples' lives.

Mr. Hawk noted the implementation steps under Objectives and Actions, and said the Committee was already working on some of them. He provided some examples of this. He said he hoped the Planning Board could support the Energy Chapter, and said the Committee would like the Board to adopt it. He said the Committee would also like the City Council to accept it, noting that the chapter had ramifications for city wide policies.

Ms. Hebert asked Planning Board members to send her any minor corrections that were needed. But she said the document they were looking at now was the one the Board would be voting on.

There was brief discussion on local composting opportunities, with Ms. Smith-Meyer noting that she used to get free compost from GroundWorks. Mr. Gregory spoke about a company in the Seacoast area that collected composting material and also delivered composted material back to customers. He said there more and more businesses like this around now.

There was no input from members of the public. The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to adopt the Energy Chapter. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to forward the Energy Chapter to the City Council, indicating that the Planning Board received it and acted to include it in the Master Plan. Mr. Kenison SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

11. Request by R.J. Moreau Communities, LLC for an extension of the period of validity of the conditional approval of the Major Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit applications of the Vintage Estates Subdivision, located on Kyle Road. (2011-0007)

The Chair said the request for an extension fell within the parameters for granting an extension.

Mr. Kenison MOVED to Grant the request by R.J. Moreau Communities, LLC for an extension of the period of validity of the conditional approval of the Major Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit applications of the Vintage Estates Subdivision, located on Kyle Road, with the condition that all conditions of the approval remain in effect. Mr. Hicks SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

12. Development of Regional Impact – Proposed expansion of an existing gravel pit in Pembroke

Ms. McPherson said planning staff was ok with what was proposed and noted that there was a draft letter to that effect included in their packets. Board members agreed that it was appropriate for Ms. McPherson to send the letter stating this.

13. Minutes of the March 20, 2013 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Hicks MOVED to approve the March 20, 2013 Planning Board Minutes. Ms. Smith-Meyer SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

There was no further business to come before the Planning Board, and the meeting adjourned at 11:00 pm.

Ms. Smith-Meyer MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Regan SECONDED the motion. Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Victoria Parmele