

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
September 12, 2007**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Barnes called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 12, 2007, in the Community Development meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Barnes asked Ms. Stewart to lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

Chairman Barnes asked Mr. Russo to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: James Barnes, George Hall, Marilyn McGrath, Vincent Russo, Terry Stewart, Richard Maddox (Selectmen's Representative), and Suellen Quinlan (arrived at 7:11 p.m.).

Members

Absent: None.

Alternates

Present: William Cole, Brion Carroll, and Ken Massey (Selectmen's Representative Alternate).

Alternates

Absent: None.

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Barnes seated Mr. Carroll in place of the tardy Ms. Quinlan.

-- FILE COPY --

Mr. Russo asked if there were any patches under the roadway. Mr. Cashell said the patches had been in place for over a year.

Ms. McGrath asked if the Town Attorney were holding the \$25,000.00 check. Mr. Cashell answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Quinlan arrived at 7:11 p.m. and took her regular seat at the table at that time, although not yet recognized by the chairman.

Mr. Russo asked about the maintenance surety. Mr. Cashell said it would be about \$15,000.00.

Selectman Maddox moved to reduce the bond by \$105,000.00 with the remainder of \$14,600.00 for maintenance. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor except for Mr. Hall, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Barnes, who abstained. Chairman Barnes then declared the motion to have carried (5-1-1).

Selectman Maddox moved that the Planning Board require the developer to submit a roadway deed, conveying Constitution Drive and its appurtenances to the Town, and further, that this document be favorably reviewed by Town Counsel prior to the Board's favorable recommendation on this street acceptance being forwarded to the Board of Selectmen. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall asked when street acceptance would be recommended. Mr. Cashell said it would not come back to the Board until the maintenance bond had been released. Mr. Hall asked if the deed would be drafted and the road conveyed while the road was still under the maintenance agreement. Mr. Cashell answered in the affirmative.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

Selectman Massey said the Town had expended \$25,000 to do the work. He asked where the money would come from to pay for the work. Selectman Maddox said he would make a phone call tomorrow.

Mr. Hall noted that the agreement said the Town would not do the work until the \$25,000 was received. Mr. Cashell said the road had been built several years ago and should be accepted.

Chairman Barnes recognized Ms. Quinlan at this time and seated her in her regular position as a voting member of the Hudson Planning Board, with Mr. Carroll returning to his normal position as a non-voting alternate member of the Board.

Mr. Cashell referenced Atty. Leonard's letter noting that the letter talked about concept plans and stated that a new set of review plans would be submitted. Mr. Cashell said he was confused by that. Chairman Barnes confirmed that the process was in Design Review.

Atty. Leonard said the proposed traffic improvements would create two parallel road systems. He said one was the Lowell Road/Dracut Road corridor. He said the applicant was proposing an intersection at River Road, a by-pass, and an interchange. He said the idea was to split up the traffic. He discussed the two proposals for the interchange and all the other changes the Board had asked for. He said that the Board had asked Mr. Kennedy to review the interchange, acknowledging that there were not traffic numbers at this time because the uses had not been addressed. He said the uses would be discussed later in tonight's presentation.

He said Mr. Kennedy's letter spoke for itself, stating that the type of interchange proposed was used in other places. He said he thought Mr. Kennedy's letter indicated that the process should continue. Ms. Quinlan asked if Atty. Leonard's interpretation of Mr. Kennedy's letter were that the process should continue. Atty. Leonard said Mr. Kennedy said the interchange was a typical design and might work. Ms. Quinlan said Mr. Kennedy had said that the only information that had been submitted were two concept plans, with no traffic volume networks, and he could not draw any definitive conclusions. She said she did not believe that Mr. Kennedy was satisfied that the plan was okay, adding that she could not go forward without the information Mr. Kennedy was asking for. Atty. Leonard expressed agreement, noting that the first step had been to present a two-dimensional layout, asking Mr. Kennedy if anything jumped out at him. Atty. Leonard said that was not the case, in that Mr. Kennedy had said the design being proposed was typical. He said Mr. Kennedy could not say if it would work without traffic numbers. Atty. Leonard said a complete traffic analysis was too early in the process, however, and he suggested that the next thing he would do would be to meet with Mr. Kennedy and come up with a preliminary traffic analysis that satisfied Mr. Kennedy.

Atty. Leonard repeated that the process was in design review phase, adding that the process was in step 1 or 2 of a 10-step process. Ms. Quinlan said she appreciated what Atty. Leonard was saying, adding she felt the process was in a catch-22 situation. Atty. Leonard said he was trying to present a direction in which the applicant was heading.

Mr. Hall said the only thing the Board was reviewing was a subdivision. He said his main issue was the impact of the roads on the wetlands, not the number of lanes in the roads. Mr. Hall said it looked like there were still issues with the wetlands.

Mr. Carroll said the applicant had said the use would be built against the capacity of the roadway system. He said it would be nice to know what the road capacity was going to be, and then restrict the applicant to build to that capacity. Atty. Leonard said he stood by his statements of last week, adding that the applicant proposed to do exactly what Mr. Carroll was suggesting. He said the first step was to determine if the roadways were generally acceptable.

Atty. Leonard said the plans were relatively simple. He said the new interchange had addressed the problems with W/S Development's interchange. He said the business owners in the industrial park were very happy with the new plan. He said the

interchange took 1300 cars per hour out of the Lowell Road/Sagamore Bridge intersection. He then noted that the business owners were particularly interested in the direct access and egress from the bridge.

Atty. Leonard said he had addressed Mr. Hall's concerns relating to wetlands. He said the reconfigured interchange reduced the wetlands impact by 15 to 20 percent. He said he would ask the Board of Selectmen if it would support talks at the State level, adding that was part of the reason he was present at tonight's meeting. Addressing the Conservation Commission's request to move the interchange to the west, he noted that could not be done because of State highway weaving requirements. He said the interchange was in the best place that it could be located.

Atty. Leonard addressed the connector road, noting that the reverse curve in the road had been eliminated, which lessened the impact to the wetlands. He said that Vectron Drive had been moved a couple hundred feet to the north, so that the road was between two wetlands and the intersection was out of the wetlands. He discussed the realignment of Steele Farm Road, noting there would be less impact on the wetlands. He said he needed to give the Planning Board more information about the road, adding that how the road was constructed would determine the impact on the wetlands.

Atty. Leonard referenced questions about the River Road intersection and neighborhood roads to the east, noting that there was a tentative design to address that concern, with Mr. Hood (GPI) having gone out to that end of Town to do a traffic count. Atty. Leonard then turned the presentation over to Mr. Tony Basso, of Keach-Nordstrom Associates. Mr. Basso said GPI had been asked to study how traffic would go through neighborhoods in the area to get to the site. He reviewed GPI's findings, noting that it took anywhere from two to four minutes to travel through a neighborhood to the site. He said GPI had proposed NO THROUGH TRAFFIC signs effective during peak travel times, similar to the ones on Webster Street. He said the changes to the plan were key to the traffic study. He said the goal was to get to the point where the traffic study could be done; adding he thought the plan was getting to that point. He said the next step was to evaluate and put numbers to the roadway system. He said a further step would be the scoping to evaluate off-site intersections, adding that he wanted to make sure that everyone had the opportunity to give as much input as they could.

Atty. Leonard said the process was going step-by-step. He said part of the process was to discuss proposed uses. He posted the use plan and discussed the proposed uses for the site. He said all questions would not be answered at this time but that he thought it made sense. He said the life style center had been downsized and that there would be two large anchor stores. He noted that a continuing care retirement community was being proposed in the south end of the site, adding that people would move through that system. He said that Director Sullivan had indicated that a use of that type would be permitted in the G zone. He said that this proposed use was a transition use, offering a substantial buffer between residential use to the south and the retail us to the north. He said there was a blank area on the use plan that would hopefully be used for a hotel. He pointed out that there would be a 20-acre park along the Merrimac River, adding that there would be a 175,000-ft² office development area. Atty. Leonard said that all regulations could be met, noting for example that all parking

spaces would be ten feet by twenty feet with a 24-foot drive isle. Atty. Leonard then asked the Planning Board for questions about the plan.

Mr. Russo said there seemed to be some discrepancy with respect to the square footage of office area. Atty. Leonard said the total would be 175,000 ft². Mr. Russo said the total number of required parking spaces would be about 1400. Atty. Leonard said that the total square footage would be 175,000 ft², so the plan was probably correct.

Mr. Carroll said the old plan and the new plan were amazingly different, saying a lot of good work had gone into the new plan.

Atty. Leonard noted that everything had been moved away from the river and that a substantial area (exceeding 100 acres) would be deeded open space.

Ms. Quinlan said she was okay with the plan, saying she liked the transitional use, the office area, the lifestyle center, etc. She said the plan was a wonderful improvement over the old plan.

Mr. Hall said he would be looking for engineering comments regarding why the Sagamore Bridge Road eastbound off ramp could not be moved farther to the west, adding that he would want explanations from both the applicants' engineer and the Town's consultant. Atty. Leonard said that was something that needed to be looked at. Mr. Hall expressed dissatisfaction with VHB (Mr. Kennedy) not attending meetings. He said that the Town had sent a letter to W/S Development explaining that \$13,000 was due to VHB. He said he did not think the Town should be involved with that, adding that the applicant should take care of that. Atty. Leonard said he would try to take care of that situation. Atty. Leonard then said Mr. Kennedy had been prepared to be at the meeting, adding that he did not understand why Mr. Kennedy was not at the meeting. Mr. Hall said he was getting frustrated with Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Cashell said he was trying to get VHB paid. Atty. Leonard said the applicants had paid everything they had been asked to pay.

Selectman Maddox said progress was being made. He asked about the 90 acres of open space. Atty. Leonard said all regulations would be met, adding that there would be additional deeded open space that would exceed 100 acres. Selectman Maddox asked about the different number of acres that were being bantered around. Atty. Leonard said the Friels owned 375 acres but that other land owners were involved and that the roads themselves took up a considerable number of acres. Selectman Maddox asked about the number of units in the continuing care retirement community. Atty. Leonard said there would be at least 600 units, adding that most of the parking spaces would be used by employees. He said that GPI had done a similar project in Massachusetts.

Selectman Maddox said the future development area could be an additional one-half million feet of retail. He questioned the capacity. Atty. Leonard said the project would be influenced by the roadway capacity. Selectman Maddox said he had gone up to Concord, finding that the intersection said to be similar to the one proposed was mechanized madness. He said he thought the intersection needed more research. Atty. Leonard said that the intersection was a preferred type of intersection, but added that the intersection would be discussed.

Ms. McGrath asked if VHB (Mr. Kennedy) had stated a reason as to why they would not be at tonight's meeting. Mr. Cashell said it was all in the letter, adding that Mr. Kennedy did not have enough information and questioned who would pay him. He confirmed that VHB had not said that the reason they were not at tonight's meeting was because they had not been paid. Ms. McGrath expressed agreement with Mr. Hall regarding his frustration with Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Cashell said it was not VHB's fault for not being at tonight's meeting, but that it was his (Mr. Cashell's) fault. He said VHB did not have enough information. Mr. Cashell asked Atty. Leonard when the plans had been submitted—adding that, whenever they were submitted, it was after the deadline. Chairman Barnes said there needed to be guidelines so that VHB got input in time to review it, adding that the Board needed VHB to be at the meetings.

Ms. McGrath asked if the Board had the power to hire consultants. Chairman Barnes answered in the affirmative. Ms. McGrath said she was happy to see the proposed access to the Sam's Club site and was happy about the transitional use next to the abutters to the south. She suggested a medical use in the office area would be nice, adding that the applicant's team had generally done a good job.

Atty. Leonard said the applicant had reached out to St. Joseph's Hospital and Southern New Hampshire for medical-type uses. In addition to servicing the site, he said, the interchange now serviced the industrial park and was not inconsistent with the idea of a Circumferential Highway. He referenced the plan and described traffic flow into and out of the site, industrial park, etc.

Chairman Barnes declared a break at 9:05 p.m., calling the meeting back to order at 9:19 p.m.

Mr. Hall said the Planning Board had asked VHB to look at the drawings that had been presented at the last meeting, noting that Mr. Kennedy had had the drawings for over a month. He said the Board wanted Mr. Kennedy to attend the meetings so that Board members could ask him questions regarding the applicant's presentations. He noted that the letter was addressed to Director Sullivan, not Chairman Barnes, adding that perhaps Mr. Kennedy did not know who he was working for. If Mr. Kennedy could not make it to the next meeting the Board invited him to attend, Mr. Hall continued, he would be looking for a new consultant.

Ms. Quinlan noted that there were other items on the agenda, asking where the Board was going to go.

If VHB were not here because of payment of funds, Mr. Carroll said, they should so say.

Selectman Maddox moved to have staff send a request to the applicant requesting an initial \$15,000.00 to fund Consultant Reviews. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Mr. Cole stated that VHB had been hired by the Board of Selectmen to be a Town resource for Green Meadow items. He cautioned the Board to be careful about setting up funds. Mr. Hall said he had made a motion stating that VHB would represent the Planning Board.

Ms. McGrath stepped down to avoid a possible perception of conflict of interest, as she was an abutter. Chairman Barnes appointed Mr. Carroll to sit in Ms. McGrath's place.

Mr. Cashell referenced a letter from the Fire Department, noting that the letter addressed the issue of the structure being constructed of wood instead of steel.

Mr. Tony Basso, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appearing before the Board as the engineering representative of the property owner, distributed copies of the plans to the members of the Planning Board.

Mr. Basso discussed the details of the plan, noting that he had provided a color rendering of the buildings. He discussed changes to the plan in response to the Planning Board's concerns, noting that CLD had not yet responded to the final plan.

Ms. Stewart referenced Note 19 on Sheet 1, noting that there would be trash pickup but no dumpsters were shown on the site. Mr. Basso said that was a standard note. Mr. Cresta, the owner, said there would not be a dumpster on the site. He said the only trash would be paper from the office. Ms. Stewart asked how items that were recovered as a result of rent not being paid on a unit would be disposed. Mr. Basso said it was disposed of by hiring someone to come on site and empty the unit.

Selectman Maddox asked about the construction office. Mr. Cresta, the property owner, said the office had been used as a construction office but would be used as the storage facility office once the plan was implemented.

Selectman Maddox asked about fire truck access and the second access, noting there was no waiver requested for the second driveway. Mr. Basso said the lanes were typically 24-feet wide. He said his understanding of the second driveway waiver was that it was for residential plans, not commercial plans. He said the second driveway would not be used by patrons, adding that it would be used for emergency vehicles.

Selectman Maddox said there would be a huge development in the south end of Hudson, and the Planning Board should push for fewer curb cuts. Mr. Basso said access to the road was State-controlled. He said the Planning Board would get a chance to look at it for any future change of use.

Ms. Quinlan said Mr. Basso was correct, saying that Heidi Marshall, the CLD consultant engineer, always said that the second driveway waiver was for residential uses. She said that the proposed use would be low impact.

Ms. McGrath asked that public input be allowed.

Mr. Hall said Mr. Basso must have been asked about the Planning Board's concern about the waiver. He asked Mr. Cashell if applicants were informed that all requests for waivers must be justified.

Mr. Basso referenced two projects on Constitution Drive, adding they both had two accesses. He said the waiver was discussed at that time. If the Board wanted a request for a waiver, he said, that would be okay, but he was going on what had happened in the past.

Mr. Hall restated his question regarding waiver justification. Mr. Cashell said that was part of the application. Mr. Hall then suggested that Mr. Cashell had not made the applicants aware of the need to justify waiver requests, as a new requirement. He said he would not grant waivers unless all criteria were met. Mr. Cashell said the applicant should be responsible for proper trash handling.

Chairman Barnes said the Supreme Court decision pertaining to requiring justification for waivers was issued on August 23, 2007, but the letter from Town Counsel was received on August 24, 2007, adding that this application had already been in place. Mr. Hall said he disagreed with the interpretation.

Atty. J. Bradford Westgate, the applicant's legal representative, said he was aware of the law, saying he would address the law as well as a couple of other issues. He said the Planning Board's past practice was that no permit was needed for commercial site plan approvals, so a waiver would not be needed for commercial sites. He said Mr. Basso could justify each waiver request with regard to the hardship requirement, but that a dumpster did not make sense in this case. Chairman Barnes said he thought the hardship justification had to be made in writing. Mr. Hall said it was new ground, adding that the Planning Board had to be given justification for waivers. Ms. Quinlan referenced the Supreme Court decision regarding justification of waivers, arguing that this case did not apply since the lots were on a State highway. Mr. Carroll expressed the belief that there were due process issues to consider; and he suggested that the Planning Board should require hardship definitions from now on.

Chairman Barnes opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor or opposition.

Ms. McGrath, 81 River Road, said she was concerned about light streaming onto her property at night and the safety of the second driveway. She asked the Board to consider additional screening, additional lighting, no trash removal on the site, and statistics from the police department regarding criminal activity in the area.

Atty. Westgate referenced the sight distance requirement. He said the property owners had granted reciprocal sight-distance easements.

Mr. Basso said the plan showed extensive landscaping along River Road and along the side. He said there was a site lighting plan that showed no spillover, adding that the site would be gated and secured.

Mr. Cole asked what "sight distance easements" meant. Atty. Westgate said it gave each property owner the right to clear the abutter's property to comply with the 400-foot sight distance requirement.

Mr. Russo asked about the road sign. Mr. Basso referenced Sheet 11 of 15. Mr. Russo asked if the sign would be illuminated. Mr. Basso said it would be internally illuminated. Mr. Russo asked if the sign would be on all night. Mr. Cresta said it would only be on during business hours. Mr. Russo asked if that could be put in a stipulation. Mr. Basso said that would not be a problem.

Mr. Cresta said he had never used the existing lot as an exit. He said a State person had told him that a permit would be required if he were to do any excavating. He said the trees out front had been removed by PSNH.

Chairman Barnes said he would ask for a motion to defer this case if the Board were not ready to approve waivers.

Ms. Quinlan moved to approve the following waivers:

HTC 275-8B (26) (g)	Parking Requirement
HTC 275-8.B (30)	Loading
HTC 275-8.B (31)	Parking Lot Landscaping
HTC 275-9.D	Fiscal Impact Study
HTC 275-9.C	Noise Study
HTC 275-9.H	HISS Study
HTC 193-10.G	Driveways

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall said he would vote against the motion, adding that he did not know if the applicant had provided sufficient justification for the waivers.

Mr. Russo asked about the parking lot landscaping waiver. Mr. Basso said there would not be any internal parking lot islands, adding that the landscaping would be around the perimeter of the parking lot.

Mr. Russo asked about the HISS mapping waiver. Mr. Basso said that was a tool for residential lot sizing and did not apply in this case.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a hand vote on the motion. All members voted in favor except for Mr. Hall and Selectman Maddox, who both voted in opposition and Chairman Barnes, who abstained. Chairman Barnes then declared the motion to have carried (4-2-1).

Ms. Quinlan moved to approve the Site Plan entitled ***Non-Residential Site Plan Advantage Self Storage Map 251; Lots 12 & 13, 84 River Road, Hudson, NH***, prepared by Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., dated May 30, 2007, revised through August 31, 2007, consisting of Sheets 1 through 15 and Notes 1 through 27, in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

1. The rendering Plan-of-Record is entitled: 84 River Rd., Hudson, NH, consisting of Sheets A-4 and A-7 and dated June 19, 2007.
2. All stipulations of approval shall be incorporated into the Development Agreement, which shall be recorded at the HCRD, together with the plan.
3. The applicant shall prepare a Sight Distance Easement Deed (said easement is shown on the above-cited plan) for the benefit of property owned n/f by Doris Ducharme, 76 River Road, Map 251/Lot 011. This document shall be favorably reviewed by Town Counsel prior to its recording at the HCRD.

4. All improvements shown on the Site Plan-of-Record, including Notes 1 through 27, shown on Sheet 1 of 15 (Master Site Plan) shall be completed in their entirety and at the expense of the applicant or his assigns.
5. A cost allocation procedure (CAP) amount of \$5,968.75 shall be paid prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. Prior to the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, an LLS-certified "As Built" site plan shall be provided to the Town of Hudson Community Development Department, confirming that the site conforms with the Planning Board approved site plan.
7. Maintenance of the onsite drainage system shall be constructed and maintained in compliance with NHDES requirements for such systems.
8. This plan shall be subject to final engineering review and approval to determine constructability, prior to plan recording.
9. The illumination of signage shall be only during the hours of operation, from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

Mr. Russo said 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. seemed bad for the weekends. Ms. Quinlan said this was a really low impact, saying she was comfortable with the hours of operation.

Mr. Russo said it was not unusual for small businesses to rent units in such sites, saying he wanted to amend the motion to read 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. on weekends, and he so moved. No second was brought forward on that amendment motion, and Chairman Barnes declared the amendment motion to have died.

Ms. Quinlan questioned fixing the hours of operation, contending that the gate would be open 24 hours a day for card-carrying customers. Mr. Cresta demurred, saying there was software to control that.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor except for Mr. Hall and Selectman Maddox, who voted in opposition. Chairman Barnes then declared the motion to have carried (5-2).

Ms. McGrath returned to her regular position as a voting member of the Hudson Planning Board, with Mr. Carroll returning to his normal position as a non-voting member of the Board.

X. ZBA UNPUT ONLY

- A. **PSNH – Z-119, Transmission Line Construction, Map/Lot 100-3, 105-6, 115-2, 114-3, 122-2, 140-40, ZI#08-07, Request for ZBA input for Special Exception (wetlands)**

Purpose of plan: Transmission line construction to meet the needs of higher energy demands in southern New Hampshire. Z-119 transmission line to be constructed within footprint of X-116 line, which was recently removed.

Chairman Barnes read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Mr. Hutton Snow, of PSNH, said PSNH proposed to build an 11-mile line through Hudson, with one pole in a wetlands area.

Mr. Dan Rubekowski described the location of the proposed power line, reiterating that one pole would be installed in a wetlands area. He said the total impact to the wetlands would be approximately 90 ft². He said temporary impact on the wetlands would be approximately 1,086 ft². He said all impacts to the wetlands area would be temporary, with the area being restored to pre-existing conditions. He showed all wetlands areas that would be impacted.

Selectman Maddox asked if Mr. Snow had provided the substation lighting plan as had been requested. Mr. Snow answered in the affirmative.

Selectman Maddox asked how the existing poles had been removed. Mr. Snow said a lot of the work was done by hand and that a helicopter was used to remove the poles.

Mr. Russo moved to forward input to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, citing that the Planning Board had no outstanding concerns regarding the replacing of the previously removed transmission Line X-116 with the proposed Line Z-119, provided PSNH complied with the terms and conditions cited in the Conservation Commission's favorable decision on this petition, and that the Plan of Record shall be as follows:

Plan entitled: ***Wetland Area HW-2 X-119 Transmission Line Construction Project Public Service of New Hampshire, Hudson, NH***, prepared by Tighe & Bond Consulting Engineers, Westfield, MA, dated: August 2007 (no revisions), consisting of Sheets 1 through 7, which are enumerated as follows: Wetland Area HW-2, Wetland Area HW-4, Wetland Area HW-5, Wetland Area HW-6 & HW-7, Wetland Area HW-8 & HW-9, Wetland Area HW-9 and Wetland Area HW-12.

Selectman Maddox seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

XI. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

Chairman Barnes noted that there were no **Conceptual Review Only** items to discuss at tonight's meeting.

XII. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Barnes noted that there were no **New Business/Public** hearings items to discuss at tonight's meeting.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Discussion on Municipal Planning, re: Parking and Vehicle Queuing Requirements for Eating and Drinking Establishments Section 275-8(26)(c) of the Planning Board Site Plan Review Regulations.

Chairman Barnes referenced the handout that Town Planner Cashell had provided with respect to parking and vehicle queuing requirements.

Mr. Carroll said he did not see the difference with regard to fast food establishments. Mr. Cashell said it was its own separate category.

Mr. Cashell asked if the Board wanted to stay with "eating and drinking establishments" rather than "restaurants." Selectman Maddox said the Board needed to look at the definitions.

Ms. McGrath moved to defer this item date specific to the October 3, 2007, Planning Board meeting. Selectman Maddox seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

B. Green Meadow

Selectman Massey suggested that in the future Green Meadow should be the only item on the agenda on nights it was to be discussed, with a discussion of Green Meadow being the only item on the agenda. Selectman Maddox suggested that Green Meadow's time be limited to not going beyond the break. Mr. Carroll said the Board had to be clear as to what it wanted Green Meadow to do in preparation for a meeting.

Mr. Russo moved to defer this item date specific to the October 3, 2007, Planning Board meeting. Ms. Quinlan seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

-- FILE COPY --

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been addressed, Selectman Maddox made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Quinlan seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor.

Chairman Barnes then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Date: October 08, 2007

James Barnes, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Marilyn McGrath, Secretary

Transcribed by:
Joseph F. Hemingway and J. Bradford Seabury

-- FILE COPY --

The following changes were made to the draft copy in accordance with review comments at the Planning Board meeting of 12-05-07:

Page 1, last line — the word “in” was inserted ahead of “place,” so that the phrase now reads “in place of.”

Page 2, 2nd paragraph under Correspondence, 2nd line — substituted “objection” for “exception.”

Page 10, 7th paragraph, 3rd line — changed the word “driver” to “driveway.”

Page 14 — the 5th and 6th two-sentence paragraphs were noted to be the same, except that one word had been changed. The 6th paragraph was deleted, as redundant.