

ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL

Present: Dennis Lentz - Chairman, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Ed Cieleszko, Christine Bennett.

Absent: Melissa Horner – Alternate (excused).

Voting members: Dennis Lentz, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Ed Cieleszko, and Christine Bennett.

ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE

ITEM 4 – 10-MINUTE PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

There was no public input.

ITEM 5 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES

Mr. Bouchard moved, second by Mr. Whalen, to approve the minutes of February 20, 2018, as amended.

VOTE

5-0

Chair concurs

ITEM 6 - PUBLIC HEARING(S)

A. Julie Lane (Map37/Lot 3) PB18-1: Request for Planning Board Action – Change of use to establish a truck terminal and storage operation. Property is located in the Commercial/Industrial Zoning District. *Public Hearing Notice publication date: 03/09/2018.*

1. Letter from L. Chamberlain of Attar Engineering dated 03/16/2018
2. Sheet 1 of 2: Site Plan Amendment prepared by Attar Engineering Inc. dated 01/12/2018, revised through 03/06/2018.
3. Sheet 2 of 2: Site Details prepared by Attar Engineering, Inc. dated 03/06/2018.

Received: January 22, 2018

1st Heard: February 20, 2018

Public Hearing: March 20, 2018

2nd Hearing: March 20, 2018

Site Walk: N/A

Approval: March 20, 2018

Mr. Chamberlain, Attar Engineering, and Mr. Cresta, applicant, were present for this application.

7:06 PM Public Hearing opened.

Ms. (Rosanne) Adams asked about the storage of cars at this property.

Mr. Chamberlain said that they operate a towing and recovery business and will tow wrecked vehicles and store them temporarily, on-site, in the gravel yard that's shown on the plan; that he believes their proposal is to not have any particular vehicle there for longer than 60 days.

Mr. (Bob) Fisher, Frost Hill Road, commented that there was storage of vehicles at the old location for much longer than 60 days and discussed his concern for that continuing at the new location.

Mr. Cresta explained that the owner of that property owns a construction company and most of the stuff there does not belong to National Wrecker Service. He added that we need to get rid of the vehicles as quickly as possible because he doesn't want them there; that he isn't a junk yard and he doesn't want to be a junk yard; that he doesn't want to contaminate any brooks and that's why we try to move as quick as we can.

Mr. Lentz asked the Planner if there was a condition of approval that would come into play, here.

Ms. Cole-Prescott said that, regarding the number of days vehicles could be stored, she wasn't 100% sure; that she would be happy to research for the PB and report back at the next meeting.

Mr. Cieleuszko discussed his concern that the applicant has fleet trucks that will be there as part of the applicant's operation and we don't want to mix up storage of abandoned and wrecked vehicles with the fleet vehicles; that we have to be very careful about putting limitations on like that.

Ms. (Lisa) Graichen, Conservation Commission, said that she wanted to echo that the PB make sure there are no impacts to the surrounding water body and that that's taken into account.

7:11 PM Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Lewis said that he did respond to the concern about stormwater; that we've revised the plans, proposing to regrade the gravel yard to better contain the water on-site and pitch it to a deep-sump catch basin that will be equipped with a hooded inlet that will trap hydrocarbons and floatables so that they don't come out onto the buffer; that, then, that will have a pipe coming out to a level spreader and, then, about a 100-foot upland buffer between the outlet point, the level spreader, and the edge of the wetland. He

added that we have added some details for erosion and sedimentation control and, then, maintenance of that structure; that we are proposing to inspect it quarterly and pump it out at least once a year.

Mr. Cieleszko asked if the floor of the upland area was the level spreader.

Mr. Chamberlain clarified that it is a kind of depressed area that will be lined with riprap and, then, the riprap will transition into the existing grade. He added that the collection of contaminants will happen back at the structure and, then, once the water comes out of the structure into the hood, it will enter a pipe that will lead out to the level spreader. He added that, basically, it's a water/oil separator, with water coming out below. He said that there is no alarm for this.

Mr. Bouchard asked, on average, how long a car would sit on the lot that you tow in.

Mr. Cresta said 45 to 60 days. He added that if we have to go through the State statute to either get the title for the vehicle, if the people don't claim them, or the insurance company takes a while to come pick them up.

Mr. Bouchard asked the applicant if he has any vehicles on his lot, now, that have been there for six months.

Mr. Cresta said that the only reason we have something like that is if a vehicle gets impounded from a fatal accident, or something of that nature, then we might have to impound it a little bit longer; that that doesn't happen very often, at all, and is to protect the PD's we work for and the consumer of the vehicle. He added that 60 days is the limit for storing either wrecked or unregistered vehicles.

Mr. Lentz said that he believes the applicant has answered the stormwater issue with the new design.

Mr. Cieleszko asked, regarding the structure that will have the separator, if there was any power going to that building, to that structure.

Mr. Cresta said no.

Mr. Cieleszko said that it would be nice to see an 'oil minder' in there that alarm for water contaminants but it needs power to run it.

Mr. Chamberlain said that, typically, you will see stormwater infrastructure with those types of things and, with the inspection we've proposed, we feel it's going to...

Mr. Cieleszko asked if that was the industry standard.

Mr. Chamberlain said yes.

Mr. Lentz said that the new limits of the asphalt have been added on Sheet 1.

Mr. Whalen said, regarding Note 7 – sign location, he didn't see anything on the plan that reflects any existing signage or proposed, asking if that was a future consideration.

Mr. Chamberlain said that that was what the intent of the note was, just to make sure that the proper procedure is followed if they want to get a sign, which they understand from the last meeting that that's a process through the CEO.

Fire Department comments were to maintain the current knox box and fire alarm system. There was no comment regarding access around the building.

Ms. Bennett asked if there was going to be a septic system on this property.

Mr. Chamberlain said yes, there is one right now; that that is pointed out on the plan – right in the back. He added that we actually provided the design for that with the original application.

Mr. Bouchard moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board approve PB18-1, as presented, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The property may be developed and used only in accordance with the plans, documents, material submitted, and representations of the applicant made to the Planning Board. All elements and features of the use as presented to the Planning Board are conditions of approval and no changes in any of those elements or features are permitted unless such changes are first submitted to and approved by the Eliot Planning Board.
2. The permit is approved on the basis of information provided by the applicant in the record regarding the ownership of the property and boundary location. The applicant has the burden of ensuring that they have the legal right to use the property and that they are measuring required setbacks from the legal boundary lines of the lot. The approval of this permit in no way relieves the applicant of this burden. Nor does this permit approval constitute a resolution in favor of the applicant of any issues regarding the property boundaries, ownership, or similar title issues. The permit holder would be well-advised to resolve any such title problems before expending money in reliance on this permit.
3. The applicant authorizes inspection of premises by the Code Enforcement Officer during the term of the permit for the purposes of permit compliance.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Whalen said that he wanted to make certain that the comments by the Fire Chief get attached to that.

Mr. Lentz said that they are part of the packet.

Ms. Cole-Prescott asked if the PB would like her to bring back any information on the storage of vehicles, as asked earlier.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought, for the PB, that would be interesting, even if it doesn't totally apply to this.

Ms. Cole-Prescott agreed. She said that waste containers in §45-422 may be a condition – that the dumpster waste container follows that ordinance requirement, even though it's under zoning.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought that had been added to the sheet.

Ms. Cole-Prescott said that it's on the plan; that this was just a suggested condition to comply with that ordinance.

Mr. Cieleszko said that he thought they had to comply with the ordinance.

The PB agreed.

Ms. Bennett said that she wondered if we could make a condition of approval to ratify the schedule the applicant delineated – the quarterly inspection and annual pumping of the waste oil separator.

Mr. Chamberlain said that that is on the plan; that that is on Sheet 2.

DISCUSSION ENDED

VOTE

5-0

Chair votes in the affirmative

Mr. Lentz said that the application stands approved and there is a 30-day period from which the PB decision can be appealed by an aggrieved person or parties – move forward but move forward cautiously.

ITEM 6 – REVIEW “NOTICE OF DECISION” LETTERS

A. 40 Caslyn Drive (Map 16/Lot 12) PB17-18 *approved with conditions at 02/20/2018 PB meeting*

Mr. Whalen asked if, under Decision #10, there was reference in either our discussion or in the motion that also indicated that the verbiage was changed to ‘uses similar to those not listed’.

Ms. Bennett said that she believes there was in the minutes we just approved; that there was a conversation that we do not have a definition of a storage unit but we have a

definition of a warehouse. She added that, in order not to err on either side, we decided to use this.

Mr. Lentz agreed.

Ms. Lemire confirmed that that discussion and agreement is in the minutes of February 20, 2018.

Ms. Bennett suggested adding the Book and Page numbers for the most current deed so that we have a good chain of title within our land use record.

It was agreed that this would be added.

Mr. Cielszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board accept the Notice of Decision PB17-18, as amended.

VOTE

5-0

Chair votes in the affirmative

B. 25 Rogers Point Drive (Map 32/Lot 1) PB17-26 *approved with standard conditions at 02/20/2018 PB meeting*

Mr. Bouchard moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board approve the Notice of Decision PB17-26, as written.

VOTE

5-0

Chair votes in the affirmative

ITEM 7- PUBLIC APPLICATIONS OR PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED

D. Application for a Shoreland Zoning Permit and a Request for Planning Board Action – Resubmission of Site Plan Application – Expansion to Non-Conforming Structure. Property is located at 21 Foxbrush Drive (Map 50/Lot 19) and is located in the Suburban Zoning District and Limited Residential Shoreland Zoning District. Applicant/Owner is 11 Crowley Street, LLC (mailing address: PO Box 1037, Dover, NH 03821-1037). Agent for 11 Crowley Street, LLC is Tidewater Engineering & Surveying, PLLC (mailing address: 89 Route 236, Suite 3, Kittery, Maine 03904). (PB18-2)

Received: January 22, 2018

1st Heard: February 20, 2018

Public Hearing: _____, 2018

2nd Hearing: March 20, 2018

Site Walk: March 20, 2018

Approval: _____, 2018

Mr. (Ryan) McCarthy, Tidewater Engineering, and Ms. (Elizabeth) Fisher (Crowley Street LLC) were present for this application.

A site walk was done.

Mr. McCarthy said that this is for relocation of an existing structure that's within 75 feet of the Piscataqua River; therefore, we are required to meet §44-34 (c) for expansion of that structure; that expansion is limited to 30% in area and in volume based on the existing structure's area and volume; that, based on their calculations, the proposed expansion meets that 30% rule. He added that because we're in the Shoreland Zone and this is a very small lot we are also sensitive to lot coverage calculations for both the Shoreland Zone and the Suburban Zone, ensuring compliance with that, as well. He said that we resubmitted the application showing just the one option; that all the information in the PB packets should be revised accordingly and we are happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if there had been any additions onto the existing structure because it looks like things have been added onto it; also, has that been taken into account with the 30%.

Mr. McCarthy said that we did look into that and, as far as we could tell, the existing structure is, currently, how it's always been; that we couldn't find the answer to when the deck was done, which is on the front side away from the water; that we went through the records, the CEO files, and couldn't find a set date on that. He added that we do think it happened some time between 1987 and 1990, right around the time when your shoreland regulations went into effect. He said that, after some discussion, we decided to exclude the deck from the calculations, do the calculations based on the existing structure without the deck, and do the 30% from there. He said that the calculations on the left side of the plan show both that and take that into account; that we made sure we addressed that.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if he had pulled it back around 4 to 6 feet off its original line.

Mr. McCarthy said yes.

Mr. Whalen asked Mr. McCarthy to review those calculations for the PB.

Mr. McCarthy reviewed the calculations:

- Existing conditions calculations:
 - 638 square feet – basement
 - 669 square feet – first floor
 - 166 square feet – existing patio
 - 345 square feet – existing deck (*unknown construction date, excluded from calculations)
 - Total existing area of structure, including deck – 1,818 square feet
 - Total existing area of structure, excluding deck – 1,473 square feet

He said that we took the 1,473 square feet and timed that by 30%, which gave us 442 square feet by which to expand the area; that if we did it by the 1,818 square feet, we would have a much higher amount. He added that the 442 square feet was added to the total existing area (1818 sq ft) and that had a total of 2,260 square feet for a proposed scenario of what we could have for the building structure's area. He said that the deck doesn't come into play with volume, only area.

- Existing volume calculations:
 - 11,702 square feet – structure, additions, entryway
 - 30% increase – 3,510 cubic feet
 - Total allowable (proposed) – 15,212 cubic feet

He said that, with the proposed conditions calculations column, he gave them the total proposed area and compared that with gross total area, and the same thing with the volume. He added that, with the area calculation, we still have 670 square feet available; that we are maxing out the volume a lot quicker; that with the volume, we are only under by 11 cubic feet.

Mr. Whalen asked, on the information sheet, how he got a #18 item (application) to the 2,497 square feet. He asked where the extra square footage came from to bump that up to 2,497 square feet.

Mr. McCarthy said that that's a different calculation; that that is the lot coverage calculation versus the area and, in looking at the plan, realized it should be 2,500 in the application, not 2,497. He added that that includes the house footprint, the deck, patio, and the gravel driveway.

Ms. Bennett asked Mr. McCarthy to describe the existing and proposed driveway condition and proposed changes in coverage.

Mr. McCarthy said that the existing gravel driveway is a lot larger than what we're proposing so we are reducing the amount of gravel surface; that when you were at the site this afternoon, a lot of that gravel surface was still covered by snow – off to the left-hand side in front of the deck; that a lot of that area is going to be removed. Pointing to the plan, he described the areas being removed and, by taking those surfaces away, we can meet the lot coverage calculations and apply those towards the building.

Ms. Bennett asked if there were any other configurations of the driveway that would allow that building to move further away from the river.

Mr. McCarthy said that we looked at that quite a bit, trying very hard to move it back as far as we could; that the reason we can't push it any further is, with this front addition, if you come in and park straight on, if 'this' was moved all the way up to that (orange line), when you backed up you would be backing up and turning around on the other property. He explained that we look at standard turning templates and radiuses to make

sure we have adequate space for turning around; that that's actually tight, to begin with, and that represents a car versus a large pick-up truck.

Mr. Lentz asked if the turn-around driveway will remain gravel.

Mr. McCarthy said yes.

Mr. Lentz said that there were a couple of waivers requested – perimeter survey and high intensity soils report, asking how the PB would like to handle those. He asked Mr. McCarthy why we would not want a perimeter survey.

Mr. McCarthy said that we are showing the boundary lines on the site plan so we didn't want to create a separate plan just as a boundary survey; that we feel very confident with the lines we are showing; that every corner is well-marked in the field with pins, as well, so we don't feel that doing a separate plan as a boundary survey is necessary for this.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if Mr. McCarthy's plan was certified by a surveyor.

Mr. McCarthy said, this plan, he is going to stamp off with his engineering stamp; that he's also a licensed surveyor. He added that, typically with a boundary survey, he is going to create a separate plan that only shows the lots and then stamp with his survey stamp.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the work was done for the perimeter survey and overlaid on the site plan.

Mr. McCarthy said yes.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if he was still bound by what he has there in the event of an error.

Mr. McCarthy said that, as a practicing engineer, if he goes forward and does this type of work that are this close to the setbacks, and he doesn't do the work and make sure he is confident of the boundary, that could be considered negligence on his part; that, with that said, he is confident in what we show 'here'.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if this gives Mr. McCarthy just as much liability as if he had a separate survey with just a boundary survey.

Mr. McCarthy said that it could, yes; that the difference is that boundary surveys are more detailed to give the bearings and distances going to each individual corner.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he might be in the minority but he thinks it's fairly important for this lot to have a boundary survey.

Ms. Bennett said that she would support the contention that this be a recordable, or at least a defensible, survey; that she is looking at the deed, which just calls along land

hubs. She said that he put on his plan that he found iron posts, and perhaps the code doesn't require this, but she thinks it would behoove the applicant to firmly determine exactly where the boundaries are because it is a very small lot; that he wouldn't be negligent but, at the same time, it could flow down to abutting neighbors and/or heirs.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that the ordinance does require it; that he is asking for it to be waived.

Mr. McCarthy said that we've done all the legwork, research, and field work to do it; that it's just we are trying to keep the cost down for the applicant as well as to keep it simplified for the PB.

Mr. Whalen said that we have had discussions at the Board level over the past several months regarding documentation in our files and reference to prior approved applications; that once the files are vetted we discover, all too often, that an existing plan, didn't, or couldn't be found and/or the applicant, moving forward, has not utilized an existing plan either recorded or a sketch plan that happens to be in the file. He added that the PB, of recent, has wanted to upgrade the requirement that is a stipulation in the ordinance, anyway; that he thinks, moving forward, the PB's position has been that that base survey plan be the foundation of everything that occurs from that point, forward. He said that he would think, again, from the PB's perspective, the department's perspective, and the applicant's perspective that we continue with that consistency of documentation; that he would support that this document be included.

Mr. Lentz agreed, saying that that lot is so small for what the applicant is trying to do that he thinks it's critical.

Mr. Bouchard said that what he's heard from the PB and hearing the reason is due to cost and the work is already done, he would not be in favor of waiving §33-127 (4).

Mr. Cieleuszko said that, regarding the high intensity soils report, he would support waiving that.

Mr. Whalen said that the other request that has been part of the approval process of late is that a post 'as-built' plan be filed with the department once the project is completed.

Mr. McCarthy said that we don't have an objection if the PB would elect to go that route; that we don't have an objection to providing a boundary survey and we can certainly do that; that he would just request that if you could make it a condition that we provide that for the next meeting so that it doesn't affect your vote in determining this application complete.

The PB agreed that they could do that.

Mr. Whalen moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the request for waiver of §33-127 (4), Perimeter Survey, be denied.

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is denied

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board grant the waiver request for §33-127 (12), High Intensity Soils Report.

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Mr. Bouchard, that the Planning Board grant waivers requested that are marked N/A in the application.

VOTE

5-0

Waivers are granted.

NOTE: N/A requests waived to be listed in the Notice of Decision.

Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleuszko, that the Planning Board accept the application PB18-2 as complete with the perimeter survey to be supplied by the cut-off date for the next meeting.

VOTE

5-0

Application is accepted as complete.

The Public Hearing is scheduled for April 17, 2018. Deadline for submission is April 3, 2018.

E. Shoreland Zoning Permit Application – Existing 2-story dwelling to be moved 27' away from the HAT line of the Piscataqua River; single-story addition and dormer to be added to existing dwelling; various portions of existing dwelling to be removed; installation of septic system to serve two (2) dwellings located at 52 Wisteria Lane (Map 9/Lot 15). Applicants are Jennifer Scism and David Koorits (mailing address: 484 US Route 1, Kittery, Maine 03904). Owner is the Estate of Donald A. Pike and co-owner is Peter Macy, Esq. (mailing address: 1 Elm Street, Suite 1C, Andover, MA 01810). Property is located in the Village Zoning District and Limited Residential Shoreland Zoning District. (PB18-3)

Received: January 22, 2018

1st Heard: February 20, 2018

Public Hearing: _____, 2018

2nd Hearing: March 20, 2018

Site Walk: March 20, 2018

Approval: _____, 2018

The applicants, Jennifer Scism and David Koorits, were present for this application.

A site walk was done.

Mr. Lentz said that there are several additional documents for this application.

Mr. Koorits said that there are two existing structures, one of which will be the primary residence; that the entire structure is within the 75-foot setback of the HAT line, with the closest section being 21 feet. He added that the proposal is to move the primary structure back and add an addition; that it is less than the allowable 30% expansion. He explained that there were several reasons for not moving the structure back further; that the ROW driveway would then come straight into the building, as there is a pretty good decline on that driveway, coming down, so we are just worried about any snowy conditions and any damage to the building; also, enough room to come in and turn vehicles as well as a future area for a garage; that, additionally, with the proposed septic system and leach field, we want to keep the structure away from that, and the well, as well.

Ms. Bennett apologized for being unable to attend the site walk, asking if the applicant could further explain why the structure could not be moved further away.

Pointing to the site plan, Mr. Koorits explained that it really has to do with the drive; that there's quite a bit of a hill coming down and the structure would be 'right here', so, any further back would be a direct line for the driveway coming down. He added that there is a lot of traffic from people coming down and turning around; that because it is a ROW, we can't move where the driveway is, either. He said that, if we move the structure back, we'd have to cut a lot more trees and it would be closer to the septic system and the well.

Mr. Bouchard asked if all the calculations were correct.

Ms. Scism said that they are; that we sat with the CEO and the Planner to correct them.

The Planner said that she had also asked the CEO to look at the file and was able to on Friday; that Mr. Amsden came down with some revised calculations on Monday showing the 30% expansion below the 75-foot setback line; that that is what the calculations are based from.

Mr. Bouchard asked if the existing bungalow (shack) was going to stay 'as is'.

Ms. Scism said that we are going to keep it 'as is' for now.

Mr. Bouchard asked about the proposed septic system design.

Mr. Koorits said that we are adding that just in case; that we are having the workmen go in there with an excavator and we don't want them going over the property in the future.

Mr. Bouchard said that he saw no issues with this application.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (8).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (9).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (10).

DISCUSSION

Ms. Bennett discussed her concern as it states there are no natural features or site elements preserved in the rationale.

Ms. Scism said that we aren't moving any rock walls or anything like that; that we may take a tree down here or there.

Mr. Lentz said that there is nothing there but trees and we talked about this.

The Planner said that she has spoken with the applicants about possibly replacing some of those trees; that we will look at the ordinances before the next step for them as to what trees may need to be replaced.

Ms. Scism said that we already met with Mr. (Mike) Lee regarding this; that she just wants to get some lower trees in; that right now the trees are about 75 feet and we would like to get trees that belong there but not that tall.

DISCUSSION ENDED

VOTE

4-1 (Bennett)

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (12).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (13).

DISCUSSION

Mr. Bouchard asked if nothing was existing on the property; no water mains, no sewer, etc.

The applicants said that there was not.

DISCUSSION ENDED

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (17).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (18)(c).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (18)(d).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (18)(e).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Whalen, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (18)(f).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Mr. Bouchard, that the Planning Board waive §33-127 (18)(h).

VOTE

5-0

Waiver is granted.

Mr. Whalen moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board accept this application as complete

VOTE

5-0

Motion is approved.

A Public Hearing is scheduled for April 17, 2018.

ITEM 8 – DISCUSS STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS

There was no discussion.

ITEM 9 – CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence

ITEM 10 – UPDATES FROM TOWN PLANNER

A. Submission Deadlines Update

The Planner said that we have been informing our applicants that submission deadlines will be sooner than previously; that of the people most she is aware of coming through, or who have inquired, know that the deadline for the April 17th meeting is April 3rd. She added that, going forward, she anticipates packet delivery for your April 3rd workshop meeting to be March 27th. She said that, with submission deadlines, she would like to start posting the full packet online; that it is common practice in other municipalities and will give the public ample time to review the information before the meeting. She added that, if that sounds appropriate for the PB, she will begin that for the next packet delivery; that we'll just post the whole thing online, with the agenda.

The PB agreed.

The Planner said that the PB would be getting one document; that she is working to get headers on that so they can jump around in the document. She added that we added submission deadlines to the web site and linked information from the Planning Board section of the web site to the Planning Department section to get application documents and additional information. She said that next steps would be to make some of those documents fillable and make the web site sections a little more user-friendly. She added that, if there is any information the PB would like on the web site, we are working on that and the white board is for that, so feel free to let her know or add to the white board.

B. Annual Report Draft

The Planner reviewed the draft with the PB, saying that if there are any changes or revisions, she would love to have that so that she can give that to Ms. Albert; that submission of this is pretty close to the deadline so she would appreciate the PB's consideration.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought it was a good report. He suggested that, for the next one, we should get together in a workshop to put ideas down.

The PB was in agreement that they liked the draft; that their only suggestion was to add that they are looking for volunteers.


The Planner agreed that she would add that and submit the report to Ms. Albert.

ITEM 11 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for April 3, 2018 at 7PM.

ITEM 12 – ADJOURN

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 PM.


Dennis Lentz, Chair
Date approved: 4/17/08

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary