

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

7:00 PM

June 15, 2023

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Chellman, Chairman; Corey Clark, Vice Chair; Karen Conard, City Manager; Joseph Almeida, Facilities Manager; Beth Moreau, City Councilor; Peter Harris; James Hewitt, Members; Jayne Begala; Andrew Samonas, Alternate.

.....

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Stith, Principal Planner

MEMBERS ABSENT: Greg Mahanna

.....

***Items in brackets denote timestamp of video recording.**

Chairman Chellman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Alternate Andrew Samonas took a voting seat for Greg Mahanna, who was absent.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Approval of the May 18, 2023 Meeting Minutes
- B. Approval of the May 25, 2023 Work Session Minutes

*Councilor Moreau moved to **approve** the May 18 meeting minutes and the May 25 work session minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 8-0, with Vice-Chair Clark abstaining from the vote.*

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Begala recused herself from the following petition.

- A. The request of **Eversource Energy (Applicant)** and **Public Service of New Hampshire (Owner)**, for properties located off **Gosling Road, Greenland Road, Borthwick Avenue** and **Ocean Road** requesting a proposed Wetland Conditional Use Permit under Section 10.1017 for utility structure replacement project involving the replacement of wooden utility poles with steel poles and associated equipment. This work would be throughout the Portsmouth transmission corridor between Gosling Road to Echo Avenue and between Borthwick Avenue and the Ocean Road Substation. In total, the proposed project requires approximately 208,734 sq. ft. of temporary wetland impact for the

placement of timber matting and structure replacements. There will be approximately 3,310 sq. ft. of temporary impact to Pickering Brook in order to span the stream with timber matting. The project also proposes 78,642 sq. ft. of temporary buffer impact in uplands for clearing and grading to gain access to structures. Said properties are located on Assessor Map 238 Lots 2, 3 and 20, Map 239 Lots 7-1, 8, 13-2, 16 and 18, Map 240 Lots 2-1, and 3, Map 258 Lot 54, Map 259 Lot 12 and lies within the Gateway-1 (G1), Waterfront Industrial (WI), Office Research (OR), Industrial (I), and Rural (R) Districts. (LU-23-60)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 6:21] Patrick Crimmins of Tighe and Bond was present on behalf of the applicant to speak to the petition, along with Ashley Friend of Eversource Energy. Mr. Crimmins said they were seeking a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a utility pole replacement project. He noted that 45 existing wooden poles would be replaced with metal ones. He reviewed the petition and said they would also need Alteration of Terrain permits and a Utility Statutory Permit to conduct the work and that the work would also be regulated by Federal permits.

[Timestamp 14:52] Councilor Moreau asked how long the metal poles would last, noting that steel rusts. Ms. Friend said their lifespan would be from 70-80 years to over 100 years. Councilor Moreau asked if substituting the silt fence with silt sock would be alright, and Ms. Friend agreed. Mr. Harris said the steel would break down at some point, and he asked what kind of environmental impact it would have and if it was a new tech product in the market. Ms. Friend said it was the industry standard and that she didn't know what would happen when it degraded.

[Timestamp 17:55] Vice-Chair Clark asked how it was different from the work done in the past years between Middle Road and Ocean Road. Ms. Friend said it was a cyclical maintenance project, and the structures that failed and needed replacement were identified yearly. Vice-Chair Clark asked if it would take care of all the wood structures in that stretch. Ms. Friend said the project would not address all the wood structures in that area except for the ones that failed inspection. Vice-Chair Clark said he didn't see anything in the packet about cleaning the mats before and after installation within the proposed activities and the protected measures, so he asked that that language be included in the document to make it clear. Ms. Friend agreed. Vice-Chair Clark asked if DES required a decontamination area for the mats while they were being cleaned or if the mats were picked up one at a time or brought to a central location. Ms. Friend said there was no requirement from DES for that area and that the mats were swept.

[Timestamp 21:51] Mr. Hewitt asked if there would be any EPA involvement. Ms. Friend said there would be EPA involvement in the Alteration of Terrain and Wetlands permits. Mr. Hewitt asked if any of the agencies recommended or required that it be done in the winter. Ms. Friend said none of the agencies recommended that the work be done certain times of the year and that the permits were good for all twelve months of the year.

Chairman Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Reginald Baird of 296 Buckminster Way said he lived adjacent to the bogs and was concerned about noise and the impact on wildlife. He said the project was done the year before and asked why it was being done again so soon. He said he didn't know how long steel would last in a wetland environment. He also asked if the abutters would see a survey to know if the poles would be on their properties. Chairman Chellman said the plans were available online.

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough said metal poles were very noticeable and thought it was disconcerting that they would not blend in with the bog. She said Iceland had artistic metal poles and suggested that Eversource consider something like that instead of just a pole.

Jayne Begala of 669 Greenland Road said she was an abutter. She said some of the poles has osprey nests and asked what would be done to preserve them. She asked if the gravel pads would be temporary, noting that she didn't see a plan saying they would be removed after the project.

Ms. Friend said the 100'x100' gravel pads were shown on the plans and that they were permitted temporary wetland matted pads so that the contractor could safely replace the structures. She said anything temporary would be removed and anything that was gravel would be tapered back to a 30'x60' area for future maintenance. She said there were no osprey nests of any of the poles but if there were, Eversource would work closely with NH Fish and Game and install platforms for the ospreys to nest. Regarding the aesthetics of the structures, she said the poles would be weathered steel ones with a rust coating on their exterior, and over time they would get a brown coating that looked more like a tree. Regarding wildlife concerns, she said Eversource worked with the NH Heritage Bureau and NH Fish and Game and also had a cyclical maintenance program. She said she understood the inconvenience in terms of noise and duration and that there was a person that a property owner could contact regarding those issues. She said most of the project was done on an easement, and if it was a substation, Eversource owned the property.

No one else spoke, and Chairman Chellman closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Vice-Chair Clark moved to find that the Conditional Use Permit application meets the criteria set forth in Section 10.1017.60 and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Almeida seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 8-0, with Ms. Begala recused.*

Vice-Chair Clark moved to grant the Conditional Use Permit as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Silt sock shall be used wherever practical.*
- 2. Plans and documents need to clarify the mat cleaning process to remove invasive species.*
- 3. Prior to construction, a poll inspection shall be conducted to identify any other poles within the plan set area that might need to be replaced within two years of the date of inspection. This information shall be provided in a letter report to the Planning Department, including the locations of any such additional poles.*

*Ms. Conard seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, 8-0, with Ms. Begala recused.*

Ms. Begala returned to her voting seat.

- B.** The request of **Mojo's West End Tavern (Applicant)**, for property located at **95 Brewery Lane** requesting a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.440, Use 19.50 for an outdoor dining and drinking area as an accessory use. Said property is located on Assessor Map 146 Lot 27 and lies within the Character District 4-W (CD-4W) and Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L-2) (LU-23-75)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 43:19] Sandra Bringer from O'Neil Landscaping and the applicant/owner Kevin Crowell were present. Ms. Bringer said they proposed to replace the mulch bed with planting beds and put in a permeable paving patio for outdoor dining.

[Timestamp 45:07] Mr. Samonas asked if there would be access to the door. Ms. Bringer agreed. Councilor Moreau asked where the plantings would be. Ms. Bringer said the planters were added after the first submittal and that they would be in the four corners and in the ornaments planting beds on either end. Ms. Begala asked if there would be outdoor entertainment or music. Mr. Crowell said he didn't plan on it but might consider it in the future. Mr. Almeida asked about piping in amplified music through speakers. Mr. Crowell said he currently had speakers that were very light and that the sound would not be increased.

Chairman Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one spoke, and Chairman Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Vice-Chair Clark moved to vote that the Conditional Use Permit application meets the criteria set forth in Section 10.243.20 and to adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

*Vice-Chair Clark moved to vote to approve the Conditional Use Permit as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

- C.** **Ryan T. and Heidi E. K Mullen (Applicants)**, and **RTM Trust (Owner)**, for property located at **253 Odiorne Point Road** requesting a Wetland Conditional Use Permit according to Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for proposed improvements to existing drainage issues on the property including the installation of crushed stone to help with infiltration into two existing French drains and an additional French drain installation. The proposal includes an extension of existing stone walls, a concrete slab addition under the deck, an expansion of a deck and the relocation of deck footings and stairs which totals approximately 2,500 s.f. of impact within the wetland buffer. The applicant proposes additional native buffer plantings and a rain garden to help slow and

infiltrate stormwater before it reaches the wetland source on the property. Said property is located on Assessor Map 224 Lot 10-19 and lies within the Single Residence a (SRA) District. (LU-23-36)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 51:22] Property owner Ryan Mullen was present to review the application.

[Timestamp 1:03:53] Ms. Begala said she was concerned that the wetlands would at some point reach full capacity due to everyone in the area shunting their water and asked if the project engineers considered that. Mr. Mullen said there was a drainage easement. He said his property extended to the north and around the edge of a cul-de-sac, and the brook led to the drainage easement and out to the road and greater expanse of wetlands, which he felt was a natural drainage solution to the homes around him. He said the only water he had seen was in his backyard. Councilor Moreau asked where the stairs would fall in relation to the wall that would be expanded. Mr. Mullen said he proposed that the stairway be half of what it currently was and that it would come over the rock wall and land in the side yard.

Chairman Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one spoke, and Chairman Chellman closed the public hearing.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Vice-Chair Clark moved to find that the Conditional Use Permit application meets the criteria set forth in Section 10.243.20 and to adopt the findings of fact as presented. Ms. Conard seconded the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

Vice-Chair Clark moved to grant the Wetlands Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions:

- 2.1) *A silt sock shall be used in addition to the existing silt fence to help mitigate construction impacts.*
- 2.1) *No plantings shall be planted within the wetland itself, just the buffer, and no removal of invasive shall be performed within the wetland.*
- 2.2) *A final planting site plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior submission to the Planning Board.*
- 2.3) *In accordance to Section 10.1018.40 of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant shall install wetland boundary markers during the construction process. The signs can be purchased through the City of Portsmouth Planning and Sustainability department.*
- 2.4) *The Conservation Commission recommends the homeowner to follow NOFA land care management standards at the site.*
http://www.organiclandcare.net/sites/default/files/nofa_organic_land_care_standards_6thedition_2017_opt.pdf

*Ms. Conard seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

- D.** The Planning Board will consider a recommendation to City Council to adopt amendments to Chapter 10 – Article 5A – CHARACTER-BASED ZONING, Section 10.5A20, Regulating Plan, Subsection 10.5A21.10 Contents of Regulating Plan, Map 10.5A21B – Building Height Standards, Section 10.5A43.30 – Building and Story Heights, Subsection 10.5A43.33, Section 10.5A43.40 – Maximum Building Footprint, Subsections 10.5A43.41-44, and Section 10.5A45 – Community Spaces, Subsection Figures 10.5A45.10 Community Spaces, Section 10.5A46.20 – Requirements to Receive Incentives to the Development Standards, Subsections 10.5A46.21-22, and Article 15 – DEFINITIONS, Section 10.1530 – Terms of General Applicability, of the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth.

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 1:10:20] City Principal Planner Nick Cracknell was present to give a presentation about density incentives in the character districts specific to downtown and the west end. He said it was broken up into six parts and he reviewed each part.

[Timestamp 1:13:27] He reviewed the amendments to the density incentives and what the existing density incentives were in the Overlay Districts. Mr. Hewitt said he thought the existing requirement for workforce housing was 20 percent for ownership or rental and cited the West End Yards as an example. Mr. Cracknell said the incentives were different depending on the location and that they only affected the Overlay Districts.

[Timestamp 1:16:32]. Mr. Cracknell reviewed who had used the incentives in the Overlay Districts and what would change. He said the biggest change would be that a Conditional Use Permit would be required, which would give the Planning Board the opportunity to determine if the trade between the ‘carrot’ and the ‘stick’ would be appropriate on a case-by case basis.

[Timestamp 1:18:02] Ms. Begala said that just because the properties opted for community space didn’t mean community space currently existed throughout the buildings. She asked whether it should be a requirement that the community space would be done when the buildings were done. Mr. Cracknell said there were 13 types of community spaces that included a public greenway, and as an example he said a greenway was a linear park that would be created over time by connecting properties together. He said the only way to create that public benefit was to design, build and permit it and that it made no sense to hold up a hotel to build a greenway. He said they needed to come up with a better timeline in the future. He said the Planning Department would manage the design and permitting of the greenway and the owner would contribute financially to the greenway construction, but it was an example of a linear park that crossed many properties. He said they were also requiring both workforce housing and community space for lots greater than 100 square feet. It was further discussed.

[Timestamp 1:25:31] Mr. Cracknell reviewed potentially affected parcels in the North End Overlay District and the existing density incentives for larger footprint buildings. Mr. Hewitt asked who was responsible for maintaining the community space at 60 Penhallow. Mr. Cracknell

said it was case-by-case but believed that the applicant was responsible for it. He said it was negotiated under the Conditional Use Permit. It was further discussed.

[Timestamp 1:33:02] Mr. Cracknell reviewed the proposed changes to the density incentives for large building footprints. He said an amendment and update were made that if a project was done without housing it would still have to provide 30 percent community space. He reviewed four properties that were potentially affected and qualified for the incentive. He reviewed the incentives for large parcels over one acre in size, noting that the applicant had to be outside the North and West Overlay Districts and get an extra story or ten feet and had to provide 20 percent community space. He showed examples of properties that used the incentive. He said the proposed changes would be using a Conditional Use Permit instead of an as-of-right and that both community space and workforce housing would be done. He said a pedestrian passage, a public observation deck, and a pedestrian arcade would be added to the existing community spaces for a total of 16 types of community space.

[Timestamp 1:44:07] Mr. Cracknell reviewed the building footprint statement and the proposed exemptions. He said he set a maximum grade of ten feet for a park or square but noted that it would be under a Conditional Use Permit and could be less.

[Timestamp 1:46:14] Mr. Cracknell reviewed lowering the building height standard for the south side of Bow Street. He said building heights of 45 feet or 4-1/2 stories were currently allowed and what was proposed was to lower the building height to 40 feet or 2-3 stories to make the block more continuous. He said a Conditional Use Permit would continue to allow density incentives for larger buildings up to 55 feet. Ms. Begala asked how it fit in with the vision plan for that area. Mr. Cracknell said it fit. He said the 2022 and 2023 community plans were modified but were essentially the same in the treatment of what would happen along that corridor. He said large parcels would go from 20 percent community space to 50, which would require a Conditional Use Permit. The new 50,000 sf footprint was discussed. Mr. Cracknell said it was directed toward the large lots. The change of the overall massing was discussed. Chairman Chellman said it was a matter of the neighborhood's character and pointed out that the building fabric was in much smaller increments, and allowing a building footprint in excess of the McIntyre Building and the post office together was scary. Mr. Cracknell further explained it and said the Historic District Commission would ensure that the project would add to the City's fabric and not clash with it. Ms. Samonas said he didn't hate the fact that 18 different buildings on Congress Street could make up 50,000 square feet but thought adding one 50,000 sf building didn't necessarily align with the District and could only work if the developers were on hand.

[Timestamp 2:10:40] Mr. Cracknell addressed the issue of why two community space types that were presented at the land use committee, the shared pedestrian street and the community building, were not included in the presentation. He said he sent it to the Legal Department, who felt that the language conflicted with parts of the code. The Board discussed how the density incentives document would be commented upon and reviewed. Ms. Begala said the proposed minimum of 600 square feet for a workforce housing unit would not accommodate a family of three or four and thought it should be greater. Mr. Cracknell discussed the 4-5 properties downtown that were one acre or more and the issues with square footage. He discussed whether outdoor dining should have restrictive access.

[Timestamp 2:29:34] Ms. Begala referred to the table that stated 19 or more total dwelling units would include eight percent of workforce housing and asked how that figure was reached, compared to the two units for renting and the three units for sale that was indicated in the rest of the document. It was further discussed. A tiered site was also discussed.

Chairman Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Elizabeth Bratter of 159 McDonough Street said she didn't see the 30 percent for non-residential buildings on the list. She asked that the greenway not be allowed in the 25-ft buffer and that it be 10 feet away from buildings. She said it may not be cost effective to put in workforce housing for a building that had less than four units and thought the caliper of trees should be added to the list. She suggested that the 50,000 sf mass be shown on a picture to see what it looked like.

Petra Huda of 280 South Street said the packet did not include all the data and didn't think the incentives were ready to move forward. She said the 50,000 sf figure was large and asked how a 50 percent community space on top of that would fit. She said there were a lot of questions and that the RFAs on workforce housing should be further looked at.

[Timestamp 2:46:40] Chairman Chellman agreed that something should be addressed with more attention, like the tiered space, the ranking of the community spaces, and getting the language of the post office and the shared driveway correct. He noted that other issues came up, like tree calipers. Councilor Moreau said consultants would be hired to look at the finances and what made sense for workforce housing and that things like adding more community spaces could be part of that conversation. She thought it was okay to move forward. She said she was fine with an amendment about keeping the buildings away from the greenway a certain distance. Mr. Samonas said there were goals and tasks to be worked on and that the Board should give Mr. Cracknell and the Planning Department some idea of what the Board wanted to see as a result of the feedback. Mr. Hewitt agreed and said there were enough issues to have another work session.

[Timestamp 2:56:37] Assistant City Attorney Jane Ferrini was present and spoke to the publication notice deadline for the second reading process. She suggested that it be continued to a public hearing instead.

Vice-Chair Clark moved to recommend approval of the zoning amendments to the City Council as amended with the following conditions:

- 1. Buildings shall be ten feet away from the greenway.*
- 2. The trees shall be a minimum of four inches in diameter and four feet high.*
- 3. The 50,000 square footage shall be reduced to 40,000 square feet.*

*Councilor Moreau seconded. **There was no vote taken.***

[Timestamp 3:03:08] The Board discussed the motion. Ms. Begala suggested changing the wording of the workforce housing unit size back to 800 square feet instead of the proposed 600 square feet as a minimum, especially for a family of three or four. She noted that income

eligibility was based on a 3 or 4 member family. Councilor Moreau explained why she thought it was fine to leave it at 600 square feet. It was further discussed. Mr. Hewitt thought another work session was needed due to a lot of unresolved issues.

Chairman Chellman concluded that there would be an adequate quorum to have a public hearing the following week.

FINAL DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Almeida moved to **continue** the public hearing to the June 22 meeting, seconded by Mr. Samonas. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-3, with Vice-Chair Clark, Councilor Moreau, and Ms. Conard voting in opposition.*

III. PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL CONSULTATION

- A.** The request of **Prospect North 815 LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **815 Lafayette Road** requesting preliminary conceptual consultation for the demolition of the existing building and tower along Sagamore Creek and the construction of three 4-story, 24-unit multi-family buildings (72 total units) with first floor parking and a 2-story, 15,000 SF office building. The project will include associated site improvements such as parking, pedestrian access, utilities, stormwater management, lighting and landscaping. Said property is located on Assessor Map 245 Lot 3 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LUPD-23-4)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 3:15:22] Patrick Crimmins of Tighe and Bond was present on behalf of the applicant to review the petition.

[Timestamp 3:19:20] In response to Vice-Chair Clark's question, Mr. Crimmins said the remaining tower in the rear was currently accessed by a gravel drive and that they might need to follow that existing accessway. Vice-Chair Clark said it made more sense for the office to be placed up front by Route One and for the residence to be moved out back to limit vehicular traffic. Councilor Moreau suggested moving the office farther into the other corner to gain access through the parking lot. Mr. Crimmins said they didn't intend to develop that far into the property and were trying to stay within the existing disturbed area. He said a traffic consultant would look at it. Mr. Samonas asked if the forested back portion of the property toward Winchester Apartments was a precluding factor that the applicant wanted to stay away from. Mr. Crimmins said there was significant ledge but they didn't want to touch that piece of land and just wanted to keep the development to the front of the site. Ms. Begala asked whether there would be a playground or dog area. Mr. Crimmins said they designated an amenity area between both buildings for outdoor space but were constrained by the 100-ft buffer along Sagamore Creek and also by the frontage of the site where there was a large DOT drainage unit. Ms. Begala asked if there was a way to exit the office building or have another entrance exit to the office building that went around the plaza, noting that all the vehicular traffic seemed dangerous for

families. Mr. Crimmins said they didn't have control over those parcels. Mr. Samonas asked about a possible traffic pattern conflict, and Mr. Crimmins said it was very low traffic flow.

[Timestamp 3:24:24] Chairman Chellman asked if the total number of units and office space used up the site area for density purposes and if it would be reserved for future development. Mr. Crimmins said it wasn't the entire area and that they were not contemplating anything for future development at the time. In response to further questions, he said he thought there was an easement with the adjacent commercial use for access. He said it would involve other elements related to parking access, traffic flow, and design and that they were trying to keep the project simple. Ms. Samonas said he'd like to see a view corridor analysis of the MacDonald's light looking down toward the property and trying to avoid any kind of walling situation.

[Timestamp 3:26:22] Vice-Chair Clark asked if the applicant considered having the office space be another residential. Mr. Crimmins said they had but didn't want to place a residential into that location, given the proximity to the tower and the rear of the plaza. Mr. Hewitt asked if the applicant was requesting any variances of CUPs. Mr. Crimmins said they would need a CUP for work in the wetland buffer. Mr. Stith thought the applicant would also need a variance for the setback from Lafayette Road. Mr. Crimmins said it might be possible to angle the building along the drive to bring it out to the setback but that they would review it with the Planning Department. He said the hope was not to seek further relief.

Chairman Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one spoke, and Chairman Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

There was no motion or other discussion.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Granite State Convenience LLC (Applicant)**, and **Mastoran Restaurants INC (Owner)**, for property located at **2255 Lafayette Road** requesting a 1-Year Extension of the Site Plan Approval, Conditional Use Permit, and Wetland Conditional Use Permit granted on **June 23, 2022. (LU-22-13)**

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Councilor Moreau moved to grant a one-year extension to the Planning Board Approval of the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permits to June 23, 2024. Vice-Chair Clark seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

The request of **RIGZ Enterprises LLC**, for property located at **806 US Route 1 Bypass** requesting a 1-Year Extension of the Site Plan Approval granted on June 23, 2022. (LU-22-81)

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Councilor Moreau moved to grant a one-year extension to the Planning Board Approval of the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permits to June 23, 2024. Vice-Chair Clark seconded. The motion **passed** unanimously.*

The following items were not addressed, and no action was taken by the Board.

- B.** Chairman updates and discussion items
- C.** Planning Board Rules and Procedures
- D.** Board discussion of Regulatory Amendments, Master Plan & other matters

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault,
Secretary for the Planning Board