

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

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

7:00 PM

August 17, 2023

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Chellman, Chair; Corey Clark, Vice Chair; Karen Conard, City Manager; Joseph Almeida, Facilities Manager; Beth Moreau, City Councilor; Members Greg Mahanna; James Hewitt and Alternate Andrew Samonas

.....

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Stith, Principal Planner; Peter Britz, Planning Director

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Jayne Begala, Peter Harris

.....

Note: The timestamp denotes the video time.

Chair Chellman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He stated that Alternate Andrew Samonas would take a voting seat for the evening in place of excused member Peter Harris.

I. PRESENTATIONS

- A.** Presentation on Capital Improvement Plan Process and appoint a CIP Advisory Committee

[Timestamp 5:20] Planning and Sustainability Director Peter Britz did a presentation on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) process. There were no questions from the Board.

[Timestamp 12:19] Chair Chellman said there would be a subcommittee of three members from the Planning Board for the CIP Advisory Committee, including himself. Mr. Mahanna said he would volunteer. Other members said they had conflicts. Since a few members were absent, Chair Chellman said a third member would be chosen at the September meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Approval of the July 20, 2023 meeting minutes

Mr. Mahanna moved to approve the July 20 minutes, seconded by Vice-Chair Clark.

Mr. Hewitt requested that the words “in Dover” be added to the following sentence (Page 8, third paragraph) so that the sentence reads as follows: “He said the buildings would have to have

between 102-116 spaces in Dover”. Mr. Hewitt said he had compared it to the City of Dover requirements.

*Mr. Mahanna and Vice-Chair Clark agreed. The motion was **approved as amended** by unanimous vote, 8-0.*

III. DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLETENESS

SUBDIVISION REVIEW

SITE PLAN REVIEW

- A. REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval to demolish two existing commercial buildings and an existing shed and construct a 75,000 s.f. industrial warehouse building with 75 parking spaces as well as associated paving, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

Mr. Mahanna moved to postpone the above application and also Public Hearings – Old Business Application B for 375 Banfield Road’s Site Plan approval request (p. 3) to the September meeting, seconded by Vice-Chair Clark. The motion passed by unanimous vote, 8-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS -- OLD BUSINESS

Councilor Moreau recused herself from the following application.

- A.** The request of **Tanner Family Revocable Trust (Owner)**, for property located at **380 Greenleaf Avenue** requesting a Wetland Conditional Use Permit according to Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a new 20 x 20’ one-story garage on a residential property with various additions of native buffer plantings and areas of storm water improvement to mitigate any impervious impacts from the garage. The proposal includes removal of 885 square feet of impervious asphalt, installation of 2’ drip edge of crushed stone around the perimeter of the garage and 484 square feet of pervious pavers leading up to the garage where asphalt currently exists. Additional planting beds are proposed in areas of existing asphalt. Said property is located on Assessor Map 243 Lot 63 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (LU-23-62)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 17:02] The applicant Alisson Tanner was present to review the application. She said the home was built in 1979 before any wetland buffer restrictions and that the lot is 1.14 acres, with over half of it buffer and under half of it wetland. She said they wanted to build a 20’x20’ two-car garage on the paved area of the driveway and reduce the impervious surface area by 885 square feet. She said the new garage would be moved away from the wetland so that its closest

point is 45 feet away. She said they would use erosion control during construction and no trees and shrubs would be disturbed. She said a drip edge would be put around the garage and a planting bed would be brought down. She showed the proposed location of the new garage and explained why it was the best location for it.

The Board had no questions. Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE APPLICATION

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

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 to adopt the findings of fact as presented. Ms. Conard seconded.

Vice-Chair Clark said it was great to see that the garage is in the footprint of the driveway and that a drip edge that didn't currently exist would be installed. He said it seemed like it would be in the most reasonable location, seeing that the entire property was in the wetland buffer. Mr. Mahanna said it's an improvement over the existing conditions, with the reduction in impervious. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

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

- 2.1) The applicant shall provide detailed specifications for the proposed pervious pavers including a cross-section plan and information about how they will be installed within the driveway area.*
- 2.2) The applicant shall provide a maintenance plan for the proposed pervious pavers.*

Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Councilor Moreau resumed her voting seat.

- B. REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The application of **Banfield Realty, LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **375 Banfield Road** requesting Site Plan review approval to demolish two existing commercial buildings and an existing shed and construct a 75,000 s.f. industrial warehouse building with 75 parking spaces as well as associated paving, stormwater management, lighting, utilities and landscaping. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 266 Lot 7 and lies within the Industrial (I) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE (LU-20-259)**

DECISION OF THE BOARD

The application was postponed to the September meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

- A. The request of **Nerbonne Family Revocable Trust (Owner)**, for property located at **189 Gates Street** requesting to modify conditions of approval of the previously approved Conditional Use Permit for an accessory dwelling unit granted on April 21, 2022. Said property is shown on Assessor Map 103 as Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. Said property is located on Assessor Map 103 Lot 6 and lies within the General Residence B (GRB) and Historic Districts. (LU-22-30)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 24:17] Attorney John Bosen was present on behalf of the applicant. He said the Board approved a Conditional Use Permit for the ADU in April 2022 with conditions and he was asking that two of those conditions be modified. He said the first condition required that the applicant install a fence along the boundary line between 189 Gates Street and 199 Gates Street. To satisfy neighbors' concerns, he requested that the condition of approval be changed from requiring that the fence be installed on the property to the fence being constructed on the western edge of the fence easement area on 189 Gates Street. He said it would satisfy the neighbors and resolve the litigation that took place in Superior Court. Regarding the second condition, he said they needed to do some improvements that required a building permit, so they were requesting that the approval be modified to state that the stipulations of approval would be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Chair Chellman said the first modification is a fence "to be constructed" and asked if it should say that or should say "not is constructed". Attorney Bosen agreed. Chair Chellman said there was a fence there now that wasn't in the right spot. Attorney Bosen said they would move it to the easement area to satisfy the neighbor's concern.

Vice-Chair Clark clarified that the easement was from the applicant to the abutter and the fence is going to be on the easement. He asked who would ultimately be responsible for the fence. Attorney Bosen said it would be on his client's property and that his client would incur the costs. Vice-Chair Clark asked for clarification for the purpose of the easement for the abutter. Attorney Bosen said the applicant was before the Board because the decision said his client had to construct the fence on the property line and that his client did what he thought was at the neighbor's request at the initial hearing, but as they got into the appeal, the neighbor wanted the fence moved over into the easement area, so the client was just moving the fence a few inches toward his property. Vice-Chair Clark asked how the abutter would benefit. Attorney Bosen said he wasn't sure that the easement had much to do with the request but wanted to ensure that his client was putting the fence in an area that the Board would approve. He said the Board had said that the fence had to be placed on the property line and the neighbors wanted it moved closer to the Dearborn house, so it was a minimal change but had to come before the Board because it was a Conditional Use Permit. Chair Chellman clarified that the abutters would have the right to walk up to the fence and do whatever the easement allowed them to do in that space. He noted that the reciprocal easement for the driveway had nothing to do with the Board.

There were no further questions, and Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE APPLICATION

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Mahanna moved to **amend** the conditions of approval as presented, with the following change to 1.c) a fence to be constructed on the easement line between 189 Gates Street and 199 Gates Street that is in accordance with the Zoning Regulations. All conditions of approval must be completed prior to issuance to a Certificate of Occupancy.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Almeida.

Mr. Mahanna said the approval would benefit the abutter and not the applicant. Chair Chellman said it was also in litigation and no one objected.

The motion passed unanimously, 8-0.

Vice-Chair Clark recused himself from the following petition.

- B.** The request of **Whitney and Robert Westhelle (Owners)**, for property located at **198 Essex Avenue** requesting a Wetland Conditional Use Permit according to Section 10.1017 of the Zoning Ordinance for the following: Demolition of the existing garage and breezeway and construction of a new 753 square foot attached garage with a patio and deck. Construction of a new addition located 62 feet from the wetland and completely within the 100-foot buffer resulting in total impervious impacts of 993 square feet. Said property is located on Assessor Map 232 Lot 128 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) District. (LU-23-88)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 31:55] The applicant Robert Westhelle was present. He said 80 percent of the property was in the wetland buffer and that he proposed to build a new garage with a bedroom and bath above as a 1300-sf addition and add a 300-ft addition, an extension to the family room. He said he would improve the vegetative buffer and restore the 25-ft setback as much as possible. He said erosion control would be provided during construction and that the rainwater from the roof would be captured in rain barrels. He said the proposed deck would have a gap between its boards to let rain filter through and eight inches of crushed stone below it to retain some of the runoff. He said any non-invasive trees that had to be cut down would be replaced and that dark-sky compliant exterior lighting would be used.

Mr. Mahanna said the north addition looked like it was mostly in the footprint of the existing garage. Mr. Westhelle agreed and said the existing garage was nonconforming and extended over the side lot, so he was pulling it back about 4-6 inches. Mr. Mahanna asked what was in the proposed deck and patio location now. Mr. Westhelle said it was a 3-season porch and that the existing 100 square feet of impervious surface would be removed.

Mr. Mahanna asked what the net impact on pervious vs. impervious would be in Phase 2. Mr. Westhelle said he did overalls including the first and second for that. Mr. Mahanna said it was important because of the way it was labeled as three separate projects, noting that the deck wasn't labeled as a phase. He said Phase 2 had the most impact. Mr. Stith verified that it would include the deck. Chair Chellman asked if the text on the plan was correct. Mr. Westhelle agreed and said he included it for Phases 1 and 2. Chair Chellman clarified that the Phase 2 numbers were inclusive of Phase 1. He asked if there was 217 square feet of impervious. Mr. Westhelle said Phase 2 was 1900 square feet and Phase 1 was 1700 square feet, including the existing dwelling. Mr. Samonas asked what the foundation and basement depth were for Phase 2. Mr. Westhelle said it would depend on whether there was a cross space or full depth. Mr. Samonas asked if there would be a disconnect between the deck and patio in the Phase 2 portion, and Mr. Westhelle agreed.

Chair Chellman asked for an explanation of the house's layout on the Phase 2 addition portion that made it the logical spot to put it. Mr. Westhelle said the proposed design would remove the two walls of the existing dining and family room and extend it out to provide a larger family room space. He said the current family room would become the dining room and the kitchen would stay that way it was. He said there wasn't a lot of room to extend out from the house toward the street, so extending it out the side of the house was the best solution. Mr. Mahanna asked if Mr. Westhelle considered putting the Phase 2 addition to the southwest where the 3-season porch was instead of going south and closer to the wetland setback. Mr. Westhelle said he did but the kitchen was redone a few years ago and he wanted to keep the daylight by maintaining the window. Mr. Mahanna said it could be moved to the southwest vs. the south. Mr. Westhelle agreed but said the kitchen would have to be relocated. Mr. Mahanna said it was then a cost issue and not a wetlands preservation issue, and Mr. Westhelle agreed.

The Board had no more questions. Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

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

DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD

Mr. Mahanna said he had a problem with moving closer to the setback and increasing the impervious when there was an opportunity to do something different. Mr. Almeida said there was an incredible amount of detail to architecturally explain what was going on. He said it was a well thought-out plan and understood how the applicant got to that place. Chair Chellman said

cost was not a hardship. Councilor Moreau said the applicant was going to great lengths to restore the vegetative buffer, and some of the positives that came out of this for the wetland mitigated the addition with the limited space of how to expand the property. She said getting rid of the invasive species and the lawn and putting in native plantings outweighed the bad, and that was more of the Board's determination. Mr. Samonas said there were topographic challenges as well in the southwest portion and the applicant understood the drainage and how the water flowed through his property to the best of his ability and was making improvements based on that knowledge. He said he could see how 86 percent of the property being in the buffer was a hurdle and thought the applicant had done his due diligence to understand how to correct an almost unsolvable problem. He said it wasn't great but less bad, and the Conservation Commission efforts were carried through. Mr. Mahanna said the comment from the Conservation Commission said "an additional method of infiltration should be provided for the rain barrel overflowers". He asked about the drainage off all the new construction, gutters, and so on. Mr. Stith said the drainage would be directed to the rain barrels.

Chair Chellman said it pointed out a deficiency with the ordinance. He thought the applicant should be approved but was constrained by the language in the ordinance. He said the Board would meet with the Conservation Commission soon to discuss that sort of change and he wanted to keep this application in mind for that meeting. He said the proposed was an improvement of the site and that cost was not a criteria, but maybe it should be. He said the ordinance didn't say anything about "if the applicant is making it better, the Board should approve it" but thought it should. Mr. Hewitt said he was sympathetic to the applicant and thought he was a victim of circumstance. He said the house was built in 1940 and then the City dropped the 100-ft buffer somewhat through the house, so the applicant was locked down to pretty much any future improvements unless the Board considered his situation. He said the edge of the home was 74 feet and the application would push it another 12 feet. He said if he were in the applicant's position, he would feel that the rules had unfairly constrained him.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Councilor Moreau moved to find that the Conditional Use Permit application meets the criteria set forth in Section 10.1017.50 and to adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Almeida seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Councilor Moreau moved that the Board grant the Wetland Conditional Use permit with the following conditions:

- 2.1) Any trees to be removed will be replaced with a similar species type and number trees.*
- 2.2) Any patio or deck area installed shall be pervious.*
- 2.3) In accordance with Section 10.1018.40 of the Zoning Ordinance, applicant shall install permanent wetland boundary markers during project construction along the 25' vegetated buffer. These can be purchased through the City of Portsmouth Planning and Sustainability Department.*
- 2.4) Applicant shall provide a report back to the Planning and Sustainability Department one year after vegetated buffer area has been planted, demonstrating at least an 80% survival rate of new plantings.*

- 2.5) *An additional method of infiltration shall be provided for rain barrel overflows.*
- 2.6) *Any increase in impervious surface will require a new wetland conditional use permit.*
- 2.7) *Applicant shall use only dark sky friendly lighting on the exterior of the home.*

Mr. Almeida seconded.

Councilor Moreau said the applicant went to great expense to add the rain barrels, infiltration through the deck, and the vegetative buffer. She said the mitigating circumstances made it an approvable project. She said she had seen that type of situation before when the buffer was changed from 50 feet to 100 feet and existing properties became backward. She said she had no problem approving the application because of all those reasons.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Vice-Chair Clark resumed his voting seat.

- C. The request of **Aviation Avenue Group LLC (Applicant)**, for property located at **80 Rochester Avenue (100 New Hampshire Avenue)** requesting Amended Site Plan Approval for construction of a 101,200 sq. ft. footprint including 4,700 sq. ft. of office space and associated site improvements consisting of parking, loading docks, underground utilities, landscaping, lighting, and a stormwater management system. Said property is located on Assessor Map 308 Lot 1 and lies within the Pease Industrial (PI) District. (LU-22-210)

SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION

[Timestamp 51:24] Attorney John Bosen representing the applicant was present along with his team that included members of the Aviation Avenue Group, Neil Hansen of Tighe and Bond, and Michael Mates, Director of Engineering for the Pease Development Authority (PDA). Attorney Bosen said they were requesting an amendment to the site plan approved on April 20, 2023. He said the Board approved their site plan for an advanced manufacturing facility but then the client realized that the facility was much weaker than anticipated. He said the market was stronger for a supply chain and logistics management type user, and they were able to sign a lease with a company that needed a 100,000-sf facility that does white glove delivery of furniture and large home goods items. He said it would still be an industrial use in an industrial zone but the end user would be less intense. He said the building would have fewer employees, less parking demand, and less traffic coming in and out of the site, but there some were minor changes to the site plan. He said the project went before the PDA on June 15 and received a recommendation for conditional approval and also went before TAC on July 15.

[Timestamp 53:14] Neil Hansen reviewed the amended site plan in detail. plans in detail.

Mr. Mahanna asked if the primary access was on Rochester Avenue now. Mr. Hansen said the access was the same for the site. He said the trucks would come in on Aviation Avenue from Routes 33 and 95 and come down Lee Street directly into the site, then leave the say way. He

said the car access would be off New Hampshire Avenue and would likely come from Grafton Road and Route 33 from the south or Route 16 from the north and would be the same as previously approved. Mr. Hewitt asked why the applicant was before the Board if the PDA already approved the project. Mr. Hansen said the PDA asked them to come back before the Board and TAC.

[Timestamp 57:59] Michael Mates, Director of Engineering for the PDA, said with the change in use, the applicant had to come back and restart the process. He said they went back to the PDA Board of Directors and got conceptual approval, which allowed them to file a new application with the City for review with the Planning Board and TAC. Mr. Samonas said if the use were to change and the parking and traffic impact became larger, he asked if it was something that the applicant would return to the Board for approval regarding future considerations. Mr. Hansen said it was likely, depending on the significance of the change. Mr. Samonas said there were previous concerns from the neighbors and abutters, so he was trying to understand what constituted the change. He said it seemed like a drastic reduction from the initial approval but he wanted more clarification as to what could be expected in the future. Councilor Moreau said that, under the review, there were two stipulations when it went through TAC, one of which was in the Staff Memo and one that was after the third-party stormwater report was reviewed by the Department of Public Works (DPW). She asked if DPW had comments and if the Board needed to include the revisions that were made based off those comments, if any. Mr. Stith said DPW made comments during their TAC review and those were addressed except for one that was carried over, the review of the third-party report.

Mr. Mahanna referred to Plans C102-1 and -2 and said it looked like the truck access was off Lee Street and not Aviation Avenue. Mr. Hansen said Aviation Avenue ran east-west and had a 90-degree bend in it, and Lee Street ran parallel to the 90-degree bend. Mr. Mahanna said the parking lot on Plan C102-2 exited onto Lee Street via Rochester Avenue, so it wasn't exiting onto Aviation Avenue. He asked why they wouldn't go straight down Rochester Avenue by turning left. Mr. Hansen said it wasn't the most direct access to Grafton Road.

Chair Chellman said that, in the Transportation Master Plan for Pease, it seemed that the Route 33 entrance was the primary one for the entire Pease project in terms of traffic volumes. Mr. Mates said there were three entrances and named them. Chair Chellman said according to the data, the one on Grafton Road had the heaviest volume but the study stopped and did not include the Route 33 intersection in the 2010 study. He asked if Pease agreed to study the Route 33 intersection as part of the prior approval. Mr. Mates said they did not because they had no jurisdiction there and weren't permitted to spend money off of the Tradeport because it was considered a diversion of revenue. Mr. Stith said the Planning Board made a condition that the PDA look at the traffic on Route 33 toward Greenland but that it was just a request. Chair Chellman asked if Pease intended to look at any of the Route 33 traffic. Mr. Mates said they couldn't spend money on it. Chair Chellman asked if it was for improvements or analysis. Ms. Conard said the Rockingham Planning Commission was forming a group to have a charette at the end of the month that might be beneficial for the Planning Board. Chair Chellman said he understood that improvements couldn't be done off site and that Pease was precluded from analyzing additional traffic that would be placed onto an intersection immediately off site onto a State highway. Councilor Moreau said she would get an update for the September meeting.

Chair Chellman said he was looking at the data and the 2010 Master Plan showed significantly heavier volumes of traffic projected at that location than the other entrance points. He said the 2020 projections went up even more. He said the comments from the last meeting should be addressed. Attorney Bosen said that, consistent with the Planning Board's prior decision, one of the stipulations requested was that the PDA make that study on Route 33.

Mr. Mahanna said he hoped it could be restated in the change of approval that there were three entrance to Pease: one in Portsmouth, one in Greenland, and one in Newington. He said the definition of regional impact was important. He noted that he went to a Newington selectboard meeting and there was a lot of vitriol about the process and how things in Pease affected Newington and that they didn't like not having any say in it. He said the Board didn't have the authority for that but did have the authority to discuss things that had regional impact. He said Greenland and Newington would get upset at the Board for not recognizing the impact of the decisions they made. Councilor Moreau said the Board didn't make decisions, only recommendations, and that the DPA made the final decision. Mr. Mahanna said he'd like on the record that the PDA recommended what the Board was talking about.

Chair Chellman asked if there were plans to update the PDA Master Plan. Mr. Mates said when they did the 20166 analysis they had not realized the pre-Covid traffic that was experienced and that they didn't plan on updating the Master Plan until they saw more traffic. He said they didn't have any data that said it was different. Chair Chellman asked if the PDA was monitoring all the studied intersections to make that determination, and Mr. Mates agreed.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAISNT THE PETITION

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

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice-Chair Clark moved to recommend amended site plan approval to the PDA Board with the following conditions:

- 1.1) Third-party stormwater report shall be reviewed by DPW.*
- 1.2) Applicant shall monitor pedestrian safety for the first six months or up to a year after full occupancy and report back to City Staff. Applicant will coordinate with PDA, DPW, and City Staff to set up and schedule monitoring.*
- 1.3) Require all truck deliveries to use the Intestate I-95 and Route 33 entrance.*
- 1.4) Request that the PDA look at traffic on Route 33 towards Greenland, taking into account the TA Truck Stop.*
- 1.5) Request the PDA conduct an overall analysis of existing and projected traffic conditions for all of Pease for the next 5-10 years post construction with a report back to the Portsmouth Planning Board.*

- 1.6) *Applicant shall monitor trip generation for 1 – 2 years after full building occupancy.*

Councilor Moreau seconded.

Vice-Chair Clark said adding those stipulations would help qualify all the different concerns that the Board and others had about the development and creating additional pedestrian and traffic issues throughout the Pease complex and onto Routes 33 and 95.

The motion passed unanimously, 8-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Chair updates and discussion items

Chair Chellman asked if there was a date to meet with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Stith said there was a potential date of August 30. Vice-Chair Clark said he had something planned for then. Mr. Stith said he would come up with a different date.

B. Planning Board Rules and Procedures

Chair Chellman said he met with the Legal Department many times since the beginning of the year and received a draft from them that day that he would review and comment on and circulate to the Board members for comments. He said he would then meet with Legal to review those comments and hopefully have it ready for discussion and a possible vote at the September meeting. He said the current rules were out of date with the current Statute.

C. Board discussion of Regulatory Amendments, Master Plan & other matters

Chair Chellman said that, regarding the Master Plan, he contacted the Superintendent of Schools, who reached out to the high school faculty, and that he would have more information at the September meeting.

Mr. Mahanna said the contact form on the Planning Board website was changed to indicate that public users contact the committee chair and the staff liaison. Chair Chellman said he was the Committee chair and the Board Chair and Mr. Stith was the staff liaison. Mr. Mahanna asked why public comments or questions were being sent to a Board Chair. Ms. Conard said they were trying to make it consistent for people to reach out to the boards and commissions. She said the term “committee chair” should be changed to “committee board” in this case. She said every board and commission had a Chair and a staff liaison that would get public inquiries via email and that the City was in the process of making it consistent across the website.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joann Breault,
Secretary for the Planning Board