

Candia Zoning Review & Revision Committee
Minutes of July 19, 2017
Approved Minutes

Present: Tom Giffen; Al Hall; Judi Lindsey; Rudy Cartier; Ken Kustra; Carleton Robie; Dave Murray, Building Inspector; Dean Young, Fire Chief; Dennis Lewis, Road Agent; Dick Snow; Betsy Kruse; Sue Young, BOS; Bob Petrin, ZBA Chairman.

The purpose of this volunteer committee is to review potential changes to the Town of Candia Zoning, Subdivision and Site Plan regulations and make recommendation for changes or additions to the Planning Board. This meeting is open to anyone that wants to participate.

The meeting started at around 7:52 pm following the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes from October 19, 2016:

D. Snow **motioned** to accept the minutes of October 19, 2016 as presented. C. Robie **seconded**. K. Kustra, R. Cartier, D. Snow, D. Young; D. Murray, J. Lindsey were all in favor. It was the consensus of the committee present to accept the minutes. T. Giffen and A. Hall **abstained (8-0-2)**. **Motion carried.**

Guests Present: Bryan Ruoff from Stantec Engineering

Stantec Update on Their Review of Candia's Current Regulations; Earth Excavation, Major Site Plan and Major Subdivision Regulations:

The Town of Candia contracted Stantec for \$1,500 to review our current Major Subdivision, Major Site Plan and Earth Excavation Regulations. Bryan Ruoff from Stantec provided binders to the Planning Board members showing the existing current regulations in a tab, the proposed draft of changes, and the tracked changes showing what changed in another tab. A copy will be in the Land Use office for review. The goal is to develop continuity in the regulations and standardize everything. Stantec also provided a draft of a *procedural instruction amendment* outlining procedures for the process of submitting the application, application fees, timing to respond, all of this has been incorporated into all three of the regulations, along with compliance and inspections.

T. Giffen said these are changes in Planning Board changes. We're not talking about zoning changes. The Planning Board would be the body that has the obligation to review these, discuss them, and then vote to either adopt or not and then they would be binding.

B. Ruoff reviewed some examples of proposed changes:

Drainage Standards - Storm-water standards previously for the subdivision regulations there was just one sentence that said *all drainage will be designed for the 100 year storm*. This doesn't meet current engineering standards, the 100 year storm isn't practical and the Board kept getting waivers for it. We turned it into 3 pages and made it consistent with the Site Plan Regulations and the Subdivision Regulations that laid out what the design standards are for all storm water conditions that you could run into.

R. Cartier commented that this will be easier for the applicant because your letters of issues would be less because they would be able to refer to these regulations; cut down on the back and forth. B. Ruoff said the intent is to make this clear and easier for everyone. Yes it should cut down review letters and review times by half. It should save time and money.

Site Plan Regulations: For example Site Plan regs 8.06, I. Drainage Systems – 6 different scenarios are now provided. This is more in line with safer designs for Towns. DES looks at a 10 year; essentially we're looking at a higher standard. This is in line with storm frequency in this area. Site Plan regs

require a lighting plan but there are no standards for lighting. We dialed all that in to make it clear for what's allowed or required.

Earth Excavations - the definitions and requirements for blasting and rock face slopes were expanded to be in line with current NHDOT standards. We also looked at some preliminary revisions that were identified by the former Chairman Sean James, that we did think were worth adding to the regulations as well. Mostly dealing with definitions; wells and distances from wells but no definition on a well; dialing in definitions. And to be consistent with NHDES standards, we revised the definition of abutters to be within the defined blasting, monitoring area of 2000 feet or ½ a mile.

Subdivision Regulations - Added in information regarding drainage and requirements and specifications for structural systems. If you remember the High Street project, 66 Vinton Street, we made a number of recommendations for box culverts that weren't currently in the regulations. We've added those to be consistent with NHDOT standards. Some outdated NHDOT regulations, we make reference to features shall be current with NHDOT standards. Examples of that is guardrail. But by saying shall be consistent, it won't be outdated. We tried to clarify what's in there and make it better defined and so you don't have to revise it going forward.

T. Giffen commented this is a lot of heavy detail that we will each have to read and review before we act. The highlight is the proposal for procedural changes for the all major applications; Preliminary Major, Subdivisions and Major Site Plans. The idea in revising the procedural instructions is to eliminate a lot of the late night meetings on an application being forced to continue it, having points raised by Stantec that numbered up to triple digits and having to address point by point. By streamlining the process, it's consistent and we're in line with current practice. Because there will be interaction between the applicant and the engineering firm that will take place before the Planning Board first discusses the application in a public meeting, a lot of the small detail points will have been worked out. We were here til 10:35 here one night. This addresses a lot of that. I'll read it:

DRAFT

CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
PROCEDURAL INSTRUCTIONS ADDENDUM
FOR ALL MAJOR APPLICATIONS:
Preliminary Major Subdivision and Major Site Plan

1. *The Applicant shall be required to submit a check in the amount of \$1,500 with their application that shall be held in escrow to pay for the Planning Boards Completeness Review Committee and the Town's engineer to perform a completeness review of all Major Site Plan and Subdivision applications.*
2. *A determination shall be made by the Planning Board and will be issued in writing to the Applicant within 7-days of the receipt of submittal regarding the completeness of the application.*
3. *If an application is deemed to be incomplete by the Planning Board, the application would then be rejected by the Planning Board and the Applicant is then required to submit all necessary information prior to the application being reconsidered for acceptance by the Planning Board.*
4. *All additional fees associated with re-notifying abutters for the submittal of additional information or re-submittal of an incomplete application shall be borne by the Applicant.*
5. *Once a complete application has been provided to the Planning Board, the Town's engineer will provide a cost estimate for the technical review of the submission. If the estimated amount is greater than the remaining completeness review budget the applicant shall provide the additional balance to the Town, to be held in escrow to pay for the technical review of the plans.*
6. *An application shall be heard within 30-days of the notification of a complete application by the Planning Board.*
7. *All technical reviews and associated review letters shall be provided to the Applicant by the Town within 14-days of the Town's receipt of the Town engineer's technical review fee costs.*

8. *All subsequent technical reviews and associated review letters shall be delivered to the Applicant by the Town within 7-days of receipt of revised or modified plans, reports, waivers or other submitted documents.*
9. *All review letters shall be provided to the Planning Board three business days prior to the scheduled Planning Board meeting or the application will be continued without decision.*
10. *Upon approval of a Major Site Plan or Subdivision Plan application the Town's Engineer shall develop a construction cost estimate for the purpose of establishing a project surety. The Applicant or Developer shall provide access to the surety in the amount determined prior to the Planning Board signing the final plat plans.*
11. *Upon approval of a Major Site Plan or Subdivision Plan application the Town's Engineer shall develop a construction monitoring estimate for the project. The Applicant or Developer shall provide a check for the estimated amount that will be placed in escrow for inspections and monitoring of the project during construction prior to the Planning Board signing the final plans.*
12. *Prior to start of construction activities the Developer shall provide a construction schedule and shall request and attend a pre-construction meeting with the Town Departments and the Town's Engineer.*
13. *Any unused escrow funds required for the completeness review, technical review or construction inspections shall be returned to the Applicant or developer, as appropriate.*

T. Giffen said so this gets people in to see the Planning Board with something that's complete and where the minor housekeeping details have been cleaned up by the applicant in advance based upon their preliminary discussions with the Town's engineer. It should keep the meetings and process more efficient. Help approvals proceed more quickly where appropriate. The applicant goes in knowing what to accept.

D. Snow asked why didn't you address minors, just majors. T. Giffen replied minor ones were reasonably simple, there's no engineering review on a minor. Majors have a huge amount of engineering involved, it's more complex.

The Board discussed some of the items in the proposed Draft. B. Ruoff said regarding #2, 7 days is reasonable, it's a review for the completeness not a full review. C. Robie suggested a change on #10. T. Giffen suggested that we read and review, do our homework and make notes, bring them back and discuss them. It was discussed to put DRAFT on every page of any PDF that is posted online so people can review it. B. Ruoff from Stantec recommended that the finalized 2017 regs be clean going forward and you keep a copy of your old regulations so you have it. But the finalized 2017 version would be clean.

T. Giffen suggested discussing the *procedural instructions addendum* tonight and come back to discuss the Earth Excavation, Major Site and Major Subdivision. R. Cartier said one section in a meeting. B. Ruoff said Vinton St. is a good example. We basically did a full engineering review of a set of plans that didn't have any drainage design. So essentially we wasted the applicant's fee, roughly \$2,000 in doing a full engineering design review of a subdivision. We would like to avoid that. It's not good for the Town, the applicant or for us. The \$1,500 should be able to cover most review fees and that's the idea. Dial it in to that number. Most Towns that require a completeness review up front that is the fee. That's our goal. That's about ½ of our estimated review fees. Our goal is to bring down fees and streamline the process for the Town and the applicants.

C. Robie had a comment on #10. *Town's Engineer shall develop a construction cost estimate for the purpose of establishing a project surety.* That's premature. We're only accepting the application, that's worded incorrectly? B. Ruoff, point #5, once the application is complete, application acceptance there, point #5. Then we go into the RSA's about when the applicant would be heard, that's 30 days. We set the standard for how quickly we will get a full technical review done. 14 days within the original submittal, point #7 and then point #8 is 7 days for any re-submittal or additional information. Discussion ensued on #10 regarding the correct terminology of approval, application. B. Ruoff said #10 and #11 would be approval of the plans. R. Cartier suggested the application being deemed complete. D. Lewis stated comment #10 needs to be incorporated into 5.03 in our regulations,

neither one reference the Town engineer for figuring out the surety amount. It leaves that open but then it says the engineer, building inspector, road agent, everybody has a part in releasing it but it doesn't say who calculates it. 5.03 of subdivision regulations.

They asked B. Ruoff to make the changes on #10 and #11 and bring it back next time. Bryan will come back next meeting. T. Giffen confirmed that's all part of the budgeted amount. B. Ruoff agreed. B. Ruoff said we'd like to incorporate for Subdivision Appendix A,B and C, there are current, construction details that are not really clear. I can't read the detail so with the Board's permission we'd like to add something that's more clear to read; add any additional construction details that may be warranted; i.e. utility trench etc. We can coordinate that with Dennis. T. Giffen again confirmed that this is all within the scope of the accepted proposal. B. Ruoff said yes. T. Giffen said good to go then.

Discussion of Procedures and Regulations:

T. Giffen started with conditional approvals. You can have conditions of approval and in that case, unless somebody has met the conditions, they don't get an approval. And then you have a conditional approval where an approval is granted but they must continue to perform. Example the setting of bounds, it usually takes a month or so to get bounds set. When the number of conditions on a conditional approval start to get to a large number, it becomes difficult to manage for the people in the Land Use office. It's difficult with 10 or 12 of them. Perhaps changing our procedure so we limit the number of conditions for a conditional approval and try to have more conditions of approval so that until something is performed, there is no approval. C. Robie said if we follow the procedure that we just recommended to the applicants, that a lot of that will go away. R. Cartier agreed. The RSA's have specific areas that we can't hold up approval for subsystem designs and things like that.

T. Giffen said sometimes the more rules, the more difficult it can be. Maybe on a case by case basis. If we adopt some of these regulations, a lot of these problems will go away. We might want to defer acting on that. Board agreed to wait. C. Robie said we should change not conditional approval, an approval of condition, we should change the wording. We always right conditional approval. It should be approval if they meet the conditions. They have to meet the condition. They got the approval as long as they meet the condition. An applicant would need to be sure he's going to get an approval to get to the final condition. Give them an approval with a condition, not a condition with approval. It's like #10.

R. Cartier replied we're not approving it, we're giving them conditional approval if they meet these conditions, then it's approved. It's a conditional approval because we can't give them an approval. T. Giffen commented it's not uncommon for a conditional approval subject to the setting of bounds. Bounds get set, it could be a week or a month out, depends on schedule, we have chosen not to hold them up but to give them an approval, I believe Dave would go out and check to see if the bounds have been set. C. Robie said nobody goes out to check; the certified engineer sets the bound and signs the paper. D. Lewis said some towns bond those monumentations so they do get a full approval and they've bonded the monumentation part. Then you don't have a conditional approval out there. It's like a road being built. R. Cartier said I think there's an RSA that refers to conditional approval. *RSA 676:4. Administrative and Enforcement Procedure; A planning board may grant conditional approval of a plat or application, which approval shall become final without further public hearing.* T. Giffen said so you don't make the person come back in other words, you're done. The concern is if you have 8 or 10 conditions, it's difficult to manage. Do we need a rule or will a lot of this go away with our new changes that are possibly going to happen so maybe we should defer on that for now. That will be a form of recommendation of the Board. Leave it alone. D. Lewis asked if you grant conditional approval or condition of approval or however it's worded, can a notation be added that no construction can commence until all conditions are met. You know the problems we've had with this, things started without conditions being met. T. Giffen reiterated no construction can begin until all conditions are met.

B. Kruse asked who monitors whether the conditions have been met. T. Giffen said that's normally you Dave right? D. Murray said yes, pretty much. C. Robie said or Stantec, clearing up the details with the other engineer sending a letter saying that. T. Giffen confirmed if it's an engineering change but on the ground, you're the point person. D. Murray said that's right so when it gets to be 10 or 12 of them, it's difficult. Not too bad with one subdivision at a time but this year we had a burst of them and it's been crazy. C. Robie said how is anyone doing any work without an approval? If the conditions haven't been met, they're not supposed to be getting a permit. D. Lewis said sometimes it isn't a building permit; they're starting to put in driveways or build the road. C. Robie replied they can put in a driveway if they have a driveway permit. D. Lewis said but the lot hasn't been finalized. C. Robie said if he doesn't have a permit, he can't put in a driveway. If he doesn't have a lot, then he can't get a permit. D. Lewis responded well usually they don't have their permit yet but they think they have Planning Board approval so they're off and running. How we interpret it and how they interpret it usually becomes an argument. D. Murray commented working with Stantec, a lot of that will go away. We can revisit this. B. Kruse asked would it be part of the procedure that the applicant is reminded, "you may not start" you're talking about putting that note on the paper of conditional approval but you also need to remind the applicant and have it be in the minutes that the applicant was reminded not to start construction. C. Robie said I think we always do, they all know that. B. Kruse said well you assume that they know it but whether they know it and choose to follow it are two different things. T. Giffen said there's an economic pull, time is money and people want to get things done. Something needs to be *set or said (unintelligible)* so they know that they can't start until things are done. R. Cartier said they get conditional approval and go to their bank but they can't do anything until they come in and get a permit from Dave or a permit from Dennis, other than clear land. No permit required for clearing lots. They really wouldn't be able to start anyway. B. Petrin asked can that be laid out in the notice of decision. T. Giffen if we have an approval with conditions that have not yet been performed, it certainly should be. B. Petrin that includes no work can begin without a permit that would come from Mr. Murray. C. Robie said we don't give out the project's been completed until the conditions have been met. We don't send that letter until the conditions have been met. T. Giffen said in the past some notices of decision went out when bounds hadn't been set. C. Robie said well they shouldn't have. T. Giffen reiterated what C. Robie said that we shouldn't even send out a notice of decision until such time as everything's been completed.

More discussion ensued regarding conditions being be met before the approval and getting the permits.

B. Kruse said if an applicant says I'm going to build my house here and building it anywhere else it will create problems and then the plan changes and the builder is building in a different place than what was presented to the Planning Board. In a situation like that where it's important for a structure to be built in a particular place, is that something that would get written on the approved plan. T. Giffen said no. C. Robie said you can't do that. Using the application we approved tonight, the gentleman has 245 feet of road frontage with buildable soils on all 500 feet; he can build anywhere in that 250 feet he wants, as long as he meets the setback requirements. B. Kruse replied I understand that but there have been other projects where it was expected the building was going to be here because of the topography and then the building got moved for economic reasons but that was not what was presented to the Planning Board. The result it creates other problems, the footprint of that building changed. C. Robie responded I don't think the Planning Board approves any plans with a footprint of a building on them. I don't know if the Planning Board can tell a landowner where they have to put their house or not. I don't know if that would stand up in court. If you have a piece of upland soil that meet the criteria and the regulation, they can probably put the house anywhere they want on that lot. R. Cartier said there are 2 issues. Residential, we never have where they are going to locate the house. We have maybe where they will put the septic system but that gets approved by the state. Some of the larger subdivisions or commercial developments it was part of the Planning Board approval of where everything would be located because of the engineering studies and drainage. It's a two sided issue. T.

Giffen said First Stoppe is a good example of that. Drainage design, lighting design meeting requirements with detail on the plan with light poles and ice cream “cabin” would go and parking. And that gets approved with that detail as a part of it and it gets built to that design. The approval is for a specific design at that point. C. Robie corrected that’s site plan, not subdivision. D. Lewis said the same holds true for driveways. That’s why we don’t issue a driveway permit prior to the plan being subdivided. As long as it meets the sight distance requirements, they can put it anywhere. As long as there is a location available, that’s what’s looked at.

R. Cartier said the Board can grant conditional approval and it will become final without public hearing. *A planning board may grant conditional approval of a plat or application, which approval shall become final without further public hearing, upon certification to the board by its designee or based upon evidence submitted by the applicant of satisfactory compliance with the conditions imposed.* To my knowledge, we’ve never received confirmation that the conditions have been met. I could be wrong. D. Snow said the reason you don’t, the statutes allow the Planning Board to create a lot and when you’re talking about the septic, you don’t have to put it in the same place. Just that the lot is capable of supporting the septic system. When the Planning Board creates the lot for residential use, it gets turned over to him (*Dave Murray*), and he’s responsible for ensuring that all the conditions are met. If there not met, the guy doesn’t get his CO, doesn’t get his building permit. The statutes don’t allow the Planning Board to micro-manage. R. Cartier said but if we do a conditional approval, it requires the applicant provide to the Board that they have met the requirements, whether it comes through Dave. So if we have a list of 4 conditions have to be met, they can’t do anything on that until the Board has received the information that it’s been done. D. Snow said my guess of what the lawyer’s would say is once you’ve given conditional approval, you hand it over to him (*Dave*), you might expect him to do something but you can’t control the applicant once you’ve signed the...*unintelligible*. D. Murray said the conditions have to be met before you sign off on the mylars. R. Cartier said we cannot sign off on a mylar if it says conditional approvals. D. Snow said that’s not true. You sign off as soon as you approve it with conditions. R. Cartier said no, not according to 676:4. T. Giffen said if we were in compliance with 674:4 we would not. We will be in compliance. I don’t know if there were instances in the past where we weren’t compliant but going forward we will be in full compliance. D. Snow said you may be right; you may be able to say we’re not going to sign; you’re not approved if you haven’t met all the conditions. More discussion ensued about conditional approvals and waivers. T. Giffen said I haven’t read 674:4 yet so we will defer and move on.

Letter from Resident of Crowley Road.

T. Giffen said I indicated we’re not going to talk about Crowley Road but this is a request for work on zoning and I’d like to have it read into the record. J. Lindsey read the letter.

July 14, 2017 6 Crowley Road Candia NH 03034

Dear Fellow Citizens of Candia,

*As a registered Candia voter and 40-year resident of Candia, I am one of the citizens who were at the standing-room-only Planning Board Meeting of Wed. June 21, 2017. It was obvious that there is an overwhelming objection to approving the proposed 60-unit "Crowley Woods" housing development located in the town of Chester having its **ONLY** access from Crowley Road in Candia, a somewhat narrow, curving, designated scenic road.*

According to Mr. Griffin, Candia does not have any zoning ordinances prohibiting major housing developments on a non-arterial road. If "Crowley Woods" is approved, then all of Candia is vulnerable to similar projects which permanently alter one of the primary assets the town has that attracts new residents - our much-loved rural atmosphere. In our family, waiting at an intersection or at the end of our driveway for 5 or more cars is considered "rush hour" with 10-plus being heavy traffic.

Please consider adding zoning requirements for all Candia subdivisions that address the safety and other


challenges of the current "Crowley Woods" proposed development.

At the June 21 meeting, many very pertinent points were voiced by concerned area residents. Tom Griffin, as Planning Board Chair, is commended for running a difficult meeting in a civil and fair way. Thank you for voting to have the subdivision considered as one with "major regional impact." It was clear from public conversations after the meeting, that there was frustration that legally stopping the project seems impossible and that a beautiful, quiet, rural road could become a dangerous heavily traveled thoroughfare with an estimated additional traffic of 600 vehicles per day (10 trips per house) plus all the heavy construction trucks needed to build the 60 houses and roadway in Chester. This scenic, very lightly traveled road is the reason we chose to live on Crowley Road! All the adjoining streets will feel the brunt of this population growth as well. I live at the corner of Crowley and Chester Roads. It is the bus stop for all the children living on Crowley Road - currently about 10, driven to the corner.

The negative impact for Candia goes beyond those who will lose the quiet, rural nature we love about living on Crowley Road and the connecting roads. The Town of Candia will be the biggest loser. Tax money from 60 houses will go to the Town of Chester while Candia will be financially responsible for the cost of maintaining the heavily travelled roadways and most likely providing for increased first responder aid by police, fire, emergency, etc., for the Chester properties. Distance to Chester's police, fire, school, emergency services is **DOUBLE** the distance from Candia's.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Claver

Regrettably, I cannot be at the July 19 Work Session. However, I would be happy to help develop and pass this zoning ordinance in whatever way that would be of assistance to get it instituted at the earliest opportunity so our town will be protected against large tracts of farm land and forests near small roads becoming large housing developments.

Eli: (on behalf of the Candia residents affected by the "Crowley Woods" development proposal)

T. Giffen said my goal was to simply get it read into the record. It's a request for a zoning change, to restrict development on non-arterial roads. We'll take this up at a later time.

Surety Bond Amounts

T. Giffen said 66 Vinton; there was a spread of Stantec's number and theirs of \$400,000 or \$500,000 roughly. C. Robie said double. T. Giffen said there was an issue with getting a bigger bond. Is what we're doing now inefficient, unfair, or unreasonable? What do we need to do if anything to improve the surety bond determination process. Last time we worked back and forth, we made a few compromises. Discussed it as a Board, we voted, we gave them the number we would accept. The fact that it got shot down by their bonding agent is not necessarily our problem or our responsibility. I think we did a reasonable job of protecting the Town's interest. It's unfortunate for them that they weren't able to go through with it. They failed to get a bond. C. Robie said take that for what's it worth, that's none of our business.

D. Lewis said on roadway bonds if they use DOT numbers and can back that up, it's the safest way to go. The applicant's never going to agree to it, they'll want it for way less. It's just the bond and the quicker they get their project done the quicker it gets lowered. In our best interest if Stantec follows DOT numbers is the best way to go. Site Plan is a different matter. R. Cartier asked shouldn't that be in the zoning regulations under surety that surety bonds, roadways based on current NHDOT specifications. D. Lewis said gravel is gravel; pavement is pavement so DOT numbers should be alright. T. Giffen said if we go by current NHDOT rates, we're doing a decent job of protecting the Town it's not up to us to make it as inexpensive as possible for a developer to come through, that's not our goal. D. Lewis replied and it's fair across the board. C. Robie commented 10 or 15% cost to bond a project like that, shouldn't break a guy that's doing a project of that size. It isn't like its \$800,000 cash, if you're reputable, 10 to 15% you're going to get bonded. It's not a whole lot of cash out up front. T.

Giffen said in order to get bonded you need to submit financial statements and sometimes personal credit. You go to a bonding company with strong credit and good audited financials and the proposals reasonable; you're probably going to get bonded.

K. Kustra asked if things are done in stages, should there be a separate surety bond. T. Giffen replied said let's take the Crowley Rd proposal as an example. Their talking about building a stretch of road going in. Then stage 2 where they would build a second stretch of road to loop back out. Then the 3rd stage would be the additional leg of the cul-de-sac. So that's clearly 3 different projects. There might be a reason to have a separate bond for each. Whereas somebody is building one length of road say 2300 feet, their entitled to get something back as they complete part of it. That solves the problem. That's true of any phase of a phased project. I think we're already there. C. Robie said let's let the surety bond play out to the best of our ability.

Letters

T. Giffen said the Planning Board already discussed this but although our regulations require applicants to go get a letter from the Police Chief, a letter from the Fire Department and a letter from the Assessor's Office, with respect to current use, often times they weren't doing that themselves. They were throwing that back over to staff. We all like to be nice to people but sometimes enough is enough. We reached that point. We discussed as a Board and we decided to follow our own rules and have people go get their own letters. A. Hall said if you refer to the Planning Board minutes with the new administrative assistant, she's just doing her job, enforcing the regulations. We're enforcing it now.

Conservation Commission Communication Etc.-All Boards

T. Giffen said all Boards working in conjunction with the Planning Board so that we have a better, fuller picture of all the stakeholders concerns. It's my intent as Chair to work fully with all of the Boards so where there's an instance where input from any other Board is likely to be helpful or if another Board feels that they have something we should listen to, we'll listen. We'll try to have joint meetings if needed. We'll invite other Board members to come to our Board meetings if possible. Letters received will be read into the record and concerns will be discussed and addressed. Keep the lines open. D. Snow commented in the past the other Boards haven't gotten anything, some member of the Board might see it, might be at the meeting but that may be at the point where you guys are already making decisions as opposed to seeing it when it starts. T. Giffen replied we should copy all agendas because that's the start of the process. D. Snow replied you should ask if there's input from the Conservation Commission, maybe you put something on there that says I need something from the Conservation Commission that they looked at it. T. Giffen said if we circulate an agenda, I would think the Conservation Commission would be able to make that judgment on their own.

B. Kruse said if I'm looking at an agenda, I may not appreciate the conditions of the application coming before you unless I come to the meeting. T. Giffen said it may make sense to get a copy of the application and preliminary plan. B. Kruse continued I would ask that the Planning Board in the process of looking at an application feels that this particular application may be impacting an area in such a way to bring that to our attention. I'm not sure that that's been done with any regularity in the past. T. Giffen replied I think that if we get you as much information as we ourselves get, as soon as we get it, that you're better equipped as a Conservation Commission to make a judgment as to whether you should be involved and send us a quick memo in response once a plan is received. So maybe if we copy applications and preliminary plans, have a single point of contact so we can distribute to the Chair. We could do that for the Historical Commission as well. Just send off a PDF. D. Snow said give Dennis everything, who is a member of the Conservation Commission which is a help, and we have a member on the Planning Board but part of the procedure, Dennis isn't around anymore, the procedure is the Conservation Commission gets the same kind of thing that the Road Agent does. T. Giffen replied as a procedural thing, I would think an email list could be implemented and PDF's could be sent to the Chair of each respective Board.

More discussion ensued about the best way to notify other Boards and departments of applications and plans or any informational received by the Planning Board for review.

T. Giffen said an email list of the Chairs of Zoning, Conservation, Historical or Heritage, and if a Chair decides to opt out of the list, they can. Police Chief, Fire Chief. Carleton will always need a hard copy. A. Bickum commented that the public notice does go out at least 10 days prior to any Planning Board meeting and it's always posted with what's going on so if anyone wants to look at anything, they can come to the office. I'd be happy to show them. S. Young pointed out that they have a tax map and lot number and they can go on the website for the tax maps. A. Bickum agreed the tax maps are all online.

MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** to close the Zoning Revision meeting. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in agreement. Motion carried (6-0-0) for Planning Board Members.** It was the consensus of the entire committee present to close the ZRRC meeting.

MOTION:

C. Robie **motioned** to adjourn the Planning Board meeting. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion carried (6-0-0).**

Meeting was **adjourned** at approximately **9:23 pm**. The next ZRRC meeting will be August 16th.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary