

PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

TOWN OF LITCHFIELD

Held on January 21, 2014

approved 2/4/2014

The Litchfield Planning Board held a Public Hearing in the Town Hall conference room 2 Liberty Way, Litchfield, NH 03052 on Tuesday, January 21 at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Russell Blanchette (Chair), Tom Young (Vice Chair), Frank Byron (Selectmen's Rep), Michael Caprioglio, Jason Guerrette (alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kevin Bourque (Selectmen's Rep), Joel Kapelson, Michael Croteau, Bob Curtis, Steve Perry (alternate)

ALSO PRESENT: Jen Czysz (NRPC Senior Planner), Joan McKibben (Administrative Assistant)

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Blanchette called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1) Second Public Hearing in accordance with NH RSA 675.7. Text available online or at the Town Clerk's Office.

Mr. Blanchette read over the Introduction.

Over the past year, the Litchfield Planning Board has been working to understand Litchfield's residents' vision for the future of the community through a future land use mapping workshop, one-on-one conversations with local residents and business owners, and a community survey. Based upon what residents stated, the board has been working to update regulations to balance future opportunities to protect the town's agricultural character and allow for non-residential development in a way that blends with the community's character. Additionally, the Board has been working to update regulations such as its bylaws and description of zoning boundaries - both last reviewed in 1989.

Mr. Blanchette explained the Hearing Procedures.**Aquifer Protection Overlay District:**

Minor amendments are proposed to the Aquifer Protection District to clarify existing provisions. The definition of impervious is updated to provide additional detail and examples and has been further revised to incorporate comments from the 12/17/2013 hearing. Amendments unchanged from that which was heard in December include a reminder that a current use permit is already allowed for applications will exceed 15% impervious was added earlier in the ordinance. Lastly, the referenced zoning districts are amended to correctly cite the current zoning districts.

Mr. Blanchette Opened the meeting for public comment.**Public Comment: -**

Mr. Kevin Lynch of 312 Charles Bancroft Highway came in front of the board to state that on the impervious surfaces, examples of impervious surfaces include, but are not limited to roofs, and unless designed to effectively absorb or infiltrate water, decks, patios, and paved, gravel or crushed stone driveways considered impervious? Mr. Blanchette asked Jen how we came up with that? Jen stated that those are examples and are pulled from the shoreline protection act, because they are effectively impervious. Kevin stated that a stone driveway is not impervious, he can see paved driveways; something that does not allow the water to go through. Decks allow water to natural causes going down for a pervious bed underneath. Kevin stated that when he sees something come by like that he is going to say that it is pervious by design. Gravel is pervious, stone is pervious. Kevin stated that he is just bringing it up, but he can make it work still. Jen stated that ultimately when it comes to your gravel, it depends on what the construction profile is below that, because you can end up with something that is effectively impervious. Mr. Lynch stated that he understands.

Mr. Blanchette closed the Public Comment.**Non-Residential Zoning Districts:**

The intent of the proposed amendments to the Non-Residential Zoning Districts (Commercial, Transitional, and Commercial-Industrial) is to promote development with a small New England town character and set standards and boundaries that match existing parcel configurations. Since being heard in December several changes have been made, including: added 3 new definitions, clarified that prohibited large regional shopping type

uses are those with a footprint of 20,000 sf or more, exempted agricultural uses from screening requirements, removed prohibition on automobile service centers as the use is allowed by special exception, and clarified that lighting standards also apply to signs and applicants must still comply with the Site Plan Review Requirements.

That which remains unchanged from December includes: a new section (408) of General Requirements for Non-Residential Uses consolidates all common requirements, which are in turn struck from the individual districts to eliminate redundancy, and adds new standards (landscaping, lighting, screening unsightly features) to protect community character. Amendments to sections 600-1000 include reduced frontage requirements (200 feet on Routes 3A and 102), amend permitted uses to be consistent with existing and desired development (expand agricultural uses, limit large scale or more industrial uses such as vehicle salvage yards), and amend zoning district boundaries to reduce instances of split lot zoning and update parcel references to correspond to the current assessing maps.

Public Comment:

Claudette Durocher of 158 Charles Bancroft Highway had a question about the Northern Commercial Zone which says east of 3A, three parcels at the intersection of Albuquerque and 3A (currently the commercial/industrial and transitional districts) are proposed to be added to the district. CLaudette wanted to know what the purpose of that was and what would it allow. Russ stated that it is just to maintain some contiguous zoning lines on the map and trying to be consistent with what is in that zone already, and as far as what could be built there, whatever will be allowed that stays with the character. Russ asked Jen for a little clarification. A member of the public asked to be shown on the map. Jen pulled up the map on the screen and stated that in terms of the change and the difference of permitted uses, it would be slightly less intense uses that would be allowed here (pointing to the map) because the orange section is commercial/industrial so the primary concern was having the potential for more industrial uses to be that close to 3A and that location right at that intersection which is a pretty prominent intersection so pulling that in to be part of the northern commercial district which was the smaller scale commercial uses, and then the transitional here was just simply a matter of how that (one parcel which is split) just pulling it to be together. Jen stated that this map is in the handout on page 3. Kevin Lynch asked Jen and the Board to go through each page and explain what the difference is to what was proposed and what was not proposed. Jen went to the map on page 4 which is the southern end of 3A; (Jen explained that this particular map splits on two pages) the specific changes here; the solid colors are the current existing underlying zoning, the hatched is the proposed. On the western edge of 3A there is a transitional district that exists, that is a thin strip along 3A which creates a situation where there are many lots that

have split lot zoning, where the front of the lot is zoned as transitional , but the majority of the lot is zoned as commercial, the intent was to eliminate any confusion where that zoning boundary specifically lies and to create harmonious districts where you go in and know as a property owner, this is what my property is zoned. Right now for these folks along here, they would only have a small portion zoned with one set of permitted uses and densities and the rest of their lot zoned differently so that has to split their development as such. Also, for the portions that are zoned commercial along 3A, currently they are not allowed to count their frontage on 3A as their frontage, so they would have to build a road into their parcel to actually be able to develop those commercial portions of the land. Jen mentioned that similarly on the east side of 3A, at parcel 393 you have a similar condition where it is transitional at the front of the lot with frontage on 3A and commercial industrial east of that, the proposed is to bring the commercial industrial right up to 3A and part of this is with the understanding that with these zoning district changes, there is also increased provisions proposed for the front buffer, having that vegetative landscaping along 3A and part of that went into the site plan regulations and there is companion language proposed for the zoning ordinance. Jen explained that at the northern end of this district where the greatest concern was where the transitional district truly had a use of separating the higher intensity uses from the residential district was to make sure the transitional district was of a functional size that it really allowed for more than just a sliver and so proposed to eliminate the split lot and follow the parcel boundaries, but also to pull in the few parcels as part of that larger transitional district. Similar at the southernmost segment you have a segment of transitional district that borders route 3A where the commercial district is proposed again to come up to the road, the commercial/industrial district to come up to the road, then the large parcel at the southern end of town is actually owned by the State of NH and is the parcel of land that the state retained for the circumferential highway were it ever to be built. Jen explained that if that was ever to happen we would be luck if it was 20 to 30 years out, the intent was that if that is going to be more of a highway like road that the state were to create there then the zoning uses should be consistent with that of a highway type road and so proposed that this be part of the highway commercial district that is in that south eastern corner of town that this connects to. Jen stated that the south eastern corner of town, you have this green portion where this is the remainder of the state owned land where it connects into the highway commercial district, then what the Board did was look at the western boundary of the highway commercial district and noted that it did not follow parcel lines, it just runs straight through parcels, so you have many parcels that are partially in the highway commercial district and partially in the residential district, and what they did was follow property lines and roadways. While it is a slightly more jagged line, it makes it clearer as it follows the parcel lines. The other proposed change here is in this little corner, there are several parcels here in the southeastern corner that are currently included in the highway commercial district, however they are all residential properties, they all have

frontage on Derry Road and many of them it is just the back portion of the lot, where the front of the lot is actually located in Hudson and zoned as residential so that proposed change is just to pull them out of the highway commercial which means then they would revert to be part of the commercial district.

Claudette asked about the little section on Page road that is becoming transitional, was that going to become a conflict, where that district all around them is residential and you have that little piece jutting out. Jen stated that it is part of parcel 39. Claudette asked about the green zone along 3A, and wanted to know if in planning for this because you are going to have an awful lot of activity out of that big lot, is there any provision made for when this is developed, that there would be certain setbacks for widening of 3A because we know that from neighboring towns, that when you get a lot of commercial activity, the road can not just take two lanes, you eventually have to widen it. Russ stated that is why we have the setbacks that we have currently, so there is that provision for future alterations to the road if necessary. Claudette asked about the setbacks. Jen stated that road widenings for 3A would have to go through the ten year highway process and right now the emphasis is on maintaining the existing roads, not in expanding capacity. Claudette stated that while you are planning this, shouldn't you think of this now because the land is vacant. Jen stated that the front setback is 50'. Kevin stated that the state owned parts of 3A in some parts are 60'. Kevin stated that if you are going to get something that is going to go in there, as a Planning Board function, your site plan regulations require green space up front. Claudette mentioned that you are better off asking for a deeper frontage and provide for that and you won't have to fight every site plan you approve, because some people might say it is not the law and I don't have to do it. If they know what the rules are it makes it easier for everybody.

David Doyle of 12 Rotterdam Drive stated that he had one thing about the project in general, which is changing the ordinances now. Mr. Doyle stated that we have to be real careful about the changes we make because we can't just keep going back and forth. You are talking about taking something that is somewhat commercially zoned or industrial zoned and changing it to residential and ten years down the road somebody is going to come in and maybe want to put something light industrial there, and it is going to be a problem for them to do that. Mr. Doyle asked if the Board is absolutely sure they want to take some of this traditional land and change it into a residential use, even if it is what we need because of the State which has requirements for that, we don't have to overdue that requirement. Russ stated that right now what they are discussing is a non residential zoning amendments. Tom stated that most of this is done to get rid of the split lot zoning. Mr. Doyle stated that makes perfectly good sense to him.

Margaret Berg of 294 Charles Bancroft Highway, stated that she understands the ease of this for the split lots, but does not understand cutting the setbacks. Margaret asked for

someone to explain that to her. Tom Young stated that they are not changing the setbacks, it is the frontage. Mike mentioned that the setback is the way it always has been for a number of years, the depth on the road is still the same. Jen stated that 50' is the standard and you rarely see more than that.

Public Input is closed.

Multi-Family Residential Overlay District:

The proposed overlay is updated from that proposed in 2013 to better identify the overlay boundaries based on public input. Additionally, based upon comments received at the 12/17/2013 hearing, the district boundaries as proposed have been revised to incorporate parcels north of Page Road between Route 3A and Albuquerque Avenue. The remainder of the proposed ordinance remains unchanged from that which was presented at the December hearing. The new Multi-Family Residential Overlay District is proposed to provide opportunities for development of Multi-Family housing as required by state law. As drafted, the ordinance requires any new multi-family construction to maintain the existing character of the neighborhood. The minimum lot size proposed is 2 acres for the first 3 dwelling units, with an additional 5,000 square feet required for each additional unit and no more than 6 dwelling units may be permitted in any one structure. The proposed district boundaries are the Residential and Commercial Districts north of Leach Brook and the Residential, COmmercial and Transitional Districts south of Chase Brook and east of Route 3A to Albuquerque Avenue and then south of Page Road.

Public Comment:

Margaret Berg asked to see this on the map. Jen pulled up the map. Jen stated that in anticipation of Mr. Doyle's question, the multi family district is an overlay so it functions as an additional set of property rights that you have in addition to the underlying district, so the underlying district remains and then where the multi family district is applied, you are also allowed to do multi family. Jen explained that the reason it is done as an overlay is because the district does not necessarily conform to any one of the underlying districts and so in some cases it overlaps. Jen stated that at the northern district, the area selected are those parcels north of Leach Brook that is predominantly residential , there is a small portion of transitional and a small portion that is in the commercial district where you would also be allowed to create multi family for this to be adopted. Similarly at the southern end of town, the portion that was added since the last hearing (showing on the map) is this segment here north of Page Road and South of Chase Brook, which is based on the testimony of the hearing where somebody had suggested including that land, this was through to Albuquerque and then the boundary returns to being south of Page Road. Essentially it takes anything east of 3A, south of Chase Brook up to Albuquerque and south

of Page Road and then north and west of the town boundary. It would be any parcel where the underlying zoning is residential, commercial or transitional. Jen mentioned that at the same time there is proposed changes to those underlying district boundaries, so the overlay is tied to the underlying district, so if this strip here is no longer transitional, multi family would no longer be allowed on this strip here, but where that transitional district gets a little larger, it would incorporate those few parcels. Jen stated that the difference is 4 acres in the overall total and pulled it up on the map to show everyone what it would look like if it were to be included on the ballot and passed if that multi family would shift.

Claudette questioned why the district is expanded to beyond Page Road to Chase Brook. CLaudette stated that was not really discussed at the last hearing except for that one guy got up and said that he owns 6 acres, would you mind just pushing the boundaries over, including his land. Why was this done? Russ stated that it is only between Albuquerque and 3A.

Mr. Steve Ducharme who lives on Page Road, and stated that he spoke to it before. He owns 6 to 8 acres there, but across the street it was developable land, so they were going to be able to develop there and you can see it but not be able to do the same to your own land which was a reasonable thing to ask. Kevin stated that what you basically did was to follow the brook all the way up through as a buffer. Russ stated that it is a natural boundary. Claudette stated that the people who live on Page Road , it is not a buffer for them, you are just going to open their lots all over the place, they are going to be surprised that they are a single family house and in their backyard somewhere somebody is going to put up multi family. Russ stated that if this is passed there are specific conditions, it does have to meet the requirements, it is not just going to be a pagewood oval put down in the middle of a single family. Claudette asked why they opened it all the way? Claudette thinks the Planning Board went overboard with the whole strip. We don't have municipal sewerage and you are going to have to rely on septic fields for these multi family, and you are going to be near the brook which is a major drainage basin, why do we want to do that, why do we want to risk bringing a lot of potential drainage problems, because septic fields only last so long before you have to relocate them. Why don't we leave the lines the way they were, it was a natural separation and is working fine. Mr. Caprioglio said that it would be more contiguous if you change it because otherwise you could have a road on one side of the street that has multi family and on the other side of the street have single family. Mr. Caprioglio stated that a lot of the lots are not big enough to put up multi family there. Mike asked Jen if a lot of the lots are not big enough to include multi family because of the requirements for it. Jen stated that it is a minimum of 2 acres. Jen stated that there is a lot of single family. Jen pulled up a document and stated that it is in the south and north end of town, you have a total of 21 parcels, so in that really large area at the south plus the area

to the north, you have 21 vacant parcels and 3 agricultural parcels that have enough land for multi family development. Jen stated that you have another 45 parcels that are vacant but do not have enough minimum acreage to be eligible. Jen stated that if they are too small and they have septic they are not going to be able to do it because they are not going to have enough land area to meet their septic loading requirements. CLaudette asked how many potential apartment units, if all of this goes through could people build, what are we looking at. Jen stated that if every parcel available that meets the minimum lot size criteria were to be developed to their maximum potential (Jen stated that they deducted wetlands, so they started with raw numbers, deducted out wetlands, steep slopes, a couple of other natural constraints, roads, surface waters, conservation lands: bare in mind, that doing this as a spread sheet model assumes that that acreage is contiguous, which if that acreage is not contiguous, these numbers are not even remotely feasible, so these numbers are absolute maximum with the assumption that it is contiguous and that someone even wants to build multi family.

Jen stated that the other consideration to bear in mind is that the State of NH parcel is 98 acres and that is the largest share of any of this land, so that parcel alone has a total possible number of 33 structures or 33 six unit structures which would equate to 198 units just on that State of NH parcel. Jen stated that this is excluding the wetlands. Jen stated that this is a really generous high number. Jen stated that is the problem with doing spreadsheet calculations of your development potential because it never reflects the actual potential to develop the land. Jen stated that not counting the State of NH parcel, there is another 23 parcels total that could support a 109 structures of varying sizes for a total of 646 units, again this assumes that this land area is contiguous and assumes that you can develop to that maximum density potential, and assumes that there is the market demand for the construction and you got a willing landowner and a willing developer. There are a lot of assumptions that go behind those numbers, so in reality the numbers aren't what you would see. Claudette asked if it includes the hash marks along page road. Jen stated yes, it includes everything that is in the hash marks that are in your handouts. Claudette mentioned that you are talking about almost 700 apartment units. Jen stated 109 buildings, 646 units.

David Doyle of 12 Rotterdam asked what the State is looking for for numbers, what do they want from us. Jen stated a reasonable and realistic opportunity. Claudette asked if we were overdoing it. Tom stated that he cannot foresee a builder coming in and saying, I can put 109 buildings in, it is not going to happen in this area. Claudette stated that it is not going to happen overnight, but he may come and buy this parcel and hold it for the future. Tom stated that it is not all one big parcel, (The State parcel, yes) but the rest of them are split. We just have to say what areas it could be done in. Tom stated that it is a overlay not zoning.

Kevin Lynch of 312 Charles Bancroft Highway stated that the purpose of this is to provide

some space for something to be done in the future. Kevin stated to Jen that her analysis of numbers are just numbers. Land use in the area (which he knows what is there and what is available) Kevin stated that you have your wetland delineations and then you get your buffers. If you get into a planned residential development, you got extreme buffers on that regulations now. (Jen stated that those buffers are not calculated in here) Kevin stated that one vernal pool are going to kill it and you know we are going to find those. Kevin stated that there is individual lots all the way through there and there are some lots that you can't even consider to be used because they are already calculated in another load, for the elderly, there are two of them there, there are two on Cutler, Page and then there is Arbor. Kevin stated that a lot of these numbers are taken up, they are already earmarked, they are already done. If the Town is changes the zoning and allows something different because they put in municipal sewer, that is another septic issue down the line. Sewer load, there is so many gallons you need for a three bedroom house, there is 2200 square feet of land area you need for subsurface. Kevin stated that if you take a one acre site, there are going to be other reasons. Kevin stated that as a whole he is not a fan of this, but it is the best way to do it right now, it is a start, comeback and refine it, receive some input. Kevin stated that we are obligated by revisions of statute, it did the statistical analysis on what we have for existing multi family, we have very little for a population of 8000. To turn multi family, we say in our regulations, we say 6 units, they can be town house, they can be two family with a common area. Everybody thinks of multi family being apartments, it is not always that. That is where the stigma is. You can take side by side condo's, triplexes and multiplexes, you are going to need water if you do anything in the first place, you are going to need to put in a sprinkler system, State law has said that three units or more requires fire suppression, so you are somewhat restricted on your density. Kevin stated that it is not the best in his opinion, but it is something.

John Regan of 9 Chase Brook Circle, mentioned to Kevin that if Jen's numbers are the mathematical extent, what is your practical opinion of likely. Kevin stated that he can say you can drop those numbers by 60%. Kevin stated that is spread out through the whole thing and that satisfies the state. Kevin stated that you have done something to show that you are going to do it. If we can only get 100 units out of this whole thing because there are many restrictions, you have shown that you have done something. Kevin stated that in the North end as an example shows a big section, you can't increase the density anymore, there is only about two parcels of land in the whole north end that would meet anything. Kevin stated that the Board is trying to meet an obligation that statute is requiring us to meet. The term multi family is a term that everybody hates, but everybody has lived in one growing up, whether it is a condo, multi family or rental.

John Regan stated that the Northern section, we are limited, we zone it and applied the overlay, but there is not a lot of practical use. The southern overlay is a mathematical extent, but the practical use is about 300 units, and the combination of the two still satisfies

the state requirement. Kevin stated that in his opinion being in zoning as long as he has, he thinks we have done something to show that we want it and we are complying. Mr. Guerrette stated that it is a matter of who is using the term reasonable.

Margaret Berg asked if this brings into account any existing multi family that is not on here. Russ stated for these calculations, no. Mike stated that you still need the overlay, because the state would say that it is not enough. Jen stated that the State does not take into consideration your existing housing stock when referring to multi family, so for multi family, what the state calls for, it has to be feasible that a developer could walk in the door today and submit an application for multi family. Mr. Doyle stated that the Board has three months to sell this, that is the biggest problem is getting it by the voters, it does not have any legs. Jen stated that is the next homework assignment. Russ stated that the Board is happy to take suggestions. Mr. Doyle said to change the name, it is the multi family that is killing us, and the overlay thing needs to be brought out in the open so everybody understands that. Mr. Doyle stated that up until tonight, he did not understand that, he thought that they were changing the ordinance completely, so that it was irreversible and five years down the road, somebody comes in and wants to do something, then we have to flip flop and they are going to get whatever they want because the Lawyers are going to say that these people don't even know what they are doing, they keep changing back and forth. Mr. Doyle does not believe that anybody really understands about what transitional zone means, its the other stuff is still underneath and makes him a little nervous because now 400' away from his bedroom window, they can put one of these buildings. Russ stated that is why he would like people to read the rest of the ordinance, where they have the performance standards. Mr. Doyle stated that nobody is going to sit there and read that. Mr. Doyle stated that you have to sell it as a short version. Margaret Berg stated that they need to have someone explain it in laymans terms of what you're going to actually accomplish. Margaret stated that she is educated and read this and does not understand. Claudette stated that she thinks when people see the overlay district going into established neighborhoods, it makes them nervous. Claudette stated that she does not think it is a good thing to just overlay existing neighborhoods that are already defined. Margaret Berg asked if you cut out the section of the overlay on Page Road, what kind of acreage are you losing and how does that affect your reasonability standard that the state is looking for. Tom stated that just because this is a overlay, we still have the same problem where we put in a multi family unit and right next to it is single family houses. It is not something with just the existing houses, you can have a multi family on each side, in front or in back of it. Kevin went to the map and explained what is already developed and what is available. Tom asked Jen to show pictures of the houses. Jen stated that they are affordable multi family houses. Tom stated that they do have revisions in Town to say what they are going to look like, this is in the Site Plan. Regulations.

John Regan asked the Board what their plan is to make this passes. Russ stated through

public outreach like this and a similar piece at the deliberative session, the standard stuff. John stated that this has not worked for twenty years. Kevin stated that the proposal you put forth is reasonable, the reality of what is really there needs to be described.

Margaret Berg stated that she thinks personally that what got her attention was the one page flyer that came in the HLN. Margaret stated it got her attention, but it didn't explain. Margaret stated that she is not really sure what the best venue is for the Board to get the word out. Claudette stated that it is a lot to absorb. Margaret stated that the Board needs to explain the if we don't do this, then the State can do this. Margaret stated that you need to show what happens in other Town's if they do not do this. Claudette asked how other Town's handle this. Jen gave a brief overview of what some of the other communities in the area do and stated that the majority of Towns in the region allow multi family in their ordinances already and cannot name one in the surrounding area that does not. Litchfield is one of the minority right now.

Jen proposed that one way to help get the word out - is if the public that is present can help get the word out. The Board can put it in the newspaper, cable access, put it on the Town website and the social media sites. Those are the mechanisms the Board has already utilized some point along the way. The other thing is just folks talking to their neighbors and help spread the word, which is one of the biggest ways that can help.

Claudette had a question on the southwestern commercial district where it talks about the change of permitted uses, large regional shopping type uses, such as department stores not exceeding 20,000 square feet. Claudette stated that she has trouble visualising 20,000 square feet. Claudette asked for an example in this town. The Board gave a few examples.

Mr. Regan asked if the Board was unanimously in favor of this proposal. Most of the members said yes. Frank stated that he thinks that will be determined with the votes.

Mr. Regan asked how the warrant was written. Mike stated that there are certain ways it has to be written which is not user friendly. Jen explained that they do have comply with state law and provide opportunities as required by state law, so it is in there twice.

Mr. Guerrette stated that there is no right answer until it is tested, a lot of things in NH are built that way. Jen stated that it was only on last years ballot. Conversation ensued.

Jen stated that her understanding of what the Board has done is by drawing the boundaries as they have, they have a broad mix of parcels, a lot are already developed, however by having those larger bounds, you are pulling in many parcels that do have potential. The specific analysis of those individual parcels, you can't do going into this, it is unreasonable for a Board to go into each individual parcel and do a development potential analysis of every individual parcel included within a regulation which is why we do the rough numbers. Jen stated that the other thing is to the reasonable and realistic part, you do have many

parcel, while they are developed have been excluded, they may still have the potential to be subdivided, they may have the potential for the individual structure itself to be redeveloped and split apart into two or three units, so what you're doing is creating a lot of opportunity and feasibility, but also you are doing it in a way that thoughtfully considers your local character which you have every right to do as a community and make sure what you are proposing is in balance with what you as a community and your existing character and scale and development, but also recognizing you don't have water and sewer throughout town, and so there is some balance to that regard.

Mr. Blanchette closed Public Comment and thanked the public for giving their input.

Mr. Blanchette asked Mr. Guerrette to be a voting member of the Board.

Aquifer Protection District Ordinance:

Motion: by Mr. Young to send the Aquifer Protection District Ordinance to ballot.

Second: By Mr. Caprioglio

Vote Passes: 4-0-1

Non-Residential Zoning:

Motion: by Mr. Caprioglio to send the Non-Residential Ordinance to ballot.

Second: by Mr. Young

Vote Passes: 4-0-1

Multi-Family Overlay: The Board further discussed.

Motion: by Mr. Caprioglio to send the Multi-Family Overlay to ballot.

Second: by Mr. Young

Vote Passes: 4-0-1

Jen went over the three articles and explained that what is here is the best draft they can get working with counsel. Jen stated that if they want to further revise what language is in the warrant they can, but it has to get to counsel first thing tomorrow morning and to Jason for posting.

The deadline to send warrant articles is tomorrow , January 22nd.

The Board further discussed the warrant articles. The Board will send forward the warrant articles.

2) Moose Hollow Road Update

Joan stated that she sent a letter on January 8 and heard nothing. The first time she was given the wrong address. Joan told Amos White, of Homes by Paradise owner of the road, that they would be discussing this at the meeting tonight. Joan stated that she told Amos that the letter was coming and still has heard nothing back. Russ will call and send another certified letter. Kevin stated that he will also call Amos. At the next meeting of the Planning Board they will discuss the final strategy.

3) Deliberative Session speakers

Russ stated that the Board of Selectmen have set the date of Deliberative of February 1st at 10:00 am at Campbell High School.

The Board discussed who would talk on what ordinance at the deliberative session. Jen stated that she would be more than happy to have the Board members prepared for the deliberative session. The snow date if necessary will be February 8th.

Approve minutes of January 7, 2013

Motion: by Mr. Young to approve the minutes of January 7 as amended.

Second: Mr. Caprioglio

Vote Passes: 5-0-0

Other Business

Jen stated that the 2014 meeting calendar s and submission deadlines are on the Boards google site.

Tom mentioned that last Thursday he was at the state house testifying about HB 1573 which is to eliminate the Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) of New Hampshire and to have all Planning Board members elected instead of appointed. It looks as if the majority of the people there were opposed to the bill. Tom will keep the Board informed of what is going on.

Frank mentioned that the sequence of events that will be followed is that they had a public hearing on that and excepted input, then they will have whats called an executive session. The executive session is where the committee will vote the bill and then it will go to a full house, if you continue to look at the house calendar, you will see that bill potentially come up in the next couple of weeks again, and that will be when the committee will vote the bill.

The committee when they do their sessions does not take public input, they only debate amongst themselves and vote a motion on that. It is the motion that will go to the full house. People can attend, but the committee will not take any public input.

Motion: by Young to Adjourn

Second: by Mr. Caprioglio

Vote: 6-0-0

The Next Planning Board meeting will be held on February 4, 2014 at 7:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm

Minutes taken by: Donna Baril