

HOLLIS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 5, 2019
FINAL

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Moseley – Chairman; Doug Cleveland – Vice Chairman, Chet Rogers, Cathy Hoffman, Jeff Peters, Matt Hartnett (Alternate), Rick Hardy (Alternate) David Petry, Ex-Officio for the Selectmen (arrives late).

ABSENT: Ben Ming

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Fougere, Town Planner; Evan Clements, Assistant Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM. J. Peters lead the group in the Pledge of Allegiance. R. Hardy appointed to vote for B. Ming.

2. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES – Meeting of September 17, 2019 – C. Hoffman moved to approve the minutes of Sept. 17, 2019. Motion seconded by d. Cleveland and unanimously approved. **Minutes of October 15, 2019.** C. Hoffman moved to approve the minutes of October 15, 2019 and include the recovered footage. One correction: Line 109 – change from M. Hartnett to J. Peters. Motion seconded by R. Hardy and unanimously approved.

3. DISCUSSION AND STAFF BRIEFING

- a. Agenda additions and deletions – C, Rogers – Discussion of establishing a cutoff time of 10:00 PM for Planning Board meetings
- b. Committee Reports - none
- c. Staff Report - none
- d. Regional Impact – none
- e. Site Walks – There will be site walks on Sat., Nov. 9 at the locations for the two pending solar installations.

4. SIGNATURE OF PLANS – Board approved signatures for the following plans: 2018-11 Cormier Site Plan; 2019-09 Seager 2-lot subdivision; 2019-10 Hollis Vet Site Plan.

5. HEARINGS –

- a. **File PB2019:05: Final Review** – Bella Meadows. Proposed two-lot subdivision and site plan for multi-family (32 units) townhome Workforce Housing (10 units) & market rate homes development (22 units). Old Runnells Bridge Road and South Depot Road. Map 10 Lot 31-1. Owner: Raisanen Leasing Corp. Applicant: Raisanen Homes Elite, LLC. Zoned R&A, Recreation and Multi-family Overlay Zone. **Public Hearing** (cont. from Oct. 15, 2019).

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, began by addressing the comments made by staff challenging the veracity of the Hollis Watch mailing, specifically: (1) No supporting evidence of decreasing school enrollment; (2) No significant increase in traffic at the site. Information from traffic study that was presented was only the most favorable to the applicant. Other information supports the information in the mailing; (3) Unit count was not expressed correctly. Although the unit count has been reduced the intent was to point out that the density is 8x that of single family homes. Mr. Garruba then addressed these points. School Enrollment: Information presented in October was one-sided, and only historical information of past enrollments up to the last few years. The present enrollment projection from the Hollis School District shows a 20% increase in enrollment in the next 5 years.

Adding the expected impact of this development (20 new students) will result in an enrollment surge of 22% - a 2% increase over the already expected increase, which will present logistical and budgetary problems. Traffic Report: Table 5 of the applicant's traffic study shows that in 2030, as a result of this development, the projection for Rt. 111A northbound weekday PM level of service will degrade from a C to a D. This represents a vehicle delay of 38.4 seconds at the intersection. This is directly related to this development. Parking Spaces. Hollis regs require 2 spaces per unit at a minimum of 9' wide by 18' long. The driveways on the plan are only 8' wide, and the application should not be approved with this noncompliance. Waivers. Applicant has requested two waiver requests – road turnarounds and minimum turn radius. Granting these waivers is contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. Deed restrictions do not prevent a road from becoming a town road in the future. The proposed hammerheads are not even half of what is required, and are good for cars only. Town cannot use standard snow removal equipment on these roads. The town's engineer recommends 55' turn-arounds for phase I of this project. The applicant's rationale for the waiver are about cost and impervious surface, not about safety. Approving the waiver is contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations and should be denied. Minimum turn radius. Radii shown on the plan are far below the 125' requirement. Any long-based vehicle will be in both lanes on the curves. The waiver request addresses the entire table for a total of 17 dimensional requirements. The Planning Board must think about safety and maintainability when addressing waiver requests. Wildlife Hazard Assessment. A number of requirements are not satisfied by the letter provided by the applicant. The Conservation Commission has voted to require a complete wildlife assessment with a wildlife biologist chosen by the town. The NH National Heritage Bureau indicates that there are records of endangered species in the area. Phasing Plan. Projected to bring 16 to 20 students but the actual number will be higher. Applicant has proposed 2-phase phasing plan but with no timeframes. J. Garruba recommends a 4-year phasing plan allowing 3 buildings per year. Classification of man-made ponds. Applicant claims ponds can be removed without a State permit so they can use the area of the ponds in their density calculations. NHDES has confirmed that the ponds are not allowed to be removed without a permit; both are jurisdictional wetlands. Per State regulations, neither pond can be considered as agricultural or irrigation ponds because they have both been abandoned for a long time. Although the southern pond can be repaired or replaced, a wetland permit is still required. The plan cannot be approved unless it is approved by the Hollis Conservation Commission as well as NH DES. The northerly pond is a natural wetland as shown on the USGS maps of 1944 and 1950. It is actually an altered wetland – not a man-made pond. Any filling of this pond would require approval from the Conservation Commission and the State DES through a dredge and fill permit; one cannot take credit for the land for density purposes until this process has been completed. Net tract area. This is defined in the Definition section of the Zoning Ordinance. To calculate it properly, one must look at 3 things – delineated wetlands, hydric soils, and surface waters. A plan from 1997 when the golf course was built shows the pond and surrounding area

as wetland, and there were very specific conditions put on to protect those areas. The area in the south was also delineated as wetland. In 1998 the Planning Board sent a violation letter to the owner for unauthorized activity in the wetland areas. The process changes when there are unauthorized activities and there are 2 methods for delineating wetlands. One is the 1987 US Army Corps of Engineers manual, which requires going back to prior historical delineations, and the other is the 2012 US Army Corps of Engineers northeast north central supplement that emphasizes conditions and field observations. When the Town hired Jim Gove to review the wetland delineation, he did not know that there had been unauthorized disturbances, and he was given direction to do his delineation based on the northeast north central regional supplement, not the 1987 Army Corps manual that is called out in the ordinance. There is approx .28 acres of land that should be considered wetland. Hydric soils. The applicant conducted a site specific soil survey, which is the most accurate means of characterizing soils. Once hydric soils form they stay that way. The area in question is identified as Pipestone, which is a poorly drained hydric soil. Karen Dudley, the USDA NRCS soil scientist, indicated in her letter of October 2 that Pipestone soil is hydric. This means that .283 acres of hydric soil must come off the net tract area. Both ponds must be deducted from the net tract area – northerly pond = .254 ac and southerly pond = .077 acres. The applicant indicates that they have 8.077 acres of available land. If you take away .208 acres of wetlands, .254 acres of surface waters, .077 acres for smaller pond, .283 for hydric soils. The total is 7.255 acres, which multiplied by the town's density equals 29.02 units. The Board should require that the density be reduced to comply with the ordinance.

Mark Longton, 60 Dow Road, referenced the 2011 Suncoast Properties vs. Windham case. Windham rejected a workforce housing application. The applicant appealed via a "builder's remedy" and the local planning board was over-ridden. Has the Board considered the current applicant seeking this remedy if the project is not approved? Has the board consulted legal counsel? In the Windham case, the Court forced the workforce requirement to be increased; has the board considered this? If this development is approved, does it meet our requirement relative to providing workforce housing or can another developer see what has happened here and use the same tactic to force through another high density condo style development. If people do not like this, they should be talking to their State senators and representatives relative to amending or repealing the workhouse housing law.

Karen Brown, 11 South Depot Road, abutter, stated that having the project go four years is "horrible", and requested a shorter timeframe so neighbors will not have to live with a construction site for a long time.

Paul Armstrong, Fieldstone Drive, spoke in favor of the project, citing the need for every municipality to provide some type of housing that people can afford. The Board should impose a 100% performance bond to assure that the project gets done quickly and all at once.

134 Mark Kramer, 46 Old Runnells Bridge Road, asked if everything (taxes, HOA fees,
135 etc.) is included in the formula for affordability. M. Fougere – not HOA fees,
136 basically the mortgage. Was soil tested for contaminants, and how was testing
137 done? Opposed to the project as proposed. Like to see 100% of this be affordable.
138 Prefer to see nine traditional single family homes.

139 Daniel Brideau, 15 Old Runnells Bridge Road, discussed the importance of the
140 individuality of the homes relative to rural character. This project has none of that.
141 What assurances will the town have that the project gets completed? There should
142 be some sort of continuity plan in place. There is a “non-zero” chance that there
143 could be asbestos buried here, and this is a concern that should be part of the public
144 record.

145 Jackie Raibeck, 2 Sherwood Drive, questioned why there has to be 32 units; her
146 understanding from the last meeting is that there would only be 9 or 10 units.

147 Chad Brannon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, representing the applicant, addressed
148 the Board. He pointed out that Fieldstone is a professional land consulting
149 company, comprised of many professionals (land surveying, engineering, certified
150 soil scientist, certified wetlands consultants, etc.) A lot of what Mr. Garruba is
151 presenting sounds good, but is out of context and does not apply. The town did a
152 very good job of bringing in third party consultants. With respect to the number of
153 students, he range as calculated by town staff, is 12-16 students, and that is for a
154 total project build-out. The projection is that it might be rebounding, but that means
155 it is up to what it was 5 or 10 years ago. The traffic projections are not just from this
156 project, but for the area. It has been proven that the project will not have a
157 significant impact on the adjacent traffic stream. This is a State road requiring a
158 DOT permit. This the appropriate location for this type of development, and is
159 zoned for this use. Parking space width has already been addressed. There are no
160 regulations pertaining to construction phasing for this type of development in the
161 ordinance. The affordable units will be blended in as the project is built and it is
162 hoped that the Board will support the market determining what the phasing will be.
163 There will be bonding, as is standard for all projects according to the Hollis
164 regulations. With respect to the waivers, the roadway numbers come from
165 engineering standards, ASHTO, DOT, etc., and are associated with a mph rating –
166 about 30 mph. This addressed a broad range in town, and is not meant to be applied
167 to a project like this where there is no right-of-way. This is a different setting where
168 units are closer and radii are tightened up, creating a community setting and traffic
169 calming. This meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance relative to rural character,
170 (reducing impervious surfaces, maintaining green space, landscaping, etc.) The plan
171 has been evaluated for safety by town officials and meets their requirements.
172 The plan clearly meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The town’s engineer
173 has stated that the end of Joe’s Way would not require a turn-around. Mr. Brannon
174 showed a plan of what the project would look like if the waivers are not granted;
175 there will be more pavement and impervious cover, but the layout and density of the

project will not change. There is no reason or benefit to not granting the waivers. This project has no right-of-way and there is therefore no setback to the buildings internally. This is really a site plan. Mr. Brannon stated that he does not see a way that this could ever be petitioned to be a town road; there is no separate parcel that the road sits on and none of the homes would meet any kind of setbacks. The applicant is willing to put a deed restriction on the plan. The wildlife study was prepared based on what the Board requested. What Mr. Garruba presented relative to the Natural Heritage database was not factual; Mr. Brannon quoted from the letter stating that “although there was a NHB record...present in the vicinity we do not expect that it will impacted by the proposed project”. The applicant is required to work directly with NH Fish and Game to secure their Alteration of Terrain permit.

There is a lot of misinformation regarding the ponds. There are two processes (local and State). The local process does not apply to manmade ponds. It is jurisdictional on a State level, and the applicant is applying for a State permit. The abandonment for five years does not apply to local permitting. Local Conservation Commission permission is not required, although the State may seek their input for the State process. The primary reason that Jim Gove evaluated the site was because of the old wetlands plan. Chris Guida specifically evaluated those areas. Mr. Brannon submitted several letters addressing the wetlands evaluation and hydric soils issues. The information presented by Mr. Garruba is wrong. The third party consultant obtained by the town (Jim Gove) agrees with the findings of Fieldstone’s wetland scientist, Chris Guida. All this information was shared with the State, who agreed with the findings of Gove and Guida. With respect to the net tract area, the wetland is non-jurisdictional and does not come out. Hydric soils are also out of the calculation. Manmade surface waters do not apply.

Mr. Brannon then addressed issues raised by the public. Builders Remedy. The applicant is asking for the Board to approve a project that has been voted on by the town’s people. Workforce Housing Numbers. It is 30% because that is what the regulations require. Phasing. Would like to build project as the market warrants; two phases called out because it is practical. Test pits. Did many (24) large deep test pits and did not find anything of concern. Also did research with former owner and town and nothing was found.

Mr. Brannon concluded by requesting that the Board entertain a conditional approval of the plan.

M. Fougere noted several emails received from interested parties that had been included in the Board’s packets. He then discussed the Workforce Housing statute, which was originally discussed by the Planning Board in 2008. There were two choices – do nothing and hope there were no challenges or be proactive and present something to the voters, which is what the Board decided to do. The statute requires that there is a reasonable and realistic opportunity for construction of workforce housing, which is defined as affordable to the median area income of our region

(currently \$105,000) for owner occupied. Also required is opportunity of multi-family housing, including low income housing (60% of area median income, which is approx.. \$1200/mo in rent.). Hollis is in the Nashua region, and the areas are set by HUD. The numbers come out every year and the current number that NH Housing has is \$136,500. Workforce housing must be allowed in a majority for the community that is zoned residential, meaning it is allowed in the Residential Zone (about 70% of the community). Here, workfoce housing single-family units are allowed as part of a HOSPD. A builder can get extra density for workforce housing. On the multi-family, this area is the only place with access to city water and State highways. In Massachusetts, every community must have 10% of their housing restricted as “affordable”. There is one other project in Hollis, built in the 80s, that could qualify as workforce housing. To make a viable defense, a town must prove that it has enough workforce housing for the region. It would helpful if NRPC would undertake a study to help local communities with that number. It is staff’s belief that Hollis meets the State statute and is in compliance. If the plan is denied, the applicant has the opportunity to seek a builder’s remedy. In Windham, the voters turned down a workforce housing ordinance twice, the developer sued and the final result was 10 units on 2.5 acres with the density going from 30% to 50%. The statute in Hollis has been on the books for ten years and this is the first application. The reason the Workforce Housing statute was passed was because communities put up barriers to prevent this type of housing. J. Peters: If this passes, will it meet our obligation? M. Fougere: Do not believe we could say we do not need any more. Amherst has had workforce housing for over 30 years. J. Peters: Was northern pond naturally occurring in the past? M. Fougere: A USGS photo from 1944 does not prove anything. Based on the evidence we have, we believe it is manmade.

The chairman closed the public hearing. C. Rogers: What happens if years from now the residents want the town to take over the road? M. Fougere: I have been told by an attorney in another community that any citizens can petition to have the town take over a road. The town can reject it. The road is not being built to town standards and has not been inspected by the town.

Waivers. C. Rogers moved to approve the waiver for the hammerhead. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved. C. Rogers moved to approve the waiver for the geometric radii. Motion seconded by D. Cleveland and unanimously approved.

M. Fougere reviewed the required findings for the conditional use permit and proposed conditions. It is staff’s opinion that this meets the zoning ordinance; things that do not meet the ordinance are not put on the agenda. J. Peters asked about the bonding process. M. Fougere: Bond will cover landscaping, stabilization and erosion control. If the project fails or there is a bankruptcy, the town will not go in there and finish the project beyond what is included in the bond. J. Peters: Would like to see a requirement that the perimeter landscaping be done at the beginning of the project. It was agreed that trees along the north side of the pond,

and along the road in the bottom corner and entrance way would be done as part of the first phase. R. Raisanen asked for a one-year window so he can get some irrigation in. R. Hardy pointed out that the existing farm pond could be used. J. Peters: What is anticipated build-out timeframe? R. Raisanen: About two years. R. Hardy: Still have concerns about the net tract area; don't know if the northern pond was a wetland. Can look at maps from the late 40s and early 50s; 3D aerial photos are very accurate. Also – there must have been a reason the Planning Board had reservations in 1997 about that pond and the wetland. That should be explored. There are definitions for abandoned ponds – five years. There is no documentation regarding discussions with the Wetlands Board. There is no documentation that NRCS has met with the Wetlands Board regarding concerns about the pond. Would like this to be clarified before we make a final decision. C. Brannon responded that the abandoned pond question is in the local level review and jurisdiction. We did look at the photos and it has always appeared as a pond. There is a clear edge to the pond and no neighboring jurisdictional areas. The areas surrounding the pond do not meet any of the three criteria for delineating wetlands (soils, hydrology and vegetation). All information was shared with the State and they agreed with the delineation. The third party consultant, Jim Gove, who is a highly regarded soils and wetland scientist, specifically touches on the wetlands and the manmade nature of the pond. The reason this is a pond is because it has been excavated into the seasonal high ground water. This may even be lined with some material that allows it to hold water. R. Hardy stated that if the State gets additional information and some of the land has to come out due to a wetland boundary, everyone should realize that the applicant will have to come back to the Planning Board. J. Peters noted that if it did have to come out, it would equate to losing one unit. M. Fougere noted that Jim Gove was brought in to review all the plans because there was a change from what the Planning Board had looked at in 1998. C. Brannon added that all the data from neighboring test pits is also part of the evaluation. M. Hartnett: Can we actually set a timeline for a two-year build-out? M. Fougere: Do not see how we could require homes to be built that aren't sold. C. Brannon: We are willing to commit to infrastructure being done in two years from start of construction with the septs and buildings being built as the market allows.

M. Fougere then reviewed the following list of conditions of approval:

- NHDES state subdivision approval shall be required;
- NHDES permit to fill irrigation pond;
- Bonding must be in place for all landscaping;
- Site bonding will be required for erosion control, along with general site inspections;
- Restrictive workforce housing covenant shall be recorded with plan;
- All lot pins shall be set prior to subdivision recording;
- NH DOT permit;
- Note on plan that all roads will remain private;
- Addition of wetlands stamp;

- Check parking width;
- Adherence to Fire Dept. approval letter;
- Adherence to phasing outlined by town engineer;
- Addition of No Parking signs at turn-arounds;
- Landscaping at perimeter as discussed will be in place within a year;
- Within two years all site work, drainage, binder course, pavement and landscaping will be installed.

M. Hartnett: Who makes the final determination regarding whether the pond is man-made? M. Fougere: Applicant's soils/wetland scientist made that determination and that is why we brought in Jim Gove to check his work. J. Peters: How do we know the State is aware of our concerns? M. Fougere: I will send them a letter. D. Cleveland asked C. Hoffman (who is on the Conservation Commission) if the HCC has taken a position on this. C. Hoffman: I have kept them apprised of the project but HCC has not taken an official position or discussed permits yet. C. Brannon: State will reach out to the HCC during the review process.

B. Moseley moved to approve File #PB2019-020, pending the appropriate restriction and guidelines as proposed by staff. Motion seconded by C. Rogers. Voting in favor: Moseley, Cleveland, Rogers, Hoffman, Peters, Hardy. Voting in opposition: Petry. Motion carries and the plan is approved.

(Board takes a 10 minute break.)

6. OTHER BUSINESS – ZONING AMENDMENT DISCUSSIONS

a. ZBA recommendations

The ZBA would like to add a definition for "set back": *"The minimum distance between the nearest portion of the building or structure and a lot line, a right-of-way line, or a terrain feature such as a shoreline or wetland area"*. Setbacks are required to support the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance, as specified in State law. The reason for adding a definition of setback is that the word appears 56 times in the Hollis Zoning Ordinance. Board members agreed to schedule this amendment for a public hearing.

b. Mr. Joseph Garruba recommendations, potential zoning petition changes.

Joe Garruba, 28 Winchester Drive, informed the Board that he has four petitioned warrant articles for Town Meeting. The petitions are all signed and have been submitted to the Town Clerk. He has a month long window of opportunity to take input and incorporate it into petitions. D. Petry explained that it is typically the Planning Board that presents changes to the zoning ordinance, based on recent cases, input from the ZBA, guidance from the Master Plan. This is not the norm of what the Planning Board usually does, and is putting the cart before the horse. It is frustrating to do this in reverse. Mr. Garruba responded that he did come before the Board during the year, and he is hoping to have the Board's support.

342 Mr. Garruba began his PowerPoint presentation with the reasons for updating the
 343 ordinance: protect rural character, protect schools, control taxes, preserve aquifers,
 344 changes that have happened since the Workforce Housing RSA was approved in
 345 2008; restrictions on development have been loosened in the past few years. There
 346 is a cost to the Town for Workforce Housing and High Density Development: more
 347 traffic, road maintenance, capital expenses, increased demand for services,
 348 environmental damage and loss of rural character.

349 There are four petitions: Multi-Family Housing, Workforce Housing, Housing for
 350 Older Persons, Hollis Open Space Development. Mr. Garruba summarized the
 351 changes to each section (see handouts for specific details), and asked for the
 352 Planning Board's input and support. Because the window of opportunity is short, he
 353 asked that the Board review the amendments and report any concerns at the Nov. 19
 354 meeting. The State RSAs give the authority to citizens to do this, but Mr. Garruba
 355 would like it to be a "bi-directional" process.

356 C. Rogers expressed concern about requiring the developer to reveal his costs and
 357 profits. Mr. Garruba responded that this is already in the zoning ordinance as an
 358 option, and it is there because it came from a State RSA. It is keeping the profits to
 359 what is required by State law. M. Fougere noted that there is no set percentage on
 360 what is an appropriate profit for a developer. He cautioned that this is something
 361 that could be done, but it is a double-edged sword. C. Rogers pointed out that these
 362 changes raise the costs for the developer. J. Garruba argued that as long as it is
 363 economically viable, it is fine. C. Rogers stated that he is against establishing that.
 364 M. Hartnett questioned if the State sets a minimum density for Multi-Family
 365 Workforce Housing. M. Fougere explained that the State did not set the density, but
 366 did require at least three units. D. Cleveland noted that there are 30 changes in the
 367 four articles. The Planning Board must discuss each one of them and decide if
 368 agrees or disagrees with them. D. Petry agreed, noting that this is something the
 369 Board discusses. If it has questions it asks staff. The normal procedure is that the
 370 Planning Board initiates the changes and if it decides not to put something on the
 371 ballot any citizen is welcome to follow the petition process. If the Planning Board
 372 agrees with some of the changes, he recommends that they be put on the ballot by
 373 the Planning Board rather than by petition. He added that there are several changes
 374 that he agrees with. D. Cleveland noted that this is a very time-consuming process.
 375 M. Fougere noted that the petition window closes on Dec. 11. Under statute, the
 376 Planning Board has to set a hearing date at the next meeting. That date would be the
 377 first meeting in January. He pointed out that there are several sweeping statements
 378 and wrong conclusions in the proposals, and the Planning Board did not "loosen" its
 379 regulations. D. Petry recommended taking the changes under advisement. M.
 380 Fougere suggested that Board members come back with a list of which amendments
 381 they could support. He noted that whatever was presented to those who signed it is
 382 exactly what must appear on the ballot. One only needs to show what is being
 383 altered. He asked that Mr. Garruba re-do the petitions and only include that
 384 language that is going to be amended. D. Petry agreed, noting that the purpose will

be lost if the ballot is too long and complicated, and people will just vote no. M. Fougere noted that a major change is presented on the ballot as a summary, with the entire change available online and at town hall. What appears on the ballot is a concise summary so the voters will understand it. Mr. Garruba offered to work with staff to arrive at a better way to present his changes.

c. **Jim Belanger – recommended changes relative to side setback requirements in the R&A zone.**

This change comes from Mr. Belanger only and not the ZBA. Currently if something does not meet setbacks, a variance is required. J. Belanger would like to change this to a special exception for a side setback. R. Hardy questioned why this is coming from just one individual and not the entire ZBA; he suggested it come from the entire ZBA or do it via petition if it is just his initiative. Board members agreed that this should be remanded back to the ZBA or submitted as a petition by Mr. Belanger. Staff will inform Mr. Belanger.

7. OTHER BUSINESS – SETTING TERMINATION TIME FOR PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS

C. Rogers recommended setting a cut-off time of 10:00 PM for Planning Board meetings. At 9:45 PM the chairman could assess where things are in anticipation of a “hard stop” at 10:00 PM. M. Fougere noted that TV filming stops at 11:15 PM. He noted that some towns have a rule of no new business after 10:00 PM with an 11:00 PM cut-off. D. Petry added that the only issue is the 65-day limitation for a Planning Board to review something. Typically applicants will give Planning Boards extensions to provide more time for them to review the project and make a decision. J. Peters suggested no new business after 10:00 PM and hard stop at 10:30 PM. C. Rogers noted that the Board can always add another meeting to the schedule. D. Petry agreed, noting that the Planning Board used to have two meetings a month. There also used to be a limitation of 30 minutes per application. Consensus to establish a guideline of no new business after 10:00 PM with a hard stop at 10:30 PM. B. Moseley will incorporate this into his opening remarks.

D. ADJOURN –

C. Rogers moved, seconded by J. Peters to adjourn. All in favor; none opposed. Meeting adjourns at 10:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Mills
Secretary *pro tem*

427

428

429