

KENSINGTON PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
Virtual Meeting due to COVID-19  
TUESDAY March 16th, 2021 – 7:00pm  
Minutes – Approved 4/20/2021

In attendance: Robert Chase, Chairman (alone); Mary Smith (alone), Vice Chair (alone); Therese Wallaga, Member (alone); Jim Thompson, Member (alone); Mike Schwotzer, Member (alone); Bob Solomon, Selectman's Representative (alone); Julie LaBranche, Rockingham Planning Commission (alone), Peter Merrill, Member(alone), Josh Preneta, Alternate(alone), Christine Ouellette, Alternate (alone)

At 7:10pm, Robert called the meeting to order. At the time the meeting started, there were 21 participants on the call.

Robert read through the NH State of Emergency E-Meeting Compliance Checklist and took roll call.

It was noted that the website did not have an updated link. Public notice was given through the agenda page on the website, there were 2 physical notices and any issue could be resolved through the provided phone number.

Robert set a time limit of 45 minutes for each agenda item.

Mike recused himself from both Felch public hearings.

**At 7:21pm Robert made a motion for Christine to act as a full member. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Jim voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes, Bob voted yes.**

Attorney Kerry Marshall represented the applicants, Franklin and Kathleen Felch, for the following two Public Hearings. Family members Travis, Kathie, Sam and Martin also participated.

**At 7:22pm Robert made a motion to open the Public Hearing for the Felch Family Trust and read the following aloud:**

*Felch Family Trust, Franklin and Kathie Felch, Trustees with a physical lot address of 137 Amesbury Road, Kensington, NH further identified as Map 9 Lot 2, for a Minor Subdivision in accordance with Article III Subdivision Regulations for the Town of Kensington. The intent is for the property owners to subdivide one 2.01-acre parcel from the 26.5-acre parcel known as Map 9 Lot 2. This item was continued from December, January, February until now.*

**Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Jim voted yes, Christine voted yes, Bob voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Robert asked the Felch Family, or their representative, to present their modified plan to the Board.

Ms. Marshall, representative for the Felch Family, requested the following to be put on record:

*"The record will reflect that the board previously indicated that access could not be made through Pevear Lane which is a Class VI road. There was an issue then about driveway access for a class VI road and steep slope. There was a discussion as to whether there could be a buildable lot on a class VI road. Mr. Quintal was representing the board. There was an issue as to whether there has ever been runoff. I believe the record will reflect that there's never been any kind of a complaint from the state regarding runoff. There was also an issue regarding whether the state or the town has jurisdiction where ultimately, we are looking for a lot that would be accessed through a state road with erosion control and stormwater management and as to whose responsibility it was. I believe that has been resolved. My client has received a State of NH curb cut. It was suggested that the subdivision could be approved with the condition on the approval of steep slopes. I believe we have also addressed that. There was a meeting on September 15<sup>th</sup> and the intent was then the property owners, the Felch's to adjust the current property lines and lot acreages by reducing map 9 lot 2 by .189 acres resulting in*

24.49 acre lot. It was agreed in October that Dennis Quintal would review the entire application and that point the matter was continued until November 17<sup>th</sup>. On November 17<sup>th</sup> this board took up the issue of a minor subdivision with article 3 subdivision regulation of the town of Kensington. It was articulated then that the intent was for the property owners to subdivide one 2.01 acre from the 26.5 acre parcel known as Map 9 lot 2. A continuance was ultimately requested and approved. On Dec 15<sup>th</sup> 2020, the matter was continued to January 19<sup>th</sup>. There is an error in your records. Your records indicate the matter was continued to January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 obviously it was 2021. On January 19<sup>th</sup> 2021, the matter was continued to February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021. And, although your records reflect that the minutes meetings were from February 16<sup>th</sup> 2020 the matter was heard on February 16<sup>th</sup> 2021 and continued until today. The record will reflect on March 6<sup>th</sup> 2021 that Dennis Quintal sent a letter to the town that should be in your file. He indicated that a subdivision plan will meet the needs and requirements of the Registry of Deeds obviously for recording. As it defines the limits of the access easement. We are prepared to address that. New Lot 2-3 according to Mr. Quintal appeared to meet the minimum subdivision requirements of 200 feet of frontage and 2 acres of land. He also opined that there appears to be ample area for building of a single-family home with appropriate well and sanitary waste disposal. The topographic plan according to Mr. Quintal showed a 15-inch culvert at the existing driveway labeled as inaccessible. He represented that must be correct, which I understand is not an issue. The new DOT driveway permit allows access for a single-family residential dwelling. Dennis indicated potentially that that may limit the ability to develop the rest of the lot. We disagree with that and don't believe there is any reason that the remainder of Lot 2 would be non-buildable. The existing gravel driveway has been constructed according to previously approved plans. Mr. Quintal recommended a draft document be reviewed by the town prior to final approval so that a building permit could be obtained prior to the approved lot to the terms be executed. He asked what would happen with regard to an existing dug well given the proposed driveway passed over that. We are prepared to address that. There is a possible wetland issue I believe has also been resolved. He recommended the grade be changed on the driveway to flatten the grade. I believe that has been addressed. He recommended a swale in the driveway on the uphill side. He noted that the proposed foundation will be at or near station 6. He requested the driveway profile and grading extend to where the proposed foundation is to be constructed. He indicated that he did not anticipate that a sprinkler system or cistern will be required and we agree with that. I would remind the board that New Hampshire RSA 674:41 that no building permit shall be authorized unless a frequenting access to the lot is proposed so obviously we meet that requirement. There have been 2 test pits and both have passed and the Department of Environmental Services has approved this plan. And with that said I would defer to the engineers so they can also provide some updates."

*N.B.: Ms. Marshall's comments have been added to the record at her request. However, it must be noted that the Board considers these statements to be reflective of Ms. Marshall's understanding as opposed to agreed upon statements of fact.*

Robert asked if there were any questions.

Jim Thompson asked why there may be no restrictions to Lot 2 to be further buildable.

Ms. Marshall explained that even though this was for a single-family residence, that does not keep the Felchs from building on the other land of Lot 2. She noted that the DOT driveway permit allows access for a single residential dwelling. She stated that only described the DOT's description of the curb cut, not that the rest of Lot 2 would be unbuildable.

Robert said that the State did not approve the original curb cut application because the maximum number of curb cuts from the original donor lot, Map 9, Lot 2 had already been made. In the newly approved application, the pre-existing gravel pit curb cut would be used, and branching off as a residential drive. Robert asked about the status of the gravel pit. A discussion took place about the status of the gravel pit and its future use.

Julie stated that it was an active, grandfathered pit of non-conforming use and has received no present approval as a building lot. A restoration plan would have to be made; they would have to provide additional information for the lot to build on that lot. She stated that it was not guaranteed. Julie stated that the subdivision plan should reflect the status of the donor lot. Ms. Marshall agreed that a future owner would have to come forward to get proper approval and would be noted on the plan.

Julie brought up the fact that some of the information was very recent between the two engineers and that there was room for conversation between the two. Julie questioned the status of wetlands. A Certified Wetland Scientist (CWS) from Gove Environmental Services has been engaged by the applicant to evaluate a potential wetland. The ground was still frozen and too snowy to check for wetlands. Mr. Landry believes that this would happen in April. Peter noted that based on the findings of the CWS, the plan could be revised. Ms. Marshall stated that the area in question was a sediment pond, which would be removed in Phase II of the gravel pit, but the applicant would abide by the findings of Gove's Certified Wetland Scientist.

Julie noted that the plan lacked a representation of any building envelope or notation of the buildable area. She questioned the setbacks and buildable area. Peter Landry said they could add the setback lines, but there were 25 foot setback lines in the zoning summary. Julie questioned the location of the building. She would like the buildable area defined and also the setbacks noted.

Robert asked Mr. Landry to note whether the driveway came within 50 feet of the building. Mr. Landry stated that he would talk with the engineers about the distance to the building from the driveway. Julie asked if the locked iron gate at the existing driveway was permanent. Mr. Landry stated that the minor subdivision plan noted "gate relocated" to be near the mobile office in the middle of the pit for free access from the highway to the site. Julie suggested for safety there should be stop signs at the intersection of the gravel road and the driveway for vehicles heading down towards Amesbury Road.. Peter Merrill noted that the mobile office may create a blind spot for commercial vehicles to see cars coming from the residential driveway if there were no stop sign. Ms. Marshall said the mobile office is due to be scrapped. She said that any new office would be placed in the correct location for traffic.

Robert mentioned that Christian Smith's letter noted a 15 inch culvert near Route 150 was noted as inaccessible and asked Mr. Landry to elaborate. Mr. Landry stated it was debris and that at the time of review the inverts were inaccessible. However, he also stated they simply needed to be cleaned out. Robert asked whose responsibility it was to clean the culvert. Mr. Landry stated it was in the DOT right of way but the responsibility was shifted to the owners. Robert asked if the Felch Family maintains the culvert. The Felch's stated that the State has cleaned the culvert historically. Responsibility to maintain the culvert was acknowledged by the Felch Family. Julie had commentary about Route 150 and the detention ponds at the end of the driveway as being overflowed in the past and there had been sediment and water in the road. She stated that the culvert may not be as clean as it could be. She said it needed to be addressed, and that, if responsibility has been shifted from the State to the Felch Family, there needs to be a plan for maintenance, and the system possibly upgraded or revised to handle drainage.

Ms. Marshall said the plan states the water is supposed to runoff in the ponded area. The Felch's indicated that there are culverts under Route 150 and there is a standpipe in the middle of the pond so the culvert doesn't get blocked. Peter noted that these culverts were on the plan. A discussion took place about why the culvert was inaccessible. Ms. Marshall noted that the ponded area could be eradicated. She stated that the 15" culvert was maintained as part of the curb cut. Bob Solomon stated that a reclamation plan would have to address these issues in the future.

Robert asked why the state shifted the responsibility of maintaining the culvert to the Felch's. The Felch's were unsure. Robert asked if a site walk had taken place, but none had. Robert mentioned that a site walk may be necessary. Robert stated that there were outstanding issues, and that a site walk with Dennis, Christian, Peter Landry and the Board should take place.

Ms. Marshall stated that she would like the Board to accept the application as complete tonight. Ms. Marshall asked for a list of everything necessary for accepting the application. Robert asked the Board for their input on the completeness of the application. Christine stated she would like to see a footprint of the buildable area on the plan and had agreement from the Board. Ms. Marshall asked if there was anything else on the plan necessary. Robert noted erosion and sediment control. He also would like the engineers to resolve the issues identified by Dennis Quintal. Julie mentioned that a stormwater management plan and an erosion and sediment control plan needed to be in place. An access easement would also be necessary for the length of driveway to the new lot. A maintenance agreement for the culvert is needed. Robert mentioned that drainage impact that the new driveway has on the existing driveway is missing. Robert stated that Christian would have to look at this impact.

Peter asked if the trailer would be or potentially be removed because of line of sight safety. Ms. Marshall said that it may be removed before the next Planning Board meeting, to which it was asked to be removed from the plan.

Robert described the necessary steps to get the application accepted and that the board would work with the Felch Family to move forward.

Robert stated that there were items in the summary that he and other board members would not agree with in regards with how they transpired.

**At 8:15pm Peter made a motion to continue to April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Mary seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Jim voted yes, Christine voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:17pm Peter made a motion to close the public hearing. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Christine voted yes, Jim voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:18pm Robert made a motion open the Public Hearing for the Felch Family Trust and read the following aloud:**  
*Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Article VI Section 6.2 Steep Slopes District for Felch Family Trust, Franklin and Kathie Felch, Trustees with a physical lot address of 137 Amesbury Road, Kensington, NH further identified as Map 9 Lot 2, to allow 5,870 square feet of disturbance to steep slopes to permit a driveway and access easement across Map 9 Lot 2. Continued from January 19, 2021. The applicant has requested that this be further continued to March 16, 2021.*

**Mary seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Jim voted yes, Christine voted yes, Bob voted yes, Peter voted yes, Mary voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Robert confirmed with the Felch Family their wish to withdraw the current Conditional Use Permit application for the Steep Slopes.

**At 8:20pm Jim made a motion to withdraw the Felch Family Steep Slopes Application without prejudice. Peter seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Christine voted yes, Jim voted yes, Therese voted yes, and Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:20pm Therese made a motion to close the public hearing. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Christine voted yes, Jim voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

At 8:20 there was a 5 minute break.

Mike came back as a Full Member, and Christine became an Alternate Member.

**At 8:26 Robert made a motion to open the Public Hearing for the Survivor's Trust c/o Welsh Living Trust and read the following aloud:**

*Survivor's Trust c/o Welsh Living Trust, with a physical location of 13 North Road, Kensington NH, further identified as Map 11 Lot 30, located on North, Amesbury and Osgood Roads in Kensington, NH have submitted a Subdivision application for a 2-lot subdivision in accordance with Article III Subdivision Regulations for the Town of Kensington. This item had been continued from the February 16th meeting.*

**Mike seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Jim voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Jim voted yes, Robert voted yes, Mike voted yes. The motion passes.**

Robert commented on what had been covered at the last meeting. The property had to comply with the Lot Shape requirements and the Board had since received a revised plan that meets those requirements. Pam Welsh stated there had been a 100 foot buffer between the Lot 30-2 and Lot 11-7. The buffer has been removed and Lot 30-2 will now be over 5 acres and that new maps were provided and the new Certification of Monumentation has been furnished. Robert read through the Subdivision Application Checklist. All application requirements were either not applicable or met by the applicant. It was noted that a buyer of the property would have to go before the Board for a driveway permit.

Julie asked if they need a driveway permit for Osgood Road. Robert responded that it is not required to accept the application. Julie stated that the granted waiver request dates of February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021 need to be noted on the plan.

**At 8:42, Therese made a motion to accept the application. Mike seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Jim voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mary voted yes, Therese voted yes, Mike voted yes, Peter voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Robert asked if there were members of the public with questions about the Welsh application. Joni Praded asked about a change to the lot area if it was in the same location or if the buffer had just been removed. Robert stated the buffer had been removed.

**At 8:46pm, Mike made a motion that the Planning Board approve the subdivision conditioned upon the addition of the date of the waiver granted and that when it is completed the Chairman has the authority to sign for the Board. Mary seconded. Bob abstained. Peter voted yes, Mary voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert yes. The subdivision is approved.**

Robert discussed the next steps for the Welsh application for the applicant.

**At 8:50pm, Peter made a motion to close the public hearing. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mike voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Bob voted yes, Peter voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:50pm Robert made a motion to open the Public Hearing for Hog Hill Preserve, LLC and read the following aloud:**

*TF Moran, Inc. c/o Corey Colwell on behalf of Hog Hill Preserve, LLC with a physical location of 104 South Road, Kensington NH further identified as Map 4 Lot 41 have submitted a Subdivision application for a 3-lot subdivision in accordance with Article III Subdivision Regulations for the Town of Kensington. A portion of the parcel involved is also located in East Kingston, NH. This was continued from February 16, 2021. The applicant has requested that this item be continued to the April 20, 2021 meeting.*

**Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:52pm, Jim made a motion to continue the public hearing to April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Therese seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mike voted yes, Jim voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:53pm, Therese made a motion to close the public hearing. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:54pm, Robert made a motion to open the Public Hearing for Hog Hill Preserve, LLC and read the following aloud:**

*TF Moran, Inc. c/o Corey Colwell on behalf of Hog Hill Preserve, LLC with a physical location of 14 Bartlett Road, Kensington NH further identified as Map 4 Lot 3 and TF Moran, Inc. c/o Corey Colwell on behalf of Hog Hill Preserve, LLC with a physical location of 2 Bartlett Road, Kensington NH further identified as Map 4 Lot 7-1 have submitted a Lot Line Adjustment application in accordance with Article III Section 3.2 G1 of the Kensington Subdivision Regulations. A portion of the parcels involved are also located in South Hampton, NH. This item was continued from February 16, 2021. The applicant has requested that this item be continued to the April 20, 2021 meeting.*

**Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

The applicant asks that the applicant be continued to the April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting.

**At 8:56pm, Peter made a motion to continue the public hearing to the April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 8:57pm, Therese made a motion to close the public hearing. Jim seconded. Robert took a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Peter voted yes, Bob voted yes, Jim voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Karen Parker Feld, Peter Freeman, Bruce Scamman (site engineer) and Amy Manzelli (legal counsel) were present for the following consultation.

*Karen Parker Feld of Crow's Feat Farm Consultation only about agricultural uses of property with address 178 Drinkwater Road Map 12 Lot 46.*

Robert asked Karen Parker Feld, Peter Freeman, Amy Manzelli, and Bruce Scamman to describe their project. Ms. Feld summarized by stating they are building a cooperative farm with 3 to 5 enterprise farmers allowed under New Hampshire statute 21:34-a. They would like to have a gathering space at 180 Drinkwater Road and a farm store. The gathering space would typically hold fewer than 50 people. The activities would be mainly educational. They would like to maintain the rural character of the area. Amy Manzelli stated that this is a preliminary consultation according 676:2-a to exchange information. She stated that typically agricultural uses do not undergo a full Site Plan Review, but they want good community relations. She stated that they were looking for general input and they were hoping that no formal Site Plan would be needed. They would however prepare a Site Plan if necessary. She discussed waivers that may be sought if they do go with a Site Plan. Mike spoke about subdivision regulations and preliminary consultations and the legality of the consultations. There was a discussion of town subdivision regulations. Amy Manzelli corrected her reference to New Hampshire statute for consultation to 676:4, II(a). Julie stated this consultation was allowed under state regulations. Bruce Scamman with Emanuel Engineering shared the existing site plan. They proposed a new gravel driveway, grass parking, and a farm stand. The only new pavement would extend 20' from Drinkwater Road into the beginning of the gravel driveway. He described the design of the store and operation of the site and the placement of

the farm stand. Mr. Scamman described a farm kitchen to process vegetables and fruits, and possibly to-go meals made in the store. The design of the farm stand and its location was discussed.

Jim Thompson asked Karen Parker Feld and Peter Freeman about the process of deeding the farmland, farm structures and equipment to Crow's Feat Farm, LLC. The residential structures are deeded to Crow's Nest LLC. Ms. Feld stated that the occupants of the residential structures would be working on the farm. Ms. Manzelli stated that there was no subdivision of real estate. This process would separate the ownership of the residential and the farm structures and the land around it, such that the ownership of the land and the ownership of the structures are separate. Julie asked if there would be a common septic system between the farm structures and the residential structures. The owners of the residential structures would have easement rights to utilities, septic, and the well. There are 2 existing wells and 2 existing septic systems. Bruce Scamman discussed well placement and leach field placement. Possible future well placement was discussed. Julie asked if the residential property could be purchased. Ms. Manzelli states yes, and described that Crow's Nest LLC would be the actual owners, so the physical owners could change but the LLC would stay the same. Karen Parker Feld stated that she and Peter Freeman would be the owners of Crow's Nest, LLC. The cooperative ownership would be shared but that they would be the first owners. She described the continuity of ownership of the LLC.

Julie asked whether a Site Plan Review was necessary and required. She stated it was a hybrid of a residence and a farm which may be adding elements of commercial activity. She described concerns about drainage and parking. She wanted to make a distinction between agricultural and commercial activity. Julie noted that the Fire Department would also want to weigh in on the property. She stated that the Board can ask for Site Plans for public health and safety, which would also give abutters the ability to weigh in. Ms. Manzelli asked whether the Board requires a Site Plan Application, but deferred to the board. Karen Parker Feld stated that, even without a formal Site Plan, they would conform to standards. Julie stated that they were near to having a fully complete Site Plan Application with the documents they already have, and that the process would add public accountability and formality. Mr. Scamman stated that they would have to go to the Building Inspector even without a Site Plan which would bring in other officials such as the Fire Department. He also discussed the grass parking area and possible wear. Julie asked about the 2 driveways across the street from the proposed farm stand. Mr. Scamman stated that they were residential driveways that were not aligned with the new farm stand driveway and there would not be much use for either driveway or the farm stand driveway. Bob asked about the line of site from the hill to the driveways. There was discussion of the sight lines from the hill to the driveway. Robert had a question about the inground pool and whether there was a fence around the pool to which Mr. Scamman replied that there was. Mr. Scamman stated that the sight lines for the farm stand driveway meet AASHTO requirements for a 35-mph zone. The curve was discussed in relation to the farm driveway. A previous site walk of the new subdivision across the street was discussed in relation to the sight lines of the road. Mike brought up Zoning Ordinance requirements 4.2.2.i for a grade of 2% in the first 10 feet for the pavement segment of the farm stand driveway. He noted 4.2.4a.ii where there is a requirement for a sight distance of 400 feet in both directions. Julie again asked if they needed a Site Plan Review. Josh asked about the definition of agricultural products 21:34-a. Julie stated that NH allows agriculture as a permitted use. Robert stated that the definition of agricultural uses is quite broad. Robert stated that he felt they needed a Site Plan Review. The Board was in agreement. Julie stated that she could meet with Robert, the applicants, Ms. Manzelli and Mr. Scamman to decide what a Site Plan Review and application would look like. Ms. Manzelli asked about the timeline of the process would be. A timeline was discussed with the May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting as a target. She then asked if the Board would both accept the application and vote on the application in one meeting. Robert said this is possible but that he could not guarantee.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- Planning Board Member term expirations and (re)appointments:

Robert discussed Jim Thompson and Peter Merrill leaving the board in April of 2021. Robert and the remaining Board Members, and Julie LaBranche thanked them both for their decades of service to the town and the Board. Robert discussed three candidates for these two Full Member positions: Vanessa Rozier, Christine Ouellette and Josh Preneta. Josh suggested that, since he is relatively new to the Board, he is comfortable continuing to learn the ropes as

an Alternate. Mike spoke in favor of Christine and Vanessa as Full Members and Josh as an Alternate. There would be room for 1 or 2 more Alternate Members.

**At 10:16pm Mike made a motion for Robert to submit to the Board of Selectmen Vanessa Rozier and Christine Ouellette as Full Members of the Planning Board as of the end term for Peter and Jim for the new term ending in April, 2024.**

**Jim seconded. Rob called a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mike voted yes, Christine voted yes, Peter voted yes, Jim voted yes. Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

**At 10:18pm Mike made a motion to reappoint Josh Preneta an Alternate Member with term ending in April, 2024. Therese seconded. Robert called a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Jim voted yes, Peter voted yes, Therese voted yes, Bob voted yes, Mike voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

- Administrative changes to documents (progress update) – updates are being made to Zoning Ordinances administratively. Changes will be provided as they are completed to be reviewed administratively.
- Prior Applicants Conditions of Approval – No updates.
- Growth Management – Robert said Janan Archibald may possibly have an interest in working on a Growth Management Plan and would check into it.
- Application Process Improvement – No updates.

#### **UPDATES ON PRIOR BUSINESS:**

- Tannery Way Acceptance and release of security funds
  - The Board decided to wait to vote to release security funds due to the fact that the deed to transfer ownership to the town has not yet been agreed, executed, and recorded.

**At 10:28pm Therese made a motion to approve the Planning Board Meeting minutes of February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021.**

**Mike seconded. Robert called a roll call vote. Mary voted yes, Jim voted yes, Peter voted yes, Mike voted yes, Therese voted yes, Bob abstained, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Josh Preneta asked about the Buildout Analysis. Julie stated that the Rockingham Planning Commission were capable of this. RPC could create a proposal for analysis, maps and data.

The next monthly meeting will be Tuesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 7:00pm.

**At 10:33pm Jim made a motion to adjourn. Peter Seconded. Robert called a roll call vote. Jim voted yes, Peter voted yes, Mike voted yes, Mary voted yes, Bob voted yes, Therese voted yes, Robert voted yes. The motion passes.**

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Clarke  
Planning Board Clerk