

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES**  
**Town of Auburn**  
**Planning Board**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**  
**December 20, 2017**

**Present:** Ron Poltak, Chairman. Steve Grillo, Vice-Chairman. Michael Rolfe & Jeff Porter, Members. Paula Marzloff, Jess Edwards & Tom LaCroix, Alternates. Dale Phillips, Selectmen's Representative. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

**Absent:** None.

Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked the Board members to introduce themselves to everyone present.

Mr. Poltak explained that there was a simple agenda tonight. Mr. Poltak then moved on to talk about the minutes and asked the Board members if they had any questions and if not that he would entertain a motion to accept the minutes of December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**MINUTES**

<p><b>Mr. Porter moved to approve the minutes for December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017 as written, Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.</b></p>
--

Mr. Poltak began by informing the Board members how he intended to handle tonight's agenda and pointed out to the Board that there was an informal of which he did not think it would be anything more than a simple request and then they have the discussions on both the Master Plan and the Zoning Amendments. Mr. Poltak indicated that prior to moving on to the Master Plan that he wanted to talk to the Board about the lighting plan at the Ambulatory Center and he wanted to talk about the Zoning Board of Adjustment's decision of yesterday and its implication of which he believed was an ill-advised decision but nonetheless one that they have to accept. He would like to talk about Petition zoning articles and scheduling hearings and rollout of zoning changes. He also wants to share with the Board the specificity of what they talked about last time relative to the provision that was in our ordinance respectful of lot size and frontage respectful of condominiums and the like of which each of the Board members has before them.

Then, Mr. Poltak added that he may entertain a last-minute request that someone has a proposal for the corner lot on Dartmouth Drive which is in no way connected to what the Board has approved previously in terms of use on the property. This is a proposal that was rejected in 2013 and has somehow arisen from the dead and a request has been made to talk to us tonight.

Mr. Poltak went on to say that he will now move on with the informal session and asked them to introduce themselves to the Board. With this in mind, the applicant for the Public Hearing stood up instead of the informal presentation.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Mary & Magdiel Canales &  
CMS Limited Partnership  
824 Londonderry Turnpike, Tax Map 1, Lots 21 & 22  
Lot Line Adjustment  
Zoned Industrial**

Bob Kilmer of Sandford Survey and Engineering began his presentation by saying that he was before the Board tonight representing Magdiel and Mary Canales, Tax Map 1, Lot 21 and CMS Limited Partnership at Tax Map 1, Lot 22. Mr. Kilmer went on to say that what they are proposing is to do a lot line adjustment between the two parcels which is consistent with about 2.15 acres to be transferred from Lot 22 to Lot 21. Mr. Kilmer talked about both lots and explained the reason for the lot line adjustment is to acquire the acreage to meet the Industrial zone requirements of 3 acres. Mr. Kilmer pointed out to the Board that Lot 22 is mostly wetlands and that the two (2) acres was mostly wetlands of which the Canales' know that there is no use with this additional land but only making the lot now conforming with the Town of Auburn's zoning requirements of 3 acres in the Industrial zone. Mr. Kilmer did state that, if they were to do anything on this that they would still be dealing with other factors being the wetland setbacks. Mr. Edwards asked what the motivation was in expanding with land that you can't build on. Mr. Kilmer said that the basic reason why the Canales' want to do this is to meet the 3-acre minimum requirement in the Industrial zone making the lot now conforming because every time they go to do something they have to go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment because of the reduced lot size. Mr. Kilmer explained that it is currently 1.15 acres and by adding the 2.15 acres would now make the lot 3.3 acres.

Mr. Kilmer moved on to talk about the two (2) waiver request that they would be asking from the Board. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Kilmer what the waivers were for. Mr. Kilmer began with the first waiver being a waiver request from Section 3.01 (1) Subdivision Classifications: Lot Line Adjustment as *"the parcel that is being added to Lot 1-21 will increase the size by approximately 53%. The parcel is mostly wetlands and is being acquired to fulfill the area requirement for the Industrial zone."* Mr. Kilmer went on to the second waiver request being a waiver request from Section 3.07 (3) Soil types for the parcels being *"The parcel being transferred to Lot 1-21 from Lot 1-22 is predominantly wetlands and Lot 1-21 is already a developed site (used auto dealership)."*

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Kilmer that, for the record, the purpose of this is relative simply to the 3-acre requirement. Mr. Kilmer said yes, simply to meet his 3-acre requirement. Mr. Poltak also wanted to hear Mr. Kilmer say that there was no proposed development or further operational change relative to the site plan whatsoever. Mr. Kilmer stated that, when he told Mr. Canales that Mr. Canales said no, that he was happy in the way that he

was working and the size of his operation and he knows full well that this will have nothing further going on. Mr. Porter added that, if there is no further development plan then what is the purpose for actually increasing the size of the lot. Mr. Kilmer said that he does not know any other reason than meeting the 3-acre minimum in the Industrial zone. Mrs. Phillips commented that with the additional 2.15 acres that she could see him coming in asking for more pavement for more parking. Mr. Kilmer did not know that or what Mr. Canales' plan was but was before the Board tonight for a lot line adjustment and reiterated that Mr. Canales has stated to him that he was happy with the situation and the number of cars he has and that is what he is going on. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the request. Mr. Poltak added that, that this was just a simple lot line adjustment and lacks no further implication or definition then that. Mr. Poltak also commented that, if in fact there is going to be a change of use to the property in the future that it would have to come back before the Planning Board because it would require approval by having an amended site plan.

Mr. Tatem commented that, he was not asked to look at this but just took a quick look at the plan and asked the Board if it would be appropriate to include the level of wetlands on the drawing and the associated setbacks including the building setbacks and the wetland setbacks so there is a clear indication of what is buildable with the new lot. Mr. Poltak understood what Mr. Tatem was saying but given there is no intent to do anything that they would only deal with the lot line adjustment and then should any development proposal come forward then the normal course of action would be to have that site plan reviewed and have the Conservation Commission look at it and that type of action and activity he would like to coordinate with him to begin with and make it all happen in that fashion. Mr. Tatem wanted to point out one more thing that he would suggest the Board require is that the plan should show a bound at every corner and there were a couple that were missing and this is part of the requirements. Mr. Poltak agreed and asked the Board if they had any other comments.

Mrs. Marzloff commented that, she believed when they looked at the property the last time that they were specific that they did not want to block off that section as they wanted to use that frontage for future planning for future development and now you're taking away that 226 feet of road frontage. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the frontage. In conclusion, Mr. Poltak understood what Mrs. Marzloff was saying but pointed out that the lot in question is basically a bog and is very wet.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if they had any questions or concerns. Mr. Porter commented that in dealing with the ZBA that they are very conducive to acceptable change and that his concern is that this is a Level One wetland and that, any encroachment upon that, they would more than likely lose out in keeping that area secured from development. Mr. Porter also believed that this area was a sensitive area and that he believed that there was a plan but that it just was not being communicated. Mr. Grillo and Mr. Poltak discussed approving the waivers and reiterated that, if a proposal for future development that it would have to come before the Planning Board for approval and that all the concerns being focused on now would be handled at that time.

Mr. Poltak asked what the pleasure of the Board was and pointed out that they had two (2) waivers to take up and then the request itself and believed it could all be handled tonight. Mrs. Marzloff asked if this was an informal discussion. Ms. Royce said no that it was duly notice as a Public Hearing.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any abutters present. None were noted. Mr. Poltak suggested that they take up the two (2) waiver requests first and then take up the request itself. Mr. Porter asked if they were at a point where we can say that they would have to come back before us for any future development. Mr. Poltak stated that, we have an approved site plan and that if there are going to be any changes to this site plan relative to the site as it will have legal status following our presumed action tonight that they will have to come back to us to revise that site plan. Mr. Poltak also pointed out that, they have it on the record respectful thereof that, this lot line adjustment is not intended and is in no way to impose a change of activity on the site so it should and it would have to return to us if any changes were to be made.

**Mr. Grillo made a motion to approve the waiver from Section 3:01-1 Subdivision Classifications: Lot Line Adjustment that, Lot 1-21 the parcel being added will increase the size by 53% which is larger than the ordinance of 25%, Tax Map 1, Lots 21 & 22. Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.**

**Mr. Grillo made a motion to approve the waiver from Section 3:07-3 Soil Types for the Parcel that the Lot 1-21 from Lot 1-22 is predominantly wetlands and Lot 1-21 is already a developed site (used auto dealership), Tax Map 1, Lots 21 & 22. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.**

**Mr. Grillo made a motion to approve the Lot Line Adjustment Plan Tax Map 1, Lots 21 & 22, 824 Londonderry Turnpike, for CMS Limited Partnership and Mary & Magdiel Canales. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.**

Mr. Poltak explained to Mr. Kilmer that, before he leaves tonight that he wanted to make sure that he understood Mr. Tatem's point earlier regarding updating this site plan relative to boundaries and respectful thereof and asked the Board members if they saw anything else that needed to be addressed. Mrs. Marzloff pointed out that there would be an issue relative to recording and that being there cannot be any lines going through numbers or letters and pointed out a few areas for Mr. Kilmer. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that the bounds should be set prior to recording the Lot Line Adjustment. Mr. Poltak agreed and the record would show that. Mr. Kilmer understood and thanked the Board for their time and exited the meeting.

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

At this time, Mr. Poltak moved on to discuss the Ambulatory Center on Dartmouth Drive and asked the Board members if they had a chance to drive by there to see the lighting. Mr. Poltak just wanted to quickly explain what the issue was over there. Mr. Poltak began by saying that they received approval from the Planning Board and then the lighting was put in as a part of that construction of which Mr. Tatem went out there and that he also went out there as well. Mr. Poltak commented that they were all kind of taken aback by the brightness of the lighting of the parking lot and pointed out that it was 10 to 15 times the minimum requirement that we have regarding commercial facilities. Mr. Poltak indicated that it was very very bright and didn't believe there was an issue of where it was located because it isn't in a residential development.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak believed that we needed to put a maximum on our standards so that we don't run into this issue again and informed the Board that they don't have a maximum right now. Mrs. Marzloff asked if the Board approved a lighting plan. Mr. Poltak said yes but informed everyone that there was no basis because we do not have a maximum limit. At this time, the Board discussed lighting and possibly adding a maximum lighting amount in our ordinance. Mr. Rolfe commented that there have been some issues out there and that the brightness is probably a good thing.

Mr. Poltak turned the discussion over to Mr. Tatem and Mr. Tatem began by saying that, Mr. Poltak commented about not having a maximum limit and he did not know if any town that has that. They say that you can't have glare and you can't spill onto your neighbor's property and other criteria and right now your dealing with a situation that has no residential abutters, nobody is complaining and it's a medical facility and it probably should be a little bit brighter. Discussion ensued with regard to lumens and stick lighting.

Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had anything else to add. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that, in speaking with Mr. Tatem that she knows that our ordinance and site plan regulations' are somewhat vague because they give the minimum and the maximum just talks about enough lighting to safely navigate the site. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about the previous chairman had an issue with lighting. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that, if this issue comes up again before any changes are made to the regulations that the Board could put it as a condition when approving a site plan.

Mrs. Marzloff asked if the lights could be seen from Rockingham Road. Mr. Tatem said no, and don't even see them when you drive up Dartmouth Drive as it is perfectly hidden. Mr. Tatem asked Ms. Royce if she had a set of plans for the Ambulatory Center. Ms. Royce left the meeting to retrieve the plans for Mr. Tatem. Discussion ensued with regard to the Ambulatory Center lighting. Mr. Tatem reviewed the lighting plan for the Ambulatory Center.

Mr. Poltak moved on to the informal.

**Informal –  
266 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 44  
Discuss Potential Use of Property**

Karen Wilson, one of the owners of Accurate Tree Service began by saying that she is a manager of Burl land clearing and they own a piece of property in Hooksett on By-Pass 28. They were advised by George Chadwick of Bedford Design to discuss a piece of property that they are looking to purchase. Mr. Poltak stated that they have a site plan for that piece of property that is approved so how does this come along. Ms. Wilson indicated that, the person that was going to purchase that building backed out so they are now looking to purchase it but not with the way it's laid out. They just wanted to get an idea from the Board if this was something that they could do which is to use the existing driveway that is located on Rockingham Road. They are looking to stockpile tree stumps and brush in one section which they would need to clear a portion of the lot in order to stockpile the material there for now. There would be a stockpile of stumps and brush in one area, logs in another area and come in as needed and grind that pile of stumps and brush and truck the material out and the same thing with the logs. They would like to sell the location that they are at now and then to come in to put up a building but for right now they would like to only have the material stored and be able to process the materials. Mr. Poltak asked if there would be any structures. Ms. Wilson said no because no one would be physically working there on a regular basis. Mr. Poltak asked if it would be a daylight operation. Ms. Wilson said that they would have the material there and if they received a phone call from someone that needed firewood then they would go down and process it and then load the truck up and deliver it. Ms. Wilson indicated that it would basically be for storing material and occasionally processing the material. Mr. Porter asked where they were currently located. Ms. Wilson answered by saying 150 Londonderry Turnpike. A brief discussion ensued with regard to storing and processing material.

At this time, Ms. Wilson passed out copies of a site plan for the Board members to review. Mr. Poltak explained that, they could not have temporary storage facilities on the site because they have to have permanent structures and they can't have trailers. Mr. Poltak also talked about bathrooms and that they cannot have port-a-potty's and asked if they came before the Board members before because they had a similar request from someone a few years ago. Ms. Wilson informed the Board that they would not have someone working at the site for 8 hours a day. Mrs. Marzloff also pointed out that the town of Auburn does not allow outside storage. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also pointed out that the lot was located in the Industrial zone and that the lot was located near Dartmouth Drive which has fiber optics, gas and water so from a planning standpoint that they need to look at what the best use of the property would be. Mr. Poltak also added that aesthetics, sight, fencing and storage is all stuff that they would be looking at very strongly and that it is an area that is so visible. Mr. Poltak also believed this would be a staging area and that most importantly, any activity there has to be supported by permanent structures. They do not allow temporary structures of any kind.

The Board members also pointed out to Ms. Wilson that the property is pretty steep and that it was also very wet and that there were buffers to maintain. Ms. Wilson indicated



that the Board has answered all her questions and thanked the Board members for their time and exited the meeting.

## **ZONING AMENDMENTS**

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented about the ZBA decision last night about the Accessory Dwelling Unit out on Chester Turnpike and how it was brought to her attention by an abutter who was denied a Variance to have a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote continued by saying that, they were cited with a Notice of Violation and appeared before the ZBA in October. In October they were Tabled until December and last night the ZBA Board denied them an Appeal of her decision and subsequent to that they then presented a Variance application to request permission to allow the detached ADU to remain and that was granted by a vote of 3 to 2. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also informed the Board that, the applicant has also submitted a Petition Warrant Article to amend our zoning ordinance to allow detached Accessory Dwelling Units that will be on the March ballot. Discussion ensued with regard to the Petition Warrant Article submitted. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that, she did not see them withdrawing it but if they were denied this would be another way to get it approved if the voters approve the warrant article. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also mentioned to the Board members that the Board did not have the opportunity to amend the article because basically what they did was take the language that we have in there now and instead of saying "detached dwellings are prohibited" that it will now say "detached dwellings are allowed" if it passes. Mrs. Marzloff asked if they will have to come before the Planning Board for a site plan. Mr. Poltak said no. Mrs. Marzloff further added that the Board has the ability to either Recommend or to Not Recommend the petition warrant article. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the Board not recommending this warrant article. Mr. Poltak did not believe this was a good precedence to set and believed it was an ill-advised decision in his opinion.

Mr. Poltak went on to say to the Board that, they had two petition warrant articles and one they just mentioned and the other was to rezone a section over by Exit 2 from Residential to Commercial that they would have to deal with. Mr. Poltak went on to discuss lot size and the lot requirements along with frontage and to put a section back into the ordinance to eliminate what occurred with regard to the condo thing. Mr. Poltak went on to say that he has spoken with Attorney Bennett and they have discussed putting the language back into the ordinance which would be another item for an amendment to our zoning ordinance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that basically it would say that, for every dwelling unit you would have to have the acreage requirement relative to that zone. Mr. Poltak said yes. A discussion ensued with regard to the acreage requirement.

Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to go back to what occurred last night at the ZBA and asked if there was anything that the Planning Board could do in that regard for the future. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote said no but explained that if the voters in town allow detached then this one has smooth sailing but if the voters deny detached then her message to the ZBA would be that, the voters have spoken twice now and they don't want detached then that should be how the ZBA should proceed.

Mr. Poltak added that, if this community adopts what he is proposing respectful to lot size and frontage then that should hold the Zoning Board of Adjustment respectful of varying action thereafter because it's obvious in terms of the intent of the ordinance in our community that you will not be putting an 8-unit condominium on a two (2) acre site. Discussion ensued with regard to the condominiums that are going in off of Rockingham Road and the price of each unit possibly starting at \$300,000.

Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to move onto the discussion about sheds and the setbacks. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote began by saying that there were two (2) sheds that went before the ZBA of which both were built without the benefit of a permit which went before the ZBA and both were within the setbacks. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also informed the Board that both sheds were larger than 120 square feet and both of them the ZBA granted with very little conversation. The Board asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote if she had the ability to fine people. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that she did not have the ability to fine people, that only the Courts can set fines but she is going to propose to the Board of Selectmen that, after the fact permits shall be twice the price of a regular permit obtain prior to putting up the structure. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote went on to say that, what she is proposing to do is that instead of structures 120 square feet or less do not have to maintain setbacks from property lines that it will say "structures 200 square feet or less which coincides with the building code as well as Article 5 of the zoning ordinance gets a conditional Use Permit as well as provisions for wetlands. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote believed that 15 feet from a side line or a rear line and depending on what zone it's in now it's 30 feet and that she would like to keep the 50 feet front setback in place and also keeping the language for building coverage per lot not to exceed 5% in Residential zones. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained to the Board that the ZBA did not see a problem with the two (2) shed request and with that, Mrs. Rouleau-Cote did not see the reason to send people to the ZBA if they were only going to be granted and therefore believed that the setback should be reduced if that were the case. Mrs. Marzloff understood Mrs. Rouleau-Cote's frustration but did not see the need to relax this ordinance because she believed that there were still going to be violations and they were still going to have to come before the ZBA. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that she chose the setback to be 15 feet because she believed it was a common setback maintained by someone putting up a shed and they usually are seeking relief for that distance. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the distance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that, the reason she is seeking to do this is because every time the applicant comes before the ZBA that they seem to get granted so if they are going to keep granting them then why don't we make it so they don't have to go before the ZBA and make it a 15-foot setback from side lines.

Mr. Poltak commented that for the next meeting that he will have the language with regard to the setback for sheds, the language for the acreage as well as the two (2) Petitions that will be before the Board members and will get that to the Board prior to the next meeting and believed that this was as far as they could go tonight.

Mr. Grillo asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote about the detached ADU as we have language in our ordinance about that, they must be attached and they must have a door connecting the two (2) units and wanted to know what happens to this language if they become detached.



Mrs. Rouleau-Cote answered by saying that they still need to meet the 750 square feet requirement and the door connecting the two (2) units can be locked as before they could not be locked so if it's detached and gave an example of one being detached of which she would make sure it met all the life safety components which is fire separation between the garage and the dwelling unit above, the means of egress for the dwelling unit above from the bedroom, the smoke detection/CO detector. Mr. Rolfe asked if she would be able to do that with the one that just was granted by the ZBA. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote said yes and that was one of the conditions as well as obtain a permit after the fact and life safety inspection and septic. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote noted that they did not actually show an actual plan but has not seen the documentation yet but that was one of the provisions. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote went on to say that it would have its own heating system if it were detached and have its own electrical service and how it ties into the septic system and it could tie into the existing septic system or it may have its own septic system.

Mr. Grillo asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote about impact fees. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote commented that she was under the impression that if they have a growth ordinance that they cannot have impact fees because they already regulate the number of homes available to be built.

Mr. Poltak reiterated what the Board would be doing which is Mrs. Rouleau-Cote's suggestions for zoning amendments and the one that he gave which pertained to the minimum lot size and they also had the two (2) Petition Warrant Articles. Mr. Poltak informed the Board members that they would have to vote on all of them as to whether or not the Board would recommend or not recommend each one. Mr. Poltak informed the Board that they cannot amend the two (2) Petition Warrant Articles so the only thing they can do with those is to decide whether to recommend or not recommend the petitions. Mr. Poltak then commented that, he will get together with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, Ms. Royce and Attorney Bennett to come up with a Zoning schedule to schedule a Public Hearing. Mr. Poltak stated that he would get back to the Board members with dates. Everyone understood what Mr. Poltak was saying and Mr. Poltak thanked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and Mrs. Rouleau-Cote exited the meeting.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem about the lighting plan for the Ambulatory Center and Mr. Tatem informed the Board the strength of the lighting and informed the Board that he would check it out tomorrow and the Board will await to hear back from Mr. Tatem with regard to the lighting for the Ambulatory Center.

At this time, Mr. Poltak moved on to the Master Plan with Mr. Tatem and Mr. Whitman.

## **MASTER PLAN**

Mr. Tatem passed out copies of what would be discussed tonight to each Board member. Mr. Whitman began by saying that there were six (6) things to discuss tonight and began going through each one as follows:

- 1) Need feedback on the Land Use Chapter
- 2) Need feedback on the Economic Development Chapter
- 3) Land Use Worksheet which would be to go through the zoning districts
- 4) Land Use Map if there are changes
- 5) Implementation Actions to be filled in (Table)
- 6) Need to think about what this will look like as a formatted document and to possibly do the Master Plan as a Landscaped document

Mr. Whitman asked about photos available of the Town of Auburn. Mrs. Marzloff suggested that they check with the Historical Society as they have a postcard collection. Mr. Poltak suggested that they contact Ms. Royce and she could get them in contact with someone at the Historical Society. Mr. Tatem indicated that he has taken a few photos as well.

Discussion ensued with regard to the Land Use Map and Mr. Poltak believed that they could eliminate the Village District off the Future Land Use Map. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the Village District and the Board members believed it would never happen due to the fact that most of the Village District is within the Shoreland Protection Area.

Mr. Porter believed that water and sewer would eventually come into plan at both ends of town which is near the Derry side and the Manchester Road section. Mr. Whitman commented that it would be premature to put it on the map right now but that they could add it to possible future development. Mr. Tatem believed it should be in the Board's plan because the action item has to reflect the changes that the Board makes to the map which gives them a plan for the next 10 years to do these things. Mr. Tatem asked the Board, if the Board could give them some input on the map then it could be one thing that they could check off the list. Mr. Whitman stated that they really need the map marked up and they need the worksheet filled in and they need the implementation section filled in.

Mr. Tatem asked the Board members to look at Goffstown and Hooksett's impact fees. Mrs. Phillips pointed out that Deerfield also had one. Mr. Tatem talked about how to spend the money that is collected from developers because a few people lost their jobs because they weren't spending impact fees and not following the rules with regard to impact fees. Mr. Tatem stated that this could be an action item to put impact fees along with a spending procedure. Mrs. Marzloff asked if there was a timeframe in which a town had to use the impact fees. Mr. Tatem said six (6) years. A brief discussion ensued with regard to impact fees.

Mr. Whitman moved on talk about the map and the chart and explained to the Board that if the Board has a chapter that doesn't have any actions that they can just pull it and if they want to rearrange them we can do that as well. Mr. Whitman also pointed out that he just organized them by chapter so the Board could look at them.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Whitman what exactly they were looking at the Board to accomplish. Mr. Whitman indicated that the Future Land Use Map at some point needs to be updated so if they had thoughts on changing any areas they could indicate to them what changes they would like to see. Mr. Poltak talked about what Mr. Porter had mentioned with regard to an R3 district located at both ends of Auburn which would be at the end of Manchester Road and near the Derry line. Mr. Poltak also talked about removing the Village District and will they keep it at one acre. Mrs. Phillips believed it would be a problem if they kept it at one acre because there was a lot of land behind a lot of these one-acre parcels. Discussion ensued with regard to the Village District. Mr. Whitman suggested calling it "Auburn Village" and dropping the "District".

The Board members and Mr. Whitman discussed the zones in which workforce housing is allowed as well as multi-family units and color coding the map to indicate those areas. The discussion moved on to Manchester Water Works land and how it was governed under Auburn's regulations because they can't just do whatever they want on that property just because they own it. Mr. Poltak pointed out that if they ever wanted to subdivide the property that they would have to come before the Planning Board in order to do so. That land is subject to all of our Land Use requirements. A brief discussion ensued with regard to Manchester Water Works property.

The Board discussed the Commercial Two zone and possibly eliminating residential in the commercial zone. In conclusion, Mr. Whitman commented that, if the Board could do what they said about the implementation actions and they can work on the Land Use Map and the short term and long term.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board how they felt about taking an hour or two and coming down and going through this together. Mr. Rolfe thought it was a great idea. Mr. Whitman said that they can do primary and secondary responsibility. Mr. Rolfe thought that they could come in an hour earlier at the next meeting and Mrs. Marzloff said that she could do that but could not do during the day. Mr. Poltak believed they could all take this information home and work on it and then get together to discuss it at the next meeting on Wednesday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Edwards also stated that it would work for him. Mr. Poltak commented that he was driven motivationally to use Stantec instead of SNHPC who did our last Master Plan because of your experience Stantec's in general experience including Mr. LaBranche that you would be able to see where the short comings in our ordinance in comparison to other surrounding communities. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem when they would be getting his input as well and asked if they would be joining the Board at 6:00pm on January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Tatem said that they could do that and what he will find is traffic, transportation and they have looked at sewer and water multiple times and they have looked at different transportation things and they've looked at the CIP and they could advise the Board to do a number of different things of which have been done and did not believe there was anything out there for them to look at because they have already looked at it and things have not changed in town that much. Mr. Poltak talked about sensitive lands that were in the last Master Plan that nothing ever happened with it but if they could tie it into an impact fee program. Mr. Tatem agreed and stated that a potential impact fee plan is already in there. With that said, Mr. Tatem stated that he would

recommend that they investigate an impact fee study and an ordinance and if they say yes, it's a good action item then they could work on it. Discussion ensued with regard to talking about impact fees and where the monies are going to go right now is way too premature. Mr. Tatem believed they should study the potential of doing one and think about rezoning some of the sections to R3 and investigate it and then you use that as your plan.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

The Board voted to change the time to meet with the Planning Board to 6:00pm instead of 7:00pm for the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Poltak asked if anyone had any other business. None were noted.

### **ADJOURN**

<p><b>Mr. Grillo moved to adjourn the Hearing. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:48p.m.</b></p>
---

***The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted.***