

UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
January 18, 2017

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

Absent: None

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members to introduce themselves to everyone present for tonight's meeting. Mr. Poltak asked the audience if they were attending the meeting tonight for the Ambulatory Surgery Center or the Zoning Ordinance amendments. A few were in attendance to hear about the Ambulatory Surgery Center and a few stated that they wanted to hear what the zoning amendments were. Mr. Poltak indicated that he would go in the order of the printed agenda.

At this time, Mr. Poltak moved on to the acceptance of the minutes for both December 7th and December 14th.

MINUTES

<p>Mrs. Marzloff moved to approve the minutes for both December 7, 2016 and December 14, 2016 as written, Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.</p>

ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

➤ None were reviewed at this time.

GENERAL BUSINESS

None noted.

PUBLIC HEARING

**Access Ambulatory Surgery Center, LLC
Auburn Medical Properties, LLC (Owner)
45 Dartmouth Drive, Tax Map 6, Lot 18-4
Major Site Plan Review
Ambulatory Surgery Center
Medical Facility (Phased)**

Mr. Jason Lopez of Keach Nordstrom introduced himself as being the Project Engineer and also introduced Mark Moeller of JSA who is the Project Architect who will also discuss the building. Mr. Lopez then proceeded to introduce Dr. Joshua Siegel who was a member of Auburn Medical Properties, LLC and Access Ambulatory Surgery Center, LLC. Mr. Lopez passed out copies of the plan to the Board members that did not have a copy. Mr. Lopez explained the location of the property which has 11.32 acres with 758 feet of frontage. Mr. Lopez also indicated where the drainage easements were located on the property. Mr. Lopez went on to say that they have hired Mark West to flag the wetlands and pointed out that one was classified as a Level One wetland and that there were two (2) smaller wetland pockets that were classified as Level Three that were possibly areas that were over excavated. Mr. Lopez also stated that they also hired Jack Hayes to go out and do a soil survey of the property and that the entire area that they are looking to develop has been disturbed and with that were concerned of what possibly could be buried out there. With that in mind, they went out and did borings under the area of the building and where the parking lot would be to see what was out there. Mr. Lopez further added that they also conducted four (4) test pits of which two (2) where they were proposing to do the septic system. Mr. Lopez commented that he went through the town records on the property and that there was a long standing communication about the stockpiles of material that had been left on the property which was supposed to get cleaned up but was still there. Mr. Lopez explained that the piles were sitting in what was the wetland buffer so what they are proposing to do there is to remove the piles out and do some regrading and level that area and then go out there with a conservation mix and stabilize it. Mr. Lopez believed that it would take about two (2) growing seasons and then after that they would let it grow wild and let it re-establish itself and let it grow up.

Mr. Lopez stated that they have determined their boundary for the wetland setbacks and have determined the areas that they would like to develop. Mr. Lopez further stated that they are proposing to do the construction in three (3) phases and added that Phase I would be to construct a one story building consisting of 7,300 square feet of an ambulatory surgical center and then in Phase II would be 3,800 square feet which would be for a future addition. Then Phase III would be a separate detached building consisting of 6,000 square foot footprint with 12,000 square foot GFA which would be a two (2) level building that would be for professional office space. Mr. Lopez went on to say that, with Phase II and Phase III of which market conditions would set which one would be constructed first depending on the operation of the surgical center and also the market for professional office space. Mr. Lopez informed the Board members that

they were looking for approval for all three (3) phases with the condition that they would come back before the board with the architectural component for Phase II and Phase III. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Lopez if he was prepared tonight to talk about the functionality of the facility associated with the type of care that would be provided along with hours of operation and emergency vehicles coming and going. Mr. Lopez said yes and began talking about the first phase and indicated where the patients would enter as well as being discharged. At this time, Mr. Lopez explained the building and location and then moved on to talk about the second phase with the additional parking spaces and attached building addition and the third phase which would be the detached building. Mr. Lopez explained that Phase I would require 34 parking spaces, Phase II would require an additional 13 parking spaces and then Phase III would require 44 parking spaces for a total of 91 on-site parking spaces which would include 5 handicap spaces.

Mr. Lopez moved on to talk about the water which would be served by Manchester Water Works and that the sewer and the fact that there was a dry line in place that was capped off at Rockingham Road which would require an on-site septic system. Mr. Lopez pointed out that it would be a Neptune Waste Management System which he considered to be like a wet vac which was used as a surgical piece of equipment. Mr. Lopez went into more detail of the on-site septic system which was Clean Solution that was a septic system with multi compartments. Mr. Poltak had a question relative to new technology and believed that it was not considered a new system to DES correct. Mr. Lopez said yes and that it has been around for a while.

Mr. Lopez moved on to talk about obtaining power to the site as well as obtaining a generator because they need to make sure that they have power at all times. Mr. Lopez also pointed out that they would also be connecting to the high pressure gas line that is already available on Dartmouth Drive so they would be tying into that which was owned by Liberty Utilities.

Mr. Lopez also talked about the fact that there was a fire hydrant right across the street but that the building would also be sprinkled.

Mr. Lopez stated that they had a screened dumpster location in the rear of the property that would be further screened from the road once the second phase of the addition was put on and would look at the dumpster location.

Mr. Lopez explained to the Board members that they did take a look at the traffic and that the PM peak hour was 57 trips in the evening with 14 entering the site and 43 exiting the site of which they would be heading out towards Rockingham Road.

Mr. Lopez talked about the drainage and indicated that they would be going with a closed drainage system with catch basins as well as the detention ponds which would require an AOT permit.

Mr. Lopez indicated that the signage would include a sign on-site and a sign at the entrance.

Parking and traffic flow would be two-way traffic around the building and pointed out the delivery area. Mr. Lopez explained that no waivers would be required for this proposal and talked about Stantec's letter that contained 80 comments and stated that most of the comments they could address and did not see a lot of issues. At this time, Mr. Lopez asked if the Board had any questions and if not that he would turn the presentation over to the Project Architect, Mark Moeller. Mr. Poltak answered by saying that he would rather see them move through their presentation and then he would turn to Mr. Tatem of Stantec and then to members of the public that had questions and would then turn to the Board members for questions.

At this time, Mr. Mark Moeller of JSA Architects began by saying that he would like to give just a brief overview of the layout so that the Board members would have an idea of what would be going on inside the building. Mr. Moeller pointed out that his copy was color coded and explained where family members would be waiting to pick someone up and another area that would be used for pre and post op areas where a patient would be assigned to one of the recovery bays where they would change their clothes. Mr. Moeller stated that there was only one procedure room but there was a secondary one but was only used for lower tech procedures but truly had one primary room which was utilized as the business area of this facility. There was also a support area for the staff with locker rooms and lounge and mechanical and electrical rooms as well. Mr. Moeller then directed everyone to the location of where the patient would be accompanied by someone and helped to the car while being picked up by someone. Mr. Moeller explained that, when Phase II becomes a reality that the door would need to be relocated and that the nature of the addition would include one additional operating room and would increase the recovery rooms. Mr. Moeller reiterated what Mr. Lopez said about it being a one-story building with roughly 14 foot high ceilings consisting of a wood frame building.

Dr. Joshua Siegel gave an example of a surgical center up in Newington and they have had one room for a long time and believed it was built back in 2000 and that the one room has been very efficient and there was no need to expand it. Dr. Siegel believed that this area was different and believed that there were a lot more surgeons out there that would be very interested in moving into a very efficient surgical center environment. Dr. Siegel went on to say that, dependent upon the number of surgeons that show an interest that it could be a short as three (3) years or as long as eight (8) years. Mr. Poltak asked Dr. Siegel what the nature of the business would be. Dr. Siegel explained that they were all ambulatory surgical procedures of orthopedics. Dr. Siegel also stated that the main ones being ophthalmology, pain procedures that are done through anesthesiologist and also ear, nose and throat procedures.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if there were any questions. None were noted. Mr. Edwards suggested that they rethink the area where patients are being dropped off and pointed out that it was only a suggestion. Mr. Poltak did not believe they would be having emergency vehicles coming and going and asked Dr. Siegel if they would be having emergency vehicles. Dr. Siegel explained that it was unusual to admit patients to a hospital after one of these procedures and further said that, last year there were

1,200 procedures done in the one room and there were 6 admissions and they were generally stable patients and it was very rare that an ambulance would have to come. Dr. Siegel also indicated that they were making arrangements with two (2) of the nearby hospitals such as CMC and Elliot Hospital to assist them as well. Mrs. Phillips believed that this facility was similar to the one in Bedford. Dr. Siegel said yes.

At this time, Mr. Poltak moved to Mr. Tatem for comments. Mr. Tatem suggested that Mr. Lopez comment on any issues that he had because he had a few comments that he wanted to discuss. Mr. Poltak agreed and turned to Mr. Lopez. Mr. Lopez began by going through the letter received by Stantec and started with #11 that *"A note must be added specifying that the wetland buffers are to be marked with conservation markers (which are available at the Town Hall for purchase)"*. Mr. Lopez asked the Board if this was something that the Board wanted completed on the project. Mr. Poltak said yes.

Mr. Lopez moved on to #12 *"Granite bounds must be specified to be set at all existing lot corners and ROW angle points."* Mr. Lopez pointed out that this was an existing lot in an existing commercial subdivision and that they have not gone out to see if they're there or not and would they need a waiver for this or would they be required to put them in. Mr. Tatem explained that, that subdivision that monuments are required to be put in and the developer, Mr. Mesiti who did the entire subdivision and roadway did not put the monuments in because he made an agreement that as the lots were sold and developed that the monuments would be put in. Mr. Tatem explained that if a marker is to be placed under a foot of water that it could be placed at a set distance away from it and mark it and that they are all granite bounds.

Mr. Lopez moved on to #15 *"Note #10 must be revised to reference the dry sewer line that must be connected to the existing sewer stub."* Mr. Lopez stated that they were putting an on-site septic and putting in a sleeve under the pavement so that if Manchester and Auburn ever make an agreement then they would have that sleeve in place and connect at that time. Mr. Lopez believed they would have to put in a pump system and have a pump out. Mr. Tatem indicated that he has reviewed all the plans in the subdivision and that every lot is connected to the sewer and added that it would benefit the site as well if they connected to the dry sewer line.

Mr. Lopez moved on to #18 which talks about the signs and whether or not the Board would require a formal sign package to have for the Board's review. Mr. Poltak stated that he was very sign conscious and would be looking at that. Mr. Tatem explained to Mr. Lopez that, on the recorded site plan in the note that they should add the dimensions of the sign (ex. 4ft by 8ft monument sign) that way if it's on the plan and the ordinance changes then they would be grandfathered. If they don't note it on the plan and the ordinance changes then they would not be grandfathered.

Mr. Lopez went on to talk about #47 which was the Landscape Plan and that they went through all the requirements for all the required trees and plantings and so forth and added some shrubs to the front as well.

Mr. Lopez asked the Board members if they had any questions at this time. Mr. Poltak stated that they would be getting into that in further detail later on but would like to suggest that they work with Mr. Tatem and Stantec and would like them to come back at a later date and that the Board would hope that a lot of the 80 items in Stantec's letter dated January 17th would be taken care of.

Mr. Tatem pointed out to the Board members that the ordinance states that the side setbacks are approved by the Board and further pointed out that the side setbacks were massive on this plan by hundreds of feet and believed it would be good if the Board is fine with the setbacks that they are proposing because they were really defined by the wetland setbacks anyways.

Mr. Tatem stated that the other thing he wanted to bring to the Board's attention was regarding the Lighting Plan as it is proposed will require a waiver and pointed out that this was discussed with the project across the street from Stantec because the Town of Auburn's regulations require 12 foot poles and believed that the whole road has between 18 and 20. Mr. Tatem suggested that they go over to Linear Technology and check out their poles and therefore would require a waiver unless they go with 12 foot poles which he thought would be a bad idea because it would then require a lot more lights.

Mr. Poltak stated that he would be turning to the public given that this was a Public Hearing for comment but wanted to ask Mr. Lopez if the hours of operation dictated the lighting. Mr. Lopez said yes. Mr. Poltak asked what the anticipated hours of operation would be. Dr. Siegel answered by saying that they usually open their first surgical patient around 7:30am and that staff usually arrives around 6:30am and that they are usually done by 5:00pm/5:30pm which means that staff would usually leave by 6:00pm/6:30pm. Dr. Siegel also added that they are open Monday through Friday and generally not on weekends but if they happen to get really busy and they found doctors that wanted to operate on a weekend then they might open on Saturday. Mr. Edwards asked that when Phase III was complete if the hours would be the same. Dr. Siegel said yes. A brief discussion ensued with regard to hours of operation.

Mr. Poltak thanked Mr. Lopez, Mr. Moeller and Dr. Siegel for the presentation and turned to ask if there were any abutters present. Mr. Lovely voiced his concern with regard to traffic as he lives on North Reading Street and informed the Board members that it is very hard to turn onto Rockingham Road/Wellington Road because the road is hidden and that it was very difficult to exit North Reading Street. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Lopez about traffic concerns. Mr. Lopez stated that the bulk of the traffic would be passenger vehicles but that there would be a few delivery vehicles such as small box trucks. Mr. Lopez reiterated that they anticipate 57 trips at PM peak at full build out of the surgical center (all 3 phases completed) which would be 14 entering and 43 exiting. Mr. Edwards asked how it compared to the current pattern. Mr. Lopez did not know. Mr. Rolfe asked how many employees they would have to get this going. Dr. Siegel answered by saying that they would start with generally 8 to 10 full time staff and that there would always be two (2) doctors.

Mr. Connors stated that he was a property owner/business owner in the Town of Auburn but did not live here and believed this would be a good addition to the town. Mr. Connors talked about the light poles and how they are usually 20 to 22 feet which gives you a lot more general light and believed it would be safer for the people and staff.

Mr. Hodgson asked about the septic system and what the proposed system would be. Mr. Lopez reiterated what he stated above about the septic system. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the septic system. Mr. Tatem commented that they would have permanent approval from the state. Mr. Hodgson's second question was regarding security of the building and securing narcotics. Dr. Siegel indicated that there was very little narcotics kept on site and considered it to be a low target and talked about the security system being very good.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked if there were any further questions. None were noted. With that in mind, Mr. Poltak suggested that the Board move to accept the application and then respectfully of the intent that the applicant and Stantec, our consultant work towards resolving the outstanding issues and then continue the hearing until such time that the applicant and Stantec feels comfortable coming back before the Board. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Lopez when they would like to come back and asked Ms. Royce for the upcoming meeting dates. Ms. Royce stated that there was February 1st, February 15th, March 1st and March 15th. Mr. Lopez thought they could get it all done by February 15th and therefore asked to be continued until February 15th.

Mrs. Marzloff made a motion to accept the application and to schedule the next hearing until February 15, 2017, Mr. Grillo seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.

Mr. Poltak informed everyone that the meeting was continued until Wednesday, February 15th.

**Legal Notice
Town of Auburn, New Hampshire
Planning Board**

The Auburn Planning Board will conduct a public hearing on **Wednesday, January 18, 2017** at 7:00 p.m. at the Auburn Town Hall, 47 Chester Road, Auburn, New Hampshire.

The purpose of the public hearing is to present proposed amendments to the Town of Auburn Zoning Ordinance, and to solicit comments and discussions relative to the proposed amendments.

Amend Articles 2.02, 4.05, 4.07 and Appendix A to comply with RSA 674:72 and permit, by Special Exception, accessory dwelling units in Rural, Residential-One and Residential-Two Zoning Districts. The amendment will permit one accessory dwelling unit to be attached to a principle dwelling unit. The accessory dwelling unit shall consist

of no more than 750 square feet of living space, two or fewer bedrooms and provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, sanitation and parking.

Amend Article 2.02, 4.05, 4.06, 4.07, 4.08, 4.09 and Appendix A by renaming current (3) "Agricultural Use" as "Agriculture, Farm, Farming" as defined in NH RSA 21:34-a. As amended, Agritourism and marketing as defined under NH RSA 21:34-a (b)(5) shall require a Special Exception and be subject to Site Plan Review.

Amend Article 13.01 Building Permits Required as authorized by NH RSA 674:51 III (d) and enact a provision authorizing the Board of Selectmen to establish fees, to be charged, by the Building Inspector, for building permits, inspections, and for any certificate of occupancy.

Amend Article 13.06 In-Ground Pools to expand pool barrier requirements to be consistent with NH State Building Code and rename as Article 13.06, Swimming Pool Barrier Requirements.

At this time, Mr. Poltak believed that they should go through each section and then take public comments and then turned the meeting over to Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector to read the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance to those present tonight. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote began by reading the first proposed amended Article 2.02 as follows:

Amend Article 2.02 Definitions, Words and Terms, by deleting current (28) Dwelling Unit, Accessory in its entirety and replace with the following language to comply with NH RSA 674:72, Accessory Dwelling Units.

(28). Dwelling Unit, Accessory:

Residential living unit that is within or attached to a single family dwelling, and that provides independent living facilities for one or more persons, including provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation on the same parcel of land as the principal dwelling unit it accompanies.

Accessory Dwelling Units shall be permitted by Special Exception as governed under Article 14.14 of the Auburn Zoning Ordinance in all zoning districts that permit single family detached dwellings.

A Special Exception shall be required for construction and or change of occupancy for creation of an accessory dwelling unit.

The Accessory Dwelling Unit shall meet the following requirements:

- (a). An accessory dwelling unit shall have no more than two bedrooms. and shall not exceed 750 (seven hundred fifty) square feet in living area and shall be attached to a single family dwelling. Attached means sharing a common habitable space wall.
- (b). An interior door shall be provided between the principal dwelling and the accessory dwelling unit, but it shall not be required that it

remain unlocked. The accessory dwelling unit shall have door with direct access to the exterior, or common space to hallway to exterior door.

- (c). The accessory dwelling unit shall have interconnecting smoke/carbon monoxide/heat detectors with the principal dwelling unit.
- (d). There shall be adequate provisions for water supply and sewage disposal for the accessory dwelling unit in accord with NH RSA 485-A:38, but separate systems shall not be required for the principal and accessory dwelling units.
- (e). An accessory dwelling unit shall meet all zoning setbacks and all applicable building codes. There shall be adequate parking to accommodate an accessory dwelling unit.
- (f). The property owner must occupy one of the dwelling units as his/her principal place of residence.
- (g). Only one accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted for any single family dwelling.
- (h). Detached Accessory Dwelling Units are not permitted.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions so far. Mrs. Willett asked about the septic system for an Accessory Dwelling Unit. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote answered by saying that the current laws under the State Statute RSA 485-A:38 which is the septic laws so what they have to do is prove to the town that the leachfield that they have can accommodate the Primary Dwelling Unit and the Accessory Dwelling Unit. Typically a septic system is based on the number of bedrooms and when you look at an Accessory Dwelling Unit you have to look at the kitchen as being a half bedroom. A brief discussion ensued regarding the septic system and having an Accessory Dwelling Unit as well as parking which would be dealt with at the Zoning Board of Adjustment during the request for a Special Exception.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote moved on to the next change that would reflect the changes made to the Accessory Dwelling Unit change above and the zones that each fall into.

Amend Article 4.05 "R" Rural District

Delete (t) Accessory Dwelling Unit from (2) Permitted Uses in R District
Add (h) Accessory Dwelling Unit to (3) Uses Permitted by Special Exception in R District

Amend Article 4.06 “R-1, Residential-One and R-2 Residential Two Zoning District

Delete (n) Accessory Dwelling Unit from (2) Permitted Uses in R-1 District
Add (o) Accessory Dwelling Unit to (3) Uses Permitted by Special Exception in R-1 District

Delete (s) Accessory Dwelling Unit from (4) Permitted Uses in R-2 District
Add (i) Accessory Dwelling Unit to (5) Uses Permitted by Special Exception in R-2 District

Amend Article 4.07 C-1 Commercial One District and C-2 Commercial Two District

Delete (u) Accessory Dwelling Unit to Commercial Establishment from (4) Uses Permitted in C-2 District

**Adjust Appendix A, Zoning Matrix of Uses and Districts Accordingly.
Renumber all sections as required due to amendments.**

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote moved on to discuss the next zoning change which was also to amend Article 2.02 definitions with regard to Agriculture and pointed out that the current definition was somewhat antiquated and that the definition had not been modified during the last 20 years. At this time, Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated to everyone present that she had a copy of the RSA if anyone wanted to take a look at it and went through the modification made to amend Article 2.02 Definitions relative to Agriculture as follows:

Amend Article 2.02 Definitions, Words and Terms, by deleting current (3) “Agricultural Use” in its entirety and replacing with the following language:

(3) Agriculture, Farm, Farming as defined in NH RSA 21:34-a. and as may be further amended

A single family detached dwelling shall be a permitted accessory use.

(a) Agritourism and marketing as defined under NH RSA 21:34-a (b) (5) shall require a Special Exception in accordance with Article 14.14 of the Auburn Zoning Ordinance and be subject to Site Plan Review through the Auburn Planning Board.

(b) Farm Roadside Stand: shall remain an agricultural operation and not be considered commercial (Agritourism), provided that at least 35 percent of the product sales in dollar volume is attributable to products produced on the farm or farms of the stand owner. The floor area of the Farm Roadside Stand shall not exceed one hundred fifty (150) square feet.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked if there were any questions regarding the definition change. Someone asked how that affected the Industrial zone. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out that several of you received a letter relative to the Public Hearing this evening and explained that under the State Statute whenever a zoning change is going to affect a zoning district which, in this case was the Industrial zone, and that zoning district has less than 100 property owners, that State Statute says that each property owner must be notified of the change. A brief discussion ensued with regard to this change and there were no changes to be made.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any further questions. None were noted and asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to move on to the next zoning change.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote again pointed out the changes that would reflect the changes made to the Agriculture change above and the zones that each fall into.

Amend Article 4.05 “R” Rural District

Rename (a) Non-Commercial Agriculture to Agriculture in (2) Permitted Uses in R District

Delete (b) Commercial Agriculture –Forestry Only from (2) Permitted uses in R I District

Delete (c) Commercial Agriculture from (2) Permitted uses in R District

Rename (d) Produce Stand to Farm Roadside Stand in (2) Permitted Uses in Rural District.

Add (h) Agritourism to (3.) Uses Permitted by Special Exception

Amend Article 4.06 “R-1, Residential-One and R-2 Residential Two Zoning District

Delete (g) Commercial Agriculture – forestry only from (2) Permitted Uses in R-1 District
Rename (i) Non-Commercial Agriculture to Agriculture in (2) Permitted uses in R-1 District

Rename (g) Commercial Agriculture to Agritourism in (3) Uses permitted by Special Exception in R-1 District.

Rename (h) Produce Stand to Farm Roadside Stand in (3) Uses permitted by Special Exception in R-1 District

Rename (g) Non-Commercial Agriculture to Agriculture in (4) Uses Permitted in R-2 zoning District

Delete (h) Commercial Agriculture from (4) Uses Permitted in R-2 District

Rename (i) Produce Stand to Farm Roadside Stand in (4) Uses Permitted in R-2 District

Rename (a) Commercial Agriculture to Agritourism in (5) Uses Permitted by Special Exception in R-2 District.

Amend Article 4.07 C-1 Commercial One District and C-2 Commercial Two District

Delete (q) Commercial Agriculture from (2) uses permitted in the C-1 District

Rename (r) Produce Stand to Farm Roadside Stand in (2) Uses permitted in C-1 District

Rename (a) Commercial Agriculture to Agritourism in (3), Uses Permitted by Special Exception in C-1 District.

Rename (p) Commercial Agriculture to Agritourism in (4) Uses Permitted in C-2 District

Rename (q) Produce Stand to Farm Roadside Stand in (4) Uses Permitted in C-2 District

Rename (h)N on Commercial Agriculture to Agriculture in (5) Uses Permitted by Special Exception in C-2 District.

Amend 4.08 “V” Village Center District

Rename (a)(i) Commercial Agriculture to Agritourism in (3) Permitted Uses in V District.

Amend 4.09 “I” Industrial District

Delete Commercial Agriculture from (2) Permitted Uses in I District

Adjust Appendix A, Zoning Matrix of Uses and Districts Accordingly.

Renumber all sections as required due to amendments.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote moved on to the next proposed zoning amendment that relates to Article 13.01 Building Permits Required and began by going through the proposed change as follows:

Amend Article 13.01 Building Permits Required **as authorized by NH RSA 674:51 III (d) and enact a provision authorizing the governing body to establish fees, to be charged for building permits, inspections, and for any certificate of occupancy.**

Amend Article 13.01 Building Permits Required to read:

No building shall be erected, constructed, reconstructed, altered or repaired without a building permit issued by the Building Inspector. The Building Inspector is authorized to

charge and collect for the Town, the fees for building permits, inspections and certificates of occupancy. The Auburn Board of Selectmen shall be authorized to establish a fee schedule and amend as necessary following required statutory public hearing process.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained what the proposed change meant to everyone present and the fact that the Building Permit Fees have not been altered in approximately a decade. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that she was trying to get the Building Permits done online right now. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the current fees.

Mr. Poltak asked if anyone had any questions with regard to this discussion. None were noted.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote to move on to the next zoning change. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote read Article 13.06 In-Ground Pools along with the proposed change to the Board members and everyone present as follows:

Amend Article 13.06 In-Ground Pools to expand pool barrier requirements to be consistent with NH State Building Code.

Re-name Article 13.06 Swimming Pool Barrier Requirements

Amend Article 13.06 to read:

All swimming pools installed within the Town of Auburn shall comply with applicable state building codes and amendments under NH RSA 155-A. All pools shall have barrier requirements in place prior to final inspection and issuance of certificate of completion.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained what was in place now and what the change would entail and further pointed out the fact that, the change would be a way of modernizing our zoning ordinance so that it was not just referring to fences anymore but actually calling them what they really are which is swimming pool barriers and the language is there so that there is an expectation that the barrier is in place when the pool is installed and not a year in a half later.

In conclusion, Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that these were the proposals that would be on the ballot for the March election which will be held on Tuesday, March 14th. Mr. Poltak pointed out that these have all been discussed and that there have not been any changes. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote pointed out to the Board members that the Board should make a formal motion to formally post for the town ballot.

Mr. Rolfe made a motion to formally accept the Zoning Ordinance amendments as presented at the Public Hearing tonight to be voted on at the March election, Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

OTHER

CIP Update

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if he wanted to move on to discuss the CIP. Mr. Tatem passed out copies of the revised CIP to each Board member to review and follow along.

Mr. Tatem began by saying that the last discussion regarding the CIP Update was back in December. Mr. Tatem stated that he sat down with Mr. Herman and that they have revised the CIP somewhat. Mr. Tatem indicated that Mr. Herman gave him a list of changes and that what they are trying to do is to bring Auburn more into following a CIP program. Mr. Tatem stated that the old one is of no value as they have bumped up the date from 2017 – 2022 to 2018 – 2023 because we are already in the year 2017. Discussion ensued with regard to the changes made and Mr. Tatem directed the Board members to go to the last page where Appendix C: Schedule of CIP Projects, Annual Costs and Revenues and talked about the column in yellow. Next, Mr. Tatem directed the Board to Page 6 Table 3: Summary of Projects Requested and suggested that the Board to rank them in the order of priority. Mr. Tatem stated that Mr. Herman took a look at it and believed he was happy with it.

Mrs. Marzloff asked Mr. Tatem how many of the improvements will be required if the new school passes. Mr. Tatem said that this would be a good question for Mr. Villeneuve but the thought was to put the school in to see if it passes and if it passes that Auburn will not have a new school in a month because it will probably take a couple years. Mrs. Marzloff believed this was a work in progress until we have a vote on the school. Mr. Tatem did not believe that the school would affect the salt shed facility.

Mr. Poltak suggested that the Board members take the CIP home and rank them accordingly and then after town meeting, the Board would discuss how to rank each of them on the list. Mr. Tatem agreed that if the Board reviews it prior to the Board's next meeting that they could go through them more quickly.

Subdivision Regulations Master Plan

Mr. Tatem moved on to briefly discuss the Subdivision Regulation changes and pointed out that the copy before the Board members had redlines in it so that it would be easier for the Board to see the changes. Mr. Tatem asked the Board if they were prepared to go through the Subdivision Regulations tonight and if not, they could review it and meet at a later date to go through any comments or questions that the Board may have. The Board all agreed. Mr. Tatem further indicated that the changes pertained mostly to the construction standards.

Mr. Poltak mentioned that they continued the hearing for the Ambulatory Surgical Center until February 15th and suggested that they continue this meeting for that same date. Discussion ensued with regard to the dates to schedule the next meetings. Mr. Tatem stated that he would not be available for the next few months to meet on the first week of each month but that Mr. LaBranche could take his place if the Board so chooses to meet the first week of each month. Mr. Poltak suggested that they meet on March 15th to discuss the Subdivision Regulations and then do the CIP in April and that they would have the Master Plan kicked off as well.

Mr. Rolfe requested to discuss with Mr. Tatem a few situations that has occurred regarding roads and what he would like to suggest. The Board all agreed and Mr. Poltak explained to the Board members that anyone could meet with Mr. Tatem if they had anything to add.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked everyone present tonight if they had anything else to add. None were noted.

ADJOURN

Mr. Rolfe moved to adjourn the Hearing. Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:53p.m.

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 1, 2017 at 7:00pm at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted.