

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES  
Town of Auburn  
Planning Board  
PUBLIC HEARING  
September 20, 2023**

**Present:** Ron Poltak, Chairman Jeff Porter, Vice-Chairman. Jill Dross, Member. Michael Rolfe, Selectmen's Representative. Minutes prepared by Denise Royce.

**Also Present:** Matthew Peterson, Keach-Nordstrom. Dan Tatem, Stantec. Michael Ploof, Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC. Jeff Wenzel and Steve Munroe.

**Absent:** Michael O'Callaghan, Members. Paula Marzloff & Jess Edwards, Alternate Members.

The meeting was held at the Auburn Town Hall. Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Mr. Poltak informed everyone that they had a full agenda and that they do have a quorum tonight as there are a few members of the Board that are absent tonight. Mr. Poltak moved on to the approval of the minutes of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

**MINUTES**

**Mr. Porter moved to approve the minutes of September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023, as written. Ms. Dross seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

With that said, Mr. Poltak asked how many were present tonight for the Tanglewood project. There were a number of people present for this project and therefore Mr. Poltak would take this item up first.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Matthew Peterson, Keach-Nordstrom  
On Behalf of Tanglerock Holdings, LLC &  
Russell Sullivan  
Off of Tanglewood Drive & Rockwood Terrace, Tax Map 4, Lots 13-4 & 16  
Major Site Plan Review (55+ Community Development – 62 units) &  
Lot Line Adjustment  
Continued from August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Mr. Poltak began by saying that there were two (2) items with regard to Tanglerock Holdings to be taken up tonight and both of these are necessary under state law. Mr.

Poltak explained that, state law requires them to take up the Lot Line Adjustments prior to taking up and further discussions associated with application acceptance and then moving towards approval or disapproval of the project. Mr. Poltak pointed out that there were two (2) informal discussions which took place on May 24<sup>th</sup> where the application was brought forward to town hall. Mr. Poltak went on to say that a copy of the application and plan set was sent over to our third-party review which is Stantec who would take up a comprehensive review of this plan set and collaborates with the applicants' engineers and that is where we are at tonight. Mr. Poltak went on to say that this is when the application has met all of the requirements within the context of state law and all of the requirements of the regulations we have in place in Auburn. What will happen tonight is that we will take up the Lot Line Adjustment due to the fact that some time ago, possibly 17 or 18 months ago the Board approved the Lot Line Adjustment but it never got filed with the Registry of Deeds so the Board will have to revote that tonight in order for the process to move forward. Mr. Poltak stated that, once this is done the next step would be to the acceptance of the application as complete and then we will begin the process of a comprehensive review with the proposal leading to the approval or disapproval of what is being presented. Mr. Poltak indicated that he is planning on having Planning Board meetings after discussion tonight with the applicant associated with the fact that the next Planning Board meeting would be October 18<sup>th</sup> and then the meeting thereafter would be November 15<sup>th</sup>.

With that said, Mr. Poltak stated that he would be asking for a motion from the Planning Board to approve the Lot Line Adjustment, which was pretty straightforward, which is the transfer of land between Mr. Sullivan and the project itself. The Lot Line Adjustment is pretty straightforward, and the Planning Board is to look at a Lot Line Adjustment from the prospective of compliance with its local regulations and the last thing you want to see with a Lot Line Adjustment is the creation of a non-conforming lot that does not conform with our zoning ordinance. Mr. Poltak pointed out that this does not occur here, and it was approved prior but was not recorded with the Registry of Deeds.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions. None were noted. With that said, Mr. Poltak asked for a Motion to approve the Lot Line Adjustment.

**Mr. Porter made a motion to approve the Lot Line Adjustment for Tanglerock Holdings, LLC and Russell Sullivan, Tax Map 4, Lots 13-4 & 16. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Poltak moved to the acceptance of the application and indicated that he would be asking Mr. Peterson and Mr. Tatem for a summation of what they have accomplished relative to the application acceptance which is going to be our next motion. Mr. Poltak pointed out that he would be asking for a motion to accept the application which will initiate the next step in the process, which is the eventuality of a very long formal discussion with the approval or disapproval of the project.

**Mr. Porter made a motion for acceptance of the application for Tanglewood Holdings, LLC, Tax Map 4, Lots 13-4 & 16. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem and Mr. Peterson to give a summation of the work that they have accomplished in the sense of reaching the point of acceptance of the application. Mr. Peterson spoke first and began by introducing himself to everyone present tonight. Mr. Peterson stated that, he was before the Board tonight with this proposal and stated that they submitted the application on May 22<sup>nd</sup> for application acceptance and that Mr. Tatem's company completed a review and submitted a letter on August 8<sup>th</sup> and there were 7 items that were not on the plans. Mr. Peterson noted those items as listed on the letter dated August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2023 from Stantec. A copy of which is located in the file. Mr. Peterson stated that they have completed those items as requested. Mr. Peterson talked about the one waiver request to not include full design plans for each septic system for completeness purposes of which Stantec took no exception with the condition that full design plans are provided for each septic system prior to final approval of the application.

Mr. Peterson concluded by saying that he would need at least 3 to 4 weeks to get the plans revised and back to them, which kind of puts us to the beginning of October and believed that November 15<sup>th</sup> was more realistic. Mr. Peterson stated that basically that is where they are currently. Mr. Poltak wanted to point out to everyone that there was a lot of material associated with this project. Mr. Poltak informed everyone that the plans are available to anyone to review at the town hall. Mr. Poltak added that there was a wetlands study, a traffic study and all other studies that are necessitated by the size of this project which is all upstairs for review and will be taken up during the approval and disapproval process. Lastly, Mr. Poltak stated that the state statute gave Planning Boards 65 days for approval or disapproval of which the applicants have waived so that we can work cooperatively so that all of the reviews and all of the studies can be reviewed. Mr. Poltak also informed everyone present tonight that the Conservation Commission has also weighed in and conducted a site walk last Saturday and their comments will be incorporated into the review. At this time, Mr. Poltak turned the discussion over to Mr. Tatem.

Mr. Tatem began by asking the Board members to act on the waiver request to not provide detailed septic designs before the acceptance of the complete plan. Mr. Poltak did not want to take that up tonight but wanted to deal with waivers at the time of approval or disapproval process. Mr. Tatem mentioned the wildlife and wetland study which will be forthcoming. They have done one complete technical review including the traffic study, the plans and application and supporting documentation. Mr. Tatem indicated that he had a conversation with Mr. Peterson and indicated that the revised plans are forthcoming, and they will have a week or two to review those plans and should have no problem being prepared for that November meeting. Mr. Peterson added that they have provided the condo docs for review by town counsel as well.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked the abutters or interested parties for comment and input and stated that November 15<sup>th</sup> will be the date for which this proposal will be continued

too and at such time the Board will begin the approval or disapproval process. An abutter asked about a comment made at an earlier Planning Board meeting where the Chairman requested renderings of what the buildings would look like and asked if it has been submitted. Mr. Poltak stated that they had not seen any of that yet, but it would be part of the approval or disapproval process. An abutter asked about the impact studies and asked if the Board will rely solely upon that. Mr. Poltak stated that they can exercise the opportunity to use an independent review over and above our third-party consultant which is Stantec. The Board will review the information and authenticity and the accuracy of the initial review and then decide accordingly whether or not an independent party necessitates another review. Mr. Peterson responded by saying that all those studies are reviewed by DES, Alteration of Terrain, Stantec and the town and DOT for the traffic. Mr. Poltak reiterated that it's a pretty intense process that they will all be involved in. Mr. Butts of Tanglewood Drive asked when the Conservation Commission comments will be provided to the Planning Board. Mr. Porter, Chairman of the Conservation Commission commented that they conducted a site walk last week and they will be doing a second one when the leaves come down and will be making comments after the second pass. Mr. Peterson added that they are looking for the first of November when the leaves come down.

Ms. LeBlanc talked about the traffic study which was done during the wintertime and asked if there was a timeframe with regard to the traffic study. Mr. Peterson explained that on November 15<sup>th</sup> he will have the traffic engineer present at that meeting, and he will have the wetland scientist there to answer any of these questions. Mr. Peterson added that he would get those dates for the next meeting on November 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Porter made a motion to Continue the Public Hearing until November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023 for Tanglerock Holdings, LLC, Tax Map 4, Lots 13-4 & 16. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Poltak informed everyone that he will see everyone on November 15<sup>th</sup> for the continuation of this Public Hearing. An abutter asked about October. Mr. Poltak stated that there would be a Planning Board hearing in October, but that Tanglerock will not be on that Agenda.

Mr. Poltak moved on to the Public Hearing for 213 Eaton Hill Road which was before the Board previously for an informal. Mr. Poltak added that this one lot subdivision was pretty straightforward and turned the meeting over to Mr. Ploof.

**Michael Ploof - Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC**  
**On behalf of The Harland Eaton Revocable Trust of 2018**  
**213 Eaton Hill Road, Tax Map 8, Lot 15**  
**One Lot Subdivision (creating One New Lot)**

Mr. Ploof presented on behalf of the Trust and pointed out the location of the property which was 213 Eaton Hill Road. Mr. Ploof began by saying that the existing lot consists of 78 acres with over 1,230 feet of frontage along Eaton Hill Road. Mr. Ploof went on to say that they are proposing to subdivide off one three (3) acre lot with 436 feet of frontage which will contain the existing house, septic and well. The remainder of 75 acres will remain in its current state with no development anticipated. Mr. Ploof pointed out that the last time they were before the Board was for a preliminary hearing which was on September 6<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Ploof stated that a few things that he added to this plan based upon that meeting was adding text labeling the existing 3-bedroom house and they also recovered the septic approval number from NHDES which was included on the plan. The final thing they did was point out the monuments to be set for the new lot. At this time, Mr. Ploof concluded his presentation and stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board if they had any questions. Mr. Poltak mentioned the placards for the wetland delineation. Mr. Ploof stated that he has spoken to his client, and they are agreeable to add the wetland delineations and pointed out on the plan where the placards would be placed.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any abutters who wanted to speak. Mr. Cote of Eaton Hill Road pointed out that his well is on Mr. Eaton's property, and he does have a well easement. Mr. Cote asked if it was possible to do a Lot Line Adjustment so that his well could be on his land. The Board informed Mr. Cote that this had nothing to do with what is being presented tonight and that he should work with the property owner in that regard. Mr. Tatem explained to Mr. Cote that his well is in a location of a non-buildable area and that he was in a good situation and that the State of New Hampshire just changed their requirements where you don't have to have the protective radius on your own property anymore. Again, Mr. Tatem informed Mr. Cote that his well is safe and that it was in a non-buildable area. Mr. Cote indicated that his concern was if he decided to sell that the mortgage company may have a problem with that. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the well for 191 Eaton Hill Road. Mr. Ploof stated that they were before the Board tonight for a One Lot Subdivision and that he would certainly speak to his client. Mr. Rolfe commented that this had nothing to do with what is being proposed tonight. Mr. Tatem pointed out that the Town of Auburn's regulations state that all property monuments be set and asked about the flag lot and recommended that those bounds be set. A brief discussion ensued with the Board members regarding the monuments.

With that said, Mr. Poltak asked for any further questions. None were noted. Mr. Poltak asked for a motion to approve the one lot subdivision.

**Mr. Porter made a motion to approve the One Lot Subdivision for 213 Eaton Hill Road, Tax Map 8, Lot 15. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Poltak informed Mr. Ploof that he was all set, and the one lot subdivision was approved.

## **GENERAL BUSINESS**

**Informal – Jeff Wenzel  
81 Priscilla Lane, LLC  
81 Priscilla Lane, Tax Map 1, Lot 16-21  
Discuss Potential Site Plan Amendment**

Mr. Wenzel was present tonight. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Wenzel to speak with regard to what he is proposing to do at 81 Priscilla Lane. At this time, Attorney Chris Swiniarski introduced himself to the Board members and indicated that he would be presenting on behalf of Wenzel Oil Company and Jeff Wenzel. Attorney Swiniarski had the plan that Mr. Poltak had in front of him. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Wenzel if they were the new owners of 81 Priscilla Lane. Attorney Swiniarski stated yes and what they are proposing to do is pretty minor activity and want to prepare a minor site plan approval but wanted to see exactly what the Board would be looking for from them. Attorney Swiniarski stated that he has reviewed the site plan regulations and the list for minor site plan review is pretty extensive and is geared towards asking for waivers. Attorney Swiniarski added that it would be better for everyone if they found out exactly what the Board would like to see. Attorney Swiniarski began by saying that what they would be doing is geared towards Mr. Wenzel's fleet and also storage for empty propane tanks that are tanks for new customers which would be their inventory that is stored there. Attorney Swiniarski also pointed out that some soil would be stored there as well which would be the soil dug out of people's yards to install the tanks. The only real site change would be the yellow area and they are not sure what they want to do there right now, but the trucks would be driving on that to get to a door on the back of that building and right now it's just grass which is not really suitable for driving on it. They are not looking to pave it, but they are looking for some options. Attorney Swiniarski stated that, even if they pave that area, they would still be under the 40% lot coverage. Attorney Swiniarski believed it would be gravel for now with pretty minor and no grade changes and no new construction. This would be pretty minor and low intensity use and want to do this as expeditiously as possible. In conclusion, Attorney Swiniarski stated that they were looking for some input from the Board on what they would require from them.

Mr. Porter asked what they would be looking to store and about the storing of soil. Mr. Wenzel chimed in and stated that they are a heating oil and propane company and they do heating air conditioning and pointed out the back portion of the lot highlighted in yellow was previously undeveloped from any perspective and was overgrown with brush. Mr. Wenzel went on to talk about the storage tanks and raw dirt that they take out and fill with



sand over the propane tank and they would just store it there until they could dispose of it. They use a lot of crushed stone, loam and sand and any excess fill that they get. As far as tanks go, Mr. Wenzel talked about Dead River who is nearby has hundreds of tanks there and that they are nowhere near that size. They may have 100 or 150 which seems like a lot but it's just basically to store them onsite until we are able to bring them to a customer's account. Mr. Poltak asked if there would be fuel in those tanks. Mr. Wenzel stated that the majority of the time they wouldn't but that the majority of the time there would not be and then they would prepare a handful of each size tank at a time so at any time they would put in 5% capacity which would be 100 gallon tank they would put in 5 to 10 gallons so they can set it on someone's property and hook it up without having a truck there the same day. Mr. Rolfe asked Mr. Wenzel if they planned to put any big tanks like Dead River has. Mr. Wenzel said as of right now no because they have a different property for that. Attorney Swiniarski pointed out that something like that would be a different application of which they would be back in front of the Board.

Mr. Poltak wanted to point out the health and safety side of the equation and the storage of tanks and materials would have to be run by the Fire Department for their recommendation as well. Mr. Poltak was impressed by how well Mr. Wenzel did his homework for this project and asked if they had any intention of changing the parking in the front. Mr. Wenzel said they have no intention of changing the front parking lot. Mr. Poltak informed Mr. Wenzel that he would leave it up to the Fire Department with regard to the storage of empty tanks and whether or not it needs to be paved or not. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the used and it was noted that it was a permitted use in that zone. Mr. Wenzel believed it was most analogous with a warehouse establishment where they house goods and service goods and items that they then sell outside of the property. Attorney Swiniarski informed the Board that they would work out the use with the Code Enforcement Officer as they began discussions, and it looked pretty clear that they were in a permitted use.

For the sake of tonight's discussions, Mr. Poltak presumed that they would be moving forward by formalizing a site plan and speaking with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and then coming back before the Planning Board. Attorney Swiniarski just wanted to identify any specific things that the Board might want to see. They have this conceptual plan, and they are not really contemplating adding a whole lot more but that they would be asking for waivers from most of the other requirements. Attorney Swiniarski believed the application was pretty intense and was almost the same for a minor site plan review as the major site plan review. Again, Attorney Swiniarski just wanted to see what the Board would want to see on the site plan specifically. Mr. Tatem asked Attorney Swiniarski what type of items he was proposing to waive. Attorney Swiniarski pointed out that there was a long list and gave an example of the grading because they are not changing the grades at all and as a matter of fact it's pretty flat. Mr. Rolfe agreed it was pretty flat. Mr. Tatem believed a list of waivers would be appropriate to provide and then the Board could decide if they are reasonable or not. Attorney Swiniarski agreed and the Board agreed to do it that way.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if there were any further questions. None were noted. Mr. Wenzel asked the Board what he could use instead of paving the area that trucks would drive on and not parking vehicles on and storing the tanks on. A brief discussion ensued with regard to paving or the use of gravel. Attorney Swiniarski believed they had some homework to do on that. Attorney Swiniarski believed this was helpful and the discussion ended at 7:51pm.

**Informal – Steve Munroe - M&M Ventures, LLC**  
**22 Dartmouth Drive, Tax Map 25, Lot 44**  
**Discuss Potential Tenant for one of the Contractor Bays**

Mr. Munroe introduced himself as well as his partner Mr. Midolo. Mr. Munroe explained that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote recommended that they come before the Board to see if there is anything they need to do from a site amendment standpoint for this type of business. The business is a transmission company which falls under the existing site approval and according to Mrs. Rouleau-Cote it may need a site plan amendment. Were looking to lease to a transmission company where they are unable to service trucks that over 7 1/2' tall so he would use this facility for trucks that exceed that. He would store trucks inside the building and remove the transmissions and take the transmissions to his shop in Manchester and then return them and install them back into the vehicles. There would be no outside parking as all the vehicles would be stored inside. It would be two (2) to three (3) times a month that they would have people there to do this. Mr. Munroe explained that the transmission fluid would come in 3-gallon containers and the old fluid would be drained and placed in 100-gallon drums and transported off site. Again, Mr. Munroe explained that they would be removing transmissions and taking them off site for repair and then brought back to this shop and installed back into the trucks.

Mr. Poltak stated that he has reservations. Mr. Poltak talked about the last person who was before the Planning Board last time with regard to repairing vehicles for sale. Mr. Munroe indicated that he came to the Board without their knowledge, and he was more retail. Mr. Poltak asked about the lease and the number of parking spots and asked where all this would be occurring and would trucks be stored outside waiting to be repaired. Mr. Munroe commented that each unit would have a number of parking spaces assigned to each unit. Mr. Munroe asked Mr. Poltak if he would like it more defined and sent to him in an email of what exactly was to occur in this unit with the repair of transmissions. Mr. Poltak said yes, he would need more information on what would be occurring in this unit. Basically, Mr. Poltak needed a more accurate detail of what would be occurring with regard to transmission repairs. Mr. Munroe asked if they put something in writing that there is to be no outside storage would that help. Mr. Poltak said yes and informed him to speak with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and that they would wait to hear back from him with more information.

Mr. Munroe and Mr. Midolo both thanked the Board for their time and the discussion ended at 8:00pm.



## **PUBLIC HEARING**

**Matthew Peterson – Keach-Nordstrom  
On Behalf of Maine Drilling & Blasting  
88 Gold Ledge Avenue, Tax Map 1, Lots 18-4 & 17-4  
Major Site Plan Review (Proposed Office & Warehouse)**

Mr. Peterson presented on behalf of Maine Drilling & Blasting and introduced their tech Bridget who was also present tonight. Mr. Peterson presented Ms. Royce with a check in the amount of \$165.00 for Stantec's review of the storage area. Mr. Peterson also presented Ms. Royce with another check in the amount of \$239.00 for the previous application. Mr. Peterson also presented Ms. Royce with an escrow check in the amount of \$5,580.00 that was just cut today and so Mr. Tatem has not had a chance to go through and complete a review yet. Mr. Peterson asked the Board members if they wanted him to go through a quick review or if they wanted to continue this until October. Mr. Poltak recalled the project for clearing of land up top and now we have this project before the Board tonight. Mr. Scott explained that they had intended to build the yard outback this spring and when they got to pricing the cost of the gravel, they had in that was causing the project to be over budget. Their contractor said that if they switched to a different grade gravel it would get them back into budget. They submitted with the AOT the drainage calculations were impervious surface for the gravel they were using so if they change the gravel, it wouldn't affect AOT they just wanted to ask permission from the Board and Mr. McGuire thought they just had to talk to Stantec, and the contractor wanted them to change the documents so when he built it, he was actually matching it. He was on medical leave for three (3) months which slowed stuff down. That change has not been submitted yet and he is working on that. The most important piece is getting the yard completed and hoping to get this all done this fall. With that said, they had to modify the AOT. Mr. Peterson took over the presentation at this time and explained that they are doing treatment of the ponds. Mr. Scott explained to the Board that the Dubay Group is still responsible for the storage yard site plan and that Mr. Peterson of Keach-Nordstrom is responsible for the lower portion site work for the proposed Office and Warehouse. Mr. Scott indicated that they have an approved AOT to complete the yard outback. Right now, the plan is to build the building in the spring of 2024. Mr. Scott reiterated that there are still two (2) projects, which is to build the yard outback and to build the office and warehouse facility down front.

Mr. Scott believed they were still awaiting final approval from the town. Mr. Tatem gave a little summary of what has transpired and began by saying that there was still an outstanding review letter from Stantec which may be from back in November 2022 which had approximately 7 items on it. Mr. Tatem stated that if they want to construct the storage yard that they need a signed plan to be recorded. Mr. Poltak recalled that they received Conditional Approval and Mr. McGuire was going to follow through with everything else. Mr. Tatem was concerned about the project outback and the project out front and how they would overlap with two (2) different companies handling different projects. Everything needs to mesh like it's one project.

Bridget explained that the Dubai plan was pretty clean cut, and they were able to mesh it to connect and she will be working with amending the AOT.

Mr. Scott talked about the deed being delayed and if it was needed to start this project. Mr. Poltak said yes. Discussion ensued with regard to the Lot Line Adjustment that occurred with NH Signs. Mr. Tatem suggested that they present since everyone is present. Mr. Poltak agreed and asked Mr. Peterson to go ahead and present.

Bridget began the presentation by saying the project is proposing a 6,400 square foot building which would be a two tier where you would come in on the bottom and 20 feet up is the upper parking area. The upper area would be office space and the lower part would be contractor doors so they could work on the trucks inside the building. Associated project improvements are that they will be relocating the existing driveway further down. The fuel station will remain, and the existing exit out will remain. The plans show the drainage and grading requirements for this type of project. They are taking into consideration the split level so they have a bio retention pond that will treat the upper parking area and then they have a dual pond system working in tandem that would collect the runoff from this driveway. Calculations show 44 parking spaces which we have provided. Bridget talked about the landscape plan which was shown to the Board. New septic and well would be installed as well as a cistern system for fire. Mr. Tatem asked what size the cistern would be. It was noted that it would be 20,000 gallons where the building would require 12,000 gallons. There would also be an underground propane tank installed for gas.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if the Board would be in a position for our October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting to be able to review in a formal sense and take action on this with Stantec's recommendations. Mr. Tatem commented that because of the delay and when they submitted plans and not being able to do much tonight, I would recommend that at the next meeting that we can do a completeness and technical review discussion in about a month. Mr. Poltak commented that he believes we could meet on the 18<sup>th</sup> of October and get all this done as it was not that complicated. Everyone was in agreement and would continue the Public Hearing until October 18<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Porter made a motion to continue the Public Hearing until October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7:00pm for Maine Drilling & Blasting, 88 Gold Ledge Ave, Tax Map 1, Lots 18-4 & 17-4. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and all were in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Scott thanked the Board and the discussion ended.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if there were any new business that they would like to discuss. Mr. Rolfe wanted to talk about Freedom Lane and the timing for acceptance

of the road. Mr. Tatem indicated that he had been out there. Ms. Royce informed the Board that she received a call from Mrs. Martel giving an update on the road paving.

Mr. Poltak informed the Board about SB78 which precludes Planning Board's from moving forward in the requirements of Surety until such time as it gives the developer the opportunity to go forward absent reclamation surety on a subdivision until the sale of lots and/or request of building permits. Mr. Tatem indicated that it was for subdivisions only and not site plans.

Mr. Poltak believed that was all for now and asked for a motion to adjourn.

### **Adjourn**

<b>Mr. Porter made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Dross seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:23pm.</b>
---

**The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7:00 pm. This meeting will be held at the Auburn Town Hall, 47 Chester Road. This date is subject to change.**