

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
October 21, 2015**

Present: Ron Poltak, Chairman; Alan Côté, Vice-Chairman, Paula Marzloff, Member. Jim Tillery, Alternate Member. Dale Phillips, Selectmen's Representative. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

Absent: Steve Grillo, Member.

Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Board members to those present. Mr. Poltak indicated that in the absence of Mr. Grillo that he would elevate Mr. Tillery to full voting status for tonight's hearing.

MINUTES

<i>Mr. Côté moved to accept the minutes of September 16th, 2015.</i>
--

Mrs. Marzloff had one question regarding the minutes of September 16th which was located on page 5 in the first paragraph, line 7 where it reads "they had close to 20 to 24 inches of separate before and now..." Mrs. Marzloff was unsure of what it should say. Mr. Côté believed it should read "they have close to 20 to 24 inches of separation instead of separate." Ms. Royce noted the correction and the Board moved on to approve the minutes with one correction.

<i>Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.</i>

GENERAL BUSINESS

**Rick Eaton
Wethersfield Subdivision, Tax Map 2, Lot 4
Discuss Bond Release for Road Bond
Windsor Drive & Winters Way**

Mr. Poltak asked if Mr. Eaton needed to be present. Ms. Royce did not believe he needed to be present to release the Bond. Mr. Tatem agreed and stated that Mr. Eaton did not need to be present. Mr. Poltak indicated that the Bond was in the amount of \$6,189.31 for Winters Way and Windsor Drive because the work has been complete.

Mr. Côté made a motion to release the Bond in the amount of \$6,189.31 for Winters Way and Windsor Drive in the Wethersfield Subdivision; Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

**Daniel Goulet/C Squared Realty, LLC
65 Dartmouth Drive, Tax Map 6, Lot 18-5
Major Site Plan Review**

Mr. MacGuire presented on behalf of the applicant and began by saying that they were before the Board last month requesting a minor extension so that they could do the parking before winter and that they were before the Board now with a full plan. Mr. MacGuire prepared a quick overview of the proposed plans for the property and indicated that it was almost identical to what he proposed to the Board last time. Mr. MacGuire explained that the property was brought to gravel grade with all the utilities installed based on the future phases anticipated for this project. The phases included two (2) additional buildings with parking and circulation and what they are proposing to do is to work within that existing footprint but propose just one new building and additional parking to supplement their existing use. At this time, Mr. MacGuire went through the plan with the Board members. Mr. MacGuire informed the Board members that the utilities worked out well with the new building. Mr. MacGuire stated that they would be moving the warehouse inventory to the new building and the existing building would become all office space which is the reason for the additional parking area. Mr. MacGuire talked about the tractor trailers coming and going and the location of the delivery docks. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the buildings.

Mr. MacGuire pointed out that with regard to the grading and drainage standpoint that he lucked out a bit because he was able to utilize all the existing drainage that was already in place by just re-grading the area by directing the water to where they were and pointed out all the catch basins and stated that they would be utilizing the same structures for this design. A brief discussion ensued with regard to drainage. Again, Mr. MacGuire informed the Board that they really did not have to change any of the drainage design and did not have to do anything with the utilities except to extend it through. Mr. MacGuire talked about the sewer and indicated that they were proposing a separate septic system for the new building which is shown in the center of the parking lot which is away from the drainage and the utilities. Mr. MacGuire stated that the existing septic system is able to service the existing building as it was sized to handle two (2) different buildings so from a loading standpoint it would work well with just the one building because it will have more office space rather than office and warehouse use. Mr. MacGuire also pointed out the potential for later on to hook up to Manchester sewer which was available for all of Dartmouth Drive. Mr. MacGuire also pointed out the location of the pump station for if and when it becomes available.

Mr. MacGuire moved on to talk about the landscaping and that they were proposing additional landscaping where they were doing improvements and that they would be preserving and protecting what was installed for Building A and would expand upon the landscaping.

Mr. MacGuire talked about the lighting and that they were working off of the existing area and that they would like to request a waiver from the requirement for 12 foot high poles and that they would like to allow them to match the existing condition which is 22 feet high. Mr. Côté asked if they would be LED. Mr. MacGuire said yes and that they would not have to worry about night sky pollution because this site does sit down lower than the road. Mr. Côté pointed out that with LED's that you usually do not have an issue with night sky pollution and that was the nice thing about LED as it was directed downward. Mr. MacGuire agreed and said that it was because they were all flat paneled. At this time, Mr. MacGuire handed Mr. Poltak the waiver request from the pole height and asked the Board to take up that request. Mr. MacGuire believed this was about all he needed to discuss at this time and had a few things he wanted to discuss with the Board regarding Stantec's letter but wanted to ask the Board if they had any questions first.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. MacGuire that he thought that they would be doing the parking lot first and the building later and asked if that was still the thought process. Mr. MacGuire stated that when they last talked that they wanted the extension which is under construction at this time. Mr. Côté reiterated what had transpired at the last meeting where Mr. MacGuire said they would come back before the Board soon with the building. Mr. Poltak asked when they were looking to start on this new building. Mr. MacGuire stated that assuming they get conditional approval tonight that they may not have time to get the site developed and paved this season but they would like to start on this during the winter and get it done as quickly as they can. Mr. Poltak understood what Mr. MacGuire was looking at obtaining.

Mrs. Marzloff asked about the snow storage area. Mr. MacGuire indicated that Mr. Tatem brought that up as well and that they would be looking into that as well. Mr. MacGuire stated that he would be reviewing the old plans and seeing what they had for snow storage and would utilize that but in a worst case scenario they would be looking at removal from site if necessary. Mrs. Marzloff also asked about the proposed septic area and if it would rule out a future third building or is this just an interim solution until they get a third building. Mr. MacGuire believed this was a lot of infrastructure for the site based on the increase amount of office use shown and have no intention of providing an additional building as he did not believe there was enough space based on the configuration of the building. Mr. MacGuire did not believe it would work with another building.

Mr. Poltak asked the other Board members if there were any further questions. None were noted. At this time, Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem for comments. Mr. Tatem pointed out that the letter dated October 21, 2015 was sent out to the Board members today at 5:55pm of which the Board did not have time to review prior to tonight's meeting. Mr.

Poltak believed there were quite a few items in the letter. Mr. MacGuire believed that a lot of the comments in there were minor things with no issues and believed that most of them were to add to the details and that there were only 2 or 3 items that he had questions for the Board to address and asked Mr. Poltak if he could go through them. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if he felt the same way as Mr. MacGuire as to the items to be addressed. Mr. Tatem indicated that he had 2 concerns but that the rest of them were very simple. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. MacGuire to continue with his discussion. Mr. MacGuire began with asking for clarification with regard to the zone where it indicates that it was up to the Planning Board to decide the setbacks and that they assumed that it was 30 feet because that was what was on the existing plan and wanted to make sure that it was okay with the Board. Mr. Poltak stated that it was his understanding that it was the same. Mr. Côté wanted to clarify that it was up to the Board to determine the setbacks and that he did not have an issue with the setback being 30 feet. Mr. Poltak believed that with previous submittals that it remain at least 30 feet. The Board members all agreed.

Mr. MacGuire moved on to the other issue with the drainage design which they utilized the existing structures and that there were a few structures that were out in the gravel areas and because they did not want to set brick and inverts that they put a plate and covered it with gravel. Mr. MacGuire stated that he had his surveyors who tried to dig one up of which it was a coned funnel of which they had been digging for hours and that the plate was so large and would take a lot of work. Mr. MacGuire further stated that Mr. Tatem brought up that he would like to see what those inverts were and that he would request that all the inverts not be dug up and would like to get feedback from the Board to see how to handle that comment. Mr. Côté believed that it would be something that could be handled when they were getting ready to cut subgrade. Mr. Tatem pointed out that at the time it was not a town road and that they did not monitor it and that they would have to assume that what was there was actually installed and if the Board did not believe it was a big deal then they can do when they do subgrade. Mr. Côté reiterated that he did not believe it was a big deal and believed they could do it when they do subgrade.

Mr. MacGuire stated that the only other item that he would like to discuss of which he already talked with Mr. Tatem about was regarding a retaining wall that was put in and proposed pavement at the limits that was proposed before. Mr. MacGuire commented that they were proposing light poles and that Mr. Tatem's concern, of which was a valid concern was as they were placing the guardrail and putting in light post if the wall structurally stable for that. Mr. Côté asked if it had a geo grid and when it penetrates the geo grid is when it becomes a concern. Mr. MacGuire agreed and would like to do more research on this. A brief discussion ensued with the lighting. Mr. MacGuire further added that he would like to coordinate this improvement by sending it to an engineer and possibly the one that engineered the wall. Further discussion ensued with possibly having some directional lighting on the building as opposed to light posts. Mr. MacGuire thought it would be a good idea and they could possibly eliminate the light posts. Mr. Tatem only asked Mr. MacGuire about the actual design of the wall and would like to see the actual plan details showing where the guardrails were on that plan

because the original plan is in their archives. Mr. MacGuire did not believe it would be an issue. Mr. Tatem further added that the other two (2) things that the Board would be interested in would be architectural renderings and the landscaping plan. Mr. Tatem stated that they have taken a look at the landscaping plan and it appears to meet the regulations and that everything else can easily be taken care of between Mr. MacGuire and himself.

Mr. MacGuire went on to say that the applicant is working with a design build firm and that the building itself will be in the same design as the existing building which will be nice. At this time, Mr. MacGuire went through the design portion of the building with the Board members. The Board seemed to be in agreement with the design of the building while viewing the design of the building. Mr. MacGuire concluded his presentation at this time. Mr. Poltak commented that he was a stickler with regard to the landscaping design.

Mr. Tatem wanted to inform the Board members of one last detail which was that they have reduced the impervious and used the existing drainage system and has left the high points where the high points were and did not provide a revised drainage study. Mr. Tatem further added that he has looked at the conceptual plan and thought it was appropriate. Mr. MacGuire pointed out that he put the existing three (3) building plan alongside the proposed plan and further pointed out what he had provided to Stantec.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members what they would like to do. Mr. Côté asked if they had accepted jurisdiction yet. Mr. Poltak did not believe that the Board had accepted jurisdiction at this point in time.

Mr. Côté made a motion to accept jurisdiction as the application was complete for C Squared Realty, LLC, 65 Dartmouth Drive, Tax Map 6, Lot 18-5; Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

At this time, Mr. Côté stated that he has looked over the list of items in Stantec's letter and also believed that they were items that could be taken care of between Stantec and Mr. MacGuire and did not believe there was any reason not to grant conditional approval tonight. Mr. Tatem agreed with Mr. Côté.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant a waiver to allow the light pole height of 22 feet where 12 feet is allowed based on the fact that they are using LED's for C Squared Realty, LLC, 65 Dartmouth Drive, Tax Map 6, Lot 18-5; Mr. Tillery seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant conditional approval subject to the following conditions: 1) that the items in the letter from Stantec dated October 21, 2015 be addressed; 2) subject to appropriate escrow to be put in place; 3) subject to the waiver that was granted regarding the light pole height being 22 feet; 4) subject to appropriate surety to be put in place; and, 5) that conditions be completed within 90 days for Tax Map 6, Lot 18-5; Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

At this time, Mrs. Marzloff exited the meeting.

**Sterling Homes, LLC/Keith Martel
Peter Wovkonish & Ruth Cullinane Rev. Trust
58 Dearborn Road, Tax Map 8, Lot 42
Zoned Residential Two
Major Subdivision (19 Lot Subdivision)
Continued from September 16, 2015**

Mr. MacGuire began by passing out a waiver request for this project to the Board members. Mr. MacGuire began by talking about Stantec's letter and only saw two (2) items that he would like to discuss with the Board members. Mr. MacGuire began by talking about the first plan set where they proposed two (2) ponds and pointed out the location of the two (2) ponds to the Board members and everyone present for tonight's hearing. Mr. MacGuire stated that the feedback from Conservation Commission was that they really were not comfortable with the vast encroachment into the buffer and they wanted to see something different. Mr. MacGuire pointed out that they ended up physically moving the cul de sac 50 feet back which shortened the overall length of the road. They also tried to keep a larger buffer in between by putting the drive access right down the middle and placing the pond further down in the back and the Conservation Commission thought this was a clear improvement. Mr. MacGuire further pointed out that they also went before the Zoning Board of Adjustment and received approval for this impact associated with the driveway and the pond. They are now back before the Board with these changes and revised drainage calculations. Mr. MacGuire talked more about the changes that were made with minimizing impact of the buffer. Mr. MacGuire indicated that they modified the road center line to make sure they met the 35 mph design speed as well. Mr. MacGuire also talked about the infiltration pond and because it's an infiltration pond, Alternation of Terrain requires you to store that water without an outlet to be recharged as part of the design. Mr. MacGuire pointed out that the depth turned out to be a foot in a half and that in the regulations it requires that anything with over a foot of detained water to require a fence. Mr. MacGuire felt that in this case that he did not see it as a safety issue and did not believe it required a fence. With this in mind, Mr. MacGuire stated that they would like to ask for a waiver from the regulations to not have a fence and allow the area to naturalize. Mr. Poltak indicated that from a Chairman's prospective that he did not have an issue with that waiver request and believed it made sense to go without a fence. Mr. Côté added that the problem with fences is that they create problems for rescues because now you have to

go over the fence. Mr. Côté further added that as far as swimming pools go that anything less than two (2) feet deep in water that you are not required to have an enclosure and would like to consider the Board changing that in the regulations as it would be a wise choice down the road. Mr. Côté also pointed out that he agreed with Mr. Poltak. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the meeting with the Conservation Commission.

At this time, Mr. MacGuire talked about the possibility of using the driveway to maintain the infiltration pond. Mr. MacGuire stated that he actually would like to propose a second driveway access which will be seeded and loamed which would allow it to naturalize so that you have the structural rigidity but you're not getting that impervious surface. The only concern was that it does have more of an impact on the buffer and may be considered a temporary impact and wanted to get some feedback from the Board about this. Mr. Côté commented that there would probably be a paved driveway and that the minute the Road Agent backs down there that any crack they get that they would blame the Road Agent. Mr. Tatem stated that the Mr. Dross, the Road Agent stated that, that would not happen. Mr. Côté agreed and did not believe that it would have a profound impact by having a natural driveway and did not believe it would have a huge issue and asked Mr. Porter if he agreed. Mr. Porter said no he did not agree and believed it would be considered an impervious driveway from a Conservation Commission standpoint. Mr. Porter also stated that he was not in favor of it and would have preferred a cluster as well as Manchester Water Works would prefer the cluster. Mr. Poltak stated that the vote was three (3) to two (2) and that we've been through all of that. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. MacGuire if they could minimize the impact. Mr. MacGuire and Mr. Côté did not believe it would be a problem with a gravel access road as it would not be used all the time and did not have an issue with what is being asked. Mr. Tatem also agreed and stated that there are a few access roads throughout the Town. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the access gravel road. The Board all agreed that it was not a permanent impact at all and that it was only a means of access. The Board talked about the width of the right of way and agreed that they would like to minimize the impact to the Level One wetland and did not see a major issue with what was proposed. Mr. Tatem asked the Board members who would be in charge of making the decision on whether or not there would be an impact to the Level One wetland. Mr. Côté believed that the Planning Board could make that decision and that anyone could appeal the Planning Board's decision to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Poltak agreed with Mr. Côté.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any further questions from the Board. None were noted. Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions from abutters. None were noted. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if he had anything to add. Mr. Tatem said no. Mr. Poltak asked the Board if they wanted to take any action tonight.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 10.07.40 to allow to not have a 4 foot fence around detention structure that has more than 12 inches of water in it for Liberty Woods, Tax Map 8, Lot 48; Mr. Tillery seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. MacGuire if he had anything else to add. Mr. MacGuire said no. Mr. Tatem indicated that all the rest of the comments were okay and had no issues. Mr. Côté asked Mr. MacGuire if he would be coming back before the Board once he has addressed the conditions. Mr. MacGuire thought that the conditions could be handled with Mr. Tatem because they were minor. Mr. Tatem agreed that the outstanding items were minor. Mr. Poltak believed that the Board could move forward with conditional approval tonight.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant conditional approval subject to the following conditions: 1) that the items in the letter from Stantec dated October 19, 2015 be addressed; 2) subject to appropriate escrow to be put in place; 3) subject to the waiver that was granted regarding Section 10.07.40 to not have a fence; 4) subject to appropriate surety to be put in place; 5) to obtain all state permits; 6) subject to the modifications shown tonight with the access way down to the detention ponds; and, 7) that conditions be completed within 90 days for Dearborn Road Subdivision, Tax Map 8, Lot 42; Mr. Tillery seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. MacGuire thanked the Board and exited the meeting.

**Crown Energy Solutions, LLC
Shawn Thrasher
692 Londonderry Turnpike, Tax Map 1, Lot 11
Zoned Industrial
Major Site Plan Review (Garage)
Continued from September 16, 2015**

Mr. Mitchell presented on behalf of the applicant, Shawn Thrasher. Mr. Mitchell stated that this application was before the Board on September 16, 2015 and was unsure that the Board accepted jurisdiction. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the property is 6.3 acres and was zoned Industrial which was currently vacant. Mr. Mitchell explained to the Board members that they were proposing a warehouse space of approximately 7,050 square feet with an associated office of about 1,500 square feet. With that, there would be 18 parking spaces with proposed outside storage of new propane tanks which would include green space. Mr. Mitchell stated that they have submitted plans to Stantec and from what he has seen would be something that they can take care of. They have also applied to the State for a curb cut of which they have not heard back yet. Mr. Mitchell talked about the waiver that they had sent out with regards to a lighting review to allow 20 foot lights to be mounted. Mr. Mitchell also presented the Board members with a water test result. Mr. Poltak asked if the site would require mediation. Mr. Mitchell said no that it was only one of the lab results. Mr. Tatem suggested that the Board make the report a condition of the Board's approval. Mr. Poltak agreed with Mr. Tatem.

Mr. Mitchell moved on to discuss the landscaping and the berm where it will be in excess of 6 feet and talked about the security entrance fence. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if he would be watching the landscaping and pointed out a few issues with the current regulation. Mr. Tatem pointed out that there would be a landscaping bond put in place for two (2) years.

Mr. Mitchell moved on to talk about the last review letter dated October 21, 2015 of which he believed could be handled between them and Mr. Tatem. Mr. Poltak informed everyone present that the Board did accept jurisdiction on this and asked Mr. Tatem if he had any to discuss. Mr. Tatem said no and they did not have any issue to the waiver regarding lighting.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant a waiver to Section 10.13(4)(A)(iii)c – Lighting Plan Specifications to allow 20 foot poles where the regulations require 12 foot maximum light pole height and based on the fact that they will be LED for Crown Energy Solutions, LLC, 692 Londonderry Turnpike, Tax Map 1, Lot 11; Mr. Tillery seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Côté talked about the area which shows recycled asphalt and asked if the drainage would be impervious. Mr. Mitchell said yes. Mr. Tatem commented that they did not have an issue because they would be storing brand new propane tanks and if they were used propane tanks then they would require them to do pavement. Mr. Tatem suggested that the Board require them to put a note on the plan that says “this outdoor storage is not for parking and will be used for clean new tanks only” that way if they sell the property and the new owners want to do something different that they would need to come before the Planning Board. Mr. Côté agreed and stated that it was a very good point. At this time, Mr. Côté reviewed the minutes of September 16th regarding comments on recycled asphalt. Discussion ensued with regard to pavement and recycled asphalt. Mr. Tatem reiterated that it should be noted that it was storage area only and not to be used for parking.

Mr. Tatem also pointed out that the septic design would be added as an additional sheet to the plan set. Mr. Côté asked if it would be over 100,000 square feet. Mr. Tatem said yes that it was over 100,000 square feet.

Mr. Côté made a motion to grant conditional approval with the following conditions; 1) that notes be added to the plan that the storage area is to be used for storage of new empty tanks only and not used for parking of any vehicles; 2) that they obtain DOT curb cut; 3) subject to all state approvals; 4) that the conditions are to be met within 90 days; 5) that Stantec’s comments in the letter dated October 21, 2015 be addressed; and, 6) that appropriate escrow be put in place to insure the completion of the landscaping and other improvements on the site be done appropriately, for Crown Energy Solutions, LLC, 692 Londonderry Turnpike, Tax Map 1, Lot 11;

Mr. Porter asked about the site being a shared use because the property was a large lot which could have potentially more businesses on it. Mr. Côté and Mr. Poltak both stated that if they wanted to do more on the property that they would have to come back before the Board for site plan approval but for now this is for one business only. Mr. Mitchell stated that the purpose of the notes is for storage only and that if it were to be expanded or to change the use itself then they would have to come back for site plan review. Mr. Poltak understood and asked for a second.

Mr. Tillery seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

➤ None were reviewed at this time.

OTHER

BOARD DISCUSSION OF ROAD CONSTRUCTION DETAILS & CLUSTER SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Mr. Côté suggested that they look at the regulation with regard to the pole height for lighting and now everything is going LED. Mr. Tatem stated that if you have a commercial site and there are two (2) residential properties on both sides that he did not believe that 12 foot high poles was unreasonable but in an industrial zone it could be up to 30 feet. A brief discussion ensued with regard pole height.

Mr. Poltak moved on to the update of the Master Plan and meeting with the BOS to do the budget for the review. Mr. Poltak moved on to ask Mr. Tatem about the road standard changes and noted that Mr. Tatem has been working with Mr. Côté on these changes. At this time, Mr. Tatem explained what has been going on and went through the Draft Stantec Memo dated October 19, 2015 of which had 44 items on it. Mr. Tatem went through each item individually which also included Cistern Specifications along with General Regulations. Mr. Tatem also noted that he has also been working with Mr. Dross, the Road Agent with these road construction details.

Mr. Tatem went on to talk about requesting a waiver and pointed out that Mr. MacGuire handed the Board members a waiver request that he had written on a piece of paper and believed that if they did not advertise the request for a waiver then someone could appeal that because the Public Notice needs to address waivers. Mr. Tatem asked Ms. Royce if that was the process and Ms. Royce indicated that it was not necessary and that we did not normally do it that way. Mr. Tatem indicated that the Town of Hooksett

has said that the class that they attended that the notice had to indicate the request for a waiver has to legally public input. Mr. Côté pointed out that the abutters are already publicly noticed with regard to the actual site plan review of the subdivision because we cannot be held because the Board may decide that night to make that condition and there is no way you can spell out everything you are going to condition on a plan and that's why the abutters need to attend the meeting. Mr. Tatem stated that he would double check that with the land use attorney. Mr. Côté did not believe that this was a requirement.

Mr. Tatem moved on to talk about having a checklist for the review to ensure the application is complete. Mr. Tatem added that once this is done then they can do the technical review and have a procedure that they use in other towns as well as the review submission deadlines. Mr. Côté thought it would be helpful if Ms. Royce had a checklist to go by to help her out. Ms. Royce agreed with Mr. Côté. Mr. Tatem also pointed out that if Ms. Royce does a completeness review then Mr. Poltak could ask Ms. Royce if the application was complete and Ms. Royce says yes then the Board could accept the application as complete and then Stantec can do the review.

Mr. Tatem also commented that two (2) sets of plans are submitted directly to Stantec and that one set of plans is sent directly to the Town and that every time Stantec gets a copy of anything then the Town should receive a copy of the same thing and that the Town is informed that copies were submitted to Stantec. Mr. Tatem went on to talk about #7 where the Town will require at the time of submittal an engineering review fee of \$1,000.00 because the review for C Squared was received on September 30th but a check was not received until October 14th so the plans sat on his desk for two (2) weeks because there was no check. If the Town were to require a \$1,000.00 check at the time the application was submitted then the review can be started that day. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the \$1,000.00. Mr. Tatem indicated that this was just to get the review started.

Mr. Tatem and the Board members talked about lighting again and reiterated what was said above. Mr. Tatem also touched upon the landscaping plan and surety to be held for two (2) years.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if he would be going back and formalizing these changes. Mr. Tatem said yes. Mr. Poltak indicated that there was an estimate for the CIP for \$7,000.00, there was the subdivision and site plan review at \$1,500.00 and what was the review amount for cluster. Mr. Tatem thought it was \$5,000.00. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem to call him in the morning with the amount because he would like to do the budget for these items. A brief discussion ensued with the amounts as both Mr. Poltak and Mr. Tatem were unsure of the amounts. Mr. Tatem stated that he would get the numbers to Mr. Poltak tomorrow.

Mr. Tatem informed the Board members that he has also been working with Mr. Grillo with regard to the cluster regulation and believed they needed to schedule the first Public Hearing on this which would probably need to be done at the school on a non-

public night. Mr. Tatem thought it would be a good idea to get some sort of outline to the Board members to review and add any comments prior to scheduling a public hearing night. Mr. Poltak agreed.

Mr. Poltak asked Ms. Royce to check with town counsel with regard to statutory changes in Concord relative to changes to be made within the town. Mr. Poltak also wanted to obtain input from Mrs. Rouleau-Côté, the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer.

Mr. Tatem stated that he would get the cluster ordinance outline to the Board as soon as possible because that will be up for town vote.

At this time, Mr. Poltak thanked Mr. Tatem for his time and concluded the Public Hearing.

ADJOURN

Mr. Tillery moved to adjourn the Hearing. Mr. Côté seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, November 4th, 2015 and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road.