

UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
December 7, 2016

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

Absent: Tom LaCroix, Alternate.

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

MINUTES

Mr. Grillo moved to approve the minutes of November 16, 2016 as written, Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed.

Mr. Poltak informed everyone present that the Board would be taking up three (3) informal discussions but that he would jump ahead to discuss the CIP as there were a few people present that could not stay through the whole meeting and with that moved on to discuss the CIP with Mr. Tatem of Stantec and Mr. Herman, Town Administrator.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

➤ None were reviewed at this time.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Planning Board Workshop Regarding:
Master Plan
CIP Update
Subdivision Regulations

Mr. Poltak informed everyone that the Board has been engaged with Stantec for quite some time to try and develop a Capital Improvements Plan and believed that they have made significant progress. First, Mr. Poltak wanted to direct the Board members to page 6 of the Draft Town of Auburn Capital Improvements Plan which was shown in

yellow as being a priority. A brief explanation ensued and Mr. Poltak turned it over to Mr. Tatem of Stantec and Mr. Herman, Town Administrator.

Mr. Tatem explained that Mrs. Marzloff and he started the process off as Mrs. Marzloff was designated as the representative of the Planning Board to work on this with them. Mr. Tatem pointed out that the CIP Priority Recommendations were still blank as they did not feel that it was their role to make a recommendation of where the CIP should go. Mr. Tatem indicated that on Page 5 shows the priority system by letter and defines what each letter represents. Mr. Tatem stated that Mr. Herman has taken a look at this and had some minor comments of where some money was coming from. Mr. Tatem pointed out that the Fire Department had a changing of the guards and had some updates in that area. Mr. Tatem wanted to talk about one of the big things which were the school and the potential for a school upgrade or rebuild which would significantly impact the CIP and tax rate.

Mr. Tatem indicated that the law requires that the CIP be updated every five (5) years and it is recommended that it be updated annually and this could be one of the annual update. Mr. Tatem talked about the 2017 budget being done and that one of the recommendations that Mr. Herman had was to bump up the CIP date to 2018 and call it the 2018 to 2023 CIP which would be an easy change. Mr. Tatem believed what would be worthy to talk about was on Page 7 under "Net Taxable Value" which shows the average increase if you exclude 2010 when there was a re-evaluation is 1.98%. Mr. Tatem moved on to Page 9 where it includes the school budget which increases it to 3.60% which is higher than the increase of taxable value and believed this would be something to think about. Besides adding the school and making some of those changes the only recommendation that Mr. Tatem had was either the Budget Committee or the Planning Board or a team of both of those Boards and maybe the Selectmen may want to get together and require that the Department Heads come up with these 5 to 10 year plans for expenditures that they can actually implement into the CIP. Mr. Tatem moved on to talk about Page 16 which looks at years 2017 to 2022 and making it even across the board to keep the tax rate consistent.

Mr. Poltak asked when this is done does it become a blueprint for them. Mr. Herman stated that it was advisory for budget purposes and gave a few examples for the Board members.

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if they had any questions. Mr. Edwards asked about Page #2 where it showed a demographics and asked about the under 17 group and the over 62 group and asked if there was data that was quality data to see the demographic splits. Mr. Tatem indicated that the census does include that type of data and that he would do some additional research to see if he could find a credible source. Mr. Herman indicated that this was what the state uses and was unsure how it was broken down. Mr. Herman explained that probably half of the housing in Auburn within the last 5 to 10 years was not people with kids but older folks without kids and buying the big houses.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to the rail trail from Manchester to Candia. Mr. Herman commented that Manchester Water Works owns the property as they have agreed to establish and the intent of the funding program is to be a connector of existing trails and it does do that. Mr. Herman explained the location of the trails within the Town of Auburn.

Mr. Poltak moved on to talk about developing the Master Plan and everyone wanting to keep Auburn rural and talked about growth and development and to take a hard look at whether or not from a planning perspective to extend public water and sewer and contract with the City of Manchester. Discussion ensued with regard to the Master Plan.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Herman where do they go next and where are we with the school. Mr. Herman did say that he had spoken with Mr. Villeneuve and that he would like the school board to be involved and could not speak for the school. Mr. Tatem indicated that they could contact Mr. Villeneuve directly and get the update information then.

Mr. Tatem pointed out to the Board members to take the drafts and review them and then they could meet in a couple of weeks to go over it and that this did not need to be approved at the next meeting as they could discuss it further and understood that they still needed to tweak the document further. Mr. Poltak stated to Mr. Tatem to see if they could get some stronger more update figures from fire and police. Mr. Tatem said that he would do that and that Mr. Herman had a couple other comments and other items and that he needed to get one more form from fire and that they needed to tweak a couple more items as well.

Mr. Poltak believed the Board's schedule will be getting heavy because we have the Zoning Amendments, the Subdivision changes and we have the Master Planning process and the CIP. Discussion ensued between the Board members and Mr. Tatem with regard to the next meeting possibly being Wednesday, January 4, 2017 to meet with regard to the CIP. Mr. Tatem stated that he would get a few hard copies and give them to Ms. Royce to distribute and then send an electronic version as well to her to be distributed as well.

A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to the school and Mr. Tatem indicated that he would contact Mr. Villeneuve to obtain the information regarding the school. Mr. Herman indicated that there was an increase of high school students and were anticipating or projecting 15 more high school students. Further discussion ensued with the CIP with regard to the school and the need for more information. Mr. Poltak thanked Mr. Herman for staying to answer questions and pointed out that they would discuss it further on Wednesday, January 4, 2017.

Mr. Poltak moved on to the Master Plan and Subdivision Regulations and asked Mr. Tatem if he was before the Board tonight to discuss these issues as well and also asked what the estimate on time was. Mr. Tatem suggested doing the Master Plan and could discuss it in five (5) minutes. Mr. Tatem began by saying that he has the document and

that the Board went over it about a year ago and then the cluster got squashed and so he had to remove all the cluster stuff and then it kind of got put on the back shelf for the summer. Mr. Tatem stated that he has made some minor changes and that everything is in red (track changes) and could distribute it out to the Board members tonight so they can review it and make comments and then make the changes and then we would need to have a public hearing with public comment in about a month.

Mr. Poltak went on to discuss the Subdivision Regulations and pointed out that there were changes that he wanted to see take place and gave an example and talked about a preconstruction meeting taking place before a spade hits the ground or a tree is taken down to strengthen our regulation and asked how we can get this included. Mr. Tatem stated that it was already included. Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote what her thoughts were. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote began by saying that, prior to the cutting of trees that a preconstruction meeting shall take place because basically they want to go out and clear the trees. Mr. Poltak stated that he was tired of them going out and cut before having a preconstruction meeting showing where to cut and where not to cut.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote believed that there should be a standard approval showing a list of conditions stated. Mr. Tatem indicated that they have done this for other towns and could very easily do it for the Town of Auburn. Discussion ensued with regard to the cutting of trees. Mr. Tatem pointed out to the Board members what they have done in a bunch of other towns is, once a plan has been taken under jurisdiction by the Planning Board and once a full engineering review has started the process, at that point no tree clearing or earth moving shall take place. Once the project has been taken under jurisdiction they are agreeing to that by submitting an application. Discussion ensued with regard to whether or not the Board could enforce that and the Board members and Mr. Tatem were in agreement that they would seek advice from legal counsel.

Mr. Edwards asked Mr. Tatem about the color coding of black, blue and red and asked what the significance was between the colors. Mr. Tatem indicated that it was different sequences of updates but to someone that has not seen any of the changes would all be considered new changes to them. Mr. Tatem stated that he would send out a PDF version of the changes made to the Board members.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem about the Master Plan. Mr. Tatem passed out a potential Master Plan update schedule to all the Board members and went through the list. Mr. Tatem indicated that they are working with Steve Whitman who owns Resilience Planning & Design who has a very good reputation and so they had him put together this schedule. Mr. Tatem pointed out that there were a lot of meetings to be scheduled. Looking at the schedule, it starts out with a kickoff meeting then schedule visioning session which would be scheduled on a Saturday. The work sessions 1 through 4 could go into June. Mr. Poltak had one concern that he did not want to get too deep into this process and have one or two members of the Board not run for re-election or not get re-elected in March and then we've lost that constant. Mr. Tatem asked how many seats were up. It was noted that two (2) seats were up in March 2017. Mr. Poltak wanted to get this going in February and asked the Board members for comments. Mr. Rolfe

believed they would be completed by summer. Mr. Edwards asked if this could be completed before the election. Mrs. Marzloff and Mr. Poltak stated that it's too intense to be completed by the time the election comes around. Mr. Poltak indicated that he would like to get the first meeting going by February 2nd and the visioning session would be coming immediately after town meeting. Mr. Poltak explained that if at that time there is a change within the Board members that they would just have to take the time to bring the new Board members up to speed and go from there. It was noted that February 2nd was a Thursday and so the date was changed to February 1st and then have the visioning session on the first Saturday in April which would be April 1st.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem if that was all and Mr. Tatem said yes. Mr. Poltak thanked Mr. Tatem for his time and moved on to the Agenda.

Informal – Steven Chartier
Heritage PHCE
28 Commercial Court, Tax Map 1, Lot 16-24
Discuss Potential Changeable Copy Sign

Mr. Chartier passed out copies of what the proposed sign would look like to each Board member to review. Mr. Chartier also talked about the sign across the street for Castlerock Storage and stated that his sign would be directly across the street from that one. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Chartier if he was ready to answer questions. Mr. Chartier said yes. Mr. Poltak asked if the sign would be lit and if so, what part would be lit. Mr. Chartier said yes and basically the whole sign would be lit and then there would be digital on one section which you can put anything you wanted on it and it would be similar to Castlerock's sign across the street and very similar to the one out front of the Town Hall. Mr. Chartier indicated that the sign could indicate offers or employment opportunities. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked about the section that could be changeable if it would be text. Mr. Chartier said yes it would be text and it would not be animation. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the sign and whether or not it would be animation. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote reminded the Board members that the Town of Auburn's Zoning Ordinance does not allow animated signs. Also, the Town of Auburn limits the square footage of signs and if they are looking at exceeding the square footage that the Planning Board has the ability to waive the required square footage.

Discussion ensued with regard to the number of signs already on the property which included a sign at the cul de sac on Commercial Court and a sign on the building. Mr. Edwards asked if they were looking to see if it fits in the regulations. Mr. Grillo did not believe it fit due to the multiple signs already on the property and would require a waiver because it exceeds the quantity of signs and the actual size of the signs. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote had the ordinance in front of her and explained that the current sign regulation as the signs permitted in the Commercial/Industrial district has a limitation of square footage being 40 square feet and one sign on a single lot and read section 3.10 (5)(a) Signs Permitted in the Commercial and Industrial Districts for the Boards review. Basically, any increase in total combined square footage beyond sixty (60) square feet,

and any increase beyond two signs, shall require a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mrs. Marzloff did not see the benefit to Heritage to have the sign. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also suggested that Mr. Chartier could whittle the number of signs down in order to get this sign and then come back before the Planning Board for site plan review to have the sign. Mr. Poltak suggested that the Board members take a ride by to see what is there now and pointed out to Mr. Chartier that basically, the Planning Board would not allow signage in excess of what is allowed in our ordinance. In conclusion, Mr. Poltak believed Mr. Chartier options included that he could whittle the number of signs down in order to get the new sign or go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment to obtain a Special Exception to allow an increase in signs beyond two signs and beyond sixty (60) square feet.

Mr. Poltak asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote how this would affect the change in the sign ordinance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed everyone that once the Board posts for the new regulation then Mr. Chartier would be subject to the new ordinance.

Mrs. Marzloff asked Mr. Chartier what his connection with Heritage was. Mr. Chartier indicated that he was the owner of Heritage.

Mr. Poltak informed Mr. Chartier to go back and take a look and now he knows his options currently with respect of the number of signs and square footage as the Planning Board will not go beyond the required square footage with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Poltak reiterated to Mr. Chartier his options which were to whittle the number of signs down in order to get the new sign or go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment to obtain a Special Exception to allow an increase in signs beyond two signs and beyond sixty (60) square feet. Mr. Chartier understood what the Board was looking for and indicated that he would much prefer to have a sign on the by-pass and that any sign on the building would be taken down. Mr. Chartier asked the Board if there were any other concerns other than the ordinance requirement beyond sixty (60) square feet. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that if he did that then he would be filing a minor site plan amendment which shows the location of the sign and it would then be up to the Board to decide what level of minor site plan that they would be looking for. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote also believed that it would be most likely one public hearing approved with whatever conditions the Board determines. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote believed Mr. Chartier should get it in prior to the zoning changes.

Mrs. Marzloff asked how far it was off the right of way. Mr. Chartier was unsure what the exact distance was. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed the Board members that as long as he keeps it on his property he would be fine as the right of way does not go into someone's property.

Mr. Poltak reiterated to Mr. Chartier to decide what he was going to do and then within the context that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote, Building Inspector outlined would proceed with a minor site plan if he so chooses to move forward this way.

Discussion ensued with regard to sight distance and the like which was noted that it would be included within the minor site plan.

Informal – Ray Shea
On Behalf of C.M.S. Limited Partnership
876 Londonderry Turnpike, Tax Map 1, Lot 22
Discuss Potential Industrial Subdivision (Development)

Mr. Shea presented on behalf of Mr. Simard and began by passing out copies of a proposed subdivision plan to each Board member. Mr. Shea pointed out that it was approximately a 47 acre parcel located on the by-pass. Mr. Shea explained the area to the Board members to familiarize them with the location. Mr. Shea indicated that the property was very wet and that currently has an existing right of way on it for a house located behind the property. Mr. Shea informed the Board members that they have done test pits about three (3) weeks ago and put this plan together for an informal discussion with the Planning Board. Mr. Shea stated that the property was for sale and is basically unsure how to subdivide the parcel because they don't know exactly what the potential buyer will be looking for and where they will have to come before the Board for site plan anyway they decided to hold off and do it all at once. The biggest issue they see is access to the lot and what they are proposing on this particular plan is the one driveway into the northerly lot and then one driveway to the southerly lots so basically these two (2) lots would share a driveway of which the Town of Auburn's regulations does not allow. Mr. Shea believed that the property really does not lend itself to a road system. Mr. Shea indicated that they did submit driveway permits to DOT to see what their concerns were but they did get a driveway permit for a common driveway to access the two (2) southerly lots and a driveway permit for the northerly lot. The permits were only good for a year and have since expired because they did not act upon them. Mr. Shea indicated to the Board members that they were just trying to get a feel from the Board on their thoughts if the plan was for three (3) lots.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked the Board members if they received her memo that she wrote after she witnessed the test pits of which she made a determination that historically the Planning Board would not be allowing common driveways and certainly not for industrial uses with truck traffic. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote further added that she then informed Mr. Shea to come before the Planning Board because historically the Board would be looking for a road which would have one access point off the by-pass to service the three (3) lots. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote gave examples of Leppert Way, Gold Ledge Ave and Grey Point Ave. She did advise Mr. Shea to come before the Planning Board before he got too far along especially since this was an Industrial zone. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked Mr. Shea about the driveway permits that were issued by DOT and if they were for Industrial uses. Mr. Shea stated that they weren't but it was noted that when they had a specific use that they would go back. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the width and the like. Mr. Poltak wanted it noted that the Board would not be approving a common driveway. Mr. Shea understood what Mr. Poltak was saying. Mr. Poltak believed that they were going about it the right way without actually subdividing the

property and reiterated that if common driveways are out that the best they would be able to do here is a two (2) lot subdivision. Mr. Shea agreed with Mr. Poltak because of the odd shaped lot in which case they would have two curb cuts and would have to incorporate that right of way into one of the drives. Mr. Shea indicated that he did receive good advice from Mrs. Rouleau-Cote.

Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked about the house in the back and if this was the only access to it. Mr. Shea said yes. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked how large the parcel was. Mr. Shea was unsure of the size but believed it was pretty large. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about future planning of that lot and that this would be the only access to it. Mr. Shea believed that there may be access from Londonderry and would look into it. A brief discussion ensued with regard to future development of the back property. Mr. Shea believed it was fairly wet but that he would look into that prior to filing an application with the Board. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and the Board members talked about the road currently servicing the house in the back and Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed the Board members that it was currently a driveway.

Mr. Shea understood what the Board was looking for and thanked the Board for their time and exited the meeting.

Informal – Keith Brown

803 Chester Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 106

Discuss Landscape Buffer for Nathaniel Way Cluster Subdivision

Mr. Brown informed the Board that back in September that he received a letter from the Board about a Lot Line Adjustment for one of the lots so he came down to look at the plans and noticed that the landscape buffer that was on the original plans that he has from the subdivision plan showed a landscape buffer with trees planted in that landscape buffer and now no trees have been planted. Mr. Brown indicated that he had spoken with Ms. Royce and that she has tried to contact the developer and has received no response and so wanted to know which way to go and wanted to know if the plans changed or that the trees never got put in. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote asked if it was a landscape buffer or a cluster buffer. Mr. Brown indicated that the plans he has show's trees planted behind all of the houses and didn't know if the plans changed or what. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that it would not have been a change that the Board would have entertained on a Lot Line Adjustment. The Board members all agreed with Mrs. Rouleau-Cote. Mr. Brown asked what happened to all the trees that were shown in the original design and asked if the developer has to put them in. Mr. Poltak explained that if it was something that the Planning Board approved then the developer would have to do it and asked if there were any more lots left to be sold. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote said yes and the lots that Mr. Brown is talking about at the beginning, one has a foundation on it and the other one is vacant. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that we could revisit the subdivision plan and if there is a requirement and there was supposed to be plantings within the landscape buffer then that would be provision of Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Brown asked about the whole development and the houses that are

already built because it showed trees planted all the way down. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed Mr. Brown that the Town of Auburn is still holding surety for the entire development and if there is something lacking from the approved plan before we release that surety then Stantec would be going through and identifying anything that is missing or not complete. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote explained that it truly needs to be clarified that it is truly a landscape buffer or landscaping required and not just a cluster buffer and there were no improvements required within the cluster buffer. Discussion ensued with regard to the 50 foot buffer. Mr. Brown remembered that there was supposed to be trees planted within that landscape buffer. Mr. Brown further asked if that had been changed would he have been notified. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that if there were a change to the plan that all the abutters would have been notified and Mr. Poltak acknowledged what Mrs. Rouleau-Cote was saying.

Mr. Brown thanked the Board for their time and the Board noted that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote and Ms. Royce would review the subdivision plan.

OTHER

Ms. Royce informed the Board members that she had sent an e-mail to poll the Board members on whether or not they wanted to hold a meeting on December 21st and stated that she had originally posted the meeting for December 14th. With that in mind, Ms. Royce asked the Board members what date they wanted to meet and if they wanted to meet on December 14th rather than December 21st that the Board would need to make a motion to move the December 14th meeting to December 21st. Mrs. Marzloff asked Ms. Royce if there were anything on the agenda for December 14th. Ms. Royce stated no but asked if the Board members wanted to hold a workshop to discuss zoning amendments and the like or to just not have a meeting. The Board members were okay with holding the meeting on December 14th except for Mr. Edwards who indicated that he would be unavailable on December 14th. The Board members all agreed to meet on December 14th rather than December 21st. Mr. Poltak did not want to meet if there was nothing on the agenda. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote wanted to speak with the Board prior to them adjourning tonight about zoning amendments and wanted to make the Board members aware of the deadlines for posting the public hearing which would occur immediately after the holiday so the Board would have to set the January hearing dates at the next meeting. Mr. Poltak commented that he has had no contact personally with anyone at the firm. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote indicated that she had asked back in October to start this process before the public hearing process starts.

Mr. Poltak wanted to address the agenda for the purpose of having a meeting and wanted to know if either Attorney St. Hilaire or Attorney Bennett would be available to meet with the Planning Board on either December 14th or December 21st. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed the Board members that she and Ms. Royce would be meeting with Attorney St. Hilaire and Attorney Bennett tomorrow and could ask them at that time if either of them would be available for either December 14th or December 21st.

Mrs. Marzloff commented that, instead of getting into this tonight with regard to the proposed sign regulation and the accessory dwelling units that it would benefit the Board to have counsel present and if the Board did it on December 14th and Town Counsel agreed to be here on December 14th then that meeting would be more productive. Mrs. Phillips indicated that Attorney St. Hilaire was just introducing Attorney Bennett tomorrow as she would no longer be our legal representative.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak stated that we would have the commitment on December 14th pending their availability. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote wanted to suggest to the Board members that, if they were not going to go into the zoning amendments tonight that as a Board we would schedule the meeting for December 14th to meet to discuss the proposed zoning amendments. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the sign regulation and everyone was unsure of what has occurred in other towns.

Mr. Poltak stated that he was available on both December 14th and December 21st and asked Ms. Royce to see what date Town Counsel was available to meet with the Board to discuss the proposed changes. Ms. Royce stated yes that she would find out and notify the Board members as soon as she finds out tomorrow.

Mr. Rolfe asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote about the accessory dwelling units and stated that he had just went to a conference with Mr. Tardiff and the regulations on those accessory dwelling units that there were no septic changes. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote stated that she considers them a one and a half bedroom. A brief discussion ensued and that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote did not believe that there were no septic changes with regard to this and stated that she would check on it.

At this time, Mrs. Rouleau-Cote passed out copies to each of the Board members of the proposed amendments that she has been working on. With regard to ADU's and asked the Board on whether or not they wanted to allow these by right in all zones because these would be similar to a duplex than as a single family home and with that in mind that the Board may not want to allow them by right but require them by Special Exception or Conditional Use Permit be required. A brief discussion ensued with regard to allowing these and the thought about them turning into a condex of which the Board was concerned and believed further discussion would need to occur. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote talked about the square footage and whether or not the Board wanted to keep it at 950 square feet or drop it down to 750 square feet and whether or not the Board wanted to allow them to be rental units. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote informed the Board members that if the Town of Auburn drops the ADU then the states definition would kick in which would be a bare minimum ADU and would be required by right. Mr. Poltak believed that they should tweak it the way we want to otherwise we would be remised. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote added then the other issue would be to see if we want them by Special Exception or Conditional Use Permit so that we can have some control with regard to parking and we can ask to limit the nonrelated people within the accessory unit which would mean that the people in the accessory dwelling unit are supposed to be related to each other also and to limit it to one accessory dwelling unit per single family home.

Mrs. Marzloff asked Mrs. Rouleau-Cote how this would affect the Town of Auburn's growth ordinance. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote answered by saying that she counts them as a unit because when she issues a permit for a single family home with an ADU she considers it another unit. Mr. Poltak believed there certainly were a lot of questions that needed to be answered on December 14th or December 21st.

Alan Villeneuve

Mr. Villeneuve wanted to discuss possibly expanding the Commercial zone to include across the street to rezone the school parcel located on Hooksett Road to include the Manchester Water Works property and from the highway to the rail bed. Mr. Villeneuve explained why which was because when the cluster ordinance was eliminated that it devalued the school property for residential purposes. Mr. Villeneuve wanted to know if this could be a possibility. Mr. Poltak stated that they have not taken this up as of yet but that the Board would be taking it up. Mrs. Rouleau-Cote reminded the Board members that this is where we got in trouble with the property owned by the Tenn's because the Board itself should not be doing this as Mr. Villeneuve should be speaking with the property owners. Mr. Villeneuve pointed out that he was talking about three (3) parcels which includes the state owned parcel, the school owned parcel and the Manchester Water Works parcel. Mr. Villeneuve understood that he would need to speak to the property owners about rezoning these three (3) properties. Mrs. Marzloff believed it would be a question for Town Counsel to obtain an opinion from counsel.

ADJOURN

<p>Mrs. Phillips moved to adjourn the Hearing. Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:10p.m.</p>

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 14, 2016 at 7:00pm at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted.