**UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

**Town of Auburn**

**Planning Board**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**July 22, 2015**

**Present:** Ron Poltak, Chairman; Alan Côté, Vice-Chairman, Karen Woods & Paula Marzloff, Members. Jim Tillery and Steve Grillo, Alternate Members. Dale Phillips, Selectmen’s Representative. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

**Absent:**  None.

Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Board members to those present. Mr. Poltak informed everyone present that Mrs. Marzloff will have to recuse herself and therefore would elevate Mr. Grillo to full voting status.

**MINUTES**

***Mr. Côté moved to accept the minutes of July 8th, 2015; Ms. Woods seconded the motion. A vote was taken;* all were in favor and the motion passed.**

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**Keith Martel/Tilton Place Subdivision**

**Nathaniel Way, Tax Map 5, Lot 104**

**Request Surety Reduction from $235,160.05**

**Down to $88,969.75**

Mr. Poltak read the letter from Stantec recommending a reduction of surety regarding Tilton Place Subdivision. Mr. Poltak asked the Board members what they would like to do.

***Ms. Woods made a motion to approve the reduction in surety from $235,160.05 to $88,969.75 for Tilton Place Subdivision, Nathaniel Way, Tax Map 5, Lot 104; Mr. Côté seconded the motion. A vote was taken;* all were in favor and the motion passed.**

**Mountain Road Extension Subdivision**

**Mountain Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 4**

**Request Surety Reduction from $44,792.00**

**Down to $33,470.75**

Mr. Poltak read the letter from Stantec recommending a reduction of surety regarding Mountain Road Extension Subdivision. Mr. Poltak asked the Board members what they would like to do.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to approve the reduction in surety from $44,792.00 to $33,470.75 for Mountain Road Extension Subdivision, Mountain Road, Tax Map 9, Lot 4; Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken;* all were in favor and the motion passed.**

**Dana and Jocelyn Carlucci**

**Silver Hill Road, Tax Map 2, Lot 25**

**Request 120 day extension for**

**Reclamation of Excavation Pit**

**Continued from April 8, 2015**

Mr. Roscoe Blaisdell presented on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Blaisdell stated that they have met with Conservation Commission, Zoning Board and that Mrs. Rouleau-Côté has taken a look at it as well. Mr. Poltak asked for an update. Mr. Blaisdell further stated that there was about a half of an acre that they would like to excavate and then reclaim it once they were complete. Mr. Blaisdell stated that they did get the relief for 25 feet from the wetlands from the Zoning Board. Mr. Blaisdell went through the plan for the Board members and everyone present. Mr. Blaisdell pointed out that they would be leaving about a 4 or 5 foot berm so there was no way that any runoff would get into the swamp. Mr. Blaisdell stated that once they were all done with the pit that they would be reserving the topsoil and then they would seed it and mulch it so that there was no erosion. They would not be using any fertilizer because Conservation Commission did not want them using any fertilizer. Mr. Blaisdell explained that Silver Hill Road was a Class VI road and that it was in pretty good shape and that he has driven his truck out there. Mr. Blaisdell reiterated that it was not a very big project because it was not a very big pit and wouldn’t take that long for them to do it. Mr. Blaisdell asked Mr. Carlucci how long it would take him. Mr. Carlucci stated that it was hard to say at this point. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Carlucci how long he has owned the excavation pit. Mr. Carlucci said that he has owned it since 1977 and have not sold any material off of it.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions from the Board. Mr. Côté asked what would be the quantity to be pulled out of the pit. Mr. Blaisdell did not know but reiterated that it was not a very big project. Mrs. Marzloff believed that they would have to bond the road in case of damage to the road with the trucks coming and going out of the pit. A brief discussion ensued with regard to bonding the road.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to whether or not a SWPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) would be needed. Mr. Blaisdell informed the Board that since it was under an acre that a SWPP would not be needed. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Carlucci when he would be done. Mr. Carlucci stated that his variance runs out in two (2) years so it would have to be by within two (2) years. Mr. Poltak asked if in two (2) years it would be completed and fully restored. Mr. Carlucci said yes.

Mr. Porter talked about the conditions that were placed on the restoration plans in terms of reseeding and replanting some shrubbery such as blueberry bushes to reforest that area. Mr. Côté believed that if it didn’t get mowed then it would turn to shrubbery and that nature would take over if the area was to be left alone. Mr. Côté did not have a problem because it was such a small excavation pit but did want to have some sort of surety in place to restore the area if Mr. Carlucci were to walk away and asked Mr. Tatem if he could come up with a number. Mr. Tatem stated that they could come up with an number. At this time, Mr. Côté reviewed the regulations to see what was required.

Mrs. Marzloff asked about the refueling area. Mr. Carlucci said that it would be a mobile refueler and would not be left on site.

Mr. Poltak read the state statute where it states “Except for exposed rock ledge, all areas which have been affected by the excavation or otherwise stripped of vegetation shall be spread with topsoil or stripping’s, if any, but in any case covered by soil capable of sustaining vegetation, and shall be planted with seedlings or grass suitable to prevent erosion.” Mr. Poltak asked the Board what they would like to do. Ms. Woods asked if the restoration was complete enough to move this forward. Mr. Poltak believed the Board members were okay with it being a Class VI road. Ms. Woods said yes. Mr. Côté reiterated that he did not have a problem with grassing it over as opposed to plantings as he believed that it would be overgrown if left alone. Mr. Grillo asked if they would need a waiver if the ordinance did not allow grass for reclaiming an excavation pit. Mr. Blaisdell stated that they could ask for a waiver if the Board recommended a waiver. Mr. Poltak believed that a motion could be made to approve as discussed tonight that the operation of this gravel pit for a period not to exceed two (2) years. Mr. Côté believed it should read “restoration to be completed within two (2) years. Mr. Poltak agreed and believed they could add the slope ratios. Mr. Côté wanted to add a friendly amendment. Mr. Poltak stated that he could not make the motion and therefore Mr. Côté made the motion as follows.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any abutters present. None were noted. Mr. Dandrade had one comment and wanted to add that it was an ATV playground and that as far as restoration that it be monitored prior to releasing any bond until it’s well vegetated as it gets a lot of heavy use.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to accept the application as complete for reclamation of excavation pit, Tax Map 2, Lot 25, Silver Hill Road; Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

***Mr. Côté made a motion to approve the restoration plan as presented tonight subject to confirmation that a 2 to 1 slope is allowed without the use of geo fabrics and in the event that it is required that it be added on as a note and subject to restoration bond or surety to guarantee complete restoration of the property as determined through Stantec and said work to be completed within two (2) years and restoration to be completed by September 2017 and subject to RSA 155:E:5 for Silver Hill Road, Tax Map 2, Lot 25; Mrs. Marzloff seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion passed.***

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**John Gianitsopoulos**

**Patty and Sheila, LLC**

**346 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 31, Lot 11**

**Minor Site Plan Review (Restaurant Lighting)**

**Continued from June 17, 2015**

Mr. Bruce Scammon presented on behalf of Mr. Gianitsopoulos and talked about the lighting plan and stated that they have made a few changes at the Board’s request. They have added the snow storage, they have added the recorded plan numbers that were asked of them, they put a note for the proposed signs which would be replaced in kind. They are working with the Building Inspector and they are looking at adding a new entrance with a new ramp running across the front of the restaurant. There will also be a set of stairs coming down from the second floor. A brief discussion ensued with regard to what the second floor was used for and it was noted that it used to be an apartment but was last used as offices for the restaurant. They have submitted a set of plans to Stantec and Stantec has reviewed the plan and has commented. Since they have received the comments from Stantec, they have made a few changes per the letter dated July 21, 2015. Mr. Scammon stated that he had a handwritten waiver request to submit to the Board with regard to granting a waiver to Site Plan Regulations Section 10.13.4.A.iii(c) for no poles with heights over 12 feet. Mr. Scammon pointed out that on Commercial properties they are typically 20 to 30 feet tall and that their electrical engineer recommended for them to use 13 feet to 18 feet mount heights.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Scammon what had transpired between him and Stantec. Mr. Tatem stated that he did not see any big issues and believed that they could work it out and that this was a vast improvement. Mr. Tatem did not think that 13 feet to 18 feet mount heights were a big issue and suggested asking the abutters.

Mr. Poltak suggested that the Board members take this up in two (2) motions with one being a motion with regard to the waiver and the other to conditionally grant approval with the condition being that they finalize with their engineer this final plan for the appropriate spacing of the lights.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 10.13.4.A.iii(c) for the lighting poles to be no more than 18 feet for 346 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 31, Lot 11; Ms. Woods seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

***Mr. Côté made a motion to grant approval of the lighting plan provided that it is reviewed by Stantec to ensure that it is at least .2 foot candles at all paved parking spaces on the parking lot for 346 Hooksett Road, Tax Map 31, Lot 11; Ms. Woods seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

At this time, Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Scammon what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Scammon stated that they are proposing the hours of operation to be 11:00am to 12:30am, 7 days a week and Sunday mornings from 6:00am to 11:00am.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to the stairway coming down from the second floor and where it would meet down below. Mr. Scammon stated that they have a structural engineer looking at that now and that they were working with the Building Inspector as well. Mr. Tatem suggested some bollards be placed around them. Mr. Scammon so noted the suggestion.

**Michael Cleary**

**21 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 10-1**

**Minor Site Plan Amendment**

**Continued from June 17, 2015**

Mr. Cleary began by saying that the Board requested a scaled drawing and presented the Board members with a scaled drawing of the property. The Board reviewed the scaled drawing and believed it was what they have asked and that it was now complete. With this in mind, Mr. Poltak asked for a motion.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to approve the minor site plan amendment for 21 Bunker Hill Road, Tax Map 7, Lot 10-1; Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

**Maverick Development**

**Steve Febonio/Eric Mitchell**

**Haven Drive & Pingree Hill Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 29 & 36**

**Major Subdivision – Final Review**

**25 Lot Cluster Subdivision**

**Conditional Use Permit – to permit a road**

**To be within 25 feet of a Level 3 wetland**

**Continued from July 8, 2015**

Mr. Mitchell presented on behalf of Maverick Development and began by saying that they were before the Board members two (2) weeks ago of which they were continued until tonight. Mr. Mitchell gave the reasons for the continuation which was that the plan was submitted to Stantec for the review and that they did not have sufficient time to review it before the last meeting. Since then they have done the review and have addressed some of the comments. Mr. Mitchell indicated that there were a few questions that they had for the Board members relative to Stantec’s comments. Mr. Mitchell stated that they have a waiver request on the velocity of the pipe which needs to be 2fps and based on Stantec’s letter does not take any exception on this request. Mr. Mitchell also stated that they have a waiver request to reduce the buffer for lots 5-34 and 5-35 to be reduced from the required 250 feet to 200 feet which was discussed at the last meeting of which Mr. Febonio has letters from these homeowners that they are in agreement. Mr. Poltak believed that the Board wanted to get a lot of this behind them and was aware of the discussion between Mr. Mitchell and Stantec.

At this time, Mr. Mitchell asked the Board to consider conditional approval tonight on the plan. Mr. Mitchell went on to talk about Stantec’s list of items which had to deal with the vernal pool report when they moved the road they decided to do one vernal pool which was not a requirement which they would be doing as a teaching and learning experience. It was there understanding that the work on the vernal pool that they would be constructing would be monitored for two (2) seasons of monitoring. Mr. Poltak stated that he was very interested in seeing whether this mitigation works. Mr. Poltak hopes that there is no impact to the initial vernal pool to any degree and the concept of having a backup is in order of which Mr. Mitchell is in agreement. Mr. Poltak would like a liaison relative to the two (2) year monitoring period and that it goes to Stantec so that they can interpret it for them. Mr. Poltak believed that the vernal pool issue was behind them at this time. A brief discussion ensued with regard to what was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Tatem asked the Board if they wanted Stantec to review their reports after it has been constructed to see how they are doing that he would suggest having a note on the plan that says “during the monitoring process after construction that the report shall be sent to the towns consulting engineer for review.” Mr. Febonio indicated that Ms. Tracey Tarr will be conducting the monitoring as well as overseeing the construction of the vernal pool and believed that she would be sending reports to DES, Fish and Game and that they can send a report to Stantec as well.

Mr. Mitchell asked the Board members to give consideration to the waiver for velocity of water to be less than 2fps. Mr. Poltak read comment #104 of Stantec’s letter dated July 20, 2015 to the Board members of which a copy is in the file for review. Mr. Tatem stated that Stantec has no concerns about this request.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to grant the waiver request from Section 10-07.23 to allow the flow to be less that 2fps velocity within the closed drainage system for Maverick Development, Tax Map 5, Lots 29 & 36; Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

Mr. Mitchell moved on to a third item has to do with the buffer behind one of the lots on Haven Drive and they have shown some trees being planted of which would be discussed between Mr. Febonio and the abutter that would be affected once the house lot was cut. Mr. Tatem believed this was reasonable, however, suggested that they get it in writing from the abutter. Mr. Febonio explained that he originally did not want this on the plan because it was an agreement he had with that abutter and until that lot is cleared they don’t know exactly what they are going to do because it could be 15 trees or 20 trees and believed this could be a discussion between him and the abutter at that time. Again, Mr. Febonio stated that he would discuss this with the abutter and decide what the abutter would prefer once the lot in question was cleared. Mr. Poltak pointed out that this would be in the minutes that Mr. Febonio would be receptive to what the abutter wants and needs by mutual agreement.

Next, Mr. Mitchell talked about the buffer reduction request from 250 feet down to 200 feet which would make the lot more useable and asked the Board members to consider reducing the buffer for Lot 29-1. Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions from the Board members. Mr. Côté stated that he voted against the last reduction in the buffer and would vote against this one because he is very sensitive to the fact that people are right that the Board has granted too many waivers in the past on these buffers and did not intend on granting any waivers to the cluster buffer anymore so he would be voting against this. Mr. Poltak asked if there was any further discussion. None were noted. Mr. Poltak asked if there was any discussion from abutters. Mr. Willett agreed with Mr. Côté. Mr. Febonio talked about the waiver request and the fact that they have moved the road to go around the vernal pool and the fact that the lot is worse now because they moved the road away from the vernal pool. Mr. Febonio stated that even by reducing the buffer down to 200 feet that there would still be a lot of trees as a buffer and that he was trying to make it easier for everyone in the future. Mrs. Marzloff did not like the idea of relying on the abutter’s backyard as a buffer and could not support this waiver request. Mr. Mitchell pointed out that they have the two abutters who have signed letters saying that they are in support of the reduction from 250 feet to 200 feet which is acceptable to them.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions. Ms. Remillard commented that there was a reason for the buffer requirements and talked about the road being near the vernal pool and believed that the Board should stick to the rules. Mr. Febonio stated that he could have gone through the vernal pool but worked very hard to miss the vernal pool and was looking for a little credit. Mr. Febonio reiterated his comment with regard to the buffer and did not believe his request was unreasonable.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Mitchell if the lot in question was still a buildable lot without the waiver request being granted. Mr. Mitchell said yes. Mr. Poltak asked if there still would be a house built on this lot regardless. Mr. Côté asked if it was a reasonable buildable lot. Mr. Mitchell believed it would be.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any further questions. Mr. Porter commented that regardless of whether or not the buffer is reduced that the owner would be back looking for further reduction. Mr. Poltak explained that regardless of whether or not the waiver is granted that there would be a house built and that they would be back before the Board looking for waiver to put in a pool, shed or whatever.

Mr. Poltak stated that a motion was in order and would like to put this behind them. Mr. Dandrade wanted to comment that the yield on the property is exactly the same from the first plan so as far as Mavericks efforts that this question continues to come up that whether or not the Board grants the waiver from 250 feet to 200 feet that you are still looking at something that is still very very tight and that would be going before the Zoning Board. Mr. Dandrade believed that the Board had the ability to control it right now. Mr. Dandrade believed that the Board could have done other things such as having a peer review of the wetlands of which the Board chose not to do. At this time, Mr. Dandrade stated that the area within the buffer that the Board granted relief for the detention basin that the area would be a wide open corridor visible. Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Dandrade to point out the area that he’s talking about. Mr. Dandrade pointed out the detention basin area to the Board members and believed that the area would be wide open. Mr. Willett commented that he has 365 feet of frontage and that there were three (3) culverts in front of his home and believed that there would be more water pouring into his the back of his property and that he was opposed to cluster housing period. Mr. Mitchell explained the drainage area and pointed out that the area would not be wide open because the road curves in and that it would not be seen from Pingree Hill Road.

Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if they were satisfied and ready for a motion. Ms. Woods said yes. Mrs. Marzloff believed that Mr. Côté would be making the motion in the affirmative. Mr. Côté stated that he would not be making the motion. Mrs. Marzloff stated that she would make the motion in the negative.

***Mrs. Marzloff made a motion to deny the waiver request from Section 9-18(b) to reduce the exterior buffer for Lots 5-34 and 5-35 for Maverick Development, Tax Map 5, Lots 29 & 36; Mr. Côté seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the waiver was denied by a vote of 3 to 1.***

At this time, Mr. Mitchell stated that with the rest of the things on Stantec’s review letter and have complied with a lot of them and could comply with the remainder of them and that he would ask that the Board to consider conditional approval subject to conditions that the Board would normally have which would be final review by Stantec and one item that was talked about earlier which was the placement of the demarcation of the buffer lines which would be done prior to the preconstruction meeting. Mr. Poltak wanted Mr. Tatem to respond. Mr. Tatem stated that they have provided Stantec with a series of revised plans today that they have taken a look at and agree with Mr. Mitchell that the remaining comments are minor house cleaning stuff that they have no concerns with. Mr. Poltak asked for a motion. Mr. Côté stated that he was not prepared to make a motion unless lot 29-1 was eliminated because he believed it was an unrealistic footprint. Ms. Woods asked Mr. Côté if he now wanted it completely removed. Mr. Côté did not believe the size of the lot was realistic and that they would be back before the Board looking for relief. Mr. Poltak pointed out that the lot was an eligible lot under our ordinance. Mr. Côté pointed out that the Board was supposed to plan. Discussion ensued with regard to the size of the lot. Ms. Woods stated that it meets the requirements of what they have approved in the past and if someone wants to buy it and they come back before the Board then they can deny it.

Mr. Porter stated that Mr. Febonio has done an amazing amount of work and that there were a lot of negotiations back and forth and he has done great job of getting it out of the wetlands.

Mr. Mitchell talked about Lot 29-1 and how they’ve changed it from the beginning because they moved the road. Mr. Poltak asked for a motion.

***Ms. Woods made a motion to grant conditional approval of the cluster subdivision for Maverick Development, Tax Map 5, Lots 29 & 36; Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1 with Mr. Côté voting to deny.***

Mr. Dandrade asked what the conditions would be. Mr. Poltak stated that they would be taking those up now. Mr. Dandrade suggested that when the Board makes its motion on conditions that they include not only placards but include a berm as well.

***Ms. Woods made a motion to grant conditional approval of the cluster subdivision with the conditions being as follows: 1) Surety being in place prior to the preconstruction meeting, 2) conditions to be met within 180 days; 3) that the wetlands be placarded; 4) that the recording fees be submitted; 5) that Stantec’s comments being addressed; and, 6) that there is no cutting within the wetland buffer, for Maverick Development, Tax Map 5, Lots 29 & 36; Mrs. Phillips seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed by a vote of 4 to 1 with Mr. Côté voting to deny.***

A discussion ensued with regard to conditional approval granted by the Planning Board. Mr. Poltak explained what the procedure is for granting conditional approval.

**JMJ Properties, LLC**

**Jean Gagnon/Eric Mitchell**

**Lovers Lane, Tax Map 8, Lot 25**

**Major Subdivision – Final Review**

**26 Lot Cluster Subdivision & 3 Conventional Lots**

**Conditional Use Permit – to permit a detention pond**

**Within a Level One wetland**

**Continued from July 8, 2015**

Mr. Mitchell presented on behalf of JMJ Properties, LLC and that they were asked to come back before the Planning Board at the last meeting held two (2) weeks ago. Mr. Mitchell went through the two (2) items that they had to address and that one of them was regarding the fire protection. Mr. Mitchell indicated that the Fire Chief has contacted him and that they came up with the decision to have the last four (4) houses at the end of the cul de sac to have sprinkler systems in them of which Mr. Mitchell pointed the four lots that would require a sprinkler system to the Board members. Mr. Poltak read the letter from the Fire Chief that gave two (2) options which were either a 20,000 gallon cistern placed appropriately within the proposed subdivision or require the four (4) or five (5) homes not covered by the a cistern to have sprinkler systems installed within the homes. Mr. Mitchell indicated that the developer has decided to install sprinkler systems within the four (4) homes requiring fire protection. Mr. Tatem commented that he has spoken with the Fire Chief several times in this regard and that he indicated that the letter was a little vague and that he would have recommended that the last eight (8) lots be sprinkled but would recommend that the Board at least require the last five (5) homes have sprinkler systems installed in them because he would not go down to the four (4) because it really should be eight (8). Mr. Poltak asked the applicant if he was agreeable to five (5) and Mr. Gagnon said yes.

Mr. Mitchell moved on to the next issue which was the well radii on each lot and that he has discussed this with the Building Inspector and what they have decided to do on this particular site is that wells would be drilled at the same time as the foundations and that they do foundation certifications for each lot anyways. They would also show wells for the lots that would require easements on the adjacent lots so before they were allowed to frame that they would show the lots with easements for lots that have the well radii going onto the other lot.

In conclusion, Mr. Mitchell stated that they have received their wetlands and subdivision approvals and with that asked the Board members to consider granting conditional final approval tonight. Mr. Poltak asked if there were any questions from abutters or interested parties. Ms. Cleary asked about the open space and wanted to know if there would be a conservation easement on it because she would like to see that land protected. Mr. Poltak stated that this was dedicated open space under the cluster ordinance and could not envision anyone in the town voting for greater density than currently exists. A brief discussion ensued with regard to open space. Mr. Poltak did not know what would occur in the far future. Mrs. Phillips suggested to Mr. Gagnon, who was present at tonight’s meeting to look into possibly putting it into a conservation easement as it would not cost him anything. Mr. Mitchell indicated that there would be covenants and restrictions so that the open space could not be built upon that would go on forever. Mr. Côté added that they could have a note on the plan that says “that the open space is to remain undeveloped in perpetuity.” Ms. Cleary agreed with that statement.

Ms. Cleary wanted it noted in the minutes that the Wethersfield Subdivision had open space with an open big pit in it and that a lot of fill has left the development and that nothing has been done about it and believed that it could happen because it is happening. Mr. Tatem explained that it was an allowed use per the approval and is fully bonded and that Mr. Eaton has to fully restore it with loam and seed and left to grow up and become woods again which is a requirement. Further discussion ensued with regard to this site. Mr. Gagnon wanted to ask the Board what this had to do with his subdivision. Ms. Cleary said nothing.

Mr. Poltak asked if there was any further discussion. None were noted. Mr. Poltak also pointed out that with regard to fire suppression that it would be whatever the Fire Chief says.

***Mr. Côté made a motion to grant conditional approval of the cluster subdivision “Long Pond Woods” with the following conditions: 1) Surety being in place prior to the preconstruction meeting, 2) conditions to be met within 180 days; 3) that the wetlands be placarded; 4) that the recording fees be submitted; 5) that Stantec’s comments being addressed; 6) that there is no cutting within the wetland buffer; 7) well radii being shown on the foundation certification plan provided that it is required to show the easements needed on the abutting lots; and 8) that the last five (5) houses at the end of the cul de sac be equipped with sprinkler systems, for JMJ Properties, LLC, Tax Map 8, Lot 25; Ms. Woods seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.***

Mrs. Marzloff asked Mr. Mitchell about the name of the subdivision and if it was “Lovers Lane II” or “Long Pond Woods.” Mr. Mitchell indicated that it was “Long Pond Woods.”

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE**

* None were reviewed at this time.

**OTHER**

**ADJOURN**

***Mr. Côté moved to adjourn the Hearing. Ms. Woods seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:55 p.m.***

*The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, August 19th, 2015 and will be held at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road.*