

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

In attendance: Arnie Rosenblatt - Chair, Dwight Brew-Selectman Ex-Officio, Bill Stoughton, Mike Dell Orfano, Cynthia Dokmo, Marilyn Peterman, Brian Coogan, Tracie Adams (Alternate), Chris Yates (Alternate), and Christy Houpis (Alternate).

Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director; Natasha Kypfer, Town Planner; and Kristan Patenaude, Recording Secretary.

Arnie Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m., with the following statement. As Chair of the Amherst Planning Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, as extended by various Executive Orders, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order.

However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting.

All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone #312-626-6799 and password 830 2516 9065, or by clicking on the following website address: <https://zoom.us/j/83025169065> that was included in the public notice of this meeting.

Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting using Zoom or telephonically. Instructions have also been provided on the website of the Planning Board at: www.amherstnh.gov.

Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access: If anybody has a problem, please call 603-341-5290.

Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to- Know law.

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

Roll call attendance: Dwight Brew; Bill Stoughton; Mike Dell Orfano; Brian Coogan; Tracie Adams; Cynthia Dokmo; Marilyn Peterman; Christy Houppis; Chris Yates; and Arnie Rosenblatt; all alone and present.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. CASE #: PZ13877-031221 – Donald Theriault and David & Suzanne Theriault (Owners & Applicants), 482 Boston Post Road, PIN #: Tax Map 2-170-37 & 10 Aglipay Drive, PIN #: Tax Map 2-170-14–Public Hearing/Lot Line Adjustment & Subdivision – Depict a lot line adjustment and subdivision to create one new residential lot. Zoned Residential/Rural. *Continued from April 7, 2021.***
- 2. CASE #: PZ13878 – 031221 – Donald Theriault & Dany Lagios (Owners & Applicants), 482 Boston Post Road, PIN #: Tax Map 2-170-37 – Public Hearing/Conditional Use Permit -To reduce the wetland buffer from 100 feet to between 50-100 feet to allow a driveway and associated drainage per Section 4.11.H.2. Zoned Residential/Rural. *Continued from April 7, 2021.***

Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened both cases.

Arnie Rosenblatt noted that, as these applications were previously accepted as complete, the Board is now in a public hearing. The applicant will make a presentation, the Board will ask questions and make comments, the public will have a chance to ask questions and make comments, and then the Board will continue discussions and make any decisions.

Ken Clinton, Jason Bolduc, and Doug Brodeur, of Meridian Land Services, joined the Board.

Ken Clinton stated that he would like first to address the wetland CUP application, as the Board did not seem to have many concerns and questions regarding the subdivision/lot line adjustment application. Ken Clinton explained that he broached the Board's concerns regarding the application with his client. He noted that he and the applicant originally believed the proposed size of the garage (40'x28') to be acceptable because it was to be built inside of the building envelope setbacks and wetland buffers, without seeking any relief. However, since considering the concerns of the Board, the applicant is now proposing a 28'x44' garage (a 61.5% reduction in size). This reduction is to show that there is not any proposed commercial use of the property. The garage is still proposed to be two stories but will comply with all zoning use and dimensional requirements. Ken Clinton explained that there will also be a small reduction in the size of the gravel driveway proposed due to the reduction in the garage size. The applicant does still reserve the right to utilize the garage per the approved uses of the Residential/Rural zone, noting for instance that home occupations are allowed. If a commercial use was to be proposed for the property, the applicant would need to come back before the Planning Board and likely, the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

Ken Clinton stated that the applicant is planning to match the façade of the garage to the façade of the existing house, with some of it being brick, and an asphalt shingle roof. In regard to the proposal made at the last meeting by a Board member, Ken Clinton stated that the applicant is not sure that a membrane to be placed under the proposed garage is necessary, due to that fact that it will be used for residential purposes and will be located within the allowable setbacks and buffers. He explained that the applicant is willing to consider this membrane proposal, but that he doesn't believe it should be a condition of approval.

Ken Clinton stated that the suggestion that the driveway be placed on the southeast side of the property, to run between the house and proposed garage had been considered early on in the process and it had been determined that it would require cutting down every tree along the lot line, excavating, and dealing with an 8' slope in that area. In order to accommodate for this, the house and septic system would need to be pushed northwesterly on the property, causing them to be moved into the buffer area. Ken Clinton noted that this option would be costly, visually unappealing, and have a greater environmental impact than what is currently proposed.

Ken Clinton explained that the applicant is already seeking relief from the disturbance completed on the property (stumping and grubbing). There is a drainage swale being proposed that will collect any runoff to be treated in an infiltration basin, and eventually run back into the wetlands. He noted that the original stormwater mitigation plan looked at only the 25-year storm, but that this has been updated to reflect the 50-year storm, per the Town's Stormwater Regulations.

Ken Clinton stated that those were the key critical issues that he was aware of from the CUP application, and that the Lot Line Adjustment and Subdivision was straightforward. Jason Bolduc stated that there have been no changes made to the revegetation plan since the last presentation, except that the conveyance swale has been stretched to catch any runoff from the proposed driveway.

Doug Brodeur explained that the main focus on the technical aspects of the stormwater management design was to remove nitrogen from the runoff. He stated that this stormwater mitigation plan looks to capture and infiltrate 100% of the runoff on site. There is no flow path for pollutants to go into the surface water on this site. He explained that the MS-4 permit requirements, per 40 C.F.R. § 122 Section 3, states that the preferred method for treating runoff is through infiltration. In this case, as is being proposed here, the runoff and pollutants are then considered non-existent.

Doug Brodeur addressed the potential need for a 75' separation between the stormwater treatment and the wetlands on site. He explained that the NH Stormwater Manual appendix has a spreadsheet regarding different stormwater practices that hasn't been updated in the last 10-15 years. There is very little research regarding treatment methods. The UNH Stormwater Center has more current research about the efficacy of different Best Management Practices (BMPs). The 75' separation requirement was put in because septic systems are required to be located 75' from wetlands. Thus, some thought this should be done for infiltration systems as well. He noted

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

that the pollutant load of sewage is much higher than that of stormwater, particularly in terms of nitrogen and phosphorus.

Christy Houpis noted that he had some internet issues and missed the first part of the meeting. He asked for clarification on the reduction of the garage size. Ken Clinton explained that there seemed to be a misconception by the Board at its last meeting that, due to the size of the garage, it was going to be used for commercial purposes. The applicant has since reduced the size of the garage to 28'x44' in order to illustrate that it will not be used for commercial purposes. The applicant does have a fair number of personal belongings to store in the garage. The applicant also does not believe that the suggested membrane under the garage is necessary because the garage is proposed for residential use only, and will be located within the necessary setbacks, so no relief is being sought for it.

In response to a question from Christy Houpis, Ken Clinton explained that the applicant has no issues with the four items mentioned in the Conservation Commission's recommendations to the Planning Board or with the suggested conditions in the staff report. Ken Clinton explained that Jason Bolduc has addressed one of the ACC items by putting together a list and photos of endangered/threatened/valuable species that could be found in the area that will be handed out to the owners and contractors. Ken Clinton stated that there are also no issues with the items raised in the Staff Report.

In response to a question from Christy Houpis, Ken Clinton stated that the applicant has no issue with the Board performing a site walk, although he noted that it is unfortunate that the Board did not agree to this at its last meeting so that the walk could be performed before this meeting. Ken Clinton explained that he never conceived that this application would warrant two, let alone three, meetings.

Tracie Adams noted that she is happy to see that the stormwater plan captures 100% of the proposed impervious surface runoff.

In response to a question from Tracie Adams, Ken Clinton stated that he is unsure how many square feet of the wetland buffer is being proposed to be reduced from 100' to 50' in this plan. He explained that the Wetland Functions and Values analysis denotes this area to have 50' setbacks, but because it is within the Pennichuck Watershed Overlay District, these setbacks are extended to 100'. He explained that there will not be any disturbances closer than the 50' setbacks. He noted that Pennichuck does not seem to have any issues with the proposal.

Brian Coogan stated that he had no questions at this time.

Mike Dell Orfano noted that the reduction in garage size seems to limit the temptation for the area to be used by paving trucks. However, he still has concerns about the use of oil in the garage. Ken Clinton stated that the applicant, Don Theriault, is a mason by trade and is not involved in his brother's paving business. Ken Clinton stated that there is no reason for any paving equipment to be on this lot.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

Marilyn Peterman stated that she had no questions at this time.

In response to a question from Cynthia Dokmo, Ken Clinton explained that the applicant has a pickup truck that he uses for his masonry business, but that there is no expectation that other commercial/masonry-related vehicles will be stored on this property.

In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Ken Clinton stated that the infiltration basin is proposed to be approximately 75' from the brook. Bill Stoughton stated that this makes sense, because the BMPs give a 60% nitrogen reduction credit if the basin is located 75' away from surface water. Bill Stoughton noted that this will meet the Town requirements. Ken Clinton explained that the basin is kidney-shaped, due to the grading of the lot. Ken Clinton explained that, if conditional approval is granted, the position of the basin will be placed to be exactly 75' from the brook.

Bill Stoughton questioned why there is a CUP to reduce the wetland buffer from 100' to 50' across the whole site, instead of changing the permitted uses within the buffer. This would help maintain the 100' buffer into the future, so if a future owner wants to do something inconsistent with the regulations at the time, s/he would need to come before the Board.

Ken Clinton explained that the phrasing in the application is overly broad because it is not necessary to utilize the full 50' buffer request as part of this proposal. The area of the drainage swale that feeds the infiltration basin is the last permanent infrastructure that relief is being sought for. Thus, the applicant is not seeking to utilize the 50' buffer; it will be part of the regeneration area. He explained that the Board could condition the approval to include a general 50' buffer, as shown on the plan presented, to the limit of the drainage swale and basin. The 100' buffer and 100' wetland setback switch control back and forth along the site. The more restrictive of the two was used for the absolute limit of the request.

Bill Stoughton stated that he would like to approve the stormwater management plan and driveway requested uses within the 100' buffer, but not to reduce the width of the buffer. Ken Clinton stated that he believes this would work for his client.

In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Ken Clinton stated that he is not aware of any vehicles proposed to be stored on site that do not belong to those living in the residence.

Chris Yates stated that he had no questions at this time.

Dwight Brew stated that wetland buffers are in place to protect the Town and, more specifically, the water in the Town. When someone approaches the Board seeking to encroach upon the buffer, the Board needs to analyze the request and be certain that any relief will not result in any negative impact to the Town. While the proposed garage is not located within the buffer, access to this garage will result in traveling over a driveway that is primarily within the buffer.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

The large garage structure, the onsite bathroom, the two-story nature of the garage, and the large outside parking area all factor into the risk, in his opinion. He asked what the reaction would be if the Board were to request that parking in the buffer be restricted and grant a CUP to access only a garage 28'x44' in size. In other words, if a larger garage or additional buildings were to be built that would traverse this driveway an additional CUP would be required.

Ken Clinton stated that he does not believe it would be appropriate or reasonable to restrict parking outside the garage. He noted that it is typical for owners to park vehicles outside the garage if the inside is being utilized. He explained that the proposed uses are allowable uses within the zone and there is no need for relief as the garage is proposed to be built within the building envelope. The proposed bathroom drains into a septic tank and then to a properly sized leach field; again, with no relief sought for these items. The proposed gravel driveway footprint immediately in front of the garage has been reduced. Thus, it would not be appropriate to restrict parking in this area. In regard to the proposal to restrict future expansion of the garage, he also believes this would be inappropriate, as long as the addition fits within the building setbacks and no relief is sought.

Dwight Brew noted that the access to all proposed buildings is over the existing wetlands buffer. His requests were only seeking to reduce the impact to the Town and neighbors, in exchange for allowing this travel over the buffer.

Ken Clinton stated that the only reason that this property is subject to 100' setbacks instead of 50' setbacks is because of the Pennichuck Watershed Overlay District. Pennichuck has already noted that the proposal is okay, in terms of the public water supply.

Public Comment:

Ken Levasseur, 19 Aglipay Drive, asked what the oversight for this proposal will be if the Board approves this application. He asked what sort of Board oversight there will be in terms of maintenance and monitoring of the proposed reduction in size of the garage. He stated these landowners (the Theriault family) has been known to take a mile when given an inch.

Glenda Kovaliv, 8 Aglipay Drive, stated that she also has concerns regarding oversight of this proposal. In the past, abutters have had issues with these lots and commercial vehicles on them. She explained that concerned phone calls have been made and letters have been sent to the Theriaults by other neighbors without any response. She asked who abutters should call if there are issues with this approval.

Natasha Kypfer noted that there were no other hands up from the public at this time.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he would go back to the Board for any further comments.

Dwight Brew explained that this application is not for the Board to approve a garage of any size; it is for approval of a lot line adjustment and to allow access over a wetland. If these two items are granted, he believes the applicant could get a building permit for a larger garage, as long as it

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

does not encroach upon the wetlands. He has a concern about this. He noted that there are no assurances about what will be done with this property, beyond what is seen on the plan. The request for assurances was met with a 'no' response. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that Ken Clinton did not say 'no,' but instead that it wasn't appropriate.

Dwight Brew stated that this application is all a matter of risk. A larger facility on the property with more use is a larger risk. A smaller facility, as currently proposed, seems to be less risk, but there are no assurances as to what will be built.

Mike Dell Orfano suggested that the Board should require that ACC placards be placed along the wetland boundary as a reminder to current and future owners as to where the buffer is. He echoed Dwight Brew's concerns.

Bill Stoughton also agrees with Dwight Brew's concerns. He does not believe it is inappropriate to place a condition of approval that the proposed garage not be built larger than 28'x44' because the current stormwater regulations limit the amount of impervious surface on a site. The size of the proposed garage controls that limit. The goal is to limit the effects of the proposal on the 100' buffer. Thus, he supports Dwight Brew's considered conditions. He also noted the abutter concerns regarding enforcement are also a concern of his. He would like to try to include a condition of approval that the buffer be maintained and not reduced, so that a future owner would have to come back to the Board if proposing a use inconsistent with the buffer restrictions.

Bill Stoughton moved that the Board finds the application satisfies the criteria of Section 4.11 I. 1. of the Zoning Ordinance, addressing the findings required for approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the Wetlands and Watershed Conservation District; and, further, that the Board finds the application satisfies the criteria of Section 4.11 H. 2. of the Zoning Ordinance addressing the findings required for approval of construction of streets, roads, and other access ways, including driveways, footpaths, bridges, and utilities if essential to the productive use of land beyond the Wetland and Watershed Conservation District use; and, further, to approve Case # PZ13878-031221 for Donald Theriault and Dany Lagios, for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a driveway and associated drainage per section 4.11.H.2., as shown on the plan exhibited tonight, April 21, 2021, with the following conditions:

- 1. There shall be no reduction in the wetland buffers. This CUP is solely to allow the driveway and stormwater management features, as presented.**
- 2. The permitted driveway is to access a garage no larger than 28'x44'.**
- 3. There shall be no storage of vehicles and equipment, other than those owned by residents of the lot.**
- 4. All the conditions in the Staff Memorandum.**

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

5. The conditions suggested in the Amherst Conservation Commission comments.

6. Posting of the wetland buffers, as required by ordinance.

Dwight Brew seconded.

Discussion:

Arnie Rosenblatt asked if the motion is based on the assumption that the lot line adjustment application is also approved.

Bill Stoughton amended his motion to include:

7. That the lot line adjustment, submitted herewith, also must be approved.

Dwight Brew seconded.

Discussion:

In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Bill Stoughton stated that the wetland buffer postings, referenced in his condition #6, are the placards that Mike Dell Orfano previously mentioned.

In response to a question from Marilyn Peterman, Ken Clinton stated that this is a residential property, and the proposed garage is for residential use.

Marilyn Peterman stated that she is unaware of any zoning ordinances in Town that specify that visitors, friends, neighbors, etc. are not allowed to park their vehicles in a residential garage.

Mike Dell Orfano suggested amending the motion to reflect temporary parking being okay for visitor and guests.

Bill Stoughton asked Marilyn Peterman if she would be okay with the condition if it was amended to reflect long-term storage of a vehicle being disallowed. Marilyn Peterman stated that she is unaware of anything in the zoning ordinances that disallows someone from letting a friend, non-resident, etc. park in their garage.

Bill Stoughton explained that the CUP request in the Wetlands and Watershed District allows the Board to place any conditions necessary to protect the environment if the use is approved. Thus, he stated, that Marilyn Peterman is correct that there is nothing restricting this parking item in the zoning ordinances, but the condition is within the Board's power. He explained that the proposed condition is to try to address concerns of abutters and Board members that the proposed large garage could be used for commercial uses in the future.

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

Marilyn Peterman stated that, regardless of the CUP request, she does not understand the proposed condition that disallows the owner from letting a friend park a vehicle in the garage, whether for short or long-term. She asked Bill Stoughton what the difference is whether this is part of a CUP request or not.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that Bill Stoughton has already responded to this line of questioning.

Bill Stoughton stated that he believes it is clear what his proposed conditions are trying to do.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – nay; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 5-1-0; motion carried

Bill Stoughton moved to approve Case #PZ13877-031221 for Donald Theriault and David & Suzanne Theriault, for the above cited Lot Line Adjustment of Map 2 Lots 170-37 & 170-14, resulting in a Subdivision of the resulting Map 2 Lot 170-37 into two residential lots, with frontage on Boston Post Road and Aglipay Drive, with the conditions set forth in the Staff Memorandum dated April 21, 2021. Dwight Brew seconded.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- 1. Discussion re: the Planning Board requesting that the Board of Selectmen initiate a study of the village intersections projected to fail in the light of future development and associated traffic and to consider recommended improvements to those intersections**

Dwight Brew explained that there are several intersections in Town that, with proposed developments will become worse, but even without developments will fail on their own. While it would be nice to make developers pay to make sure these intersections do not fail, and developers should have to pay their proportionate share of improving the intersections, so they don't fail, they only have to pay for the share of the traffic they are responsible for.

Dwight Brew stated that he believes the Planning Board needs to ask the Board of Selectmen, by way of the DPW, Community Development Office and Town Administrator, to look at the number of intersections proposed to fail in Town. There is no one currently actively taking steps to address this issue.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Dwight Brew stated that he believes a traffic study was complete by NRPC back in 2015 as part of the Village Study. This study showed that the intersections would fail. Dwight Brew stated that he would like a plan to be developed as to what to do to make these intersections not fail.

In response to a question from Marilyn Peterman, Dwight Brew stated that the first step would be for the Planning Board to ask the Board of Selectmen to have the Town Staff look at this issue and make recommendations. There might be a cost involved along the way. He is unsure what the timeframe for this project would be.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that the only downside he could see for this proposal is that the Planning Board might not get to touch this item again after passing it along to the Board of Selectmen.

Cynthia Dokmo stated that the Board of Selectmen ultimately control the roads in Town. The Planning Board can always ask to aid in this project.

Bill Stoughton moved that the Planning Board request the Board of Selectmen to examine Town of Amherst road intersections that have been projected to “fail” based on anticipated future traffic and to assess potential improvements to improve traffic performance in those intersections. Cynthia Dokmo seconded.

Discussion:

Mike Dell Orfano stated that he has a concern that this motion circumvents the Planning Board.

Arnie Rosenblatt suggested that the motion include wording that the Planning Board retain some amount of counsel/advice in this matter.

Bill Stoughton revised his motion to include language that the Planning Board retain some amount of counsel/advice in this matter. Cynthia Dokmo seconded.

Discussion:

In response to a question from Marilyn Peterman, Cynthia Dokmo explained that the original traffic/roads study in Town was completed by George Bower for free. There were a number of people in Town who thought the study was not worthy because it was done for free and ultimately turned it down.

Brian Coogan suggested that the study could also look at impact fees and the effect it would have on the current traffic friction for nearby parcels to be developed to shoulder the cost. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that the proposed study is not necessarily inconsistent with this idea.

Bill Stoughton stated that the recent traffic study showed that, even without the proposed number of developments nearby, these intersections will still fail. The

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

study will help to examine the intersections as they are now and what to do about them. Down the road, the study could also investigate other alternatives and the costs for them.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

2. Discussion re: Amherst Subaru, Map 2 Lots 49 & 53, 96 & 98 Amherst Street, plan changes due to AoT requirements.

Nic Strong explained that, after the Planning Board approved this item, the application went to the AoT for its permitting process. During that process the State informed the applicant that there was PFAS contamination on site, so AoT will not allow any infiltration as designed. The stormwater will now need to run into the DOT stormwater system on Route 101A. She asked if the Board would like this to be handled as an administrative item or if the Board would like the applicant to come back to review the amended site plan. The Board is in receipt of a letter from Attorney Brett Allard, dated April 12, 2021, that gives the applicant's reasons for believing they do not need to come back before the Planning Board due to the State's action preempting the Zoning Ordinance.

Brian Coogan stated that he had no questions at this time.

Christy Houpis stated that he is fine with this item being handled administratively.

Tracie Adams stated that Attorney Allard's letter makes it clear that the State law preempts local law. She believes it is okay for this item to be handled administratively.

Bill Stoughton stated that, based on the information given, all the Board knows is that PFAS contamination was found on site. The Board does not know where it was found or at what levels. The Board does not know if other changes were made to the site plan as a result of this change. He suggested that the Board hear from the applicant in order to answer these questions. He believes the Board and public deserve to hear this item.

Cynthia Dokmo stated that she is okay with this item being handled administratively.

Marilyn Peterman agreed with Bill Stoughton and stated that she would like the Board to hear this item.

In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Nic Strong stated that, in order for the applicant to get the AoT permit, no infiltration can be done on site. Any other exact details about plan changes made are unknown.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

April 21, 2021

APPROVED

Dwight Brew stated that if there is something that allows the Board to revisit an item after approval, he believes this item should be heard by the Board.

Chris Yates agreed that the Board should hear from the applicant on this item.

Arnie Rosenblatt noted that there was a hand up from the public. He explained that, if the Board was to take public comment, it would also need to hear from the applicant and other members of the public. Bill Stoughton noted that this item was not properly noticed for a public hearing.

Mike Dell Orfano moved that this applicant come back before the Board for review of any substantive changes made. Bill Stoughton seconded.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – nay; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 5-1-0; motion carried.

Nic Strong noted that the next Planning Board meeting is on May 19, 2021. Marilyn Peterman noted that she will not be present at that meeting.

1. Minutes: 4/07/21

Bill Stoughton moved to approve the minutes of April 7, 2021, as submitted. Marilyn Peterman seconded.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Cynthia Dokmo moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:42pm. Mike Dell Orfano seconded.

Roll call: Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Marilyn Peterman – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; Dwight Brew – aye; and Bill Stoughton – aye. 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Kristan Patenaude

Minutes approved: May 19, 2021