APPROVED

- 1 In attendance: Arnie Rosenblatt Chair, Dwight Brew-Selectman Ex-Officio, Bill Stoughton,
- 2 Brian Coogan, Cynthia Dokmo, Mike Dell Orfano, Tracie Adams (Alternate), Chris Yates
- 3 (Alternate), Marilyn Peterman [7:07 pm], and Christy Houpis (Alternate) [7:04 pm].
- 4 Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director; Natasha Kypfer, Town Planner;
- 5 and Kristan Patenaude, Minute Taker.
- 6
- 7 Arnie Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m., with the following statement. As Chair
- 8 of the Amherst Planning Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the
- 9 Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's
- 10 Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, as extended by various Executive
- 11 Orders, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.
- 12 Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this
- 13 meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order.
- 14 However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:
- 15 Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video
- 16 or other electronic means:
- 17 We are utilizing Zoom for this electronic meeting.
- 18
- 19 All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this
- 20 meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if
- 21 necessary, participate in this meeting through dialing the following phone #312-626-6799 and
- 22 password 864 4339 8082, or by clicking on the following website address:
- https://zoom.us/j/86443398082 that was included in the public notice of this meeting.
- 24
- 25 Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:
- 26 We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting,
- 27 including how to access the meeting using Zoom or telephonically. Instructions have also been
- 28 provided on the website of the Planning Board at: <u>www.amherstnh.gov</u>.
- 29
- 30 Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are
- 31 problems with access: If anybody has a problem, please call 603-341-5290.
- 32
- 33 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
- 35 rescheduled.
- 36
- 37 Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.
- 38
- 39 Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence,
- 40 please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is
- 41 required under the Right-to- Know law.
- 42

APPROVED

44	Cynthia Dokmo; Chris Yates; Mike Dell Orfano; and Arnie Rosenblatt; all alone
45	and present.
46	
47	Tracie Adams sat for Marilyn Peterman, until her arrival.
48	
49	PUBLIC HEARING
50	1. CASE #: PZ12803-062920 –6 Pine Road LLC (Owners & Applicants) – 6 Pine Road,
51	PIN #: 008-042-000–Public Hearing/Non-Residential Site Plan. To illustrate
52	the layout of a climate controlled self-storage building on Tax Map 8, Lot 42. Zoned
53	Limited/Commercial. Continued from November 4, 2020
54 55	Christy Houpis entered the meeting.
55 56	In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Arnie Rosenblatt stated that there is no time limit
50 57	for applicants to postpone their hearings to.
58	for applicants to postpone then hearings to.
59	Dwight Brew explained that he doesn't like it when applicants cancel at the last minute. Last
60	minute cancellations mean that the Board cannot move up other items that are waiting to be
61	heard. He would prefer the Board to stick to its schedule and not push out items at the last
62	minute. He also requested that all information for cases be supplied to Board members a few
63	days before the meeting and not sent in piecemeal.
64	
65	Mike Dell Orfano moved to table CASE #: PZ12803-062920 to February 17, 2021, at
66	7pm, via Zoom. Dwight Brew seconded.
67	Roll call: Bill Stoughton - aye; Dwight Brew - aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Tracie
68	Adams – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – aye; and Brian Coogan - aye. Motion carried
69	unanimously.
70	
71	<u>COMPLIANCE HEARING:</u>
72	2. CASE #: PZ5694-120814 – The Stabile Companies (Applicant), Stacy J.
73	Clark (Owner), 131 Hollis Road, PIN #s 001-013-000, 001-013-004 & 001-013-005-
74	Request for Planning Board compliance of a site plan and condominium subdivision
75	for a 16-unit workforce housing development. Zoned Residential/Rural.
76	Nic Strong explained that this is a compliance hearing for the Amherst Fields subdivision. A
77	condition of the site plan approval was for the Board to have a compliance hearing to make sure
78	that everything has been built as was shown in the plan. Included in the hearing are the
79	landscaping, road location, and Keach-Nordstrom improvements noted and seen. The Board
80	must then vote whether or not to release the bond.
81	must then you whether of not to release the bond.
82	Nic Strong noted that there was an issue with the abutters to the project not being notified within
~	1. 1. 1. 1. I was an interest in a substantial and a second state project not being housing within

Roll call attendance: Dwight Brew; Bill Stoughton; Brian Coogan; Tracie Adams;

83 the 10-day time frame. The owner went to each abutter to discuss the issue and returned to the

APPROVED

Town signed letters noting that abutters acquiesce with this issue. The Board should discuss thisand determine if the letters are acceptable.

86

87 Mike Ploof, a licensed land surveyor of Fieldstone Land Consultants, presented the case. He 88 explained that this hearing is for a 16-unit condominium development, located at 131 Hollis 89 Road. The as-built compliance plan includes the as-built units and Adams Way roadway, and a 90 blown-up view of the landscaping, site drainage, utilities, and as-built road profile. There are a 91 few altered tree placements on site, as the proposed locations were deemed to be too difficult per 92 the contractor. The location of these trees is exhibited on the plans as shown. There were 107 93 proposed trees, per the original plan, but the as-built plan shows 123 trees (16 extra trees). The 94 original plan also called for 149 proposed shrubs, but the as-built plan shows 159 mapped shrubs 95 (10 extra shrubs). He explained that the placements of these trees/shrubs will bode well for the 96 development as they will provide wonderful screening. The additional trees located along Route

- 97 122 will also grow in and provide additional screening.
- 98
- 99 Mike Ploof explained that the as-built drainage is very close to the design. The basins, etc. are all 100 in compliance and Keach-Nordstrom has signed off on this.
- 101
- 102 In response to a question from Cynthia Dokmo, Nic Strong explained that when the notice for
- 103 the hearing was created, the Department pulled the original application package in order to not
- 104 create a new case number, which is why the owner's name is different on the agenda than the
- 105 Staff Report.
- 106
- 107 Cynthia Dokmo stated that the abutter notification issue doesn't bother her, as the applicant 108 sought approval from each of them and obtained signed letters.
- 109

110 In response to a question from Chris Yates, Mike Ploof stated that the affordable covenants are

- recorded in the declaration of restrictive covenants in the document that outlines the sale of each property. All buyers must sign this document. The Town is afforded the right of enforcement of
- 113 these covenants.
- 114
- 115 In response to a question from Chris Yates, Nic Strong stated that there is no formal process in
- 116 place to allow the Town to monitor these sales to be completed as outlined in the covenants. It
- appears that the covenants are written in such a way that this affordability needs to be monitored
- 118 even in the leasing or subletting of these units.
- 119
- 120 Mike Dell Orfano noted that, in the past, the Planning Board wanted no part in trying to manage 121 the sales or rentals of units and monitoring others' incomes in regard to affordability. It was
- 121 the sales or rentals of units and monitoring others' incomes in regard to affordability. It was 122 suggested at the time that an intermediary, such as the New Hampshire Housing Authority, be
- hired to complete this monitoring. As the Town is not equipped to monitor for these covenants, it
- will eventually fall by the wayside and these units will cease to be considered as affordable
- 125 housing.
- 126

127	Chris Yates stated that he would like this issue addressed before moving forward with this
128	application.
129	
130	Bill Stoughton noted that he shares Chris Yates' concerns.
131	
132	In response to a question from Dwight Brew, Mike Ploof explained that he believes the income
133	restrictions on these units is also noted in the deeds. Mike Ploof read a sample from the deed. He
134	noted that the form references all the requirements for the covenants and that new owners must
135	sign that they will honor the declaration of covenants for the unit at the time of sale.

- 135 136
- 137 Mike Ploof read into the record an excerpt from the deed.
- 138
- In response to a question from Dwight Brew, Nic Strong noted that a copy of the deed was notincluded with the applicant's file. A copy of the covenants was included.
- 141

142 Christy Houpis stated that he shares the concerns of some of his fellow Board members. He is
143 concerned with how these units will be monitored for affordability and how subsequent sales will
144 be monitored after the initial purchase.

145

In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Mike Ploof stated that he hasn't spoken withthe NH Housing Authority in regard to acting as an intermediary for this monitoring.

148

Mike Dell Orfano explained that the NH Housing Authority uses HUD's data and annually
publishes the workforce housing definitions for the State. He requested that the declaration of

151 covenants be brought back to the Housing Authority to make sure it complies with State law. He

152 noted that the Town has no mechanism to monitor who buys these units and what their income

153 might be. There is also no way to monitor the resale value of these units. He believes requesting

154 this of the Town places a terrible burden on the Town. He is not sure if the application is in

- 155 compliance due to this issue.
- 156

157 Tracie Adams stated that she shared the concerns of some of her fellow Board members. She158 does appreciate that Keach-Nordstrom has no objections to the visual aspects of the property.

159 160 Mile Dell Oxford and include

160 Mike Dell Orfano questioned if Town Council has reviewed the documents submitted for

- 161 compliance. Nic Strong noted that Town Council did review the documents during the original
 162 subdivision hearing.
- 163

164 Marilyn Peterman explained that this issue has been raised a number of times. The Town has

- 165 never put into place a way for these types of units to be checked, other than through the
- 166 deeds/condo documents. The Town has heavily relied on realtors in the past in regard to this
- 167 issue. She believes that placing the onus on the applicant simply because the Town never put the
- 168 correct mechanisms into place, is difficult to swallow. The Town has approved a number of
- 169 workforce housing applications throughout the years under this same understanding. She doesn't
- 170 believe the Board can hold up an application because the Town/Board has not been forthcoming

APPROVED

171	in creating a proper mechanism to follow the sale of these units. This is a hardship to the
172	applicant.
1 = 0	

- 173
- 174 Arnie Rosenblatt noted that no one wished to be recognized for public comment at this time.
- 175
- Nic Strong noted that there is a Notice of Decision letter, dated February 23, 2015, that the Board
 can find in the Dropbox. She also noted that the bond was necessary because the Certificate of
- 178 Occupancy was requested prior to the compliance hearing.
- 179
- In response to a question from Chris Yates regarding if the condo association for Amherst Fields
 would require approval for potential leases/renters, Nic Strong explained that any requirements
 are noted in the condo documents.
- 183

184 Bill Stoughton stated that there is a reference in the deed to a maximum price limit for these

185 units, and in the restrictive covenants. This gives the Town some level of assurance through the

186 closing and lender's review. The covenants, during this process, would be examined and the

- 187 price would be compared to the current limits.
- 188

189 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he agrees with Marilyn Peterman. He believes it is okay to approve 190 this compliance hearing, as the Board has approved similar plans in the past without any formal 191 monitoring mechanism. He believes the market will take care of this issue. He also understands

- 192 and appreciates the concerns of others.
- 193

194 Mike Dell Orfano explained that, at the original subdivision hearing for this case, he mentioned 195 that the Housing Authority was willing to do income qualifications and verify the sales of these 196 units. This would allow for third-party verification of compliance. The Town's ordinance

requires compliance for 25 years. A lot may happen within the Town and the market during that time.

198 199

Marilyn Peterman stated that banks and other entities review the sales of these units, which is an
 initial check/balance process for the Town. There is some indication that banks and mortgage

- 202 companies will sell units at a correlated price.
- 203

Bill Stoughton stated that workforce housing has a maximum price at which it can be sold. He questioned if there is an examination of income level for buyers of this type of property.

206

Mike Dell Orfano stated that, since its inception, the level has been 100% of the median income
set by HUD. There was a bill to raise this to 125% but he does not believe it passed. Buyers
should be at or below the median income amount set by HUD based on market conditions for
regional pricing.

- 210
- 212 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Nic Strong noted that some of the units in this
- 213 development have gone through an initial sale.
- 214

	December 2, 2020 APPROVED
215 216 217	In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Mike Ploof stated that he is unsure whether the original sale buyers of these units were qualified by their income prior to sale.
218 219 220 221 222 223	In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Mike Ploof mentioned that, from a compliance standpoint, this development meets all of the qualifications for compliance. Mike Ploof stated that he is unsure if any of the other workforce developments in Town have a system in place for monitoring, as is being discussed. Mike Ploof requested that the bond be released tonight, even if there are conditions to it.
224 225 226 227	Brian Coogan agreed that the applicant has satisfied the criteria for compliance. He is unclear how the Board can obligate a developer to regulate and maintain these sales for workforce qualifications.
228 229 230 231	Mike Dell Orfano moved for conditional approval of compliance, subject to a satisfactory retention policy for workforce housing, and to include release of the bond. Dwight Brew seconded.
232 233 234	Discussion: Dwight Brew questioned whose satisfaction this motion would be predicated upon.
235 236 237 238	Brian Coogan stated that a policy is a document to provide governance. In this case, there is no governing body in place to hold the developer accountable to the monitoring process.
239 240 241	Mike Dell Orfano noted that the NH Housing Authority could be the governing body in question, as the Town is not equipped to do so.
242 243 244 245	Mike Dell Orfano amended his motion to read: moved for conditional approval of compliance, with the NH Housing Authority as the third-party arbitrator for sale qualifications for retention of workforce housing, and to include release of the bond. Dwight Brew seconded.
246 247 248 249 250	<u>Discussion:</u> Marilyn Peterman stated that there is nothing in the regulations to say that a third- party is necessary to look over the qualifications. There is nothing in the regulations to make a developer proceed with a third-party intermediary.
251 252 253 254 255	Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – nay; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – nay; Dwight Brew – aye; Bill Stoughton – aye; Cynthia Dokmo – nay; and Arnie Rosenblatt – nay. 3-4-0; motion failed.
255 256 257 258	Arnie Rosenblatt explained that, while he respects his fellow Board members concerns, he does not believe this to be a good remedy.

258

Mike Dell Orfano explained that the language within the Master Plan states that the Town will
monitor these sales. Mike Ploof stated that his client's attorney mentioned that he believes the
language only states that the Town has the right to monitor these sales, if it so chooses.
Dwight Brew stated that the Board approved of workforce housing in the past, with the

expectation that these units would remain workforce housing for a number of years. In reality,
there is no enforcement mechanism to ensure this remains the case after the first sale of the unit.
Bonuses have been awarded to developers in the past with the expectation that workforce
housing would remain as such, but this expectation has not been carried out. He believes this is a
concern for the Board. He believes that, even if the Town had the money to carry out this
process, it might not be practical for it to do so. He stated that there are third-party agencies with

- experience in this process in the area. He suggested that if bonuses are to be given for
- 271 expectations, that these expectations be carried through into the future.
- 272
 273 Marilyn Peterman stated that the Board should go by the deed and condo documents. If the
 274 Board wants to require third-party oversight, it will need to be written into the ordinance.
- 275

293

302

Bill Stoughton moved to confirm compliance with the conditions to the approval of
the non-residential site plan for GMEC Properties, LLC, 131 NH Route 122 (aka
Hollis Road), Map 1, Lot 13, and to release the security being held in the amount of
\$52,429.30 subject to the subsequent conditions identified in the Staff Report dated
December 2, 2020. Dwight Brew seconded.

- 281282 Discussion:
- 283 Bill Stoughton stated that he believes third-party review would be better, but 284 without regulations that give the Board clear authority to require that, he doesn't 285 want to hold up the application further. He believes that the subsequent conditions will allow the Board, if this process is being abused and if a monitoring procedure 286 287 can be set-up, to do something about it. The subsequent conditions include these two 288 statements: 1) The applicant shall comply with all Town of Amherst Non-Residential Site Plan review regulations and Zoning Ordinance; 2) The approval is 289 290 based upon the plans, specifications, and testimony submitted to the Planning 291 Board; any alterations, additions, or changes to the plans are not authorized and 292 require additional Planning Board approval.
- Bill Stoughton explained that the express representation in this testimony is that the
 housing will be workforce housing for 25 years, as assured by covenants and deed
 restrictions. He believes, if this proves not to be the case, the subsequent conditions
 allow the Board to figure out how to do something about it.
- 298299Roll call: Marilyn Peterman aye; Mike Dell Orfano aye; Brian Coogan aye;300Dwight Brew aye; Bill Stoughton aye; and Cynthia Dokmo aye. 6-0-0; motion301approved unanimously.

303	COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF APPLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING
304	IF APPLICATION IS ACCEPTED AS COMPLETE:
305	3. CASE #: PZ13385-111720 – Ballinger Properties/Nash Family Investment
306	Property (Owner) & Ashoke Rampuria (Applicant) – 2 Howe Drive, PIN #: 002-
307	034-001–Submission of Application/Public Hearing/Non-Residential Site Plan –
308	Amended Site Plan to show five potential multi-tenant spaces in the approved
309	warehouse building, additional 21 parking spaces to the Northwest and trailer
310	parking markings to the East. The building footprint will reduce 2.294 square
311	feet. Zoned Industrial.
312	Arnie Rosenblatt explained that the threshold question is if this application is complete. If the
313	application is complete, the Board can then vote to open a public hearing.
314	
315	Natasha Kypfer stated that all of the required items for this application have been submitted. The
316	Board also needs to discuss regional impact of this application. She explained that on March 6,
317	2019, the Board voted that there was regional impact in this case to Hollis and NRPC. Now that
318	this amendment to the application has been submitted, the Board must discuss this issue again.
319	
320	Cynthia Dokmo moved to accept the application as complete. Bill Stoughton
321	seconded.
322	Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – aye;
323	Dwight Brew – aye; Bill Stoughton – aye; and Cynthia Dokmo – aye. 6-0-0; motion
324	approved unanimously.
325	
326	Mike Dell Orfano stated that the Board decided previously that there was regional impact
327	regarding this application to Hollis and NRPC. As this amendment looks to expand the use of the
328	site, he believes the two entities need to be notified of regional impact again. He explained that
329	the route between Route 101 and Hollis is a highly traveled road and is quite narrow. As the
330	proposed project is close in proximity to this route, he has concern that an expanded use will
331	only amplify this issue.
332	
333	Bill Stoughton stated that he believes the project does pose regional impact.
334	
335	In response to a question from Cynthia Dokmo, Nic Strong stated that, when originally hearing
336	this application, the Board voted no regional impact. On hearing the application for a second
337	time, the Board voted there was regional impact. Nic Strong stated that she assumes notice was
338	sent to the two entities at that time.
339	
340	Natasha Kypfer confirmed that in February 2019, the Board originally heard from this applicant
341	and voted no regional impact. At the next hearing, the Board voted there was regional impact and
342	notice was then, presumably, sent.
343 244	Pohert Duvel of TEMoren Inc. stoted that the proposed emendment is not an interstification of
344 345	Robert Duval, of TFMoran, Inc., stated that the proposed amendment is not an intensification of
545	use of the site. In fact, this proposal will make the building footprint slightly smaller. The owner

APPROVED

346 347	may rent out part of the space before occupying it himself. There will be no intensification of traffic, or any of the other criteria for regional impact, such as increased light, noise, fumes, etc.
348	
349	In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Robert Duval stated that the site is current
350	under construction; it is not currently in use.
351	
352	In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Robert Duval explained that the plan notes that
353	tenants are to be of a specific type, that of Land Use Code 154, which will allow for similar
354	traffic contribution per the ITE Trip Generation Manual. Robert Duval stated that the owner has
355	spoken to possible tenants but hasn't yet selected one.
356	
357	In response to a question from Chris Yates, Nic Strong noted that the Board's previous change in
358	vote regarding regional impact did not have to do with the additional parking spots being
359	proposed, as this is a new amendment that includes that proposal.
360	
361	In response to a question from Marilyn Peterman, Nic Strong explained that the minutes from the
362	Board's March 6, 2019, meeting state that Sally Wilkins (prior Board member) did not agree that
363	there was no regional impact of this project and suggested that the Board notify Hollis and
364	NRPC. The Board voted to agree with that proposal.
365	
366	In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Nic Strong stated that she does not know if
367	Hollis responded to the notification.
368 369	Miles Dell Orfens noted that he believes Selly Willing mode the proposal for regional impact
309 370	Mike Dell Orfano noted that he believes Sally Wilkins made the proposal for regional impact due to the roadway in question and the increased traffic to the area. Her proposal was able to
370 371	convince the rest of the Board to vote in favor of regional impact.
372	convince the fest of the board to vote in favor of regional impact.
373	Bill Stoughton moved that there is regional impact with respect to Hollis and NRPC
374	from this proposal. Mike Dell Orfano seconded.
375	Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – aye;
376	Dwight Brew – aye; Bill Stoughton – aye; and Cynthia Dokmo – aye. 6-0-0; motion
377	approved unanimously.
378	
379	Mike Dell Orfano moved to reschedule CASE #: PZ13385-111720 – Ballinger
380	Properties/Nash Family Investment Property (Owner) & Ashoke Rampuria
381	(Applicant) – 2 Howe Drive, PIN #: 002-034-001 to January 6, 2021, at 7pm, via
382	Zoom. Dwight Brew seconded.
383	Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – aye;
384	Dwight Brew – aye; Bill Stoughton – aye; and Cynthia Dokmo – aye. 6-0-0; motion
385	approved unanimously.
386	
387	OTHER BUSINESS:
~,()()	

388 4. Minutes: 11/18/20

APPROVED

389 390 Bill Stoughton moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 18, 2020, as 391 submitted. Dwight Brew seconded. 392 Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – abstain; Mike Dell Orfano – nay; Brian Coogan – 393 ave: Dwight Brew – ave: Bill Stoughton – ave: and Cynthia Dokmo – ave. 4-1-1: 394 motion approved. 395 396 5. Discussion of potential Zoning Ordinance amendments 397 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong noted that this discussion is only to 398 move the potential amendments forward to a public hearing on December 18, 2020, and not to 399 bless/not bless them. 400 401 Marilyn Peterman expressed concern regarding the elimination of the IIHO and the effect that 402 has on allowing certain types of housing, such as elderly, within certain zoning areas. She is 403 unsure if this is a change from before the IIHO existed. 404 405 Mike Dell Orfano explained that there are criteria missing within the ordinance, now that the 406 IIHO has been eliminated, that allow the Board to make decisions regarding workforce and other 407 types of housing within different zoning areas in Town. 408 409 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he wants to be clear on the definitions of the criteria, and if these 410 changes existed prior to the IIHO. 411 412 Bill Stoughton noted that, for example, in Section 4.43, even with the deletion of the IIHO, 413 elderly and workforce housing is noted as being allowed and so remain as possible uses. 414 However, in Section 4.4, Northern Transitional Zone, deleting the IIHO may have an effect on 415 permitted uses because elderly/workforce housing is not specifically mentioned. 416 417 Dwight Brew suggested that, coming out of the public hearing, the Board might want to consider two Warrant Articles for this issue. One Warrant Article for housekeeping items and another one 418 419 for any substantive changes proposed. 420 421 Nic Strong explained that the notice has to state what the proposals are. If the Board decides on 422 different proposals after the public hearing, there will need be a new notice posted at that time. 423 The Board would have to chance for one re-do after the public hearing on December 16, 2020, 424 but there will not be enough time for notice after that one. 425 426 Dwight Brew moved to post the items for a public hearing on December 16, 2020. 427 Marilvn Peterman seconded. 428 Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – aye; 429 Dwight Brew – ave; Bill Stoughton – ave; and Cynthia Dokmo – ave. 6-0-0; motion 430 approved unanimously. 431

APPROVED

432 **6.** Discussion of revised Stormwater Regulations

Bill Stoughton explained that the draft Stormwater Regulations were sent to Town Council and
the Town Engineer for review. The new draft incorporates all of the subsequent comments. He
requested that the Board schedule a public hearing on the proposed regulations for December 16,
2020. After this hearing, request for Planning Board approval and separate approval from the
Board of Health will be sought.

438

Marilyn Peterman moved to schedule a public hearing to discuss the revised
Stormwater Regulations for December 16, 2020. Brian Coogan seconded.
Roll call: Marilyn Peterman – aye; Mike Dell Orfano – aye; Brian Coogan – aye;
Dwight Brew – aye; Bill Stoughton – aye; and Cynthia Dokmo – aye. 6-0-0; motion
approved unanimously.

444

Bill Stoughton mentioned the substantive changes made to this draft of the Stormwater

Regulations, including: the percentage of clean-up for stormwater sediment and nitrogen
removal, and the authority for the Planning Board/Board of Health to relax some of the

information necessary for the application for smaller, less complex projects. In the future, it ishoped to have two applications, one for larger projects, and one for smaller ones.

450

In response to a question from Mike Dell Orfano, Bill Stoughton noted that the regulations do
not lay out a process for the Board to follow for these applications; the Board will have to
determine as it goes.

454 455

7. Any Other Business that may come before the Board

Brian Coogan suggested that, as there is no monitoring program in place and it is costly to the
Town and the developer, that the Board look into utilizing an impact fee to developers for
monitoring oversight of unit types, such as for workforce housing.

459

460 Chris Yates stated that the State Workforce Housing Guidebook has very specific language that
461 developers should include in the deeds and covenants regarding this item. He is unclear if this
462 language exists for the applicant heard earlier tonight.

- 463
- 464 Marilyn Peterman moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:46pm. Cynthia Dokmo
 465 seconded.
- 466Roll call: Marilyn Peterman aye; Mike Dell Orfano aye; Brian Coogan aye;467Dwight Brew aye; Bill Stoughton aye; and Cynthia Dokmo aye. 6-0-0; motion468approved unanimously.
- 469

470 Respectfully submitted,

- 471 Kristan Patenaude
- 472
- 473 Minutes approved: December 16, 2020