

City of Rochester Planning Board
Monday, March 6, 2023
City Hall Council Chambers
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867
(These minutes were approved on March 20, 2023)

Members Present

Mark Collopy, *Chair*
Peter Bruckner
Keith Fitts
Matthew Richardson
Dave Walker
Michael McQuade
Don Hamann
James Hayden
Mark Sullivan

Members Absent

Robert May, *Vice Chair, excused*
Michael McQuade, *excused*

Alternate Members Present

Rick Healey
Alexander de Geofroy

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*
Ryan O'Connor, *Senior Planner*

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting. A recording of the meeting will be on file in the City Clerk's office for reference purposes. It may be copied for a fee.)

I. Call to Order

Chair, Mark Collopy called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Senior Planner, Ryan O'Connor conducted roll call.

III. Seating of Alternates

Mr. Collopy asked Mr. Healey to vote in place of Mr. May.

IV. Communications from the Chair

Mr. Collopy stated that there are no communications to be passed from the Chair.

V. Opening Discussion/Comments (up to 30 minutes)

A. Public comment

There were no comments from the public to discuss.

B. Discussion of general planning issues

There were no general planning issues to discuss.

VI. Continued Applications

A. Green & Company, Old Gonic Road Townhomes, 19 Old Gonic Road (by Jones & Beach) Site Plan to construct 170 townhomes Case# 131 – 10 – R2 – 21 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION*. The applicant has requested to be continued to March 6, 2023.**

Joe Coronati with Jones and Beach Engineers Inc. presented overview of the project including site layout, utilities, traffic, offsite improvements, amenities, architecture and drainage. Mr. Coronati stated that roads will be privately owned and maintained. Mr. Coronati stated that this development plan shows no impact on wetlands or buffers.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing.

Caroline Lewis, 14 Cedarbrook Vlg, current member of Cedarbrook Village Board, stated concerns with lack of shielding for traffic that will be exiting onto Old Gonic Road and listed concerns with the increase in traffic complications. Ms. Lewis asked about what possible lights and equipment will be present in recreation area. Ms. Lewis asked about widening Old Gonic Road with included plan of widening of Emerson Avenue for traffic increase. Ms. Lewis asked if development's drainage plans will affect water and sewer within current residences. Ms. Lewis listed concerns of damages to road caused by construction vehicles exiting on Old Gonic Road. Ms. Lewis stated concerns with increased foot traffic on sidewalks and trails. Ms. Lewis approached podium additionally to ask if townhouses will be listed as Section 8 or Low-income housing and how many bedrooms will be in apartments.

Colleen Jones, 11 State Street, asked how tall retaining wall would be between units 6 and 7. Ms. Jones stated concerns with shadow casted by building. Ms. Jones stated that in previous meeting, it was requested to move building further away from the rear property line along State Street and was unsure if this change was shown in the current plans. Ms. Jones stated that in previous Planning Board Meeting that fencing was requested in replacement of vegetative barrier and asked if this was included in plans. Ms. Jones stated concerns with increases traffic and asked how speeding would be controlled. Ms. Jones stated concerns with noise of construction and construction vehicles entering and exiting development.

Laura Gatchel, 1 Cedarbrook Vlg, stated that she agreed with and shared the questions asked by Caroline Lewis. Ms. Gatchel stated concerns with noise and with construction and construction performed outside of working hours. Ms. Gatchel stated that she is concerned with sewer drainage with additional development. Ms. Gatchel listed concerns for shielding of light and noise from new development.

Elaine Labrie, 17 State Street, stated that she has lived in her home for 40 years. Ms. Labrie stated that she agreed with, and shared concerns listed by Ms. Jones. Ms. Labrie stated that current residents of Cedarbrook Village park their vehicles on Old Gonic Road in the Winter when roads are being plowed and stated concerns with safety regarding traffic on Old Gonic Road.

Mr. O'Connor read email comments from Sandra Fournier, 5 Cedarbrook Vlg. Ms. Fournier stated that she was concerned about headlights coming into home windows. Ms. Fournier also stated concerns for shielding Cedarbrook Village homes from light on new development's buildings. Ms. Fournier stated that there is a property easement between Cedarbrook Village and the abutters and asked if the planted pine trees within the development will remain or be removed. Ms. Fournier asked why there was only plans on a sidewalk installation on Emerson Avenue and if a sidewalk should be put on Old Gonic Road as well.

Mr. Coronati responded to abutter comments. Mr. Coronati stated that Old Gonic Road is planned as an exit only and there will be an entrance/exit at Emerson Avenue. Mr. Coronati stated that the recreation will not be lit. Mr. Coronati stated that large child population is not expected and that the demographic of children should mimic Cedarbrook Village. Mr. Coronati stated that the plan is to replace the sewer line at Emerson Avenue and line will be upgraded to 8-inch pipe. Water line will be replaced on Old Gonic Rd only from the site to State Street. Mr. Coronati stated Emerson Avenue and the portion of Old Gonic will be repaved after construction. Mr. Coronati stated that the retaining wall is planned to be 6 feet high. Mr. Coronati stated that they were willing to upgrade the vegetation buffer plans along Old Gonic Road and State Street to have bigger trees. Mr. Coronati stated that there is currently a large tree line along Old Gonic Road. Mr. Coronati stated that the contractors would comply with City's working hours for construction times. Mr. Coronati stated that he felt the natural vegetation buffer was better for the environment than removing trees for fencing.

Ms. Saunders presented staff review. Ms. Saunders stated that review has been extensive due to project being one of the largest developments in the city for many years. Ms. Saunders stated that there are three waiver requests, and all have been reviewed and are recommended to be granted. Ms. Saunders stated that the waiver request in Subdivision Regulations for turning radius was reviewed by the Fire Department and approved. Ms. Saunders stated that the other two waiver request are regarding Stormwater Regulations and were reviewed by the City's third-party Stormwater Engineer and applicant was able to prove that impacts will not take place downstream from development.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to accept this application as complete, and Mr. Healey seconded.

Mr. Fitts asked if there was a waiver present for setback. Ms. Saunders stated that the applicant meets and exceeds the setback requirements.

Mr. Bruckner stated that he did not feel that the plans were complete and that he felt there was a lack of information regarding the back of the buildings. He wanted the applicant to work on the architecture. Ms. Saunders stated that the current vote states that there is enough information to continue discussion, if not complete then applicant must resubmit within 30 days so that discussion can be reopened.

Mr. Bruckner stated that he preferred to continue discussion, but that he felt there needs to be more information.

The motion carried by a voice vote. Mr. Bruckner opposed.

Ms. Saunders stated that there are no current plan modifications or plan notes. Ms. Saunders stated that based on the discussion, the applicant is willing to include additional vegetation which will be listed in Plan Modifications. Ms. Saunders stated that there are multiple easements that require approval for work on Emerson Avenue and Old Gonic Road. Drafts of easements must be submitted for review. Ms. Saunders stated that property is in Current Use and several documents must be signed and escrow accounts be collected before plans can be certified including Construction Inspection Services Agreement with deposit, the Drainage Maintenance Agreement, Construction Cost estimate, and Performance Guarantee. Ms. Saunders explained Off Site Exactions are going to be further listed in Developer's Agreement. Ms. Saunders stated that the Planning Department is

requiring Off Site Improvements. Final drawings are being requested and must be certified after Precedent Conditions have been met.

Mr. Collopy asked about the height of buildings and what are the City working hours. Ms. Saunders responded that the definition of the height is the average across grade due to grade changes. Ms. Saunders stated that applicant meets height requirement. Mr. O' Connor stated that the hours for construction are Monday thru Friday 0700-1800, Saturday 0800-1800, and no work on Saturday. Mr. Hayden asked if the hours were meant for Site Construction or Building Construction. Ms. Sanders stated that the noise restriction applies to all construction. Mr. Coronati stated that the buildings are 34 feet to the mid-point.

Mr. Walker stated concerns with 2nd story patios looking into bedrooms on State Street and asked how this would be addressed. Mr. Coronati responded that units were moved so that they did not face parallel to the lot line. Mr. Coronati stated that there would be a wooded buffer and over 50 feet distance from homes on State Street.

Mr. Walker asked if changes would also be made to Old Gonic Road. Mr. Coronati responded that the only changes are that the sewer line will be extended from the from the development's Old Gonic Road exit up to State Street and the road in that space will be re paved upon completion.

Mr. Walker asked if there would be a sidewalk made on Old Gonic Road and Mr. Coronati stated that there are currently no plans for a side on Old Gonic Road. Mr. Walker stated that he felt it would be important to have a sidewalk on Old Gonic Road due to increase in foot traffic to convenient store on Old Gonic Road.

Mr. Walker stated that he felt there needed to be a buffer present to block light for residents on Cedarbrook Village from headlights that are exiting the development. Mr. Coronati stated that he would be willing to include a wooded buffer for the homes directly affected.

Mr. Bruckner stated that the trees along State Street property line are tall but that the depth of trees need to be preserved. Mr. Bruckner also stated that he was concerned that the buildings were still too close to the homes on Stated Street. Mr. Bruckner stated that the units show no backyards and that there is only common area. Mr. Bruckner recommended that there be community areas or centers included in plans for the renters to have places to gather and children to play.

Mr. Hayden asked about plans for trash pick-up. Mr. Coronati stated that residents would keep trash cans in garages and the developer would arrange private pick up.

Mr. Hayden asked if the Postmaster has weighed in on the location of the mailbox kiosks. Ms. Saunders stated that the postmaster has not weighed in and that Planning staff have been in touch about the E911 numbering and the Department of Public Works did not have any comments.

Mr. Hayden stated that he agreed with Mr. Walker in the fact that there should be a sidewalk along Old Gonic Road.

Mr. Hayden asked about the plans for sewer lines and if the applicant knew how many people were currently tied to the current sewer line. Mr. Coronati stated that he was unsure of the exact number but that the engineers and the City's firm analyzed the plans for the sewer line through to Columbus Avenue and that the sewer line plan was adequately sized to the pump station on Columbus Avenue and that it was found that the pump station had required upgrades.

Mr. Hayden stated that he recommended the waiver request for stormwater, but that he is also concerned about the risk of pollutants. Mr. Coronati stated that the engineer has looked into the risk of pollutants and that the plans were changed from wet ponds to gravel wetlands due to treatment quality changes that AOT and the City of Rochester requires.

Mr. Hayden stated that there are trails leading to ballfields nearby development and go through berms in the wetlands. Mr. Hayden asked if those trails are to be moved to the taller slope. Mr. Coronati responded that the goal was to have the trail on top of the berm. Mr. Coronati that the developers have no plans to change the structure or grade of the land leading to the ballfield.

Mr. Collopy asked if the color schemes of buildings would be earthy tones and Mr. Coronati responded saying yes.

Mr. Collopy stated that he felt that sidewalks are a good thing but that because of the narrow roads that the lots around the sidewalks would lose property for a sidewalk to be placed. Mr. Collopy stated that markings on the road need to be updated to include pedestrian space. Mr. Collopy stated that when visiting the area that people are found to be walking in the middle of the road and that sidewalks will not deter people from walking in the middle of the road. Mr. Collopy stated that he did not believe that there were any sidewalks in the area and that an addition of a sidewalk would not be conducive to the neighborhood dynamic.

Mr. Hayden asked if the planned Old Gonic Road exit should be widened to include turning both ways. Ms. Saunders stated that improvements are being made to Emerson Avenue entrance/exit to establish Emerson Avenue as the primary way into and out of the development. Ms. Saunders stated that plans were modeled because of Old Gonic's position in relation to Columbus Street intersection and that traffic would be encouraged to use the Emerson Avenue entrance/exit.

Mr. Hayden stated that he was concerned with the increase in traffic throughout the smaller roads. Ms. Saunders stated that 75% of the traffic is expected to use the Emerson Avenue entrance/exit.

Mr. Walker stated that he supported the idea of sidewalks on Emerson Avenue and suggested that tenants be educated of traffic patterns. Ms. Saunders stated that traffic plans were third party reviewed for recommendations.

Mr. Collopy asked if there would be planned access to the dam for maintenance and recreation. Mr. Collopy asked who maintains the dam located near the property. Mr. Coronati stated that he was unsure of the ownership of the dam and that if maintenance is required then access to the dam for officials can be included, but that he would not recommend public access due to parking issues on Old Gonic Road. Mr. Collopy stated that he supported the idea of there be an access for officials.

Mr. Sullivan asked if for clarification of widening of Emerson Avenue and sidewalk installation within and outside of the development. Mr. Coronati stated that sidewalks are planned inside the development from Old Gonic Road exit through to Emerson Avenue entrance/exit, but not in the inner loop of the development.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the input from the Department of Public Works regarding sidewalks on Old Gonic Road. Mr. O'Connor stated that the concern was that Old Gonic Road is not wide enough for there to be sidewalks installed.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there have been discussions on widening of Old Gonic Road. Mr. O'Connor responded that the plan is not to encourage vehicle and foot traffic to utilize Old Gonic Road due to lack of ROW space.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the square footage of vegetation and stated that he felt the proposed estimated 80 feet of space between townhouse buildings and homes on State Street would be enough and asked for further explanation on the plans for vegetation in that area. Mr. Coronati stated that existing trees are mature and taller and should provide good enough buffer.

Mr. Walker stated he was concerned for the vegetation buffer in the Wintertime when trees lose their leaves.

Mr. Hamann stated his home has a 70-foot vegetation buffer and he has complete privacy in the summertime and that in the winter it is still not easy to see the homes on the next street.

Mr. Fitts stated that he noticed that there was a lot of asphalt in this plan and that he is concerned about where the snow will be piled in the Winter when there are buildups. Mr. Coronati stated that there are snow storage areas designated on the property, but that if a larger snowfall is expected that it will be removed off-site by larger equipment.

Mr. Fitts asked about additional parking for guests. Mr. Coronati stated that the guest parking issue has been noted and that renters may be required to speak with neighbors if additional space for gatherings is required. Mr. Coronati stated that each townhome has 4 parking spaces currently.

Mr. de Geofroy stated concerns on where the trash bins will be located on trash day with regards to traffic and recommended dumpsters. Mr. Coronati stated that renters would place cans at end of driveway and remove after they are empty as stated in lease requirements.

Mr. Bruckner asked for further clarification on paving of roads and sidewalks and how spaces will be differentiated. Mr. Coronati responded stating that lanes will be painted showing road edges and parking spaces and dotted lines showing different sides of road for traffic.

Mr. Bruckner stated the importance of the architectural plans for the rear of the buildings.

Mr. Hayden asked if wetland placards will be placed in the vegetation buffer and Ms. Saunders responded saying yes. Mr. Hayden asked if this could be added to plans and Ms. Saunders read from one of the recommended conditions that placards are required to be placed every 50 feet of the buffer upon completion of construction.

Mr. Hayden asked if the tree line be staked out for visual of spaces between units in developments and units on State Street. Ms. Saunders stated that in the conditions list the requirement that the no cut area be shown with snow fence.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there has been consideration for a unit being given up for a community center. Mr. Coronati stated that the plan is not to give up a unit and that the units are as large as typical homes and the area will not require a community center.

Mr. Collopy asked what the sign plan is for the exits and one-way locations to deter renters from driving the wrong way. Mr. Coronati stated that Do Not Enter signs will be placed on Old Gonic Road and the road will be kept narrow to deter drivers. Mr. Collopy stated that Old Gonic Road is a public street and that police can monitor the flow of traffic.

Mr. Hayden asked if fire truck turning templates have been run. Mr. Coronati answered yes.

Mr. Walker asked if the association was an HOA. Mr. Coronati answered that these are rentals with one owner, not an HOA and there would be a separate property management company.

Ms. Saunders gave an overview of the conditions discussed by the board. Ms. Saunders listed conditions discussed including potential for markings on Old Gonic Road, height rendering in relation to State Street, creation of backyard spaces and common spaces availability, pollutant monitoring, relocation of trails, dam maintenance access, rendering including rear of structure, add snow fence along tree line to restrict tree cutting, buffering for Cedarbrook Village residents.

Mr. Walker stated that he still had concerns that a sidewalk should be built on Old Gonic Road because of increased foot traffic.

Mr. Hamann stated that stated that filtration for pollutant monitoring should have already been reviewed by public works.

Mr. Walker stated that he recommends the buffer for lights towards Cedarbrook Village can be made a Condition of Approval, but that the sidewalk idea on Old Gonic Road should be presented to the board in the next meeting. And the item should be continued.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the applicant has agreed to make many changes based on recommendations from the Board and does not feel that the applicant needs to return with revised plans for sidewalks on Old Gonic Road. That can be a condition of approval. Mr. Sullivan also stated that he is not concerned with the visual plans of the rear of the building.

Mr. Hayden stated that he agreed with Mr. Sullivan to approve tonight and that the idea of pedestrian access on Old Gonic Road can be determined as a Condition of Approval.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he supports the idea of pedestrian access being added as a condition. Ms. Saunders stated that pedestrian access on Old Gonic Road would be listed as a precedent condition and would be reviewed again by the board.

Mr. Saunders stated that the ownership of the dam be verified and that it be shown on plans. Mr. Collopy stated that the Department of Public Works should be able to verify that information.

Mr. Collopy stated he wants to add a condition that at the parking area between building 7 and 10 are parking spaces and that he recommends a vegetated buffer for lights towards units on State Street.

Ms. Saunders stated that there are currently 3 waivers requested by the applicant.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve all 3 waivers as listed. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve project with discussed Precedent Conditions and General Conditions, as well as those in the memo.

Mr. Hayden asked for fire truck turning plans to be included in conditions.

Mr. Walker and Mr. Hamann agreed to amendment of motion to include Fire Truck Turning Plans. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. New Applications

A. [42 Front Street, LLC, 42 Front Street](#) (by Norway Plains Assoc./Ashley Rowe) 2-Lot subdivision. Case# 102 – 41 – R2 – 23 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Ashley Rowe from Norway Plains Associates presented a project overview. Mr. Rowe stated they are proposing a subdivision of the property. Mr. Rowe stated that Norway Plains has submitted a waiver request for driveway location on new lot. Mr. Rowe requested that the Conditional of Approval to remove or move the shed on the property be weighed and changed.

Mr. Collopy opened the public hearing.

Bruce Belles, 34 Front Street, stated that he has lived in his home since 1989. Mr. Belles stated that area surrounding property has been called the Salmon Falls Reservoir and still shows on older maps. Mr. Belles presented the FEMA map showing the flood zones covering the yard of 42 Front Street. Mr. Belles presented pictures of 42 Front Street with flooding on December 25, 2022. Mr.

Belles stated that he has witnessed that water going into basement access at 42 Front Street. Mr. Belles stated that there is a street drain present at 42 Front Street and at edge of Mr. Belles' driveway at 34 Front Street. Mr. Belles stated that stormwater drains lead directly to river. Mr. Belles stated that he is concerned for flooding and draining issues through the neighborhood. Mr. Belles stated concerns regarding removal of natural features that help with drainage and flooding.

Ms. Saunders asked for clarification on the waiver request for driveway location. Mr. Rowe stated that he had included the waiver request in plans that were delivered after Technical Revision Group meeting. Ms. Saunders stated that the waiver request wording was not reviewed by the TRG and might need to be changed, and that Public Works may need to review plan. Mr. Rowe stated that the Department of Public Works has reviewed and were in favor of a waiver request.

Ms. Saunders stated that the staff is aware of a drainage issue on property. Ms. Saunders stated that two plan notes were added including that grading and drainage plans be submitted at the time of the building permit and applicant provide a proposed finished floor elevation for building safely above the 100-year flood elevation. Ms. Saunders stated that the applicant had an individual visit the property and at that time there were no wetlands on the property and that there has not been a third-party review of wetlands.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann that the application be accepted as complete.

Mr. Walker stated that he was concerned that there are 2 pipes going into the river. Mr. Walker asked if there were any current plans for the lot being separated. Ms. Saunders stated that there is a futuristic plan of a duplex being built on lot.

Mr. Walker stated that he was concerned with the drainage of water being moved to abutters.

Ms. Saunders stated that the current motion is to accept the application as complete, or if the board felt that the applicant needed to resubmit information, they could deny the application complete vote and require the applicant submit new information.

Mr. Collopy asked for confirmation on if a waiver request was submitted and if so that information must be included in submitted packet and that he feels that the applicant should thoroughly consider the issues with the flooding and drainage.

Mr. Fitts asked for clarification on if the subdivision. Ms. Saunders stated that if a lot is subdivided with building intentions, that it be confirmed if it is buildable.

Mr. Healey stated that in GIS there is shrubbery present and that there is a wetland present and felt that the lot is not buildable and thus views the application as incomplete.

The motion that the application be accepted as complete was withdrawn by Mr. Walker and withdrawn by the seconded-er Mr. Hamann.

Ms. Saunders asked the Board if they elect to deny the acceptance, they need to give specific directions on what to resubmit, which should include a complete waiver request with information, a grading and floodplain/flooding plan for the new structure to show buildability and that a third-party review be conducted regarding the wetlands.

A motion was made by Mr. Fitts and seconded by Mr. Healey to not accept the application as complete until further information, as described is included. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Walker asked that the Department of Public Works be notified of drainage pipes into river.

B. Great Wood Development, LLC, 139&133 Flagg Road (by Norway Plains Assoc./Joel Runnals) Lot line revision. Case# 259 – 29&30 – A – 23 **Public Hearing**
ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION*

Joel Runnals from Norway Plains Associates presented overview of project. Mr. Runnals stated this is plan is for a Lot Line revision to make lot bigger.

Mr. Collopy opened Public Hearing. No comment from Public.

Mr. O'Connor explained that lot line revision was meant to straighten lot line against 133 Flagg Road. Mr. O'Connor stated that there are no current plan modifications, and that staff recommends approval of Lot line revision.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Bruckner to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve the application as conditions are stated for lot line revision. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Great Woods Development, LLC, 139 Flagg Road (by Norway Plains Assoc./Joel Runnals) 3-Lot subdivision. Case# 259 – 29 – A – 23 **Public Hearing**
ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION*

Joel Runnals from Norway Plains Associates presented overview of project. Mr. Runnals stated that lot is planned to be subdivided into 3 lots. Mr. Runnals stated that all three lots' driveways will be in easement area. Mr. Runnals stated that street name permit is going to be submitted. Mr. Runnals stated that wetlands were reviewed in 2022. Mr. Runnals stated that wetlands have been marked with placards.

Mr. Collopy opened Public Hearing. No comment from Public.

Mr. O'Connor stated that there are no current plan modifications, and that staff considers the conditional use criteria met and recommends the approval of subdivision and application to be considered complete.

Mr. Hayden asked if there was an existing graveled area into wetland. Mr. Runnals stated that the gravel was because the area is not vegetated. Mr. Harden asked if area would be re-vegetated. Mr. Runnals answered that land would re-vegetate naturally.

Mr. Hayden is existing well would be capped and discontinued. Mr. Runnals stated that well would be addressed in building permit.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Healey to accept the application as complete. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve the conditional use for porkchop subdivision. Motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approved subdivision with conditions specified. Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. Final Plan Approval

- A. [CEM3 Holdings II, LLC, 146 Old Dover Road](#) 2-Lot subdivision. Review Completion of Precedent Conditions, Final Decision. [Conditionally Approved January 9, 2023](#). Case# 140 – 72 – R1 – 22 **Public Hearing FINAL DECISION***

Ryan O'Connor presented overview of the final plans of project. Mr. O'Connor stated that plan was conditionally approved January 9, 2023 and that minor modifications have been made, all precedent conditions have been met and that staff recommends the approval of 2-lot subdivision.

Mr. Collopy opened Public Hearing. No public comment.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve 2-lot subdivision. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Walker asked why there was an additional public hearing for this project. Ms. Saunders stated that state statute lists that an additional public hearing is required is the board required precedent conditions to be met.

Mr. Walker recommended a consent calendar for approvals.

Mr. Fitts asked if the final approval public hearings were an additional chance for concerns to be listed. Ms. Saunders stated that concerns are not typically stated at final approval because of the previous chances for public hearing.

IX. Other Business

A. Planning Update

Ms. Saunders stated that Parking Review Group Poster Session is scheduled for Wednesday, March 22, 2023, 1800-2000 at RPAC. Ms. Saunders stated that this is an opportunity for the public to state current issues. Ms. Saunders stated that Mr. Collopy is going to stand in for Mr. Fitts.

Ms. Saunders stated that QR codes have been sent to all members and code brings persons directly to survey. Ms. Saunders stated that posters have been posted at the library and at the community center.

Ms. Saunders asked that board members bring green CIP books to the next workshop meeting.

B. Other

There was no other business to discuss.

X. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Healey to adjourn the meeting at 9:13pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaclyn Millard,
Administrative Assistant II

and

Shanna B. Saunders,
Director of Planning & Development