

1 **TOWN OF SUNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **DECEMBER 10, 2020**

4 Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

5 Chairman White read the Governor's Emergency Order #12 that authorizes the Planning Board to meet  
6 electronically: "As Chair of the Planning Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the  
7 Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency  
8 Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.  
9 Please note that there is a physical location at 23 Edgemont Rd in the Meeting Room to observe and  
10 listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governors Emergency  
11 Order. Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote. Let's  
12 start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also  
13 state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the  
14 Right-to-Know law."

15 A roll call was taken:

16 **MEMBERS PRESENT BY VIDEO:** Peter White, Chair; Michael Jewczyn, Vice Chair; Jeffrey Claus; Randy  
17 Clark; Sue Gottling, Ex-Officio Member; Donna Davis Larrow, Alternate

18 **MEMBERS PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Richard Osborne; Michael Marquise, Planner

19 **ALSO PRESENT BY VIDEO:** Nicole Gage, Zoning Administrator

20 **ALSO PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** John Augustine; Neill Cobb; Daniel Bonin

21 Chairman White appointed Mrs. Larrow as a voting member for the meeting in place of Mr. Butler.

22 **2021 ZONING AMENDMENTS**

23 **Amendment #1**

24 Article III, Section 3.20 – Table of Dimensional Controls - Amend ordinance to add lot coverage numbers  
25 for Mixed Use I Shoreline.

26 The full text will be as follows: Shoreline Impermeable 40%, Shoreline Permeable + Impermeable 80%

27 Vice Chair Jewczyn asked and Chairman White explained that this is a housekeeping issue for the Mixed  
28 Use I District on the Table of Dimensional Controls as the Sugar River was not considered Shoreline  
29 when the was formed. Mr. Marquise said that the Sugar River is a Class IV water body and this  
30 Amendment gives allowances for lot coverage in that Zone similar to other districts.

31 Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that these Amendments are being voted on to be  
32 passed to the Warrant. Chairman White asked and there were no comments or questions from the  
33 public regarding the Amendment.

Mr. Clark made a motion to move Amendment #1 to the Warrant. Vice Chair Jewczyn seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Clark voted yes; Mr. Osborne voted yes; Vice Chair Jewczyn voted yes; Mr. Claus voted yes; Mrs. Gottling voted yes; Mrs. Larrow voted yes; and Chairman White voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Amendment #2**

Article III, Section 3.50 (g) & (h) plus Article XI Definitions - to change the height of a minor fence from five (5) feet to six (6) feet or less. This would also eliminate the Special Exception for fences placed 2 feet from the boundary line.

The full text of the amended sections will be as follows: Section 3.50 (g) DELETED; Section 3.50 (h) The ZBA may allow a fence over six (6) feet in height (measured from the ground level) to be placed on a boundary line provided that (1) The landowners of the properties for which the fence is providing a boundary apply as co-applicants to the ZBA; (2) The subject property boundary is delineated by a licensed land surveyor; (3) Such fence in the judgment of the ZBA will not adversely affect other neighboring properties; (4) An agreement between subject owners is filed with the Sullivan County Registry of Deeds indicating that the proposed fence location is acceptable to all parties and such agreement will run with the property's chain of title.

Article XI – Structure, Minor – a minor structure is exempt from the terms of this Ordinance and shall not require a Certificate of Zoning Compliance. Minor structures shall include the following: 1) Fence measuring 6 feet high or less from the ground surface provided that the fence is constructed in such a manner as to allow the fence owner the ability to maintain both the fence and the fence owner's land, if any on the neighbors side of the fence 2) Mail Box 3) Flag Pole 4) Dog House 5) Thirty-two (32) square foot open platform and associated stairs, which is no more than 4 ft off the ground and is used for access to a structure 6) Gym/swing sets for private residential use 7) Pergolas (8 ft x 10 ft maximum footprint).

Ms. Gage said that this was something that she suggested to Mr. Marquise because there are a lot of requests for fences and this would be a way to not regulate fences that are a reasonable height, which seems to be 6 ft and under. Vice Chair Jewczyn asked why 6 ft fences are reasonable but higher fences are not. Ms. Gage said that in her experience 6 ft is a common height to purchase a fence section and it also allows for a reasonable amount of privacy. Chairman White said that he thinks that the concern with going higher than 6 ft is that the fence becomes unreasonably high. There was further discussion regarding this matter and how much space people may leave under a fence and changing the allowance to 6 ft 6 inches from the ground surface.

Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquise said that this Amendment will affect 3.50 (g) and (h) which deals with Special Exceptions.

Joe Butler signed into the meeting and it was determined that he would vote instead of Mrs. Larrow.

There was further discussion regarding the proposed fence height and if the panel sizes change in the future. There was a discussion as to why 3.50 (g) is being deleted and that it is to try and keep all the 6 ft fences from going to the Zoning Board for a Special Exception and that allowing a 6 ft fence that would meet a lot of the needs of people.

There was a discussion regarding the height of spite fences and the Board decided to table the Amendment to talk to the Town's attorney about this matter.

### **Amendment #3**

Article IV, Section 4.33 (B)(8)(a)(I) – Erosion Control - Amend ordinance to incorporate the newest publication on erosion control titled, "New Hampshire Stormwater Manual", published by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services

The full text of this section as amended will be as follows: Erosion and sediment control plans shall be required for all construction, filling, grading, dredging, and other activities requiring land disturbance within the Shoreline Overlay District. The erosion control plan shall incorporate the design standards from the most current version of the New Hampshire Stormwater Manual, a copy of which is on file in the Planning/Zoning Office. In accordance with these standards, new structures shall be designed to prevent runoff over exposed mineral soil.

Chairman White asked and there were no questions or comments from anyone regarding this proposed Amendment.

Mr. Osborne made a motion to move Amendment #3 to the Warrant. Mr. Claus seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Clark voted yes; Mr. Butler voted yes; Mr. Osborne voted yes; Vice Chair Jewczyn voted yes; Mr. Claus voted yes; Mrs. Gottling voted yes; and Chairman White voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Amendment #4**

Article XI – Definitions – Farming Amend ordinance to make it clear what constitutes farming that is allowed by right in the Rural-Residential and Rural-Lands district. Also defines what agricultural uses are exempt from the ordinance.

The full text of the new definition will be as follows: Farming – The commercial use of a parcel of land as defined by RSA 21:34-a of the NH Statutes. Any hobby or subsistence farm whose products are intended primarily for the consumption of the landowner or tenant, with only the occasional sale of surplus produce or livestock, are allowed in all Districts and exempt from the terms of this Ordinance

Mr. Marquise said that he received a letter from the Lake Sunapee Protective Association as they are concerned about setbacks to waterways. He explained to them that this Amendment is to set a definition for farming and he feels that other concerns may be addressed in the Master Plan and he thinks that they understand this.

Vice Chair Jewczyn asked if there are any farming or agricultural applications that are affecting the Lake at this point. Chairman White said that he thinks that there was one on Jobs Creek Rd that people were concerned about, however, he believes that it is no longer in operation and is not aware of any others.

Mr. Clark said that the Board discussed this Amendment quite a lot and believes that they worked it out.

John Augustine, 258 Stagecoach Rd, asked why the Board is looking to add this Amendment. He said that there is a difference between farming and keeping farm animals and it is his understanding that the

109 Police Department, Zoning Administrator, and Town Manager have received numerous complaints  
110 about people keeping farm animals. The owners of the animals claim that they are pets so they are not  
111 farming. Mr. Augustine asked the Board what they are trying to accomplish with the Amendment.

112 Ms. Gage said that she is wondering if this is saying that private use farming is allowed any where in  
113 Town for personal use. Vice Chair Jewczyn said that NH's Regulations say that if there are nuisance  
114 complaints against farm animals within the first year then the owners are not permitted to keep them.  
115 Mr. Butler asked and Vice Chair Jewczyn confirmed that this Regulation pertains to personal use.

116 Mr. Osborne said that the Amendment is meant to make it clear that what constitutes farming is  
117 allowed by right in the Rural Residential and Rural Lands Districts. Mr. Claus said that the definition says  
118 that someone can have farm animals in whichever District that they want as long as it is for private  
119 consumption. Vice Chair Jewczyn said that the lot would have to have enough space to accommodate  
120 the animals. Mr. Augustine said that is not what is currently enforced. Mr. Claus said that there is  
121 nothing in the Ordinance to enforce. Mr. Augustine said that the way that this Amendment is written is  
122 that someone could put 100 chickens in their yard and as many roosters as they want and there is no  
123 way to enforce anything. It is his understanding that there have been complaints to the Police  
124 Department and Zoning Administrator and their response was that there is no enforcement mechanism.  
125 There are people who want to move because their neighbors have decided that they want to raise  
126 chickens.

127 Mr. Osborne said that in the State of NH it is very open to farming for oneself. Mr. Augustine said that it  
128 is in certain Districts. Mr. Osborne said that the Board reviewed the State's RSAs and found that it is  
129 hard to restrict someone's personal use of their property to grow their own food. Mr. Augustine said  
130 that he thought that the way that the Ordinance was written is that it said that farming was not allowed  
131 in the Residential District, however, he is not the expert. He thought that the Town Manager spoke with  
132 the Town's attorney who said that if it was pushed by the neighbor, they could say that Town needed to  
133 do something. He thinks that this is a bigger issue than what is being proposed.

134 Ms. Gage said that it is her understanding that the way that the Ordinance is written is that farming is  
135 only allowed in the two Districts and that there was no definition of farming. When the Town received  
136 complaints about farm animals in different Districts, the Town's attorney said that the Board of  
137 Selectmen could tell her to stand down and not enforce the Ordinance. With the COVID-19 pandemic  
138 there was a worry about food shortages and people started to grow their own food and such. The  
139 Planning Board has the opportunity, either through a Zoning Amendment or through the Master Plan, to  
140 try and determine something about agriculture. Ms. Gage continued that if agriculture is not regulated  
141 then the State's RSA allows it in all Districts. She is a little concerned about the allowance of people in  
142 every District being allowed to have farm animals as long as it is for personal use but if that is the  
143 intention that is fine. Chairman White said that if the Board of Selectmen told the Zoning Administrator  
144 to stand down then it is not really regulated in the Ordinance. Ms. Gage said that she thinks that the  
145 Ordinance currently says that people cannot have chickens unless they are in the Rural Lands or Rural  
146 Residential Districts.

147 Mr. Claus said that in the Residential District farming is not listed as a permitted use and he thinks that  
148 the Board was charged with coming up with a definition of farming. However, he is concerned with the  
149 idea that farming will be allowed in all Districts.

150 Vice Chair Jewczyn said that he has a farm and has 25 chickens which produce roughly two dozen eggs  
151 per day. It is very expensive and difficult to keep 25 chickens let alone 100 chickens; it is a lot of work  
152 and generally it is not a break-even situation. Additionally, there is one year for a nuisance clause in  
153 NH's Statute.

154 Mr. Augustine said that he does not think chickens are as much of a concern as roosters, pigs for the  
155 smell, and guinea hens that are not contained on the owner's property. These are things that are going  
156 to cause concern for the neighbors because of the noises or smells or because their child might get  
157 bitten or scratched. The concern about someone getting bitten or scratched could be dealt with by  
158 enforcing that animals must be kept on the owner's property but some people believe that they are free  
159 range and will allow their animals to roam. He believes that other towns allow a certain number animals  
160 and / or certain types of animal such as no roosters and up to 10 chickens. He thinks that the Board  
161 needs to look into this further as it is not just about the number of chickens.

162 Vice Chair Jewczyn asked how long the roosters and guinea hens have been on the properties where  
163 there have been complaints. Mr. Augustine said that he does not know but believes they may have  
164 been there for many years. The reason that it has become a nuisance this year is because pre-COVID  
165 the neighbors would get up and go to work and school so what they did not see or hear they did not  
166 worry about but this year is different because people are home. There was further discussion regarding  
167 this matter.

168 Mr. Osborne said that this is not something that the Board can address this year. They are defining  
169 farming and that is as far as they can go or they choose not to do what they have proposed. Mr.  
170 Marquise said that the goal of this Amendment was to go back to the intent 20 years ago and regulate  
171 commercial farms. There was further discussion regarding this matter.

172 Mrs. Larrow asked if the definition could be changed to read: "The commercial use of a parcel of land as  
173 defined by RSA 21:34-a of the NH Statutes. Any hobby or subsistence farm whose products are intended  
174 primarily for the consumption of the landowner or tenant, with only the occasional sale of surplus  
175 produce or livestock." This would create the definition of farming without allowing it to be everywhere,  
176 it would just apply to the Rural Residential and Rural Lands Districts and would then give the Board an  
177 opportunity to do more in the future. Mr. Marquise said that removing the last portion of the definition  
178 leaves the sentence hanging and he thinks that there needs to say that the use is something.

179 Chairman White said that the Board did look at surrounding Town's Ordinances; for example, New  
180 London has definitions for farms and commercial farms. He thinks that the proposed Amendment aligns  
181 with other Town's Ordinances.

182 Chairman White asked the Board how they would like to proceed. Vice Chair Jewczyn said that he thinks  
183 that the Amendment is good as written. Mr. Osborne said that he thinks that the Board should move it  
184 to the ballot and let the voters decide.

185 Mr. Osborne made a motion to move Amendment #4 to the Warrant Article. Mr. Claus seconded the  
186 motion. Vice Chair Jewczyn said that he thinks that the Amendment is perfectly fine as written. He  
187 understands Mr. Augustine's concerns and roosters can be noisy but they were there first and NH's  
188 Statutes allow for that; the Board is moving forward and they cannot deal with something from the past.

If someone has 100 chicken then that would be a commercial use. Mr. Augustine said that there is an issue with cows and pigs. Mr. Osborne said that the Board cannot do anything about that now. Mr. Augustine said that he knows but Vice Chair Jewczyn keeps coming back to 100 chickens and he does not address pigs and cows and roosters, which is his point. There is nothing in the Amendment that talks about waste, making sure the animals are contained, etc.; it is extremely open ended. Mr. Marquise asked if there is a set of Ordinances that the Board of Selectmen could write that could handle this issue outside of Zoning. Mr. Augustine said that the Board of Selectmen have discussed the issue but they prefer to have it decided by the voters via the ballot, which is why he thinks that it has come to the Planning Board. The outcome of the vote may impact future discussions at the Board of Selectmen's meetings and they could write an Ordinance in the future. Mr. Claus said that he shares the same concerns regarding the control and New London does have controls such as for the minimum amount of space for larger animals, how far waste needs to be away from things, etc. He thinks that is reasonable to say that when people live in certain areas, they do not expect livestock. He thinks that there is more of a public nuisance with livestock than domesticated animals like dogs and cats. He does not want to get into defining what a personal pet is, however, he does think that there should be some control measures and there is not anything to stop people from having 10 chickens or three cows with this language. He is OK with putting this on the ballot, however, he does think that the Board needs to look further into this in the future. Mr. Augustine said that he thinks that people who already have animals would be grandfathered but he thinks that there should be controls on what goes on in the future to keep the problems from escalating. Chairman White asked and Mr. Claus said that New London's Ordinance lists the minimum size of a lot and certain animals that they consider livestock. He thinks that something like New London's Ordinance is good because when people move to certain Districts they do not expect livestock. Chairman White said that he thinks that New London's Ordinance is based on the State's RSA. He knows a lot of people who have chickens and animals and he thinks that a lot of people see Sunapee as a small town community and those sort of things have happened for many years. He is struggling with the concept of having an influx of people or someone's circumstances changing and if that makes what was there wrong. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Clark voted yes; Mr. Butler voted yes; Mr. Osborne voted yes; Vice Chair Jewczyn voted yes; Mr. Claus voted no; Mrs. Gottling voted yes; and Chairman White voted yes. The motion passed with six in favor and one opposed.

#### **Subdivision Regulation Amendments & Site Plan Review Regulation Amendments**

Mr. Marquise said that the Board votes on Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Amendments, they do not go to the Warrant.

#### **Subdivision Regulation Amendments: Amend Section 3.07 (A) Boundary Line Agreements/Annexations**

The current wording of this section requires that a boundary line agreement must have a review and approval from the Planning Board. This amendment will recognize that all boundary line agreements that meet the criteria of RSA 472:4 may be completed without any action of the Planning Board provided a copy of the survey is placed on file with the Town of Sunapee Planning Board.

The full text of Section 3.07 (A) as amended will be as follows: Section 3.07 (A) Boundary Line Agreements/ Minor Lot Line Adjustments In cases where the proposal is a boundary line agreement or minor lot line adjustment, which will not create additional lots, the applicant shall proceed as follows: (i)

230 Boundary Line Agreements: If the boundary line agreement meets the criteria set forth in RSA 472:4  
231 then it does not require any action of the Planning Board provided that a copy of the agreement (and  
232 any accompanying survey) is placed on file with the Town of Sunapee. (ii) Minor Lot Line Adjustments:  
233 The applicant shall apply to the Planning Board for review and approval. The application shall be  
234 considered at a regular meeting of the Planning Board. No public notice will be required for such a  
235 proposal, except the normal notifications of the Planning Board meeting. A mylar and four copies shall  
236 be submitted to the Planning Board on or before the posted deadline date of the meeting which the  
237 plan will be considered. The applicant shall pay an administrative fee of \$75.00 to the Town of Sunapee  
238 at the time of submission.

239 Mr. Marquise said that this section was updated about a year and a half ago, however, it was brought to  
240 his attention by an attorney that RSA 472:4 overrides the Board's process. The RSA essentially says that  
241 the Town does not have a right to review boundary line agreements.

242 Mr. Osborne said that the second to last line should read "...on or before the posted deadline date of  
243 the meeting at which the plan will be considered."

244 Mr. Claus asked if the administrative fee should be specific if it changes in the future. Mr. Marquise said  
245 that there are many different fees in the Subdivision Regulations and if they are updated it is typically  
246 done all at one time.

247 Mr. Osborne made a motion to approve the amendment for Section 3.07 as stated. Vice Chair Jewczyn  
248 seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Clark voted yes; Mr. Butler voted yes; Mr. Osborne  
249 voted yes; Vice Chair Jewczyn voted yes; Mr. Claus voted yes; Mrs. Gottling voted yes; and Chairman  
250 White voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 251 **Site Plan Review Regulation Amendments: Amend Article V, Section A3 Application Requirements**

252 The current wording of this section requires that a signature block be placed on the plans that include  
253 the Police & Fire Chiefs, Road Agent, Superintendent of the Water & Sewer Commission, and designee  
254 of the Conservation Commission. The section will be amended to reflect the process of Peer Review  
255 which occurs on a monthly basis. All comments are directed through that process and a final sign off is  
256 completed once the project has been constructed.

257 The full text of the amended section will be as follows: A3. Appropriate signature block for the signature  
258 of the Planning Board Chair. The various Department Heads including the Police and Fire Chiefs, Road  
259 Agent, Superintendent of the Water and Sewer Department, representative of the Conservation  
260 Commission, and Zoning Administrator shall pass along verbal or written comments to the Planning  
261 Board via the monthly Peer Review process. The final Site Plan improvements shall be signed off by all of  
262 the above Department Heads prior to occupancy per Article XII of these Regulations.

263 Mr. Marquise said that this makes it so that signature block on the Site Plan will just be for the Planning  
264 Board Chair, none of the other Department Heads. The Department Heads review will be done at the  
265 Peer Review Meeting and eventually through a signature on completion. Chairman White asked and Mr.  
266 Marquise confirmed that the Planning Board will get either verbal or written comments from the  
267 Department Heads after the Peer Review Meeting.

268 Mr. Osborne made a motion to approve the amendment to Article V, Section A3. Vice Chair Jewczyn  
269 seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Clark voted yes; Mr. Butler voted yes; Mr. Osborne  
270 voted yes; Vice Chair Jewczyn voted yes; Mr. Claus voted yes; Mrs. Gottling voted yes; and Chairman  
271 White voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

272 **CONSULTATION: PARCEL ID: 0211-0018-0000; SUBDIVISION OF 962 ROUTE 11**

273 Neill Cobb, 14 Orchard Circle, said that he is conceptually looking at a subdivision of 962 Route 11. They  
274 want to take all the buildings, the septic, and the well and put them on one lot of just over three acres.  
275 The proposal is to have the current house turned into a two-family unit, which is why they are proposing  
276 having three acres; they would like to then have the larger parcel for boat storage. The two lots would  
277 share a driveway. The lot is in the Mixed Use III District and according to Clayton Platt the subdivision  
278 would leave about 7 acres in that Zone and 6 acres in the back. The smaller 3 acre lot would all be in the  
279 Mixed Use III District.

280 Mr. Marquise asked and Mr. Cobb confirmed that they would like to keep the building with the dance  
281 studio and then turn the current house into a two-family unit which is why they have one of the lots just  
282 over three acres. Mr. Marquise asked and Mr. Cobb confirmed that they are planning on having a shared  
283 driveway for the two lots.

284 Chairman White said that as this is a consultation it is just an informal discussion and if the Board sees  
285 anything major it can be discussed but there is no vote taken nor any approval or denial implied with any  
286 of the discussion.

287 Vice Chair Jewczyn asked and Mr. Marquise said that this has not been formally applied for or noticed  
288 yet.

289 Mr. Osborne asked and Mr. Marquise confirmed that the Mixed Use III District is 600 ft deep. Mr.  
290 Osborne asked how much of the lot has to be in the Mixed Use III District. Mr. Marquise said that half of  
291 the lot has to be in the Mixed Use III District. Mr. Osborne asked and Mr. Marquise said that they will  
292 need to discuss with the Zoning Administrator if taking 3 acres out keeps the larger lot in the Mixed Use  
293 III District. Mr. Cobb said that about 7.5 acres would remain in the Mixed Use III and 6 acres in the  
294 Residential Zone in the back.

295 Mr. Marquise said that he knows that there are some wetlands to the north part of the lot and asked if  
296 the land on the back of the lot is good for development. Dan Bonin, said that they have walked the lot  
297 and the current owners have done a good job roughing in the lot; it has been stumped, the road has been  
298 roughed in, the drainage has been done, and it looks like it will be easy to have someone go in and level it  
299 off and put it to use.

300 Chairman White asked how steep the lot is going towards the back and if any of it has any steep slopes.  
301 Mr. Bonin said that towards the back-boundary line there is some elevation; the land is very usable and  
302 flat until there is an abrupt upslope.

303 Mr. Cobb asked if the subdivision would require the dance studio to come back before the Board for an  
304 updated Site Plan or if the use could continue. Mr. Marquise said that he thinks that the use could  
305 continue per the original Site Plan unless the site improvements such as the parking, well, septic, etc. are



306 removed. Mr. Bonin said that the main building is structurally great, it is just a victim of some deferred  
307 maintenance. He plans on adding a new roof and siding and making the building look nicer.

308 Mr. Marquise said that once the plan is finalized, they can formally apply for the subdivision and have a  
309 hearing and the Board can ask more specific questions.

310 Chairman White asked and Mr. Cobb said that the 3 acre lot would stay essentially the same except for  
311 the house would be a two-family dwelling unit; the large lot would be for boat storage. Chairman White  
312 said that something that the Board is always concerned with is buffering and vegetative screening and  
313 lighting; it may or may not apply in this case but that is something to keep in mind.

314 Mr. Marquise said that he attempted to roughly draw out the lots on the screen for the Board.

315 Mr. Bonin asked and Mr. Marquise said that they may want to do the subdivision and the Site Plan for the  
316 two-family unit at the same time as they relate to each other.

317 **MISCELLANEOUS**

318 Mr. Marquise said that he was putting together the meeting schedule for 2021 and there is one conflict in  
319 November but he has recommended moving it to 18<sup>th</sup> of November.

320 Mr. Marquise said that he is hopeful that the Board can start focusing on the Master Plan in 2021. He  
321 would like to do a Zoom meeting to hold a workshop.

322 **MINUTES**

323 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from February 13, 2020: The minutes were continued until the  
324 next meeting.

325 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from March 12, 2020: The minutes were continued until the  
326 next meeting.

327 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from June 11, 2020: The minutes were continued until the next  
328 meeting.

329 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from July 9, 2020: The minutes were continued until the next  
330 meeting.

331 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from August 13, 2020: The minutes were continued until the  
332 next meeting.

333 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from September 10, 2020: The minutes were continued until  
334 the next meeting.

335 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from October 8, 2020: The minutes were continued until the  
336 next meeting.

337 Changes to the Planning Board minutes from November 12, 2020: The minutes were continued until the  
338 next meeting.

339 Mr. Osborne made a motion to adjourn at 8:54 pm. Vice Chair Jewczyn seconded the motion seconded  
340 the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

341 Respectfully submitted,

342 Melissa Pollari

343 Planning Board

344 \_\_\_\_\_

345 Peter White, Chairman

346 \_\_\_\_\_

347 Joseph Butler

348 \_\_\_\_\_

349 Jeffrey Claus

350 \_\_\_\_\_

351 Donna Davis Larrow, Alternate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Jewczyn

\_\_\_\_\_  
Randy Clark

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Osborne

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne Gottling, ex-officio member