

1 **TOWN OF SUNAPEE**

2 **PLANNING BOARD**

3 **OCTOBER 14, 2021**

4 Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:11 pm

5 Roll call was taken.

6 **MEMBERS PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Peter White, Chair; Joseph Butler; Jeff Claus; Randy Clark;
7 Suzanne Gottling; Greg Swick, Alternate; Michael Marquise, Planner

8 **ALSO PRESENT IN THE MEETING ROOM:** Rodrick Finley, Emmons Neill Cobb, and Emily Cobb

9 **PRESENT VIA ZOOM:** Michael Jewczyn, Vice Chair; Richard Osborn

10 **CASES:**

11 **PARCEL ID:0238-0073-0000 &0238-0074-0000; LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT TO REVOKE/VOID ANNEXATION**
12 **FOR 42 PENACOOK PATH AND 48 PENACOOK PATH. ANNEXATION WAS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING**
13 **BOARD MAY 13, 2021. 131 TROW HILL RD. JEFFREY AND KIMBERLY STOUGHTON/ AARON AND**
14 **JESSICA WARKENTIEN.**

15 Mr. Marquis stated that this application was withdrawn via E-mail from both parties.

16 **PARCEL ID: 0211-0018-0001; SITE PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSING AN ACCESS ROAD TO TOW BOAT**
17 **STORAGE AREAS; LOWER BOAT STORAGE AREA 60' X 188', UPPER BOAT STORAGE AREA 100' X 215'.**
18 **962 NH ROUTE 11. EMMONS NEILL AND EMILY M. COBB.**

19 Chairman White requested from Mr. Marquis the status of the application in regard to its completeness.
20 Mr. Marquis stated that the application was filed in advance, the abutters have been notified,
21 notifications were posted, and fees were paid. This application falls under Article V of the Site Plan
22 Review Regulations, he has gone through the checklist and believes all the items are present for the
23 presentation. The only subject he felt would be questioned are the State permits including what may be
24 required from DOT and what might be required from Alteration of Terrain. The board may also have
25 additional questions on wetlands although they have identified them. With that said he believed the
26 application is complete.

27 Chairman White asked the Board if they had any questions on the completeness of the application.
28 There were none at this time

29 **Mr. Clark made a motion to accept the application as complete pending the discussion of State**
30 **permits. The motion was seconded by Mr. Claus. The motion passed unanimously.**

31 Rodrick Finley presented the case. Pathways Consulting prepared the plans for this application. Neill and
32 Emily Cobb were also present. The property is on Route 11 behind the dance studio, just south of the

33 Space Place. The plan being presented that shows the gravel area in grey for the storage area. The
34 parcel is 13.7 acres that wrap around the dance studio lot and has road frontage in two spots. The parcel
35 has been zoned as Mix Use III in the front portion and boat storage is a permitted use in that Zone. The
36 back portion is zoned as Rural Residential and is rather steep. As you go up the property there are some
37 additional 25% slopes on the east back side of the property. The land is vacant and cleared; when
38 surveying they had a soil surveyor on site and they did delineate the wetlands, just north of the
39 proposed storage area. There are some wetlands, however, there is a developable section on the north
40 side of the lot, potentially for a second phase of this applicant. With this proposal there will be no
41 impact to the wetlands as they will maintain the 25-foot wetland buffers, they have no impact to the
42 steep slope district, and they will be sharing a driveway, Mr. Finley is working to find out if he needs to
43 amend the application with the State about the driveway or if they will be ok with the two uses of that
44 driveway. He is checking in with District 2's Steve Turgeon.

45 They are less than an acre of total workspace in the proposal so there is no EPA permit with a Storm
46 Water Pollution Prevention Plan required. Mr. Finley said he had planned out erosion control plans that
47 will be followed during construction. They also don't need an Alteration of Terrain permit due to the size
48 of the build. He believed that there was no further State permitting other than the driveway at this time.

49 They have planned a landscape plan, there is some existing vegetation, and they are supplementing that
50 between the lower and upper lots. There are some white pines and three red oaks on the property. The
51 applicant expressed concern of the trees dropping leaves and needles into the stored boats, so he is
52 looking to remove some of those. There is a construction sequence within the plans provided, they are
53 proposing all gravel lots and storage spaces. There will not be any spot delineation on the area; they
54 were planning to squeeze in as many boats as possible.

55 Mr. Butler asked what the square footage was, and Mr. Finley stated that it was on the application
56 58,600 square feet. Mr. Finley then recognized that that is over an acre, so it may need a Storm Water
57 Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Vice Chairman Jewczyn asked if the area was all permeable, and Mr.
58 Finley replied that it was gravel access roads and parking area. There is one culvert crossing the access
59 road. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated that there are a lot of cross sections of drainage and wanted to
60 know where all that water went. Mr. Finley said it was going to be conveyed south of the project, the
61 ditches will be grass-lined, and they will flatten out near the bottom of the development and eventually
62 end up in the low contour which is in the very south-west corner of the lot and then eventually flow
63 down along Route 11. Vice Chairman Jewczyn asked, and Mr. Finley replied that he did not suggest a
64 detention pond. He continued that from the State's perspective it falls below the threshold for any State
65 permitting which would ask for some of those requirements. He didn't think that the Town had any
66 requirements for facilities that are smaller than that threshold. There was further discussion around the
67 water distribution and if they would need to have detention ponds. Mr. Finley stated that the lot
68 currently is already a cleared, gravel area but he did acknowledge that when graveling an area there will
69 be some additional water retention. Mr. Marquis suggested some smaller systems around the edges; he
70 recognized that it would be hard as they are not supposed to disturb the buffers but suggested
71 something smaller to control the water flow.

Mr. Clark asked where the 25% grade was on the lot and Mr. Finley stated it was on the eastern side of the lot in a dark grey on the plan provided. The lower storage lot is graded at 5% and the upper storage lot proposed is at a 2% grade. Mr. Marquis stated that according to the plans they are splitting the flow of the water so some of the water run off would be absorbed in the wetland area. Mr. Claus asked about the size of the culvert on Route 11 and Mr. Finley stated he was unsure of its size. Mr. Claus also asked about the slopes of how it would be delineated, and he was worried that there is actually more land that is around the 25% grade not being shown. Mr. Finley stated that with how they do their measurements, the grey area was where the 25% continual grade was. Mr. Clark asked about the retaining wall and Mr. Finley stated that they are putting that in as part of the application. They would be putting it in front of the 25% slope, then grade down to the storage area, and they are proposing it be made out of stone as well.

Vice-Chairman Jewczyn then asked about the size of trailers and vessels that will be stored in the proposed sections and if there would be any large equipment being used to help store the boats. Mr. Cobb responded that he estimated about a 25 foot by 10-foot space for each boat, but boats are getting larger so he can't state a set size for each vessel being stored. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated he's not as concerned about the size but the weight of the equipment and vessels. Mr. Cobb responded that the largest equipment they will be using is a three-quarter ton truck and some smaller farming type tractors. As far as the boats with trailers, they may be up to 10,000 to 11,000 pounds on the heavier boats, as an average they are looking at about 3,000 pounds per boat. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated that he was concerned about heavy traffic driving regularly on that gravel driveway that could impact the grade as well. Questions on the retaining wall were brought up again, Mr. Marquis stated that it looked from the plans to be 6 to 8 feet high, and he advised the applicant that they may need to meet the Zoning Board requirements for that. Mr. Clark asked for a rough estimate of how many boats this proposal could hold at maximum capacity. Mr. Cobb estimated roughly 254 boats if each boat takes about 250 square feet. They do not have a gate or fence proposed at this time. It will strictly be storage there will not be work being done on the boats in the lots. Chairman White asked and Mr. Marquis responded that they would just need a Certificate of Zoning Compliance, they would not need to go before the Zoning Board. Mr. Clark asked for a timeline if the plan is approved. Mr. Cobb stated that he has his guys on standby and they are ready to go, however, he doesn't believe that they will have the whole project done this fall.

Chairman White stated that they may need to get in contact with the State as they will be pulling out to a State road that is posted at 50 miles an hour. Mr. Finley said that he had not made that call as he was assuming that they would be entering through the existing driveways into the property in the same location that there are now and the visibility from the driveway is very good, but that he agreed that he should make that call. There was further discussion regarding if that was something the State required and that there were counts on both sides where they had and hadn't had requirements of visibility.

Chairman White asked and Mr. Cobb responded that there was no electricity at the lots so there would not be any sort of lighting, there is a proposed sign. Chairman White brought up the road front buffer required. Mr. Finley stated that the parking location is 50 feet from the road giving them plenty of space for that 25 buffer and they are proposing to grow an oak tree where there currently isn't any. The Board then discussed buffering and how they have required more buffering for these types of projects in the

past. Chairman White and Mr. Marquis stated that they had worked hard in the past to make sure that there is more of a buffer for visual purposes. Mr. Butler stated that he wasn't sure that seeing the storage space is a bad thing. Mr. Claus said that he would agree that he would advocate for more of a screening. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked, and Mr. Marquis said the buffering is a Town requirement, not a State requirement. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated that the State does have right of way requirements so they may not be able to plant the buffer in that area. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked about streetlighting and hours of operation. Mr. Cobb said that there is no proposed lighting or power to the property. Hours of operation would be 8am to 6pm seven days a week, during the winter there wouldn't be as much traffic going in and out of the lot, and they would snow blow the driveway during the winter months. It was suggested by Mr. Marquis that they don't have excess run off, based off the 10-year frequency which is not that high of a standard. That could be achieved with some small rain guards with outlet structures, but it is something for them to keep in mind. Mr. Finley agreed that could meet that requirement pretty easily. Chairman White asked if they planned to have anything other than the boats parked in the lots. Mr. Cobb responded that it would just be the trailers without their boats during the boating seasons.

It was then discussed about the screening/buffer on Route 11 again. They discussed different trees that could be used. Mr. Cobb asked that they not be White Pines or any high sap producing trees as sap is bad for the boats. He would be ok with evergreens though.

Mr. Marquis recapped what they had gone over: address the drainage for a 10-year storm, update DOT approval, resolve the question about the SWPPP, and the added screening.

Mr. Butler asked if the Board wanted to discuss the hours of operation. Chairman White responded that they may be getting additional information and asked if these items were things that they would stipulate? Mr. Marquis stated that that was up to the Board. Mr. Marquis suggested that they could continue the case to their Planning meeting next week, scheduled for October 21st. Chairman White asked the Board and the applicant if that would be feasible for the applicant's timeline, they responded that they would be ok with that.

Mr. Claus made a motion to continue Parcel ID: 0211-0018-0001; site plan review of the proposed access road in to boat storage areas until October 21, 2021. The motion was seconded by Mr. Butler. The motion passed unanimously.

2022 PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS

Chairman White stated that these are a first draft of the proposed amendments.

Amendment number 1 is on Article III, Section 3.10 on the Table of Dimensional Controls. The amending Ordinance communicates that the definition of height in a reduced side setback will be consistent with the Article XI definition of maximum structure height. The full text of the amended section will be as follows: "If a structure is allowed a reduced side or rear setback due to inadequate lot size the portion of the structure in the area of the reduced setback will have the maximum structure height of 25 feet. "

Mr. Marquis said that this goes back to the meeting they had had with the Zoning Board. There has been a lot of confusion on height definition; currently, that section just states that it will have a maximum height, but they don't really define height, so the proposal will state maximum structure height which is what is defined in the ordinance as the lowest ground level to the highest portion.

Mr. Claus added that the struggle with this is how it has been applied in the past, when talking about portion of structure within a reduced side setback is that applicants have been taking the lowest grade within the side setback rather than the lowest grade of the structure. Chairman White and Mr. Marquis both agreed that that was correct and reasonable.

Chairman White then read Amendment number 2. Michael had stricken this amendment. That is something they would look at down the line as State guidelines are changing in regard to aquifers.

Chairman White then read **Amendment number 3 which is on Article III, Section 3.40 (e), Additional Requirements. The amendment of the Ordinance is to allow for garage spaces to be counted as parking spaces for residential uses. The full text of the amended section will be as follows: from paragraph (e) "parking for one- and two-family residential units shall be as follows: one-family dwelling up to four bedrooms equals two spaces plus one half space for each additional bedroom over four; two-family dwelling up to 8 bedrooms equals four spaces plus one half space for each additional bedroom over eight. Total required spaces must be rounded up to nearest whole space. Garage spaces may be counted as parking spaces for residential uses, and three or more dwelling uses and commercial uses must meet the parking guidelines in the Site Plan Regulations."**

Mr. Marquis stated that this seems to already be in practice with the Planning Board, and that the amendment was being made to clean up the verbiage in the Ordinance to make more sense. There was a discussion within the Board of lot size and some of the properties that are local that may not be following these guidelines already.

Mr. Butler stated that he was struggling with the last sentence of this suggested amendment. Mr. Marquis replied that this was only a first draft and that the Board is more than welcome to make suggestions and edits to them. The Board will be going over these again in November.

Chairman White read **Amendment Number 4 which is on Article III, Section 3.40 (I), Additional Requirements. Amend the Ordinance to clarify how, long term, what constitutes steep slopes. The full text of the amended section will be as follows: "Option a) There shall be no construction on slopes that exceed 25%. This includes slope measure as an average across an area with an elevation change of 20 feet or more, means of establishing the degree of slope is not restricted to the boundary lines of a parcel in question. Driveways, utilities, and stairways will be exempt from this requirement provided a drainage and erosion control plan is prepared by a licensed professional engineer."** or **"Option b) There shall be no construction on slopes that exceed 25% as measured between six consecutive two-foot contour lines. Utilities and stairways will be exempt from this requirement provided a drainage and erosion control plan is prepared by a licensed professional engineer."**

185 Mr. Claus stated that he worked with Mr. Marquis and the struggle is that engineers come before the
186 Zoning Board and say it's not a consistent 25% slope in the parcel. There was a discussion on the burden
187 on the designer of measuring those contours outside of the parcel or those 20 feet. Vice-Chairman
188 Jewczyn asked about the properties that already have the buildings on the lots. Mr. Claus stated that
189 then they would need either a variance or use the grandfathered structure to build. Mr. Claus said that
190 they currently use 33% as a maximum grade for mulling a lawn, he felt that at a 25% slope, they could
191 have an engineering requirement involved, and then at a 33% slope, have that as a stop line. He found
192 that this was common among other Zoning Ordinances to do this. The Board then discussed
193 grandfathering and what constitutes as new construction. Mr. Butler asked about buildings on stilts, Mr.
194 Marquis stated that would still be considered construction.

195 Chairman White asked if having an element of horizontal distance was an important requirement. Mr.
196 Claus stated that he had gotten examples from New London and Newbury and they both have some sort
197 of horizontal measurement definition. Chairman White raised the concern that, for some applicants,
198 they need to make the Ordinance as easy as possible to understand. Mr. Claus responded that Newbury
199 has pictures that help to show the definition, and other towns' Zoning Ordinances take two pages to
200 dissect this problem. Mr. Claus said that there are other towns that also have regulations on slopes of
201 driveways which is not something Sunapee currently has. He stated that they could add a line stating
202 that driveway slope cannot exceed 15%, other towns' Zoning Ordinances are much more descriptive
203 than Sunapee's, they can be as descriptive or as simple as they would like. Mrs. Gottling asked about the
204 geometry of the horizontal vs. vertical measurements. Mr. Claus verified that with having these
205 measurements you can get a better picture of the slopes within the parcel. He stated that Option B
206 makes it easier to differentiate especially on these smaller lots. Mr. Marquis is concerned that 10 feet is
207 too short, whereas 20 feet would show a more substantial slope. He went on to say that the purpose of
208 this proposed change was to clean up the verbiage, now they are getting into the criteria of it.

209 Chairman White asked about driveway regulations in other towns. Mr. Marquis stated that a lot of
210 towns do not regulate it. Mr. Claus stated that he had found 1 or 2 that did regulate it for emergency
211 safety purposes and erosion control. Mr. Butler stated that he worries about places right on Lake Ave.
212 where garages are right on the road and that 15% slopes are reasonable. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn
213 believed that the State regulations had changed, it used to be that your driveway had to have a foot of
214 decreased elevation within the driveway so that run off wouldn't go right into the roadway.

215 Mr. Claus stated that moving forward this amendment will need some changes and editing, and they
216 may want to add something more about the driveway. They may also need to clarify how to measure
217 the slopes. Mr. Marquis added that he feels that Option A is consistent with what they have already
218 been doing but it clarifies that it is an average measurement and that it should include land outside of
219 the property boundaries. Mrs. Gottling stated that if it were not for Mr. Claus's explanation, she would
220 not understand why they would need to measure off of the property.

221 Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked that when someone is creating a subdivision, creating a lot, or re-doing an
222 existing lot what are the rules to build on those new lots, and Mr. Marquis responded that they need to

223 meet the setbacks and the septic or Town sewer requirements. Mr. Osborne asked if the whole lot is
224 over 25%, Mr. Marquis stated then it wouldn't be a buildable lot.

225 Mr. Claus brought up a project that had been approved because the engineers had used some of these
226 loopholes and although it was a good project it shouldn't have been approved. Mr. Osborne asked what
227 made it a good project and Mr. Claus stated that he felt that they focused on stormwater maintenance
228 and erosion control, but there is nothing in the Ordinance that requires that. Mr. Osborne argued that if
229 it was a buildable project then they should make the verbiage focus on erosion and erosion control
230 measures rather than making these buildable lots now not buildable with proposed slope criteria. Vice-
231 Chairman Jewczyn responded stating that it may be hard to calibrate erosion. Mr. Osborne stated that
232 the engineers should be calculating and maintaining that. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked how someone
233 could counter the proposed amendment, if someone came to the Zoning Board with a proposal to build
234 on a 30% slope, does the Board simply tell them no, or is there a way to build? Mr. Claus stated that
235 they would need a variance. It was asked by Mr. Clark what the hardship would be in that case and Mr.
236 Claus stated that if the whole lot is over 25% then that is a hardship to approve a variance, so long as it
237 meets the other 5 criteria, meaning it would need to be a good plan, including a focus on erosion
238 control. Mr. Osborn then asked if they should state in the Ordinance that they can apply for a variance.
239 Mr. Claus stated that that is automatic in that case, any Ordinance put in implies that you can apply for a
240 variance.

241 Mr. Marquis said that there is a value to this 25% slope requirement because as people subdivide it can
242 direct them on making sure the subdivisions have buildable areas and are staying away from these
243 sensitive areas. Mr. Clark stated that he felt that if they don't address this now and clean it up it will be
244 something they will have to deal with later. Mr. Marquis agreed, stating that it sets a boundary that was
245 not formally there before.

246 Chairman White said that in Sunapee they have quite a bit of lake front properties and quite a bit of
247 other properties that aren't on the water and they are trying to find a spot in the middle that addresses
248 all different conditions. Mr. Marquis stated that he has not seen many properties that would require this
249 variance, and that it really just sets a boundary for making lots down the road.

250 Mr. Claus added that there has been a shift in peoples focus, that even if the lot is not on the water,
251 there is a focus on water shed everywhere right now. He is leaning toward Option A with some verbiage
252 changes. He asked if the Board had any suggestions on the driveway slope topic. Mr. Marquis stated
253 that that would be a separate topic and would need to be added in a different section of the Ordinance.
254 It was agreed that the Board was leaning more toward Option A.

255 Chairman White read **Amendment Number 5 which is on Article IV, Section 4.10, Permitted Uses, all**
256 **Districts and Article XI, Definitions to amend the Ordinance to add Food Vendor Carts in the list of**
257 **uses with a proper definition added. The full text of the amended section will be as follows: "Article**
258 **IV, Section 4.10- Add the term Food Vendor Cart to uses by right in the Village-Commercial District.**
259 **Article XI- Definitions, add the following definition: Food Vendor Cart- A small cart usually pushed by**

260 **hand or towed to its location and is intended for the sale of food or drinks. This definition does not**
261 **include food trucks or other large vending vehicles.”**

262 Mr. Clark asked if these carts would go through a site plan review and Mr. Marquis stated that they
263 would. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked if this should be amended to say non-regulated drinks. Mr. Butler
264 stated that selling alcoholic beverages from a cart would be illegal. They would need a liquor license to
265 do that, and it couldn't be sold in the Harbor because that is a public location and there is a Town
266 Ordinance against that as well. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked what “small” meant. This turned in to a
267 discussion of including larger food trucks. Mr. Marquis stated that they had not addressed large food
268 trucks as all yet and they were just discussing push carts. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated that it's about
269 what the people of the Town would want, not what the individuals of the Board want. Chairman White
270 stated that the board had been told by the town's people for years that they wanted the harbor to be a
271 more “active” and inviting place to benefit the town. Mr. Clark reflected on the farmers markets that
272 had been held and stated that it lent itself to the Harbor and he saw the potential there for it to be more
273 then what it currently is. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn stated that the town is all about the lake so if they can
274 bring more people and more revenue into that area then that would be great. Chairman White stated
275 that it would also be great for the community having more events and getting people together, as that is
276 what builds a community.

277 Mr. Claus stated that he had heard from some of the community that it wasn't completely fair to let
278 these stands in, as the brick-and-mortar stores pay a lot of taxes and other things to keep their doors
279 open. He agreed that from an event standpoint that it is a great idea. Chairman White disagreed stating
280 that if the vendor has a good product and the market is there for that product then the consumers
281 should be allowed to have that option. Chairman White stated, “they shouldn't be forced to have a bad
282 meal just because it's all that is available in the Harbor.”

283 It was suggested by Chairman White to remove the word “small” as the statement of “hand pushed”
284 clarified that. It was then suggested to have a specific square footage. Mr. Marques stated that they
285 don't have to have this set-in stone today. Chairman White also pointed out that they are talking about
286 people who are either leasing or own a property to “park” their cart, on private property. Chairman
287 White and Mr. Marquis agreed that this would also need some tweaking on the wording.

288 Mr. Claus stated that he had a few other topics that were not formal amendments to talk about tonight.
289 The first being the buffer plantings. There are no guidelines, but should there be, for re-planting where
290 there once were plantings. Mr. Butler stated that he feels that that should be on a case-by-case basis.
291 Mr. Marquis said that the goal of the Ordinance was to stop the clear-cutting and the Ordinance says
292 nothing about re-planting. Chairman White pointed out that there are planting requirements though,
293 that state that if there are no plants it is suggested to re-plant. Mr. Claus points out that there are no
294 specifics on this and said that it may be easier for applicants if there was more of a guideline on what
295 the board is looking for. The development of the requirements currently in place for the planting is
296 because people like to feel like they are driving though the country. Mr. Claus asked, and Chairman
297 White agreed that the requirements may be too arbitrary. Chairman White stated that many applicants
298 are forced to put in more plantings, where they should want to and have to do it. Vice-Chairman

299 Jewczyn and Mr. Osborne stated that if they didn't require buffering, they may end up looking like the
300 Laconia Strip. Mr. Claus agreed. Mr. Clark stated that they don't have the specifics in the Ordinance to
301 really enforce it. Mr. Marquis stated that in the Site Plan Regulations, they do have adequacy of
302 landscaping and landscaping details. He said that when having a landscape architect present the
303 difference between a project with or without landscaping, they would hope that an applicant would see
304 the value of the landscaping.

305 Mr. Claus stated that there is definitely a different feel when there is landscaping, however, there are
306 additional costs when you have that landscaping, so he goes between being cost conscious but also
307 being a little more prescriptive. Mr. Osborne asked if they could provide screening to these properties.
308 Mr. Claus stated that that is sort of what the Ordinance says now but there is no additional information
309 on that. Chairman White said that it was a struggle as each project needs different landscaping
310 depending on the visual of the lot, some are higher, and some are lower. Vice-Chairman Jewczyn asked
311 what counts as screening, and Mr. Claus replied that they generally are talking about organic screening
312 and buffering. Mr. Butler stated that he doesn't think that they should be telling private landowners
313 what they need to put on their property but that they can point them in the right direction. Chairman
314 White stated that he tries to focus on if what they are proposing will be effective. Chairman White
315 stated that they will have further discussion on this topic.

316 Mr. Marquis stated that the investment of landscaping can and should be very desirable, and if they
317 could show that difference to the applicants it may be beneficial. Mrs. Gottling suggested a list of
318 planting and Mr. Claus stated that he could provide some examples of other Ordinances that have
319 planting regulations. Chairman White stated that the guidance would be appreciated if Mr. Claus could
320 bring something in for them to look at.

321 **Meeting minutes**

322 All minutes continued to the next meeting.

323 **Mrs. Gottling made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:48. Mr. Clark seconded the motion. The**
324 **motion was passed unanimously.**

325 Respectfully submitted,

326 Sarah Liang

327 Planning Board

328 _____

329 Peter White, Chairman

330 _____

331 Joseph Butler

Michael Jewczyn

Randy Clark

332	<hr/>	<hr/>
333	Jeffrey Claus	Richard Osborne
334	<hr/>	<hr/>
335	Suzanne Gottling, ex-officio member	Gregory Swick, Alternate
336		