



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PO Box 120, Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

www.WindhamNewHampshire.com

Approved Planning Board Minutes Wednesday, January 7, 2015 7pm @ the Community Development Department

Board Members:

Kristi St. Laurent, Chairman – Present

Alan Carpenter, Vice Chair – Present

Paul Gosselin, Member – Present

Pam Skinner, Member – Excused

Ms. Crisler, Member – Present

Ms. Nysten, Member – Present

Bruce Breton, Selectman – Excused

Joel Desilets, Selectman Alternate – Arrived at 7:15

Steve Bookless, Alternate – Excused

Jim Fricchione, Alternate – Excused

David Oliver, Alternate - Excused

Kathleen DiFruscia, Alternate – Excused

Staff:

Ms. Scott, Community Development Director

Ms. Wood, Community Planner

Chair St. Laurent called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, member attendance and a brief synopsis of the agenda.

Public Hearing Continued from 12/17/14

Case#2014-38/Minor Site Plan/The Willows (14-A-925)

A Minor Site Plan Application has been submitted for the Willows 55+ Condominium Development located on Addison & Nesmith Roads (Lot 14-A-925) in the Neighborhood Business District Zone and Wetland and Watershed Protection District. The applicant, Peter Zohdi of Edward N. Herbert Associates, on behalf of the property owner, KB Bergeron Development, LLC is proposing to amend the previously approved residential site plan to not install the 2 freestanding signs at the road entrances, as well as not installing the trails, lights, benches and a bridge, that were part of the approved Site Plan due to privacy and safety concerns.

- Mr. Shayne Gendron of Edward N Herbert & Associates spoke about removing the Willows I & II signs. Herbert's office met at TRC and talked a little bit to the fire department and he believes they were in support of that. They prefer not to see the project signs differ from the road names. They feel it could be a protrusion for 911.

There was a discussion of the Site walk which was conducted on Saturday, January 3, 2015. There were several positive comments regarding the site.

Discussion continued on density bonuses and the value of having a trail vs. not having a trail Shane read the letter and the Declaration and included it in the Planning Board packet. Page 9 lists out all construction processes.

- Ms. Crisler stated she was on the Planning Board when this project was approved in 2007. She stated this is not just a condo association. It was to provide specific amenities to seniors, which were not provided at other elderly housing developments. Walking trails are a passive type of recreation.

She would like to see the access to the Waterhouse Store. She feels they should provide onsite ways to get around without having to venture out on highways. Mr. Gendron was not able to provide info regarding the Planning Board Minutes.

- Mr. Carpenter understands the points, but stated since this is a shared resource the people that come in to purchase have the right to the walking trails and benches. He understands that the trails were probably not the best planned out. All the amenities are not built. The residents have a deeded right.
- Ms. Nysten states she is concerned that quite a few items have already been removed from the original approval.
- Mr. Gendron stated that zero units requested any type of handicap accessibility. All units were standard and could be changed at a later date.
- Mr. Desilets' sole concern is that a resident may expect these amenities. He asked if adding some sort of vegetation was discussed during the site walk. Mr. Gendron stated most of the property was a field and there was no discussion to add additional screening.
- Ms. Crisler stated she does not understand why folks don't want the trails. She asked if the trails could be moved. She feels they should consider keeping the one trail that would connect to the Waterhouse Store.
- Chair St. Laurent agrees with Ms. Crisler regarding keeping the trail that would connect to the Waterhouse store.
- Mr. Gosselin feels the connection to Waterhouse does have merit. He is in support of making the connection to the Waterhouse store.
- Mr. Desilets feels the same and values the concerns. He would not like folks walking in his backyard. He likes the distances as it appears.

Chair opens to the public:

- Mike Morin – President of the Willow's Condo Association

Most of the residents do not want the intrusion of folks walking the trails. He had never considered the Waterhouse trail. Personally he doesn't see it as a necessity. However, if any improvements were to be made he would suggest improvements to the current trail. The bridge may be a danger; there is no support or handrails. He stated they would pay for the benches as a condo association. It would be nice to have some sort of a conclusion to cobblestone for a motorized wheelchair. Their main concern is to upgrade the trail.

- Mr. Carpenter referenced the morning traffic in the summer to Howie Glen's from Ministerial Road. He feels if they had access to the trail it may be used more than one thinks. It may be something more substantial down the road since it is for sale. He agrees the walking trail is deficient. Mr. Carpenter asked what type of upgrades to the trail would be made. Mr. Morin stated paved would be best, crushed stone is a quicker fix and may not be the best.
- Ms. Crisler questioned paved vs. unpaved. If you don't pave it will wash out? If you have a motorized chair you really need a good hard surface.

- Per Mr. Morin, it would be an annual expense to the condo association if not paved. He stated he doesn't see a lot of wash out happening.
- Ms. Crisler mentioned the grass seed is down and will not sprout during these temperatures. Work will need to be done in the spring. The sonar tubes need to be cared for properly. A handrail should be installed.
- Debra Fleig of 12 Nesmith Road feels there is merit with the trail going to the Waterhouse store. There is also interest in taking all of the trails out.
- Mr. Carpenter appreciates Mr. Desilets' reference to using vegetation or screens, but feels it would be a burden on the contractor. He suggests retaining the existing trail and as per planning to build the trail to the Waterhouse Store and to pave what is there and also pave the new trail. The cost that would incur is far less than building out the other trails and lighting. Ken Bergeron stated the cost would be 50/50. Mr. Carpenter would like handrails and suggests a swing gate at the entrance with no trespassing signs, which will keep some of the wanderers out. Mr. Bergeron plans on adding benches in the spring, which were removed in 2010. Benches on the existing trail and the connection from the parking lot to the Waterhouse store.
- Mr. Desilets noted that there appears to be a large number of benches which may end up to be quite a bit less. 7 benches down to 2. Disagrees with Mr. Carpenter in regards to the swing gate. He feels the option should be proposed to the residents.
- Ms. Crisler asked if the roads were private. Per Ms. Scott they are private. Ms. Crisler agrees with Mr. Carpenter.
- Mr. Gendron cautioned the Planning Board and doesn't feel the Board has the right to pave on the Waterhouse Store property. Mr. Carpenter would like to know if we could ask them.
- Mr. Gosselin stated that is up to the Waterhouse Store owner and the developer Mr. Bergeron.
- Mr. Carpenter - condition of approval, the path would go and if per the conversation it is not a go it gives some leeway and feels they may want the customers.
- Chair St. Laurent to Mr. Bergeron if you pave to the property line pave right to the bridge. The bridge does not exist today, but he would pave right to it. Per Mr. Bergeron, Gary owns it now and Kevin made the agreement with Kevin.
- Mr. Bergeron feels both trails should be paved. Stating there is work to be done in the spring.
- Mr. Carpenter feels with the low traffic it will stand for decades.

Chair closes to the public

Mr. Carpenter motioned to once again modify the previous approval. Mr. Gosselin seconded. The minor site plan is as follows:

1. The two development signs at the entrances to the road can be removed.
 2. Existing Trail between Nesmith Road and Addison Road
 - a. Trail is to be paved
 - b. Lights and benches are to be installed, as shown on the previously approved site plan
 - c. Wooden foot bridge is to have handrails
 3. Proposed Trail between Nesmith Road and Waterhouse Country Store parcel
 - a. Trail is to be paved to the footbridge
 - b. Trail is to continue onto Waterhouse Country Store parcel to the existing parking lot
 - c. Lights and benches are to be installed, as shown on the previously approved site plan
 - d. Wood foot bridge is to have handrails
 4. All other trails, lights and benches shown on the previously approved site plan are to be removed.
- To install a new walking path between the North Side of the parking lot and Waterhouse as shown on the original plan and install a bridge. All trails and existing trails will be paved. All bridges will have handrails. The board will remove the requirement to install the Willow's I and II signs. Removing the lights, additional trails and lights other than the additional Waterhouse connection. Per Mr. Gosselin, get rid of the two back yard trails that residents do not want.

Vote: 6-0

Public Safety Impact Fee Methodology Public Hearing

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held to adopt "Public Safety Impact Fees: Review and Update 2013" dated December 11, 2014 per Section 715.6 of the Zoning Ordinance

Per Ms. Scott this is the Public Hearing and the Planning Board is adopting the entire Fee Schedule.

Per Ms. Scott, Mr. Mayberry as per the request of the workshop revised and updated the data per the Planning Boards request. He updated the data and the population information. Pages 3 and page 4 were updated. He also updated the Section E addendum which is on Page 18 of document. Per Ms. Scott, the entire document was posted at the website and the front counter. This was also sent to Attorney Campbell, Ms. Paul, Mr. Sullivan and Chief Lewis and Chief McPherson.

Ms. Crisler makes a motion to open the impact fees methodology. Mr. Gosselin seconded the motion. Vote: 6-0.

- Ms. Crisler had a question that refers to apartments for the elderly on page 6.2. Page 2. This needs to be changed to 55 plus.
-
- Per Ms. Scott the Planning Board is adopting the fee schedule listed in Page E in the appendix so that it is clear.
- Mr. Carpenter questioned fees for single family, detached, duplex per unit and single family. This is the fee for every unit.
- Ms. Nysten – When Mr. Mayberry was here the Board was asking the cost of building vs. the capital equipment and it appears on page 6 it shows what the percentages are. Anything approved prior to today that would be what the break down would be. If fees are to be returned it would be based on these percentages. Per Ms. Scott she provided this breakdown to the Ms. Dana Call and Mr. Sullivan. Administration is in charge of any refunds.

- Mr. Desilets' concerns are centered around the population figures that were used; everything down to the base year space deficiencies down to the values in the tables in the Fee Schedules. In the table for the fee schedules for table 18 and going forward. If he uses the same methodology and if the town grows at 1% compounded annually. Essential states there facilities would need to be expanded. The CIP does not state we need a police station in 3 years. Mr. Desilets is not comfortable moving forward with this as is.
- Chair St. Laurent asked what other impact would this have? Would it give us more time before the impact formula methodology? Who would say that we would need to build a new station?
- Mr. Desilets' asked what value on page 19 table 18. The population that can be supported with the building expansion is 17,020 residents. When this number was chosen did the police chief or his staff consider growth? Today we are already at 16,315 residents we would reach this within a year or two at a 1% compounded rate. Mr. Desilets has concerns about the table and population.
- Per Ms. Scott it is based on ratio per officers per population. The Chief agrees with the ratio. It is not in the CIP because the voters continue to turn it down. This has nothing to do with the Impact Fee methodology. Whether the Chief or the Voters move something forward has nothing to do with this methodology.
- Chair St. Laurent references the table 18 on Page 19. Is that their estimate or based on census? Ms. Scott, they do the base year on census, state population growth, building permit issuance in each town. This is updated each year.
- Mr. Carpenter - Not relevant if the numbers are entirely accurate it matters if we use the same measuring stick.
- Mr. Desilets makes a point that the impact fees are proportional to growth. It could be neglectable. It could be \$50, it could be \$100.

The Chair opened the hearing to the public and hearing none the public portion was closed.

- Ms. Nysten wanted to clarify a question from a previous meeting in the beginning of December. Page 18. Two family units is referring to permits and it says units authorized by permit. Is it 6 units authorized or 6 buildings authorized. Ms. Scott will need to go back to 2009, 10, 11 and 12 to view permits. Ms. Nysten believes this is also referenced in the master plan. 6 duplex (12 units) or 6 units that are in duplexes which is 3 buildings. Ms. Scott will look into this and get back to the Planning Board.
- Mr. Desilets did a quick calculation. The fire department states there existing facility can serve 12,598 people. When looking at the credit calculation it is a 72.9 % increase of the existing space deficiency credit. Currently it is .15 and it would increase to .26 per credit.
- Chair St. Laurent page 21 table 21 the numbers that Mr. Desilets was speaking about the floor area of facilities is 16,000 and the station space per capita. Is this a standard number? Ms. Scott stated yes this was an update of 2008. Both Chiefs have looked at the numbers and agree with the numbers.
- Mr. Desilets did a quick calculation for both the fire and police station the deficiency credit caused by the delta is \$50 each. There is about \$100 and they are not being credited. Ms. Scott clarifies and states that he is referring about the credit. The way this is structured that they are not being credited.
- Chair St. Laurent stated that a reliable yardstick would be to look at the births, the vehicle registrations, and we need to come up with an accurate measurement. The actual number and the OEP are estimates.

- Mr. Desilets stated that these numbers are used by our Police and Fire Department. It could be negligible and would like to highlight the concern that this delta may not make the impact fee too low, but too high.
- Chair St. Laurent, stated that the fee for a single family detached house would be \$553 for police and \$907 for fire for a total of \$1,460.
- Ms. Scott stated this is the impact fee. \$1,460.

Ms. Crisler would like to motion that we adopt the Public Safety impact fee Methodology as presented tonight with one correction. Where is states apartment for the elderly it states 55 instead of 62. Mr. Carpenter seconds on the motion.

6-0 in favor.

- Chair St. Laurent – added an item to the Agenda to review material provided by Attorney Campbell on Housing for Older Persons. 10 minute recess.
- Chair St. Laurent stated it was additional comment around what happens when you expand the sizing and clearing and impacting the land. Ms. Crisler understands the reasoning and felt she thought it was done and completed. She feels it should have been left alone.
- Chair St. Laurent we have the language and it is posted on the website. As scheduled we would discuss this next week. The board needs to decide do we feel comfortable as the hearing next week or we could propose a new hearing for January 21, 2015. The hearing for January 14, 2015 would be cancelled. Or we could pull it work on it next year.
- Mr. Carpenter- Ms. Wood as scheduled we made changes to the document on the 14th. No major changes that would change the intent. We could not make any subsequent changes next week. If we do not do anything tonight. Do we put this on the warrant or not? Mr. Carpenter called staff this afternoon, when you're doing zoning and make impulse decisions and maybe they weren't done correctly. The Planning Board made an error late last wed night. 7.7.2

610.7.10 (page 3) you will find it our existing ordinance today 100% need to be adaptable.

If you make 30% density bonus. How can we revisit the issue? We could address it tonight and post as a public hearing and discuss it on the January 21, 2015.

Does not take it lightly that we are discussing something that was not on the agenda.

- Ms. Crisler - She would like to give everyone a 30% density bonus. 610.7 paragraph 3 is not clear at all. Ought to correct everything tonight and repost for hearing.
- Mr. Gosselin, we as the board took a requirement and gave a freebie. Unless there are specific points to discuss for the 100th time.
- Ms. Crisler feels they have made substantial improvements and would be disappointed if it got posted until next year.

- Mr. Desilets – rewording to say a setback to any building should be a minimum of 50ft.

It is one parcel and they share the land in common.

Discussions around the buildings and property lines.

- Mr. Gosselin, to make it simpler if we go with what Mr. Carpenter was talking about (25” wide vegetative buffer) with a minimum with of 50 feet.
- Ms. Crisler also wants 50 feet of pavement. The buffer should not include the driveway.

Discussions around buffer and setbacks.

- Mr. Carpenter 610.1.75 – the building and or pavements shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet.
- Mr. Desilets’ concerned that this has not been discussed. Is this more astringent?
- Mr. Carpenter - Recap bottom of page 2 add building and or pavement-accepting access drives. Top of page 3 the building set back shall include vegetative buffer with a minimum 50 feet.
- Ms. Crisler would like to go back to the 35 feet. Should stick to what is already there. We really need more consideration before we change something. Section (page 2) sentence above last sentence.

Discussions around open space development based on type of housing that we want to cluster. What is the fire department requirement? 15 feet with sprinklers.

- Ms. Crisler - Lets not fix it until we spend more time on it.
- Mr. Carpenter reading regulations. He would like comments from fire chief.
- Ms. Crisler feels this does not need to be discussed right now.

Discussions are around total feet.

- Ms. Crisler - Elderly smoke...concerned around excessive fire. Not the typical homeowner. NFPA requirements as presented less stringent. Firewalls come in to play.
- Chair St. Laurent mentioned 30 feet.
- Mr. Desilets doesn’t like the 35 foot value.

Suggested making it 30 feet for everything and keep it simple. Mr. Carpenter agreed with Mr. Desilets point. Leave it at 30 and take it up.

NFPA has legitimate reasons they choose the number of feet.

- Chair St. Laurent – the language we don’t need to include the more than one building on the lot.

Eliminate of the single family, duplex

- Mr. Carpenter – what do we do about adaptability?
- Mr. Desilets stated a lot of effort did not go into the definition. Bernie's states to change the language to concealed.
- Chair St. Laurent - Middle of Page 4 a bonus of 15% if they had at least 50% of total units. Discussions around ramp and garage. Accessibility feature, turnkey may take a little longer to sell the unit. 50% is a lot. If we had a smaller percentage of turnkey. Maybe 10 or 15% you got the 30% bonus.
- Mr. Carpenter suggests we have two developers and one engineer suggestions before we continue.

Open to public: Buffer, separation and accessibility. Any comments?

- Mr. Gendron

Separation – Pelham's setback it 20 feet and it's doable, viable.

Vegetative buffer – makes sense. 25 feet.

Accessibility – there needs to be some attainability.

- Mr. Carpenter – if we delete 6.10 and left the language (strike the existing sentence all units need to be adaptable) and lower the % of the bonus.
- Ms. Crisler disagrees with Mr. Carpenter. The needs of the senior citizens are the ability to make it handicap accessible. We should not allow workarounds for our zoning. Should leave the adaptability.
- Mr. Carpenter, make all adaptable
- Ms. Nysten – ramp in a garage that does not block another stall. Mr. Carpenter - Most are one car garage.
- Mr. Desilets is concerned that they will all be adaptable, but may not be accessible
- Mr. Gosselin what is the risk/reward for the developer?
- Mr. Doug Roberts in the audience stated the density bonus was not to exceed 15% and it was if you construct and provide adaptability.
- Mr. Carpenter would like to know how many took advantage of the bonus.
- Mr. Gosselin - Streamline how the formula works to make it reasonable on how to apply.
Accessible vs. adaptable. What is the cost?
- Mr. Morris was disappointed that Mr. Carpenter had this conversation with Attorney Campbell. He understands the entire concept. 30% is way too high.
- Mr. Desilets stated 5 and 20 percent is a good recommendation.

- Mr. Morris recommend taking out the bonus for adaptability. It's a giveaway. Everyone will give away everything to get the bonus. The issue is it would have gone in if this meeting did not happen tonight.
- Mr. Bergeron stated accessibility vs. adaptability is not really a lot of money. When you make them accessible. For the majority of the people there is not really any resale value. He agrees with Mr. Morris. The distance of 20' is doable. 35' is too excessive. What you think makes sense now, will not make sense in 10-20 years.
- Mr. J.R. Gauthier hopes to be in front of the board with one of these communities. Doesn't matter to him if he builds 5 more feet of street. In order to give people the developers some latitude. The particular development is one story two car garage and he would put the ramp in between the two bays. He feels the bonus is a good idea even if they don't build them. If you need to sprinkle every unit 20 feet apart. He would like to cluster the units in small clusters with a lot of open space. Windham is very exclusive as far as soil type and bedrooms. Whether it is 5, 10 or 20%. 65 acres looking at 25 units. If you're trying to accommodate the elderly. If you want 50 feet of spacing what do you really want for your community? If you make it too difficult he would build single family homes that would put more children in the school district. Per the state of NH regulations he could put 50 units.
- Mr. Doug Roberts – it's no secret that he, living on Canterbury Road, abuts Mr. Gauthier's land. 15 feet for sprinklers. Huge water problems on Canterbury and Bramley.

Planning Board stated this is not a conversation for tonight.

- Mr. Desilets – in the coming years we should look at studying further and reconsidered. We are at the 30 feet. As for the accessibility he would propose 6.10.7.2.2 page 4.
- Ms. Nysten comments barrier free (same paragraph) crossed out barrier. We need to leave this STRUCK. There were some discussions over what barrier free is. Page 1 is there a typo? It should be 21 not 18. Both the words and the numbers needs to be changed.
- Mr. Desilets stated it is in the definition section that has been superseded.
- Mr. Morris stated it was brought up last week. This is the only multifamily development in residential A. Why? Mr. Morris feels this is an important point. Wayne feels to do justice you should have WFH included in Residential A as well.
- Mr. Gosselin stated we never discussed Residential A, B, in terms in different zoning and we could not achieve that tonight. That brings up a good question re: WFH.
- Mr. Doug Roberts – when they were passing work force housing they looked at the fundamental reason on why we have zoning in place. Mr. Roberts feels it is an oversight. It was defined in the original Windham zoning ordinance. A is called out as single, b is...
- Mr. Gosselin continued discussions around Residential A zoning and conflicts.
- Ms. Crisler agrees this is not the type of development for Residential A
- Mr. Gendron questioned how many changes the Planning Board was going to make and noted that this was not on the agenda. These are substantial changes that will not be made in public.

- Mr. Carpenter – discussion are Residential A and does not feel comfortable making a decision.
- Mr. Carpenter would like to make a motion to move the document tonight to Public Hearing on the January 21, 2015. Mr. Carpenter would like this in a separate article.
- Chair St. Laurent stated WFH is required by the state to make sure we provide adequate opportunity. There is not a requirement for elderly housing. Chair St. Laurent would be open to have this discussion in 2016.
- Mr. Desilets – concerned with the Chair and stated this will take a considerable amount of time and we need to analyze this.
- Mr. Morris – two points 62 and older. As far as the workshop tonight according to Attorney Campbell you can make any changes tonight. Luckily Mr. Roberts called him otherwise he would not know about the meeting. 55 and older do not need specialized housing...do away with it or go back to 62.
- Ms. Nysten is concerned that this was not advertised. Maybe do something separate like Mr. Carpenter suggested.

This needs to go on the ballot.

- Mr. Gosselin – from a step one stand point. The items we addressed tonight and there are a couple of items that were glaring mistakes. Outside of those two. The more we drift into other territories we could be crossing lines or peoples perspective.

Closed to the public

Mr. Carpenter made a motion to move housing to older persons to Public Hearing on January 21, 2015 with the following amendments to the last published document: (Amendments in **Bold)**

*Section 610.2.4 at the end of the word design **and/or** Barrier Free Design Code...*

610.2.4 Handicapped Accessible: Meeting the design requirements of the Federal ADA Standards for Accessible Design **and/or** “Barrier-Free Design Code for the State of New Hampshire”.

*610.2.6 Change the word concentrated to **concealed**.*

610.2.6 Adaptable: A adaptable dwelling unit has all the accessible features that a fixed accessible unit has but allows some items to be omitted or **concealed** until needed so the dwelling units can look the same as others and be better matched to individual needs when occupied.

610.4 Under bullet # 1 an adult over the age 18 and reinsert 21 numbers and words

610.4 Occupancy of each unit shall be restricted to persons fifty-five (55) years and older, with the following exceptions:

1. An adult over the age of **twenty one (21)**, if their presence is required to provide medical care to a resident aged fifty-five (55) or older;
2. Employees of the housing for older persons project (and family members living in the same unit) who are under fifty (55) years of age, provided the employees perform substantial duties related to the management or maintenance of the project’s facilities.

*6.10.7.1.4 Shall now read where there will be more than one building on a lot building should have a min of separation of **thirty feet (30')**, and the rest of the paragraph continues as written.*

610.7.1.4 Where there will be more than one (1) building on a lot, buildings shall have a minimum horizontal separation of **thirty feet (30')**, subject to applicable NFPA requirements. The Planning Board may require a greater separation where topography, or other unique characteristics of the site or the development will affect the use of emergency equipment between buildings;

*6.10.7.1.5 Shall read building **and or pavement, accepting access drives**, continues shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet.*

610.7.1.5 Buildings **and/or pavement, accepting access drives**, shall be set back a minimum of fifty (50) feet from the nearest lot line;

6.10.7.1.5.1 The building set back shall include a min of 25-foot vegetated buffer. Continue 4 structures containing and include a vegetative buffer with a min width of 50 feet.

610.7.1.5.1 The building setback shall include a minimum 25-foot wide vegetated buffer. For structures containing more than four (4) residential units, the building setback shall be 100 feet and include a vegetative buffer with a minimum width of 50-foot

610.7.2.2. The Planning Board may award a bonus of 20% of the equiv-based density to an applicant proposing to construct and provide a minimum of 5% as accessible, in compliance of 610.2.4

610.7.2.2 Provision of Barrier-Free, Handicapped Accessible Design Features: The Planning Board may award a density bonus not to exceed **twenty percent (20%)** of the **equivalent Base Density to an Applicant proposing to construct and provide a minimum of five percent (5%)** “Accessible” units in compliance with Section 610.2.4 of this ordinance, and incorporate additional significant and substantial barrier-free features and elements throughout the site’s entire design. In approving such an award, the Planning Board shall consider the extent to which the location and nature of the barrier-free features contribute to and enhance the overall liability of the proposed development for older persons with limited mobility or other physical limitations;

The ordinance will be renumbered per the Planning Boards input and Attorneys Campbell which was on January 5, 2015

Mr. Gosselin seconded the motion. Vote: 6-0

The Public Hearing has been cancelled for January 14, 2015 and rescheduled for January 21, 2015.

Mr. Carpenter motioned to adjourn at 10:48pm, seconded by Mr. Gosselin. Motion passed. Vote 6-0.

These minutes respectfully submitted by Ms. Suech, Planning Assistant, Interim Minute Taker