



Town of Plaistow, NH
Office of the Planning Board
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH 03865

Approved as Amended July 15, 2020.
See notes on Pages 8 and 14

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 17, 2020

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:37 PM

The Plaistow Planning Board, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, is authorized to meet electronically, and these reasons shall be reflected in the minutes. Notice of this electronic meeting was sent to all abutters and published in the Eagle Tribune Newspaper.

The Plaistow Planning Board is utilizing the GoToWebinar program of the GoToMeeting platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during the meeting through the GoToWebinar program, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary participate in this meeting. The link to access this meeting was provided on the Town's website, with the notice where to email with. It is strongly suggested that you test the link in advance of the meeting to make sure you are able to access it. Please report any issues to dvoss@plaistow.com.

There is a "raise your hand" feature of the program that will allow attendees to participate in the discussion. There is also a Q&A box for the public to type questions during the meeting. The Public can also send emails with questions or concerns prior to and during the meeting to dvoss@plaistow.com. Please note: all questions and concerns typed into the Q & A box or sent via email will be read aloud to become part of the public record. The meeting will also be live on Plaistow Access Cable - Channel 17 and will be livestreaming on the Town's website.

ROLL CALL: Tim Moore, *Vice Chair Elect – Remote access, no one else present*
James Peck, *Chair Elect – Present at Town Hall*
Laurie Milette – *Present at Town Hall*
Karen Robinson – *Present at Town Hall*
Francine Hart, *Selectman's Rep – Remote access, no one else present*
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate – Present at Town Hall*
Greg Taillon, *Selectman's Rep Alternate – Remote access, no one else present*

Also present: John Cashell, *Planning Director – Present at Town Hall*; Dee Voss, *Planning Department Administrative Assistant, Remote access, no one else present*; Attorney Charles Cleary, Wadleigh, Starr & Peters, PLLC, *Planning Board Legal Counsel, Remote access, no one else present*; Steven Keach, Keach-Nordstrom Associates, *Planning Board Review Engineer, Remote access, no one else present*.

Agenda Item 2: Reorganization – Election of Officers and Committee Assignments

Nominations for Planning Board Chair:

★ L. Milette nominated J. Peck for Planning Board Chair. K. Robinson second the nomination.

T. Moore asked if there were any additional nominations, there were none.

Discussion:

F. Hart noted that the Planning Board Chair is also the chair of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee. It was also noted that another member of the Planning Board can be designated as the chair of the CIP. She expressed concern that J. Peck has never served on the CIP committee and suggested that become involved with that committee to learn more about that process.

J. Peck responded that it was his understanding that he could designate someone else from the Planning Board to be the chair of the CIP. He added that he was hoping that T. Moore would be willing to carry on in that capacity. T. Moore agreed that he would.

F. Hart asked if J. Peck would at least be a member of the CIP Committee.

J. Peck offered that while he had limited experience with municipal budgeting he did have experience with corporate budgeting and would agree to sit on the CIP Committee.

There was no further discussion on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: T. Moore – Jim Peck; J. Peck – Jim Peck; L. Milette – Jim Peck; K. Robinson – Jim Peck; F. Hart – Jim Peck

T. Moore passed the meeting to J. Peck

J. Peck thanked the Board of their nomination and noted his experience and that he looked forward to learning more and working with staff in the “new normal.”

Nominations for Planning Board Vice Chair

★ L. Milette nominated T. Moore for Planning Board Chair. K. Robinson second the nomination.

Discussion:

T. Moore offered that he was hoping that someone else would be willing to step up to the position.

J. Peck noted that F. Hart could not be chair, the K. Robinson was newly elected and L. Milette didn't want the position

J. Cashell offered that T. Moore's experience and long presence on the Board made him the only real nominee.

T. Moore agreed to accept the nomination.

There were no additional nominations or discussion

Roll Call Vote: J. Peck - Tim Moore; L. Milette – Tim Moore; T. Moore – Tim Moore; K. Robinson – Tim Moore; F. Hart – Tim Moore.

Committee Assignments

Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC)

It was noted that the current RPC reps are Tim Moore and Julian Kiszka, with Greg Taillon as the alternate. J. Kiszka is still within his term, T. Moore's term expires 2020 and the paperwork for G. Taillon was never processed.

★ K. Robinson moved, second by L. Milette to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that Tim Moore be reappointed as a representative to RPC and Greg Taillon as an alternate, both for four-year terms.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll call vote: J. Peck – yes; T. Moore – yes; L. Milette – yes; K. Robinson – yes; F. Hart – yes. 5-0-0 U/A.

F. Hart noted that she would bring the nominations to the Board of Selectmen at their July 13, 2020 meeting.

It was noted that there was no need to make an appointment to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) as that would be handled at an RPC meeting.

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Committee

J. Peck designated the T. Moore would be the chair of the CIP committee. He added that he would like to be the second member and asked G. Adams to continue on as the alternate.

★ K. Robinson moved, second by L. Milette to appoint T. Moore, as chair, J. Peck and a member and G. Adams as an alternate, to the CIP committee.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll call vote: J. Peck – yes; T. Moore – yes; L. Milette – yes; K. Robinson – yes; F. Hart – yes. 5-0-0 U/A.

Agenda Item 3: Meeting Minutes from March 4, 2020

★ *L. Milette moved, second by F. Hart to approve the minutes from March 4, 2020.*

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll call vote: J. Peck – yes; T. Moore – yes; L. Milette – yes; K. Robinson – abstained; F. Hart – yes. 4-0-1 U/A.

Agenda Item 4: Public Hearing(s):

PB 20-03: The completeness of an application from Exeter Med Real, Inc. The plan proposes an amendment to the site plan that would alter the business hours of operation from 7:00AM-7:00PM, Monday through Sunday to 6:30AM-8:00PM, Monday through Sunday. The amended site plan will also show the field changes made during construction. The property is located at 127 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 29, Lot 58 in the Commercial 1 District. The applicant is the property owner of record. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the Public Hearing.

Chris Raymond, The Engineering Corp (TC) and Phil Chaput, Exeter Med Real, were both present for the application by remote access.

★ *J. Peck opened the public hearing*

C. Raymond offered the following

- Conditional site plan approval was granted in December of 2018
- Conditions were met, the plan was recorded and construction started in June of 2019
- The application before the Board this meeting was to request a change in the hours of operation from 7:00AM – 7:00PM to 6:30AM – 8:00PM
- The amended site plan includes field changes that were made during the construction of the project
 - Dumpster Pad
 - Relocation of the generator and transformer further away from Jesse George Road
 - Future connections for municipal potable water

F. Hart asked what was the reason for the 6:30AM request.

C. Raymond offered that it was to offer before work appointments to a handful of physical therapy clients.

F. Hart asked if the urgent care would be open that early. It was confirmed that it would not, those hours would be 8:00AM to 8:00PM.

L. Milette noted that it was not disclosed during the original site plan review that there would be an urgent care. She recalled that the hours of operation were of concern to the abutters at that time.

There was additional discussion about the hours of operation. The following concerns were expressed by the Board:

- Noise created by ambulance service to the site
- Added traffic to the site that would increase disturbance to the abutters
- If extended hours are approved other offices, other than the just physical therapy, would start opening at the earlier hour and staying open later without the approval of the Board
- The urgent care might evolve into opening at 6:30AM
- Does the Fire Chief have any concerns about the increase in hours
 - Potential for interference with departmental shift changes
 - Additional stress on Fire Department resources

P. Chaput offered the following responses:

- Ambulances are not common to the urgent care. Patients are not brought to urgent care by ambulance. Services are walk-in, but if a patient requires a higher level of care, then an ambulance could potentially be called by the urgent care to transport to a hospital
- Sirens can be controlled
- The hours of operation for the urgent care are 8:00AM to 8:00PM and can be noted on the site plan that way to lock it in
- The 6:30AM requested start time would be for physical therapy patients only
- They would be happy to consult with the Fire Chief regarding protocols or concerns
- They did not have the urgent care tenant at the time of the initial plan review

There was additional discussion about the urgent care and the requested change in hours. There was a consensus that the urgent care was an asset to the community; the concerns were about the lack of disclosure during the review process and the extended hours, particularly the earlier start time, disrupting the abutters. The Board also wanted to evaluate, by getting input from the Fire Chief that the additional hours would not strain those services. It was noted that Plaistow Fire would be the first responders for any calls to the urgent care and members stressed concerns that extended hours not be an additional financial or personnel stress on the Town's resources.

T. Moore offered that if someone was in need of ambulance services it wouldn't be much different if they received those services from their home or the urgent care. He agreed it would be helpful to have input from the Fire Chief.

C. Raymond offered that there could be a medical emergency anywhere in town that the fire department would need to respond to. He added that those who are transported from the urgent care will already have a treatment started prior to being sent to the hospital.

J. Peck suggested that the meeting be continued to July 15 in order to get input from the Fire Chief.

C. Raymond noted that there had already been so many delays with the project and he was concerned about additional delays to the opening of the facility.

J. Cashell noted that urgent care facilities are becoming more common in many communities as they are more user-friendly and a good financial option for consumers. He said that it was regrettable that this urgent care had not been brought up during the original review, but he was walking back on his original concerns now after understanding that people who use the urgent care are not doing so for life-threatening circumstances, which would need an ambulance whether from home or an urgent care.

There was additional discussion regarding the hours of operation specific to the urgent care.

C. Raymond suggested that the hours for the urgent care could be specifically broken out separately on the site plan.

J. Peck asked if there were any additional question or concerns of the Board, there were none. He asked if there were any abutters who wished to speak on the matter. There were no questions posed, no emails to present and no "raised hands" for question.

The public hearing was closed.

★ K. Robinson moved, second by F. Hart, to approve the application to amend the site plan for the hours of operation at 127 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 29, Lot 58 with the following conditions:

- Hours of Operation for the Urgent Care shall be 7:00AM to 8:00PM***
- The Lot designation in the plan's title block be changed to reflect Lot 58***
- The Title Block designated as "Issued for" be updated to read "Amended Site Plan Hours of Operation and Construction Field Changes"***
- Remove the word "proposed" from the project title***
- A favorable letter of response regarding the proposed hours from the Fire Department must be submitted to the Planning Department***

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: *J. Peck - yes; T. Moore - yes; L. Milette - yes; K. Robinson - yes; F. Hart – yes. 5-0-0 U/A.*

PB 20-04: For consideration of the Superior Court Order dated May 18, 2020, pertaining to the matter Richard and Sanaz Anthony vs. Town of Plaistow Planning Board, as it relates to any intended Planning Board involvement under Stipulations #3 and #7 listed in the Planning Board’s conditional approval dated June 19, 2019. The conditionally-approved site plan is related to the property located at 143 and 145A Plaistow Road, Tax Map 30, Lots 73 and 72. Milton Real Properties of Massachusetts (ProQuip).

★ *J. Peck opened the public hearing*

J. Peck noted that this public hearing was not to re-review the ProQuip application, but to answer the Court’s question regarding conditions #3 and #7 of the June 19, 2019 conditional approval.

There was discussion as to who would be the voting members for this matter. Since the time of the original site plan review of this project, a new member had been elected to the Board.

C. Cleary offered that there was no legal reason that the newly-elected member couldn’t vote on the matter, if they could certify that they had sufficiently reviewed the available records. He added that it would be his recommendation that the since the original voting members where all available at this meeting, and the judge’s questions were in reference the Board’s intentions at that time, it would make sense that those members vote, as they would each know their intent.

C. Cleary explained that the Court is seeking to understand if it was the Board’s intention that conditions #3 and #7 were conditions requiring additional action of the Planning Board once met, or the more ministerial in nature.

Scott Hogan, Attorney for Richard and Sanaz Anthony, plaintiffs in the Anthony v. Planning Board matter, offered that boards frequently have turnover and if the newly-elected member felt comfortable and informed enough to vote on the matter they should be allowed to.

J. Peck offered that he didn’t have any problem telling the Court the Board’s intentions (on conditions #3 and #7), noting that K. Robinson wouldn’t know those intentions. He added that she should be feel able to participate in the discussion.

K, Robinson offered that she had reviewed the materials and felt comfortable voting on the matter.

J. Cashell offered that S. Hogan's opinion that a member at their first meeting aside, the advice of the Board's own counsel should be considered. He added that G. Adams had a full participant in the original matter and this was K. Robinson's first meeting. The logical action would be to follow C. Cleary's advice, since all the original members are present it makes sense that they would be the voting members.

Sanaz Anthony, 4 Village Way, offered that one of the original board members (Lisa Lambert) who had been at all the meetings on this matter was not present for the voting and G. Adams was put in to vote at the last minute.

L. Milette noted that G. Adams did not step up when there was a vacancy on the Board and that K. Robinson did to become an elected member.

K. Robinson asked if G. Adams had been at all the meetings on this matter.

G. Adams questioned what his status as an alternate versus a regular member had to do with anything. He added that he's been an alternate on the Board for eight years and was in attendance at nearly every meeting over that time period, whether he was a voting member or not.

J. Peck offered that all things being equal, he felt that the Board should listen to the advice of their attorney.

★ ***T. Moore moved, second by F. Hart that the members of the Board who would be voting on the Court's remand public hearing will be T. Moore, J. Peck, L. Milette, G. Adams and F. Hart.***

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll call vote: J. Peck – yes, T. Moore – yes, L. Milette – no, K. Robinson – no, F. Hart – yes. 3-2-0 – Motion passes.

C. Cleary explained that the final notice of decision that came back from the Court noted it believed that conditions #3 and #7 were intended to require additional review and acceptance by the Board once the final comments from Steve Keach were available.

K. Robinsons asked if she could still be a participant in the discussion without being a voting member. It was confirmed that all members of the Board are able to participate and comment.

J. Cashell added that only voting members can participate in the deliberation process.
(*see footnote on amendment at end of these minutes.)

S. Keach explained how the applicant now had met the conditions described in conditions #3 and #7, which are both in reference to the monitoring wells and stormwater management. He referenced his June 11, 2020 report memo to the Board that offered his

review of the technical details of the monitoring plan and how conditions #3 and #7 of the June 19, 2019 Notice of Approval were now a part of the plan and, in his opinion, now met.

S. Keach offered that his June 11, 2020 report did outline a number of remaining ministerial items that needed to be address and his June 15, 2020 follow up report notes those items to be met.

J. Peck asked for confirmation that conditions #3 and #7, regardless of being ministerial or not, were now met.

S. Keach replied that they were met and a little beyond.

There was additional discussion of the details of the stormwater management and monitoring plan. It was noted that in the first two years there was bi-annual and quarterly reporting requirements now part of the plan. If those reporting requirements are failed to be met, the property owner would be in default of the site plan and the Planning Board to could appropriate action at that time. It was explained that with if the Board is satisfied with Mr. Keach's report that notes the conditions #3 and #7 met that the Court matter is resolved.

S. Hogan offered that he has listened to all the discussion regarding conditions #3 and #7 and whether or not they are ministerial or now met, and how that impacts the Court's final order. He noted that is this would then be the Board's final decision; his client would still have an option to file an additional appeal of the decision. He also offered that the Court's final order noted that they could make application to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). He explained that a condition that would allow the applicant to just work out any engineering details with the Planning Board's engineer took those details, which are of paramount importance to his clients, out of the public hearing process.

S. Hogan added that he was also present for the previous public hearing where there was much discussion about the hours of operation for the urgent care and concerns that 8:00AM to 8:00PM would be too disruptive to the abutter, yet this business was allowed to have hours of operation starting at 6:00AM to 7:00PM, with construction hours of 7:00AM to 7:00PM Monday through Saturday. He added that he found it difficult to reconcile the two matters as his clients had raised many of the same issues regarding this site. Mr. Hogan offered that the Court's order brought the matter back to where it had been left off and he had hoped that the Board would be willing to revisit some of the issues previously raised by his clients. He noted if the Board decides to just check the boxes off on conditions #3 and #7, that would constitute the Board's final decision, which the Court's order then allows for any abutter to appeal, adding that it was not what his client's where looking to do.

F. Hart offered that Mr. Hogan was mixing quite a few metaphors and she referred to NH RSA 677:15-1A which speaks to the process of making and appeal to the ZBA under the

parameters of 676:33. She suggested that he was introducing a number of caveats to getting through what the Board was trying to accomplish at this meeting.

F. Hart also referred to page 4 of the letter Attorney Hogan had submitted to the Board on the day of the meeting. The reference was to inadequacy of a meaningful buffer. Ms. Hart reminded that the site plan called for a 50' no-cut buffer of 20'-40' tall trees, a six-foot fence as well as 200' of woods between the back yards and Route 125. She added that didn't know how much more a meaningful buffer there could be. She offered that comparing ambulance sirens and headlights in windows to equipment being moved was inappropriate to the discussion.

J. Cashell noted that the Board had already legally and finally closed the public hearing on the matter of the site plan review and deliberated on the approval of the site plan. He noted that ample opportunity had been given to the public to offer additional information and comment, but none was offered. Once the Board legally closed the public hearing on the site plan and entered into deliberations, the matter of the site plan review was closed. The Board's purpose at this meeting is not to re-open the site plan public hearing, but to make a determination on the Court's notice as to whether or not the conditions noted were ministerial and now have been achieved.

C. Cleary noted that Mr. Hogan can file any appeal that he would like, adding the Court's order noted that abutters have the right to appeal, but offered no opinion on whether or not such an appeal would be successful. He added that it was his opinion that they would not be. He added that the Judge stated in his order that the Board did a proper job in their due diligence on the issues of water quality and buffering. Attorney Cleary noted that the Board was focused properly, which was on conditions #3 and #7.

J. Peck offered the Board was now tasked with deciding between two options with reference to each of the conditions;

- A. Was it the intent of the Board that once Mr. Keach had done a final review that the Board would take a re-vote on conditions #3 and #7
- B. These conditions were intended to be ministerial and once verified, along with the other twelve (12) conditions, as being met the plan would be signed and then recorded.

J. Peck suggested that they apply these question to both the conditions, starting with stipulation #7, which he felt would be the easier on to decide. Was receipt of the final review from Keach-Nordstrom Associates (KNA) to be considered as a ministerial item, or was it to come back to the Board.

F. Hart offered that it was her intention at the time that she felt it to be ministerial, which was the Board's common practice. She added that the Board has always trusted the expertise and attention to detail from KNA.

T. Moore agreed.

J. Cashell offered that in all the thirty-plus years he's worked as a municipal planner he's never come across this kind of a situation. This is a common, basic stipulation and once the public hearing has been closed and deliberations complete it becomes a ministerial matter. He added that if Mr. Hogan was representing the community he would not be raising these kinds of issues.

S. Hogan offered that he represents his clients zealously and honestly and has done so for twenty-five years. He offered that he has cases where different planning boards have different procedures for conditions of approval. He noted that in his interpretation of the Court's order, the Court is saying that the Plaistow Planning Board has not yet issued a final decision and once they do so, his clients will have additional rights to appeal, which is all he is advocating for,

D. Voss noted there were questions on the message board, a couple being about giving Attorney Hogan the ability to speak, which has been addressed. She noted that S. Anthony offered that there were issues with respect to the RSAs quoted by Ms. Hart.

J. Cashell asked for C. Cleary to clarify what are the rights the public has to comment on this particular matter.

C. Cleary noted that it was advertised as a public hearing, but the public should not be commenting on matters not currently before the Board. The matter of the ZBA is a side matter and not part of this discussion. He noted that he had a recommendation to make to the Board once they have discussed condition #3.

J. Peck went around the Board and asked each member consensus on whether or not condition #7 was ministerial:

- F. Hart – ministerial
- L. Milette – not ministerial and she added that she has had issues with some of the past practices of the board
- G. Adams – no comment
- K. Robinson – no comment
- T. Moore – ministerial

Condition #3

J. Peck offered this condition to be more complicated. He noted that the KNA report offers that this condition has been met, so it's a moot point, but the judge is looking for it to be clarified as to whether or not it was ministerial. J. Peck added that it was his opinion that it was ministerial.

T. Moore stated that it was his opinion that this was a ministerial condition. He noted that the Board's request was that there be monitoring wells and a maintenance plan to go with them. Since he is not an expert he is reliant on the well-written KNA report. The

applicant agreed to what was proposed and so there was no need for it to come back before the Board.

L. Milette agreed, as did G. Adams, K. Robinson offered no comment. F. Hart agreed as well, adding that she left the meeting a year ago never expecting the matter to come back again and now that the condition has been met it's a moot point.

J. Peck noted that he was in agreement that the conditions were ministerial, despite having voted against the plan in general. It added that he was in agreement with the conditions that were placed on the plan's approval and felt it was important that they be upheld. He noted that he was concerned about the Board's remedy if the conditions are not upheld, but he would leave that to the engineer.

C. Cleary offered that it was important for the Board going forward to clearly note conditions as precedent or ministerial. He noted taking the conditions one-at-a-time the judge found them to be ministerial, it was when he read them together he came to a different conclusion. Attorney Cleary suggested that the Board add a phrase to their motion that noted acceptance of KNA's final report.

J. Cashell questioned if something should be added to the motion to declare that this is a final approval of the Board so there is no question. He added that the big lesson learned in this matter that there needs to be clarity when the Board is making a final decision, that way if there is an appeal the will be clear.

C. Cleary suggested that the Board could have two lists for their conditions, conditions precedent and conditions subsequent (ministerial).

There was discussion regarding the wording of the motion.

J. Peck asked about the status of the remaining twelve (12) conditions. He asked S. Keach to run through them.

S. Keach offered that the judge dispensed of those conditions, and should be left off the table. Some will be handled by D. Voss and J. Cashell for verification.

★ T. Moore moved, second by F. Hart, that in accordance with the Planning Board's Site Plan Approval Decision for ProQuip Rental & Sales, Inc., 143 Plaistow Road, Plaistow, NH, dated 19 JUN 2019, that said Board issued a final decision without any conditions precedent necessitating Board involvement, i.e., the placement of the monitoring wells was to be determined by the Intervenor, in consultation with the Town Consultant Engineer, but without the need for further review by the Planning Board. Note: the board takes the foregoing action, based on custom, practice and/or intent, the Subject Conditions #3 and #7 were ministerial only, required no further involvement or action of the Planning Board, and were essentially check-the-box conditions following which the Planning Board chair would unilaterally endorse

the Site Plan. Furthermore, the Board has accepted the final report from Keach-Nordstrom Associates.

Discussion:

L. Milette noted that she and Mr. Peck had asked for updates on the Court matter multiple times and did not receive any information. This was the first time seeing Attorney Cleary and no information was provided. Therefore, she would be voting no on this motion.

Roll Call Vote: J. Peck - yes; T. Moore - yes; L. Milette - no; G. Adams - yes; F. Hart – yes, 4-1-0 – Motion passed.

★ F. Hart moved, second by L. Milette to close the public hearing.

Roll Call Vote: J. Peck - yes; T. Moore - yes; L. Milette - yes; G. Adams - yes; F. Hart – yes, 5-0-0 – Motion passed.

The Chair called for a break at 9:48 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 9:56 p.m.

Agenda Item 5 – Old Business

Route 125 Corridor Study – Resilience Planning Proposal

The Board reviewed a proposal for a Route 125 Corridor Study that was submitted by Resilience Planning and Design in the amount of \$51,000.

J. Cashell noted that the commercial corridor (Route 125) is well established and the task was to design an overlay district that would help to revitalize the commercial district and make it more attractive. He suggested that the Board take on the task of the overlay district with a few workshops. At that time the Board can re-evaluate the need for additional assistance from a consultant.

L. Milette asked if all Resilience Invoices related to the Master Plan update had been paid in full. It was confirmed that they have been.

Agenda Item 6 – New Business

Bond/Escrow Release – Plaistow Center (5-11 Plaistow Rd)

D. Voss reported that a letter had been received from Taurus Investment Holdings to have the escrow and bond monies for 5-11 Plaistow Road released. The project has been long completed with the construction of the PetSmart building. There are no outstanding invoices, or issues with the Planning Board Review Engineer or Building Inspector.

★ *L. Milette moved, second by T. Moore, that the escrow monies, in the amount of \$111.19, being held for the site development at 5-11 Plaistow Road be released and returned to Taurus Investment Holdings and the account closed.*

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: J. Peck - yes; T. Moore - yes; L. Milette - yes; K. Robinson - yes; F. Hart – yes. 5-0-0 U/A

★ *L. Milette moved, second by T. Moore, that any bond monies, and any accrued interest, being held for the site development at 5-11 Plaistow Road be released and returned to Taurus Investment Holdings and the account closed.*

There was no discussion on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: J. Peck - yes; T. Moore - yes; L. Milette - yes; K. Robinson - yes; F. Hart – yes. 5-0-0 U/A

Review and Adoption of 2020-2025 CIP

T. Moore noted that he had hoped to have a final copy available for the Board at this meeting, but it wasn't quite there yet. He added that the would get it to the Board as soon as possible

Alternate Planning Board Member

J. Peck asked what the status was of a resident's request to become an alternate member of the Planning Board.

T. Moore reminded that the Board had concluded that until the court case that involved that resident and the Planning Board was fully resolved that request would stay on file.

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dee Voss
Administrative Assistant

** At the July 15, 2020 meeting K. Robison requested that language be included, referenced to the discussion on page 8 of these minutes that state J. Cashell was rude and disrespectful, citing that J. Cashell referred to her as possibly being predisposed in wanting to inject herself into a meeting matter of which she previously played no role.*