

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



**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES (DRAFT MINUTES- Subject to change once approved and amended by the board at its next meeting on September 2.)**

**August 19, 2020**

**Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:40 PM**

Chair Peck read the following COVID-19 statement:

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 [jcashell@plaistow.com](mailto:jcashell@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 [jpeck@plaistow.com](mailto:jpeck@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

- 1. ROLL CALL:** James Peck, *Chair* - Present at Town Hall  
Tim Moore, *Vice Chair* - Present at Town Hall  
Laurie Milette- Present at Town Hall  
Francine Hart, *Selectman's Rep*- Excused  
Karen Robinson - Present at Town Hall  
Greg Taillon, *Alternate Selectmen's Rep*- Present at Town Hall (voting)  
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate* – Present at Town Hall (non-voting)

Also present: John Cashell, *Planning Director*

**2. REVIEW/APPROVAL of the June 17, 2020 Minutes:**

Chair Peck passed out a copy of the draft minutes written by Planning Director Cashell along with proposed amendments regarding corrections and additions based on a detailed review of the tapes.

***G. Taillon moved, second by L. Milette to approve the amended minutes from June 17, 2020. There was no discussion on the motion. Motion passed 5-0-0.***

### **3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Ch. Peck changed the order of hearings placing PB 20-08 first due to the expected quickness of the hearing. He read the hearing notice:

***PB 20-08: An application from Heidi Mongeau for a special event, namely a charity obstacle course challenge. The one-day event is proposed to be held across two (2) parcels, 90 Newton Rd, Tax Map 68, Lot 8-A, property owner of record St. Mathews United Methodist Church and 82 Newton Rd, Tax Map 68, Lot 8, property owner of record Sweet Hill Farm, LLC. Both parcels are located in the ICR zoning district.***

Heidi Mongeau, event director, 7 Chute Rd, Byfield, MA, explained this was the fourth year for the event and this year it would be held on October. They had made appropriate changes to allow for maximum safety given the COVID-19 situation. Only 10 runners would run the course at a time. Breakfast would be served to participants under extra safety measures. Their passion was to give back to the community and to provide a safe, fun time for families.

G. Adams asked what was being done for traffic control. Ms. Mongeau said they expected much less this year and there would only be parking at the church lot. They had coordinated with the PPD and PFD.

There were no abutters or public to speak to the application.

***T. Moore moved, second by K. Robinson to approve the application. There was no discussion on the motion. Motion passed 5-0-0.***

Ch. Peck explained the next hearing, PB 20-07, was a continued hearing from the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

***PB 20-07: The completeness of an application from Ocean Storage, LLC c/o Bussiere & Bussiere, PA. The application seeks to amend an approved site plan to change the previously approved, but not constructed, retail space, to a climate control self-storage building of +/-99,000 GSF. The property is located at 88 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 27, Lot 21 in the C1 District. 88 Plaistow Road, LLC/Mark Murphy is the property owner of record. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.***

Ch. Peck explained the application was voted complete at the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. He then noted the response from the ZBA on the Planning Board's question as to their decision on a usage variance on May 20, 2019 to allow the applicant to put self-storage in a C-1 zone. Ch. Peck had sent the ZBA a copy of a letter asking them to clarify whether they issued self-storage variance including the entire parcel or not. He had been informed by D. Voss that the ZBA would discuss the letter at their July 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting. The ZBA then discussed only a letter from Mr. Cashell asking essentially the same question. Their response was that the variance applied to the entire parcel at Tax Map, 27, Lot 21 as they had not set any conditions. A copy of their Notice of Decision was forwarded to the PB along with their letter reply, both of which are on file in the Planning Office, along with the letters from Ch. Peck and Planning

Director Cashell.

K. Robinson asked if the PB would ask for parcel improvements and Ch. Peck cited the responsibility of the board to ensure plans provide for “aesthetically pleasing” construction for the town.

Michael A. Malynowski, PE - Senior Project Manager, Allen & Major Associates, Inc., Manchester, NH | Woburn, MA | Lakeville, MA (remote and alone), presented the Amended Site Plan. Emile Bussiere, the applicant also participated. Mr. Malynowski this amended plan provided less disturbance to the wet land buffers than the 2019 plan. They also had added a very extensive landscaping and vegetation plan along Route 125 and throughout the parcel. In response to the board’s previous request, Mr. Malynowski presented two architect’s renderings of the front building from the road and from the south. He said these renderings were consistent with the amended plans submitted as to both the building and the landscaping depicted.

He also said they had reduced the impervious surfaces around the front building from before, and he showed a perspective view of the building height- 30 feet throughout the middle and 35 feet at each end, both below the allowed maximum height of 45 feet.

Questions were asked relative to the renderings:

J. Cashell stated that the site was currently in deplorable condition and that these renderings showing significant improvement would have been helpful in July and did a good job in answering board concerns. He then asked what guarantee the board had that the actual construction would match the renderings. Mr. Malynowski replied that yes, they matched the plans except maybe the color schemes.

Ch. Peck asked why these renderings differed from Ocean Storage 3-story facilities in Virginia Beach, but Mr. Malynowski said those were a different company. Ch. Peck asked where the applicant had facilities near NH. The answer was in Bourne and Swansea, MA.

J. Cashell asked what size the trees would be when planted. Mr. Malynowski answered 2 to 2 ½ inches and that the renderings showed more mature trees a few years down the road. The trees in the rendering matched the plan.

Discussion ensued on the distances from the front building to Route 125 and the relative depth of the tarred parking lot versus the landscaped strip. Mr. Malynowski answered that there was 44 feet from the building to the inside edge of the landscaped area, then 15 feet total of landscaped area to include 12 feet to the lot line and 3 more feet of green space to the sidewalk which was about 4 feet wide, so the total set back from the road was 63 feet, but 56 feet to the lot line, above the required 50 foot set back. The rendering was done on a perspective basis so the grassy area looked wider than the parking area, but it was, in fact, not.

In reply to questions from J. Cashell and Ch. Peck on the type of trees and vegetation, Mr. Malynowski said there would be grass and wildflowers, and the trees included scarlet oak trees, Frazier firs, and even some flowering trees, even in the corners by the driveways.

G. Adams asked if the driveways were 2-way and the answer was yes, on existing curb cuts, and, because storage generated less traffic than retail, the DOT would likely have no issues with the permits.

Ch. Peck noted the receipt of a letter of support from the CONCOM. T. Moore, also a member of the CONCOM, explained the amended plan reduced the affect on the wetlands so they had no problem again supporting this plan versus the previous approved plan

J. Cashell asked about the lighting plan as to whether it would be dark sky friendly. Mr. Malynowski replied that it was friendly and the LED lights had zero light trespass on abutters following our zoning ordinances.

J. Cashell and Ch. Peck asked about additional, free-standing signs which were not on the plan. Mr. Malynowski replied that they had not yet decided, but would follow our zoning rules and go to the ZBA, if necessary, for a size variance, though that wasn't expected.

K. Robinson asked what are the "checks and balances" on the ZBA when they rule on variances. Ch. Peck, T. Moore, G. Adams and J. Cashell replied that the ZBA ruled based on set criteria for granting variances but they were allowed by law to grant variances. The check was a 30-day appeal period during which the Planning Board or anyone could file an appeal on the decision.

J. Cashell remarked that retail store fronts are passé and different usages including storage and mixed use was the wave of the future. He also commended the applicants for "setting the pace" on aesthetically pleasing construction that would attract future businesses as potable water came into Route 125 in the next year or so. Ch. Peck agreed 100%.

L. Milette asked what the hours would be. Mr. Malynowski replied the office would be open 7 days a week from 9 AM to 6 PM. The climate control units were open further to 9 PM with coded access, then were closed until the morning. Regular storage units were open 24/7. These hours were in note 16 on plan C-2.

Ch. Peck asked how the applicant would ensure no hazardous waste or illegal items were put in the units. Mr. Malynowski answered that the plan noted no hazardous waste would be allowed and that the rental contracted stated such.

Ch. Peck asked if there were no changes to the back area from the previous approved plan. Mr. Malynowski said the only change was the narrowing of the access road which resulted in less infringement on the wet lands and buffers.

Ch. Peck asked if the total square footage of storage was in fact 155,00 consisting of 99,000 in the front and 56,000 in the back. Mr. Bussiere said yes and said it was a very, very large facility.

L. Milette asked if they planned to build the front building first then the back buildings. Mr. Bussiere said yes. They would monitor occupancy rates and would decide when to start in the back, but he expected to fill the front relatively quickly. They would decide whether to add climate-controlled or regular storage in the back based on relative occupancy rates in the front.

Ch. Peck asked for questions from abutters or the public. None were forthcoming remotely or by email. One question was asked in person by Tom Alberti, 2 Ridgewood Road, Plaistow: Did the plan allow for any outside storage, like boats or cars?

Mr. Bussiere said they had no intention of outside storage in the front and had none in the back in this plan, but might down the road come back to request outside storage in the back.

A long discussion ensued as to whether the board should add a condition that no outside storage be added without planning board approval. T. Moore stated that there was no room and the plan didn't have so perhaps a condition wasn't necessary. The consensus of the board was to add a condition.

Ch. Peck then asked Mr. Malynowski to take the board through the four waivers he was requesting. He explained each, the first reaffirmations of previous waivers from the 2019 approved plan and the other two new waivers.

After his presentation and a few questions, the waivers were all approved as follows:

***T. Moore moved, second by G. Taillon to grant the request to waiver SPRR (Site Plan Review Regulation) §230-23A and not require a full 25-foot landscape buffer where C1 abuts a residential use, for the proposed amended site plan at 88 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 27, Lot 21. The waiver request is approved for the reasons stated in the application.***

***Vote: 3-2-0 (L. Milette and K. Robinson opposed) Motion passed.***

***T. Moore moved, second by G. Taillon to waiver SPRR (Site Plan Review Regulation) §230-22.a.(2) and allow for the placement of site light fixtures closer to the property line than the formula in the regulation requires, for the proposed amended site plan at 88 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 27, Lot 21. The waiver request is approved for the reasons stated in the application.***

***Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

***G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore to waiver SPRR (Site Plan Review Regulation) §230-12.G and allow for the for the reduction of the number of required parking spaces for the climate controlled self-storage facility, for the proposed amended site plan at 88 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 27, Lot 21. The waiver request is approved for the reasons stated in the application.***

Some discussion on the adequacy of 18 spaces but concluded there was room if needed.

***Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

***G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore to waiver SPRR (Site Plan Review Regulation) §230-14.1. XX and to not require dumpsters on a pad for the self-storage use, for the proposed amended site plan at 88 Plaistow Road, Tax Map 27, Lot 21. The waiver request is approved for the reasons stated in the application.***

***Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

***G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore, to approve the application for an amended site plan proposed to change the retail use at 88 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 27, Lot 21, to self-storage with the following ministerial conditions:***

***–Receipt of all State Permit Approvals, or Amendments of previously approved permits by the Planning Department, and any conditions thereof are incorporated into the site plan. The approval numbers shall also be noted on the recording plan***

***–All comments in the KNA Review Report (July 13, 2020) are addressed and a letter KNA a letter of is received by the Planning Department and verified by KNA. A final report from KNA noted that all comments have been addressed shall be received by the Planning Department***

***–All conditions shall be met within ninety (90) days of the date of conditional approval, unless an extension is granted by the Planning Board. Requests for extension requests shall be submitted in 5 writing, with justification, and are subject to the approval of the Board at the next available meeting.***

***–there will be no outside storage without prior Planning Board approval.***

*– Once these conditions have been met and verified by Staff, the Amended Site Plan will be signed by the Chair and recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. No conditions require additional review or action of the Planning Board.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion Passed.*

Ch. Peck read the following into the record:

*– IMPACT FEES:*

*This site plan, once implemented, will be subject to a Public Safety Impact Fee. That fee is \$0.42/SF of net new construction. Since this will be all new construction, there is no offset.*

*NOTE: Only the total numbers need to be reported for the record – the breakdown is provided to illustrate the calculations.*

*– Building 1 – Front Building 32,300 SF \$13,566.00*

*– Building 2 – Rear Building 10,720 SF \$ 4,502.40*

*– Building 3 – Rear Building 4,500 SF \$ 1,890.00*

*– Building 4 – Rear Building 4,500 SF \$ 1,890.00*

*– Building 5 – Rear Building 6,200 SF \$ 2,604.00*

*– Building 6 – Rear Building 6,100 SF \$ 2,562.00*

*TOTALS 64,320 SF \$27,014.40*

*Payment of the Impact Fees is due prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each of the noted*

Discussion ensued that the above calculations were **INCORRECT** as they omitted the second and third floors in the Buildings 1 & 2. Both J. Cashell and T. Moore stated that the total should be gross square footage including all floors. A quick estimate by Ch. Peck resulted in an additional 86,040 square feet for a total of 150,360. The board agreed that staff will review and correct the calculation and that will be applied. The applicant agreed.

Ch. Peck read the next hearing notice:

*PB 20-09: The completeness of an application from Ethan Conley. The application proposes to amend a subdivision plan recorded as D-25619 at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. The property is known as Forrest Street Rear, Tax Map 48, Lot 40 in the LDR 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.*

*G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore, to accept the application proposing to amend a subdivision plan recorded as D-25619 at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds as complete. The vote was 4-0-1 (L. Milette). Motion passed.*

Ch. Peck opened the hearing.

Charlie Zilch, P.E., S.E.C. and Associates explained the application was to amend the 1995 plan to delete a comment therein whereby the landlocked parcel was “to be consolidated with tax lot 66-1-26,” which is the former map-block-lot designation for 43 Forrest St., also owned by Ethan Conley today.

The applicant has been granted a variance to build a single-family dwelling on the subject parcel (Forrest Street Rear, Tax Map 48, Lot 40). (ZBA #20-13, June 25, 2020).

The applicant purchased the property in good faith that there were two (2) separate parcels. Steps were missed by both the original owner at the time of subdivision, and by the Town that would have consolidated the parcels. The applicant is not seeking to further subdivide the property, only to clear up the “cloud” on the plan so that the record matches the circumstances under which he purchased the properties. Mr. Zilch stated that all Mr. Conley wants to do is build one house lot if this plan is approved.

The intention is to come back for a conditional use permit (c. u. p.) for a driveway encroaching on the wetlands through Mr DeLucia’s property (easement already secured by Mr. Conley). There are 7-acre buildable, contiguous uplands on the 12.27-acre lot. Most of the wetlands are in the western part of the parcel. The intention was to build an 800-foot driveway from woodland drive impacting approximately 6,000 square feet of wetlands. The alternative was a driveway through 43 Forrest Street.

K. Robinson asked if the intention was to build only one house on the land. The answer was yes. Mr. Zilch said they still have to do septic design, get driveway permit and a c.u.p. from the Planning Board.

T. Moore hypothesized that the reason for the note was because Ernie Brown’s development couldn’t be approved with a lot that didn’t have frontage on a road. Mr. Moore was on the Planning Board in 1995 when the note was made.

Ch. Peck asked for any abutters or members of the public to comment. He read the following comment, received by email, from abutter Lisa Lambert, 5 Tracey Lane, into the record:

Dear Mr. Peck,

I am writing to you with regards to the Public Hearing on Wednesday, 8/19, PB 20-09. As an abutter, I would like to express my concern with the development of the property behind my residence located at 5 Tracey Lane.

I attended the June 25, 2020 ZBA meeting in which Mr. Conley applied for a variance to permit a single-family dwelling to be built on a lot without frontage on a town road; the property is known as Forrest Street read, Tax Map 48, Lot 40 in the LDR District. During this ZBA meeting, I asked Mr. Conley, and the ZBA also stated back, that the intention is for only one single-family dwelling (home) to be built on this property. I requested for that condition to be recorded on the variance and it was not.

I am requesting the Planning Board record on the site plan the condition of one single-family dwelling (home) only to be built on the above-mentioned property before accepting the plan as complete.

Respectfully,  
Lisa A. Lambert

Ch. Peck commented that he believed the Notice of Decision by the ZBA stated the application was for “a single-family residence” and the application was approved with no conditions. So, perhaps it wasn’t necessary to place a condition on our approval today.

There were no more public comments. The hearing was closed.

***G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore, to approve the subject plan entitled “Amended Subdivision Plan” for the property known as Forrest Street Rear, Tax Map 48, Lot 40, which amends Plan D-25619, recorded at Rockingham County Registry of Deed, by removing the note which reads “to be consolidated with tax lot 66-1-26” and establishes Tax Map 48, Lot 40 as a separate, stand-alone parcel with the following condition:  
- A note is added to the plan specifying only one single-family residence may be built on the parcel.***

***Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

Ch. Peck read the next hearing notice:

***PB 20-10: The completeness of an application from Northland Mall, LLC. The application proposes to amend a site plan for a new daycare facility use, and related outdoor playground area. The property is located at 134 Newton Road, Tax Map 70, Lot 20 in the ICR 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.***

Ch. Peck stated that a letter was received from the town Health Officer, Dennise Horrocks, stating she had no issues. Also, no comments were received from either the PFD or PPD.

***K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon, to accept the application proposing to amend a subdivision plan recorded as D-25619 at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds as complete.  
The vote was 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

Ch. Peck opened the public hearing.

Kevin Hatch, L.L.S., Cornerstone Survey Associates, Inc. explained the application as the owner’s representative. They updated the site plan for Northland Mall, last updated in 2015. The main change is to add a day care in units 7 & 8 of the plaza with an outside play area.

Ch. Peck asked if pads would be placed under the dumpsters in addition to screening them as noted on the amended plan. Mr. Hatch answered they would.

Ch. Peck asked if the plan would need further amendment once the requested variances from the ZBA for dog grooming were received. Mr. Hatch said he had added “Possible Future Dog Grooming” in unit 12 to this plan already thus negating the need to amend further.

There were no further questions from the board and there were no questions from abutters or the public.

Ch. Peck closed the hearing.

Mr. Hatch presented the five waivers.

***G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore to approve the waiver request for SPRR §230014.1 (Z) and (AA) – topography and grading for the reasons stated in the waiver request.***



*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.*

*K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon to approve the waiver request for SPRR §230-14.1 (DD) – topography and grading public and private utility information for the reasons stated in the waiver request.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.*

*G. Taillon moved, second by K. Robinson to approve the waiver request for SPRR §230-14.1 (II) – Lighting Plan for the reasons stated in the waiver request.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.*

*K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon to approve the waiver request for SPRR §230-14.1 (HH) – Landscaping Plan for the reasons stated in the waiver request.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.*

*T. Moore moved, second by K. Robinson to approve the waiver request for SPRR §230-14.1 (YY) – Architectural Renditions for the reasons stated in the waiver request.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed*

*K. Robinson oved, second by G. Taillon, to approve the amended site plan for 134 Newton Road, Tax Map 70, Lot 20, to include a day care use with the following conditions:*

- Receipt by the Planning Department of the original signature agent letter*
- Title Block is updated to include a description of the amendment*
- Utilities as they come into the site are noted on the amended plan*
- Snow Storage location is indicated on the plan*
- Hours of Operation are indicated on the plan*
- Note regarding amendment of previous plan be updated to specific language as preferred by RCRD as noted in in the checklist.*

*Vote: 5-0-0. Motion Passed*

#### **4. Old Business**

None

#### **5. New Business**

**Planning Board Alternate volunteer:** Tom Alberti, 2 Ridgewood Road, appeared before the board to express his desire to become an Alternate. He had sent a letter of interest to the board previously and he further described his background, his family, and his volunteering activities as a coach in town.

Ch. Peck thanked him for stepping up, mentioning he knew Tom and recommended him.

***K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon, to appoint Tom Alberti as an Alternate Member of the Planning Board.***

***Vote: 5-0-0. Motion passed.***

Ch. Peck will submit notify the Town Clerk to get the BOS signatures and set up a time for him to be sworn in.

**Planning Board contacts with Administrative Assistant.** Ch. Peck passed out emails from Town Manager Pearson and referred to his request that the board no longer directly email or contact D. Voss, rather they should email J. Cashell as her supervisor, and copy D. Voss if need be.

J. Cashell asked that board members forward all questions to Ch. Peck and he would forward to J. Cashell with a cc to D. Voss. J. Cashell will check his emails at least at the end of each day and respond.

J. Cashell clariid other points in the emails- namely that draft and final minutes should be sent to D. Voss, not B. Hossack as Mr. Pearson had requested and that draft minutes are not posted to the web site. Discussion ensued on the latter point in that Ch. Peck thought that draft minutes should be posted with a prominent “Draft” stamped on them, so the public had access within the required 5 business days for availability. J. Cashell said that was the standard practice and G. Taillon said Steve Buckley of NHMA recommended draft minutes be posted until final minutes are approved and posted.

The consensus and desire of the board was to post draft minutes. T. Moore suggested adding a statement at the top: “Draft Minutes- Subject to change once approved and amended at the board’s next meeting.”

A discussion of how extensive minutes should be. J. Cashell suggested that details were not necessary, that the decisions, motions, and votes are the most critical and intervening questions and comments by board members, or the public are not legally required by NH law.

Ch. Peck said past minutes by D. Voss and S. Cote were excellent and included the details of questions and comments. The more disclosure and transparent the minutes are, the better. They may even be legally important.

K. Robinson stated that these details were important.

G. Taillon stated that details were not necessary as the tapes could be reviewed and minute takers could make mistakes.

Ch. Peck countered that the minute taker takes responsibility for accurate minutes and the board reviews and approves them. He would prefer more details so the public could understand what was discussed and who supported which views.

Further discussion on the cost and benefits of a transcription service ensued. J. Cashell stated a transcription service would be exorbitant. But he agreed that the board had the prerogative to determine what detail they wanted in the minutes.

K. Robinson stated that the public often referred to the minutes and did not access the tapes so the details were important as to board member and public questions and concerns.

**Planning Board Rules of Procedure (Chapter 225):** Ch. Peck framed this discussion by explaining that the current Rules of Procedure were first adopted in 1996. T. Moore was the Chair at the time. The

Rules have been amended only twice since then, and Ch. Peck felt they had always been followed closely by the board, T. Moore agreed.

Ch. Peck stated that the Rules were very important, and we should have a “healthy discussion” of them at our next meeting. He also referred to the emails from Town Manager Pearson where he said that the rules were “non-binding on his management of the town employees.

Ch. Peck pointed out that the existing rules say the board can determine the roles, responsibilities, and duties of town staff support. Further, RSA 673:16 which says the board can “appoint” town staff for required duties. In fact, the Planning Board has a specific budget each year approved by the BOS, BUDCOM and by town vote.

This discussion to be continued at the next meeting.

## **6. Communications, Updates, FYIs, and Other Business**

None

## **7. Adjournment**

**There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 PM.**

Respectfully Submitted,

James M. Peck  
Chair & Acting Recording Secretary