

PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, NH

Minutes of November 19, 2018

Members Present: Ivy Vann, Dario Carrara, Jerry Galus, Joe Hanlon, Bob Holt, Tyler Ward, Jerry Galus, Sarah Steinberg Heller, and Dario Carrara

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Laura Norton, and Kristin Bixby - Office of Community Development

Chair Holt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., welcomed the audience and introduced the Board members and staff. He appointed Mr. Juengst to sit for Mr. Zeller.

Mr. Galus interjected that while he had not been present at the October 15th meeting, “I have read the minutes, reviewed the maps and drove by to take a look... I feel comfortable sitting in on the hearing.”

Chair Holt then announced that the Board would be considering the Conditional Use Permits only tonight (continuing the Subdivision to December 17, 2018). He also reviewed the process whereby the applicant presents their case followed by questions from the Board and then questions and concerns from the audience and concluding with Board deliberation and a vote.

Continued Public Hearing: Village at Stone Barn - “Village at Stone Barn LLC”, is seeking Subdivision and Site Plan Review approval and issuance of a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed 33-unit multi-family residential condominium development and a non-residential accessory retail use of a farm-to-table café, on property currently owned by “Peterborough Highland Farm LLC” located at 63 Old Street Road, Parcel No. U002-039-000. This property is located partially in the Family Zoning District and the Rural Zoning District. The proposal seeks approval under the Section 245-15.4 Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone II. The project requires the granting of Conditional Use Permits for: the development of three or more dwelling units on one lot; for a non-residential accessory retail use; and for encroachment into the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone, and granting of a waiver of Section 245-15.4.D.1 to allow more than 10 residential units in a building.

Amelia Tracy of Conducive Life stood and introduced herself as the Project Manager. She gave a brief update on the project in general noting they had been pre-selling units for the past two and a half months, “and we are about half way sold” she said. Ms. Tracy noted that Mr. Branon was present to give an update of the engineering adding the architecture has

remained the same. She concluded by telling the Board, “we appreciate all the hard work that has been done on our behalf. We hope to start construction in March 2019, so this is a reality for next year.”

Chad Branon stood and introduced himself as a Civil Engineer for Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC and representative for the Village at Stone Barn. He told the Board he planned to recap the details that have happened since the October 15th meeting. Noting the site walk, he thanked those members who were able to attend, adding, “since then we have had the opportunity to work through a number of details with Staff and the Fire Department on the layout.” He reported, “the Fire Department is happy with the location of the [fire] hydrants and any remaining issues are permit issues that do not need to be addressed by the Planning Board.”

Mr. Branon told the Members a formal stormwater management report had been submitted to the Town for review. He went on to say, “We are trying to finalize details in the report that will trigger a DES Permit for mitigation and treatment standards from the State.”

Mr. Branon noted a Traffic Memo by Stephen Pernaw. He summarized the report and noted that the data showed that Old Street Road hosts about 2,000 vehicles a day with the closest intersection of Routes 101 and 123 located approximately a half mile away hosting 10,000 vehicles a day. He noted the report qualified the proposed redevelopment of the Stone Barn site (including the Café) is estimated to result in 32 (am) and 22 (pm) vehicle-trips during the weekday peak hours and 38 vehicle-trips during the Saturday peak hour. “That is a conservative number” said Mr. Branon, adding, “the memo found the increase in traffic would not significantly alter the prevailing traffic operations at the intersection (and) the Old Street Road/existing driveway to the site was functional and efficient with its one approach lane on each leg of the intersection.”

Mr. Branon went on to note that he had submitted a complete plan set including landscaping and lighting plans as well as the design and profiles of the utility’s connection. “The topics covered tonight pertain to the waiver request and the Conditional Use Permits (CUPs)” he said.

Mr. Branon told the Members the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone II (245-15.4.D.1.) states “residential uses include single-family, two-family, and multi-family up to a maximum of ten dwelling units per building.” He explained, “we are asking for 16 dwelling units in the barn.” Mr. Branon told the Members the existing Barn was quite large and that “we need the additional units in the structure to make the project economically feasible.” Mr. Branon spoke briefly about the difficulty of finding a proper use for the Stone Barn and how it had been vacant for so long. “This project is a great fit” he said, adding, “a denial of the waiver would be a hardship for my client.” Mr. Branon

then asked how they may wish to proceed with the requests for the night. Chair Holt replied, “the Board will take up the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone first.”

Conditional Use Permit for Encroachment into the Wetlands Protection Overlay Zone:

Mr. Branon handed out a color-coded graphic (Figure 1) showing wetlands area, proposed permanent wetland buffer impact area for construction access, proposed temporary wetland buffer impact area for grading and stormwater, proposed temporary wetland buffer impact for grading and pump station, proposed temporary wetland buffer impact for stormwater, proposed temporary wetland buffer impact agriculture and proposed additional area estimated to be used for agriculture.

He told the Members that there was confusion on how the Overlay Zone applied to the project. “So I would like to walk you through it” he said.



Figure 1: Color-coded graphic of the proposed Stone Barn development plan

Beginning with the 1,800 square feet of permanent wetland impact Mr. Branon reiterated the area was not a high functioning wetland. Pointing out the yellow areas (proposed

temporary wetland buffer impact for stormwater) on the graphic, he cited Section 245-25.J.3.b. which indicates sediment and detection basins are exempt from the ordinance. “Those areas are permitted use and are exempt. We are not talking about them” he said.

Mr. Branon went on to review the other areas including greenhouses and planting for agricultural uses as well as the removal of invasive species in the back and on the south side of the lot. He told the Members the light green was an approximate 2 acres of land for agricultural and farming uses on the lot. He noted the CUP being requested is for the jurisdiction wetlands, demarcated as the blue area to left of the permanent disturbance. He also pointed a small area (230 square feet into the buffer) where the pump house would go and noted “we believe the impact is essential and required for productive use of property.” Mr. Branon told the Members any change in the current layout would fragment the project and result in three times the amount of impervious coverage that the plan has now.

Mr. Branon went on to review all the mitigating components of the plan and explained the steep slope on the south side would ultimately be more stabilized than it is today. He reiterated most of the buffer areas have been previously impacted, are not native and have been filled with invasive species over time. He noted these invasive species would be removed and replaced with engineered stormwater management basins and treatment structures that will significantly improve the quality of the ground and surface water. Mr. Branon also noted that when speaking of loss to buffer functionality it was important to look at the property and project *as a whole* noting that the project minimizes the overall impacts to the land and the buffer/wetland systems. “The rear of the property will remain intact with this plan. With the qualitative and quantitative mitigation and no changes in hydrology, it is our opinion that it will be an improvement over all of the previously approved projects as it relates to overall impacts” he said.

Mr. Branon then proceeded to address the CUP criteria, noting that the project had demonstrated compliance with all the Performance Standards including *no net loss of buffer functionality* (citing the Functions and Values Assessment in conjunction with the State’s requirement to evaluate wetlands and buffers with a point system indicating existing conditions and overall functions and values are not hindered by this project); *stormwater management* (the project contemplates local and State regulations as it will require a DES Alteration of Terrain permit. He noted the design of the project adequately mitigates runoff from the site as well as stormwater runoff providing quantitative and qualitative treatment); *low impact design techniques* (Mr. Branon noted the consolidation of the project to the front of the property minimizes the overall impacts, resulting in a low-impact design. He briefly reviewed the treatment swales, level spreaders, forebays, and stormwater management ponds. He noted the landscaping will also be low impact and will fit with the layout of the project) and *Mitigation* (Mr. Branon again noted the removal of the invasive species, construction of the stormwater features, new landscaping, and the

active farming of the net zero Agrihood development all combine to provide consistent and continued mitigation on the property.

In closing Mr. Branon reiterated the plan as submitted constituted the best and most productive use of the land. He reviewed the stormwater mitigation, wetland wildlife corridor improvement and stabilization of steep slopes noting “we set up the situate for success, that is why there is a diversion at the top of the slope.” For the record Mr. Throop reminded the Members the areas depicted in yellow on the color-coded map were exempt from the ordinance.

With no other questions from the Board, Chair Holt opened the Hearing to the public.

Stan Fry introduced himself and told the Board he was the current owner of the property. He went on to say he believed the steep slope issue was exacerbated by developers throughout the years. “In cleaning up the property, we pulled out a lot of trash and other things from the bank” he said.

Francie Von Mertens introduced herself and spoke on behalf of the Peterborough Conservation Commission regarding their concerns to the impacts to the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone (WPOZ). “It is our sense there is lot going on” she said. Ms. Von Mertens went on to say that it was unusual for the Board to have brought a project this far along (referring to the pre-sold units and engineering, architectural, and design plans rendered) adding “and here you are looking at making a motion to approve a part of it” (referring to the Conditional Use Permit for the WPOZ encroachment). Ms. Von Mertens then stressed the importance of their decision. “Let me just say it is very important to get it right. I think there is a bit of pressure here. Maybe you should ignore the statement that half of the units have been presold.”

Ms. Von Mertens briefly reviewed the Conservation Commission’s view of the productive use of the land “which we had trouble grasping when we see access that crosses the WPOZ to reach two carports.” She noted the WPOZ ordinance allows crossings “if essential to the productive use of the land not designated as wetland, which has typically meant crossing the WPOZ on vacant parcels to reach buildable upland. But this is not the case, so what is the productive use of the land?” She also noted concern that the extensive stormwater treatment was located within the WPOZ to favor increased density on the lot and the steep, sloped buffer area of the Overlay Zone would be cleared of mature trees, stumped, and graded. “These cause major concerns” she said, adding, “and you say there will be more trees planted in the stormwater treatment area. My understanding is that you cannot do that, the roots are incompatible.” Ms. Von Mertens also noted stormwater treatment swales and detention areas have limited revegetation possibilities and strict vegetation management requirements. She suggested plantings in the SWT areas and noted, “that should be a condition of approval. That is pretty important.”

Ms. Von Mertens concluded by noting the New Hampshire Method of a Function and Values Assessment was “not much more than stormwater treatment and not acceptable as mitigation of high functioning wetlands.”

Mr. Branon responded he’d received a copy of the Conservation Commission’s letter and had gone through it, addressing each requirement in the ordinance. He told the Board, “the Conservation Commission takes aim at all of the wetland on the property when many of them are exempt.” He went on to say, “we have made a commitment, it is a good design.”

Mr. Branon also told the Board that blueberry shrubs, dogwood, and other transitional vegetation would be planted along the perimeter “and I want to be clear we are not planting trees in the wetlands. That is *not* proposed” he said. Ms. Vann asked if DES had a list of plantings for an area such as that with Mr. Branon replying, “yes they do.” Ms. Vann noted “then I suggest you use it.” “We do” replied Mr. Branon.

Mr. Galus asked about screening from Old Street Road with Mr. Branon reiterating that the tree line along the road would be maintained. “The goal is to keep the appearance of Old Street Road and the symmetry around the Stone Barn the same” he said.

Mr. Fry spoke briefly about the base cost of the restoration of the barn. He said, “Back to [the question of] hardship, the base cost of the barn is a hardship. It makes sense to start with as many units as possible.” Mr. Fry reviewed some of the soil and erosion issues he encountered while restoring the structure. Ms. Vann noted the land behind the barn was pretty much hard pack. Mr. Branon replied “100% correct.” Mr. Fry added, “Ms. Tracy was trying to accomplish land for agriculture. That is really important. We don’t want to miss the essential point here which is the *use* of the land.” Mr. Branon agreed and noted that the two wells and hard pack with glacial till in some areas would be reclaimed and revived though this project. “There is a lot of work to do to make the land agriculturally viable, but it is going to be a significant improvement with much more absorption than right now. This is the best layout for the existing conditions of the property” he said.

Libby Reinhardt introduced herself and asked about the exemptions of the wetlands talked about earlier. “Why are they exempt and what are they exempt from?” she asked. While pointing out the sediment, detention basins, and swales on the plan, Mr. Throop reviewed the RSA that exempted them.

James Kelly introduced himself and said, “to me this is a great example of what the Master Plan calls for. It is a fabulous example. It has social, economic, environmental, and regenerative value highlighted in an innovative and creative way. I am highly appreciative of what they are doing.”

Steve Walker stood and introduced himself. He noted he’d been watching barns for 25 years, adding, “Projects come and go, and about three years ago I thought the Stone Barn

was gone. If we lose this barn, we lose a part of our town.” Mr. Walker was highly appreciative of the quality of those involved with the barn’s restoration. “I am very much in favor of this, especially considering all the effort that has gone into it.”

Mr. Ward asked if there was any plan to expand the project with Mr. Throop replying, “No, not at this time.”

Alex Walker introduced herself and noted the planting of orchards in the back was a big asset to the project. “It is an innovative project and we will benefit greatly from it” she said.

With no further questions from the audience, Chair Holt closed the public hearing.

Deliberation:

Chair Holt noted the Board’s to focus attention on the comments that pertain to the area subject to the Conditional Use Permit and its criteria (reiterating detention/sediment basins are exempt).

1. *The use is essential to the productive use of the land not designated as wetland.*

Each Member was polled individually, and the unanimous decision was that the impact was quite small, or “inconsequential when you look at the amount of damage that could have been done,” when the whole picture was looked at. Mr. Carrara complimented Mr. Branon on his plan. “I think the engineers did a good job” he said. Chair Holt agreed adding “the responsiveness has been great. I think impact has been minimized as much as it can be.” Mr. Juengst interjected, “I am not an expert but with what I have heard here tonight I am satisfied there is no negative impact.”

2. *The use will be located and constructed so as to minimize and avoid to the maximum extent practicable any detrimental impact of such uses upon the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone.* All Members were in favor.

3. *There will be no net loss in buffer functionality taking into consideration the functions taking place prior to disturbance and the impact on those functions that will result if the proposed project is constructed.* The Members considered the proposed use of low impact development techniques, mitigation measures, and enforcement before, during, and after construction. Mr. Galus noted not only was there no loss in the buffer functionality, “it may even be better as a result of this project” he said. Ms. Vann agreed, noting the amount of refuse collected by Mr. Fry in the cleanup. “Looks like we are dealing with an already disturbed area” she said. Mr. Carrara added, “it was altered over time and we need to acknowledge that it was used as a dump site. Let’s call it what it was.” When asked for a consensus, all Members were in favor.

4. *Surface runoff will not be directly discharged into adjacent wetlands without preliminary treatment, especially to capture sediment and first flush flows.* All Members were in favor, citing the extensive drainage and stormwater plans presented.

5. *The encroachment will not modify the site hydrology so as to disrupt adjacent wetland hydrology with adequate flow to the wetland to be maintained over time.* As the Members weighed in one at a time, Mr. Hanlon interjected, “I think it is fair to say we are all in agreement and all in favor.”

Mr. Throop took a moment to review their findings and specifically noted that if the Board wanted the removal of the knot wood as a part of the mitigation, it should be recorded as a condition of approval as it relates to mitigation. “How it is removed and how it is managed should show as a note of the plan. It should be documented” he said. Ms. Vann added “a planting plan for the areas of the detention and how the slope will be stabilized should be provided as well.”

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Carrara) to approve a Conditional Use Permit as it relates to the encroachment into the Wetland Protection Overlay Zone with planting and slope stabilization plans specified on the plan. All members were in favor.

Waiver of Section 245-15.4.D.1. to Allow More Than Ten Residential Units in the Stone Barn Building:

Mr. Throop noted the Planning Board is authorized to grant a Conditional Use Permit for requests to waive any requirements of this section but can only grant a waiver if the Board finds (by majority vote) that the waiver is not contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance and strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.

A brief discussion followed with Mr. Carrara noting the structure was large and more than ten units seemed appropriate. Mr. Vann agreed, adding. “Dario is clearly correct, they don’t need to be creating 3,000 square foot units just to fill up the building. This does pose a hardship to the applicant.”

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Juengst) to grant a waiver to the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone II *Permitted Uses* that residential uses include single-family, two-family, and multi-family units up to ten dwellings per building, with all in favor.

Conditional Use Permit Approvals (CUPs):

Mr. Throop noted, “there are two parts to the Conditional Use Permit, with two different sets of criteria.” Ms. Vann suggested the Board deal with one at a time, starting with the minimum requirements for non-residential uses. Non-residential uses such as personal or professional services and retail that are primarily intended to serve the neighborhood such as a coffee shop or small repair services may be approved as accessory uses to a residential

use by CUP and applicable Site Plan Review requirements, *provided they remain secondary and incidental to the principal permitted use.*

Chair Holt read the minimum requirements, including, “the Planning Board shall not permit non-residential uses that present the likelihood of undesirable noise, traffic [both vehicle and pedestrian], light, fumes or other anticipated impacts that may be inconsistent with the rights of residents nearby and onsite.”

Chair Holt added, “the number of non-residential uses on a lot may not exceed the number of dwelling units on the lot and, to maintain a neighborhood scale, the total combined allowable area of all non-residential uses on a lot shall not exceed 25% of the total residential living area.” Chair Holt concluded, “so the intent of the regulation is to *not* have non-residential uses cause problems with the residential use.”

Mr. Branon noted that the layout of the project is such that the residential uses are internal and on the back side of the building “so we have a lot of buffering to the neighbors.” He went on to note the traffic flow and parking were also sensitive to the neighbors. He affirmed that the non-residential uses were in place to serve the residents as well as being an amenity to the public. Mr. Branon also pointed out a community space under the *J*, *K*, and *L* units, where a yoga studio would be located. “It is also a business and is cited in site amenities. I want to make sure that is clear” he said. When Mr. Throop asked if it was a separate unit Mr. Branon replied, “this is a condominium development, this is common space that is rentable.” Ms. Reinhardt asked if the yoga studio would be open to the public. Mr. Branon replied “yes.” Ms. Vann interjected “it is a community space rented by a yoga instructor to do classes.” Ms. Heller asked, “so is it a yoga studio or a common space that you can get a yoga lesson?” Mr. Branon replied that the space had no restrictions, adding, “it is a space to serve the residents, it is an open space that may be used for a variety of uses. We just want to make sure that is apparent.” Ms. Reinhardt asked how big the space was with Mr. Branon replying, “about 1200 square feet.” Ms. Vann interjected, “it is like Scott Farrar or Summerhill or RiverMead where a request for a use of their common space may be received and the Homeowners Association says yes or no.”

Deliberation:

Chair Holt read the criteria that a non-residential use may not present the likelihood of undesirable noise, traffic light, fumes or other anticipated impacts that may be inconsistent with the rights of the residents onsite or nearby and that the non-residential use remains secondary and incidental to the principal use. He went on to say, “the number of non-residential uses on a lot may not exceed the number of dwelling units on the lot and in maintaining the neighborhood scale, the total combined allowable area of all non-residential uses on a lot will not exceed 25% of the total residential living space.”

Mr. Throop suggested that the Board might want to discuss the hours of operation for the Café. He went on to say, “I believe the café has 50 seats.” Mr. Galus asked, “will there be any outdoor seating?” Mr. Branon noted a patio area in the back and that it would most likely accommodate some seating in nice weather. A brief discussion about the regulation of operation hours and outdoor seating followed with the sense of the Board being that both issues would be self-governing under the guise of the Homeowner’s Association. Mr. Juengst interjected, “Having been involved with HOAs I can tell you the residents will make it known if they are not happy with something.”

Chair Holt polled each member individually and the Members unanimously agreed the non-residential use was secondary and incidental to the primary residential use and the likelihood of undesirable noise, traffic light, fumes or other anticipated impacts that may be inconsistent with the rights of the residents onsite or nearby was not a concern.

Mr. Throop noted the plan called for the Café serving breakfast and lunch and asked, “what about dinner?” Chair Holt replied, “is that a concern for the Board?” Mr. Carrara replied, “not to me.” Mr. Throop repeated “again, I just want to make sure you are considering public testimony received at prior meetings expressing concerns about hours of operation.” The Members again agreed the project in itself would be self-regulating.” Mr. Branon agreed with the Board noting the project should have flexibility and have the HOA have regulation over what is served and when. He added that while the Café was primarily there to serve the residents, “it may also be a public amenity.” He then briefly reviewed several of the concessions that had been made in favor of abutter concerns. Mr. Hanlon asked, “will the Café have a commercial kitchen?” Ms. Tracy replied, “that is the plan.”

From the audience, Ms. Reinhardt noted, “the abutters have been thrilled with your response to them.” Mr. Ward agreed, adding, “I appreciate your consideration for the neighbors and your respect for everything I gripe about all the time.”

Mr. Carrara interjected, “I see Stan [Fry] is about to leave and I just want to go on the record and say the Stone Barn is a landmark and if it were not for Stan it would be gone. I saw the price tag to save it, we are indebted to him.” Mr. Fry replied, “Thank you, it has been an interesting time trying to find the right use for the building and it is not easy letting go.”

Chair Holt read the minimum requirements for the residential development of three or more units on one lot:

1. To qualify for application of the TNOZ II, all parcels are required to connect to municipal Water and Sewer. Note: *The proposed project intends to connect to municipal water and extend municipal sewer to the site.*

2. Minimum Lot size requirements (excluding utilities, rights of way, easements and 50% of all wetlands) is 5,000 SF. The entire development will be sited on a single 32.18-acre lot. The 33 units will be condominium units located in seven buildings. One of the buildings will have 16 units, which is more than the standard of 10 units per building. Note: *The Applicant has requested a waiver of this standard. That waiver has been approved.*
3. Minimum Frontage requirement for each lot is 50 feet. Note: *The frontage of the parcel is approximately 849 feet.*
4. Lot Coverage by impervious surfaces shall not exceed 40%. Mr. Throop noted the applicant had not yet provided this calculation. Note: Mr. Branon stood up and said, “the impervious cover is 5.3%”
5. Front Setbacks shall be at least 2 feet and not more than 20 feet from the property line. Note: *The front setback for this project is proposed to be the same as the existing building on the property (the Stone Barn).*
6. Side and Rear Setbacks - Buildings shall be separated by the minimum distance as required in the building code. No building or driveway shall be closer to the side and rear property line than 5 feet, except where a shared driveway or parking area is approved by the Planning Board (Cross access easements are required for shared driveways and parking lots.) Note: *The side and rear building setbacks for this project are proposed to be no less than 20 feet.*
7. Storm Water Management: Stormwater management shall be managed in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations. Low Impact Development techniques are strongly encouraged. Note: *Because of the scale of this project, stormwater management is required to be designed in accordance with NH Alteration of Terrain Permit Standards. These standards are more stringent than Peterborough’s storm water management standards. The applicant has represented that the design incorporates Low Impact Development techniques.*
8. Building design requires that the front door for all buildings will be oriented toward the street. The height, scale, and massing of the building, sizing, orientation, and spacing of doors and windows and the shape and orientation of the rooflines shall reflect “traditional Peterborough forms” as described in the TNOZ I Site and Building Design Guidelines. Note: *The existing building has a front door that is oriented to the street and the only changes to the front façade will be to enlarge the size of the windows on the center section of the building. All other residential buildings are located behind the existing building.*
9. Parking and Driveways: Parking spaces shall be shown on the plans. Parking for two cars may be in tandem. Parking spaces and cars must be at the rear of the lot unless the applicant can demonstrate that it is either not reasonable or feasible to create the parking area in the rear. In any event, a garage must be located at least 20 feet behind the front building lint of the house. Shared driveways and parking areas between lots are

encouraged, in which case, side setbacks related to the shared driveway and parking lot do not apply, cross access easements are required. Note: *42 of the proposed parking spaces will be in garages whose openings do not face the street. All other surface parking spaces are located at least 20 feet beyond the front building line of the Stone Barn.*

10. A conditional use permit is required for subdivisions of three or more lots. Applicants must include enough site and building design detail to enable the Planning Board to determine compliance with the ordinance. Note: *Full architectural renderings and floor plans have been provided.*

In evaluating the Conditional Use Permit criteria, Chair Holt reviewed the *purpose and intent* of the ordinance is to allow higher density and infilling of lots in closer proximity to already developed areas. He read the criteria (creating housing opportunities that reflect changing household demographics (seniors, single person household and affordable housing); creating opportunity for smaller, more energy-efficient (and thus more affordable housing); discouraging extensive development in rural parts of town; providing opportunities for small village business districts outside the downtown area; maintaining neighborhood scale and character as well as reflecting Peterborough's historic development patterns as they exist in the Downtown Center; locating density in closer proximity and with greater access to Police, Fire, and Emergency Services; enabling residents to become less auto dependent; and making more efficient use of the Town's infrastructure including water & sewer services).

The "Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone Site and Building Design Guidelines" provide the following guidance: design guidelines are intended to be used by the Planning Board to ensure that new homes respond to existing neighborhood patterns that residents' value; foster pedestrian-oriented streetscapes; promote design creativity; orient windows and entry way to the street with front facing garages 20 feet back from the façade; parking in the rear when possible.

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Carrara) to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a proposed 33-unit multi-family residential condominium development and a non-residential accessory retail use of a farm-to-table café, with all in favor.

Mr. Throop recommended that the Board hold off on voting to approve the subdivision and site plan, pending receipt of the results of the storm water review by the Board's consultant and receipt of the condominium subdivision plat from the applicant.

A motion was made/seconded (Carrara/Vann) to continue the Public Hearing to a time and date certain of December 17, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. with all in favor.

Other Business:

As he distributed an updated graphic submitted by Warren Street Architects, Mr. Throop explained several minor changes in the architecture of the Bridge Street Recovery Center

that the Board had approved in August. He noted, “as they went through the program plan on how to use the building, it differed from the architectural plan. So, they’ve made some design changes so that they don’t have windows in the middle of walls or bathrooms.” Mr. Throop asked the Members if they felt he could address the changes administratively. “Do you need a motion?” asked Chair Holt. Mr. Throop replied, “I need a sense of the Board.”

A motion was made/seconded (Carrara/Juengst) to have Mr. Throop coordinate the architectural changes and revisions administratively so that they may move on with their project. All Board members were in favor.

Next Meeting

December 10, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in the Select Board Meeting Room

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant