

TOWN OF CHESTERFIELD, NH  
PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2009

Present: Susan Lawson-Kelleher (Chair), Elaine Levlocke (Secretary), Jon McKeon (Selectmen's Representative), Helga Frohn, Bob Del Sesto, Brad Chesley (alternate), and Stephen Pro (Vice-Chair) – arriving at 8:10 p.m.

Absent: Tom North

### Call to Order

*Lawson-Kelleher called the meeting to order at the Town Hall at 7:30 p.m.*

### Seating of Alternates

*Chesley was seated for North.*

### Minutes –

- June 1, 2009

*Frohn moved to approve the minutes as amended. Chesley seconded and the motion carried (Del Sesto – Yes, Chesley – Yes, McKeon – Yes, Frohn – Yes, North - Yes, and Lawson-Kelleher – Yes, Levlocke abstained).*

### Appointments

- **William & Robin Penney/Truck Camper Warehouse and Bell Engineering** – The Board reviewed the application for a proposed Major Site Plan Review of approximately 2.6 acres located on Lyman Way (Map 14, Lot A11.4) in the Commercial/Industrial zone.

It was noted that the spelling of “Warehouse” must be corrected throughout the application; all submissions including all sheets of the plan sets spelled this w-h-a-r-e-h-o-u-s-e. The Board could not identify a list of all permits that would be required.

*Chesley moved to accept the application as administratively complete enough for discussion. Frohn seconded and the motion carried unanimously (Pro had not yet arrived).*

*The public hearing was opened.*

Bill Penney and Ron Bell presented the application. Due to the slow economy and lack of funding Penney would like to start the business off with a smaller building and storage on Map 14 lot A11.4 rather than the building approved for the final site plan of Map 14 lot A11.5. Penney owns the lot along Route 9 (Map 14 lot A11.5) and an adjoining lot (Map 14 lot A11.4). They are proposing initial development including a 42' x 60' standard metal building to be utilized for office space with a small bathroom, storage and maintenance along with 16 parking spaces. Maximum building height is 25'. Well and septic are proposed onsite. There are good soils with minimal run-off anticipated. A storm water detention pond

designed for Map 14 lot A11.5 will be used for both lots and 2 catch basins on Map 14 lot A11.4 should catch parking lot runoff.

Use Intensity cites 5 employees. Hours are 7-6 Monday through Saturday and 11-5 on Sundays. Anticipated traffic is 20 customers daily, the business being seasonal in nature; the highest volume is anticipated in summer. Sixteen parking spaces include 1 handicapped parking spot. Parking is estimated 10,000 square feet; 11.3% of lot is impermeable. There will be 3 exterior lights attached to the building – full cut-off, on timers. Landscaping consists of 4-5 proposed Eastern Hemlocks.

The Board was concerned that many of the factors to be included in this stage of development were not reflected on the plans before the Board at this time. The Board would like all aspects of the initial site development indicated on plans and a part of the application for preliminary development.

*Lawson-Kelleher allowed comment from the public.*

Sean Graves referred to the Bell's statement that most of the runoff from the parking lot would flow into catch basins; what about the rest? Bell stated that there was an embankment to the north of the building and a flat area below (septic area). There were good retention soils to accommodate the anticipated runoff. Graves asked for clarification that it would not runoff into the river. Bell stated there would not be runoff into the river.

Del Sesto stated that the locus plan was very general, not the standard submission. It is hard to see details. He requested the applicant provide a standard locus map showing both lots.

*Pro arrived at 8:10 p.m.*

McKeon inquired about the storm water detention pond and calculations. If the information related to this is to come from the original application approved for final site development, it must be included for review and approval as a part of this application.

The Board cited the following information that must come before the Board for review at the next meeting:

- Updated drainage calculations (surface water drainage management plan from previous plus what is added to be incorporated);
- Information/Plans for the storm water detention pond;
- One legend keyed for all plans (suggested presentation on Page 1);
- Sheet 3 – Layout to include distances from building to lot line;
- Drainage Easement;
- Note in Use Intensity Statement that there will be no accommodations for overnight camping and no associated septic waste disposal/dumping until approved by the Planning Board;
- Dumpster fencing detail to be added;
- Sheet 4 – Drainage to include high point/low point
- Parking space dimensions and delineation (to west);
- Velocity Reducer to be incorporated and shown;

- Use Intensity Statement to include percentage of parking to be used for outside display and storage (and delineation of area designated for such);
- Parking note to say, “Storage/Display”

*Del Sesto moved to continue the public hearing to Monday, July 6, 2009 at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Offices. Frohn seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

- **Browne Ltd. Partnership, Elizabeth Principe** – The Board reviewed the application for a proposed 9-lot Major Subdivision of approximately 111.8 acres located on Atherton Hill Road (Map 10, Lot A1) within both the Residential and Rural/Agricultural zones. No buildings are proposed at this time; lots are to be subdivided to be developed residentially at a later date. The Board had questions on completeness in the following areas:
  - Drafting requirements of Section 404.2.4 – Technical requirements/statement by engineer/surveyor: there is a statement included but not exactly as written in Land Development Regulations; will it be sufficient to satisfy the Board?
  - Deeds/Easements/Covenants needed – there are none identified/not known to the Board;
  - List of permits required – the Board could not identify a formal list: NH WS PCD (Storm Water), Wetlands, etc. Town and State subdivision are the only known requirements at this time;
  - Engineered estimate, as per 404.5.f – applicant has indicated “n/a”; there are no roads, etc. Is a waiver request in order? May be premature to try to assess at this point;
  - Proposed driveway locations as per 404.5.b – must applicant show proposed driveway location to show that lots can support driveways that meet with regulations?
  - Proposed septic– must applicant show that lots can support septic that meets with regulations?

Rebecca Todd, attorney for the Concerned Friends of Atherton Hill Road, requested permission to address the Board regarding completeness of the application. The Chairman indicated that this was not usual and customary, but would permit limited comments from both Todd and the applicant.

Todd submits that the application on its face is incomplete without the Site Impact Analysis as required by 404.5.e. This requires a written report to the Board by individuals qualified to provide precise technical details. Todd specifically refers to item #5 relative to surface water and groundwater quality and stated that the applicants have stated in the application to refer to a report from Steve Bracket. There is no report from Bracket included in the application. Todd believes that the Board should not find the application complete and allow the public hearing to commence this evening.

Ari Pollack, an attorney from Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell representing the applicant, requested permission to address the Board. Pollack stated that this stage is a completeness review in a public meeting by the Planning Board and input from the public is not proper in advance of opening the public hearing. He also stated that a statement from the engineer that there would be no impact is included; a report would be provided at a later date and all questions would be answered. The report was expected in time for this evening’s review; Pollack apologized, but felt that there was sufficient information to begin the review and

requested the Board move on with standard procedure to determine completeness of the application.

*Lawson-Kelleher polled Board members on whether they felt the submissions were adequate to find the application administratively complete enough to proceed with a public hearing. The results were "Yes" by all members (Chesley, Frohn, Del Sesto, McKeon, Levlocke, Pro and Lawson-Kelleher).*

*Pro moved to accept the application as complete enough to proceed with a public hearing. Frohn seconded and the motion carried unanimously. The public hearing was opened.*

Agents representing the applicant included Ari B. Pollack of Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell, Robin Freiman of SVE, Russell Huntley, Surveyor and John Parrelli, SVE engineer. Pollack initiated the presentation, stating that each ultimate purchaser of a divided lot must put in a driveway. They deliberately made the lots in R/A super-sized for conservation. Each of those lots were large enough for their own development, but they made individual residential lots specifically to provide for enhanced conservation of large areas of the land. Pollack believes the application meets all ordinances and regulations. The applicants have received the message loud and clear that the Board wanted a well-researched, responsible plan. Pollack believes that they have accomplished that. The Bracket report is in process and Pollack believes that the Board will be satisfied.

Pollack stated that his client's intent is to liquidate the real estate and noted that neither he nor his client is aware of any offers to purchase or conserve the parcel. He assured that he would listen politely when it was the public's turn to speak as called upon, and they would entertain any offer to purchase the parcel as well; but he expected the same consideration of those in attendance to conduct themselves with the same courtesy.

The Board read aloud comments from the Road Agent and Code Enforcement.

Greenwood would like to see a fire pond required with a hydrant and necessary site work. He noted that this would have to be a deeded restriction and may require a DES permit.

Bevis responded as follows:

"The Highway dept. has looked at and read the proposal and find one main issue of concern; access. The 9 driveways have a potential to create quite an impact on the roadway not only with possibility of overburdening the existing drainage, but nine new accesses may (in some cases, not all) cause issues with visibility thereby creating a potential safety problem. This also will add a degree of difficulty to plowing snow as the possibility of nine more persons pushing snow out toward our road then exists. This road has mud issues in the spring of the year and I see the proposal of nine new drives potentially as a real problem. The Highway Dept. sees the original proposal from Browne Limited Partnership, that being one new intersection with individual accesses away from Atherton Hill Rd. as a far better option with less impact to our existing road. As these driveways are placed, there will undoubtedly be spots where some of the mature trees will have to be cut to ensure maximum

visibility for safe access. I see this as yet one more reason that the original proposal is the better alternative.”

The Board issued a reminder that we are here solely to review the current application; previous development concepts are not a consideration this evening, although the concerns expressed by the public that were within the realm of what the Planning Board had authority to consider would remain a deliberation.

Del Sesto addressed the traffic study that was provided. He noted that he spent 1-1/2 hours reviewing a copy of the traffic study at home and still does not fully understand it; nor does he have the technical ability to understand it. Del Sesto suggested the Planning Board send it out for an independent professional review by an individual qualified to understand it and relate the information to the Board so that they in turn may fully understand it.

Lawson-Kelleher concurred with Del Sesto and stated that the entire application may deserve a review by a third party engineer qualified to do the same.

Pollack stated that they could offer an explanation to the Board. John Parrelli of SVE addressed the Board. He stated that the study showed that there were approximately 86 trips per day. At the peak period, there were 9 one-way trips (6 in, 3 out) at one intersection. Intersections were graded “A” to “F”, similar to school grading. The intersection was currently graded “A”. The traffic study showed that the proposal outlook showed the intersection would remain an “A” grading. He believes that the size, condition, pavement/tar, etc. were all taken into consideration. Pro asked for confirmation of that when the public hearing reconvened.

Del Sesto stated that in his view he saw the study viewing one end, then in the middle “internal rural intersections” only, then the other end... he did not see information on the intersection at Route 9 or at Cady Lane.

Robin Freiman of SVE stated that was because the impact was so low, it was the engineer’s decision, those areas would not be impacted.

Del Sesto felt there was a difference between that assumption and the reality of the number of cars backed up at the intersection to Route 9 and a hairy intersection at Cady Lane. Del Sesto feels this must be looked at, the actual existing conditions and impact from the proposal. Pollack said they could ask their engineer to do that, or they could wait for the opinion of an independent engineer if the Board appoints one.

Del Sesto said that when inputting, information was proportioned across time from existing information and there was a reference to accidents somewhere that cited a number of accidents from a figure in the Master Plan (“500 or something”); out of those, only 6 were on Atherton Hill. Del Sesto felt that of Chesterfield’s rural roads of this nature, Atherton Hill would be up there near the top 1/3 or at least 10-20% of accidents. He does not agree with the statement as he interpreted it.

Lawson-Kelleher would like to see information from the applicant’s engineer first.

Pollack referred to Bevis' comments and reference to the previous preliminary application; he stated that that application was not before the Board this evening and that the scope and proportion of this proposal versus that development were not the same; that was a whole other ball game and should not be considered this evening.

Lawson-Kelleher also stated that she did not want to entertain discussion of the previous application in reviewing this application.

The Board would like driveway locations indicated to demonstrate they could safely be accommodated. Applicants will need to consult with Bevis.

Since they felt sprinklering could be a requirement by the time the lots are developed, the applicants are proposing a requirement of sprinklers in each unit. Each home's unit would have a reserve tank fed by the individual unit's well. Applicants feel there would be sufficient pressure and hopes that sprinklers would alleviate the need for the need for an independent water supply for fire trucks and asked if this was a sufficient alternative to a fire pond. Pro requested that the applicants add a statement on the plans or a deed stating that sprinklers would be required. Lawson-Kelleher noted that the fire department has made it clear in the past that it wanted to see fire ponds in developments of this proportion and they need to get input from the appropriate fire department representative. Del Sesto commented that if the study they do not have tonight that purports to show that there is sufficient water supply for wells to support sprinklers to operate and provide adequate fire protection in lieu of a fire pond, there must be a study with information to support that stand. Lawson-Kelleher stated that she would check with Greenwood to see if he was aware that the applicants were proposing a sprinkling requirement.

Del Sesto asked how the applicant would ensure that the land within the larger proposed lots, that they are saying will be a buffer/conservation, will remain undeveloped. He sees enough land and frontage, etc. to put in a future development.

Pollack stated that they are looking to preserve the land within these larger lots. They propose no further subdivision of these lots; they would accept conditions restricting future development and would memorialize the condition with an acceptable deed restriction, but only if it makes the proposal more appealing or desirable to the Board for approval.

Pollack expressed his embarrassment that the Hydrology Study was not completed in time to present this evening as expected and apologized to the 35-40 people in attendance.

Applicant representatives stated that well radii are allowed in wetlands and are preferred in wetlands, actually. The well radius and wetlands serve to protect each other. The radius shown on plans serves to show the area protected from encroachment.

Russ Huntley stated that the squares that had been questioned were the areas where the leach field could be put based on perc test information. It was typical and enough to obtain a permit from the State.

The Board inquired what the square building was that was indicated on Lot 10-A-1. Freiman stated that it was an old foundation of a fallen-in house that appears to have been recently demolished.

*Lawson-Kelleher opened the public hearing to comments and questions from the public.*

Rian Peloquin of Lincoln Road said that this is not just an issue of Atherton Hill Road. Atherton Hill Road and Lincoln Road are tied together. You must consider what happens to Route 9 in emergencies and bad weather. Traffic gets rerouted up and around Cady Lane to Lincoln and Atherton. He would like to see these considerations addressed in the traffic assessments.

Eric Herr asked once the application is approved, what happens if the new owners come to the Planning Board for further development? Lawson-Kelleher stated that she would be comfortable with a deed restriction if it holds up; it would be a positive point.

Tom Duston of the Conservation Commission suggested they consider a conservation easement. They are a much better and permanent alternative rather than a deed restriction.

Sean Graves stated he does not see how the traffic study could be accurate as he personally makes 6 trips per day (round-trip) to Keene. He also noted the need to consider the safety of people walking, people walking dogs, children, horses etc. and road maintenance. There is a giant dirt section; in the winter the bus has had to circle around via Route 9 to circumvent this area and in the spring there is mud that makes passage impossible. There was just another accident at Cady Lane and Route 9. This is a dangerous intersection and he avoids it routinely. If the subdivision is approved he suggests paving and feels that the taxpayers should not be burdened with the cost to do so. He enjoys the wooded undeveloped area and says that in these tough economic times there are more than enough lots already for sale that we should allow to sell before creating more lots. He is also concerned about the ecological impact and would like to see a wildlife study. He spends a lot of time in the woods in this area. This further impacts his quality of life by not being able to hunt or enjoy this property that he states is currently open to public access. Lastly, he suggests assuring the use of appropriate signage when improvements are made and they are working on the road, citing instances of coming around a blind corner to find large trucks and equipment stopped in the middle of a single-lane road with little or no warning.

Dan Rath voiced concerns about traffic and safety and restated that in the winter more people will be using that road. He uses the road in the winter and he knows that he will see more traffic. He wants to know Bart [Bevis]'s assessment of impact to the road. He also wants to see the water plan. He stated that when Chesterfield Heights built a number of residents in the area had to hydrofrac and put in new wells; he has concerns about water supply. He also asked if they had considered the possibility of extending Chesterfield Heights Road for access to the lots rather than using Atherton Hill Road; this may provide a safer access.

Lawson-Kelleher stated that she would like to take a straw poll for her information purposes only; how many people in attendance felt that the quantity of the water in their well had been impacted by the development of Chesterfield Heights. There were 8 people raising their hands. She asked Rath how many gallons per minute he got from his well. He was not sure of the figure. Another resident answered that it was extremely poor. Pro suggesting checking the State's website for information. A member of the public stated that all of the information was not available on the State's website.

Pollack stated that he asked a consultant to solicit comments from people in the area who have had problems with their wells; he stated that he had no objection to a straw poll of residents for informational purposes, but he would object to drawing a direct correlation between the perceived impact on abutters from the Chesterfield Heights development and what would happen as a result of development of the subject property; that is would be an expert opinion that we here are not qualified to make.

Lawson-Kelleher conveyed that they did not intend to draw such a conclusion. She was unsure if Pollack had been aware of the perceived impact that had been experienced in the area. Del Sesto stated that in reviewing the proposal; they had to consider the possibility of impact on neighboring properties. Pollack understands, but took issue with a member of the public stating that their property was affected by drilling wells for a different project. The Board will be looking for a statement from a qualified hydrologist indicating that there would be a sufficient supply of water available that would not create a negative impact on the water supply of neighboring properties.

Some of the residents in attendance acknowledged that they had received surveys inquiring about their water quality.

Bob Graves asked how many gallons per minute would be needed when the sprinkler systems were called upon. He suspects it would require a lot of pressure.

Pro said he would like to see information from the NH Heritage Bureau on wild life, wetlands, plants, etc. in the area that may be impacted.

Louise Rath stated that she assumed that when Chesterfield Heights went through the approval process, they had to have tests indicating that they had a sufficient water supply as well and feels that tests will not assure that neighboring residences will not be impacted; she believes that at some point they will run out of water. The tests will be conducted on the applicant's property and not on the neighboring properties. The tests will show that they have access to sufficient water, but not that their water supply will not be impacted. She also inquired if there was an existing pond or wetlands.

There is an existing natural pond on jurisdictional wetlands. The application as it stands proposes to leave that as is; if the Planning Board requires a fire pond, that may be subject to change.

Lawson-Kelleher also noted that the initial approval for Chesterfield Heights was obtained prior to the current subdivision regulations were enacted in 1991; regulations at that time were nowhere near as detailed as our current regulations.

Sigfried Richter referred to the pond across from the Houghton property. He noted that this is a seasonal pond and he has seen that pond dry many times, but feels that wells are the most serious issue. He has hydrofractured twice to get a sufficient water supply.

Frank Richter agrees that they need to see the groundwater study and would like to have seen it before the board accepted the application.

There was a question of the plans showing, when overlaid, drainage appears to go to a pond which is connected to California Brook; there has been an effort to protect this watershed area.

Tom Duston, representing the Monadnock Conservancy, stated that 750 acres of land are held in conservation to protect the California Brook watershed; he asked that drainage be looked at carefully as this is a significant effort to protect the area.

Del Sesto asked how conservation easements are obtained; are they purchased? Duston stated that they are purchased or donated. The applicant could grant an easement to the Town.

It was noted that the applicant has stated they are willing to grant a deed restriction and accept that as a condition of approval; but the Board cannot force them to grant a conservation easement if they do not offer to do so willingly.

It was noted that the California Brook watershed goes into the Ashuelot watershed that in turn goes into the Connecticut River.

Pat Grace is an abutter who has been affected by Chesterfield Heights, but is concerned because this property is even closer to home to nine other existing abutters.

Rebecca Todd stated that the Concerned Friends of Atherton Hill Road opposes this subdivision. They feel it is not wise, they believe it is not sustainable and they believe it is not allowed under the Town of Chesterfield ordinances. There have been numerous problems heard. She wanted to highlight some things that had not been discussed. Discussion this evening has been of a proposed 9-unit subdivision but she believes it should be looked at as 10 units; this means not just an additional 9 more trips per day on the roads, but 10 – or not just 86 trips per day, but 96 trips added to a road that has winter safety issues, mud issues, school bus safety issues, sight issues for driveways and an existing accident rate that demands we view this as a significant safety issue. The level of service issue is really a red herring; we have a level of service “A” here; we are going to have a level of service “A” here... while it may be inconvenient, traffic is not the real issue – traffic and safety are the real issues here. There are significant issues with both surface water quality and ground water quality. She finds it problematic that the Planning Board accepted the application as complete because now the clock is ticking and we will have a lot more information, both anecdotal and scientific, that we need to have. Aside from the amount of anecdotal information presented to give us pause regarding an area with historic water quality problems, there are really 3 items we need to address: water, roads, and the rural character of the area. If allowed, this subdivision will alter an area prized for natural resource value. It is still an integral part of the California Brook watershed, an area that a lot of people have invested time and money trying to protect. Development will irrevocably alter the character. She requested a continuance until all studies and requests have been completed. She intends to submit written testimony.

Del Sesto asked Todd specifically what ordinances she believed the application did not meet. Todd cited only Section 604.1 of the Land Development Regulations that states:

#### 604 SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

## 604.1 Adjacent Properties

Surface water resulting from land development shall not cause increased flooding or unreasonable deposits of storm water runoff or sediment onto adjacent properties or properties further downstream in the drainage basin unless easements for the same are obtained and granted to the Town. The Planning Board has the right to review and approve or disapprove the layout, rights granted or language of any such easements.

Todd stated that the 10-year and 50-year drainage show increases in flooding.

Pollack asked for clarification of whether the Concerned Friends of Atherton Hill Road is an entity or a group of individuals; if it is a group of individuals, he would like that disclosed for the record and a list of the individuals comprising the group so that members of the public can be identified as to who is represented and who is not. Lawson-Kelleher requested that information as well. Todd will provide a list.

Bob Graves asked if the applicant is willing to redo the road in the spring when it becomes impassable.

Lawson-Kelleher said that the Board can look at impact and identify improvements that will be necessary. The Planning Board can require improvements be made, funded by or partially funded by the applicant, but it is not a cut and dry issue; it needs research.

Pollack stated that they are not required to respond; the applicants maintain that improvements are not necessary at this time.

Pro recalled that many residents voiced opposition to paving the road at the previous preliminary hearing.

Sarah Cooper-Ellis stated that the feeling was that “some of us” prefer to maintain the rural nature, but with the addition of 9 more residences they do not want to be responsible for paying for improvements if they are necessary. She also voiced concern regarding not only the demand on wells, but also the flood implications. It was stated that the Surface Water Management Plan will address this issue.

Pro summarized some key points to be revisited:

- Access/sight
- Fire protection
- Traffic Study
- NH Heritage Bureau information
- Water Study
- Surface Water

He noted that .3 CFS is the extent of the anticipated increase. A zero-increase is possible, but may require a structure and the Town would have to take it over eventually. The Board

needs to discuss and look for balance between safety and maintenance and the potential impact on the Town.

Pollack agreed that is all correct, but it is their position that the post-development figures show a negligible increase. Pollack is not opposed to the Town seeking more qualified individuals to make an assessment.

Kate Foldeak of Lincoln Road said that there area lot of vernal pools along the road. Impact from the exhaust from additional traffic should be noted as a concern as well.

*Del Sesto moved to continue the public hearing to Monday, July 20, 2009 at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Hall. Frohn seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

### **Items for Discussion**

- **Evangelical Free Church of America Camp Spofford** – Conditionally approved application for a Site Development Review on property known as Camp Spofford to replace a previously existing structure that was destroyed by fire. The Board anticipates final submissions, but the applicants were not present this evening. The Board will review submittals when presented for review at a public meeting, and will address the matter of appointing an independent Life Safety reviewer.
- **State of NH/Welcome Center** – Lawson-Kelleher read the response drafted aloud for the Planning Board heard. The Board commended her on her efforts. Minor editing was performed. Lawson-Kelleher will finalize the letter and forward it to the appropriate parties.

*Del Sesto moved to authorize Lawson-Kelleher to sign the response and send it to NHDOT with copies to DRED, NH State Liquor Commission, State agents, Senators, Representatives and the Governor. Frohn seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

### **Items for Information**

- **ZBA** – Alex Kwader Notice of Decision: Rehearing of the application for Variance from Article 204.4 Section B, Lot Frontage, to permit a residential lot with 55 ft. of frontage where 400 ft. is required - denied June 9, 2009
- **Hinsdale Planning Board** – Notice of Public Hearing: Wal-Mart, Major Site Plan, Tuesday, June 16, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m. at the Hinsdale Town Hall
- **Town of Winchester** – To host a Planning Board Training Seminar June 29<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, conducted by Lisa Murphy from SWRPC: RSVP by 6/24/09.
- **LGC** – New Hampshire Town and City: June 2009 edition
- **LGC Life Resources – Member Assistance Program**: Available to Board Members – Materials were not distributed or reviewed this evening. This item will be re-listed on the July 6<sup>th</sup> agenda.
- **LGC** – Knowing the Territory: 2009 Edition available to order in print or CD
- **AIA New Hampshire** – Results of Blueprints for America

### **Other Business**

- **Planning Board Contact List** – circulated for updated information.

## Items for Signature

- **Planning Board Minutes** – May 4, 2009
- **Planning Board Minutes** – May 18, 2009
- **Planning Board Minutes** – May 26, 2009
- **Planning Board Minutes** – June 1, 2009

## Adjournment

*Del Sesto moved to adjourn at 11:13 p.m. Frohn seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

Respectfully Submitted by:

**Patricia L. Blum**

Approved July 6, 2009:

                  //s// Susan Lawson-Kelleher  
**Susan Lawson-Kelleher, Chairman**

                  July 20, 2009  
**Date**