

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Mark Olson, Chair  
Brendan McNamara, Vice Chair  
Fran McMahan, Clerk  
Tracy Emerick  
Keith Lessard  
Rick Griffin, Selectmen Member  
Ann Carnaby  
Jason Bachand, Town Planner  
Laurie Olivier, Officer Manager/Planning

**ABSENT:**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Olson began the meeting at 7:00 p.m. by introducing the Board members and leading the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Mr. Olson asked if the Board minded hearing 31-33 Ocean Boulevard first. The Planning Board agreed.

Mr. Olson also stated that Stowecroft requested to be continued to February of 2015.

**MOVED** by Mr. Emerick to continue Stowecroft to February of 2015. (Note: The applicant requested to be heard on February 18, 2015 via correspondence).

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahan.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 - 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

- 31-33 Ocean Boulevard – Discussion about December 3, 2014 Site Plan Approval. (moved to beginning of meeting)

Mr. Steve Pascoe and Mr. Joe Coronati appeared on behalf of 31-33 Ocean Boulevard. Mr. Coronati stated they used the tax maps in preparing the abutter list. Mr. Coronati did a 75-foot radius around the properties as well. A resident at 3 River Road claims to be an abutter. He wasn't within the 75 feet and Mr. Coronati does not feel they are a direct abutter. The gentleman was present at the meeting and was prepared and did speak at the meeting. Mr. Coronati wants the Planning Board's views.

Mr. Bachand stated the Board saw the 3 River Road property question before the prior meeting. Mr. Bachand received a call from Mr. Walter Wyse. Mr. Bachand asked the Town Attorney for his view on it and a Memorandum was provided. In Attorney Gearreald's opinion, he believes Mr. Wyse is an abutter and believes the approval should be vacated, and it should be re-noticed.

Attorney Gearreald appeared. He handed out State statutes to the Board. RSA 676:4 was discussed; the definition of abutters was given as well. If a perpendicular line is drawn, it hits Mr. Wyse's property. He thinks Mr. Wyse will appeal this to the Superior Court. He has

## HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

### MINUTES

December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.

appealed many times before. RSA 677:15 was discussed also. He asked if the Board wants to cure the defect now.

Mr. Emerick stated said the definition does not say “street(s)s”. It is one street. Mr. Wyse’s property is reached by crossing two streets. If we vacate it and then re-notice, it will be faster than going to Court. Mr. Pascoe said she or he will appeal anyway. It was noted that the applicant could go either two cycles with them or one cycle with them. Mr. Pascoe said this is a nuisance. He heard the argument that night. It was drainage. Building size and everything was agreed upon. Mr. McNamara asked what would be the soonest date a new approval could be given. Mr. Bachand said we could get a notice in to get the applicant in for January 7<sup>th</sup>. Abutters would have to be done immediately. The approval could be on the 7<sup>th</sup> of January also. Mr. McMahan said it’s been accepted. The variance is still in place. Mr. Pascoe agrees.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to vacate the December 3, 2014 decision along with the stipulation that the fees paid for the application are sufficient. Abutter notification fee needs to be assessed.

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahan.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

- 20 Keefe Avenue – Request from Peter Saari, Casassa and Ryan to release or reduce bond held by the Town of Hampton (vote required).

Mr. Olson discussed Keefe Avenue with Mr. Coronati. Attorney Peter Saari wants the bond to be reduced or released. Mr. Bachand discussed reducing or releasing the bond in the project. Two bonds were taken out; first, a \$20,000 bond followed by an Irrevocable Letter of credit in the amount of approximately \$55,000. CMA and Frank Richardson were contacted by Mr. Bachand to discuss work completion and bond issues. Frank Richardson is satisfied. CMA provided a memo which the Board received. The Town of Hampton wants to retain \$5,000 for plantings to be installed in the spring, as recommended by CMA. Mr. Bachand recommends that the Town retain the \$5,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Coronati stated the plantings are in the wetland area that was created on the development. They were planted when the development was put in. They are not coming up as quickly as anticipated. They have to monitor that site for 5 years and 4 years are remaining. Mr. Richardson will make recommendations to what he sees out there. The applicant is obligated under the wetlands permit on how the plantings proceed. If plantings do not take, the State will come down on them.

**MOTION** by Mr. Olson to return the entire bond amount and not retain \$5,000. He believes the bond is for the road and other improvements.

**SECOND** by Mr. Emerick.

### PUBLIC

Ms. Rayann Dionne, Conservation Coordinator, appeared. She said the special permit does require that the plants survive for two growing seasons. The Conservation Commission

## HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

### MINUTES

December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.

looked to Frank Richardson for guidance. The areas that were barren are getting shaded by the buildings. She is not certain that vegetation will take over. It may need some help. She does not see the harm in keeping the \$5,000. It is an important piece of the project; it's their mitigation. It would be unfortunate if that piece were not successful. It can take a substantial amount of time for DES to act on certain things that may be violations or need correcting.

Mr. Bachand recommended once again that the \$5,000 be retained. Mr. Olson said if the bond is not attached to this scope of work, he feels it should not stay. The bonds have nothing to do with this portion of the project per Mr. Olson. The bond got thrown at them mid-project. It is in favor of the Town. We are then holding retainage on something that doesn't give them any leverage. Mr. Coronati was satisfied with what he saw in the photos.

**VOTE: 5 – 0 – 2 (McNamara and Lessard)**

**MOTION PASSED.**

## II. ATTENDING TO BE HEARD

## III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

### PUBLIC HEARING FOR ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

1. Amend Article II – Districts, Section 2.4 to bring the Special Flood Area section of the ordinance into compliance with the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) allowing the community to remain eligible to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) once the new FIRM maps become effective.

Amend Article XI – Construction Provisions, Section 11.6 to bring the Floodplain Development Regulations section of the ordinance into compliance with the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) allowing the community to remain eligible to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) once the new FIRM maps become effective.

Town Planner Jason Bachand appeared with Town Attorney Mark Gearreald. A PowerPoint presentation was provided. It was noted that the Zoning Amendments are available at the Hampton Planning Department and the Library. They were also posted on the Town's website.

Mr. Bachand discussed the proposed Amendment. He noted the new flood maps are expected to take effect in Fall 2015, and the Amendment is the result of a compliance review by the State Office of Energy and Planning.

Mr. Lessard noted and reiterated to the public that this Amendment has to pass for people to remain eligible for flood insurance.

There are comments from the Town Manager's office. Consistency between Sections 2.4 and 11.6 regarding Definitions were discussed. Along with the compliance changes, they are trying to clean up the Ordinance. A second hearing may need to occur. Attorney Gearreald stated that the Board could have three public hearings if needed. It's best to err on the side of another hearing to reduce the potential for a challenge.

**PUBLIC**

## HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

### MINUTES

December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Jay Diener, Conservation Commission, appeared. He reminded people about the Community Rating System. Certain steps can help rate holders receive a lower flood insurance rate. The Town of Hampton has over 1,700 policy holders.

Ms. Woolsey discussed Page 5, Item 9. She said there's a trend to raise the properties at the beach. She said this gives another aspect to problems down there. Mr. Griffin said it's estimated that we could easily be the recipient of up to 20 percent off and as high as 40 percent off insurance rates. This is through the CRS process, which is separate from this Amendment.

Mr. Bachand verified the changes for the second hearing would include clarifying the Section 2.4 title as "Special Flood Hazard Area" and correcting the Definitions references.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to continue this article to the Planning Board's January 7, 2015 meeting for a second public hearing.

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTED: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

Mr. McMahon asked if this is the only meeting the Board can make substantive changes. Mr. Bachand noted it can be heard again on the 21<sup>st</sup> of January as well.

2. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.3 to replace all references to "Special Permit" with "Wetlands Permit", to expand the definition of wildlife habitat to include vernal pools (Section 2.3.1), to add a definition for vernal pools (Section 2.3.2D), to establish standards for very poorly and poorly drained soils (Sections 2.3.2C.1 and 2.3.2C.2), to revert back to previously existing language stating that forestry and tree farming are permitted uses in the Wetlands Conservation District (Sections 2.3.3A.1, 2.3.3B.1 and 2.3.3C.1), to provide more detailed criteria for tree removal (Sections 2.3.3A.2, 2.3.3B.2 and 2.3.3C.2), to remove reference to tree removal under Landscaping (Sections 2.3.3A.8, 2.3.3B.9, and 2.3.3C.9), and to identify vernal pools as an area to be protected (Sections 2.3.4B, 2.3.4F and 2.3.4G).

Ms. Rayann Dionne, Mr. Jay Diener and Town Attorney Mark Gearreald appeared. Ms. Dionne stated that this is the third time that this has come before the Board. There are minor changes to present. The Conservation Commission received comments from the Town Manager's office. She provided a hand-out to the Planning Board. They want to adjust the impervious surface definition. The change is for consistency. When Ms. Dionne comes back to the next hearing, the changes in the hand-out tonight will be included in the Amendment. Mr. Emerick asked why we need two definitions for the same thing.

### PUBLIC

Ms. Woolsey appeared. She discussed an item on Page 4 of the Amendment - Page 4, Number 8. Permitted Uses. Section B, "D" caught Ms. Woolsey's eye. She discussed "wetland crossing" at the point of least impact. She does not think there should be an "unavoidable wetland crossing".

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

Ms. Woolsey discussed under “Permits” on page 4, #4-construction of wells. She assumes this is for new wells. She sees nothing that relates to the preservation of the existing wells and the protection of existing wells. She apologized if she did not read it correctly. Ms. Woolsey discussed fertilizers, etc. It is under 2.3.4”. She asked if there were an enforcement provision. Attorney Gearreald stated the enforcement power lies with the Building Inspector and Selectmen.

Ms. Dionne stated there are no further edits to the Amendment.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to continue this Article to the January 7, 2015 meeting.

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

3. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.3.7C and 2.3.7C-a to combine Sections 2.3.7C and C-a to reduce repetitive language, and to modify Section 2.3.7C by requiring dwelling structure(s) and attached garage(s) to be at least 12 feet from the Wetland Conservation District edge. The proposed minimum 12 foot setback from the Wetland Conservation District would apply to the RAA, RA, RB, RCS, G, and I Zoning Districts.

Mr. Diener discussed that this Amendment applies to properties in the noted zones where there are wetlands and wetland buffers on the property. This leaves room between structures and buffer to prevent intrusion into the buffers. It is a primary structure setback.

The other changes help to shorten the Ordinance since they are redundant.

Mr. Olson said this is the buffer from the buffer. It is not more restrictive. This deals with primary structure setback. Ms. Dionne said for a shed or deck or patio – it is useable space. A bulkhead is part of a primary structure. Steps off a deck are permitted.

Mr. Olson likes how this is being addressed. He thinks giving the 12' seems reasonable.

**MOTION** by Mr. Lessard that to move this to the warrant.

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahan.

**VOTE: 5 – 2 (Griffin & Emerick) – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

4. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.8.G. to modify Table 1 and its associated notes by adding codification and improving consistency with Article IV - Dimensional Requirements, Table II in relation to the Town Center District.

Mr. Bachand appeared with Attorney Gearreald. He presented a PowerPoint slide on this Amendment. Codification was discussed as a means to prevent zoning relief from the entire table. The table was further modified to reflect the dimensional table in Article IV.

Mr. Lessard asked about “codification”; it is codifying. Ms. Ostman had a comment about adding parking spaces per dwelling unit; Mr. Bachand just received it today. He noted that parking is a separate section of this Ordinance did not recommend incorporating it here.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to move this Amendment to the Ballot.

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

5. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.8H.2. to modify Section H.2. providing clarification regarding exemptions from off-street parking requirements in the Town Center District through the granting of a conditional use permit.

Mr. Bachand discussed this Amendment went before the Board for discussion purposes before. It was presented to be stricken from the Ordinance.

Attorney Gearreald stated that the High Street parking lot has only 7 overnight spaces as is. Overnight space would need to be increased and that is only done by the Board of Selectmen.

**BOARD**

Mr. McNamara said when this was drafted last year, they were not targeting the High Street parking lot. The Board was trying to look for different relief. If someone wants to lease a space, the Planning Board was okay with that. Mr. McNamara discussed the lack of parking in that area. The Planning Board wants to keep the Village feeling. If housing is on top, we needed relief from parking. Mr. Lessard stated this would not be for residential.

Mr. Lessard wants the residences to have permanent parking. Mr. Lessard is not a fan of having a residential unit that does not have some permanently-attached parking space.

Mr. Olson said we are setting ourselves up for curb cuts. Mr. Olson asked why this is such a stranglehold. That parking lot is the most under-utilized piece of property. We want to do something positive, but don't want to extend parking? It makes no sense. Mr. Griffin noted that in the wintertime, half of it is full of snow.

Attorney Gearreald asked about public versus private parking spaces.

**PUBLIC**

Ms. Woolsey appeared. She thinks businesses should provide parking on their own lots. She discussed many buildings being built are too large. Hampton controls that parking lot. Hampton can do whatever it wants with it. It could be sold later. It could be a DPW building.

Ms. Woolsey discussed the A-Block. She asked where the people in businesses will park. She feels this is not how parking should be approached. She thinks the Article should be pulled. She thinks if someone constructs a property, parking spaces should be provided for.

On the West side, there are businesses there. It's private property. Those businesses can use the lots for profit. She asked what happens if private parking area for private business get used by other individuals. She thinks the Article is a problem.

Mr. Emerick said the Town Center District is in the process to have buildings be built smaller. Mr. Griffin said for years, people have rented spots. Deeded spaces were discussed. The Town Center District does not compare to the Beach area.

Mr. Emerick said to take the word "public" out of Paragraph 2. Mr. Olson said it has been done successfully in New York City and Boston, etc. We do have people moving cars, etc.

## HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

### MINUTES

December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.

In Portsmouth and Exeter – they have village settings. Cars are mitigated from the setting. Loading the street up with cars is not in the spirit of the Village District. Mr. McNamara said this passed overwhelmingly last year.

Attorney Gearreald said “available non-public parking spaces” should be added.

Ms. Woolsey is putting in an objection.

Mr. Olson asked if the Planning Board could re-visit this. Mr. Emerick thinks the changes are worthwhile. “Non-public” makes it clear per Attorney Gearreald. Mr. Olson said the Board should accommodate retail and services. Housing is a different matter; kind of a problem. The Board decided to add “available non-public parking spaces” and to remove within 500 feet of the proposed use (ending the sentence at “off-site.”) as the changes for the second public hearing.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to continue this Article to the Board’s January 7, 2015 meeting.

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahan.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

6. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.8C - Permitted uses in Town Center-Historic District and Section 2.8F - Permitted Uses in the Town Center-South and Town Center-North Districts to clarify that permitted uses may require Site Plan and/or Subdivision approval from the Planning Board, and to add a requirement for Use Change approval from the Planning Board for all changes of building occupancy involving any use of a non-residential nature in the Town Center District, each in accordance with Article I - General, Section 1.5 - Planning Board-Site Plan Review.

Mr. Bachand discussed the purpose of this Amendment with his PowerPoint presentation. Note 3 requiring Use Change Approval for all changes of building occupancy involving any use of a nonresidential nature was discussed. Mr. Bachand discussed an additional Note 4 for prohibited retail uses. Martial arts weapons were discussed. They would be excluded from this District as well as firearms and ammunition sales. Smoke shops as well would not be allowed, based on a percentage of sales area. Mr. Bachand stated it's up to the Board if they want to adopt this addition. If so, this would need to be sent for a second hearing.

### BOARD

Mr. McNamara asked about a Pharmacy being in the District. It was asked if Zippo lighters or tobacco items could be sold.

Mr. Bachand discussed a retail comparison to the Town’s adult regulations. Mr. Bachand discussed that 15 percent of the total display, shelf, rack, table, stand or floor area was the benchmark for those uses. Mr. Bachand stated the number could be altered. Mr. Carnaby discussed tobacco use, but not the other two items. It is because they are prohibited. Accessories intended for tobacco use is how the language is worded, it does not prohibit tobacco itself. Mr. Bachand spoke with the former Police Chief to get suggestions based on his expertise. Mr. Bachand wants the downtown to be family friendly.

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

Ms. Carnaby asked if it would be the entire Town Center District.

**PUBLIC**

Mr. Olson said he does not want to break it up. He asked if the Board could leave it out of the Town Center North and Town Center South Districts, but keep it in for the Historic District. Just Note 4. Note 4 would be included but applied to the Historic District only.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to continue this Amendment to the 7<sup>th</sup> of January, 2015 public hearing.

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 - 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

7. Amend Article III - Use Regulations to add new Sections 3.47 and 3.47.1 regarding firearms and ammunition sales.

Mr. Bachand stated this Amendment was drafted per the suggestions of the Planning Board. Retail sales were discussed in the past on this, and how the use has fallen under the general umbrella of retail sales. He discussed where firearms and ammunition sales would be permitted – in the Industrial District, as well as the Business and General Districts where lots have frontage along Route 1.

Mr. McNamara said in the Business District it is to the North. It stops at the Historic District. Mr. Bachand referenced a map which clarified the proposed permitted locations in relation to the Town Center District.

Mr. Emerick asked about the Scott Road location. That is Industrial as well. Mr. Bachand clarified the use would be allowed throughout Industrial.

Attorney Gearreald said firearm sales could be allowed under the North and South Town Center Districts. Town Center North and South may need to be added as a little “box”. Mr. Bachand suggested adding this language to 3.47.1.

**MOTION** by Mr. McNamara to move the Amendment to the January 7<sup>th</sup> public hearing, with revisions noted that said firearms and ammunition sales would be permitted in the Town Center North and South Districts; only where fronting on Lafayette Road.

**SECOND** by Ms. Carnaby.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

8. Amend Article III - Use Regulations to add language indicating the use regulations for the BS Zoning District also apply to the BS1 Zoning District.  
Amend Article V - Signs, Table I - Permitted Signs per Zone and Table II - Size Chart to add language indicating the sign regulations for the BS Zoning District also apply to the BS1 Zoning District.

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Bachand discussed existing use regulations and sign regulations. Mr. Bachand discussed dimensional requirements. The BS1 Zone was previously adopted with its own set of dimensional requirements, which are unaffected by this Amendment. This Amendment clarifies that the use and sign regulations for the BS Zone would also apply to the BS1 zone.

**BOARD**

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to move this Amendment to the Ballot.

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

9. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.7F to clarify existing requirements for signs in the Professional Office/Residential District, and to add a new Table 1 identifying which signs are permitted in the District, the applicable permit granting authority, and size requirements.

Mr. Bachand stated what the change is about and it is noted on his PowerPoint presentation. He noted that the existing language was very vague; the new table makes the requirements clear. Any sign type not listed is prohibited. Enhancing the character of the Town was discussed.

A letter from a resident was given as well and was mentioned by Mr. Bachand.

Ms. Carnaby asked if electronic signs are not on there. She asked if electronic signs in existence now can remain. She asked if there is control over how fast or how bright and how many times they change. Mr. Olson said when the gambling place was going to be put in, frequency and illumines were discussed. Ms. Carnaby discussed the lights are pretty bright. Mr. Lessard said the school sign was toned down. They got a permit. Mr. Lessard thinks this is a good amendment.

**PUBLIC**

Ms. Elisa Ryng appeared. She discussed the sign near the Jr. High and she sent the letter to the Board. It is 100' from the windows and it shines into their dining room and bedroom and tenants upstairs. She received the notice that this was taking place. She supports the proposed changes. The new wording seems favorable. She is happy with new Amendment. The LED lighting is invasive. At night, the lights come through. When it rains, the intensity is doubled. She is concerned also about her property value.

Ms. Ryng asked if changeable and lighting signs are prohibited in this area. She asked how the signs came in without being informed of it.

Ms. Ryng understands these signs won't be permitted in the future. It was asked if government entities do not go to the Planning Board. She thought abutters would have been notified.

She thanked Jason Bachand, Laurie Olivier, and SAU90 for listening to them. Mr. Lessard thanked Ms. Ryng. When the building is renovated, they may discuss relocating the

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

sign. The sign was discussed at School Board meetings. Any use of governmental land that is not a governmental use is subject to land use regulations.

Mr. Olson asked about unintended consequences. Mr. Olson does not think it is the right venue to have that sign there.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to move this to the Ballot.

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahon.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 - 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

Mr. Emerick would like to keep the yellowed versions going on as they are provided in the Board's folders.

10. Amend Article II - Districts, Section 2.1.3 to establish that the Tax Maps as prepared by the Tax Assessor's Office will be utilized for final determination as to zone lines rather than the currently referenced written description of boundaries.

Mr. Bachand discussed the purpose of this Amendment in his PowerPoint presentation. There is a change to be proposed on this Amendment. Zoning boundary determinations were discussed. Attorney Gearreald proposed this along with the Town Manager and Town Assessor. This cannot relate to tax maps alone. This would have to go to a second hearing due to the change.

Attorney Gearreald discussed the change indicating an overlay in the GIS mapping system with the Zoning Map.

**PUBLIC**

Ms. Woolsey appeared. Bounds were not noted in the past. Tax maps and district lines were discussed; not on maps. Article 2.1 was read by Ms. Woolsey. Attorney Gearreald discussed his opinion on this. What was given to voters he believes was sufficient. Mr. Olson discussed generalization by consultant.

Ms. Woolsey said in the Town Center North District the lines were screwed up. One could not tell where property lines end.

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to continue this Article to the Planning Board's January 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, along with changes noted above with regard to the overlay in the GIS mapping system with the Zoning Map being utilized.

**SECOND** by Mr. Lessard.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

**IV. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**\*NOTE: APPLICANT IS SEEKING TO CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY, 2015.**

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

**\*14-029 Stowecroft Drive/Dalton Woods (continued from July 16, 2014 & 9/3/14 & 10/1/14):**

Map: 41 Lot: 1

Applicant: Richard Green/Green & Company Real Estate

Owner of Record: Lloyd T. Graves Revocable Trust

Design Review (Converted from Subdivision Application 14-004).

**V. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF December 3, 2014**

Minutes will be addressed at the Planning Board's January 7, 2015 meeting.

**VI. CORRESPONDENCE**

- Portsmouth Herald article regarding potential sites to replace a contaminated well in the City of Portsmouth. Article provided by Mary Louise Woolsey

The Board thanked Ms. Woolsey for the article.

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

- Annual Town Reports for Planning Board and Planning Office – for review/comment.

Mr. Bachand discussed Annual Reports that were prepared. Mr. Emerick said we don't have the Town piece for the CIP portion yet, but it will be complete and then this report will, in fact, be accurate. For the Town reports, per Mr. Emerick, the CIP will be done by year end.

Mr. Griffin said the Selectmen discussed not taking into consideration restrictions for wells that is referred to by Ms. Woolsey.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Mr. Emerick to adjourn.

**SECOND** by Mr. McMahon.

**VOTE: 7 – 0 – 0**

**MOTION PASSED.**

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Olivier, Office Manager/Planning

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE\*\***

**ITEMS NOT CALLED OR IN PROGRESS BY 10:00 P.M.**

**HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**December 17, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.**

**MAY BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**