

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

The regular monthly meeting of the City Planning Board was held on May 19, 2021, via Zoom, at 7:00 p.m.

Attendees: Chairman Richard Woodfin, Councilor Byron Champlin, Teresa Rosenberger (Ex-Officio for City Manager), Members Susanne Smith-Meyer, John Regan, Matthew Hicks, David Fox, and Jeff Santacruce.

Absent: Vice-Chair Carol Foss, Alternate Frank Kenison, and Alternate Chiara Dolcino.

Staff: Heather Shank (City Planner), Beth Fenstermacher (Assistant City Planner), Sam Durfee (Senior Planner), and Gary Lemay (Associate City Engineer).

Chairman Woodfin read the following statement: As Chair of the Planning Board, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;

We are utilizing the Zoom platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Zoom platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through clicking on the following website address: <https://zoom.us/j/754076629>, or by dialing the following phone # 1-929-205-6099 and entering the password 754076629. For those calling in who want to provide public testimony, dial *9 to alert the host that you want to speak. The host will unmute you during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the City of Concord's website at: <http://concordnh.gov/273/Planning-Board>

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access;

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-225-8515 or email at: planning@concordnh.gov.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting; we will adjourn the meeting and have it rescheduled at that time.

Please note that all votes taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Woodfin called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Chairman Richard Woodfin, Councilor Byron Champlin, Teresa Rosenberger, Susanne Smith Meyer, John Regan, Matthew Hicks, David Fox, and Jeff Santacruce.

3. Approval of Planning Board Meeting Minutes

April 21, 2021 Minutes

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

On a motion made by Councilor Champlin, and seconded by Mr. Fox, the Board voted unanimously to approve the April 21, 2021, Planning Board Meeting Minutes, as written, by a Roll Call vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

4. Planning Board Chair Agenda Overview

Chairman Woodfin noted that no items were pulled from the consent agenda and there were no other changes to the agenda.

5. Determination of Completeness

- 5A. TF Moran, on behalf of KRJ Finance, LLC, request Major Subdivision approval for a nine lot cluster subdivision at 462 Josiah Bartlett Road in the Medium Density Residential (RM) District.

On a motion made by Mr. Woodfin, and seconded by Ms. Smith-Meyer, the Board voted unanimously to determine the application complete and set the Public Hearing for June 16, 2021 by consent, and as part of the motion, indicated that the project does not meet the criteria for a Development of Regional Impact (DRI), per RSA 36:55, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

6. Design Review Applications by Consent

- 6A. Neokraft Signs, on behalf of Bangor Savings Bank, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new externally-illuminated projecting sign at 82 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District

On a motion made by Ms. Smith-Meyer, and seconded by Mr. Regan, the Board voted unanimously to approve the design as submitted by consent, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

- 6B. Paquette Signs, on behalf of Ameriprise Financial, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated freestanding sign at 210 Rumford Street in the Urban Transitional (UT) District

On a motion made by Ms. Smith-Meyer, and seconded by Mr. Regan, the Board voted unanimously to approve the redesign as submitted by consent, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

Public Hearings

7. Design Review Applications

- 7A. A & M Signs, on behalf of Rupert Dance, LLC, requests ADR approval for the relocation and replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign at 105 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District.

Jeff Huberty and Kevin Soterion of Empire Pools represented the application. Mr. Huberty reviewed the information from his sign company regarding the extensive work required to address

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

the Board's previous recommendations. He stated that the cost is excessive to make the recommended changes; he believes his sign is better than most signs on Manchester Street.

Chair Woodfin asked what has changed since last month. Mr. Huberty stated no changes on his end. Mr. Durfee says the application has not changed, and ADR reiterated comments.

Mr. Woodfin says its grandfathered in for height and we shouldn't make them lower the sign, but the fact that the sign is already made should not have any bearing on the recommendations.

Mr. Durfee explained regarding compliance, it is only in the Central Performance District that you are required to have opaque signs. ADR has been consistent in their recommendation to make the background of all new signs opaque across the City.

Ms. Smith-Meyer suggested moving the Pools and Spa closer to the top, and then keep the reader board where it is.

Mr. Santecruce asked if there was any way to dim the light at night so it's not as bright instead of making it opaque. Mr. Huberty replied no because it is LED, but it's on a timer from 8 pm to 10 pm.

Mr. Soterion stated they are looking for clarification on what the Board wants as they have received conflicting information. Lifting the sign up as presented should address the concern that it looks like the same business.

Chair Woodfin explained that the Board is not going to bend the rules just because they went ahead and changed the sign without a permit or approvals.

Chair Woodfin made a motion to approve the sign as submitted in the proposed image – pulling the reader board up, and keeping at the same height. Councilor Champlin seconded.

Mr. Fox asked if the opaque sign issue was resolved. Chair Woodfin stated it is not a zoning requirement, the district allows it. It's a recommendation only, but not required.

Mr. Fox followed up regarding lighting, is there any requirement on that to limit hours. Chair Woodfin replied there is nothing to say it can't be on all night.

Councilor Champlin told Mr. Huberty that he should make the sign company own this because their job was to find out what the permitting process is in this community and do what is required.

There being no further comments from staff, members of the Board, or public, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Mr. Woodfin, and seconded by Councilor Champlin, the Board voted to approve as submitted in the "proposed" image, by a vote of 6/1, the redesign as submitted, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin – in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – opposed, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

7B. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Northway Bank requests ADR approval for the installation of two externally-illuminated wall signs at 190 North Main Street in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Mr. Durfee explained that the Applicant was before the Board last month with a larger sign package. Board approved most, with the exception of 2 wall signs in question. The Applicant responded to ADR comments with a border and text changes. ADR thought the second sign on the southern façade was not necessary since there is a tree and roof line in the way so people won't see it.

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Chair Woodfin opened public hearing.

Brendan Currier represented the application. He stated that they removed the sign on the railing to address Board comments from last month. He reviewed the other changes, and indicated positive feedback from ADRC. The Applicant is trying to work with the Planning Board to get the signs approved. Mr. Santacruce asked where the issue with the monument sign stands. Mr. Durfee stated that a variance was granted at the May ZBA meeting, so it will appear before ADR in June.

Ms. Smith-Meyer asked if approved, does that allow future uses to have signs on the building? Chair Woodfin indicated yes, and they can be bigger since the applicant proposed smaller signs than is allowed by right. Ms. Smith-Meyer followed up to state that the monument sign is enough, and the building is not designed to have all these signs. Councilor Champlin stated they are within their rights to put up the signs, but thinks they are wasting money on the southern facing sign, the only place you can see it is that one picture location. But, he will be voting for approval.

On a motion made by Mr. Fox, and seconded by Councilor Champlin, the Board voted 6/1 to approve as submitted with ADR comments, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin – in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – opposed, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

7C. Cole Glaude requests ADR approval for the installation of a non-illuminated wall sign at 138 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Durfee explained what was before the ARDC this month and has returned with a resubmittal addressing ADRC recommendations. They switched coloring of the sign to a black background with white letters; previously white background with black letters.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing. There being no comments from the applicant or the public, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Mr. Santacruce, and seconded by Mr. Hicks, the Board voted unanimously to approve the sign as resubmitted, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin – in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

On a motion made by Councilor Champlin, and seconded by Mr. Hicks, the Board voted unanimously to approve the awning design as submitted, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin – in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

7D. Tasoula Lillios requests ADR approval for the construction of a new deck at 46 Centre Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Durfee gave a brief overview of the proposal.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing. There being no comments from the applicant or the public, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Mr. Santacruce, and seconded by Mr. Regain, the Board voted unanimously to approve the design as submitted, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

8. Site Plan, Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit Applications

- 8A. Remi Hinxhia, requests an amendment to a previously approved Minor Condominium Subdivision, to accommodate a minor building addition at 16 Thompson Street in the Downtown Residential (RD) District.

On a motion made by Councilor Champlin, and seconded by Mr. Hicks, the Board voted unanimously to determine the application complete and open the Public Hearing, by a Roll Call Vote as follows:

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

Ms. Shank gave a brief overview indicating the applicant is proposing an addition to the building; therefore, the plat needs to be revised.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing.

There being no comments from staff, members of the Board, or public, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Mr. Regan, and seconded by Mr. Hicks, the Board voted by a Roll Call vote to grant the amendment to the Minor Subdivision for the proposed bathroom addition to condo unit 2, subject to the following conditions to be fulfilled within one (1) year and prior to sign off by the Clerk and Chair of the Planning Board and issuance of any certificate of occupancy, or the commencement of site construction, unless otherwise specified:

- (1) Address Technical Review comments noted in Section 2 above to the satisfaction of the Planning Division.
- (2) The Licensed Land Surveyor shall sign and seal final plans and mylars.
- (3) The Applicant shall submit two checks for recording the plan at the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds (including a separate check in the amount of \$25.00 for the LCHIP fee). Both checks are to be made payable to the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds.
- (4) Submit one mylar and one paper copy of fully revised plans for sign off by the Clerk and Chair of the Planning Board.

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor.

- 8B. Nobis Group, on behalf of Brixmor Capitol, requests Major Site Plan approval for construction of two new buildings for restaurant, retail, and coffee shop use with a drive-through facility at 80 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Mr. Durfee gave an overview of the changes to the plans. He stated that the Applicant returned to ADR with significant changes to the façade of the middle and quick-service restaurant buildings. 110 Grill is not amenable to having a Storrs Street entrance, per ADRC and Board recommendations, but have added placemaking and other improvements.

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Reuben Twersky and Ryan Guheen of Brixmor represented the application along with Chris Nadeau of Nobis Group, Shawn Lang, and Frankie Campione.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing.

Mr. Twersky shared a presentation showing proposed changes. He stated that they feel it connects more to the current architecture of downtown – glass and brick and some wood elements. They revised the potential Starbucks building to be more in line with what was shown at the zoning meeting. 110 Grill added spandrel windows to break up façade to make it look like a “front” and added landscaping, otherwise the site hasn’t changed much since last month.

Mr. Twersky showed 110 Grill elevations. Patio will face Pleasant St. extension.

Starbucks elevations were shown. Mr. Twersky explained it needs to be revised to show the pick-up window.

Middle building elevations were shown. Mr. Twersky explained elements of downtown that were added. They feel this presence shows a connection to downtown and is a major improvement to what was previously presented. Overall, they feel the changes create a site that matches activity of Storrs Street and keeping with the 2020 Master Plan.

Ms. Smith-Meyer asked for clarification on the sidewalk detail, explaining there should be a landscape strip between the road and sidewalk, and stated the site is missing shade trees along the street but also the parking lot is lacking shade trees. The landscape area north of the main entrance should include shade trees, there are too many walkways and asphalt.

Councilor Champlin asked if the middle building would be built prior to Brixmor identifying a tenant and will the future tenant potentially impact the design? Mr. Twersky stated that a tenant has not been identified, but the design lends well to being flexible with a variety of future tenants, and only minor changes are anticipated.

Councilor Champlin asked if there was a charette with ADR, as recommended by the Board last month. Mr. Twersky stated that they tried, but there was no time that worked before the ADR meeting, so they used that meeting as a charette opportunity. Councilor Champlin expressed confusion as to why 110 Grill is refusing to have an entrance on Storrs Street, as it is apparently not an issue for their restaurant on Elm Street in Manchester. People may want to enter from Storrs Street. Mr. Twersky responded that 110 Grill compromised to shift the patio, and with that, shifted a secondary entrance to be closer to Storrs Street. Operationally, they cannot change and believe their customers will be parking in the parking lot. Councilor Champlin stated City Council gave up a lot to make this happen by approving the zoning change, every incremental loss of that image, makes it less appealing to him. He further stated that this project is a determining factor of future development and vision of Storrs Street and he is concerned about future tenants of the middle building – what is to say a future tenant is not going to do what 110 Grill is doing and demand an entrance in the parking lot and not on Storrs Street. Mr. Twersky replied that he thought the zoning change was solely for the drive-through and didn’t think it was predicated on entrances being on Storrs St. He feels it is the best plan they have and they bring activation to Storrs St.

Mr. Santacruce pointed out that the site plan, landscape, and rendered plan do not match and asked for clarification of what they are actually presenting and voting on. Mr. Nadeau acknowledged inconsistencies with the landscape plan. He explained further changes to the plan to include removal of head-in parking in front of the plaza due to safety concerns from the fire department.

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Mr. Santacruce pointed out in the demo plan they are removing a number of handicap spaces, which are directly opposite of a door and the crosswalk of Market Basket. ADA requires those be closest to the entrance. He asked if Market Basket is aware that they are taking away all of these spaces, and will this have a negative impact on their users. Mr. Twersky stated they have presented the plans but will follow up with Market Basket. Mr. Nadeau said they can move spaces to get closer to the entrance. Mr. Santacruce referred to the ADR recommendation for a use study of the parking, he thinks it is a good idea. He would like to see a revised plan that caters to the handicap population.

Ms. Shank stated that she wanted to clarify that staff is not recommending approval tonight. Staff did not have enough time to review the revised plans, and there are still inconsistencies and significant staff comments they have not addressed. Staff wanted to continue the public hearing for more feedback and are recommending continuance to next month.

Ms. Smith-Meyer stated that there are no trees shown in front of the building on the landscaped plan, and expressed concern with using stone as a mulch. She did not know if this was approved anywhere else in the City.

Chair Woodfin stated that he wants to give consistent recommendations to the Applicant in order for them to move forward.

Mr. Nadeau stated that there is room to add a 5' wide landscape area. He previously did not understand that is what the City desired as it is not consistent with what is across the street. Ms. Shank explained we are not necessarily looking for a landscape strip, but instead an urban streetscape with street furniture area with pavers.

Mr. Campione stated that his only concern is they have a landscape area sandwiched between the sidewalk and an accessible ramp, and by shifting the sidewalk back there will not be enough area between the sidewalk and handicap ramp for the landscaping. There will be a wider expanse of pavement now because there will not be enough room for the landscape area.

Ms. Smith-Meyer stated the goal should be to make the pedestrian experience as pleasant as possible while walking down Storrs St. Providing shade trees in the right locations helps to achieve this.

Mr. Fox stated he would like to follow up on Councilor Champlin's concern regarding design of Storrs Street moving forward. This project is the last, best hope for taking a different tact on backs/sides of buildings. He questioned 110 Grill's resistance. There will be a massive wall along Storrs Street, people will be looking at a side of a building, 68 feet long with 3 windows.

Mr. Guheen stated that he tried to work with the tenant, as he was very sympathetic to the cause. Tenant says it would be a deal breaker if they are forced to move the entrance to Storrs St. They have compromised by adding an entrance through the seating area which is closer to the corner. He stated there were significant efforts on Brixmor's part, they tried, and the compromise is the closest they could get.

Councilor Champlin thanked them for the effort and for shedding more light on the resistance.

Mr. Guheen followed up that the 110 Grill owner is very confident in his knowledge of his operations, and knows what works for his business. He wants easy accessibility to the parking area. That's what their customers tell them. They want the main entrance close to the parking.

Councilor Champlin stated that his greatest concern is setting a precedent, especially the future tenant for the middle building. The project is supposed to bring more people to businesses on Storrs Street.

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Mr. Guheen replied that with the proposed design, customers can have easy access from both Storrs St. and the parking lot. He acknowledged that it is not quite ideal for the Board.

Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

Mr. Twersky stated that they want to get a vote tonight. Being pushed to June would result in missing a whole year of construction.

Ms. Shank stated that there are significant comments that have not been addressed. Staff does not feel comfortable making them conditions of approval.

Mr. Durfee stated that several comments remain on the staff reports that were submitted back to them in April. They were able to address head-in parking without issue but there are still issues regarding loading/drop off area crosswalk, relocation of handicap spaces, and consistency in plans and other extraneous pieces that need to be addressed. They are getting close with the architecture and relation to Storrs Street, but the other issues are not insignificant.

Mr. Lemay stated that there are remaining questions related to drainage, parking layout, and site circulation. Specific to site circulation are bump-outs, bypass lane, traffic flow, and whether a fire truck could circulate through the site.

Mr. Durfee gave an overview of the bypass lane concerns, and stated staff are still fleshing out what is required to meet the intent of the regulations.

Mr. Hicks stated that we have had 4+ hours of discussion and wonders what can the Board do that staff can't do; what is the benefit of making them return to the Board.

Ms. Shank explained that staff has not fully reviewed the plans and may need the Board to decide on whether some recommendations are reasonable.

Mr. Hicks asked if we could do a special meeting before the regular June meeting to help their timing.

Councilor Champlin made a motion to continue the project. Seconded by Mr. Santacruce.

Ms. Rosenberger asked for clarification relative to having an additional meeting. Chairman Woodfin stated that the Board should not hold a special meeting until all of the outstanding items are addressed. Ms. Shank added that this is not feasible due to timing. Ms. Rosenberger asked if the applicant will be able to have address the outstanding items by the June meeting so there can be a resolution at the June meeting.

Chair Woodfin re-opened the public hearing.

Mr. Twersky replied yes, there are a lot of technical issues, they will review with Mr. Nadeau. They will be ready in June, no matter what. Mr. Guheen stated they will stay consistent with what was discussed tonight and make it happen. Ms. Rosenberg asked the applicant if they feel the Board is clear with direction? Mr. Guheen replied yes – only thing that is a debate is the sidewalk in the front; comments are a little ambiguous. He agrees with the addition of street trees to existing planting areas to soften the area without impacting the layering. Ms. Smith-Meyer clarified it is to provide shade. Mr. Santacruce asked if the applicant provides updated plans if the Board can get them earlier than the Friday before the meeting to review to allow for more time? Mr. Durfee will send to the Board as soon as they are received.

Councilor Champlin asked if the application comes back in June, can the Board deny the application if they don't think it is the right plan for the site? Ms. Shank stated that the main reason to deny an application is ADR and inconsistency with the design of the corridor and how it should function. She will have the City Solicitor review grounds for denial.

City of Concord Planning Board
May 19, 2021
Minutes

Ms. Shank stated that when looking at the landscaping, they should be proposing large shade trees not ornamental trees.

Ms. Rosenberg asked why are we continuing on with this if we think the Board is just going to deny it; why waste their time?

Mr. Fox stated that he thinks this is a good project and they are moving in the right direction.

There being no further comments from staff, members of the Board, or public, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Councilor Champlin, and seconded by Mr. Santacruce, the Board voted unanimously to continue the Major Site Plan Application to the June 16, 2021 Planning Board meeting.

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

Other Business

9. New Architectural Design Review Committee member submission

Information was previously provided to the Board for review for a new ADRC member.

On a motion made by Mr. Woodfin, and seconded by Mr. Hicks, the Board voted unanimously to appoint Timothy Thompson to the Architectural Design Review Committee, as a full member with a term through May 31, 2023.

Chair Woodfin– in favor, Councilor Champlin – in favor, Ms. Rosenberger – in favor, Ms. Smith-Meyer – in favor, Mr. Hicks – in favor, Mr. Fox – in favor, Mr. Regan – in favor, and Mr. Santacruce – in favor.

- 10.** Mr. Hicks introduced a discussion as a follow up to the Empire Pools sign application. He stated that the Board needs to be clearer on what they are allowed to do versus what the Board wants. If the Board wants changes, we need to review the Code rather than make applicants jump through hoops. Councilor Champlin agreed, stating it is their business decision if they want redundant wording; let them if they want to.
- 11.** Chair Woodfin noted that this was Mr. Regan’s last meeting and thanked him for his dedicated services over the years. Mr. Regan stated that it was an honor and a pleasure to learn from everyone, and the Planning Board provides a valuable service to the community.

Adjournment

At the request of Chairman Woodfin, Mr. Regan made a motion to adjourn at 9:23 PM, seconded by Mr. Woodfin. The motion passed unanimously.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Beth Fenstermacher,
Pro-tem