

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES ~ DRAFT

2 February 18, 2025 Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

3
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman
6 Janet Langdell, Vice Chairman
7 Andrew Ciardelli, Member
8 Pete Basiliere, Member
9 Susan Robinson, Member
10 Chris Labonte, Selectman's Representative

Staff:

Terrey Dolan, Town Planner
Nate Addonizio, Videographer
Camille Pattison, Community Dev. Dir.

11
12 **VIA Zoom:**

13 Paul Amato, Member
14 Susan Smith, Alternate

15
16 **Excused:**

17
18
19
20 1. **Call to order:** Chairman Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Planning Board members
21 that were present and staff were introduced by D. Knott.

22
23 2. **Public Hearing:**

24
25 A. **Case SP#2023-02, The "Q" Project Start Time Extension Request Letter, "0" Ponemah Hill**

26 **Road, Map** The applicant has requested a Time Extension Approval by the Milford Planning
27 Board, due to the previously denied project appeal filings of the overall project, made to the NH
28 Housing Appeals Board (NHHAB). The Major Site Plan's Expiration Date is now set for May 8,
29 2025, with the applicant now requesting a Six-Month Time Extension in accordance with
30 Section 4.07 (Site Plan Extension & Expiration of Approval) of the Milford Development
31 Regulations.

32 Matt Peterson from Keach Nordstrom and Associates noted they have gone through the appeal
33 process with some concerned citizens of the town and the appeal period has ended. They have been
34 working with staff on the final plan set and their attorney and the town attorney have been going
35 over the easement documents; they should be recorded next week. He did not think he would be
36 going past the May 8, 2025 date but wanted to cover all the bases. He hoped to get a plan set
37 before the board in the next few weeks. He would appreciate the additional six months to make
38 sure everything was in order. D. Knott asked the board if they had any questions; there were none.
39 He then opened the hearing for public comment. Scott Kimball, Whitten Road, requested this be
40 denied as the applicant felt it wasn't needed. He referenced table 7 from their original application,
41 to calculate the student generation, and felt they had made a mistake in their calculations. He felt
42 they undercounted by at least 100%. He felt better data came from the National Multifamily Home
43 Building Council; the number would be larger. He felt NPRC only looked at 6-17 year olds and
44 miss several grades. The estimated tax revenue from this project is below what it will cost the
45 town. He felt the people deserved due process under the Master Plan as the applicant has received
46 due process to ensure this won't be another millstone around the neck of the taxpayers. D. Knott
47 asked if he was an abutter; he is not. Chris Swiniarski, project attorney from Devine Millimet of
48 Manchester, NH, noted the merits of the application were litigated extensively. A key reason for
49 the delay was the appeal was filed in the housing appeals board and a week later, most of the board
50 quit so they were stalled for 6 months, and they had no recourse until that changed. D. Knott then
51 closed the public portion of the hearing. He then asked for a motion. J. Langdell made the motion
52 to extend the time period to November 8, 2025, as requested by the applicant, in the event they

need the extra time. A. Ciardelli seconded the motion. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Amato- yes, S. Robinson – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, J. Langdell – yes, C. Labonte – yes, P. Basiliere – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed.

B. Continuation of Case SP#2024-22, Stone Ledge Major Site Plan Approval Request by Loyal Holdings, LLC, for seventy (70) multi-family townhouse-styled residential units along the northeast area of Nathaniel Drive & South Street, Map 43 Lot 20

The applicant, Loyal Holdings, LLC has requested Major Site Plan Approval for a townhouse-styled rental complex to be located on approximately 15.963 acres, Map 43 Lot 20. Nine separate residential buildings shall contain a total of seventy (70) multi-family units, with a separate clubhouse building. The site is zoned Limited Commercial Business (“LCB”), pursuant to Section 5.07 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance. A singular point of primary access is being proposed for Nathaniel Drive; with an additional gated “restricted emergency access” also being proposed for the existing southern terminus of Webster Street, located along the north end of the project site. **(Hearing Continued from the 01/21/2025 Mtg.)**

Knott recused himself from the original hearing and would do so for this one. J. Langdell would chair this application. She asked S. Smith to fill in for D. Knott. T. Dolan noted they met with Keach Norstrom a week ago on February 10th regarding transportation issues, signalization, and things along those lines. The applicant has come back knowing more engineering and site design plan work is required; this will be presented at the March 18th meeting. Brad has requested to come tonight to discuss these items only. The board received a site plan and some highlights of the project in their packets, including the results of the traffic study, 3rd party review and DOT review of the project. Steven Haas, Hoyle Tanner is on Zoom and is available for comment. The original application from January 21st was also on the table. J. Langdell noted this was a limited conversation that stems from the meeting on February 10th. Matt Peterson, Keach Nordstrom & Associates was representing the Stone Ledge, the proposed residential development. He stated he was not here to discuss traffic. He wanted to update the board on what they have been doing for the past month. They will bring their traffic engineer, the town engineer and related information to the next meeting. He wanted the board to have enough time to review the documents before the March meeting. He noted there were a few things that came up from the January meeting the town council asked them to look at. There will be a new landscape plan that will increase the buffer along Prospect Street and along the wall near other residents who were present at the previous meeting. The received comments from Alteration of Terrain on January 7 and they will have their response back to the state in about 2 weeks; the board’s comments will also be included. They met at Keach Norstrom offices on February 10 with town council, his traffic council, and others to better understand the situation. Recommendations by all councils will be presented in March. All data will be explained at that time. There are 4 remaining pads sites out there and they will take a look at what a possible full build out would be with realistic assumptions. J. Langdell note that was expected from both sides. M. Peterson noted he had gotten a request for a proposal for one of the sites that he is working on. J. Langdell noted the build out discussion happened on February 10. P. Basiliere wanted to know who was present at that meeting. The applicant, Steven Haas, Terrey Dolan, M. Peterson, K&N’s traffic engineer, attorney and representative and Pete Madsen. They will have numbers for the entire project at the next meeting. He noted the town had a concern with adding an additional traffic light; that will be addressed. J. Langdell noted that was the result of the last meeting: they needed to get additional information and numbers. She thanked staff for the buildout numbers as that is a variable the board needs as well. She noted the project on Clinton Street and the question of a traffic light is similar to this discussion – it didn’t meet the warrants so there was no light. P. Basiliere asked if the 4 remaining parcels would be residential. M. Peterson replied it would be a mix of residential and commercial. P. Basiliere asked if they looked at what would happen if the residents started to use Ponemah Hill Road or Webster Street. What

protects the town so that there will never be access on Webster Street? M. Peterson said it was up to the planning board to make sure that doesn't happen. J. Langdell noted the plan has been Ponemah Hill Road is only for emergency use only and this is where it could be done as well. P. Basiliere wanted it known that at some point, there will be a large volume of traffic on those streets and a traffic study would be helpful if they would consider that. M. Peterson said they have included the 218 units, the gas station and the addition 70 units, in 2030, there will be 1.5 cars at that intersection. The last thing to discuss is the water line; there is an old water main that runs down next to the property from an old water tank that goes to Route 13. Jim Pouliott, Water Utilities Director, would like them to circle around from Route 13. J. Pouliott noted there are some water line issues on Webster Street so they might end up doing a joint project there to better the area. J. Langdell asked the board if they had any questions. C. Labonte noted blasting was discussed at the last meeting and should be addressed at the next. He asked about the turnaround at the emergency gate – where would fire trucks or ambulances be able to turn around? M. Peterson replied they are in the process of fixing that. J. Langdell opening the hearing up to the public. S. Kimball wanted to make clear he didn't see how Milford would be prospering from any of these projects. They should be able to justify whether this is good for the town or not. How does Milford benefit from this project? The Master Plan is about making sure the interests of the people of Milford are taken care of. Mikie Thornton, North River Road, noted the existing Master Plan and the future one note that the desire is to keep Milford's small-town character. With the addition of 3000 more living units by 2040, and most of them being rentals, that puts more of a financial burden on the school system. Would more single-family homes, 4-5 per acre be better? Can we make the Master Plan and what we are doing agree? J. Langdell then closed the public portion of the hearing. She recommended the board vote to continue this case to the March 18, 2025 meeting. A. Ciardelli made the motion; C. Labonte seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: S. Smith – yes, P. Amato – yes, S. Robinson – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, C. Labonte – yes, P. Basiliere – yes, J. Langdell – yes. Motion passed.

- C. **Case SD #2025-0, Robert LaMattina Revocable Trust, Condominium Conversion for Five Units, located at 20 Hammond Road, Map 43 Lot 73** The applicant/owner, the Robert LaMattina Revocable Trust has requested a Condominium Conversion of the mixed-use Lot for the existing single-family home, the attached & existing two-story commercial space presently utilized as the Tokyo Joe's Martial Arts Studio; along with the existing two multi-family (first and second floor) rental units contained within the detached garage building; located at 20 Hammond Road, Map 43 Lot 73. This Condominium Conversion is requested to approve a total of five separate condominium units, under Section 5.06 of the Milford Development Regulations. The 1.40-acre Lot is zoned Commercial ("C"), in accordance with Section 5.05 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance. D. Knott asked if the application was complete; T. Dolan replied it was. J. Langdell made the motion to accept the application; S. Robinson seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: S. Smith – yes, P. Amato – yes, S. Robinson – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, J. Langdell – yes, C. Labonte – yes, P. Basiliere – yes, D. Knott – yes. D. Knott asked if there was a motion for any potential regional impact associated with this application. C. Labonte noted there was only one of two condo conversion paperwork in the packet. J. Langdell noted it shouldn't impact the hearing of the application. She then made the motion there is no potential regional impact associated with this application; P. Amato seconded. ROLL CALL: P. Basiliere – yes, C. Labonte – yes, J. Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott - yes. Motion passed. T. Dolan read the abutter's list into the record. David Hammer, abutter, was on Zoom. D. Knott noted Justin Demontiny was present, who was considering applying to be a member of the planning board. **Jim Ack,** Fieldstone Land Consultants, was representing Robert Lamattina, owner of the property. They are looking to convert to 2 residential condo units in the detached garage, 1 residential unit in the 2-story building, an additional unit for the existing Tokyo Joe's Karate Studio with a proposed

additional residential unit to be constructed in the second floor karate studio. J. Langdell asked if it was all rented. J. Ack replied the one existing residential unit were rented and the karate studio was being used. D. Knott asked if they were asking to increase the capacity. He noted the existing second floor was an open dojo space but would be made into a 3-bedroom residential space, so it would increase the capacity. D. Knott asked if they met the parking requirements. J. A replied they did; 17 are required and there are 24 existing parking spaces. D. Knott thought there wouldn't be a significant change to the property with the addition of a few people. He asked why the applicant was doing this. J. A thought the owner wanted to sell off a few of the units to make some money back on his investment. He will maintain ownership of the dojo and the unit above. J. Langdell asked if there would be an HOA. T. Dolan replied there were condo documents. The owner has been in talks with Salt Creek, an abutter, with regard to sewer for the pending condo subdivision next door; when it is developed, J. LaMattina will tie in; all units will be tied into town water and sewer. P. Basiliere noted there really wasn't much for the planning board to do, only that the applicant must come before the board. J. Langell noted a while ago a condo conversion on Summer Street had come in and there were concerns with snow removal and parking. With the size of the lot here, those things were not concerns. S. Robinson noted they are responding to a need for additional housing in town. J. Ack clarified that when the owner converts the studio to a residential unit, he would have to come before the board for a change of use. J. Langdell replied it would go through the building department and then come to them. P. Amato had a question regarding the graphs that represent the common areas and was confused about the number of units 4 changing to 5? J. Acker replied there were currently 4 units and there would be 5 at the end. P. Amato asked if they would need a site plan. H also asked if there was a sprinkler system. J., Langdell asked if the project went to departmental review. T. Dolan replied it had not; not for the condo conversion. She was concerned about life safety. J. Ack said a firewall was to be added where the detached units were due to a breezeway that connected the units; that has been removed. C. Labonte asked if the application should be for 4 since there are 4 units, with the intent of 5 in the future. J. Sck replied this was for 5 units. D. Knott asked if there were any additional questions from the board; there were none. He opened discussion up to the public. David Hammer, abutter, owner of Hammer Family Realty and Contemporary Autos, asked who would be responsible for property maintenance – would it be the condo owners or the property owner or management. He noted there was significant overgrowth of brush, much of which is invasive and it impedes on his property. There has been no attempt by the property owner to try and cut it back. Additionally, there are several unhealthy trees on the property that drop branches on his property but fortunately have not dropped on any of the new cars that are to be sold. He hoped there was some recourse to require property maintenance as the property is visible from the road. He also had concerns about landscaping vehicles parking along the road and not in the parking area. J. Ack noted the owner had just gotten the certificate of occupancy for the 2 units and they haven't been rented out yet. There has been construction on those 2 units, but he didn't know if they were parked in the road. D. Knott noted there was nothing the planning board could do about the level of maintenance on the property. He felt there could be discussions between D. Hammer and the owner regarding the trees and brush. P. Amato thought there could be a mention in the condo docs about no commercial vehicles parked on site or something along those lines. J. Langdell noted if she was an owner of one of the units and had construction vehicles, she would want to park them there. P. Amato thought there was something in the regulations that prevented the parking of commercial vehicles in a residential zone. T. Dolan replied it was zoned commercial. D. Knott noted it was being used as mixed use. C. Labonte asked if the planning board had any say in condo docs prepared by the owner. J. Langdell noted they had to comply with the regulations. She asked where the dumpster and enclosure would be located. J. Ack said they could add it; they must have trash pickup now. Snow removal is labeled as well on the site plan. D. Knott asked, since some of the condo are residential, are there areas that are somewhat pleasant to be in? J. Ack

noted there were areas behind the residential units. D. Knott asked where the residents would be able to park. T. Dolan replied there are signed parking spaces. D. Knott noted it seemed there weren't any outdoor areas that would be suitable for family use. T. Dolan noted there was a .9 acre area dedicated to the condo units. D. Knott asked if there was space for a grill, such as a deck. J. Ack said there was no deck but there was enough space in the back. D. Knott felt there wasn't any thought put into the plan for potential residents. P. Amato noted when they approve condos, they make sure there is parking, play areas; this is 4 to 1 residential use versus commercial use. There wasn't a lot of thought put into the residential portion of the plan. J. Langdell stated they don't often see a lot of the mixed-use development and it does have some special considerations they need to bring forward. A. Ciardelli was concerned this project didn't go to interdepartmental review before coming to the planning board. T. Dolan replied it was not a site plan, the structures are existing with water and utilities being accounted for. He felt there wouldn't be much response back from an interdepartmental review. He noted the fire department has been working with the applicant on units 1 & 2. A. Ciardelli noted there was no mention of a fire suppression system in the existing buildings. J. Langdell thought this is one of the exceptions that needs to be on their radar going forward. Where you're adding residential to commercial uses, there is a change of use that should automatically go to the fire department. P. Amato thought it should require a site plan versus a condo conversion. If it was an existing apartment building and they were adding another unit, they would have to come before the planning board with a site plan. S. Smith said they are changing the commercial space to residential to do that. T. Dolan noted there was no additional parking needed; they originally wanted to expand the existing Tokyo Joe's and he told them they would have to withdraw the condo conversion and come in with a site plan. They then withdrew the extension plan and went with what they already had and split it into 4 residential units and 1 commercial unit. D. Knott asked if the commercial use had access to the rear open space or will it be fenced off for the residents, or perhaps a sign. J., Ack noted there was no access from the first floor to the back and no fence. He felt it wasn't a well thought out plan for people to live here. J. Langdell asked if there was any snow removal or dumpster enclosure location shown on the plan. T. Dolan replied there was not; he noted this was a condo conversion and not a site plan. J. Langdell noted if there is an insufficient site plan for a conversion then those pieces need to be in place. T. Dolan didn't know how to present this as it has been in use as is for several decades. J. Langdell would like to see this be very successful for the people who move there, an asset to the neighborhood and the town of Milford. Tokyo Joe's has been a great supporter of our community for decades. D. Knott felt there needed to be some kind of site review because it's such a big change. T. Dolan noted the footprint didn't change and that's a trigger for a site plan. P. Amato asked if they met the required regulations per acre. T. Dolan replied they do; it's 1.4 acres and they are allowed 5 units. P. Amato noted Mark Fougere's presentation on changing the requirements for the Oval district would trigger something if you added additional units. He thought there was more to this that should trigger additional requirements. D. Knott noted J. Demontigny stated sprinklers are triggered at the additional units. C. Labonte felt this is going to more units and changing them to condos – two different things. J. Langdell note this was a change of use and not an addition of square footage and this might trip this into further consideration. D. Knott asked what the consideration of the board would be. P. Basiliere noted D. Hammer was concerned with parking. He wondered if they would be able to dictate where future owners would be able to park to avoid commercial vehicles parking on the streets. C. Labont thought it could be triggered by the multi-use factor of the property. J. XX said the commercial use wasn't changing – it was and is still a karate studio. They have, at the request of the town, put in designated parking spots for the residential units. He assumes the vehicles that were seen parking on the street were the construction vehicles working on the property. To his knowledge, the property owner doesn't have construction vehicles in his use. There are 2 current rental units on the property plus the karate studio. P. Basiliere thought the 2 rental units, once converted to condos, could be 2

commercial businesses in the future. D. Hammer noted they have seen vehicles (mainly a truck and a trailer) parking in front of that space for several years, not just recently, during construction; he wondered if that would continue and if that is what the town wants. D. Knott asked what was currently above the karate studio. J. A replied it was an open space; he wasn't sure if it was still being used for karate. T. Dolan replied the upstairs was 1190 sf and the downstairs was 1458 sf. A. Ciardelli noted the parking lot was zoned commercial and if commercial vehicles are parked there, he didn't know if there was control over that. The residential condos have designated spots; the condo bylaws could have restrictions on what could be parked in those spaces. C. Labonte noted the lot is all commercial; there is no residential side to it. J. Langdell noted it was zoned commercial with an allowed residential use. Her property, where she lives, is zoned commercial and she has allowed residential use on her property. D. Knott noted the Q is zoned commercial and is an allowed residential use as well. J. Langdell sensed D. Hammer's concern was random commercial vehicles parked on the property that are not renting or owning any of the property. D. Hammer confirmed that was his concern. J. A saw no reason why, if someone purchased a unit and had a commercial vehicle, they couldn't park that vehicle in the allowed space. J. Langdell noted the right of the property owner is to use the property – in this case, the parking area, as they see fit. They could allow a friend to park there if they chose. D. Knott noted his original concern is to make this a decent space for people who live there. S. Smith looked at the land use regulations 674.44, page 443: *"Before the planning board exercises its powers under RSA 674:43, it shall adopt site plan review regulations according to the procedures required by RSA 675:6. II. The site plan review regulations which the planning board adopts may: (a) Provide for the safe and attractive development or change or expansion of use of the site and guard against such conditions as would involve danger or injury to health, safety" and "(b) Provide for the harmonious and aesthetically pleasing development of the municipality and its environs. (c) Provide for open spaces and green spaces of adequate proportions."* J. Langdell felt the Milford Development Regulations were more germane to the discussion. In site division application process, a condominium conversion is considered a type of site plan application". There are some minimal things that need to be included on the site plan, if it's not already there. They would need to look at the original site plan to make sure it meets the requirements for the next step for approval for condo conversion. S. Smith asked if the same applied for change of use. J. Langdell replied it was; there are references for change of use, change of site plan, etc. She noted when the condo conversion applications come in, sometimes the site plans are fine, sometimes not. D. Knott asked the board their thoughts. S. Robinson thought it didn't seem like a big ask to update the site plan. A. Ciardelli felt it didn't seem that they were required to provide a site plan. J. Langdell thought that they did need to see the required items for commercial use, that weren't provided – snow removal location and dumpster location. She wanted to keep in mind they are also adding a change of use to one space. C. Labonte asked if that would trigger departmental review. T. Dolan said he would send it out for review. P. Amato agreed with J. Langdell. P. Basiliere, S. Robinson, S. Smith had no additional comment. D. Knott asked for a motion. P. Amato thought they needed to make the motion to continue. T. Dolan asked what they were looking for. D. Knott replied they need a site plan review. J. Langdell noted everything discussed (open space, parking, dumpster, snow, etc.) would be taken into consideration. It would be good to have an interdepartmental review as well. D. Knott clarified the board wanted to continue the case for interdepartmental review, and an updated site plan. T. Dolan said it could be presented at the March 18 meeting; they will work on the interdepartmental review, site plan, etc. together. J. Langdell requested this be placed at the beginning of the meeting, if it is ready for the 18th. T. Dolan noted the deadline for submittals for the 18th passed so it is only the continuation of Stone Ledge and this case. D. Knott thought the property owner should be present as well. P. Amato restated the motion to continue this application for a condominium conversion for interdepartmental review and to include a site plan. A. Ciardelli seconded the motion. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Amato – yes, S. Robinson – yes,

A. Ciardelli – yes, J. Langdell – yes, C. Labonte – yes, P. Basiliere – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed.

- D. Case SD#2025-02, 21 Emerson Road. LLC Condominium Conversion Request, located at 21 Emerson Road, M48, Lot 35-2** The applicant, 21 Emerson Road, LLC, has requested a Condominium Conversion of the recently approved multi-family project, (previously known as Squirrel Hill Properties, LLC-Case SP#2024-13, approved by the Milford Planning Board on August 20, 2024). The three approved pairs of attached multi-family units have now been requested to undergo a Condominium Conversion, pursuant to Section 5.06 of the Milford Development Regulations. The 1.56-acre Lot is located at 21 Emerson Road; and zoned Commercial (“C”), in accordance with Section 5.05 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance. D. Knott asked if the application was complete; T. Dolan responded it was. J. Langdell made the motion to accept the application as presented; A. Ciardelli seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Basiliere – yes, C. Labonte – yes, J. Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed. D. Knott asked if there was a motion for potential regional impact associated with this application. A. Ciardelli made the motion of no potential regional impact; J. Langdell seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Basiliere – yes, C. Labonte – yes, J. Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed. T. Dolan read the abutters list into the record; Dan Bukowski of Fieldstone Land Consultants was present. This is a straightforward conversion of a recently approved plan of 3 buildings containing 6 residential units. J. Langdell asked if there were any changes to the site plan since last presented. D. Bukowski replied there were no changes, except for the limited common area for each unit containing 3000-4000 sf for each unit with a small yard in the back of each unit. D. Knott clarified that was the only change from what was approved. J. Langdell asked if the condo documents were complete. D. Bukowski replied they are not. J. Langdell noted any approval by the planning board would be conditional upon the documents being finished. She assumed there would be an association. D. Bukowski replied there would be. P. Amato asked if the town council reviewed condo documents. T. Dolan replied they do not; it’s a requirement for the condo conversion process and it becomes an internal matter between the residents and the condo association. J. Langdell asked for verification that that was the practice in the past. P. Amato remembers Attorney Bill Drescher reviewed them but can’t remember if that was the practice since then. D. Knott asked if there were any additional questions; there were none. He then opened the hearing to the public; there was no comment. He then closed the public portion of the hearing. J. Langdell assumed all the information regarding snow and dumpsters were on the plan. D. Bukowski replied it was; he asked if it needed to be on the condo conversion site plan since it was on the previously approved plan. P. Amato noted the condo conversion site plan does not take the place of the original site plan – it’s an addition to it. J. Langdell and P. Amato wanted to make clear that this was another opportunity for home ownership for the town. D. Knott asked for a motion. J. Langdell made the motion for a condominium conversion for the property located at 21 Emerson Road, subject to the completion and submittal of the condominium documents; P. Amato seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Basiliere – yes, C. Labonte – yes, J. Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed.

- E. Formal Public Hearing for proposed Planning Board Rules and Procedure Revisions III.**
 D. Knott noted this was a public hearing to adopt changes for the rules and procedures document that was revised March 14, 2022 and the final version was February 4, 2025. D. Knott asked if there were any comments from the board; there were none. He then opened the hearing to the public; there were no comments. He then closed the public portion of the hearing and asked for a motion. J. Langdell made the motion to approve the document dated February 4, 2025; S. Robinson seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Basiliere – yes, C. Labonte – yes, J.

Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed. J. Langdell noted they would be posted on the town planning board page as soon as possible.

3. Other Business: None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes: 1/21/2025 Meeting. J. Langdell made the following corrections: page 6, line 294 – change “Prospect” to “Webster”. Page 8, line 386 – change “but” to “and”; line 394 – change “change” to “chance”; line 398 – remove “this will”. D. Knott asked for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. J. Langdell made the motion to approve the minutes as amended; A. Ciardelli seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Basiliere – abstain, C. Labonte – yes, J. Langdell – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, S. Robinson – yes, P. Amato – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed.

5. Upcoming Mtgs: March 4, 2025 - Work Session & March 18, 2025 - Full Planning Bd. Mtg

D. Knott asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. J. Langdell made the motion to adjourn; A. Ciardelli seconded. ROLL CALL VOTE: P. Amato – yes, S. Robinson – yes, A. Ciardelli – yes, J. Langdell – yes, C. Labonte – yes, P. Basiliere – yes, D. Knott – yes. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted by: Kathryn Parenti

Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson: Date: _____