

Chairwoman Kathy Corson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Nowak Room on the above date.

PRESENT: Chairwoman Kathy Corson, Vice Chairman Ken Knowles, Selectmen's Representative Frank Ferraro, Members: Gwen English, Katherine Woolhouse and Ian Raum, Alternate Members: Clerk Lang Plumer, Town Planner Sylvia von Aulock and Deputy Code Enforcement Officer Barbara McEvoy.

It was noted that all board members in attendance would be voting.

NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

PENDEXTER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT – PB CASE #21111

The application for a minor subdivision of a 10.62-acre parcel into two single-family residential lots. The subject property is located at 110 Linden Street, in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #104-76.

Mr. Knowles inquired about the description of the application not including the request for a Conditional Use Permit. It was determined that the Board would only open discussion on the subdivision and that renotification would be required for discussion of the CUP at a future meeting.

Chairwoman Corson asked Ms. von Aulock if the abutters and public had been duly notified; Ms. von Aulock responded affirmatively. She asked if the application was complete enough for the Board to consider; Ms. von Aulock indicated the application was complete. ***A motion was made and seconded to accept the application (for subdivision) thereby beginning the 90-day clock for the Board to act. VOTE: Unanimous. APPLICATION ACCEPTED.***

Attorney Sharon Somers, with Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella PLLC addressed the Board on behalf of the Applicant. She acknowledged that Mr. Jonathan Ring, P.E. with Jones & Beach Engineers, Jaime Long, CWS with GZA Environmental (formerly New Hampshire Soil Consultants) and Mr. Paul McCoy were also present this evening. She provided a brief summary of the background relative to this proposal, noting that the plans had been reviewed several times by the Conservation Commission (ConCom) and New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) in conjunction with the wetlands permit required for the impact of the proposed gravel driveway. She indicated that the NHDES permit had been obtained in March 2010. Ms. Somers also stated that Applicant had received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for relief from the seasonal high water requirements associated with the design of the septic disposal system (ZBA Case #1333, July 2007). She indicated that in addition to the proposed minor subdivision, approval of a Conditional Use Permit and waivers are being sought by the Applicant.

Mr. Jonathan Ring, P.E. continued the presentation and identified the subject parcel as a 10.6 acre parcel located in the R-2 zoning district on Linden Street. He indicated the Applicant was proposing to subdivide the parcel into two lots by creating a one-acre parcel for the existing house and the remaining 9.5 acres for a new residence and gravel driveway. He noted that the minimum lot area requirement for lots served by well and septic in the R-2 zoning district was one-acre in size. Mr. Ring reiterated that that two site walks had been conducted with the ConCom and NHDES representatives in conjunction with the wetlands impact issues. Mr. Ring stated that the NHDES permit was approved for 5,650 square feet of impact for filling of wetlands to construct a 12-foot wide gravel driveway with culvert crossings to access a single family home. He proceeded to review the four waiver requests as outlined below.

- Section 7.4.7 and 9.6.2 – Natural Features. Requesting relief from providing the survey location of all trees over 16" in diameter.
- Section 7.6.10 and 9.21.3.4 – 4,000 s.f. septic reserve area. Relief requested for Lot #1 (with existing house) only. Lot #2 complies with this requirement.
- Section 9.9.2 – Wetlands Setback. Relief being sought from the 100-foot prime wetland buffer and 40-foot No-Cut/No-Disturb poorly drained wetlands setback for the construction of the proposed access drive for Lot #2.
- Section 9.23 – Underground Utilities. Requesting that the existing overhead utilities for Lot #1

remain and to provide overhead pole service to Lot #2.

Mr. Ring indicated that the application submittal also included copies of the NHDES Permit No. 2007-02676 and photographs of the wetlands, owner/agent letters of authorization, owner's deeds and test pit results. He represented that the Applicant was scheduled to appear before the Zoning Board of Adjustment on July 19, 2011 to reaffirm the variance request for relief from the Town's requirement for 24" of natural permeable soil required above the seasonal high water table (test pits). He noted that a variance approval had been obtained in August 2007, and had subsequently expired.

Mr. Jaime Long, CWS addressed the Board and provided an overview of the on-site discussions with NHDES relative to the location of the prime wetlands boundary. He identified the wetlands present on the site, including prime wetlands, the wetland buffer and setback requirements and the areas impacted for the proposed driveway construction. Ms. Corson commented that the plan was rather difficult to read with all the detail and suggested that a larger scale plan would be more appropriate.

Ms. von Aulock approached the microphone and presented her colored-up version of the plan for the Board to review. She also reviewed the wetland locations, the required buffers and setbacks, the floodplain areas, the buildable area and the driveway location and noted the elevations present on the site. Ms. von Aulock represented that she had calculated 622 linear feet of disturbance/impact to the wetland, prime wetland and floodplain areas. She indicated that the Applicant had not submitted any type of a mitigation package for filling in floodplain and no drainage analysis. She further commented that she has seen the smaller subdivisions have an alarming impact on neighbors if not designed properly. She expressed her concern of the lot being difficult to develop due to the various environmental restrictions, also noting the additional relief being sought by the Applicant in their waiver requests. She mentioned that the soils and wetland information provided was fairly old (2005-2007) and recalled that it had been done in winter conditions with snow on the ground. She indicated that she has seen changes in such information over a several year time span and requested that the site be re-flagged. Chairwoman Corson asked when the last time the Applicant had appeared before the Conservation Commission was. Attorney Somers indicated that she believed it was late 2009 in conjunction with the DES review process.

Mr. Knowles inquired if there was to be any mitigation provided for proposed filling of area located in the floodplain.

Mr. Ring proceeded to address some of the issues raised during the Board discussion. He indicated that the driveway was designed with a 2:1 slope to minimize the wetlands footprint and minimize the stretch of the filling into the wetland and buffer. He stated that this issue had been discussed with both the ConCom and Mr. Frank Richardson (NHDES) and it was determined that given the distance was minimal and that it served a single-family residence, that a guardrail would not be necessary. He offered to prepare a 20' or 30' scale "blow-up" of a portion of the plan depicting the driveway location and setbacks, etc, for the Board to review. Mr. Ring noted that there was approximately 2,000 cubic feet of impact in the floodplain area and represented that there had been discussions regarding the 100-year floodplain mitigation issue with ConCom and NHDES. He explained that there was discussion with Mr. Richardson (@ NHDES) about showing a compensatory storage area which would involve the removal of about 150 linear feet of trees. Mr. Ring indicated that he was advised by Mr. Richardson to remove it from the plan; He noted that further detail of this was addressed in the wetlands permit which specifically discusses that the 100-year floodplain mitigation not be considered. He represented that there was also discussion with ConCom and Mr. Richardson about the planting of winterberry and button bush along the wetland edge for mitigation purposes. He noted that Mr. Richardson had suggested that it not be installed; however, if the Board felt differently about it, they would be agreeable to installing the plantings. Mr. Ring concluded by stating that drainage calculations had been prepared to verify the sizing of the culvert pipes and described the flow of the proposed drainage to the river. He indicated that the drainage calculations would be provided to the Board for the file. Mr. Knowles suggested that pre and post calculations be provided given the proposed development of the floodplain.

Attorney Somers stated that she recognized that the Board had subsequently adopted some additional waiver standards and wetlands regulations in March 2010, and that the Applicant may have to return to provide the additional necessary to comply with those regulations. She stated that they also had recognized that this lot would be a "difficult lot to develop" as earlier described. Noting that discussion of the CUP application was not appropriate this evening, she asked that the Board remember that there are uplands on the proposed lot suitable for building. She stated that although the majority of the points of

issue being discussed this evening were related to access, it will be important to recognize whether the proposed construction is essential to the productive use of the land during the Conditional Use Permit discussion. She reiterated that her client would be happy to work with the board in complying with the additional regulations that were not in place the last time they were before the town for review.

Chairwoman Corson commented that is why she was of the opinion that the Applicant should return to the ConCom for another review prior to the Planning Board taking any final action on the application. Attorney Somers offered to provide the Board with the historical documentation of the past ConCom reviews.

There being no further discussion at this time, Chairwoman Corson opened the hearing for public comment.

Ms. Diane Arnheim, 114 Linden Street, addressed the Board and identified her property (and home) located to the south of the site and abutting the McDonnell Conservation Area (adjacent to the Linden Street bridge). She indicated that she had just moved in this past November and has already experienced water problems. She expressed her concern of being tremendously impacted by additional water being shed from the proposed site onto her property and about the location of the proposed elevated driveway in proximity to her property. She provided the Board with several current photographs of her property. She suggested that the ConCom and Planning Board members may want to visit her property, as well when they revisit this site, noting that particularly after a rainfall, standing water could be observed.

Mr. Ferraro inquired as to the distance of the proposed driveway from the abutting residence at 114 Linden Street. Mr. Ring responded that the proposed driveway was approximately 35' from the property line and approximately 90-95' from the residential structure at 114 Linden Street. Mr. Plumer expressed concern that 35' would not provide adequate screening and suggested that the depth of the buffer area should be reconsidered.

Mr. Gary Morrisette, 102 Linden Street, provided the Board with a brief history of the drainage problems in this area. He also expressed concern relative to the additional run-off that would be created by the proposed development of the site. He suggested that the proposal be reviewed again by the Conservation Commission prior to Planning Board making any final decision on the application. Mr. Morrisette commented that if the test pit observations did not meet the Town standards, why grant relief from the regulations.

Mr. Paul Morrisette, 100 Linden Street, addressed the Board and indicated that he concurred with the previous comments made by abutters. He emphasized the seriousness of the water problem in this area and the property being located in the floodplain. He indicated that water currently drains from the LindenFields (Exeter Housing Authority) project over the White property and across the road on his property and onto the subject property. He also provided the Board with photographs of his property for their review. Mr. Morrisette extended an invitation to the Board to come and visit his property.

There being no further testimony at this time, Chairwoman Corson closed the public portion of the meeting and Board discussion resumed.

Chairwoman Corson indicated that she felt it would be necessary for the Applicant to return to the Conservation Commission given it had been well over a year since their last review and that new wetland conservation regulations had been adopted in March 2010. She also suggested that if the review process was going to move forward, a site walk would be beneficial for the Board and could possibly be coordinated with the ConCom members, if so desired. She noted that the abutters and interested parties would be welcome to attend. She indicated that she would prefer to hear from the ConCom before any further review of the application.

Mr. Knowles stated that in fairness to the Applicant he would reserve the majority of his comments for discussion of the Conditional Use Permit application, although, he indicated that a significant amount of work would be necessary to convince him that this proposal would be a viable subdivision in accordance with criteria to be satisfied for a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Raum indicated that this was not an application seeking relief to build on an existing lot of record, but to create a new lot. He recalled the Board had reviewed several CUP applications and/or waiver requests involving proposed construction on existing lots of record. He commented that he believed it to be unreasonable to grant so much relief for the creation of a new lot.

Consensus of the Board was to table the application to provide adequate time for the applicant to submit additional information that had been requested and for them to return to the Conservation Commission for further review.

Ms. von Aulock indicated that the Board's August 25th agenda was full, and the next available meeting would be September 8th for the Applicant to return. Mr. Ring noted that the ConCom met on the second Tuesday of the month, so they would prepare a submission for their August 9th meeting and contact Ms. Murphy accordingly. ***A motion was made and seconded to table further discussion of the application until the September 8th meeting. VOTE: Unanimous.***

OTHER BUSINESS

COMPADRES, LLC (former Pride/Maplecroft Dev. LLC) – PB Case #2414

The Board reviewed correspondence from Town Engineer Paul Vlasich, dated July 13, 2011, addressing a bond reduction request submitted by Mr. Leo Manseau, on June 25, 2011, for the Beech Hill Estates subdivision (a/k/a "Rinny Lane"). Mr. Vlasich's memo indicated that he concurred with the estimate of work remaining, as outlined by the developer, although had several exceptions. Mr. Vlasich recommended the release of \$12,200.00 would be appropriate at this time.

Mr. Manseau was present to address the Board on this request. He provided a brief summary of the project construction to date. He indicated that he was requesting a waiver from the Board's regulations which describe the performance guarantee partial reduction process and that he was looking to have the 20% retainage amount also released at this time. Ms. von Aulock stated that neither she nor Mr. Vlasich had the authority to waive the Board's regulations. She acknowledged receipt of a request for similar relief from Mr. Eric Chinburg in conjunction with the "Linden Commons" subdivision, although he was requesting to post a maintenance bond in lieu of the 20% retainage amount. She noted that Mr. Chinburg's request was currently being reviewed by Town Counsel and she would forward his request to legal counsel as well, if he wished. She stated that typically the Board has not granted such relief in the past.

Chairwoman Corson indicated that she would entertain a motion to approve the bond reduction, as recommended by Town Engineer Paul Vlasich. ***Mr. Ferraro moved to approve the bond reduction, as presented in Mr. Vlasich's memo dated July 13, 2011; motion was seconded by Ms. English. VOTE: Unanimous. PERFORMANCE BOND REDUCTION GRANTED.***

RIVERWOODS AT EXETER ("THE BOULDERS") – PB CASE #2716

Continued discussion from the Board's July 16th meeting on the correspondence received from a group of 'neighboring' and abutting property owners requesting the Board to consider their concerns that the project is not in compliance with the conditions of approval as imposed by the Planning Board on May 8, 2008. Mr. Ferraro stepped down from the Board prior to opening discussion on this item.

Attorney Chris Boldt, of Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella, PLLC was present on behalf of the RiverWoods Company. He stated that subsequent to the last meeting they had reviewed all of the DVDs as suggested, and also the conditions of approval to understand exactly what was said and what representations had been made. He inquired if any of the Board members had the opportunity to do the same. Chairwoman Corson responded that Ms. von Aulock has provided and would continue to provide the highlights for the Board.

Attorney Boldt proceeded to reiterate from past discussions that RiverWoods had not brought the proposal for the "access road" to the table for discussion; it was initiated and subsequently made a requirement by the Town. He described the chronology of meeting discussions related to this issue.

He recalled discussion at the 1/24/08 meeting in which several "Ridge" residents spoke to this issue and expressed their desire to not become a drive-thru campus. Attorney Boldt noted that Mr. Plumer was the chairman of the Board during this time period. He also recalled the comment made by Mr. Plumer indicating that the access road made sense as it would allow for each campuses to have their own entrances. Comments were made by Ms. Wentworth looking for clarification of what she heard that The Ridge (White Oak Drive) was not going to be the main entrance for The Boulders. He indicated that there was a response from the Board indicating "that's correct."

Attorney Boldt continued and provided some highlights from the May 8, 2008 meeting, noting that the last 25 minutes of the meeting were "key" not only to the signage discussion but also to the wording of Condition #11 of the approval. He pointed out that Condition #11 started with the express prohibition of using Red Oak Drive (now Timer Lane) and the Blackford Drive connector for deliveries. He noted that subsequent discussion of this issue results in the language as set forth in the conditional approval granted by the Board, "11. *Appropriate signage be installed to discourage the use of Red Oak Drive and connection to Blackford Drive by delivery and service truck traffic.*

Attorney Boldt continued and represented that he was authorized to offer the proposed signage information on behalf of the Applicant. He distributed a hand-out for Board members to review which provided photographs of existing signage on White Oak Drive and Timber Lane and the proposed revisions to the same. He indicated that two additional signs designating 'exit' and 'deliveries' were also being proposed. Attorney Boldt also indicated that his client had agreed to send a letter to all of their vendors, as well as any new vendors, notifying them (on an annual basis), that all future deliveries are to be made using White Oak Drive. He stated that if these actions are found to be acceptable by the Board, his client would like the assurance that "this will be it" and would no longer be alleged to be in violation of the site plan approval granted by the Board. He indicated that his client has provided a "good faith" offer to resolve the issues and appease the neighbors. He concluded by stating that the public, the residents and RiverWoods (staff and employees) have the right to use the roads.

Ms. English commented that it was not about appeasing the neighbors, but definitely about the safety concerns (i.e. width, lack of sidewalk, etc.) with the road being utilized more than anticipated from what had been presented during the town review process.

Ms. von Aulock proceeded to provide an overview of the plan changes and presentations that were made to the Board relative to the temporary v. permanent road access issue associated with Red Oak Drive (currently identified as Timber Lane). She pointed out that there had been no changes to the layout of buildings, including the maintenance building, in conjunction with the change in the road status. Noting that there was never any reference made to this roadway being used for primary access, she indicated that there was extensive discussion about minimizing the access, gravel v. paved shoulder construction, reduced road width, sidewalks, etc. She reiterated the applicant's representation of there being very minimal traffic on the road. She asked "Why would the Planning Board allow a sub-standard road for a primary access?" She proceeded to review her suggestions previously discussed with the RiverWoods representatives (outlined in e-mail dated 4/22/11).

At this time, several segments of the May 8th, 2008 Planning Board meeting were presented by Ms. von Aulock for review by the Board. She also provided those segments requested by Attorney Boldt.

Ms. von Aulock expressed concern about how 'directions' to the Boulders facility was being handled. She indicated that it appeared that all traffic, including in-house, event and delivery, was being directed to use Timber Lane. She noted that the current internal signage (directional and exit signs) also signifies Timber Lane as the primary entrance and exit for the Boulders. Furthermore, she added that the RiverWoods website directs travelers to Timber Lane (via Pickpocket Road) as the main entrance for the facility. She inquired as to why the traffic was directed down Pickpocket Road to Timber Lane and not equally directed to use White Oak Drive. She also pointed out that the Board was currently reviewing the proposed administration building; she indicated that she was concerned that RiverWoods may remain consistent in their direction to visitors to access this new facility through Timber Lane.

Attorney Boldt responded to Ms. von Aulock's comments relative to the new administration building by indicating that appropriate signage could be discussed at the next hearing on the project. He stated that

there was an objection raised by Attorney Tucker relative to the road providing access for the public, but yet there being objection of its use by their residents and staff and for events being held at the Boulders. He indicated that the concern was with the language of Condition #11 and he stated that his client has offered a reasonable solution (letter to vendors, revised signage proposal and revised website directions) to address these concerns. Ms. von Aulock disagreed with the Attorney Boldt's statement in that his client had not satisfied all of the issues identified in her 4/22/11 correspondence to RiverWoods and representatives. At this time she asked the Board members for their comments relative to the discussion.

Mr. Knowles recalled being one of the board members who wanted a condition specifically defining the signage. He commented that he felt the signage as proposed this evening would have satisfied the intent of Condition #11 prior to it being 'softened'. He stated that Ms. von Aulock's point about equally directing traffic to both White Oak Drive and Timber Lane was valid. He commented that he had not recalled any discussion during any of the hearings regarding the prohibition of public having access to the road.

Mr. Plumer reflected on comments made by Mr. Campbell (during the review process) in terms of what the Board envisioned the intent of the road and the assurance of it being a safe intersection with Pickpocket Road. He recalled the discussion regarding signage, and although specific language was not required, he felt that the Board had acted confidently (given the representations by the applicant) in their decision. He stated that given the situation that currently exists, he felt the proposed revisions being offered by the RiverWoods representatives were an attempt to alleviate the situation and were certainly a step in the right direction. He added that it was a challenging situation and that he would like to see some sharing among the communities, noting that all of the parties were respectable property owners and taxpaying residents of Exeter.

Mr. Raum commented that it appeared to be a question of jurisdiction as to whether or not the Board has such jurisdiction to tell the Applicant how to operate. He commented that he did not feel that RiverWoods complied with the terms of "Condition #11" in spirit, but has offered to communicate the concern to their vendors and ask that they utilize White Oak Drive for deliveries. He agreed with Mr. Knowles that what has been presented will limit the use of the access road, but he would like to hear from abutters and then determine whether the proposed modifications being offered by RiverWoods will resolve the addressable concerns.

Ms. Woolhouse concurred with other Board members comments and added that she had visited the site and found the campus to be very attractive, although found it difficult to find her way to the Boulders with the existing signage.

Attorney Boldt commented that their traffic consultant, Mr. Steve Pernaw was also present this evening and prepared to address any questions or concerns the Board may have.

There being no further discussion at this time, Chairwoman Corson opened the discussion for public comment.

Ms. Marilyn Wentworth, a resident of the Ridge, recalled the many hours of discussion relative to this project. As a former Planning Board and Zoning Board member (in another community) she stated that she was relieved when the Town required the connectivity from Pickpocket Road to Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A). She indicated that because of her former participation on these boards, she was asked to be the spokesperson to the Planning Board during the 2007 & 2008 hearings for more than seventy of the Ridge residents who were opposed to using The Ridge (White Oak Drive) as an entrance to the Boulders. She requested that they (i.e. the Ridge residents) not be thought of as "corporate", but as senior citizen residents of Exeter who deserved the same protection and safety as other residents in Exeter. She commented that it seemed unreasonable for such discussion to return to the Board three (3) years later in an attempt to change the wording of this condition.

Mr. Harry Hampton, also a resident of the Ridge, indicated that he has learned to live with the increased traffic within the community and suggested that the Pickpocket Road residents do the same.

Ms. Karen Prior, 16 Pickpocket Road, commented that RiverWoods needed to address their own internal issues and not expect the Planning Board to resolve them. She alluded that RiverWoods had not lived up to the intent of the condition to "discourage service truck traffic".

Ms. Laura Davies, 20 Pickpocket Road, confirmed that the signage currently indicated “No Deliveries”. She stated that, as posted, it did not specifically prohibit service vehicles (i.e. RiverWoods vans included) from using Timer Lane.

Ms. Harriet Petruccio, 15 Runawit Road, indicated that she distinctly remembered Ms. Vogel stating that the “deliveries” issue would not need any signage and would be handled internally. She concurred that RiverWoods has not complied their representations with respect to the use of the access road. She also expressed her opposition to the RiverWoods van traffic and the event signs being displayed directing traffic down Pickpocket Road. She commented that Ms. Woolhouse had made a good point when she noted her difficulty in locating the Boulders when she recently visited the campus. Ms. Petruccio indicated that it was clear that RiverWoods did not want the Boulders traffic going through the Ridge and that was why when you access through White Oak Drive there is no direction to the Boulders.

With respect to the “event” signs being displayed, Chairwoman Corson noted that they were temporary signs and the Board of Selectmen was currently working on revising the town ordinance regulating them. Mr. Ferraro confirmed that the Selectmen were looking at revising the town ordinance, although he pointed out that the town ordinance would only be applicable to signs on Town and/or public property and within the public right-of-way. He noted that temporary signs on private property were a zoning issue. He also mentioned that the Board of Selectmen was contemplating posting Pine and Pickpocket Road with a reduced weight limit to exclude large trucks on a regular basis.

Mr. Bob Prior, 16 Pickpocket Road, indicated that the “event” signs were being placed on town/public property and have also been placed on the small traffic island at the intersection of Pickpocket Road and Kingston Road (Route 111). He reiterated that the two points that remained for discussion were the event signs and the internal van traffic.

Mr. Ferraro further clarified that the Board of Selectmen were reviewing Section 502 of the Town Ordinance, but had temporarily suspended enforcement of Section 502 regulating temporary signs due to the confusion. He noted that the revisions being considered by the Selectmen were to permit temporary signs on public and/or town property in the WC (Waterfront Commercial) and C-1 (Central Area Commercial) zoning districts only.

Mr. Kristan McCoy, a resident at 4 Runawit Road (Pickpocket Woods), also voiced his displeasure with the event signs. He indicated that the use of White Oak Drive as the primary entrance to both facilities would be a much safer situation for the residents, as well as events and deliveries.

Mr. Paul Roberge, 15 Pickpocket Road, spoke of the applicant’s misrepresentations throughout the review process and the horrible conditions through the construction period.

There being no further public comment, Chairwoman Corson closed the public portion of the meeting.

Attorney Boldt pointed out that Condition #4 of the approval letter which described the proposed Pickpocket Road improvements uses the language “new entry to the Boulders”. Consensus of the Board maintained that the intent of the condition was to describe the location of the proposed improvements along Pickpocket Road and did not imply that the access road was a primary entrance by use of the words “new entry”.

The subject of internal traffic (i.e. RiverWoods shuttle vans, employees, etc.) utilizing Timber Lane was brought up for discussion. Mr. Plumer suggested that the signage be revised to specifically prohibit “service truck traffic” (i.e. vans, UPS, contractors – any type of service truck). He stated that the applicant should be required to comply with their representations made to the Board. Ms. Barker indicated that the company would not be willing to accept that broad of a restriction.

Chairwoman Corson suggested that the RiverWoods representatives work with Ms. von Aulock on the signage issue to come to a resolution that all parties can live with. She commented that the Board was not in a position to accept the proposal offered this evening and ‘just walk away’, as requested by the Applicant in earlier discussion. Ms. von Aulock agreed with Mr. Plumers and Ms. Corson’s comments,

and suggested that perhaps give the applicant a 90-day time frame in which to hopefully return to the Board with a solution all can find acceptable. Board members concurred.

There being no further discussion, ***a motion was made and seconded to table further discussion on this matter until the Board's September 22nd, 2011 meeting. VOTE: Unanimous.***

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

TOWN PLANNER ITEMS: None

REPORTS ON "OTHER COMMITTEE" ACTIVITY: None

CHAIRMAN'S ITEMS: None

There being no further business before the Board, ***a motion was made and seconded to adjourn. VOTE: Unanimous. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 P.M.***

The next meeting of the Exeter Planning Board will be held Thursday, August 11, 2011 at 7:00PM in the Novak Room at the Exeter Town Offices.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara S. McEvoy
Deputy Code Enforcement Officer
Planning & Building Department

:bsm