

**TOWN OF WOLFEBORO
PLANNING BOARD
February 19, 2019
MINUTES**

Members Present: Kathy Barnard, Chairman, Vaune Dugan, Vice-Chairman, Brad Harriman, Selectmen's Representative Mike Hodder, Peter Goodwin, Susan Repplier, John Thurston Members.

Members Absent: Dave Alessandroni, Alternate.

Staff Present: Matt Sullivan, Director of Planning and Development, Cathleen LaPierre, Recording Secretary.

Chairman Barnard opened the meeting at 7:02 PM at the Wolfeboro Town Hall Great Hall.

I. Introduction of Board Members

Chairman Barnard introduced the members of the Planning Board and Staff.

II. Work Session

The Wolfeboro Area Chamber of Commerce met with the Planning Board. The following members introduced themselves: Mary DeVries, Cindy Melanson, and Aaron Morrissey.

Mary DeVries stated the Chamber was looking for direction from the Planning Board regarding zoning as it exists compared to the future from the Planning Boards perspective.

Cindy Melanson specifically inquired about commercial property, where the town will look to for developing new business, industrial, some commercial space or where something that's not on Main Street could go. She stated they thought it was the Filter Bed Road area.

Kathy Barnard responded Filter Bed isn't a dead issue, it will be on the 2019 work program and she was concerned that so many of the residential neighbors were caught by surprise.

Cindy Melanson stated the same presentation that was before the Planning Board took place at the Taylor Home.

Kathy Barnard noted there were issues with different boundaries and uses.

Aaron Morrissey questioned expansion, whether it is a property by property, not a do whatever you want.

Kathy Barnard replied permitted they have been allowed in the Pine Hill District.

Matt Sullivan noted another issue involved the southern property owners on Filter Bed as they were not reached out to.

Cindy Melanson asked the Board where a new contractor or agricultural/landscaping company might go to establish business. When businesses come to the Chamber where could they direct people?

Peter Goodwin stated there were two issues at the hearing 1) spot zoning i.e. the extension down the road and 2) the wording was incorrect. He noted the Board ended up removing one of their warrant articles which was associated with how the Pine Hill district was going to be rezoned due to concern on the lack of planning. The Board needs to know what the Chamber and public would like to see and work with everyone to get a plan that really works.

Mike Hodder followed with there are a number of zones in town which are specifically listed as business or commercial districts and questioned what further guidance is needed.

Matt Sullivan stated Pine Hill Road is still one of the areas he believes should be looked at long term but perhaps with less intense uses i.e. contractors' yard.

Vaune Dugan stated there was also a little discussion about looking at the list of uses, are they too extreme or should there be another list that's in between.

Cindy Melanson questioned what's considered too extreme?

Matt Sullivan responded there isn't enough variance in our industrial uses, for instance, industrial and assembly – manufacturing industries are operating cleaner, our zoning doesn't provide any less intense requirements for that sort of manufacturing that could take place in town.

Mike Hodder questioned whether that would rule out possible applications.

Matt Sullivan replied yes but seeing manufacturing and industrial scared some of the folks on Pine Hill. If there was less intense manufacturing perhaps residents would be more open.

John Thurston aired caution; how people will survive should be considered. He stated there is a fine line on the term "industrial" and folks not understanding what that means. Define it more so as not to exclude folks i.e. one who wants to open a metal shop, or small wood working shop. There is potential development lots for sale on Pine Hill; however, the Board isn't in the business of deciding where business goes.

Mary DeVries stated the Chamber is attempting to work together to tell folks what isn't already developed and what's available.

Vaune Dugan suggested a "craftsman zone" where it's shops and light commercial industry instead of heavy industrial that scare people and recommended reviewing the list of uses.

Cindy Melanson noted the importance of being able to support the group they represent and stated they would like to stop the comment "they just say no" from coming out.

Mary DeVries stated there are businesses that aren't here that asked them to come and are looking for some tools going forward.

Mike Hodder stated this is new and it would be helpful to have a sense of what the Chamber is looking for other than where the Board would like to see businesses go. He asked the Chamber if they had ideas where they thought would be potentials.

Cindy Melanson replied the Filter Bed area.

Mike Hodder stated if the Board had an idea of the sorts of uses they were looking at and the Chamber had a sense of what additional areas in town they thought were worth looking at, they could put them together and see whether or not the zoning could either adapt or the Board could adapt it in accordance.

Mary DeVries replied that sounded great and the first example would be those existing business that already exist in our community that were trying to grow in that area.

Kathy Barnard stated the Master Plan Survey supported that and existing businesses. The Board has enlarged the greater down town area i.e. Wolfeboro Falls and added a lot of uses.

Cindy Melanson questioned how to create a loop and make it walkable; the downtown area and Wolfeboro Falls. Additionally, the Chamber is getting pushback from the other part of the community who says, “see, they just say no, I’m not going to talk to them, they always say no” as the Chamber would like that conversation to end and see everyone on the same page and if not, where do we meet middle ground.

Mike Hodder stated those who say the Board just says no, are coming from a position of not having the reasons why the Board unanimously voted no and how to overcome that hurdle if they don’t do their homework unless it’s explained one on one.

Cindy Melanson replied that’s where the Chamber could help and explain.

Peter Goodwin suggested the Chamber come up with 3-5 specific issues that were desirable in that petition and that could be the goals of the Planning Board to work towards.

Kathy Barnard also suggested the Chamber add what they’d like the Board to look at it.

Cindy Melanson stated it’s also helpful to hear what the Planning Board is working on i.e. working on in the next 2 years.

John Thurston noted they made a comment about the Master Plan that wasn’t made at the meeting that night, that the Master Plan actually supported moving in that district to expand uses.

Cindy Melanson confirmed.

Aaron Melanson stated the Board knows the Plan, the Chamber wants to help the Board and work on it together prior to being turned down.

Mike Hodder stated it was on the work program and is a public document.

Matt Sullivan confirmed and noted it changes bi-weekly.

Mary DeVries stated the Chamber can do a better job helping with the communication piece.

Vaune Dugan suggested thinking about how to combat the issues that came up frequently like noise and traffic safety and how to make people comfortable with these issues.

Cindy Melanson stated in light of the petition warrant article the people of the town homes were scared based on what they were told which was false information.

Mike Hodder noted even if everyone in the community said they were in favor, the article was structurally flawed, and the Board had no choice.

Peter Goodwin thanked the Chamber.

III. Scheduled Appointments / Public Hearings / Public Forum

Jereome Holden & Dean S. and Cathy M. Sedler

Agent: Jim Rines, P.E., L.L.S.

Boundary Line Adjustment

Tax Map #204-23 and 204-31, Case #2019-04

Jim Rines stated the adjustment is to subtract 0.19 Acres from the existing 3.29 Acre Sedler lot and add it to the rear of the existing 0.25 Acre Holden lot. He referred to the plan and noted the adjustment would bring the Holden lot closer to conforming with the zoning ordinance while leaving the Sedler lot in conformance. As part of the application, a request for a waiver from Section 174-7B.(4)(g) of the subdivision regulation was submitted.

He referenced the note regarding the missing documentation that the properties are not shown within the 100-Year Floodplain and stated he checked the map and it is not on and should this be approved would ask for a conditional approval to get that note on the plan.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by John Thurston to grant the waiver from section 174-7 B.(4)(g). All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Vaune Dugan to accept the application as complete. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.

Matt Sullivan read the following 5 conditions of approval and noted removal of condition #3:

1. The following plans, as amended to the date of this approval, are adopted by reference as part of this approval:

Plan 1. Boundary Line Adjustment Plan, Owners: Jerome Holden/ Dean S. and Cathy M. Sedler ;
Project Location: 17 Grove Street and 68 Center Street, Wolfeboro, NH, 03894, Tax Map and
Lots: 204-031 and 204-023, prepared by White Mountain Survey & Engineering, P.O. Box
440, Ossipee, NH 03864, dated January 7 th , 2019.

2. The applicant shall submit the mylar plan for recording at the Carroll County Registry of Deeds and be responsible for the payment of all recording fees.

~~3. The applicant shall be responsible for monumentation and the submittal of the Certificate of Monumentation and updated plans.~~

3. All of the documentation submitted in the application package by the applicant and any requirements imposed by other agencies are part of this approval unless otherwise updated, revised, clarified in some manner, or superseded in full or in part. In the case of conflicting information between documents, the most recent documentation and this notice herein shall generally be determining.

4. A final Boundary Line Adjustment Plan shall be submitted with an original stamp by a Licensed Land Surveyor.

5. The addition of a note regarding the presence of the 100-year floodplain to the plan.

Kathy Barnard noted the Form Factor Calculations were submitted and do conform.

There being no comments or questions from the public, Kathy Barnard closed the public hearing.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by John Thurston to approve the application with the 5 conditions for Jerome Holden & Dean S. and Cathy M. Sedler, Boundary Line Adjustment, Tax Map #204-23 and 204-31, Case #2019-04. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

**Jerome Holden/JC Signs
Site Plan Review; Addition
Tax Map #204-31, Case #2019-02**

Jerome Holden referenced the picture provided, he is trying to add a left garage (32x10) and stated the layout will be an empty garage space with storage upstairs. The perimeter drainage will go into the town drain. There will be 10 parking spaces, possibly 11 but 10 is required. The snow removal is included.

Matt Sullivan asked if the existing perimeter drainage will be removed on the left-hand side of the existing garage.

Jerome Holden responded yes but will have to be moved over and noted the shed will be removed.

Matt Sullivan stated he is comfortable with the proposed parking, there is adequate snow storage provided, and has no concerns.

Mike Hodder asked what lighting is intended.

Jerome Holden confirmed no additional lighting will be installed.

Peter Goodwin asked if the parking lot is being expanded.

Jerome Holden replied it is not.

Kathy Barnard questioned if the addition does not trigger the need for additional parking.

Matt Sullivan confirmed no, it does not trigger additional parking with current use; however, if it changes or changes ownership the Board will need to revisit.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Peter Goodwin to accept the application as complete. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.

Matt Sullivan read the following 4 conditions of approval:

1. The following plans, as amended to the date of this approval are incorporated into the approval:
Plan 1. Planning Board Site Plan – JC Signs; Project Location: 17 Grove Street, Wolfeboro, NH, 03894, Tax Map 204 Lot 031 prepared by Jerome Holden. Dated January 14 th , 2019
2. The applicant shall be responsible for the payment of all recording fees.
3. All of the documentation submitted in the application package by the applicant and any requirements imposed by other agencies are part of this approval unless otherwise updated, revised, clarified in Department of Planning and Development some manner, or superseded in full or in part. In the case of conflicting information between documents, the most recent documentation and this notice herein shall generally be determining.
4. This approval does not supersede any previous Planning Board applicable conditions of the previous Site Plan Approval.

Mike Hodder thanked the applicant for going through the voluntary design guidelines process.

There being no comments or questions from the public, Kathy Barnard closed the public hearing.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Vaune Dugan to approve the application with the 4 conditions for Jerome Holden/JC Signs, Site Plan Review; Addition, Tax Map #204-31, Case #2019-02. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

Cynthia I. & Clinton A. Johnson

Agent: Jim Rines, P.E., L.L.S.

Special Use Permit; New Single Family Dwelling, Temporary Wetlands Crossing, Elevated Walkway

Tax Map #158-21, Case #2019-03

Vaune Dugan recused herself.

Jim Rines stated this is a Special Use Permit to redevelop existing property at 134 Piper Lane under Article II, Section 175-10.B. The lot is 0.8 Acres in size and has approximately 220 ft. shoreland by the shore. In 2006 the Johnsons were approved for a much larger home, it was appealed, the Superior Court upheld the Planning Boards approval, the Supreme Court overturned it and it was handed back to the Planning Board, the Johnsons ended up purchasing the property. Mrs. Johnson submitted a letter stating her father originally purchased the property and is trying to modestly redevelop this structure with a new structure from what she remembers from her childhood. There is a boundary dispute. He stated the wetlands setbacks comply with Section 175-10.B.(2). The replacement home will reduce the footprint of the conditioned living spaces from 780 sq. ft. existing to 641

sq. ft. Stone infiltration trenches will be placed along the eaves and along the proposed retaining wall as part of the stormwater mitigation. The replacement access to the home will be an elevated walkway that exchanges 78 sq. ft. of direct impact to the wetlands with 3 sq. ft. of wetlands for the impact from the piers to elevate the 217 sq. ft. of walkway that passes above the wetlands. Criteria has been met to be granted a Special Use Permit. He has provided the wetlands bureau permit, shoreland permit, and sewage disposal permit. Construction is proposed to be by a temporary access point and have proposed a maneuvering area and are proposing a more formalized walkway and erosion will be controlled by fencing.

Matt Sullivan questioned terminology *perennial run off* versus *perennial stream*.

Jim Rines responded they have been working on this application for 13 years, have referred to it as a perennial run off and upon visiting in the summer, it's been dry. However, the Wolfeboro zoning regulations do not define perennial run off, so he went to the wetlands bureau of regulations and they defined this as intermittent, as it doesn't flow at certain times of the year and would be intermittent in the applications.

Mike Hodder questioned the narrative, 1st paragraph, last sentence.

Jim Rines responded another lot that abuts this lot that will be willing to merge that as a condition of this approval.

Mike Hodder asked if that is a condition.

Matt Sullivan replied it is not and will add it.

Peter Goodwin questioned the temporary bridge and what the foundation is for that structure.

Jim Rines stated geotextiles were proposed to avoid sinking.

Mike Hodder stated given DES regulations regarding fertilizers in proximity to the lake and the Conservation Commissions concerns for Cyanobacteria blooms asked Jim Rines to address 1) their concerns and 2) what plans his client might have for landscaping within the 25-250 ft. buffer from the lake.

Jim Rines replied they will keep it as is and use natural plantings.

Mike Hodder questioned the cyanobacteria blooms.

Jim Rines stated an infiltration trench along the retaining wall and around the house was proposed. A frost wall will go down and be slab construction. The retaining wall and frost wall will help keep anything from running off.

Kathy Barnard asked Jim Rines to comment regarding the Conservation Commissions concerns with the expansion of impervious surface and nutrient inputs to the intermittent drainage adjacent to the house. She also asked for response to the Conservation Commissions comment stating any expansion in the floodplain of the intermittent stream is a poor idea and questioned the coverage.

Jim Rines stated the coverage is approximately 8 or 9 percent total. Regarding the runoff into the wetlands, he felt the infiltration trenches address the Conservation Commission concerns and in terms of the floodplain, the runoff will flow under the camp and the frost wall will aid in keeping the run off in the mentioned area.

Kathy Barnard referenced the planner review and questioned the following existing and proposed impacts: Direct Wetland Impact is 78 sq. ft. and proposed is 800 sq. ft. the Wetland Buffer Impact is at 841 sq. ft. and the proposed is 3,464 sq. ft. and the Wetland Setback Impact is 1,187 sq. ft. and the proposed is 2,126 sq. ft.

Matt Sullivan offered clarity regarding the proposed total for the Direct Wetland Impact (809 sq. ft.) he included the temporary construction access which should not have been included as it isn't a permanent impact, it should be around 200 sq. ft.

Jim Rines stated in that one line the 170 sq. ft. of the walkway was included because it's above the wetland.

John Thurston questioned if he meant 270 sq. ft.

Jim Rines confirmed he meant 270 sq. ft. and stated they included where they drive; therefore, the proposed figures aren't quite as large as they seem.

John Thurston asked to explain the walkway going across.

Jim Rines responded the retaining wall and the walkway will be level with 8 piers across to elevate to allow flow to go beneath it.

John Thurston asked if it will be wood.

Jim Rines replied it will probably be steel.

John Thurston referenced the retaining wall at the beginning of the parking area from the walkway that goes down towards the lake and comes back sideways and contains the parking area and asked what will occur with the water as it appears it will gang up.

Jim Rines stated it's a segmented wall, and is not more than 30" tall with a stone.

John Thurston asked what happens to the surface water.

Jim Rines replied it will run to it and over the face of it to the trenches.

Mike Hodder congratulated the applicant on the overall design.

Matt Sullivan referenced the infiltration trench and asked if it's on the outside of the retaining wall.

Jim Rines confirmed.

John Thurston questioned the depth of the trench.

Matt Sullivan replied 18" deep.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by John Thurston to accept the application as complete. Kathy Barnard, Brad Harriman, Peter Goodwin, and Susan Replier voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-0.

Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.

Jack Ripwater, maintenance man on Piper Lane stated he is aware of the conflicts and had two questions 1) will this cause any type of run off to the adjacent Wallace property.

Jim Rines confirmed it will not.

Jack Ripwater then asked his second question, to provide clarity regarding the temporary crossing.

Jim Rines replied the temporary crossing will allow for materials and equipment to help construct the home, will be removed and stated it is much wider than the footpath that will be used to walk to their property.

Rick Segar, attorney with Segar & Smith, PLLC representing the Wallace's, stated the long history has prevented Jim Rines from speaking with him to answer some questions and noted his clients were not present due to a family medical issue. His clients are not opposed to this application, however, want to be certain requirements are met and had the following concerns:

- The Conservation Commissions concerns regarding the buffer of 5 ft. leaves no access room for construction of the foundation.
- The house is constructed in a floodplain and there has been flooding in the past.
- The expansion of the house in this location may be desirable due to its proximity to the lake; however, the Conservation Commission believes that they can meet elsewhere on the property; a further setback of the house so that it doesn't impede on the 50 ft reference line.
- Impervious surfaces and cyanobacteria are of concern as they swim in the lake and have noticed the quality of the lake declining.
- The Conservation Commission states it's premature to allow expansion of this dwelling at this time as the intermittent stream should be looked at.
- Lot redevelopment; Section 175-67, why isn't it addressed in this application.

Matt Sullivan made comment to Attorney Segar's question referencing Section 175-67 and stated the standards are addressed through the Town of Wolfboro's shoreland permitting process, we are one of the few towns that have a municipal permitting process, so that review typically happens at a later phase. It's a subsequent process that will occur later.

Attorney Segar confirmed that will happen at a later date assuming the application is accepted and approved.

Matt Sullivan confirmed, correct.

Attorney Segar asked if this application will require a special exception.

Matt Sullivan confirmed, correct, there is a vertical expansion proposed towards the reference line on the project and that vertical is within the 50 ft. setback and would require special exception but because it does not have any wetland impact it's not part of this Special Use Permit request but would be required to seek a special exception from the ZBA.

Attorney Segar referenced the boundary dispute and believes it impacts this application. The line could be anywhere on the plan and feels it needs to be resolved before the Board approves the application. He noted his client disagrees with the expansion of the property into his client's property. He questioned the proposed parking area and wanted to know where the construction vehicles turn around.

Kathy Barnard questioned the boundary dispute and how it will intrude on his client's property.

Attorney Segar referenced the map and stated the applicant is suggesting the bottom red line is their boundary line and his client is saying the top line is their boundary line.

Kathy Barnard stated she did not see construction taking place near those lines.

Mike Hodder questioned Attorney Segar's comment regarding the boundary line as he stated it could be almost anywhere on that plan and asked him to speculate how high up he thought it might go.

Attorney Segar responded no.

Mike Hodder asked Attorney Segar if he was comfortable saying the disputed area is as shown on the plan, i.e. the line on the bottom or the line on the top.

Attorney Segar stated his opinion is he doesn't know where the boundary line is and isn't clear on how high it might go, potentially as high as where the proposed home is to be constructed. He then reiterated concern for construction vehicles and emergency response vehicles turning around. Lastly, he stated there is no design for the temporary bridge that will be crossing over a wetland and his clients are concerned for a truck potentially falling off or spills that could occur.

Matt Sullivan stated there are no details yet for the construction of the temporary bridge; however, Dave Ford is comfortable it could be addressed during the building permitting phase.

Attorney Segar asked if his client would receive any notification during the building permitting phase regarding the bridge.

Matt Sullivan confirmed they would not.

Attorney Segar asked if this is approved can his clients be notified.

Matt Sullivan noted his concern, extending that courtesy could create a possible inequity in the process that does not exist right now and he would not recommend. However, felt it fair for the parties get together to discuss but would hesitate for the town to play a role in facilitating that discussion directly.

Attorney Segar questioned the wetlands and if the application is similar to what was approved in 2009.

Jim Rines responded to some of Attorney Segar's questions beginning with the boundary line. The interior boundary isn't the historic boundary line, it was created by the Wallace's surveyor in 2001.

Matt Sullivan asked if both lines are monumented today.

Jim Rines confirmed they are monumented today and the Wallace's fenced in their boundary line and it appears both parties feel the other has encroached, but 2 surveyors have determined the lines. With regard to the turnaround for emergency vehicles, where Piper Lane reaches the shore, vehicles will likely turn around there; they won't be turning around on the Wallace's or Johnsons property. The crossing does have a design, was submitted to DES and approved. In terms of the permits granted by the state, the application before the Board is identical to the permits that were granted by the state.

Kathy Barnard asked if this is the same as what was submitted in 2009.

Jim Rines confirmed yes and is actually less than what was approved as the Johnsons want to keep this a small cottage in the woods.

John Thurston asked if there will be a driveway built first.

Jim Rines confirmed that will be built first.

John Thurston asked if there is a high slope and possible for construction vehicles to fall off the temporary bridge.

Jim Rines replied no, there is not a high slope, and this is a challenging lot, they won't be coming in with the largest vehicles and loading as high as possible, they will work with the conditions they have.

John Thurston inquired about the geotextiles.

Jim Rines stated the geotextiles will go down to keep the soil from coming through and intermixing, similar to what occurred when Dunkin Donuts was put in the town.

Kathy Barnard asked if Jim Rines would like to comment on the cyanobacteria concerns the Conservation Commission have.

Jim Rines responded his client also swims in the lake and was disturbed by the cyanobacteria blooms that occurred and this is not part of the floodplains.

Matt Sullivan confirmed it is not part of the floodplains.

John Thurston asked about the septic fields.

Jim Rines stated it's a clean solution rather than a septic tank so it's cleaner than a standard system.

Attorney Segar questioned the area outside the setback and further back from the lake; why wasn't that looked at as an alternative site.

Jim Rines responded the reason being that the current site is the best suited due to less disturbance.

Attorney Segar stated the cottage is currently on piers and are proposing a wall that allows less water to pass through, is the proposed foundation going to be more resistant to water passing through than what's there now?

Jim Rines confirmed it will be more resistant.

Attorney Segar asked if it was of any concern being in the floodplain.

Jim Rines reiterated it's not in a floodplain and FEMA does not show it in a floodplain, but it will be better than it is now.

Attorney Segar stated concern for when the construction bridge is gone, there will be no way by vehicle to access the cottage.

Jim Rines replied they will walk on the walkway.

Attorney Segar asked if there are any safety issues or concerns.

Jim Rines stated that was raised with TRC and Deputy Zotti did not see any issues with what's proposed.

John Thurston asked if the bridge is higher than 30".

Jim Rines replied no.

Brad Harriman asked if there is thought on how the septic tanks will be pumped.

Jim Rines replied the pumping will be easier, there won't be a great deal of head and can run with hose to access it.

Matt Sullivan read 6 conditions for approval and stated to also include the very poorly drained soils information including the new calculations be added to condition 1 as Mr. Rines presented and added a 7th condition, see below.

- 1) The following plan, as amended to the date of approval, is hereby incorporated into this approval:
Plan 1. Special Use Permit Site Plan, Owner/Applicant: Cynthia L. and Clinton L. Johnson, P.O. Box 5745, Berkeley, CA 94705-5745, Project Location: 134 Piper Lane, Wolfeboro, NH, 03894, Tax Map 158-

021 prepared by White Mountain Survey & Engineering, P.O Box 440, Ossipee, NH, Dated January 14th, 2019.

- 2) All of the documentation submitted in the application package by the applicant and any requirements imposed by other agencies are part of this approval unless otherwise updated, revised, clarified in some manner, or superseded in full or in part. In the case of conflicting information between documents, the most recent documentation and this notice herein shall generally be determining.
3. The applicant shall comply with the pre-construction siltation and erosion control measures and construction sequence as shown on the plan including, but not limited to:
 - a. Silt fencing
4. An inspection by the Town shall be required of siltation devices prior to construction.
5. The applicant shall be responsible for all recording fees.
6. The applicant shall be required to monument the edge of Wetlands in compliance with § 175-9.1 *Wetlands Boundary Monumentation*. This includes:
 - 1) Wetlands shall be delineated by a State of New Hampshire Certified Wetlands Scientist. Markers should be placed at 50' +/- intervals along the total wetland boundary following its general contour.
 - 2) Care shall be taken to ensure that markers are placed with the appropriate spacing at points closest to any proposed or existing structure located on the property.
 - 3) The cost shall be borne by the applicant/developer or their successors in interest.
 - 4) The applicant shall be responsible for submitting a letter of certification of the posting to the Code Enforcement Office prior to the issuance of any building permit.
7. A merger of lots 158-023 and 158-021 to be completed by the applicant prior to any construction beginning.

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Brad Harriman to approve the Cynthia I. & Clinton A. Johnson Special Use Permit application, Case #2019-03, Tax Map #158-21, subject to the recommended conditions of approval. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.6-0.

IV. Action Items

Land Use Committee Appointments

It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Peter Goodwin to appoint Bill Peterson to the Future Land Use Committee. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

V. Approval of Minutes

January 22, 2019

It was moved by Peter Goodwin and seconded by Mike Hodder to approve the January 22, 2019 Wolfeboro Planning Board minutes as submitted. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 7-0.

VI. Communications & Miscellaneous

N/A

VII. Work Session

Planning Board Letter to the Editor re: 2019 Zoning Amendments

- It was the boards consensus a letter is not necessary.

EDC

- Hold a joint meeting with the EDC at a work session in March
- Round table format
- Obtain a briefing ahead of time; bullet points
- Discuss recommendations towards the EDC from the Master Plan Committee
- Overall goal – help EDC improve the relationship and gain understanding of zoning process

The Board discussed putting something out (potentially in the paper) regarding how petition warrant articles are handled by the Planning Board and their role; the Board is unable to assist in the writing of a warrant article, nor can they assist/edit if the warrant article is written incorrectly or submitted with a flaw.

Meeting Schedule for 2019 Work Plan Items

Matt Sullivan reviewed work plans items and the Board discussed the following:

- Potentially have a 2-3-member rezoning subcommittee of the board
- Impact fee should be looked into more; obtain letters i.e. provide a box for feedback
- Potentially move landscaping and lighting regulations and parking into the site plan
- Take a closer look at storm water management regulations for improvement
- Master Plan chapters will be sent out prior to a meeting for review and placed online

VIII. New Business

N/A

IX. Planning Board Subcommittee Reports

N/A

X. Nonpublic Meeting

N/A

It was moved by Kathy Barnard and seconded by Brad Harriman to adjourn the January 22, 2019 Wolfeboro Planning Board meeting. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:09 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cathleen LaPierre

Cathy LaPierre

****Please note these minutes are subject to amendments and approval at a later date. ****