

**TOWN OF WOLFEBORO  
PLANNING BOARD  
March 3, 2020  
MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Kathy Barnard, Chairman, Brad Harriman, Selectmen’s Representative, John Thurston, Mike Hodder, Peter Goodwin, Susan Repplier, Members.

**Members Absent:** Vaune Dugan, Vice-Chairman, Dave Alessandroni, Alternate.

**Staff Present:** Matt Sullivan, Director of Planning and Development.

*Chairman Barnard opened the meeting at 7:00 PM at the Great Hall.*

**I. Introduction of Board Members**

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

**II. Scheduled Appointments / Public Hearings / Public Forum  
Wolfeboro Bible Fellowship (CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING)  
2-Lot Subdivision  
Tax Map #148-15, Case #2020-05**

Kathy Barnard read the item into the record.

Randy Tetreault stated the applicant is proposing to divide the current existing 12+ acre lot in half. This particular subdivision does not require state subdivision approval through DES due to it being over 5 acres in size. However, the town’s requirements for wetland delineation soils etc. have performed on the lot that is vacant. The existing lots have shown wetlands delineation, typography, and show the existing features i.e. the buildings, parking, etc. The lots require on lot wells and septic systems.

Peter Goodwin questioned the angle of the line dividing the lots.

Randy Tetreault replied the line ran in the direction indicated due to attempting to split each lot into 6 acres.

Mike Hodder questioned access and if there were any permit applications.

Randy Tetreault replied they haven’t made a state permit application for access off Rte. 28 because they aren’t proposing to come off of there, although it is an option; however the impact on the lot was much greater.

Kathy Barnard asked if that were to be an option where would it be.

Randy Tetreault referred to his diagram and stated the area that would be the best would be located by the boundary line and the furthest from any other entrance.

Kathy Barnard noted concern for the 6% slope pertaining to the driveway requirement and questioned if that could be achieved.

Matt Sullivan confirmed the standard does exist, is unclear on how to implement it on residential driveways, but is something the Board may use as a guiding principle for driveways of this sort.

Randy Tetreault stated the only part that would be in the steep slope category in the ordinance would be the area which is guard railed so that wouldn't be the area, this is a B slope which is 0-8% so you'd have to run perpendicular to the contour. Residential driveways for one single family unit are not usually held to 6% as compared with road regulations.

Matt Sullivan noted the road construction regulations actually allow for more grade on the roadway itself than the residential driveway; therefore, is not sure the regulations work with each other as they exist today.

John Thurston asked if the volume of water coming across the road is substantial and what adjustments would need to be made.

Randy Tetreault replied that a culvert would need to be added underneath the proposed driveway (if driveway placed directly off of Route 28) even though it's not a jurisdictional wetlands permit situation.

Peter Goodwin asked if the access off Kenney Shore Road is a more logical way to get to the property.

Randy Tetreault replied yes, but the owner's representatives had a conversation with DOT about that, who preferred they not create another entrance.

Matt Sullivan asked Mr. Tetreault to describe the boundary along Kenney Shore Road; where it's shown.

Randy Tetreault replied he completed a survey for a Wolfeboro Church (a predecessor for Kingswood Youth Association) in 1989. During the course of that survey he had to make a determination on the property line of that lot. Generally, when there is a deed that goes by the road, along the side of the road, bounded by the road etc. unless there is expressed language to the contrary where it would render a different owner in the fee title of that road, then the presumption of law the surveys have to go by, is that the title extends to the center line thereof. Reviewing the work completed in the past and today, on both sides of the road, the property line is actually the center.

John Thurston asked if the owner of the new proposed lot has the right to pass also.

Randy Tetreault replied that would be more of a legal issue, and stated anytime you abutt a road, unless expressed otherwise, you have access.

John Thurston noted it makes sense from a safety perspective to have access off of Kenney Shore Road as opposed to coming off Center Street.

Kathy Barnard stated it's also a disruption of the subject lot to come off of Rte. 28.

Mike Hodder stated it would be more difficult to come out of Rte. 28 than it would to come off Kenney Shore Road but it is possible to come off Rte. 28.

Randy Tetreault noted that wasn't the route the applicant's wanted.

Mike Hodder noted there is one access route off onto this lot, with some applications and some consultations it can be effective off of Rte. 28 and then there is the access off of Kenney Shore Road which is in dispute.

Randy Tetreault noted Attorney Randy Walker was available this evening if the Board wished to discuss this further.

Kathy Barnard noted waivers have not been requested.

**It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Peter Goodwin to accept the motion as complete. All members voted. The motion passed. 6-0.**

Chairman Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.

Roger Murray stated he was representing the property owners on Lake Wentworth who are opposed to Kenney Shore Road being used as an access road to the present church property or to the proposed lot. This evening is the first time hearing an explanation about how there might be access from Rte. 28 onto the proposed lot and have concerns i.e. frontage/access. They also oppose the subdivision using Kenney Shore Road due to believing they don't have the right to do so and distributed a letter to the Board.

Mike Hodder noted it would have been helpful to have received the letter prior to the hearing as it's difficult to analyze this while Mr. Murray is speaking and the Board is deliberating on the case, particularly presuming this exhibit is important to their case.

Roger Murray referred to the letter, see attached.

Peter Goodwin asked why it is a problem to have access off that property to Kenney Shore Road.

Roger Murray stated his clients do not want there to be such access. They are concerned about the location of the driveway due to potential repairs and maintenance issues.

Peter Goodwin stated he did not understand why it's such a problem to have another driveway off that road and perhaps folks can explain.

Carl Crosley provided some history and stated what is not recorded in previous minutes but rather in the notes of folks attending the meetings is when the church applied for a variance, the minister at the time, stated they were not going to use Kenney Shore Road, they had no access, and would use Rte. 28.

Peter Goodwin reiterated he did not understand why it's a problem to have another driveway off Kenney Shore Road.

Carl Crosley replied residents are concerned about maintenance to the road, construction, and putting a driveway at the one point they've had significant issues with slope that would create a hazard. Because Mr. Tetreault has inadvertently created a boundary line by his interpretation doesn't change the way things should be. Although they don't own the property, and they have right-of-way, they can't grant access and don't feel anyone else should be able to either because of who owns the property (the Youth Center).

Attorney Randy Walker stated the Kingswood Youth Center owns the road and they aren't objecting to this, and believe the property line runs right down the middle as Randy Tetreault has shown. The Board has approved 3 plans (in 1989, 2009, and 2016) showing it runs down the middle with no objections from abutters. This is a fourth time the plan has shown the property line running down the middle. Since 1873, the law is clear, if property abuts a road and it isn't clear that the person conveying the road retained it then you own to the center of the road. When the Youth Center property came out they got everything on the north side, and when the church property came out they got everything on the southern side and the road strip was left in between. Since 1873, the law states if a strip is left in between you split it equally unless something in the deed says that's not the case. The deeds Roger Murray provided do not say there is any exception to that rule. There is also a presumption if you own on an edge of a road you have the right to use the road. The logical place is to come down Kenney Shore road as it's safer, less traffic, shorter, etc. The people that own the road are not objecting; its non-owners objecting.

Mike Hodder questioned if Kingswood Youth Center owns the north side of the road, and it can be argued they own the entire road, has your client consider getting an easement.

Attorney Randy walker stated it was considered but from a legal perspective did not feel it was necessary. As Roger Murray did point out, the Youth Center is prohibited from using that by a deed restriction even though they own half.

John Thurston asked if there was any deed restriction for the other side.

Attorney Randy Walker replied none.

Roger Murray stated it's fair to say the reason the Youth Center isn't concerned about the use of the road is because they have no right to use it which is why they might not particularly care about who is going up and down the road; they don't maintain it and can't use it. He believes the deed is quite clear, it specifically states the church's property runs down southern or towns side of the road. While it may be logical to come in off Kenney Shore Road, but just because it's logical, if you don't have the right to use it, you can't come in that way. In this case the church does not.

Peter Goodwin noted there is an alternate way to get to the property i.e. Rte. 28 as described/shown in the plan and questioned if Roger Murray was opposed to the subdivision.

Roger Murray replied no.

Peter Goodwin stated then there is no reason to oppose this subdivision.

Roger Murray replied as long as they obtained a DOT permit as an addition to the approval they would not have a problem with it moving forward.

Randy Tetreault stated he disagreed with Roger Murray's interpretation and referred to the deed recorded 1/31/1962.

Roger Murray disagreed.

Matt Sullivan stated the Boards jurisdiction is deciding whether or not this development lot meets the criteria of the subdivision regulations. If the Board is not comfortable that the lot proposed has access whether it be on Kenney Shore Road or Rte. 28 he believes members should make a specific ask to the applicant for a driveway permit or something to that effect. If the Board feels that access has properly been demonstrated within the application he would be cautious about making any kind of determination on what the actual access is. The Board has allowed for driveway cuts to be shown on subdivision applications for many many years. In no case has an applicant, with the exception of a special use permit, been bound by the subdivision driveway permit that is shown on the plan. That process is handled through the driveway permitting process with the town or State of New Hampshire.

Mike Hodder stated from his perspective, in order to grant this subdivision he would make it conditional upon getting a NHDOT driveway permit off of Rte. 28 because access off of Kenney Shore Road is in dispute. He would want the applicant to understand that would be the condition and have the option of withdrawing the application and thrashing out one way or another, access off of Kenney Shore Road. If they are successful come back and apply for the subdivision with the access the way they'd like it to be (off of Kenney Shore Road), and if not successful come back and apply for access off of Rte. 28.

John Thurston stated he wasn't clear why the Board would have to go that route based on Attorney Randy Walkers findings; he has provided case history on the lot line and feel it's a much safer approach. Trying to come off of Rte. 28 is dangerous. The more you can mitigate the potential out there, the better; therefore, would prefer to proceed with the access off of Kenney Shore Road.

Mike Hodder stated he agreed but feels the Board can't determine the legality portion; legal access off of Kenney Shore Road.

John Thurston stated the burden is on the owner of the lot; if they end up with a lot they can't get to, it's just a lot.

Mike Hodder reiterated his comment regarding the owner thrashing out Kenney Shore Road access, which is the preferred access with the fall back being NHDOT and come back.

Kathy Barnard stated the Board's obligation is to look at safety issues and the general welfare which is why we have subdivision approvals. She agreed with John Thurston and Mike Hodder that Rte. 28 is not a safe access whereas Kenney Shore Road would be a safer and feel that's an important consideration.

Mike Hodder noted NHDOT will do the line of site, traffic study, and all of the other requirements to be sure access off of Rte. 28 would be safe. The Board is not qualified to do those studies.

Kathy Barnard noted concern as it would be very disruptive to the land (as part of the Lake Wentworth watershed) if the driveway is put off of Rte. 28. It would be less disruptive to have the access off of Kenney Shore Road.

Mike Hodder asked if the Board could grant the subdivision with access down Kenney Shore Road.

Kathy Barnard replied, not from what we've heard tonight but the Board's obligation in granting the subdivision is to determine if access is possible and according to testimony and Attorney Randy Walker there is.

Matt Sullivan stated many of the subdivisions seen, we assume that the driveway shown can be permitted. He is unaware of a case where the Board has asked for the driveway permit to be supplied with the subdivision itself. He agreed with Kathy Barnard that the applicant has demonstrated that it is possible to obtain an access and it depends on how far past that the Board wishes to proceed with a condition.

Attorney Randy Walker stated there is a group objecting to access that are not the owners of the road. They aren't objecting to the subdivision, but rather access off of Kenney Shore Road. He suggested the Board approve the application, approve the subdivision, and they will then decide whether they come down Rte. 28 or Kenney Shore Road via permit.

Kathy Barnard noted there needs to be two points of access.

Matt Sullivan stated the only thing that makes him uncomfortable is the plan shows only one of the two access points. One condition of the Board could be to show a second optimal point of access.

Mike Hodder stated if they grant the application conditional upon a DOT driveway permit subsequent, then they can thrash it out and asked if that's what Attorney Randy Walker was suggesting.

Attorney Randy Walker replied no, they were trying to avoid the DOT application as it's a waste and they don't want it, nor does the Board.

Mike Hodder asked how the Board can grant a subdivision approval without showing where they intend to get access to the lot.

Attorney Randy Walker replied a Board approved for example, the Embassy Estate subdivision that had 48 lots back in 1989 of which 48 driveways were shown and would estimate not one of those driveways was put where it was shown because it's just a suggestion, a guidance, an example of where it is. Typically the Board leaves it to the applicant to get that permit down the road when they determine where they wish to put it.

John Thurston asked if the applicant would be adverse to contributing to the road maintenance fees.

Attorney Randy Walker stated his advice would be to contribute and the law is clear, if you use the road you have to pay for it.

Kathy Barnard asked Matt Sullivan if the Board would be in a better position if they had a plan of a driveway off of Rte. 28.

Matt Sullivan replied the preferable option is to show two access points and two locations of septic and well to demonstrate the lot is buildable in two locations if the Board feels that's necessary.

John Thurston stated he did not feel that's necessary.

Jack Holebrook stated given the suggestion there may be litigation about this down the road, wondered if the thought that the potential locations is not quite as moot a point that it makes sense to actually have two locations to firm up the possibility that there are two real locations.

Kathy Barnard noted there has been testimony there are two locations.

Roger Murray stated Embassy Estates subdivision was not a good example because the town was sued. Once the Planning Board signs the plan it's done, it's a subdivision, and feels the Board needs to reconsider.

John Thurston stated say you have a driveway that is plotted in a subdivision application, it's approved, you litigate it, and then the judge says no you don't have access, is that person going to have to come back to the Board to obtain a driveway permit.

Matt Sullivan replied no, in this particular case they would be forced to find alternative access along the abutting road. It wouldn't have to come back to this Board because the driveway location in his opinion is not binding.

Kathy Barnard stated no building permit can be issued on this lot until there is a driveway permit.

Matt Sullivan confirmed that's correct.

Brad Harriman stated he'd come to the same conclusion Attorney Randy Walker had that there is an option, the Board can approve this subdivision conditional they show an option for a driveway off of Rte. 28. They can keep the option off Kenney Shore road and then it's up to the applicant whenever they come in for a building permit to figure out which one they want to use. Whether they choose Kenney Shore Road and have to go through litigation or go with the Rte. 28 option it won't return to the Board; it could be done tonight as a condition of approval on this plan and that be shown before it's recorded.

Kathy Barnard noted the testimony this evening is part of the record and wondering if the Board needs a plan showing the cut off Rte. 28.

John Thurston noted concern for potential erosion issues and would prefer a plan.

Mike Hodder asked Matt Sullivan if it's safe to approve a subdivision with no access as defined in the application itself.

Matt Sullivan replied he felt it's in the Board's best interest to have some sort of driveway cut shown and noted they aren't asking for the full driveway to be shown but rather the access points to discuss safety and traffic impacts. The Board could conditionally approve upon a plan to be revised and shown to the board. Or continue in two weeks, give the applicant an opportunity to draft a new plan showing a driveway cut along Rte. 28 that they believe can be permitted.

Mike Hodder suggested they continue this application and give the applicant and the other individual's time to thrash it out without difficulties and the applicant come back with a new set of plans showing the access point they'd like to use.

Roger Murray stated the Board needs to be careful; if they approve in some form this plan, and it's recorded in the registry of deeds, suppose the church doesn't have a buyer and sits on it 5-10 years and suddenly it's bought, it will be a problem.

Peter Goodwin recommended continuing.

A member of the public stated if it's approved showing the Rte. 28 access without DOT approval you then prejudice the DOT to take the path of least resistant and assume Kenney Shore Road is proper. Which is a contention whether it's legal access or not.

Kathy Barnard stated they haven't done that and that would be unfair to the applicant.

Attorney Randy walker stated the Board does it all the time as he couldn't think of a subdivision application submitted in the last 30 years that didn't show a driveway where it wasn't used and got moved. This application is no different, it meets the requirements, and as Brad Harriman pointed out, it shows the driveway and when they come for the building permit they will have to show whether or not that's a viable driveway.

Randy Tetreault stated it would be easy enough to show a proposed entrance point where he indicated up near the property line. They do have a legal position, by law, with the number of curb cuts to have a spot. What we were trying to avoid was designing something because we felt we had the right to use the road and if that was determined they couldn't use it, we'd have another spot and would then go through the design process.

John Thurston questioned if the Board could obtain a legal letter from Attorney Randy Walker stating they have legal access with a curb cut off on Rte. 28.

Matt Sullivan noted he could state that based on DOT criteria they are entitled to a driveway cut.

Mike Hodder suggested the Board approve it conditional upon new plans.

John Sweeney requested the application not be approved at this time due to contention where the property line really is and noted concern for how the property is surveyed. He feels the applicant should show access off of Rte. 28. Kenney Shore Road is a dirt country lane that shore front owners have used and the deeds show no intention to split access down the middle. Residents wish to keep it in the same character as it's been in the last 100 years.

Matt Sullivan read the following 7 conditions for approval:

1. The following plans, as amended by the Planning Board approval, are incorporated into the approval:  
**Plan 1:** Subdivision Plan – Prepared for Wolfeboro Bible Fellowship, 533 Center Street, Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, Tax Maps 148-015, Prepared by Randy Tetreault, L.L.S., Norway Plains Associations, 2 Continental Boulevard, Rochester, NH 03867, Dated January 2020.  
**Plan 2:** Topographic Subdivision Plan – Prepared for Wolfeboro Bible Fellowship, 533 Center Street, Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, Tax Maps 148-015, Prepared by Randy Tetreault, L.L.S., Norway Plains Associations, 2 Continental Boulevard, Rochester, NH 03867, Dated January 2020.
2. The applicant shall submit a mylar plan for recording at the Carroll County Registry of Deeds.
3. The applicant shall be responsible for the payment of all recording fees.
4. 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.
5. The applicant shall be responsible for monumentation and the submittal of the Certificate of Monumentation and updated plans including original stamps and signatures from an L.L.S and C.W.S.
6. The applicant shall provide a revised subdivision plan with proposed driveway access to Rte. 28 to an area that meets minimum development standards.
7. The applicant shall provide a letter justifying the proposed lots qualifications for an NHDOT driveway permit.

Mike Hodder questioned #7.

Matt Sullivan stated #7 was added because he thought he heard a request from the Board that the applicant's surveyor of record provide at least the basis for the statement that the lot would be entitled to a driveway permit.

Mike Hodder stated he has the frontage on Rte. 28.

Matt Sullivan stated he could remove the condition but preferred he have the justification in a letter.

Consensus of the Planning Board agreed to keep #7.

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

**It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by John Thurston to approve the 2-Lot Subdivision for the Wolfeboro Bible Fellowship with the 7 conditions of approval. Tax Map #148-15, Case #2020-05. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-0.**

**Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust  
Condominium Subdivision Amendment Application  
Addition of Stairway to Existing Deck  
Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-06**

**Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust  
Condominium Site Plan Amendment Application  
Addition of Stairway to Existing Deck  
Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-07**

Kathy Barnard read Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-06 and Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-07 into the record and noted both will be heard together and voted on separately.

Randy Tetreault stated Ms. Cline obtained approval from the condominium association first, explained the condominiums rules and noted the Board received copies. He referred to the diagram for his presentation and noted Ms. Cline requested they file the condo plan with the registry should this be approved by the Board.

Matt Sullivan requested a letter of authorization for the file.

Randy Tetreault supplied Matt Sullivan with a copy of the letter.

**It was moved by Peter Goodwin and seconded by Mike Hodder to accept the applications for Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-06 and Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-07 as complete. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-0.**

*Chairman Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.*

Matt Sullivan read the following 2 conditions of approval for Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-06:

1. The following plans, as amended by the Planning Board approval, are incorporated into the approval:  
**Plan 1:** Condominium Adjustment Plan, Unit 29, "Point Breeze Condominiums", 7 Point Breeze Road, Carroll County, Wolfeboro, NH for Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust, Tax Map 236-002-029, Plan prepared by Steve Oles, LLS, Norway Plains Survey Associates, Inc., PO Box 249, Rochester, NH 03867, Dated February 2020. The applicant shall be responsible for the payment of all recording fees.
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.

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

**It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Peter Goodwin to approve the Condominium Subdivision Amendment Application for the addition of a stairway to the existing deck for Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust with the 2 conditions of approval. Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-06. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-o.**

*Chairman Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.*

Matt Sullivan read the following 4 conditions of approval for Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-07:

1. The following plans, as amended by the Planning Board approval, are incorporated into the approval:  
**Plan 1:** Condominium Adjustment Plan for Unit 29, "Point Breeze Condominiums", 7 Point Breeze Road, Carroll County, Wolfeboro, NH for Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust, Tax Map 236-002-029, Plan prepared by Steve Oles, LLS, Norway Plains Survey Associates, Inc., PO Box 249, Rochester, NH 03867, Dated February 2020.
2. The applicant shall submit a Mylar plan for recording at the Carroll County Registry of Deeds for Unit #29.
3. The applicant shall be responsible for the payment of all recording fees.
4. 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.

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

**It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Peter Goodwin to approve the Condominium Site Plan Amendment Application for an addition of a stairway to an existing deck with the 4 conditions of approval for Frances Bridges-Cline Revocable Trust. Tax Map #236-002-029, Case #2020-07. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-o.**

#### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

- d) § 173-19(B) **Design Review Guidelines**; To repeal the existing Design Review Guidelines section of the Site Plan Review Regulations and replace with Architectural Design Review standards including the following sections, to be codified within 173-19 B.: Purpose, Authority, Applicability, Process, Building Orientation, Building Scale and Proportion, Roofs, Windows, Entrances, Mechanical and Utility Equipment, Materials, and Renovations and Additions.

Kathy Barnard stated this was continued due to bad weather.

*Chairman Kathy Barnard opened the public hearing for comments.*

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

**It was moved by John Thurston and seconded by Mike Hodder to approve § 173-19(B) Design Review Guidelines. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. 6-o.**

#### **III. Public Comment**

N/A

#### **IV. Action Items**

N/A

#### **V. Communications and Miscellaneous**

N/A

**VI. Work Session**

N/A

**VII. New Business**

Kathy Barnard stated in 3 chapters it was mentioned to add a Water Quality chapter to the Master Plan. The cyanobacteria committee is up and running and she feels that it would be a good idea to hire a consultant and start this chapter.

Matt Sullivan requested Board members to review the Work Plan and identify their top 5 to begin working on.

Mike Hodder questioned what is happening with the Short Term Rental Sub Committee.

Matt Sullivan stated he will send out the minutes from the meeting with the Short Term Rental Committee and the next meeting date is March 16<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 AM in the annex conference room.

Kathy Barnard stated the first meeting went quite well.

Mike Hodder stated he had the following suggestions/corrections for the Master plan Implementation Memorandum dated 2/5/2020: the section "Planning Board Chair and the Planning Director will..." second from the last "deliver the Community Facilities chapter to the Town Manager..." insert "and attend a meeting to discuss".

Matt Sullivan questioned a meeting with whom.

Mike Hodder replied the Community Facilities chapter delivered to the Town Manager by the two co-chairs of that chapter along with the Planning Board Chair and Planning Director. The next correction: "during delivery meetings..." last sentence "Planning Board for 2020" change "for" to "in". He questioned the section "in February of each following year..." at the end of that "a status report for the prior year's goals and recommendation".

Matt Sullivan clarified it refers to things that have not been done and will correct.

John Thurston noted when going around town, seeing work going on, he would like to ensure permits are being posted properly.

**VIII. Approval of Minutes**

February 11, 2020

Corrections: Pages 3 & 4, under Action Items. Correct spelling of Council to Counsel

Page 5, clarify Work Program items were not deleted

Under New Business, change the last sentence to read "Matt Sullivan replied it is a critical issue."

**It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Susan Replier to approve the minutes for February 11, 2020 as amended. Kathy Barnard, John Thurston and Peter Goodwin voted in favor. Brad Harriman abstained. The motion passed. 5-1.**

February 18, 2020

Corrections: Page 2, strike 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph and replace with "Mike Hodder questioned section 2, last line, and suggested inserting "2019 Master Plan", which was approved by a unanimous vote of the Board."

Page 3, under Update on Foundation Certification Policy, Vaune Dugan's statement, correct "120" to "1=20".

*It was moved by Mike Hodder and seconded by Susan Replier to approve the minutes for February 18, 2020 as amended. Kathy Barnard, John Thurston and Peter Goodwin voted in favor. Brad Harriman abstained. The motion passed. 5-1.*

**IX. Planning Board Subcommittee Reports**

N/A

*It was moved by Peter Goodwin and seconded by Mike Hodder to adjourn the March 3, 2020 Wolfeboro Planning Board meeting. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.*

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Cathleen LaPierre*

Cathy LaPierre

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