

**Brentwood Planning Board
Minutes
March 31, 2022**

Members Present:	Kristin Aldred Cheek, Chair Bruce Stevens, Vice Chair Paul Kleinman Doug Finan Stefanie Kizza Ned Matson	Mark Kennedy, Alt. – not voting Brian West, Alt. – not voting Kate Locke-Parks, Alt. – not voting Town Planner, Glenn Greenwood
-------------------------	---	--

Chairman Aldred Cheek opened the public meeting at 6:00 pm.

Residents Present: Letty Bedard, Bob Stephens, Chair of the Conservation Commission.

6:00 pm: Review DRAFT Impact Fee Assessment: Bruce Mayberry with BCM Planning, Inc. will attend via Zoom to present and review the draft impact fee assessment updated in 2022. *The last impact fee assessment was done in 2014 by Mr. Mayberry.* Board to review and discuss draft and once a final impact fee assessment is received, it will be legally noticed for adoption at a future public hearing of the Planning Board.

Mayberry gave an overview of impact fees, the draft impact fee report (on file), the summary report (on file), and the methodology to calculate the impact fee schedule. Impact fees...it's the goal of the Town to recover the costs of the capital improvements for units of new development. You've built it, paid for it in debt service and the impact fee is a form of recovering that capital investment in proportion to the demands that development places on the facility. Once it's built, it's a recoupment of what's spent.

In the summary report one facility that stands out is the Police Dept., it's in the CIP about a new station, at some point. The impact fees were formed around the new station standards, which would have more space per officer. If that goes forward, then the municipal office could expand downstairs. The projections are forecasted in the PD, fire station, library and would have capacity estimated at buildout projection from 2010. That gives a conservative basis for the impact fees.

Stevens asked in terms of methodology what's changed the most. Mayberry said the models are the same format, he recast the buildout projections, the capital value of the facilities and re-interpreted the debt service. Enrollment per dwelling unit went down considerably from 2014 as in most NH towns. But it's an average so the fee is slightly lower and equates that to the average demand on the school system. There's a school section in the report that shows the changes over time. The police station was a new look at an assessment of what the space and staffing needs would be going forward. There is a deficiency in recreation. You need another hard court (basketball or tennis) to bring it up to today's standards, so you don't end up with a lot of deficiencies and charging impact fees at the same time. Stevens suggested keeping the capital improvement schedule updated annually. Mayberry agreed the CIP core document is required to have an impact fee and needs to be maintained. If the police station doesn't go forward in the next 6 years, that would be a discrepancy with what's being paid in impact fees. That fee is predicated on the new station going forward at some point.

Mayberry explained the school impact fee equation. School impact fee is pupils per unit x # sq. ft. needed per pupil to have appropriate school size. Cost per sq. ft. to build a school. Come out with a number of what would it cost to serve a single-family unit with a K-12 school. That's what the number represents, essentially recovering that amount of money from new development to offset the share of the average impact to the schools. No part of an impact fee can go towards operation, maintenance or manpower or staffing positions. It can pay for a renovation but it's for capital improvements only. The addition to the library (around 2002) is sufficient for a much larger population than what we have today. The addition is already built, so it's a recoupment fee, as new development comes into town and

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

adds more people and users, it's an investment already made. The debt service has only one more year on the cost of the addition. Essentially it reimburses the Town for the cost of creating that facility. New development will start consuming a share of it. Kleinman said once debt service is paid, the fee is continued to be collected. Mayberry replied yes, it's a recoupment and going forward, it still needs to be spent on the library for capital improvements only; an elevator to meet ADA requirements for example or other capital improvements.

Recreation has a number of types of facilities, fields, courts, community center building. A ratio is assigned to various recreation criteria. Ratios or standards are applied to existing and future populations and the difference is contributable to new development. As a rule of thumb, some towns have a set of numbers in their fee schedule and say that's it and they don't spend it and create the improvements. Brentwood is not in that situation and is ahead of the game to be able to absorb more development. Recreation looks at a 2022 to a 2040 need. The Fire Dept. was built in 2010, a long-term facility. Fire equipment and major apparatus and vehicles are also factored in as it can be a higher capital value than the building you keep them in so the Fire Dept. will stand the test of time.

The Police Dept. uses 350 sq. ft. per officer, conservative number (low fee) for space requirements. A lot of indoor space, sally port, stand-alone building for the future so the space allowance went up. The impact fee would reflect the full development cost as well, for a new station.

The Municipal Office uses 507 sq. ft. per full time staff as a ratio, general to offices across the country. It depends on storage requirements, meeting space etc. You don't need to be confined to these standards. Without a space needs assessment, this is good to use. The fee dollar amounts are lower in the summary vs. the main report as some 2020 information came out from the American Community Survey in mid-March and Mayberry updated the variables on household size but it won't affect the numbers in a major way. Brentwood and Chester have the most impact fee categories of any other Towns in the state, so Brentwood is good.

Non-residential fees per square foot went up quite a bit. It's good that Brentwood has separate commercial fees, and the single family detached increased. *The 2014 table and current fee structure is shown. Option for fees for 2022 from Summary report are shown on the next page.*

Impact Fee Account	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PER UNIT			COMMERCIAL
	Single Family Detached	Attached & 2 or More Unit Structures	Manufactured Housing	Non-Residential Development
Police	\$394	\$369	\$328	\$0.14 per sq. ft.
Municipal Office	\$542	\$508	\$451	\$0.12 per sq. ft.
Recreation	\$976	\$925	\$826	n.a.
Library	\$759	\$744	\$675	n.a.
Schools	\$ 5,768	\$3,711	\$4,631	n.a.
Fire	947	\$1,082	\$1,052	\$0.41
Totals	\$9,386	\$7,339	\$7,963	\$0.67 per sq ft

7/24/2014

**Brentwood Planning Board
Minutes
March 31, 2022**

Impact Fee Options 2022

The fee schedules below are slightly lower than those in the draft report due to an update to the estimated average household sizes assigned to residential units.

BRENTWOOD NH 2022 IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE				
Impact Fee Category	Residential Impact Fees Per Dwelling Unit			Non-Residential Development Fees Per Sq. Ft.
	Single Family Detached	Attached and Two or More Unit Structures	Manufactured Housing	
Schools	\$5,354	\$3,397	\$3,643	n.a.
Library	\$949	\$697	\$738	n.a.
Recreation	\$1,046	\$769	\$823	n.a.
Fire	\$1,324	\$994	\$1,148	\$0.65
Police	\$645	\$499	\$635	\$0.36
Municipal Office	\$518	\$380	\$400	\$0.11
Total	\$9,836	\$6,736	\$7,387	\$1.12

For residential development, a fixed fee amount per dwelling unit provides for a standard assessment by structure type.

This per unit residential fee schedule parallels the past practice for impact fee assessment in Brentwood.

The alternative of Impact fees per square foot provide more flexibility based on the size of the dwelling units. Lower fees are enabled for smaller and presumably more affordable, housing units.

ALTERNATIVE IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE PER SQUARE FOOT (FINISHED SPACE)				
Impact Fee Category	Residential Impact Fees Per Square Foot of Living Area			Non-Residential Development Fees Per Sq. Ft.
	Single Family Detached	Attached and Two or More Unit Structures	Manufactured Housing	
Schools	\$2.35	\$2.55	\$2.84	n.a.
Library	\$0.42	\$0.47	\$0.63	n.a.
Recreation	\$0.46	\$0.52	\$0.70	n.a.
Fire	\$0.59	\$0.68	\$0.97	\$0.65
Police	\$0.29	\$0.34	\$0.54	\$0.36
Municipal Office	\$0.23	\$0.26	\$0.34	\$0.11
Total	\$4.34	\$4.82	\$6.02	\$1.12

Residential fees per square foot may also provide a basis for assessing fees to accessory dwelling units (ADUs) which can represent a broad range in floor area.

When assessing fees per square foot to residential uses, a fee cap or maximum living area subject to the fee should be adopted.

Mayberry said the attached and manufactured went down because the household sizes were too high for those types of units. Average household size is from the census every 10 years, but by type of housing information is only from small samplings. Mayberry used a statewide sample and compared average household sizes and cross referenced it with Brentwood. Using a bigger sample size for a more accurate prediction for typical housing situations. Future projections; 2010 buildout study by the RPC. It identified an increment of housing, allowable by zoning density at the time and the baseline of that was 2009. He added up the units, added to that, 93% increase of the basic housing at that time. Some of that growth has occurred. Non-residential development was also looked at. In the models, the housing figure is the buildout figure, projected to 2040 and increase of sq. ft. of non-residential and project number of employees etc. But build-out studies are going to change. The better method is a long-term view, divide by a bigger number = smaller fee, smaller users = larger fee, so what is the average entirely built out today with all these facilities in the fee, what would it cost per housing unit or commercial space to support it. This is detailed in section E in the main report (on file).

Aldred Cheek asked about how Brentwood compares to other towns. Mayberry said Brentwood's school fee is in the middle compared to other towns. It's hard to compare; how old is the fee, when was it last calculated and what type of facilities do they have? There are huge differences and a lot of variables. They are all unique. Brentwood's fees are about the same as Salem, which is a larger community, but it depends on what each town has. Smaller communities have higher fees for police, fire etc. compared to

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

larger communities. The chart just shows what other communities are paying (on file). Exeter is comparable. School fees vary greatly across the board.

Stevens said the key word is defensible. The numbers haven't gone up that much. Have methodologies been questioned? Mayberry thought in Brentwood but remembers Sandown and Danville cases that went to the Supreme court. It was regarding school fees, and it mentioned the fee was arbitrary, but the court found it had factual basis and methodology. Londonderry had charged road impact fees for state highways, you can't do that. Courts look for the methodology and is the basis reasonable. Developers claimed grandfathering to impact fees so the state RSA changed, assessed a fee at subdivision stage, that fee is fixed for 5 years. One court case basically said you can assess fees on capital improvements provided their collected on a proportionate basis, a reasonable method used. Mayberry said the ones that worry him are those that charge a fee for 20 years and never build the facility its based on.

Mayberry supplied an alternative, square foot-based fee vs. flat rate fee (*table on previous page and on file*). Affordable housing advocates look at development costs and changing the regulations to enable building smaller homes = smaller fee vs. larger homes. If you decide to use a sq. ft. foot fee, put a cap on what's to be assessed, 4 bedrooms for example. Most communities use the flat rate for residential. Apartments and ADU's for example, you may not want a 400 sq. ft. unit charged the same as a 1,000 sq. ft. unit. It's all proportionate but sq. ft. fees give more flexibility but its more work to administer. Kennedy asked about additions to buildings. It's a one-time fee when you build a home but if you add additions and increase the size of the home, how is that addressed. Mayberry said the ordinance should address it and the fee is triggered by a net increase in housing units, adding living area, to recover from the addition. What is new development? It would have to be a net increase in sq. footage or apply to existing homes too. ADU's could use a sq. ft. fee but there are pros and cons for both methods. Mayberry explained that Rec's projection is based on year + 20-year projection but the build-out assumption drives the housing and is a formula of total housing units, how many households are supported, how many are occupied units, what's average household size = population. The household population has increased. Impact fees can flex with what's happening and can be updated so you're reflecting the most recent information. Some towns have road impact fees or road studies are done, where a traffic impact study is done and the site will generate x pm peak trips per hour and add x amount of traffic, but in conclusion there's no impact. That intersection has the capacity to take the load of that development so the conclusion is there is an impact, but it's mitigated by providing the roadway or intersection capacity to deal with it. Same for impact fees. It's in place, and it meets the needs of new development, there is still an impact, but you've provided for it as the facilities are in place.

Mayberry said he will update the draft with small amendments and finalize it and he can meet via Zoom again if necessary. He can share some names or other firms to contact for a future update. *Mayberry signed off around 7:03 pm.*

Board discussed. Stevens asked so once we receive a final draft, the Board will take a vote that they concur with the new fee schedule. Greenwood said the language of the ordinance states that the fee is predicated on the methodology adopted in 2002 and all subsequent amendments so the ordinance doesn't need to change. The fee isn't in the ordinance for that reason. New development is anything that results in a new dwelling unit. Stevens asked if the BOS are assessing those fees? Greenwood thought the BOS did charge for impact fees. It's only a new dwelling unit but we should check with the BOS to see what they are using to assess a new ADU. Kennedy said ADU's should be charged impact fees. Stevens said a 1-bedroom ADU, a small unit, not large enough to accommodate a family, so do you charge the full school impact fee for that. Aldred Cheek wants to keep it consistent, either flat rate or a sq. ft. rate.

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

6:00 pm: Planning Board work session: Review and discuss PB procedures, the multi-family district, affordable housing, and other possible zoning amendments for next year (2023). Discuss any potential changes to subdivision and site plan regulations (legal notice for a public hearing required before adopting). Possibly discuss economic development along the Rte. 125 corridor etc. and the viability of expanding the commercial/industrial zone.

Aldred Cheek discussed PB procedures for hearings and particularly for an upcoming hearing. Board should be cognizant of what is being said and their conduct, adhere to guidelines about not talking to people outside of meetings regarding issues. Start with rules first to keep it organized and people should direct questions to the Board. Greenwood said in response to not talking to people outside of meetings, your response should be I'm a member of the PB, I can speak regarding applications before the Board when I'm sitting as a member of the Board, and I am 1/7th of the final vote rendering a decision. If they're asking procedural questions, you can share that but talking directly about an application, just say no. Finan added classes he's attended agree with Glenn's comment, you don't converse about an application outside of the Board. Greenwood said to direct people to call the planner on Wednesdays. Stevens added a microphone and table for resident questions to come up one at a time.

Kizza said at the last meeting there was an email from NHMA. What was the context? Did the Town reach out to them? Bickum said she had reached out to NHMA to ask about conflicts of interest to do research and to have information available. Kizza would value the rest of the Board's opinion in regard to recusal. Stevens said it's up to Kizza but maybe the developer may not contest it, or he may. Aldred Cheek said she received a letter today from the developer's attorney regarding juror standards etc. Bickum sent it to Walter Mitchell, who will be attending the April 7th meeting to be paid for by the Town. Aldred Cheek said she didn't think Kizza had expressed any comments at a public meeting and asked that Bickum circulate the attorney's letter to the Board.

Aldred Cheek discussed how alternates participate. NHMA says if you aren't sitting that night as a voting member, you should be in the audience. If you are in the audience making comments, you realize you may be a voting member of the Board at some point; think as a Board member. Kleinman doesn't have Buckley's email in hand, but Glenn had said recusal is completely discretionary to the individual. Greenwood agreed, it's up to the Planning Board member. Aldred Cheek said but if a decision is challenged due to a conflict of interest, it would get thrown out and it would start over. Kay Parks Locke said in the audience I'm a resident who cares about space and habitat. Stevens said you can have an opinion but if you are making comments you would need to recuse from a particular application. Aldred Cheek said you need to be objective, juror standards.

Kleinman asked about Buckley's letter again and was it specific to two individuals. Bickum replied yes, the two new members elected to the PB live adjacent to the proposed project, so she reached out to NHMA to ask about potential conflicts of interest and what is the process or procedure. Kleinman said Buckley's letter seems to suggest that there is a specific standard to apply. Greenwood said he and Buckley both agree that if you are an abutter, you have to disqualify yourself. But beyond that, if you live in the neighborhood and you haven't said anything at any public meeting, you are a resident of the Town and have the right to make up your mind as to whether or not you can be an unbiased participant in the process. Kleinman said Buckley seems to suggest that if there were questions asked that would suggest opposition that it would be pre-judgement and would require recusal but said Greenwood has said it's discretionary.

Matson had brought up questions that he asked at hearings. He brought up concerns about road safety and the project itself as a member of the Town, participated in the hearings and offered input. Bickum asked Matson if he went to the BOS. Matson replied I guess I went to that one, but they pretty much

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

told us that we needed to talk to the Planning Board. Bickum suggested he read the minutes from that BOS meeting. Aldred Cheek said if you started a list serve, or are a Facebook page manager, started a neighborhood organization anti the project, even if you aren't an abutter, which would fall into the same category...you've taken a position and have a clear interest. Stevens suggested it's what the judge would think. Matson said he's willing to do what's best for the Town, which being said, he thinks he can be impartial. Other people have talked too. He understands what Buckley is bringing up and makes valid points.

Kennedy said he's always asked for Glenn's counsel if the question of recusal came up and he has taken Glenn's recommendation. Even if he felt that he shouldn't have too, he did if Glenn felt he should because he didn't want it to be a problem. Stevens said Walter will be at the meeting. Greenwood said your fellow Board members should be asked and get their input. Design Reviews are non-binding, so statements made by the applicant or Board members it ends with that Design Review process. Members sitting during the review of an application can ask questions. Stevens suggested meeting with Walter Mitchell earlier, prior to the meeting to discuss. Greenwood would recommend that if you are an alternate and not voting, say that at the podium and make it clear you're an alternate on the Planning Board. Aldred Cheek said the NHMA guidance is should alternates participate in the discussion if they aren't voting members and it says no, they should sit in the audience. Greenwood disagreed but he's not an attorney. He said an alternate should remain engaged and they should be able to determine what's going on. Stevens suggested a separate table for the alternates not voting but could still ask questions. Aldred Cheek is concerned that with 5 alternates and a full Board, it could be unwieldy. Stevens felt it was important for the alternates be close enough to the discussion to be part of the interaction. Greenwood suggested checking with Walter for the best approach.

Bob Stephens, Chair of the Conservation Commission, received clarification that Buckley is counsel for the NHMA, and Walter Mitchell is Town's legal counsel. And was worried about the people who collected the new Board members for this issue. There are people who cast their votes for the new Planning Board members because they were concerned about issues before the Planning Board. Among them the elephant in the room here. Why would their votes just be ignored if people are going to recuse themselves? Are we to believe that folks don't have opinions? Just because they don't express them doesn't mean they don't have them. Greenwood said there is protocol that every Board, every organization follows. One of the protocols that the Planning Board follows is making sure that you hear all the evidence presented to you. Stephens agreed but we're having this discussion because the protocol isn't certain or set right now. Kleinman added it's Buckley's opinion. Stephens said my question is are we concerned about getting sued or the other side prevailing? An awful lot of people cast their votes because they were concerned about matters before the Planning Board and to make their votes not matter would be inappropriate. Greenwood would take a different approach and would certainly hope that they voted for people that they understood should act as a Planning Board member needs to act, look at every application with an unbiased eye. So, if they only voted for someone they thought would only be acting in one way, that to him is a bad vote. They have the right to do it but there is a responsibility incumbent upon a Planning Board member; abutters are the big one. Aldred Cheek said juror standards, I can have opinions but need to set those aside and be objective. It needs to be documented, yes, we considered this and here's why and move on.

Aldred Cheek asked everyone to come at 6 pm to help set up. Bickum will check with Andy Gray to make sure the microphones work. Bickum will reach out to Walter and see if he can come at 6:30 pm. Parks Locke asked how to ask questions. Kennedy said come up to the microphone, state your name and ask as long as you aren't a sitting member on the Board. Finan reminded Cheek about mentioning that no one should approach the Board after. Aldred Cheek will say something about being civil.

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

Possible Zoning amendments or changes. Aldred Cheek prepared a table to prioritize and thinks that workforce housing should be prioritized as Brentwood is out of compliance. Board discussed items in the table or list (on file). Stephens said he's here because the Conservation Commission wants to work with the Board to review and discuss zoning amendments. What is the procedure moving forward? Aldred Cheek said the work sessions are to discuss. Stevens said these usually take place in the Fall, but we should start a lot earlier to have months to discuss. Stephens said the senior housing ordinance was eradicated and maybe it should be worked on with other ConComm input. Aldred Cheek suggested not trying to do too many for this year and narrow it down. Stephens can review and provide input. Board discussed.

Stephens said ConComm is interested in mixed use and worker housing and senior housing. High density development is needed to alleviate the tax burden, but the problem is where is it done. Stevens said the Economic Development Committee is currently analyzing maps and information. If a land mass doesn't support it, it's a moot point. Stephens said along the Exeter River is not the place to have density development. These rules were made by those that don't have every scenario and we learn as we go. As those issues arise, if someone from ConComm isn't around, let us know so we can have some say. That piece of property was nabbed by someone who has every right to try to make a profit and now we've got a situation we may want to address with the Board. Aldred Cheek asked for bullet points and suggested he meet with the UNH interns with the Economic Development Committee. Kennedy suggested ConCom work with Greenwood to understand the zoning and the pitfalls in trying to designate areas, spot zoning.

Board's priority list:

1. **Workforce housing / Affordable housing. Multi-family zone / Rentals:** Look for those that want to develop something smaller. Board discussed the workforce housing and the limits of the market value on them, deed restrictions. Stevens said Glenn hit in on the nose on March 17th. The only way to do it, is have the Town buys a large parcel with constraints on it but gives it to a developer to build smaller units to rent or sell for reasonable prices. Board discussed. Aldred Cheek said data should come from EDC etc. and revisit once we have more data. Letty Bedard said the suggested maximum for affordable for a family of four is \$423,000.
2. **Fire Chief's Suggestions** – Have him come in to discuss his suggestions.
3. **Mixed use area** – Economic Development is interested in this. Need more information from EDC.
4. **Rural character** – define, difference between rural and rural character. More research is needed. Agricultural commission?

Stevens said whatever we do has to pass legal muster.

Board discussed possible changes/additions to Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations and the Excavation Permit.

Revise Site Plan Regulations and application requirements to include:

1. **Aerial photo of the site.** Glenn's suggested text for Site Plans only: *"A graphic exhibit will be provided with each application showing an aerial view of the subject parcel to assist the Planning Board in understanding the existing scope of activity currently on site. This exhibit can be a Google Earth™ image or the result of any other technology that can generate such an aerial image."* Greenwood said anything to be changed or added in the site plan or subdivision regulations would need to be legally noticed in paper for adoption at a later date but doesn't require Town Vote.

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

Kizza asked if they should add a time frame for an aerial image, one year or two years and costs? Her company has drone pilots which is about \$300 per hour in metro Boston. It depends on the size of the site. A recent project took 6 hours. Few hundred to a few thousand. Stevens suggested she define this more, what do we want. Board discussed scale. Greenwood said Google Earth uses the address and gives the satellite image. Aerial photo of a representation of 1" to 50", plan size. Kizza said that seems logical and recommend a time frame, one-two years. Kizza will draft it up.

- 2. Excavation permit fee.** Change from \$50 to \$250. BOS collect the money. Greenwood said PB does startup for a gravel permit request. Change to be noticed with aerial photo language once finalized.

Aldred Cheek said RPCs are doing housing needs assessments now. Greenwood said the NH Housing Authority has sample ordinances for affordability. It's easier with rentals. You can provide it with rentals or home ownership. Brentwood doesn't provide rentals. Affordability doesn't always mean ownership and the state recognizes market factors that are against affordability in Rockingham County. Asking Rye to provide affordable housing is absurd. It's a difficult issue, home ownership in Rockingham County. The issue is complying with State law. But rental housing is not impossible. Make rental units available which diversifies the housing stock and allowed a new income level to live in Brentwood, which would help a challenge in court. Aldred Cheek said so fix the multi-family zone district. Greenwood agreed. Stevens said more density would be required. Board discussed. Greenwood said maybe there's a way to work with the County on affordable housing. If the County, does it by themselves, we wouldn't get credit, but we've told them they can't do it alone. The State of NH does not have counties do housing. Stevens said we could work with the County to build affordable housing but who will pay for the schools, Brentwood would. It would be a huge cost to the Town. It's fine in elementary school but then they go to Exeter at \$17,500 per student from 6th – 12th grade, Brentwood pays that. How do you get the taxpayers to vote for it? Greenwood said due diligence, apartments doesn't mean tenements in NYC with 15 kids. It's incumbent upon us to provide the best case understanding of school age population for affordable rental units. Aldred Cheek asked for professionals that could help. Greenwood said the Seacoast Housing Alliance etc. that know this data. Greenwood can reach out to the Seacoast Housing Alliance and see if they can come in to speak to the Board. Kennedy asked about taxes from the County. Greenwood said if the Town worked with the County, which would be a major discussion point. Impact fees would apply to those new units, a double taxation. Board discussed taxation. Greenwood said the County would need to work with Brentwood to provide any multi-family housing in order for Brentwood to get credit for it, count it as part of the housing stock. The County can't do it independent of Brentwood and it would have to be taxed. Kleinman said in the Land Use Book, RSA 674:59 discusses workforce housing, pg. 458.

Board Business:

- The Board signed the manifest.
- The Board signed the revocation of site plan letter re: Carl Rullo (Jr.) re: 324 Rte. 125, red dumpster site for wetland violations; tax map 209.010.000 for recording. Steven said the state was supposed to work on this. Greenwood could ask the state what is going on. It is a wetland violation that was reported to the state and the state sent notice to Rullo but it stalled.
- The Chair has signed the mylar for the approved 2 lot subdivision for S&H Walker Woods Holdings, LLC, a.k.a. Debra Sanborn; tax map 206.009.002, Deer Hill Rd. Glenn had okayed the final plan set, CAs were met, and it was recorded earlier today.
- Greenwood spoke with Walter Mitchell, and he is not comfortable with an applicant paying. Town pays and he can attend on April 7th. *PB budget is \$2,050 total.*

Brentwood Planning Board

Minutes

March 31, 2022

- ZBA Decision Making Process NHMA in person training is scheduled for **Thurs. May 12th 4 pm to 6 pm**: 6-7 PB members are interested in attending along with ZBA members. Fremont may have at least one attendee. Kingston TBD and do a possible cost share. Brentwood PB members interested in attending are BS, DF, KAC, SK, NM, BW, KLP.
- Free OSI training for ZBA and PB tracks, April and May. Emailed link around 3-28-2022.

Master Plan Committee:

RPC Zoom meeting on 3/23 at 9:15 am with Greenwood and Bickum. "RPC would like to establish a MP committee with a couple of PB members, an EDC member, BOS member and ConComm member".

Schedule a MP committee work session Thurs. April 14th at 6 pm for RPC to come present? Glenn isn't available on April 14th but doesn't need to attend. RPC will discuss the MP overview, details, scope of work, like/don't like about MP etc. RPC had asked if the survey results from EDC survey could be available to them. Kizza is interested in being the PB member of the Master Plan committee.

Bill Dale has expressed interest in becoming a PB alternate (email to Board on 3/30/2022). Bickum said he is from Fellows Drive. Board discussed. Aldred Cheek asked if he was an abutter and is worried about the number of people available to sit on a specific proposal. Stevens said maybe after this application is over, he can come on. The idea is to have a cross section of the Town represented. He is an abutter, and the Board has legitimate concerns with the makeup of the Board to accomplish the application process and maybe it should wait once this until the application process is over. There is no way he can vote on this project. Greenwood said he could still be available on other applications, however and doesn't want to turn someone away who wants to be an alternate.

Motion made by Stevens, 2nd by Finan, to appoint William (Bill) Dale to the Planning Board as an alternate for a three-year term to 2025 but in no case could he sit on the Mill Road proposal as a voting member. All were in favor. Motion carried. The Board signed Dale's appointment slip.

Bedard said at the RPC meeting one of the RPC representatives had said no children are allowed in 55+ but wasn't sure if that was true. Greenwood said it's a decision the developer makes. A developer can make it exclusively 55+, they can do that, we can't force them. But if he doesn't make it exclusive, Federal law allows 20% to not be 55+. It's up to the developer. Board discussed.

Aldred Cheek announced that Bickum has given her notice and is moving on, so we are losing a very important person. We wish you all the best. Finan said it's a huge loss. Bickum apologized for the timing due to how busy it's been. Kennedy added you did a great job but is happy for her. The Planning Board wished Bickum the best of luck.

Approve Minutes: March 17th, 2022.

Motion made by Finan, 2nd by Matson, to approve the minutes of March 17, 2022, as presented. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion made by Finan, 2nd by Kleinman, to adjourn at approximately 9:05 p.m. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Bickum,
Administrative Assistant,
Brentwood Planning Board