

**TOWN OF SUTTON**  
**Planning Board**  
Pillsbury Memorial Hall  
Meeting Minutes  
February 25, 2014

**Present: Planning Board Members: Carrie Thomas, Co-Chairperson; Carole O'Connell, Alternate and Dan Sundquist, Ex-Officio; (Bob DeFelice, Julie McCarthy, Peter Blakeman, and Roger Wells, members, were absent); and Laurie Hayward, Land Use Coordinator (LUC).**

**The meeting was called to order** at 7:08 PM, by Carrie Thomas, Co-Chairman.

**Administrative:**

**Minutes of previous meetings:** There was no quorum so the minutes of the meeting of February 11, 2014 were tabled until the next meeting.

**Work Session:** Members then took up the Drafts of the Site Plan Review Regulations, The Site Plan Review Application, and the Site Plan Review Application Checklist. The LUC reminded the Board that, at the last meeting, it was agreed that she would review the drafts and make any changes that seemed necessary in order that the Draft Site Plan Regulations and Draft Site Plan Application and Checklist used consistent wording. Sundquist asked what changes were incorporated into the new Draft Regulations. The LUC explained that she had compared the suggested changes to the revised Site Plan Review Application and Checklist to the current Regulations and revised the language in the Regulations to be consistent with those in the draft revised application and checklist.

O'Connell asked if the recent changes to the Zoning Ordinance needed to be considered while working on these drafts. The LUC explained that the revision approved in 2013 was, for the most part, about cleaning up inconsistencies, adding language for clarity, correcting grammar, and formatting throughout the Ordinances; and the revision in 2014 was only to the Sign Ordinance. The LUC also explained that the Zoning Ordinances affect the Regulations to the extent that the Regulations must not conflict with the Zoning Ordinances; but wording in the Ordinances need not be duplicated within the language of the Regulations. The question came up whether the Planning Board Application fees should be the same as those of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The LUC replied that there are significant differences between what each of the Boards, Planning and Zoning, do and those differences seem to her to point to different fee structures. The LUC did say that she thought having postage and notices invoiced at "cost", as the ZBA now does, rather than a set fee is a good idea.

O'Connell referred to the first page of the Application, asking why the application had to be submitted by the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. The LUC explained that was because there had to be enough time to complete the noticing process in time to meet statutory requirements. Generally, notices for a Planning Board public hearing have to be published at least two weeks before the meeting date.

Sundquist asked the LUC how the application requirements were incorporated. The LUC explained that she had taken the items that the members had suggested and that had been incorporated into the Application Checklist and had used the exact same numbering and wording in the Submission portion of the Site Plan Review Regulations – there should be no inconsistencies because they were identical in the current Draft Revision. The LUC also explained to the Board that she had revised the wording in Section 9 of Article VII, Submission Procedure to reflect a comment that Sundquist had made in the previous meeting regarding the need to have professionals prepare drawings in most instances.

Sundquist asked about the reference to the "no impact" ordinances or regulations of the Town of Sutton. He asked that the LUC find exactly where that is in the town statutes and/or determine what would support the statement.

*Approved April 22, 2014*

Sundquist went on the detail several specific items to be researched and/or changed before the next meeting. Amongst the items to be researched was whether any of the surrounding towns had moved to a standard different from the "10 year storm" that has been historically used in storm water drainage calculations. His thought is that what used to be a 10 year storm is now a nearly annual occurrence and perhaps a 15 or 20- year storm produces a more useful standard. There was a brief discussion of what the implications are and whether this should be taken into consideration in this revision of the Regulations.

There was also a discussion about in Section 8.f of Article VII, Submission Procedure and suggestions for revision were made. There was some concern about how best to handle the wording about postponement for approvals and still ensure that the language was in compliance with recent state statutes and federal legal decisions which relate to timing issues and limitations. The LUC agreed to do another draft of that section and also provide more detail on recent laws passed in connection to length of time for Planning Board decisions. The Chair also asked the LUC to check some of the old version of the Regulations (2001 version page 59, for example) and see if any of that language should be incorporated.

Sundquist asked that wording that indicates that additional documentation may be required be added. It was noted that the language was in the Subdivision Regulations and should also be in the Site Plan Review Regulations.

O'Connell asked about the format of the drafts and the LUC asked that members ignore formatting until the language has been addressed. She preferred not to get into that kind of detail until most of the changes have been made and they are nearing a final draft.

**Other Business:** Sundquist explained that the Select Board did receive Burnham's letter of resignation. He suggested that the next step would be to move Carole O'Connell into the full member open position. Then the Board could look for two alternates.

There was also a discussion about some concerns that had been expressed regarding a very well lit skating area located near Lake Kezar. The LUC explained that she had been asked about that as well and her response is that she is unable to find anything in the Zoning Ordinances that would address this issue at this time. Members agreed that they did not see anything that would elicit any action on either the Planning or the Zoning Board's part.

**The LUC reminded the Board members that the second Tuesday of March is the day of Town Vote and, as always, there will be no Planning Board Meeting on that date.**

**Next regular meeting is scheduled to be a work session on March 25, 2014 at 7:00 PM.**

**There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:18 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Hayward  
Land Use Coordinator