



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Members Present: Donald Hawkins, Chair; Sue Foote, Vice Chair; Jason Janvrin; Dennis Sweeney; Elizabeth Thibodeau, Robert Moore, Ex-Officio; Alternate; Paul Garand, Code Enforcement Officer, Alternate; Tom Morgan, Town Planner; Barbara Kravitz, Secretary;

Members Absent; Robert Fowler; Michael Lowry, Alternate; Paul Himmer, Alternate;

Hawkins opened the public meeting at 6:35 PM.

### **MINUTES OF April 5, 2011 and April 19, 2011**

Hawkins said the April 5, 2011 Minutes were tabled at the last meeting because information pertinent to a vote was requested. He asked if that had been received. Kravitz said there had been no response to the follow-up email. Hawkins said in the absence of documentation from an applicant relating to a waiver request the April 5 Minutes would again be held for the next Planning Board meeting. The documentation needs to be in hand before those minutes are finalized.

Hawkins asked about the Minutes of April 19, 2011. Kravitz said this is in progress, although the essential detail had been put in the Minute Book. Hawkins said the April 19, 2011 Minutes would be held for the next meeting.

### **SECURITY REDUCTIONS OR EXTENSIONS**

There being none.

### **CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Hawkins announced that there would be a **meeting in Seabrook with federal officials from the US Department of Commerce Economic Assessment Team on May 9, 10 and 11. Attendees would include public officials and business leaders in the area.** Some of the local issues including the Yankee Fishermen's Cooperative proposal will be discussed at the meeting to be held in the Seabrook Library. Hawkins asked if the meeting would be open to the public. Kravitz said invitations had been sent to various participants by the Regional Economic Development Center. Anyone who wanted to attend could do so as it is a public meeting.

Hawkins **said confirmation had been received with the ending date for the DDR court case. He called attention to information the Board had received indicating that February 26, 2011 is the official "kick-off" date for the 18 month period during which DDR had to decide what they were going to do.** This date would also apply to the extension period for the related cases. The date is also the final date for the court case.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Hawkins opened the public hearings at 7:05PM.

### **ONGOING CASES**

**Case #2011-08 – Proposal by Harold & Beverly Perkins, Ken Wilson, Valerie Brown, and the Town of Seabrook for lot line adjustments at 79 Centennial Street, and a proposal by Harold & Beverly Perkins and Valerie Brown for a 3-lot subdivision at Anchor Way and 79 Centennial Street, Tax Map 9, Lots 29, 33, and 34-3, continued from April 5, 2011.**



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Hawkins referenced a request from Henry Boyd to continue Case #2011-08, which had been last heard on April 5, 2011, to the first meeting in June. He noted that that meeting generally had been a work session, but that Case 2011-03 had already been scheduled for that date. Kravitz said she had already responded that it might have to be the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and that seemed ok. Foote suggested putting both cases for the first week in June and make the next meeting the worksession. Hawkins asked if cases had been scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Kravitz said not at that point. **Hawkins said to switch the worksession to the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting in June and Scheduled Case #2011-08 to June 7, 2011 at 6:30PM in Seabrook Town Hall.**

Foote referenced the Case #2011-08 Technical Review Committee minutes and wanted to discuss the confusion about minor subdivisions and whether a re-subdivision could be allowed. In fairness to the applicant, she felt this question should be addressed very early because it could have extreme bearing on what they proposed to do. Foote understood that a minor subdivision could not be re-subdivided, and this case appeared to be adding lots to a minor subdivision. Hawkins commented that Garand had expressed the same position, and referred to the TRC Minutes. He referenced that discussion and asked Morgan how asked Morgan how the applicant would proceed forward. Morgan said that the only way to further subdivide Anchor Way would be for the Planning Board to grant a waiver to the original conditions of approval. Foote said that would open up every other minor subdivision. Morgan said he was not recommending that the Board do that only that, other than the Superior Court, the Planning Board itself was the only entity that could [allow a change]. Foote thought the Board should review the minutes from 2005 and 2007, the public hearing during which the minor subdivision went away, and the reasons for that action. Also why the Addendum is still part of the subdivision regulations – that is to show what the limits and the purpose of a minor subdivision was initially. Foote said that primarily the reason it went away was because it was being overextended and somewhat abused as to its original intent. It just wasn't working and was putting too much of a burden on the town.

Moore said that looking at the old regulations would make clear what could be done with a minor subdivision. Only three houses could be serviced; if the main house was serviced by the street, it could be four depending on the shape of the property and how it was set up. To do anything more would mean going to the requirements for a full-size approach, not necessarily the full 50 feet because there had been exceptions for that. He did not know why it went away because it was very clear. People were angry about the one-foot strip, but that was to protect the developer so that abutters couldn't encroach on to that land. Moore said with the minimum lot size, it was a cheap way of developing the land primarily for local people, but some business people took advantage of it. Most people couldn't afford a 50-foot road for two houses. He thought it should still be allowed. Foote said it was the road width and reduced services; most only had a two-inch water line, and a four-inch sewer line. The three houses could legally on their own have a family apartment so essentially there could be six units in total. She could not imagine four houses using a four-inch sewer line. Moore said the line to the house for plumbing could be four inches; dozens of houses could come off of a six-inch street line. Thibodeau noted only a two-inch water line would be needed.

Foote said for this case to be submitted as what appears to be a lot-line adjustment and a subdivision sort of misrepresents that it is utilizing what was created under the minor subdivision regulations. It is not a road that was built to the regular town standards. It has no stormwater or drainage, sidewalks. The idea of the minor subdivision originally was to allow the larger family-owned lots with a lot of back-land and narrow frontage an opportunity to be able to provide building lots for their children without doing the expense of a full road. Moore said one thing that went wrong was that the Planning Board did not stick to thirty feet minimum but as large as the lot would allow. That would give more footage for utilities etc. Garand said that the last application should have had a waiver request for relief from resubdividing a minor subdivision. He did not think the application was really complete. Moore said if [the regulations] say that there can only be three, it can't be subdivided. Moore said he looked at the site; there are three



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

houses and one is serviced by the street. So they could put one more dwelling unit somewhere. Foote said the back lot is still undeveloped so there is still land in the back.

Hawkins asked for guidance. Does the applicant still have the option of bringing in a regular subdivision and requesting individual waivers from the current subdivision regulations. Or was it just because, when originally developed, a minor subdivision that said no more than three houses for that lot was used. He asked if they have the option of coming back to the Planning Board to try to subdivide using the current subdivision regulations, requesting waivers for the things that they can't or don't want to do. Foote said if she were the applicant, she would present and request the waivers. Probably she would have come to the board as an informal session and discussed the possibility of waivers before enlisting engineering designs for something that may stumble on the minor subdivision regulation. The Board has to be aware that whatever way they go would open up maybe 25 to 40 minor subdivisions that will all come forward and want to do the same thing. If a precedent is set by allowing one, there are a lot of others in town that would come forward. Moore thought there might be near 50. It is the way Seabrook is laid out and originally built; with Route I-95, Route 1, and the B & M, which leaves very narrow pieces of land. You cannot do what could be done with wide-open country and there can be connecting roads.

Morgan said that this would be the beginning of a trend where people would try to do what they can because the land will become more valuable over time. He suggested that the regulations be very clear that there are certain rules that apply to certain streets made in the last 20 years. The most practical Way of putting everybody on notice would be a modest amendment to the subdivision regulations that say from 1985 to 2005 certain streets were created under the regulations with but there were specific restrictions in the approval ie no more than three lots, limited road width, etc and actually list those streets in the regulations. It would take some work but going forward, no matter where you live in Seabrook, one can look at the list to see if they are on it and know right up front that they would be subject to certain higher standards. Otherwise as time goes on and there is turnover on the Planning Board and in Town Hall, things will fall through the cracks; people won't remember which were the minor subdivisions and which were not. Foote said it is not that they would be forever unable to do certain things, but thought they should be held to bringing up their property to the standards that other streets have for stormwater, sidewalks, and proper sized services. If they want to invest in their property they have to bring the road up to the standards of a typical subdivision road that the Planning Board can consider the subdivision. Morgan said that should be in black and white so people know where they stand.

Janvrin asked if the roads in minor subdivisions were ever accepted by the town. Foote said many were. Janvrin said then to expand or operate that road they would also have to have permission from the Board of Selectmen. It would be a two-step process. He liked Morgan's idea of enumerating where those roads are. Moore said there would be about 50 dead-ends. Morgan said it would take research to determine where those roads are. Foote said that some were like driveways. Hawkins asked if most of them were 30 feet. Morgan explained that the regulations always had a 30-foot minimum and said up to 50 feet. Time after time the submissions were for 30 feet even if they had more room. Foote said they would say that was the only way they could configure it and fit in the houses they needed was to reduce it to 30 feet. Hawkins agreed that a clarification in the regulations and listing the relevant streets would go a long way to help. He did not think it would be that hard. Morgan said it is a 20 year span. Moore thought the highway department had done this. Foote thought they might not have it just for minor subdivisions. Janvrin said it would be in the case file. Hawkins said that the guidance for the applicant is that the Board would not be inclined to waive the minor subdivision regulations for this case, but if the applicant wanted to proceed it would be under the standard subdivision regulations and requesting the individual upgrades or waivers. Foote said that adding more houses removes it from the definition of a minor subdivision so the road should be what the current standards require. Janvrin asked if the Planning Board had the waiver authority. Morgan said only the Planning Board had that authority.



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Thibodeau thought that once a road had been accepted it would be hard to break it up. Foote did not know how the Board could give permission to tear up a town road without the town being a co-applicant and approving the plans. Morgan said it would be tough for the applicant to get approval by both the Planning Board and the BOS. Thibodeau thought Morgan's idea to amend the regulations was good. Moore asked why a house had not been built on the last lot. Garand said there had been some wetlands issues and when the wetlands regulations changed they couldn't get the setbacks. It would have been very expensive to cross the wetlands. Thibodeau wanted to ask the town planner to draft an amendment to the subdivision regulations. Morgan said it would be to include a section that put people on notice if they live on certain streets. Foote said there was already the Addendum, and asked if that would be moved to the front and add all the street names. Morgan suggested cleaning up the language so that it is more clear for the applicant. The Board knows what was meant but generally the applicant does not.

Moore thought it might be easier to say that minor subdivisions approved before a certain date had to adhere to the preexisting regulations. Morgan wanted to lay out the procedure if they are unhappy with that ie request a waiver from the Board. Hawkins asked if the waiver would be off the existing subdivision regulations, not the minor subdivision regulations. Morgan said it would, noting that it would be changing the conditions of a prior minor subdivision approval. A hearing would be required before that could be in the regulations. In both situations, the applicant would have to explain the reasons why it wanted the Board to allow a waiver request. Then the Board could decide whether it has merit. Janvrin thought explaining the procedure also needed to be in the revised regulation. Morgan said it should alert them as to just how many issues are involved eg the roadway, utilities etc, so the applicant could decide if it would be worthwhile to pursue. Hawkins noted that there have also been new stormwater regulations that probably were not in place for the minor subdivision. Foote thought that none had any type of stormwater drainage. Morgan said the other advantage of drafting such a regulation would be that sooner or later someone would be unhappy if the board said "no" and a case would end up in court. It would be important for a judge to understand the Board's rationale.

Foote recalled a similar instance years ago before the ZBA when a resident in a minor subdivision wanted a second dwelling on their lot. At that meeting the abutters along the roadway all told the ZBA that if that request were approved, they would be in the next month with the same request. In that case the potential would be for 12 units. Garand said the 2005 Planning Board Minutes indicate that the chairperson of the ZBA participated in the discussion of the minor-subdivision regulation and how it was working. Foote thought the Board had to figure out proper wording for future board members, and also the rationale in the event of going to court. She said to definitely highlight the streets that would be affected. Morgan said there were a finite number of streets as minor subdivisions are no longer being done. .

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Thibodeau</b>	<b>to ask the town planner to draft an amendment to the subdivision regulations based on the discussion of may 3, 2011 to lay out for applicants and other interested parties what is required to proceed with a comprehensive proposal to cut up a minor subdivision into more lots.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

Hawkins asked Morgan to communicate with the Applicant(s) about this issue so they know where they stand.

### **NEW CASES**

**Case #2011-10E – Proposal by Tim Johnson to amend a 2001 site plan approval for commercial property at 920 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 7, Lots 91-201, 202, 203 & 204;**

Attending: Tocky Bialobrzski;



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

Foote thought that the regulations say that one case must be completed before another case involving the same property can be submitted, and asked if the applicant had ever complied with the Board's last vote. Hawkins said that the vote in the Planning Board Case #2010-16 required the Applicant to build and complete the improvements according to the original site plan and reestablish a \$50,000 site security covering the improvements, before returning to the Planning Board for any further work. Hawkins did not think the security had been posted, and referenced the CEO's letter indicating that the work had not been completed. He noted that the Board had allowed the sidewalks to be moved internally to the south side and eliminated on the north side, the parking area in front of the building was taken out, work around the sign was done; there are still a number of items that Garand said had to be done.

Hawkins cited Morgan's memo of April 30, 2011 and asked for comments. Morgan explained that there are two steps in addressing a case: (i) that the application is sufficiently complete for the Board to make a decision and, if so voted, (ii) to deliberate on the merits of the proposal. His memo cited the deficiencies from a year ago, as well as his recommendations to the Board. Morgan said the application is incomplete for a number of reasons and he advised the Board to not accept it. Hawkins asked for comments from abutters. Bialobrzkeski said that a parking easement deed agreement with Seabrook Common north had not been satisfied, and questioned whether the proposed parking at Seabrook Common North was viable. She also stated that the 920 Lafayette Realty Trust should be a signatory on the application because work was proposed for that property. She submitted the easement deed. Foote said it appeared that Johnson was doing work on land other than his own. Hawkins said that one item the Board would address would be whether all of those who should be applicants had signed the application. Bialobrzkeski said that Tim Johnson had called her that afternoon to say he would not attend the meeting.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Janvrin</b>	<b>to determine that Case #2011-10E – Proposal by Tim Johnson to amend a 2001 site plan approval for commercial property at 920 Lafayette Road, Tax Map 7, Lots 91-201, 202, 203 &amp; 204, was not sufficiently complete for jurisdiction and deliberation, citing . (i) the Town Planner's evaluation memo of April 30, 2011, (ii) the Minutes of the Planning Board meeting of May 18, 2010 (page 7), (iii) non-submittal of the \$50,000 security, and (iv) that the 2001 case was never closed. The Town Planner's memo of April 30, 2011 enumerating the reasons for this decision is incorporated herein.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

**Case #2011-11E – Proposal by Dekes Realty Trust and Arnold W. Bishop, Jr. to establish a property management business and asphalt services at 204 New Zealand Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 19.**  
Attending: Joseph Bishop

Hawkins asked Bishop to describe his proposal. Bishop wanted to open a proprietary management and asphalt services business involving the parking of a couple of trucks, about two offices, and inside storage. Hawkins asked if there would be any construction, and about the previous use. Bishop said there would be no construction. The property had been a crematory. Bishop said he had been in business for 20 years and no longer wanted to run it out of his house. Hawkins asked how many trucks were anticipated. Tow dump trucks, two trailers and a tool truck. Foote asked what asphalt services entailed. Bishop said he owned a small paving company, and had worked in the local area for about 20 years. He came across the non-expensive property and wanted to no longer run the business out of his house. Foote asked if asphalt would be stored on site. Bishop said it would not; only for parking the trucks and



# Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

locking up the tools inside. Janvrin asked if there would be diesel fuel. Bishop said only in the vehicles. Janvrin asked what would be required in re hazardous materials from the fire Department. Garand said only business licensing; police and fire also go through the application before it goes to the Board of Selectmen. The facilities for storage are already on the site. Hawkins asked if this is 100 percent in the Industrial Zone, and commented that it did not look like there were close neighbors. Garand said there is a duplex structure and another house in the industrial zone. Hawkins asked if the mobile home were on the same lot. Garand said it was not; there was no obstruction on the lot except the old crematory. Garand said it was. Foote pointed out the location. Moore commented that here could be residential, commercial and industrial on the same lot. Hawkins asked about the checklist, and what was necessary but not included. Morgan said it is a simple use of a vacant building and thought the Board could be flexible about minor details; this is an existing building. Janvrin asked if this proposal fit the expedited regulation. Morgan said it did. Hawkins commented that about a year ago the Board asked that either Morgan or Garand determine if a proposal could meet expedited requirements. This is just a change of use he didn't see much on the checklist that would change his view of the proposal.

Foote asked about the sign and lighting details, as both fire and police request some signage at the site so that if they have to go to the site they know the name of the company and the address. Bishop said it could and that it had a phone number to be in touch with him; there is a building alarm. Foote asked if the lighting would be changed, or if he intended to put some sort of sign that would be visible from the street by emergency personnel. Garand said that is part of the building permit process. Hawkins asked for other questions; there being none.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>to accept Case # 2011-11E as administratively sufficiently complete for jurisdiction and deliberation.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Moore</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

Hawkins asked for further questions or comments from any abutters: there being none.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Janvrin</b>	<b>to approve, Case #2011-11E – Proposal by Dekes Realty Trust and Arnold W. Bishop, Jr. to establish a property management business and asphalt services at 204 New Zealand Road, Tax Map 5, Lot 19.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Thibodeau</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Stormwater Operations & Maintenance Methodology**, continued from March 1, 2011, and March 15, 2011.

Hawkins said that a proposed new mylar format for amending the siteplan requirements was to have been reviewed at this meeting. The DPW Manager had sent comments. Morgan sorted through those comments and the original proposal to finalize the wording for the new ordinance. Morgan called attention to his memo indicating he had some issues with language changes recommended by the DPW Manager, and said that this item had not yet been public noticed although there had been several discussions. He asked Morgan to explain his thinking. Morgan said that during the Midway site approval case there had been discussion about the struggle with recording Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plans. Henry Boyd volunteered to help out, and put together a draft he thought would be practical, using Midway as the prototype for what could be recorded at the Registry of Deeds. The notes are extensive and the board



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

wanted to proceed. It was a good idea to show this to the DPW Manager, who wrote to the Board on April 5, 2011 with six comments. The Board asked Morgan to come up with a public hearing notice that included both sets of comments. Morgan said he did not agree with some of the DPW Manager's comments, and thought it best for the Board to consider what parts it wanted to include. In the meantime, Hawkins had asked Morgan for his specific recommendations which are reflected in his memo giving the reasons which would cause him to pass on certain of the DPW manager's comments. Foote tended to back up the DPW Manager's position to use the work private development and private roadway. In the past year she had become substantially educated on the clean water requirements for MS-4 towns and the reports that must be submitted to the EPA, and the clear delineation between the private property owner's responsibility and the municipality's responsibility once it flows off the privately owned site. This is primarily to cover the town's liability; she thought it would be an added layer of protection for the town that there be no mistaking that this is a private stormwater maintenance issue, and in no way is the town taking any responsibility.

Morgan understood this but said the Board was aiming for a subdivision regulation ie what is expected of the applicant on the siteplan for a recordable mylar. He could not imagine any scenario in which the Town or the Planning Board would become .subject to that regulation. Foote commented that 15 years ago she did not envision the issues about minor-subdivisions. Morgan said these are subdivision regulations and that the DPW was not subject to them nor would it ever be. Hawkins asked if Morgan foresaw that every application would be for private development. Morgan said that is the only parties that are subject to the subdivision regulations. Foote said that someone that looks this up at the Registry might not know that. Morgan said adding the word would be easy to do but he tried to eliminate extra baggage. Janvrin called attention to the case for Arleigh Greene's property for which he was setting aside swales and drainage for which the Town would ultimately be responsible. The plan would have to say what the private developer was responsible for as well as what the town is responsible for by way of the easement. In the Midway case the town would have no responsibility. He agreed that extra verbiage could be confusing. Foote said she was cautious and asked what hurt could there be to put the word "private" in so that many years from now there would be no confusion. Janvrin suggested putting in "property owner" as even with a change of ownership that condition would still be recorded at the Registry. Foote agreed that would be better. Janvrin said that "municipality" would have to mean the Town. Morgan thought the consensus was to use "property owner".

Morgan suggested that the bulk of the verbiage be referenced as being on file in the Planning board office as a guide for engineers and surveyors. Hawkins asked if the reference would be in the ordinance. Morgan said it would be the specific title; it could be in the ordinance. Hawkins asked about an appendix. Morgan said that could be done. Hawkins did not want everyone calling in to the Planning Board office for information that they could get on line. An Appendix could be posted to make sure that it is referred to because it would be a requirement. Morgan said the website is the most practical way of making it available,, noting that in the building Code the International codes are referenced; he liked the appendix format. Hawkins said that way it is all in one place. He would be upset at having to call the office to find out what it says. Moore noted that the regulations have a stormwater section. Morgan said the proposal would be to add about seven lines to it. Another of Morgan's issues was that Boyd wanted to "reduce" road salt and the DPW Manager suggested replacing that with a "sensible parking lot" road salting; he thought "sensible" was not appropriate. Hawkins said neither word was measurable. Morgan preferred "reduce" to "sensible". Thibodeau thought "reduce" was a better word. Foote would get rid of both words in favor of "minimal required".

Garand thought that could be used in conjunction with the BMP outline on the use of salt. Hawkins asked if that would be referenced in the ordinance. Garand said in several places especially in siteplans in re the use of chemicals or salt on property. Foote asked if there is a specific BMP manual, or if UNH stormwater standards are used. Garand said they run a program for the Health Department and do visual internal and



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

external inspection. Foote asked if there is a written flyer. Garand said they do a mailing and a site inspection every 3 years. He thought it should be done for some of the big properties. Foote wanted the specific BMP to be referenced eg the Town, UNH. Moore was concerned that there is so much information in so many places that this would become unenforceable. Hawkins said if there are existing guidelines, that should be the reference. Morgan asked Garand to email some guideline titles. Garand said he would do that the next week.

Hawkins asked Morgan to write up the revised language and public notice for a public hearing on hopefully on June 7, 2011. He asked for other comments; there being none.

### OTHER BUSINESS

Hawkins referenced the letter from the Rockingham Planning Commission calling attention to the need to recommend to the Selectmen reappointment of the Commissioners. He referenced Aboul Khan's letter requesting to continue in that position.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that Aboul Khan be reappointed as the Commissioner from Seabrook to the Rockingham Planning Commission.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Thibodeau</b>	<b>Approved: In favor – Hawkins, Foote, Moore, Sweeney, Thibodeau; Abstained: Janvrin</b>

Janvrin noted that Seabrook would be allowed two Commissioners and two Alternate Commissioners. Kravitz said that Francis Chase had not yet been asked if he wants to continue, and suggested it would be a courtesy to ask him. Janvrin said he saw a memo indicating there were two billeted positions and two alternate positions to represent Seabrook on the RPC. Foote asked if Janvrin were volunteering. Kravitz commented that Chase attends the RPC meetings, and suggested doing one position at a time. Janvrin suggested asking chase if he wanted to be reappointed. Garand said to recommend it and just keep it going. Foote thought that Chase could be reappointed and then decline if he was not available.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that Francis Chase be reappointed as an Alternate Commissioner from Seabrook to the Rockingham Planning Commission.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Thibodeau</b>	<b>Approved: Unanimous</b>

Hawkins asked if Janvrin was volunteering as well. Janvrin said he would serve.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Foote</b>	<b>to recommend to the Board of Selectmen that Jason Janvrin be appointed as an Alternate Commissioner from Seabrook to the Rockingham Planning Commission.</b>
<b>SECOND:</b>	<b>Sweeney</b>	<b>Approved: In favor – Hawkins, Foote, Moore, Sweeney, Thibodeau; Abstained: Janvrin</b>

**Janvrin called attention to the rail trail cleanup on Saturday, May 7, 2011 from 9AM to 3PM.** They are meeting at the Library and will do raffles every hour and serve Pizza given donations from some of the businesses. Anyone wanting to help is welcome, and should bring protective gloves, shovels, rakes



## Town of Seabrook Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED

and a wheelbarrow if possible. Janvrin announced that the Rail Trail Committee had formed as a 501 (3) (c) entity and he was elected a vice president. He noted that some members might be at Wal-Mart or the supermarkets asking for donations. Foote said she'd heard that they were making very good process.

Thibodeau commented that weekly she picks up the liter along her street. Foote could not believe the amount of roadside litter

Hawkins asked for other business.

**Paula Wood asked if the Board had received her request to serve as an Alternate Planning Board Member.** Hawkins said this had been received. There are three alternates; Morgan said there can be up to five. Hawkins wanted to wait for a couple of weeks to see if other requests came in. He wanted to see what the existing alternates had planned on; he intended to inquire with them and said hopefully the Board would address this at the next meeting:

There being no other business;

Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 7:50PM.

Respectfully submitted  
Barbara Kravitz, Secretary  
Seabrook Planning Board