



**Salisbury Planning Board  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Public Meeting • Academy Hall  
September 20, 2021  
6:30 p.m.**

Doug Greiner, Chairman	Present	Loretta Razin, Member	Present
Joe Schmidl, Vice Chair	Present	Jeff Blanchard, Member	Present
John Herbert, Selectman Ex-Officio	Present	David Hostetler, Alternate	Present
William MacDuffie, Jr, Alternate	Absent	Jennifer King, Recording Secretary	Present
Jeff Nangle, Alternate	Absent	April Rollins, Admin Assistant	Absent

**Members of the Public Present:** Joe Landry.

**Zoom Attendees:** None

---

Chairman Greiner opened the meeting at 6:31 pm.

Approval of Minutes

Selectman John Herbert **motioned** to accept the drafted meeting minutes from July 19<sup>th</sup> with minor corrections. Jeff Blanchard **seconded** the motion for discussion. Mr. Blanchard noted some minor corrections to be made to the minutes. The Recording Secretary will make the necessary changes.

***Motion to pass the minutes as amended passed unanimously.***

Preliminary Design Review Process in the Subdivision Regulations

Chair Greiner presented a revised version of Section IV Subdivision Review Procedures, including the changes that were discussed at the last meeting.

Jeff Blanchard wanted to know at what point in the process does the decision making become binding. He also asked about the 2-meeting limit listed in the first paragraph. Chair Greiner said that this was based upon a recommendation from Central NH Regional Planning that they try and keep it to 2 meetings to avoid having the applicant go through a long drawn-out process. He also noted that this is still the pre-application period so there is nothing binding at this point in the process.

Jeff Blanchard moved on to the Preliminary Conceptual Consultation section:

In the first sentence, they were going to replace the word “may” with “shall”. It has not been changed.

In the bulleted area, he noted that the item “historic areas of concern” was discussed being added at the last meeting, but was not included under the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, “Identify important environmental features...” Discussion occurred over whether or not to include this item. It was decided that it will be added as a third “sub bullet” under the 4<sup>th</sup> main bullet.

Toward the end of the last paragraph on the first page it states, “Statements made by Planning Board members shall not be the basis for disqualifying said members or invalidating any action eventually taken on the application.” Selectman Herbert gave an example that if someone said they didn’t like a particular project, then it does not disqualify them from voting on said project.

Jeff Blanchard asked if the applicant submits all of the required items along with their application, is another meeting necessary? Dave Hostetler said that having this information combined with their conceptual proposal is what the meeting is designed for. It gives the applicant an idea of what to expect. Further discussion occurred regarding the meetings.

Joe Schmidl suggested that the top line under ‘Pre-Application’ be changed. Instead of the phrase “shall now require,” they should just put the word “requires.” Chair Greiner said that he will talk to Town Administrator Rollins to change the application to reflect these requirements so that it is spelled out there as well that these elements are now required. *Agreed.*

#### Design Review

“Applicant may seek nonbinding design review...” (change “may” to “shall”)

Jeff Blanchard would like to better define what the responsibilities are i.e. whose responsibility it is to notify abutters. Discussion occurred about who is responsible for notifying abutters of the project (the applicant).

Dave Hostetler pointed out that the last sentence of the paragraph is problematic because it implies that an application is required after the design review.

Jeff Blanchard would like to better spell out what the responsibilities of the applicant are for the design review meeting. Discussion occurred regarding notification of abutters. Joe Schmidl said that once the applicant leaves the Preliminary Conceptual Consultation, they will know whether or not a design review is the next step. If they are proceeding, then they know that they need to submit a list of abutters, a list of easement holders, and the money for postage, and the meeting will be scheduled 7 days after notification.

After much discussion, the following was determined to be more suitable:

2<sup>nd</sup> sentence: “Design Review shall consist of more detailed non-binding discussions. At this point the applicant will provide:

1. More specific design and engineering details;
2. Identification of and notice to abutters;
3. List of holders of conservation, preservation or agricultural preservation restrictions and the general public as required by sub paragraph 1(d).

Joe Schmidl noted that at their last meeting, they had decided that an applicant can waive the design review. If they choose to do that, then when will the abutters be able to view the project and offer their input? Dave Hostetler that if the design review does not happen, then they can attend the meeting where the application is reviewed.

Joe Landry asked what would cause them to waive the design review meeting. Chair Greiner pointed to the numbered criteria listed in order to waive a formal Design Review.

Design Review waiver. Chair Greiner asked for everyone to send him their red-line copies.

Joe Schmidl **motioned** that conceptually the 'Pre-Application Section IV Subdivision Review Procedures' should contain the option to waive the design review depending upon certain criteria. Selectman John Herbert **seconded** the motion that passed.

#### Any Other Business

None.

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on October 4, 2021.

#### Adjournment

Jeff Blanchard motioned to adjourn at 7:32 p.m. Joe Schmidl seconded the motion that *passed unanimously*.

**Respectfully Submitted,**  
**Jennifer L. King**  
**Recording Secretary**