TOWN OF ALTON
ALTON PLANNING BOARD

September 29, 2009
APPROVED 10-20-09

Members Present:	William Curtin, Chair Timothy Roy David Hussey Scott Williams David Collier, Alternate Thomas Hoopes
Others Present:	Sharon Penney, Town Planner Stacey Ames, Planning Assistant Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

William Curtin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p. m.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

William Curtin appointed David Collier as an alternate for this meeting. Scott Williams recused himself.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to accept the agenda as presented by W. Curtin, seconded by D. Hussey and passed with 5 votes in favor, no opposed.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Curtin opened the floor for case non-specific public input, and asked that anyone who intended to speak sign in. Hearing none, he closed public input.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Case #P09-17 **Ryan Heath**	**Map 8, Lot 25**	**Amended Site Plan** **Frank C. Gilman Highway**

Application submitted by Melissa Guldbrandsen of Alton Law on behalf of applicant Ryan Heath to amend a previously approved Elderly Housing Site Plan to Workforce Housing as allowed by RSA 674:60. Parcel located in the Rural Residential zone.

W. Curtin announced the continuance of Case P09-17, Map 8, Lot 25. It's an amended site plan for Frank C. Gilman Highway. He announced that there would be no public

input, because that had been closed. They were here just to make a decision as to which way they were going to go.
W. Curtin asked for comments from the Board.

T. Roy stated that this was a conditional approval which only allows the Board to make minor or administrative changes. As for some of the conditions, it was going to be housing for the elderly with a principal occupant sixty-two years of age or older. That could, he believed be minor, to change it over to workforce housing. But, attached to that there was a lot of discussion about curbing. They thought it was reasonable to eliminate curbing with housing for the elderly. Second, it changed from single story structures to two story structures. Again, that could be considered minor. On the tails of that, there was a lot of discussion about screening, and that goes hand in hand with going to two stories. Then they get to the number of units; it was conditionally approved for 53, and the state reduced it to 44 or 45. With that, there was a traffic study; he is not sure which number of units the traffic study was based on. For the sake of argument, let's say it was for the 53 units. Now, you have 55 units, and one would have to assume there would be more traffic impact. Peter Julia testified that there would be a difference in the amount of trips per day. Two trips could be a minor change or a major change; no one on the Board, he does not think, knows what it is going to be. That standing alone could be a major change or a minor change; they do not know. He does not know, collectively, whether they can consider this a minor change when it is all bunched into a package.

D. Hussey raised the issue of the impact on the schools and other things like that. The elderly wouldn't have had an impact on the schools; that did come up at several of the meetings where they told the public there would be no impact. With the couple things that were said at the meetings, it does warrant a site.

T. Hoopes expanded on something T. Roy had said; last week at the Law Lecture Series, there was an observation made that final conditional approvals are not final until all the conditions are met. Then the person comes back for a final, final approval. It was something he had never heard before, but it's one of those interesting cases you come up with. He agreed with T. Roy; cumulatively what they are dealing with in the change over from Elderly Housing to a Workforce Housing application – what Jim Sessler said to them was that they had to make a decision based on what they thought was reasonable – they had to choose where they would side based on the changes they saw. If they did not feel the changes were very substantive, then it is an application that could be amended. If it's a case where you find that there is an accumulation of different changes they thought were too much, they have the right not to accept it. He would come down exactly with T. Roy; there are too many changes to accept this as an amended application.

W. Curtin agreed, stating that it is a big impact on the town. Everybody was sold on Elderly Housing, now everything is going to definitely dramatically change. He's not against Workforce Housing or anything like that.

D. Hussey stated that they were not looking for a complete new plan or anything like that; they are looking at a new application that needs to be filled out properly. From there they would have to start.

W. Curtin referenced page 42 of the Zoning Ordinances where it states that duplexes and multi-family dwellings must have a minimum of one acre per unit and no more than five dwelling units per structure to comply with the July 2009 implementation of Workforce Housing, and no more than one duplex or multi-family dwelling per lot. They have a fourteen acre lot there; from the way he is reading this, they are going to get a maximum of one five-unit building on it. That's in section 463. That changes the whole ballgame all together. He doesn't know if they could get a variance from the ZBA on it.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that as the applicant they needed to have an opportunity to preserve their record for appeal. She understood that they were not taking public input, but she did want to note some objections for the record. It is a little bit baffling since they got the feedback initially that they could proceed with an amendment to the existing site plan. All of the questions the Board has expressed are legitimate questions for them to ask as the Planning Board. She would have expected those questions through the planning process. They're not trying to slip something by; they simply took an existing plan, made changes to it so it would be amenable to Workforce Housing. They changed the declarations, they changed the bylaws, they changed the association for it to be Workforce Housing. The questions the Board has are legitimate questions for them to ask and for them to ask for changes to be made to that site plan, just like any other site plan. For them to ask to submit a new application is academic because they would be back there with the exact same set of materials that they have right now. Nothing would be different.

T. Roy referred to RSA 676:4,1 (i): following conditional approval only minor or administrative changes that do not involve discretionary judgment may be made without a public hearing. It stands to reason that if conditional approval is important enough to be imposed in the first place, there ought to be some demonstration of the circumstances that justify modification of the approval. Moreover, it is consistent with Fisher v. Dover while an entirely new application seems uncalled for, the application and public hearing targeted to the limited question of whether a particular question should be modified seems appropriate.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that this is standard law; when you do a conditional approval, whether it is a subdivision or a site plan, some applicants are able to come back and sit with the planner and go through the list of conditions without a public meeting to see if they have been met or not. They've done a public meeting that was noticed.

T. Roy mentioned again that they are limited to minor changes, and he thinks collectively they are thinking this is more than a minor change. He is speaking for himself; W. Curtin spoke up and said that it is a totally different change from Elderly Housing. T. Roy went on to say that just the traffic study alone could stand on a major change; they did not know. D. Hussey said that the impact on the whole community has changed.

M. Guldbrandsen said she understood that, and she agrees; they are absolutely right. They're not trying to come back with the old conditional approval and simply go through those lists of conditions. What they are doing is exactly what the statute says; they are doing this as a full amended site plan which was re-noticed and given a new number. It has a new docket number for 2009. W. Curtin noted that the unfortunate part of it is something they should have picked up on sooner, and that is the part of section 463 that says you can only put one multi-family unit on one lot.

M. Guldbrandsen said she understands they are not debating this because she thinks they have already made up their minds. She is putting the objections on the record so that it's clear on appeal. The point is that the whole point of the Elderly Housing statute, and the whole point of the case, which she cited in her memo which she hopes they have in front of them and should be part of the record as well; Britton v. Chester, 1991, NH Supreme Court case, was exactly that situation, where the town allowed for multi-family development, but it was so restricted that the Supreme Court said that violated the Zoning Ordinance's obligation to provide for the welfare of the community which includes providing for Workforce Housing. In the whole standard that they, and she would have hoped they would have addressed this with Town Counsel at their last meeting, the standard they have to struggle with is reasonableness. That's what the statute says. It's their position that, because this density was allowed for the Elderly Housing, that provides a measure; a yardstick for reasonableness. She is sorry that did not come up in the discussion with Town Counsel. It sound like, if that is their decision right now, and they do have to make a decision so they (the applicant) have a clear path on how to proceed, that they are requiring a zoning variance, then they need to take a vote on that and make that decision. Or, maybe they need input from Town Counsel before they make that decision. That was clearly on the table when Attorney McNeill addressed them.

T. Hoopes stated that he thinks there is some confusion in the original point of contact when Town Planner Sharon Penney contacted Attorney Sessler to see if there could be an amendment. His response was that yes, they could have an amendment, but the unspoken part, which he spoke to them about when he met with them, was that it is not up to him to decide what can be done; it's up to the Board to decide, at which point the balance of the amendment is chosen. Yes, they accepted the application as an amendment to the previous application, but in discussing it right now, it certainly seems like people express points of view with the attorney but they didn't take votes or anything like that. They have not gone in that direction at this point. He is listening for the first time to what different people are saying about how they feel and he thinks they seem to be pretty much unanimous. The step now is how they have to proceed; it is a technical point and he has to yield because he got to the meeting late and he does not know what recommendations were made of how if you turn something down, how you do it.

W. Curtin said that right now they are just deciding on the amended site plan application. T. Hoopes said that was right; now they have to decide whether to void it, vote against it. W. Curtin added without prejudice, then they can come back and apply again. T. Hoopes

said they want to see the application come back fully from the point of view of a Workforce Housing application rather than an amended application.

D. Hussey said he didn't think they were saying they wanted all new engineering and everything like that; they just want to see a new site plan addressed to Workforce Housing.

S. Penney reiterated for the record again the sequence of events. They had the Elderly Housing which had conditional approval. It was fine. It was dormant for a while and it was waiting for conditions to be completed. Then Mr. Heath came in and there was a change in what they were planning to do, and the question arose, and this is the seminal question, the question arose as to whether this just needed clerical changes, re-clarification, go before the Board for a final sign-off, or if it in fact warranted an amendment to the original site plan that the Board had given conditional approval to. That is what she and attorney Sessler spoke about, and that is where they are now. A couple of weeks ago when this came in, it came under that guise, which was a functional working guise at that time, but they had not had any deliberation. It was not a fait accompli as an amended site plan, as she has said before. It was until it isn't, and now it isn't because it is within their parameters and their prerogative to decide what they want to do with it. She thinks they keep going round and round about that; unless there was some grievous misunderstanding, that is the way it went down, at least in her recollection, and that is what Attorney Sessler remembers.

R. Heath stated that in the meeting, they (the Board) accepted it as an amended site plan. T. Hoopes said they accepted it for discussion; they didn't approve it, they accepted it. He said they accept it to discuss it, and then the next step is you either vote it up or vote it down, or continue it. You can't discuss it until it has been accepted as an application.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that it is confusing that there was one night of public input and they have lingering questions that they (the applicant) have the answers to. DOT has given a new permit to this, so it's odd that they wouldn't be able to continue in the process so they could answer the questions and go forward.

W. Curtin stated that his big question is that you can only put one multi-family unit on one lot; that's what is stated in the Zoning Ordinance. With the fourteen acres, if they were to subdivide it with a road or whatever…

R. Heath said that is a debate of law because of the new state statute for Workforce Housing. You can take bits and pieces of the Zoning Ordinance and try to apply it every which way because there are different regulations for different ones. Their position is that this is not a change of use; this is a residential use and it has been from the beginning. Elderly and multi-family are under the residential use. They're using those guidelines because there are no guidelines for Workforce Housing, and the law states that if there are no guidelines then reasonable exceptions need to be made to accommodate. They need to decide what is reasonable and that's where they go with it, but the whole minor thing is subjective and wide open.

T. Roy stated that he has a feeling that collectively it is not a minor change.

T. Hoopes said he sees the point, but he does not think it is comparative to say that Workforce Housing and Elderly Housing are in a line with each other. They accepted, after the state partway through the year approved the Workforce Housing. They made some minimal changes to come into compliance, which was to change it from a four unit building to a five unit building, and without that they are dealing with the rest of the State's regulations. That's what holds. They did not change their zoning to make a complete change for Workforce Housing. He thinks that to assume that Workforce Housing could go on one lot is a big jump. Our zoning requires subdivision for multi-family housing. M. Guldbrandsen stated that was what the Supreme Court struck down in the Town of Chester. T. Hoopes said it was a reasonable enough affect with the size of the lot.

R. Heath stated that where the comparison comes in is the reason that they came up with elderly housing in the first place; what is the benefit to elderly housing? They talked about it for a year. Density makes it affordable, and that's where the comparison comes in verbatim with the State statute. The State statute says you need to provide an affordable and reasonable means, and the only way you can do that is density. T. Hoopes said that is assuming they are not in compliance with the Workforce Housing accommodation. If you look at it from a regional point of view, with the units that are available in town at the current time, there is an abundance of affordable housing at this moment. When you consider the region, you also consider Laconia, which is part of the region, and part of Belknap County. There's lots and lots of housing available there, so it's not just checking each individual town and having one town not have it. The neighboring towns could make up for it.

R. Heath mentioned that he (T. Hoopes) had mentioned that before. He is not questioning who the source was, but the language in the state statute that was passed says "every municipality". It doesn't say anything about region. T. Hoopes stated that his source was Ben Frost, the man in charge of Workforce Housing. He went on to say that all the court cases he has read about, whether it was Ossipee or whatever else, and at the various Workforce Housing classes they had last year, you had to be able, and the onus is on the applicant to prove that the town does not have its share, so they take into consideration the immediate area around the town.

D. Collier stated that he feels there is cumulative effect on this; it boils down to when you add everything up, it's no longer a minor change. There are several things they need to address, and it's not just a minor administrative change on an application. They need to address something for multi-family housing. This does not seem to fit the bill for the minor amended site plan because of all the cumulative changes.

T. Hoopes stated that the biggest impact, in a way, is the concept of going to two stories and what the visual impact is to the abutters. Going from one story with screening to two stories with screening and increasing the units, the question originally stated that it had to

be compatible with the region. They looked at that and felt that, because it was going to be Elderly Housing, it would be a fairly calm activity. There is a substantial difference.

S. Penney stated another point of reference. This is the final Legislative Changes, which is public record. The Workforce Housing Bill, which was to be implemented July1, 2009 has been changed, as of July 8, 2009, to January 1, 2010. W. Curtin asked if that was for the towns to adopt it. S. Penney said it was, but that the whole thing, the whole legislation itself was July 1. It doesn't come technically into play until January 1; it's a change in the implementation date of the legislation. R. Heath stated that he thinks that is the compliance date because you can't change a Senate Bill once it has already come into affect because they made the change on July 8, it already came into effect on July 1. The statute is already in affect; the compliance date for the town is… S. Penney said that there is time to consider the reasonableness of this. She is not advocating for or against, but the dates have been changed. W. Curtin stated that the town has already adopted this; S. Penney said yes, they had adopted something.

Attorney McNeill requested permission to speak; W. Curtin denied.

T. Roy made a motion to deny the amended site plan application for all the reasons stated, without prejudice. D. Hussey seconded the motion, which passed with 5 votes in favor.

S. Williams rejoined the Board.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

There was discussion concerning Mr. Kiersted having been invited to the meeting and whether discussion should continue even though he chose not to attend. The point was brought up that there could only be three unregistered vehicles on the premises, and that construction equipment would not count, as it is unregistered. However, the property is in a Lakeshore Residential zone and that construction equipment shouldn't be stored there anyway. During the summer there is room inside the building to store the equipment, so it shouldn't be there anyway. Right now, it is a transition time when he is moving boats, so it is hard to discern, as he has more boat trailers all over the place because he is actively shifting boats, and he did mention during the application that seasonally there would be some chaos. The brook running through the back of the property was mentioned, and that if anything was leaking oil or transmission fluid, it could be a health hazard. S. Ames stated that part of the approval was that no gasoline products be stored on the premises.

S. Williams stated that he was bothered by the fact that when the Board approved this, they were very clear on what their wishes were, and to get to this point somehow happened between the conditional approval and where they are today. He thinks there are holes there and he is confused as to why they are there.

T. Hoopes asked if there were conditions that had not been met. S. Penney said she had gone through all the tapes for the notice of decision. She and Jim had talked; they spoke to the Board, it was all warm and fuzzy, and it was all going to be this and that. This was over a couple of meetings. Then, they took them on as the last case on a horrible night when they were just beaten to a bloody pulp. It was 10:30 or 10:45 when they made the decision, and they had gone round and round. When they did the notice of decisions, and it is from the tapes and has to be transcribable, there was everything but storage. No fuel storage and no sale items, which she believes may have been the inference. They presumed boats would be sitting out there for sale. It was not articulated to the enth degree because when you are over tired you miss things, and in this particular instance they were taken advantage of. You would think someone would adhere to some standards, even if it wasn't in black and white. The premise is there, but there are no teeth in it.

T. Roy pointed out that it is a conditional approval. T. Hoopes asked if there was anything under appearance anymore. S. Penney said they have nuisance, health, health and safety they could invoke. S. Williams asked about landscaping aspect because there are still piles of stuff around. S. Penney said that the landscaping would be installed according to plan and maintained, and the plan does not call for any stationary boats or rusting hulks of metal.

T. Hoopes stated that he thinks the planting was reasonable. It's better than 90% of the ones he has seen. S. Penney agreed, but this is fourteen or fifteen months old now and the building should be done.

S. Penney said that they had as-builts. D. Hussey asked about engineer certification; S. Ames said they got as-builts. Again, this was because of the lateness of the meeting.

S. Williams said that they should do some kind of design ordinance this year. He doesn't begrudge the man having the storage building and it is the most frugal way to build it, but that building is an eyesore on the side of Route 11, in his opinion.

T. Hoopes stated that he and Tim (Roy) had discussed on the way to the Law Lecture Series having a pre-printed conditions of approval with potential ones if there is a possibility of approval that night, then leaving several blanks for additional ones that may come up for discussion. There are certain standard things that they sometimes forget about, whether it is electricity or whatever else, he thinks they are capable of mistakes.

W. Curtin mentioned that Jennifer used to do that, even while they were sitting there going over stuff.

S. Ames said she would give them a copy of what they did do, which she usually gave to the chairman. She has added some things; subsequent conditions. W. Curtin asked if, when they (the Planning Department) are reviewing something that is going to come before the Board, could they fill in as much of that as they can. S. Penney stated that she does that in the Planner Review; she tries to give them food for thought. They did have

the boilerplate before, but then they decided it was too laborious because they had to read through it. It was cut out, and they did it on a case by case basis.

T. Roy said that they learned in the Law Lecture Series that anything that is testified to is a condition. For example, using Ryan's case, when he said they were going to be single story, that's a condition. Everything doesn't have to be itemized in writing, but it helps. T. Hoopes said that if they testified that they would not have more than a certain number of boats or trailers outside, that becomes a condition.

There was discussion about adding something that states a condition of all other conditions discussed during the application process.

Incidental storage, as boats were transiting to/from storage was discussed; this was discussed as being allowed during the application process. T. Hoopes said there is no problem with 2 – 4 boats, but not all those trailers. He went on to say that if you are running a shed, you want to get the boats in the water and in and out as fast as possible. S. Penney stated that during the discussion there were at least two times when they were there that they talked about playing fair and not having an eyesore; everyone agreed and it appeared to be implicit.

D. Collier pointed out that he had not been part of the original discussion, but didn't the storage of trailers constitute a change of use? S. Penney felt that it could, after a certain amount of time. D. Collier said that he is storing stuff outside, and originally it was a boat storage facility, now he's talking about trailers outside. S. Penney felt that was a good point; after enough time elapses. There is some redress.

T. Hoopes asked about his other location; W. Curtin said he had given up the other location when he took on this one. T. Hoopes said he doesn't have another place to put his stuff. D. Collier said this whole approval was based on a boat storage facility; now we're talking about trailers on the exterior.

Discussion turned to boat storage in the parking lot at Minge Cove Marina. S. Williams said the parking area is full of shrink wrapped boats. This is an association he leases space from. There was more discussion concerning boat storage in the gravel pit; this is Ernie's. T. Hoopes said that land cannot be used because of the water table and the proximity to the town wells.

S. Penney went through correspondence and found the exception from the ZBA which says: "the language for the motion granting the special exception approval for boat storage states that the construction of the building satisfy the conditions and concerns of the Alton Fire Department to wit, no outside storage will be allowed within 50' of the building. Also, that there be no valet type storage at this facility. Board discussed that this is part of the approval from the ZBA, and he does not have 50 feet from the building to the lot line. T. Hoopes feels that the ZBA approval list is the target. S. Penney would like to have a conversation with him (Mr. Kiersted) and point all this out. The Board could revoke/rescind the approval; he has not come in for a final approval.

Board decided to approach Mr. Bailey and inform him that a condition is not being met and, according to what he is reading in the paper from Mrs. Fuller, they will do what needs to be done. The code enforcement officer is supposed to be doing enforcement on all conditions of planning stuff

S. Penney said she would bring this to Russ' attention.

T. Hoopes stated that the Board could send him a letter stating that the Planning Board is considering rescinding his application.

W. Curtin said they should talk to Russ and, worst case scenario, make a phone call to Andrew's Marine and state the fact that when they came before the Planning Board and went to the ZBA, one of the requirements that the ZBA had given, which falls down to the Planning Board, states that they are not to have any outside storage within 50' of the building.

S. Ames informed the Board that if the letter doesn't work, they need to come back to public hearing and the abutters have to be notified via certified mail. S. Williams asked who foots the bill; the Board does. S. Penney said she would need proper notice for certifieds for a public hearing. T. Hoopes asked if Russ can talk to him and explain exactly what the circumstances are, then if they don't hear within a certain amount of time, they will rescind. W. Curtin said he would not even involve Russ in it now; the Planning Office can make a phone call. S. Ames said it would have to be in a letter. Pictures were suggested. S. Penney said it was difficult now because of the season. S. Williams answered that it doesn't matter; there is to be no storage. There was discussion continuing about the fact that there would be boats in transit, but there should be no storage of equipment.

S. Williams excused himself at this point.

Minutes of September 15 were discussed briefly; copies were given to members who did not have them so they can be approved at the next meeting.

S. Penney stated that Mr. McGregor, who had been sold/traded one of Mr. Lundy's lots on Ridgewood – the monumentation still is not in. She was told of this in May, and again in June. The rebar has been cut for the pins but none of the lot corners have been staked. This isn't about the road; it is about owning a piece of property. T. Hoopes asked if they did need to be put in by a surveyor; other members and S. Penney stated that they do. S. Penney said that she has talked to Terry Fox and it has gone back and forth. Mr. McGregor is speaking to Mr. Hoover because Mr. McGregor wants to sell his lot but he can't because it has not been monumented. There was discussion of this being a problem because this isn't a subdivision until all the conditions are met. W. Curtin said he is the one that bought it; T. Hoopes asked how it could have been bought if the subdivision is not finalized and the conditions are not met yet? S. Penney said they may have traded parcels; T. Roy said it did not matter; it was still a conveyance of land. There was

continued discussion about how the land was conveyed, and that there were ongoing issues with this property. S. Penney said that this was FYI only.

W. Curtin asked about holding money; he recalled that money had been released a few months ago. S. Penney said they had not done anything he needed to do for his bond reductions. T. Hoopes asked if there were any building permits for the property; there are not. S. Penney explained that there is actually a letter of credit. D. Collier asked if something happens, and he doesn't do it, can they take care of it.

W. Curtin mentioned that Letters of Credit have expiration dates and they have to flag those dates. T. Hoopes said they had heard about this at the Law Lecture Series; when you have extensions you have to go back and check the dates of the bonds. T. Roy said to let the applicant set the date for their subdivision, then after that if they need an extension, you either give it to them or not.

S. Penney wanted her to run this by the Board. Owl's nest is in litigation, negotiation and mediation. Their lawyer called Jim and they are amenable to putting together a site plan, which was the whole problem. W. Curtin asked if they went through with the foreclosure on that; S. Penney did not know the particulars. Jim said that their lawyer wanted to know if, if they didn't have their septic plans quite ready for the next Planning Board meeting, how would the Board perceive that? S. Penney had answered that it depends – are they in failure, did they have test pits? It looks like they might have their septic approval in before the application, which makes Jim's concern moot. However, he has to carry and answer back to the other lawyer as to whether the Planning Board might be amenable if they don't have all their ducks in a row, but they would sign up for conditional approvals.

T. Hoopes asked what is there – it is a store and a few cabins. Right now it is seasonal and they are turning it into year round. S. Penney stated that this is lawyers wanting assurances before the fact about processes that haven't occurred, but it is the Board's prerogative to say whether or not they would be amenable. W. Curtin asked how the Board of Selectmen feels about it; S. Penney doesn't know because Jim asked her to ask them. T. Hoopes asked for clarification as to what they are looking for, and what the issue is with the timing. The timing is an issue because there are some court dates coming up. W. Curtin asked S. Penney to talk to Russ and make sure the Board of Selectmen are all on board with it. S. Penney said it was a good faith effort and it looks like it can be resolved. W. Curtin said to just say the Planning Board is willing to work with them. S. Penney continued to explain that this is theoretical; she will let them know that the Board is willing to work with them.

D. Collier asked a question pertaining back to the pervious subject. He asked W. Curtin if the Board could look into whether they could tap into the bond and take care of matters. W. Curtin said they could look into it, but they could not have someone put monumentation in. S. Penney stated that in her experience, that has never been done. D. Collier said that after that the next step would be to write a letter telling him they can do this, and that he needs to take care of it before they have to. T. Roy said that they could

just revoke the subdivision approval. There was discussion about the cistern; he didn't do what he was supposed to do so that still stands. This discussion continued.

S. Ames reminded the members that there is a conceptual meeting with Alton Bay Christian Conference Center at this location on October 6, 2009, at 6:00 p.m.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

T. Roy made a motion to adjourn; motion seconded by D. Collier and passed by unanimous vote of all members present.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Tetreau
Recorder, Public Session