

VERBATIM Minutes

Call to Order: at 6:40 p.m. by J. Dube, Chairman.

Members Present: Jeremy Dube-Chairman, Cynthia Balcius, Bruce Holmes, Jeanne Crouse, Bonnie Dunbar-Alternate, Jim Bureau-Alternate

Members Absent: Tom Hoopes, Wally Keniston, Cris Blackstone

Others Present: Monica Jerkins-Planning Assistant, and Carolyn Schaeffner-Recording Secretary

Appointment of Alternates: Bonnie Dunbar and Jim Bureau.

Approval of Agenda:

M. Jerkins – Any items we don't get to tonight will be continued until tomorrow and amendment #12 is the petition warrant article submitted by a citizen's group will be heard tomorrow evening after the other amendment items have been addressed.

Motion made by B. Holmes to approve the agenda, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 1: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 200, Definitions, by modifying the following definitions: *Seasonal Cabin; Dwelling – Single-Family Unit; Dwelling – Multi-Family Unit; and Frontage, Street;* and to add definitions for the following: *Corner Lot; Construction Trailer; Lot, Non-buildable; Trailer; and Upland.* Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to add language to clarify existing definitions and to add definitions for terms used in the Zoning Ordinance that were lacking definitions.

B. Dunbar – I have a problem with the dwelling unit issue. When I started to look at the rest of the ordinance. Multi-family, family, single-family is throughout the entire rest of the ordinance and unless the whole thing is re-written properly with it I think it is going to become more ambiguous than it is at the moment.

J. Dube – Where did that come from I think I was absent from that meeting.

B. Dunbar – Peer was coming up with it because I think the word family is “not enforceable” so our original dwelling single-family had the definition a detached residential building other than a manufactured home designed for and occupied by one family only and the word family can be so extensive now and construed different way and/ or attacked, that was not appropriate. I don't think that was the intent of the board to say only family members can be under one roof, it was just a unit, so I don't think it is really changing, our intent at all to leave family there, but I think to change to word family unit out of everyone of these right now without re-writing the whole ordinance would be kind of disastrous.

J. Dube – It makes sense to me. How does the rest of the board feel about that?

C. Balcius – I would agree with Bonnie on that. I had the same observation when I was reviewing it also.

VERBATIM Minutes

J. Bureau – Are you talking about the titles of each one or?

B. Dunbar – I think what you have to do is look at Amendment #1 and it is dealing with the definition here, which is in #2 under amendment #1.

J. Bureau – Keep it like dwelling single-family unit but the rest of the definition keep that where it is crossed out, keep that crossed out?

B. Dunbar – I think we should just ditch the entire change to the word dwelling unit for family.

J. Dube - #2 out of amendment #1 would be gone, right Bonnie?

B. Dunbar – Yes, I believe so.

J. Dube – That whole section would be gone.

B. Dunbar – It is too much of a conflict in the other areas.

J. Dube – Is there any other definitions? Does this come from Brian that we need a better definition on it?

B. Dunbar – It had to do with that fact that seasonal cabins when they were put into the zone for Lakeshore Residential to be allowed it was to basically allow the commercial businesses that were there, like the boys and girls camps and the seasonal rentals, it got confused with seasonal cabin or a definition what Brian Boyers at one point had wanted because people were saying “well I’ve got a seasonal cabin and this is allowed”, what is it? There wasn’t a real definition for it so they threw this definition at it and that wasn’t the real intent when seasonal cabin was allowed in the zone and it was really intended as a commercial zone and last year seasonal cabins got moved to the commercial rather than the dwelling residential units, so it really needs the commercial definition in the table of uses.

J. Dube – I was just wondering if it was an enforcement issue.

B. Dunbar – I don’t know where it came from.

B. Dunbar – Construction trailer was fine but the trailer starts “any vehicle or structure so designed and constructed in such a manner as will permit occupancy thereof as sleeping quarters”, I think you are going to run into a major problem here, because depending on where you are putting these trailers it may really be in violation of the particular zone.

J. Dube – They also go to repeat basically what a construction trailer is.

B. Dunbar – I don’t know where or why trailer came up.

VERBATIM Minutes

M. Jerkins – It was actually a little confusing the night this came up. Peer was here presenting because the board had asked for a number of items and he came prepared with a list and some suggestions and for the temporary storage unit section he had come up with a number of definitions and he had found them in different locations and they weren't all intended to be put into the definition. He wanted to provide you with an option of choices and in the confusion of the evening more than one definition got put in, but they don't necessarily all need to be there.

J. Dube – My idea would be to take trailer right out of there.

B. Dunbar – I think what we were trying to do was include the last sentence which is like this is specifically intended to include storage container pods and shipping containers, meaning those that are or are not on wheels at the moment.

J. Dube – That could be really brought up to the bottom of construction trailer to be added to that.

B. Dunbar – Would the board consider moving that last sentence up to construction trailer?

J. Bureau – I think that would make sense.

Motion made by B. Dunbar to take the last sentence in #6 specifically “this is specifically intended to include storage container, pods and steel shipping containers, and place it at the end of definition #5 construction trailer, seconded by B. Holmes.

C. Balcius – A construction trailer is totally a different thing than a storage container, pod, or steel-shipping container. On the trailer a storage container basically hitches up to a tractor-trailer and they drop it off, construction trailer is specific it is a portable thing for construction purposes; I don't think we can lump the two together like that.

J. Dube – The actual definition kind of lumps them together too.

B. Holmes – I think we are trying to deal with temporary trailers.

J. Dube – Where I have been, a construction trailer is a place where they set up temporary offices. I know the board was trying to work with storage.

C. Balcius – I know what the intent was but I think we need to have something separate.

Motion withdrawn by B. Dunbar.

B. Dunbar – It could read: any vehicle or structures so designed and constructed in such a manner for transportation or storage of goods, equipment and/or materials and so designed that I may be mounted on wheels and used as a conveyance on highways or streets propelled or drawn by other mode of power. This is specifically intended to include storage containers, pods, and steel shipping containers, **so moved by B. Dunbar that the definition be added**

VERBATIM Minutes

as #6 storage containers and the remainder of the language for trailer be deleted but add this as a new definition, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.

C. Balcius – Question on the non-buildable lot, I was not here for that and this seems to come around in a lot of different discussions.

M. Jerkins – This actually pertains to lots of record not new lots, that is why we included lot of record above it and the board just felt there need to be some sort of definition for a non-buildable lot of record but this is not pertaining to new lots being allowed.

B. Holmes –And you can't create a new non-buildable lot.

C. Balcius – That definition doesn't read that way. If you want this as a definition I would take out the last part of it "non-buildable lots are not required to meet the standards for frontage and must be clearly marked as non-buildable". You are defining what a non-buildable lot should be, I think you have it lot non-buildable you already have those on record which does not allow any structures, dwellings, or septic systems with the exception of allowable signs.

J. Dube – What did we need this for, was this an enforcement issue or..?

M. Jerkins – This is just an item the board came up with in our brainstorming session.

Motion made by C. Balcius to get rid of non-buildable lot, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with 5 in favor and one abstention.

Motion made by B. Holmes to take out #2 under Article #1, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.

C. Balcius – In the upland definition we refer to jurisdictional wetlands and I wanted to make sure we had that defined as inclusive of poorly drained and very poorly drained soils. If we have the jurisdictional wetlands it will be in there and then I am all set.

B. Dunbar – Does it jive with what you're dealing with here?

M. Jerkins – We could refer it to RSA 764.55 so we could say landforms other than jurisdictional wetlands, lakes, streams, and wetlands as defined in RSA. **So moved by C. Balcius, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

J. Dube – Open to the public

A. Sherwood – I couldn't hear what happened on the deposition of the definition of trailer was, I couldn't quite hear what the motion was.

B. Dunbar – We took out the word trailer and put storage container instead.

VERBATIM Minutes

M. Jerkins – We changed the definition to any vehicle or structures so designed and constructed in such a manner for transportation or storage of goods, equipment and/or materials and so designed that it may be mounted on wheels and used as a conveyance on highways or streets propelled or drawn by other mode of power. This is specifically intended to include storage containers, pods, and steel shipping containers.

A. Sherwood – I was thinking about the non-buildable lot definition and I guess I am not an advocate of trying to re-write a definition by committee at the last minute, so I think you did a good thing by deleting it. I think sometimes you will have a subdivision where you might want to have a certain parcel of land set aside and it might not have any frontage so it wouldn't be, i.e. Conservation area, and it might not meet our zoning requirements but you might want to create a separate lot and set it aside and this would allow you to do that, and maybe next year you might want to give that some thought but I can think of some uses in the subdivision process of that.

C. Balcius – I would agree and I think maybe that is what the intent was.

A. Sherwood – Contiguous road frontage – you added the phrase frontage distance shall be contiguous, by that I assume you mean if there is a 200' frontage requirement you want at least 200' to be contiguous but that if a lot had 600' of frontage that 600' could be non-contiguous as long as 200' was contiguous.

B. Dunbar – Would it be helpful to put the minimum frontage distance shall be contiguous.
So moved by C. Balcius and seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 2: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Section 412, Lakeshore Residential Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, to correct a formatting error carried over from the previous year's amendments by removing Section 412 A:1d and inserting Section 412 A:2 regarding the 150 foot road frontage requirement for non-waterfront lots, and also to add Section 412:F: *For all lots created after March 13, 2007, no more than 25% of the minimum lot requirement can be made up of jurisdictional wetlands (upland must be contiguous) and steep slopes – 25% or greater.* Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to protect and preserve wetland areas in the Lakeshore Residential Zone by creating contiguous land areas suitable for construction when new developments are proposed.

J. Crouse – First off it is not Section A it is Section B:1d that is being eliminated and is being made into Section B:2.

J. Dube – In your packets should be correspondence from Jim on what he got from all of the zoning amendments so the first paragraph addresses the actual wording in that sub-section. Jim forgot to put in steep slopes so Monica has something for the board to start with at least on that.

B. Dunbar – it could be re-worded the opposite way. Notice the bottom though where he says thus a 5-acre lot will have to have 1.75-acres $\frac{3}{4}$ of a 2-acre minimum is 1.5.

VERBATIM Minutes

M. Jerkins – What would happen is that we would add Section B:f All lots created after March 2007 must have a minimum buildable area made up of contiguous upland and slopes not greater than 25%, of no less than 75% of the minimum lot requirement for the zone.

J. Dube – The reasoning behind that is the intent of our ordinance was to have a dry acre and a half on a piece of land and as it reads now for a minimum lot size of a 2-acre lot you could have ½ -acre of wetland but as it reads 25% of the minimum.

B. Dunbar – Are the steep slopes included or excluded in that definition? Can you read that again?

M. Jerkins – All lots created after March 2007 must have a minimum buildable area made up of contiguous upland and slopes not greater than 25%, of no less than 75% of the minimum lot requirement for the zone.

J. Dube – It is included.

M. Jerkins – If the board is happy with that definition than we would need a motion to change what we had originally proposed and what was noticed to that definition. **So moved by J. Crouse and seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

J. Dube – Open to public, seeing none public input closed

Amendment # 3: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Section 433, Residential Zone – Restrictions Governing Use and Section 443, Residential Commercial Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, and Section 452, Rural Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, and Section 463, Residential Rural – Restrictions Governing Use, to add the following language to each of the above referenced subsections: *For all lots created after March 13, 2007, no more than 25% of the minimum lot requirement can be made up of jurisdictional wetlands (upland must be contiguous) and steep slopes – 25% or greater. Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to protect and preserve wetland areas in the Residential, Residential Commercial, Rural, and Residential Rural Zones by creating contiguous land areas suitable for construction when new developments are proposed.*

J. Dube –It is the same thing in a different zone and I recommend we make the same changes throughout this document.

Moved by J. Crouse to change to the definition as read by M. Jerkins for Amendment #3 10:G, 11:D, 12:F, and 13:E, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor

J. Dube – Open to public, seeing none public input closed

Amendment # 4:The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 300, Section 327, Setback Requirements, to add the following language regarding distance between structures: *A minimum of unobstructed 20 feet between structures. The Planning Board after consulting with the Fire Chief may prescribe standards greater than 20 feet to provide access for fire*

VERBATIM Minutes

department apparatus. Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to provide adequate means of unobstructed access to all sides of a building by rescue personnel and fire fighting apparatus by requiring a minimum distance between structures.

C. Balcius – How did this evolve?

B. Dunbar – It started out with dwellings on a single lot. We have condo units going in new, multi-family structures going in new yet all on a single common lot and thought it would be best to make a minimum distance that was appropriate that the Fire Chief was satisfied with, which he said was 20’.

C. Balcius – Does that mean those dwelling units can’t be attached they all have to be separated?

B. Dunbar – It is per structure.

B. Holmes – Did you read the note from Brian, the last line he has, this should be addressed under building regulations not under zoning.

Motion made by B. Holmes to take out Amendment #4, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with 5 in favor and 1 opposed.

J. Dube – open to public.

A. Sherwood – Where were you thinking of moving it to?

J. Dube – Into the RR Zone

A. Sherwood – your table of definitions defines a structure as anything constructed or erected or attached to a fixed location on the ground, so that could mean a lot of things and also if you just have a generic it also applies to site reviews as well as residential construction.

J. Dube – I will close public input.

Amendment # 5:The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 300, Section 329, Condominiums, to add language to clarify submission requirements for condominium conversions or new condominium constructions. Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to list submission requirements for applications for condominium developments.

J. Dube – This is what we would like to see and it is in writing now.

Motion made by C. Balcius that we adopt amendment #5 as submitted, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

VERBATIM Minutes

M. Jerkins – You didn't open that to public input and I was wondering if you shouldn't be doing that before you make the motion to adopt the amendment. Also you haven't adopted any of the others yet, you have made amendments to them but you haven't voted to adopt them.

B. Dunbar – We can't adopt them until they go to another public hearing.

J. Dube – I will open it to public, seeing none I will close public input.

M. Jerkins – Do you want to make a motion now to adopt that one, **so moved by C. Balcius, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.**

Amendment # 6: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Section 463, Residential Rural Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, to add the following language regarding the number of dwelling units allowed in the zone: No more than **one dwelling with no more than two four (2) (4) dwellings units** per lot are permitted without subdivision approval.
Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the number of units allowed in the Residential Rural Zone.

B. Dunbar – We are in trouble with the dwelling thing. Now that we have gotten rid of the word dwelling and we are back to our family units. I think this ought to be re-written. "The minimum lot shall be for a single-family unit 1-acre or put dwelling-single family: 1-acre". #2 I propose it should be "multi-family structures must have a minimum of 1-acre per unit, no more than four units per structure and no more than 1 multi-family dwelling structure per lot." #3 All other uses.

M. Jerkins – (reading back) –The minimum lot area shall be dwelling single-family 1-acre per single-family dwelling; 2. Multi-family dwellings must have a minimum of 1-acre per unit with no more than 4 dwelling units per structure and no more than 1 multi-family dwelling per lot.
Moved by B. Dunbar and seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

J. Dube – Open to public for input, seeing none public input is closed.

Amendment # 7: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 300, Section 327:B, Setback Requirements to add the following language to require the 25' wetlands buffer to also be shown on site plan submissions: For lots created after March 13, 2007, **and for all plans required under the Authority for Site Plan Review (RSA 674:43)**, buildings, driveways and structures, excluding septic systems shall conform to the following Wetland Buffer Requirements: Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to require the same wetland buffer to be shown on site plan submissions as is currently required on subdivision plans.

C. Balcius – I think the way it reads you are pulling in existing commercial lots of record that I think it would be an undo hardship to have that 25' buffer. I think we need to handle it in a way that the buffer can be applied during site plan review where possible. I think we need to be careful we are not allowing all new lots in subdivisions created after a date the ability to have a grandfathered lot not apply.

J. Dube – Do you have proposed wording for that?

VERBATIM Minutes

C. Balcius – What about in Site Plan Regulations.

M. Jerkins – So you are proposing to take this out and put it in the Site Plan Regulations?

C. Balcius – Yes

J. Dube – I will open it to public.

A. Sherwood – I think the way the zoning currently reads it applies for lots created after March 14, 2006 it applies for both residential and site plan reviews because it is in the generic part of the zoning and it says for all buildings and structures, everything that was a lot of record before that as it currently reads is exempt and every lot created after that requirements have to be met even if it is a commercial development. I think you don't have to do anything, just scratch it.

J. Dube – Public input closed.

Motion made by C. Balcius to scratch Amendment #7, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 8: The Planning Board proposes to add a section 336 to Article 300 to be titled *Temporary Storage Units* to regulate the use of various types of temporary buildings. Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to provide regulations for the use of temporary storage units.

M. Jerkins – We have not yet determined the section number that this would fall under, we are waiting for recommendation from Attorney Sessler, where it would fit best.

B. Dunbar – Re-title it to “Storage Containers”

B. Holmes – If you have a tractor trailer and bring it on site, you are using it for storage and it is a registered vehicle it is still a registered vehicle, which is it storage or vehicle, and how do you enforce it.

J. Dube – This says storage may be allowed upon a site where there is active construction of a building, why couldn't the Planning Board give approval for someone to have a storage trailer because there are places where you could have one that are a site plan where it isn't visually impacting.

Motion made by J. Dube to get rid of Amendment #8, seconded by J. Crouse.

J. Dube – I will open it to public.

A. Sherwood – This shouldn't be in the zoning, it should be in your site plan regulations because the real intent here was to deal with storage units that were related to an approved site plan as it reads it is in the general portion of the zoning and you don't define whether a site is in the zoning and this could be interpreted as you can't have a storage unit on your 15-acre farm

VERBATIM Minutes

without coming in for site plan approval. When you update your site regs. That is the place for it.

Reuben Wentworth – I have to agree I am glad that you tabled it because I have a business that has a tractor trailer unit that has shavings in it and it has been there for 12 years, if you start imposing regulations like this it does make hardship on some of the store owners.

J-Dube- I will close public

Move by J. Crouse to eliminate Amendment #8, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 9: The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Section 443, Residential Commercial Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, and Section 452, Rural Zone – Restrictions Governing Use, to add the following language regarding building size limits: ***No building used for retail or wholesale sales shall be greater than 25,000 square feet.***
Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to limit the size of new proposed retail or wholesale sales buildings in the above referenced zones.

M. Jerkins – There is correspondence from Attorney Sessler regarding this matter.

J. Dube – (reading letter into record) I have grave concerns about the proposal limiting new retail buildings to no more than 25,000 sq. ft. and work to overcome a challenge to this proposal the board have better have a very good health, safety, and general welfare basis for the proposal. A desire to protect existing businesses from competition is not a valid reason. The desire to maintain the rural character of the town can, under the right circumstances can be the basis for some reasonable restrictions but you need support from the Master Plan. You need to place the restrictions in those areas of the town that are truly rural; in character or have a significant rural character to protect and you need a solid rationale for the maximum size allowed. It is too bad that this proposal came up so suddenly I wish we had more time to review it. Jim

Reuben Wentworth – I believe if we let big box stores in it will hurt the character of the town. It does have impacts. It has impacts on schools and community as far as housing. You allow stores like this that pay low income than you have to start making uses for affordable housing, it adds to fire apparatus, the town has to spend more money to promote safety for fire apparatus, more men, full time stations, more police have to be hired when you start bringing in these larger retailers because you have more crime.

Bob Longabaugh – Alton has run four surveys since I have lived here and everyone asks what is important to you? At the top of the list it says rural character so I think that would be defensible, if that is what the community wants and certainly to keep the big box stores down to rural flavor and I hope you can find a way to do it.

A. Sherwood – There are some aspects that Jim Sessler said that you have to pay attention to that the number shouldn't be arbitrarily or picked and it would be good if there was some basis

VERBATIM Minutes

for it like what the fire department can deal with and what the police department can deal with. I don't know if you had assistance from them or not but I think you should try to get some help from them and get some factual material to back this up, otherwise it looks like it is an arbitrary number that was picked and that is what you can get in trouble with. You should get some information from police and fire in terms of structure sizes in what they can handle.

J. Dube – I will close public input

J. Crouse – I think if we try to re-design, re-word #19E & 20E both of which no building used for retail or wholesale sales shall be greater than 25,000 sq. ft and include in it a sentence to encompass the fact that maybe 25,000 sq. ft. isn't the right number if Hannaford's is 39,000 sq. ft. plus the bank which would put it down to 34,000 sq. ft. that it should be harmonious with the existing rural character of the buildings in the area and have something in there otherwise I do believe it is better to have something in there in the event box store developers will be coming to town than to have nothing.

B. Dunbar – I think the issue is really design and that is what we were trying to deal with in the Land Use Chapter where the design section ended up, we talked about not having box stores and making large buildings in the design of big house, little house, back house, barn I think that has more to do with it than the actual square footage of a building. I don't see any basis for this at all.

C. Balcius – You are limiting retail and wholesale sales, there are ways to do this.

Reuben Wentworth – It is to protect this community, we are saying just do it within 25,000 sq. ft.

B. Dunbar – I could support a 40,000 sq. ft building but I think that 25,000 sq. ft. is too low.

C. Balcius – During site plan review Fire and police work out issue with the applicant.

Reuben Wentworth – Please consider this again and I know what the town attorney said but a lot of times towns they have not always gone with the attorney's recommendation.

J. Dube –Public input closed

J. Crouse – I wasn't part of the Planning Board when Hannaford's went through what did the fire department say about the building, do they feel they can handle it.

C. Balcius – Yes, they had a cistern set up and the whole circle had an issue with fire safety and Hannaford's as part of the project put in a dry hydrant in front of the motel over and above to help protect the other buildings that were already in the circle that weren't protected. There is not enough pressure in the town's water mains.

J. Dube – I feel we need a size in place and I feel the rules need to be followed.

C. Balcius – It sounded to me that you have a predisposed bias.

VERBATIM Minutes

J. Dube – That wasn't my intent.

J. Crouse – Have it no bigger than Hannaford's and there you have set you precedent and that it will be design in harmony with the rural character of the zone.

J. Dube -If we have something in there that says it has to fit we would at least have a foundation for it.

B. Dunbar – I think you could take out the word retail and wholesale sales and make it all buildings and put it at 40,000sq. ft.

B. Holmes – I think it is appropriate to size the building whether it is retail or wholesale it doesn't matter but if you are going to protect the rural land you need to start with the rural zone. Maybe this whole thing should be out off a year.

M. Jerkins – As far as fire safety and other safety concerns those are all items that are addressed in any site plan review regardless of the size of the building.

J. Bureau – If you do allow buildings will that apply to schools as well?

C. Balcius – Schools don't undergo site plan review

J. Crouse – I agree that it needs a lot of thought for the future I would feel better if there was something in there right now to get us to next year because right now there is nothing.

C. Balcius – something ambiguous can be put in but you don't want an applicant to get caught into the ambiguity of having something barely for 12 months.

B. Holmes – you could put Amendment #9 in as is and address it next year.

B. Dunbar – you might be able to put "no building for retail business and service shall be greater than 40,000 sq. ft." I say that because you could have a riding ring that gets up to 40,000 sq. ft pretty quick.

C. Balcius – I haven't heard solid reasoning for anything.

J. Dube – Would the board like to open it to public one more time?

Board – Yes

Stephen Bell – You already have a 40,000sq. ft. building in place, you claim that the fire department can handle that, the police department can deal with it, the road agent, etc. Does that max them out? Does anyone know if they can handle anything greater than that, or is that it? I think what you need to do is find out what can they handle at this point right now and if they feel this is all they can handle what we have for Hannaford's than that is it. If you are

VERBATIM Minutes

looking for a reason there you have it the departments are maxed out and you are putting an impact on all of the residence of Alton tax wise. I think we should hold it at what we have to support our community.

J. Crouse – Is it possible to word it that no building size greater than the town services can accommodate.

M. Jerkins – That is covered in our site review processes.

Reuben Wentworth – No one knows what is going to come in this community down the road it is whether or not what we need to protect our community on and to find out if there is a need for it.

A. Sherwood – Tomorrow night will be the last night for you to make changes.

Motion made by B. Holmes to continue Amendment #9 until December 28, 2006, seconded by J. Crouse. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 10:The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 400, Section 401, Table of Uses, to replace the word “family” with the word “unit” in the Residential Uses section.

Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to use language throughout the table of uses that is consistent with the proposed modification in the definitions as described in proposed amendment # 1.

J. Dube – Public input, seeing none public input closed.

Motion made by J. Crouse to eliminate Amendment #10 because the definitions have been eliminated that accompanied it, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Amendment # 11:The Planning Board proposes to amend Article 300, Section 380, Impact Fees. Rationale: The purpose of this amendment is to strengthen the current impact fees ordinance.

Motion made by J. Crouse to continue Amendment #11 until December 28, 2006, seconded by B. Holmes. Motion passed with all in favor.

Motion made by J. Crouse to adjourn, seconded by C. Balcius. Motion passed with all in favor.