

Town of Warner
Town of Warner Planning Board



Meeting Minutes

June 3, 2019

7:00 PM Warner Town Hall Lower Level

1. OPEN MEETING and ROLL CALL

Present:

Andy Bodnarik James Gaffney Clyde Carson (Board of Selectmen representative)
Ben Frost (Chair) Don Hall (Vice Chair) Romeo Dubreuil (alternate) Ben Inman

Absent:

Peter Anderson

In Peter Anderson's absence, Ben Frost appointed Romeo Dubreuil as a voting member.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

May 6, 2019

Motion to approve minutes, as amended, by **Andy Bodnarik**, Second by **Don Hall**.
Approved 7-0

3. NEW BUSINESS:

I. PUBLIC HEARING on proposed change to the definition of ABUTTER in subdivision and site plan regulations:

Ben Frost: This change is being proposed to make the Planning Board's definition of abutter in agreement with the zoning board's definition which was recently adopted by the Town, at Town meeting.

The zoning ordinance change adopted by Town meeting this year essentially mirrors the statutory definition. If the definition changes, our definition of abutter will also change to be consistent. The current definition in the site plan review and the subdivision documents is as follows, and includes the 200 feet for an abutter. The effect of the proposed change is relatively minor except that the current definition in site plan and sub division regulations includes properties within 200 feet of the subject property's boundary and the state's definition does not. The planning board decided to put this forward, and to change our regulations; we first need to hold a public hearing. After the hearing, the board will decide what it wants to do.

Clyde Carson: The site plan review abutter list definition right now would include more properties than the statute? And we are allowed to do that?

Ben Frost: Yes. The purpose of the abutter definition is to identify the owners of properties who warrant formal notification of proceedings before the planning board for site plan review (which is non-residential development, commercial and multi-family residential development) or sub-division of land, which is for subdivision, residential, industrial or commercial.

And for whatever reason the town has had on the books, and the planning board has in their regulation this definition, which is more expansive than what is required by statute. The zoning ordinance was changed to match what is in the statute.

Open the Public Hearing to the two changes: 1)Site Plan Regulation and 2)Subdivision regulation.

Nancy Martin: I am chair of the Warner Conservation Commission. I need further clarification. We invited Ben to a Conservation Commission meeting several months ago because we had heard from other towns in the Lake Sunapee region because they had asked to have their conservation commissions included on their application to the planning board so that people who applied to the planning board for a site change would know that they also needed to notice the conservation commission. The reason for this is because in a couple of the towns in our region, people had gone ahead and done things to parcels that had a conservation easement but the conservation easement was old enough that the people in the town had forgotten about it. There were subdivisions and buildings put on parcels with conservation easements or restrictions on the land. We want to be sure that we are notified to let us know when someone proposed to do something so we can have some oversight of whether the property has some sort of easement. We had one just today; someone had come to the town asking to put a 16 x 30 building on a piece of land that has a conservation easement. If it were not for Mary's extensive knowledge in the office, we would not have known that. Would we get notified now through your application process?

Ben Frost: Not through this change of definition. At least now the Conservation commission is getting the agendas for the Planning Board. The purpose of the abutter notification is to send certified/return receipt requested mail notice to the owners of a property regarding the potential for a proposed development to somehow impact their property as an abutter. My personal opinion is that the conservation commission does not need certified mail, but should get notice so that you can comment and inform us of your views. Is getting the agenda sufficient?

Nancy Martin: I think so. I just need to change the way I have done this before because I have not been paying that much attention, and today was a good example.

Ben Frost: For now, we will send the agenda, and if the Conservation Commission identifies a need for a higher level of notice, the Planning Board can consider that. That is my view, and I am not speaking for the board.

Andy: Does the last section cover that?

"In addition to abutters, please include the names and addresses of the applicant, owner(s) of the subject property, and, as applicable, the owners' agent, engineer, land surveyor, architect, soil scientist, wetland scientist, and holders of conservation, preservation, or agricultural preservation restrictions."

Ben Frost: That does partly cover it but there may be circumstances where the conservation interest has knowledge of a property that is not addressed through an easement that exists on the property. The Planning Board would serve to benefit from having that information.

James Gaffney: My question revolves around, what is the authoritative record for conservation easements?

Romeo Dubreuil: Registry of Deeds.

James Gaffney: So, if there is nothing on the deed?

Ben Frost: You might have a deed for the transfer of property and a subsequently recorded easement that does not appear in the deed but it nonetheless applies to the property.

James Gaffney: So if someone asks for a copy of the deed, that information should carry along with it.

Ben Frost: You would have to do a grantor/grantee search of that property to identify any subsequent recording instruments. It would not show up on the deed itself necessarily unless that easement is part of the transfer of property from one owner to another. We are in the middle of a public hearing, so let's make sure there are no other public comments, and then we can move into deliberation.

Ben Frost: Any other comments? Hearing no other comment, I close the public hearing and move it back to the board.

James Gaffney: I struggle with the question of what the authoritative record is for these circumstances. It concerns me that a property owner could seemingly get into a situation where they may own a piece of property, may be the legal owner, without somehow being aware of the historical easement.

Ben Frost: That is possible. But we cannot change that with this change to the definition of abutter.

James Gaffney: Where do we stop with persons that we notify for an application? I can make an argument that we notify, I'm saying this for the benefit of us and everyone, I can make an argument that there is a valid interest in informally, via email (not certified mail), notify another town entity, a committee within the town. I think there is also valid interest in us being more open than less. I actually like/prefer the way we have done this in the past, that we are notifying more people than is required by statute. Dead ends and cul-de-sacs are a great example of that.

Ben Frost: I understand. We can always notify more people. We cannot legally notify fewer than the statute requires without having our decisions challenged.

Don Hall: I think we need to be cautious. I know there has been a lot of talk, and not all pleasant talk, about the Conservation Commission, and some of the others about how they are doing things; they are becoming very forceful, and I don't think it is appropriate at this time, for the Planning Board to be some type of a policing system for the Conservation Commission.

Ben Frost: I was just suggesting that we let the Conservation Commission know what is on the agenda. It is not formal notice of hearings.

Don Hall: It needs to be controlled; we don't need to tell them everything, I don't feel.

Ben Frost: I disagree. We are a public body.

Don Hall: I think we are digging a big hole. That is ok; we have dug big holes before. There has been a lot of discussion about what they are trying to do, and what they have done. It comes under scrutiny in some areas, and I think we need to be careful and not forcefully throw ourselves out there and give them more power.

Ben Frost: The Conservation Commission is not part of this. The only question we have before us, for action, is whether we want to change the definition of abutter in site plan regulations and subdivision regulations from what exists to something else that matches what is already in the zoning ordinance. I like the idea of consistency among zoning ordinance, site plan regulations, and subdivision regulations for notice. Let's say a resident goes to the ZBA for a variance and they get a list of properties that meets the abutter definition under the Zoning Ordinance. They identify who the owners are of those properties. And they give that land to the

land use office. Then the notices are generated. Sometime later, that same applicant comes to the Planning Board for a subdivision. The owners of the abutting properties might have changed, but the properties themselves should be the same. And then that applicant coming to the planning is required to check the accuracy of ownership for purposes of notice. And then it is up to the board to verify that the list is correct. It is the owner's entire responsibility to identify who gets noticed. It is the applicant's liability to make sure it is accurate; not the Town's. If there are two separate definitions of abutter, then they are going to be two entirely different lists of properties that get noticed. That does not sit right with me.

Andy Bodnarik: I would like to make a counter to that. I think the more expansive definition we have currently in the site plan review and subdivision it just takes the existing requirement where the statement in the RSA is, "the term "abutter" shall include any person who is able to demonstrate that his land will be directly affected by the proposal under consideration. For the purposes of receiving testimony only, and not for purposes of notification, the term "abutter" shall include any person who is able to demonstrate that his land will be directly affected by the proposal under consideration" If you look at number three in the bottom part, I would argue that anyone who has frontage on a pond, where another property with frontage on that same pond as the property to be altered, that person automatically should have that standing as an abutter under both definitions. I would think that number three is a clarification, not necessarily an expansion, to the statement in the RSA.

Ben Frost: Just recognize that the statutory definition and the zoning definition read, "any person whose property is located in New Hampshire," so we don't have to deal with that because we are not a border town, "and adjoins or is directly across the street or stream," which I construe to be a body of water, "from the land under consideration by the local land used board." "For the purposes of receiving testimony only, and not for the purposes of notification, it shall also include anyone who is able to demonstrate that their property is being impacted."

It is up to the individual who feels that he/she is being impacted, that their property is impacted, to come before the board and say, "I feel you should treat me as an abutter because I live 500 feet from this, I live on a dead end road, and I have to drive by this twice a day, every day." That is a question of fact for the board to consider, and it is a question of law for a reviewing trial court to consider. My experience with this board is that we allow people to talk, regardless of whether they are abutters. The shooting range is an example of that; anyone who wanted to talk could talk, and it does not mean they are an abutter. It does not mean that they have standing to appeal, but give people an opportunity to talk, and even if they don't like the decision, they will feel better about the process.

James Gaffney: My concern is that the change shifts the burden to someone who is technically not, by statute, an abutter, but currently would be included in the abutter's list for notification. In other words, it is instead of the Planning Board and applicant notifying, as part of the process, the person that lives in some proximity, but not within the technical definition of abutter, would then be forced to pay attention more to postings on the Town. The Town's website has been less than perfect in its timely presentation of agendas. And not exactly as friendly as it could be, and as easy as it could be for a person to go from board to board to board, week after week after week, looking for things that may impact them as a property owner.

Clyde Carson: I like the perspective of consistency. As a person who is trying to deal with the various land use boards, to look at a common definition across boards. Before we voted the new definition of abutter for zoning ordinance, were we consistent between the two boards?

Andy Bodnarik: This issue was raised during the process of recommending the statutory definition. The problem is that a lot of time was spent on the definition in the site plan review and subdivision regulations, before any discussion was held on the abutter definition and statute.

Clyde Carson: If we were consistent before we made the change, and the town thought it was OK to adopt the new definition of abutter, I think there may be some argument that says maybe we should go to be for consistency sake and bring things back to the status quo, adopt the same definition for both zoning ordinance

and the site plan reviews. It is consistent with where we were before and bring us back to where we have that same situation.

Ben Frost: To answer your question Clyde, the zoning ordinance did not define abutter, so, therefore, it relied on the statutory definition. So the zoning ordinance on the one hand, and the site plan regulation and subdivision regulations were not consistent. The definition that town meeting adopted is the statutory definition, meaning there actually was no change in the zoning ordinance. It perpetuated the existing definition which was, and is, the statutory definition. The only change was to include the word, "abutter" and to refer to the statue. The ZBA was already doing that.

Andy Bodnarik: They had to, by law. I was looking at the checklist that we hand out to people and it is part of the regulations in the back. If you look at the site plan review regulations on page 37, AI, and the items to be submitted with application, there is a little d and has a list of names and addresses, of abutters, and the list goes on. Then it refers to definitions in RSA 676:4.I b, that I am assuming that has to subsumed somewhere.

Ben Frost: RSA 676:4:I.b is known as the Board's Procedure on Plats, and it is how the Planning Board is supposed to handle applications that come before it. And that refers either explicitly or implicitly back to the statutory definition of abutter.

Andy Bodnarik: Where I was going with this is that it talks to the holders of conservation preservation restrictions and I know that there is an issue because it may not be known because it is not attached to the deed, and without additional research you would not necessarily know it. That is the problem.

Ben Frost: That issue should be in the practice of anyone appearing before the board with a subdivision or site plan review application, to include those owners of such interests because it is the statutory definition. We cannot do less than that. If they fail to do that, then they are at risk of having their decision voided by a reviewing court upon assertion by an owner of a conservation easement that they did not get the proper notice, and they did not get due process of law, under the constitution. It is up to the applicant to come up with the right list.

Ben Inman: I like consistency if they have to go from the ZBA to the planning board.

Romeo Dubreuil: Having it consistent is kind of critical. As soon as you get different verbiage, it falls into interpretation discussions.

Ben Frost: How about a straw poll? 6 yes.

Andy Gaffney: Do we have to vote on this tonight? Or can we wait and have people cogitate on it?

Ben Frost: Is the board OK with waiting until next month? The hearing has been conducted and closed. We will delay the decision until our regular July meeting.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICATION for SITE PLAN REVIEW:

Applicant:	Trunnels, LLC.
Applicant Address:	22 Danny Boy Lane, Warner, NH 03278
Property Owner:	ARD Kansas City St Realty LLC
Owner Address:	10139 Kansas City St., Port Charlotte, FL 33981

Property Address: 29 Depot Street in Warner, Kearsarge Oil Building, Old Freight Building for the Concord Claremont Railroad.
Agent Name: Vince Collins
Map 32 Lot 002-01 **Zoning District C-1**
Proposed Use: Beverage Manufacturer of craft beer and other non-alcoholic beverages, and tasting room; 1 to 7 barrel system (1 barrel = 30 gallons) under a beverage manufacturer license from the State of New Hampshire, starting with a 1 barrel system.

Vince Collins: We are hopeful to build another community center for Warner: a place to share your stories. We are not opening a bar. We are opening a brewery with tastings. One sample per person, per label, per day. The hope is that they will take a four pack, or growlers, or whatever home. We are not interested in staying open late. We will be open mid-afternoon to early evening. Our goal is to distribute to the small area around Warner, but really it is about the community.

Darryl Parker introduced himself as an investor in the project.

James Gaffney: I have a question about proposed use. In reading this, “other non-alcoholic” beverages. It implies that craft bear is non-alcoholic.

Darryl Parker: My mistake.

Vince: The intention is to have cold brewed coffee. We should consider re-writing it.

Ben Frost; My recollection is that you will start with cold brewed coffee.

Vince: We are finding that there are rules, department of health, food vs. beer. It will take up to five months to get approval to serve alcohol.

Ben Frost opened the public hearing, asked for anyone to speak, and then closed the public hearing.

Ben Frost: We first need to accept the application for consideration. They are not proposing any exterior modifications except for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access and signage.

Clyde Caron: Motion to accept the application.

Romeo Dubreuil: Second

Accepted: 7-0

Ben Frost inquired about the Warner Power buildings being listed as Walker and asked to have the current owners, on both sides, listed on the plan. Ben also asked about snow removal, the black tank in the back, and about handicapped access. He also said that the dumpster needs to be screened, and that the ramp needs a 5x5 platform and 3% grade. Additionally, Ben asked that the 100year flood zone be labeled, inquired about the disposition of the tank, and asked for a label on map 10 lot 38, the Riverside Park.

Vince Collins responded that they are proposing the snow be pushed back, and the black tank is an empty oil tank, on a concrete slab, that they will not use but will leave in place until they purchase the building. They are looking at the cost of a chairlift and said that their goal is to meet the needs of ADA. The staircase is rotting and will be replaced. The owner is going to reassess in five years, and at that point he would remove the tanks, so that another oil company could not buy the building with the tanks. They are all above ground.

Ben Frost suggested that for their own purposes, an additional general note be added, #6 This plan depicts an existing legally non-conforming building. And under the details of the bottom right hand corner, the label should be ARD.

Ben Frost noted that the label should be map 32, lot 2 which he verified that with the tax maps. It is the David Rollins Property.

Andy Bodnarik asked about the Dana Lord property.

Darryl: It was within 200 feet of the property line. I made that call. I did talk to him Friday night and he was all for it.

Andy Bodnarik asked for details on the signage and if it will be illuminated. Andy also asked for more information about the acronym terminology for the tanks in the picture.

Vince responded that the signs will be down-lit and they are the same size and shape as the previous sign. Vince Collins: HLT is hot liquor tank is where you heat the water. MT is mash tent where the grain and water are combined. BK is Boil Kennel where we boil the brew. There is a glycol liquid tank. FV are fermentation vessels where we turn it into beer.

Andy Bodnarik: I see 564/4 sf and that does not make any sense.

Ben Frost: That is the size of the room.

Andy Bodnarik: You mentioned there will be a fire suppression system for grain room and dry storage?

Vince Collins: We still need to talk to the fire department.

Andy Bodnarik: I saw the letter from the Warner Village Water District about the storage. You mention that you will have some solids mitigation?

Vince Collins: You will see the design submitted to the water district. There are two large tanks into which we will drain everything. Then we let it settle, and then off the water to the next tank. We then dump the solids, not down the drain. And we need to adjust the PH level. The water goes to the next, and then you dump the solids, and adjust the water to an acceptable.

Andy Bodnarik: Do you remove the water before you dump them? Or do you dump them wet? And if so, where will you dump?

Vince: We are looking at farms. We spoke to Yankee and he is interested. This would also be for the grain. The grain will definitely go to a farm but we don't know if they would be interested in taking the residual solvents. We may have to dump some in the town, but it will not be a lot.

Andy: You mention a lot of chemicals, PDW.

Vince: I printed out all the chemicals we are using. None of the breweries are required.

Andy: We are talking about acid and detergent mixtures. We would like to have a copy on record.

Clyde: In terms of what would be the proposed hours of operation?

Ben Frost: Hours for brewing and open to the public.

Vince suggests that the open hours will be Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Friday, Saturday, Sunday 8 am – 10pm.

Don Hall: I have a couple of questions. You should contact the highway department to be sure that drainage is adequate. On the west side of that building, there are two 250 gallon propane tanks. Are they staying? If yes, then they need to be protected.

Vince: We plan to have them moved out.

Ben Frost: On the East side of the building, there is an exterior light indicated. Are those existing?

Vince Collins: Yes.

Ben Frost; So there are three exterior lights on the building?

Vince Collins: Yes.

Ben Frost; My recollection is that the area is fairly well illuminated. I am thinking people walking going to their cars.

Don Hall: There is also a cable buried, it is dead.

Andy Bodnarik: Don't push the snow into the river, it will get you in trouble.

Ben Frost: Conditions:

1. Screening of dumpster
2. Submit ADA compliant ramp or lift for planning board records.
3. Clarification of 100 flood zone line.
4. Written confirmation from fire chief of satisfaction of fire code requirement, and submission of materials list.
5. Sign off by DPW regarding road access and drainage.
6. Relocation of propane tank, in the form of As-built to show us where they are.
7. Specification of hours, daily not later than 10pm.
8. Add note #6 under general notes: This plan depicts (from above.)

James: Do you want to limit it to that? It is a commercial zone. If I were in your shoes, I would not want to limit it. You may want to be open for another day.

Don Hall: Festival weekend?

James: ADA compliant ramp. Does the PB care about the design as long as it is ADA approved?

Ben Frost: That is up to the board. Look at what is there now, you can only improve it.

James Gaffney: It makes it easier for the planning board to make a conditional approval.

Romeo: Is the Planning Board the authority on egress?

Ben Frost: It is the Planning Board initially.

Romeo: Is that the norm to ask for egress at the PB level?

Ben Frost: Yes it is on the outside of the building. On the inside, it is the building inspector.

James Gaffney: And in this case, we are dealing with a former home heating oil site.

Motion to approve the plan by James Gaffney, Second by Don Hall.

Ben Frost: Generally, it is 60 days, but it can be longer.

Darryl: We need to get the federal TTB approval first. We can be under lease, and not be able to do business. 90 days and we will let you know where we are.

Approved, 7-0

Darryl: The TTB has a form that needs to be approve by the town. To Whom do we submit that?

Close the Public hearing.

ACTION: Approve/Deny or Continue Meeting/Public Hearing

PUBLIC HEARING - SITE PLAN REVIEW (continued from March 4, 2019)

Applicant: MadgeTech, Inc.
Property Owners: Warner Road Holdings, LLC
Agent: Erin Lambert, PE, Wilcox & Barton, Inc.
Street address of property: 6 Warner Road, Warner, NH
Map 3, Lot 34, Zoning District C-1

Description: Site Plan Review for proposed construction of 5,883 sf addition to the existing MadgeTech, Inc. building. The proposed site plan will include construction of new parking spaces, storm water controls, sidewalks and patio.

List of conditions from April 2019 meeting:

- An as-built, in particular for the sprinkler tank
- Remove the fence from the plan.
- Sign detail that is on the building
- Written confirmation from Fire Chief, that he is OK with building access.
- Bio retention detail
- Escrow for inspection. \$250.00 check for inspections.
- Catch Basin – already on the plan.

Ben Frost: Because they have not built anything, it is premature for an as-built. The fence appears to be gone.

Andy Bodnarik: Except for LA 100, landscape plan.

Ben Frost: It is the site plan that governs, but the landscape plan should be consistent. Diane let Erin know that should be modified. Sign detail on the building. The elevation view, I am not always sure which way this building faces.

Ben Inman: It faces north, as indicated by the north arrow on the plan.

Ben Frost: The Sign is showing on the front of the building, with the MadgeTech symbol. Written communication from Fire Chief, we got that.

Erin Lambert: I spoke with him. There is a letter from April 8 that he just needs to see the sprinkler details. He is fine with everything with the site, the internal exit signs have been submitted to him. I have an email that he wanted to see the fire suppression system.

Ben Frost: In the absence of written communication between Erin and the fire chief, a conversation with Diane, that she can document, is sufficient.

Ben Frost: Bio retention detail?

Ben Inman: It is in there on C5.2.

Don Hall: That still shows the cupola at 45. I thought you were lowering it to the top?

Erin: I can check with the architect. I thought all the elevations were updated to be in conformance.

Andy Bodnarick: It is on AC 201 on the left hand side, it says 45 feet, zero inches, to the peak from the ground.

Ben Frost: What did we say before? Forty feet? Is it building or zoning? Building Height.

Andy Bodnarik: In my previous notes it has show tower height as 44 feet 10 inches, from the April 1 discussion. And it should be on A 201. And A 201 shows 45 feet even.

Ben Frost: Article IV of the Zoning Ordinance, General Provisions, I.

Height Regulations: No structure shall exceed 35 feet in height except 45 feet in height is allowed in the C-1 and B-1 Districts.

Don Hall: It is also a rule in Warner that the tallest part shall not exceed the tallest ladder that the fire department has. And we always went by the 35 foot because that is the tallest ground ladder that the department owned. Thirty-five is a code enforcement that has always been levied. It is something we had always done in years past.

Ben Frost: I don't think that is something we can enforce because the Zoning Ordinance says 45. Check with the building inspector. I understand what Don is saying, and I would not be surprised. I think we are done, other than the as-built when you are done. Check has been received.

Don Hall: That has been a rule for years, but if someone does not have to follow it, then that is something else.

James Gaffney: I had a question about signage. Our ordinance says a free standing sign shall not exceed fifteen feet. Building mounted signs shall be below the eave of a hip, gambrel, or other pitched roof building, or below the main roof deck line of a building with a mansard roof. I am asking the questions, does the sign on the front of this building comply with that?

Andy Bodnarik: It is below the deck line on the roof that is shown on the drawing. There are two deck lines shown.

Ben Inman: That is the existing and the proposed.

Ben Frost: I think the purpose of that is not to have signs going above the roofline (like the liquor store), over which we have no control. I would like to know how the Plymouth Planning Board got the liquor commission to comply with their sign ordinance. Take a look at the new liquor store on Ragged Mountain Highway; the signs are small.

James Gaffney: Does the sign comply with our maximum size?

Planning Board APPROVED Minutes June 3, 2019

Andy Bodnarik: The sign is 25sf. $\frac{1}{2} \times 10 \times 5.5 \times 5 = 25$. 10 feet on the bottom, and five feet on the angle.

Ben Inman: In the notes it says it is 25sf.

James Gaffney: This is commercial C-1.

Andy: Commercial C-1 is 32sf.

James: Is that the only sign on the building? Do you know? And it needs to go to the board of selectmen.

Erin: It is already there.

Ben Frost: The sign on the road is pre-approved. It was moved from one side of the driveway to the other, but it is the same sign. This does need to go to the BOS for a sign permit. Anything else? With the exception of the as-built, once it is done, you have met all the conditions. There is no time limit on this.

Motion to approve the plan as final with the condition that an as-built sign is submitted when it is complete by **Clyde**. Second by **Ben Inman**.

Approved 7-0

4. OLD BUSINESS

5. COMMUNICATIONS

Communication with Olde Windows Restorers regarding move into old fire station.

Ben Frost: May 10, Board of Selectmen meeting minutes have a question by Judy Newman-Rogers asking if the decision is binding regarding the Olde windows Restorers. I send an email to her that, yes, it is binding. The Planning Board's decision is the force of law. If there are conditions that the Board of Selectmen want to put in the lease, they should put them in there. Enforcement by the planning board requires the assistance of the Board of Selectmen because we are not an enforcement body. We look to conditions of the approvals we make, and If something goes wrong with a project, we have the power to revoke our decision, which is a fairly heavy enforcement mechanism. Generally speaking, enforcement is from the Board of Selectmen.

James Gaffney: Do you know what was the context of Judy's question?

Clyde; I think she is just not familiar with the Planning Board process.

Ben Frost: The May 7 Board of Selectmen minutes this is just all just FYI for all of us.

Andy BodnariK: It would be helpful for me if the minutes state old fire station because they are both on Main Street.

Clyde: The lease has been signed, and Olde Windows Restorers have moved into the old fire station.

Ben Frost: Is that a lease/purchase or a lease?

Clyde: It is a lease that can be renewed one more time in a year.

Ben Frost: Don reminded me that if the Board of Selectmen chooses to dispose of the property, you have to go to the process of notifying the Planning Board.

CIP Discussion/Plan

Ben Frost; I plan to revise the form and send out to department heads to be returned in August, and have a workshop in August. Then ask Dept heads to come to our September meeting. Approval would be in October so that the budget committee has a document to work with. If we were to adopt the CIP in the first meeting in October, that would be consistent with previous years.

Clyde Carson: From the Board of Selectmen's perspective, we will be looking for a lot of guidance from the Planning Board this year.

6. REPORTS

I. Chair's Report – Ben Frost

Ben Frost: Wonderful story about Barbara Annis in the Concord Monitor.

Clyde Carson: The Governor will come to the town for the ceremony.

Andy Bodnarik: Will there be a special sign?

Clyde: The bill, as written, will have a sign on the round-about. I have to meet with the DOT about type of sign.

II. Board of Selectmen – Clyde Carson

June 19. At 6pm, at the Kearsarge Regional Middle School a forum will be held on school funding by the two men who litigated the Clairmont case. It is meant to create awareness and education funding.

Diane will send a reminder.

III. Regional Planning Commission – Ben Inman. We have a meeting next Thursday.

IV. EDAC – James Gaffney. Have not been to a meeting.

ADJOURN 8:47pm