

PLANNING BOARD

Monday, August 22, 2005
Belmont Corner Meeting House
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Chairman P. Harris; J. Pike, G. Flack, W. Peterson, C. Patten and J. Marden.
Members Absent: R. Caldwell.
Alternates Present: C. Shibles (7:05).
Alternates Absent: C. Gilbert.
Staff: C. Daigle, R. Ball and E. Murphy.

The chairman opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and explained that 234 Railroad Avenue, LLC has withdrawn their application. He also noted that BBE Realty, LLC application will be tabled until September 26, 2005.

PLAN SUBMISSION MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING – WILLIAM PERRIER REV. TRUST:

Request for subdivision approval to subdivide one lot into two. Property is located at 155 Gilmanton Road, Tax Lot 121-113 in the "R" Zone. PB # 2405

Mr. Ron Johnson presented the application.

Mr. Johnson explained that the proposal is to subdivide 19.3 acres in a rural zone into two lots. There is an existing house, garage and septic on the current lot. One lot will be 6.13 acres with 261' of frontage. The second lot is 13.17 acres with 382.91' of frontage. The parcels are twice the required size for the rural zone. He is asking for a waiver for having to extend and connect to the sewer because of the size of the lot and the lot already has a septic system. They have received the driveway permit from DOT. The utilities will be underground.

J. Marden wanted to know if they are asking for a sewer waiver for one or more lots. Mr. Johnson explained that they are proposing only one house lot at this time which Mr. Perrier intends to transfer to his son. P. Harris wanted to know if both lots meet the 4:1 ratio. Mr. Johnson stated that they do.

BOARD'S ACTION – WILLIAM PERRIER REV. TRUST:

MOTION: J. Marden moved to grant the following waiver:

1. Additional info on Soils, Topo & Wetlands.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried. (6-0)

MOTION: C. Patten moved that the application to be accepted as complete for the purpose of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted to complete review and act on the application, Action on this proposal shall occur by October 26, 2005, subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (6-0)

J. Pike wanted to know about wetlands and Forest Management notification. Mr. Johnson stated that any time timber is cut with access over a wetland the forestry notification is required.

G. Flack wanted to know about the sewer waiver. C. Daigle explained that all lots within 500' of municipal sewer must connect under the subdivision regulations. J. Marden stated that there is only one lot but it has the potential to be subdivided into more lots. Mr. Johnson stated that they have to look at this proposal and if they come back in the future the Board can address that issue.

MOTION: J. Pike moved to grant the following waiver based on the cost and the fact that it is for one lot only. Future lots will have to come back to the Board for review:

1. All building lots associated with a subdivision within 500' of a municipal sewer must be connected to the sewer.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (6-0)

The chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: C. Patten moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and recorded.

1. Submission of final plans:
 - a. All pins to be set and so certified on final plan.
 - b. All proposed driveways accessing onto a paved road to have paved apron.
 - c. Underground utilities are required.
 - d. Note referencing the "Notification of Forest Management or Timber Harvest Activities

Having Minimum Wetlands Impacts” issued June 28, 2005 noted on final plan.

2. NH DOT driveway permit.
3. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.

General conditions to be complied with subsequent to plan being signed an decision recorded:

4. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
5. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon it own motion to do so.
6. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation and changes in the Ordinances.

The motion was seconded by J. Marden and carried. (6-0)

PLAN SUBMISSION MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING – MICHAEL AND KAREN McCARTY:

Request for a Boundary Line Adjustment approval. Property is located at 680 Union Road, Tax Lot 222-053, 222-054 & 222-055 in the “RS” Zone. PB # 2805

Mr. Craig Bailey and Mr. Michael McCarty presented the application.

Mr. Bailey explained that they want to combine three lots located on Union Road into two lots. The lot in the middle, lot 222-054, will be consumed in the remainder lots.

J. Pike wanted to know if there are any houses on the lots. Mr. Bailey stated there is one on lot 222-055. Lots 222-053 and 222-054 are vacant. He will show the house on the plan. Mr. McCarty explained that his house lot will be getting bigger. They are not creating a new lot. The existing lot has been a buildable lot since 1988. He purchased the property in 1990. They are eliminating a lot and adding more land to the other lot. This is to allow the prospective buyer more usable space because of the wetlands. C. Daigle clarified the application by stating that they are merging three lots into two lots.

BOARD'S ACTION – MICHAEL AND KAREN McCARTY:

- MOTION:** W. Peterson moved to grant the following waivers:
- a. Topo.
 - b. Soils.
 - c. Narrative.

The motion was seconded by G. Flack and carried. (6-0)

- MOTION:** G. Flack moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted to complete review and act on the application. Action on this proposal shall occur by October 26, 2005, subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by C. Patten and carried. (6-0)

W. Peterson wanted to know if the 10' sewer easement is going to be extinguished. Mr. Bailey stated that it will be extinguished on the lot that is being eliminated. W. Peterson wanted to know if the utility pad easement will remain. Mr. Bailey stated that the utility easement will remain on the lot.

Mr. Elson Moody stated that all the housing developments coming to Belmont have bought up all the farms. There should be industry for all the houses that are being established. It is his opinion that there be no more real estate transactions until we get industry in Belmont. P. Harris thanked Mr. Moody for his comments but stated that they are not specific to this application. Mr. Moody stated that he has no problems with this application.

The chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any more questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: W. Peterson moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and recorded.

1. Submission of final plans:
 - a. All pins to be set and so certified on final plan.
 - b. All proposed driveways shown on plan. Driveways accessing onto paved road to have paved aprons.
 - c. Overwrites to be removed from plan to be recorded.
 - d. Wetland Scientist stamp to be on plan to be recorded.
 - e. Abutting deed references placed on plan to be recorded.
 - f. McCarty buildings placed on plan to be recorded.
 - g. Identify utility pad and easement.
2. Mortgage Release.
3. Payment of recording fee.
4. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.

General conditions to be complied with subsequent to plan being signed and decision recorded:

5. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.

6. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
7. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation and changes in the Ordinances.

The motion was seconded by G. Flack and carried. (6-0)

PLAN SUBMISSION – AMILY MANAGEMENT LLC: Request for Subdivision approval to create a 23 lot cluster subdivision. Property is located on Grimstone Drive and Wild Acres Road, Tax Lot 229-024 in the “R” Zone. PB # 2605

The chairman appointed C. Shibles as a voting member for this evening.

Mr. Dean Clark and Mr. Dennis Prescott presented the application.

Mr. Clark explained that the double driveways have been removed and lot 10 eliminated. He explained that they are asking for a waiver for depicting buildings, well and septic systems within 100’ of the site because it would require them to add information on an additional 20 acres and they are not doing any improvements near the boundary lines. They are also asking for a waiver to allow the road plans and profile to be drafted at 1” = 60’ (Hor) and 1” = 10’ (Vert) as this would allow them to keep the plans on one sheet instead of three. Mr. Clark also stated that Mr. Prescott has agreed to participate in all the reports required by the Planning Board.

P. Harris wanted to know about the waiver for underground utilities. Mr. Prescott explained that there are two sections of road that are steep and with the added 4’ shoulders for walking the underground utilities would make the road very wide. The above ground utilities would keep the road width more conducive to the neighborhood. He would have underground utilities to the houses.

BOARD'S ACTION – AMILY MANAGEMENT LLC:

MOTION: W. Peterson moved to grant the following waivers:

1. Requirement that buildings, wells and septic systems within 100’ of the site be depicted.
2. Requirement that topography lines extend 100’ off site.
3. To allow road plans and profile to be drafted at 1”=60’ (Hor) & 1” = 10’ (Vert)

The motion was seconded by C. Patten and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: C. Patten moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted to complete review and act on the application. Action on this proposal shall occur by October 26, 2005 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by G. Flack and carried. (7-0)

MOTION; G. Flack moved the applicant be required to participate in the following studies:

1. Independent review of road construction and stormwater management.
2. Economic Impact Study.
3. Traffic Study.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried. (7-0)

PLAN SUBMISSION – 234 RAILROAD AVENUE, LLC:

Request for Subdivision approval to convert the existing property to a condominium form of ownership. Property is located at 8, 12 & 18 Railroad Avenue, Tax Lots 111-088, 111-089, & 111-090 in the “RS” Zone. PB # 2705

P. Harris explained that the applicant has withdrawn the application.

PUBLIC HEARING – DURRELL MOUNTAIN ROAD L.L.C: Continuation of a request for a Boundary Line Adjustment approval. Properties are located on Durrell Mountain Road & Rogers Road, Tax Lots 214-012 & 214-009 in the “R” Zone. PB # 0905

Mr. Howard Warren and Ms. Karen Feltham presented the application.

Mr. Warren explained that Durrell Mountain Road LLC owns 29 acres of land and would like to transfer 17 acres to Andrew Sanborn Farm LLC. The Andrew Sanborn Farm LLC will have 24’ of frontage for a single lot if the access is allowed as frontage. Their attorney and the Town’s attorney have opposite opinions on whether access equal frontage. He explained that they have made corrections on the plan that staff requested. The title block states that Durrell Mountain Road is both a Class 5 & Class 6 road. The locus map has been enlarged and the bench marks have been included. He stated that staff was concerned about giving public notice on the plan that the 131 acre lot is not automatically buildable without other necessary permits. Mr. Warren gave the Board a proposed revised note to be put on the plan. The revised note stated “To the extent that the 24.84’ of frontage of parcel “A” is used for access, all required permits/improvements to access the development area over this strip shall be in place prior to any development permits being issued.” He stated that the final issue is that they are not here for a building permit. They are just doing a boundary line adjustment. The future owners would have to go to Planning Board, Zoning Board of Adjustment, Board of Selectmen or the Conservation Commission for building approval and then staff could address those issues. They are not applying for a building permit so the Board does not have address those issues. They may never have to address them if no one ever comes in to build on that lot. They could approve the boundary line adjustment with the note stating they are not implying it is a buildable lot. W. Peterson referred to staff note that suggests “The 20’ of frontage on the Class 5 portion of Durrell Mountain Road being created for lot 214-009 by this approval does not meet the Ordinance definition of frontage because vehicular access to the lot will not be over said frontage.” Mr. Warren stated that the issue does not have to be addressed now. It doesn’t mean that it can’t be addressed in the future if they need to get a building permit. They can determine at that time if access equals frontage but now they are only applying for a boundary line adjustment. C. Daigle stated that she is not sure if they would have to come back before the Planning Board. Mr. Warren stated they would have to apply to the Conservation

Commission if they came in for a wetland crossing. Staff would be involved in issuing a building permit so they are not giving up anything. He would like just to concentrate on doing the boundary line adjustment and put a note on the plan stating that more work needs to be done in order to get a building permit. C. Daigle stated that the note is not clear on what happens if the 24' of frontage is not used for access. It doesn't say that access over a Class 5 road is frontage. Mr. Warren stated that they could apply for relief if needed. R. Ball stated that if access is over a Class 5 road why would they need access on a Class 6 road. Mr. Warren stated that they want to leave the door open for the future. P. Harris wanted to know why they shouldn't address the issue now. Mr. Warren stated that they just want to do a boundary line adjustment and the others involved in the adjustment just want to sell the property. The wetlands cut through the lot and they want to adjust the line so that the dry side of the land is on one parcel. This is a timber investment. The note would tell future buyers that it may be possible to get a building permit but they need to get additional permits because it is a Class 6 road. The note would address the fact that the 20' access would require a wetland crossing permit. Mr. Warren stated that case law supports his theory that access equals frontage but that is not appropriate to decide it now because they do not plan on building on that lot. C. Daigle explained that the Board looks at land use indefinitely rather than just what the current owner wants. The Planning Board needs to give clear notice on the plan. Mr. Warren agrees with putting a note on the plan just not with the wording. He wants the wording to allow the future owners the option of using the class 5 or 6 road. C. Daigle stated that there are no issues with the boundary line adjustment just the clarification of frontage. Mr. Warren stated that there is nothing on the plan that implies that the lot is buildable. G. Flack stated that the note on the plan spells it out that the lot is not buildable. C. Daigle stated that someone looking at the plan could mistake frontage for buildability. If the frontage is intended to be access then there should be a note on the plan. Mr. Warren stated that he wouldn't agree to that. J. Pike stated that they could highlight in bold the fact that this lot may not be buildable see note #8. That would make it clear. C. Daigle stated that if they use the 24' for access then they would need additional permits but what happen if it is not used for access. Mr. Warren stated that they are focusing on the 24' access but they could prefer to get a permit on a class 6 road. C. Daigle stated if they follow note 8 it could be a buildable lot if it doesn't use 24' for access. Mr. Warren stated that people building on a class 6 road know the process. C. Daigle stated that if they are not using the 24' then they would need a variance. Ms. Feltham stated that there are three options. They could put driveway in to use a Class 5 road. They could go to the zoning Board of Adjustment for an Appeal of Administrative Decision or go for variance. C. Daigle stated that in order not to use this frontage they would have to go for an Appeal of Administrative Decision or go for a variance. Mr. Warren stated they could go for a building permit then try to get the denial overturned or come in off the Class 5 road. J. Pike stated that he agrees with having a note on the plan that stated they have to go to the Zoning Board for approval. C. Daigle suggested a note 9 stating that if the 24' frontage is not used for access Zoning Board approval is required. Mr. Warren stated that he would like to table the application and have staff work on the wording for note 9. Then he will get together with staff to come to an agreement on the wording of the note.

The chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

BOARD'S ACTION – DURRELL MOUNTAIN ROAD L.L.C:

MOTION: J. Marden moved to Table the application to September 26, 2005 to allow staff and the applicant time to draft the language for note #9 on the plan.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried. (7-0)

PUBLIC HEARING – BBE REALTY, LLC: Continuation of a request for open space Subdivision approval to subdivide one lot into 38 lots. Property is located off Sargent Lake Road, Tax Lot 238-004 in the “R & RS” Zones. PB # 0705

BOARD'S ACTION – BBE REALTY, LLC:

MOTION: J. Marden moved at the applicant's request to Table the application until September 26, 2005.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried. (7-0)

PUBLIC HEARING – SUN LAKE VILLAGE: Request for Subdivision approval to create a 24 lot cluster subdivision. Property is located at 631 State Route 3, Tax Lot 101-001 in the “C” Zone. PB # 1405

Mr. Phil Brouillard and Mr. Bill Stack presented the application.

Mr. Brouillard stated that he has been working with staff on this project. He addressed R. Ball's concern about a waiver for the 50' ROW stating that he will submit a written waiver for it at the next meeting. The road is well defined and it will always remain a private road.

Mr. Bill Stack addressed the staff report concerning access to the property. He explained that it is a 35' ROW with steep slope and the access is viable where it is. The access will be 22' wide with the slope line inside the ROW so that they don't have to move the existing road in the direction of neighbor. The idea is to fit the road in 35' ROW. The road is based on the DOT driveway permit. The State plans to cross Sun Lake's property to install drainage for Rte 3. J. Marden wanted to know where the road widens to a full 25'. Mr. Stack used the plan to show where the road widens. C. Daigle wanted to know if a wetland scientist reviewed the area along the ROW. Mr. Stack stated they have the crossings that show the work is in the ROW and not encroaching outside of the ROW. C. Daigle explained that there is a minimum setback between the toe of the slope and the wetlands. R. Ball wanted to know if the brook is going to be on the plan. Mr. Stack explained that they are staying within ROW. P. Harris stated that just because they are in the ROW they are not released from wetland setbacks. C. Daigle stated that staff supports the waiver for the 50' ROW because it will remain a private road. Mr. Brouillard wanted to know what the wetland setbacks are. R. Ball stated that all fill materials associated with roads, drives, parking facilities and structures of any size must be 25' from brooks and 15' from seasonal streams and wetlands. Mr. Stack wanted to know if they have to delineate the adjacent wetlands that are not on the property. C. Daigle stated that they have to certify that there is no construction south of existing physical road. Mr. Brouillard stated that they can make that certification. C. Daigle stated they could request a waiver for showing adjacent wetland but it should be on DOT'S plans. J. Marden wanted to know how wide the road flairs out when it connects to Rte. 3. Mr. Stack stated it is 30'. G. Flack stated that it is an existing condition and they are not infringing any closer to the wetlands.

J. Marden wanted to know where the mail receptacle would be located. Mr. Stack stated that they would

be setback off the road and in a shelter.

Mr. Brouillard stated that this is a 24 lot cluster subdivision with lots between 20,000 to 32,000 square feet. There are contiguous areas for open space and rails to trails. The impact on shoreline will be minimum because of the woods and yards. The area along the shoreline will not be developed. There will be no impact to Rte. 3 because the development is not on the front of the lot. This will be an upscale housing development. He is waiting for approval from the State to lease the waterfront for docks. They will install four fire hydrants and tie into town water. He has received a variance to expand a residential use in the commercial zone. The sewer is part of the Winnepesaukee River Basin Project. The water will be supplied by a new water line on Rte 3. If the water is not available then they have proposed a well design with the State. They are participating in the Economic Impact Study and the independent review of road construction and stormwater management.

Mr. Brouillard stated that they are planning on building six houses a year. These will be custom stick built homes. He plans to start construction this winter. The project will be a benefit to the town because they will be preserving open space along Rte 3 in an already congested area. They will provide an easement for rail to trails to use the property and are creating open space within the project. There will be minimum impact to the lake. The roads will remain private and they will maintain and plow them. They will provide their own trash pick up. The only services from the town would be water, sewer, police and fire.

Mr. Stack used the plan to show the location of the sewer hookup and wells if they become necessary. There will be overhead utilities to the site then underground utilities to all the lots. They have a discharge permit from the State. The drainage is open drainage with catchments along the edge to the basin. J. Marden wanted to know if there will be any utilities to the dock area. Mr. Brouillard stated that there would not be any. J. Marden wanted to know if Mr. Brouillard had heard anything from the State on leasing the docks. Mr. Brouillard explained that it is a year long process and he has talked to the State and they are proceeding with the application. He explained that the State can only lease waterfront to the owners across the ROW from the water. C. Daigle wanted to know if they would be having a beach. Mr. Brouillard stated that he wanted one but will not have one because of the requirements.

P. Harris wanted to know if they had seen the Fire Department's recommendations. Mr. Stack stated that they have and are working with the Fire Department and clarified there will be three hydrants not four.

W. Peterson wanted to know if the boundary line problem with Mr. Youssef has been resolved. Mr. Brouillard stated that he had his property surveyed and he is confident that his surveyor is correct. His survey matches the original one that Mr. Youssef had done and both are recorded. He has offered to do a boundary line adjustment with Mr. Youssef but Mr. Yousseff would have to pay the fees and he would do the paper work. He hasn't heard from Mr. Youssef in three months. C. Daigle stated that this is a civil matter between abutters. The area in question is not necessary to support this proposal.

BOARD'S ACTION – SUN LAKE VILLAGE:

MOTION: C. Patten moved to Table the application until September 26, 2005 to allow the applicant to provide the following:

1. Completion of engineering review.
2. Completion of Economic Impact Study.
3. Submission of waiver request as applicable.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried. (7-0)

OTHER BUSINESS:

BOARD'S ACTION-MINUTES:

MOTION: On a motion by J. Marden, seconded by J. Pike, it was voted to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2005, meeting as submitted. (6-0-1) W. Peterson abstained.

MOTION: On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by J. Marden, it was voted to approve the minutes of the August 8, 2005, meeting. (7-0)

J. Marden noted that at the last meeting he did inquire if the minutes of a non-public session have to be approved. C. Daigle explained that minutes of a non-public session do get voted on and the Board may also vote to seal them for how long in some instances. Ms. Karen Gilbert wanted to know how long minutes are sealed for. C. Daigle stated they are sealed to a time certain or to when they no longer affect the outcome of the situation discussed in the non public session. J. Marden stated that he thought they minutes have to be available in 72 hours. C. Daigle stated that decisions have to be available in 72 hours and the minutes had to be available in 144 hours unless they are sealed under RSA 91A. But a meeting with Counsel is not a "meeting" under 91A and no minutes are taken.

STAFF REPORT:

A. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM(CIP):

C. Daigle stated that the CIP meetings will be held on September 1st and 8th. The first meeting will deal the historical data and the meeting on the 8th will be to complete the review and take public comment. The information should be available to the Planning Board for their September 12th meeting and presented at a public hearing on September 26th.

J. Marden wanted to know if C. Daigle has received any request from the departments yet. C. Daigle stated that she has but has not reviewed them. She is working on gathering the historical data and then will copy the requests for the CIP members.

C. Daigle asked the Board if they wanted to include \$15,000 for capital expenses for next years projects. It was the consensus of the Board to ask for \$15,000 for projects.

B. IMPACT FEES:

C. Daigle explained that she has received a quote from Mr. Bruce Mayberry to do the Impact Fee Study. The proposal would cost between \$5,000 and \$6,500 to do the study. He would do it on an hourly rate and based on the information available, the cost could be less.

A special Town Meeting would be needed to adopt impact fees. J. Beaudin will talk to the Board of Selectmen to see if they will agree to a special Town Meeting. The Zoning Amendment would have to be done by ballot vote and the polls would have to stay open for 8 hours.

The Board needs to amend the ordinance to have impact fees. Staff will draft the language for their review. J. Marden wanted to know if the current Zoning Ordinance includes anything on the methodology. C. Daigle stated that it doesn't it is not intended as a fee schedule ordinance. The changes will have to be posted for Public Hearing. If there are no changes to the posting then they need to have one meeting if there are any changes then they need two Public Hearings.

C. BLAIR SUBDIVISION PLAN TAX LOT 218-127;

The chairman signed the Blair subdivision plan. C. Daigle explained that R. Ball has gone to the site and the driveway on Bean Hill Road has been closed.

D. STEVEN & DIANA JACQUES TAX LOT 215-003-007;

The Board signed the document for the in-law apartment for Steven & Diana Jacques on Potter Road.

E. FEE SCHEDULE:

A Public Hearing is scheduled for September 12th to adopt the new fee schedule.

F. BUDGET:

C. Daigle explained that they will be working on the budget at the worksession.

G. BROX PAVING:

R. Ball stated that Brox Paving has submitted an application and he would like to send the proposal out for review by Mr. Jim Tarr, an environmental firm the Town works with, because the proposal is on the aquifer. Brox would be responsible for the cost of the study. G. Flack stated that it is would be in the same area as it was before. R. Ball agreed but based on the feedback from another application on the aquifer he feels that the study would be in the applicant's best interest and provide the Town with professional guidance. He has talked to Ms. Sarah Pillsbury at the State and she feels that it is not a big concern at the State's level. It was the consensus of the Board to have the application reviewed by an Environmental Firm.

J. Marden stated that the trucks turning in and out of the site will impact the traffic.

H. CONSTRUCTION HOURS OF OPERATION:

Ms. Karen Gilbert wanted to know if there are any regulations concerning the hours for operating construction equipment. C. Daigle explained that there are no regulations but there may be conditions placed on approvals based on the representation made at the public hearing. Ms. Gilbert wanted to know

if there is standard in construction field for the hours of operation. The Board stated that the hours are typically Monday thru Friday 6 AM to 7 PM and a half day on Saturday. C. Daigle stated that if Ms. Gilbert had a specific complaint or request regarding an application under review then she should put it in writing so that it can be addressed at a public hearing.

I. GROWTH MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE:

P. Harris wanted to know if the Board wanted to proceed with a Growth Management Ordinance. J. Marden stated that they are waiting on the Housing Study and doesn't see how they could move forward without it.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: On a motion by G. Flack, seconded by W. Peterson, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 9:48p.m. (7-0)

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine M Murphy
Administrative Assistant