

Planning Board Minutes 08/14/12

NEWMARKET PLANNING BOARD MEETING AUGUST 14, 2012 MINUTES

Present: Valerie Shelton (Chairman), Ed Carmichael (Town Council ex-officio), Jane Ford (Alternate), Diane Hardy (Town Planner), Rick McMenimen, Elizabeth Dudley

Absent: Janice Rosa (Vice Chairman), Justin Normand, Adam Schroadter (Alternate)

Called to order: 7:03 p.m.

Adjourned: 8:27 p.m.

Agenda Item #1 – Pledge of Allegiance

Agenda Item #2 – Public Comments

None.

Agenda Item #3 – Review & approval of minutes: 07/09/12, 07/10/12

07/09/12

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to approve the minutes of the Fox Hollow Drive site walk on July 9, 2012

Second: Elizabeth Dudley

Vote: All in favor

Chairman Shelton appointed Jane Ford to sit in for Janice Rosa.

07/10/12

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to approve the Planning Board meeting minutes of July 10, 2012

Second: Ed Carmichael

Chairman Shelton stated, on page 3, second to last paragraph should read “stated it is not” when Mrs. Wheeler asked why it was released. On page 6, it should read Jeannette Hauschel, not Antoinette Hauschel. At the end of the paragraph she would like to add that Jeannette Hauschel owns property that abuts the golf course.

Motion: Rick McMenimen amended his motion to include the amendments

Second: Ed Carmichael

Vote: All in favor

Agenda Item #4 – Regular Business

PSNH - Public hearing in accordance with RSA 231:158 for tree pruning and clearing on Town of Newmarket scenic roads by Public Service of New Hampshire. This hearing is scheduled in accordance with RSA 231:158, as requested by PSNH to engage in tree pruning and cutting along Bay Road in the Town of Newmarket. The proposed activity will include, but not be limited to, tree cutting, trimming, and removal of brush and trees. All proposed activity and criteria for action by the applicants will be presented and reviewed at this public hearing.

Chairman Shelton stated Diane Hardy had forwarded the minutes to the Board of the last meeting when PSNH requested to trim trees in this area. The meeting was on May 20, 2008. At the time, the request was approved with conditions. She read them.

Chairman Shelton stated PSNH has identified six trees they want to remove.

Chairman Shelton opened the public hearing.

There were no comments from the public.

Elizabeth Dudley asked if this was reviewed in case there was a particularly spectacular tree that will be removed. Diane Hardy stated this application is just for trimming. Chairman Shelton stated they are referring to six trees, because of the declining condition of the trees. In 2008, they removed sixteen trees. They have to get permission from the property owner, too. Diane Hardy stated the trees are considered hazardous to the PSNH service lines. Chairman Shelton stated there is a frequency of power outages and impact to the power lines on Bay Road. She recalls there is a financial issue for PSNH with coming out every two years to do minimal trimming, as opposed to coming out every four years, trimming everything back away from the power lines for the purpose of maintaining electrical power along Bay Road. She read the scope of work from PSNH's application. Rick McMenimen asked if stumps were being removed. Chairman Shelton stated they will not be taking out stumps.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to approve the trimming of trees along Bay Road by PSNH and/or its contractors with the following conditions:

1. If the Town of Newmarket is interested in the wood chips that they be made available to the public.
2. That the trim clearances for the trees be cut in half by half of what is shown within the pamphlets, that the photographic evidence and identification for the purposes of the trees be provided to the Town Planner.
3. The frequency of trimming be increased to every two years instead of every four years.

Second: Jane Ford

Chairman Shelton asked if Rick McMenimen would entertain an amendment to his motion, that the clearances be as requested and that the frequency be every four years. Rick McMenimen stated that was fine.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen amended his motion to approve the trimming of trees along Bay Road by PSNH and/or its contractors with the following conditions:

1. If the Town of Newmarket is interested in the wood chips that they be made available to the public.
2. PSNH will provide photographic evidence of the six trees to be removed.

Second: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor

Town of Newmarket/William Morgan-Angel View Pet Cemetery and Crematory - Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit at 426 Wadleigh Falls Road, Tax Map R6, Lot 52-1, B3 Zone. The proposal is for an animal crematorium to provide crematorium services for equines and large companion pets.

Chairman Shelton clarified the name of the company contains the words "pet cemetery", but they are not proposing a pet cemetery, just a crematorium.

F. X. Bruton, an attorney from Bruton & Berube, a law firm in Dover, NH, represented the applicant. He stated William Morgan was present, as was the Project Engineer, Joe Pereschino, from Tighe and Bond.

Attorney Bruton stated the company, Angel View Crematory, is located in Middleborough, MA. He clarified there is no interest at all in creating a pet cemetery in Newmarket on this site. The goal on the site is to take the former DPW building and use it as a pet crematory. He gave the history of working with the Town to make this happen. They have addressed the aquifer protection zone. They do not feel that, what is called pet "cremains", the remains from a crematorium, is solid waste, but the State has identified that it is and you cannot store or handle solid waste in the aquifer protection zone in Newmarket. They went through the process of applying for a variance regarding this restriction, which they got. He explained the process involved. A pet of small or large size, large being like a horse, would be brought to the facility and placed in the crematorium. The ashes you would get from that would be stored on-site (within the building) for a short time. They would then be picked up by the company and brought to their facility in Middleborough, MA, and they would be disposed of there. There would be no disposal in NH. When they do the cremation, they end up with a bucket of ash. They either store the ash or put it in a box and return it to the customer. The customer could pick it up or they would ship it to them. When they are done with the bucket, they wipe it with a rag. The rags are taken to the Middleborough site for cleaning. There is no use of water or residue to be poured down a drain. Therefore, there will be no effect on the aquifer. That is why the ZBA granted the variance.

This site was the former DPW site. The Town presented, to the Planning Board, a subdivision plan to create a separate three acre lot for the site of the building. This proposal is only to be located on those three acres of land. The applicant has a contract with the Town to purchase the land contingent upon getting approvals. They are here tonight for a Minor Site Plan Approval and for a Conditional Use Permit. This is what you might consider a flexible use, which is permitted in this zone, as long as they get a Conditional Use Permit.

Attorney Bruton stated Diane Hardy's memo raised some questions they can answer and it also suggested they meet again at the next meeting, which is fine with them. They would like to understand any thoughts and concerns the Board may have and see if they can address them.

He stated the outside of the building will not change at all. There will be some minor modifications of the interior to provide for an area for a mini-service, if desired by a family. Typically, though, two or three people would come, they would receive the "cremains" and leave the facility. So, it is a minimal use in terms of the actual property, obviously far less than what the DPW did.

Joe Pereschino will address concerns that were raised regarding septic, parking, and ADA issues. They feel they can address each of those.

Chairman Shelton stated the Board should first rule on the Conditional Use Permit. If that is approved, they can go into Site Plan review.

Attorney Bruton stated there is a list of ten criteria for the Conditional Use Permit.

He stated the first criterion is that the permit is in the public interest. They believe they satisfy that criterion, as the use represents a reasonable use, not only for the property, but for the area in general. The facility will offer the residents of Newmarket and the Seacoast an opportunity to use the facility, where they can have this service performed. They could go directly to the crematorium. The facility will also be used by practicing veterinarians, as well, who may be asked to facilitate that process on behalf of a client, as opposed to the client coming directly to the facility. The property will be on the tax rolls. Right now it is in the hands of the Town and generates nothing for the Town. They believe it will have no negative effect on either the Town or the abutters.

He mentioned they will need two permits from the State, a solid waste permit and an air quality permit. Those are standard for any crematory to get. They need to get the approval of the site plan, in order for the engineers of the company which produces the data to go to the State and show this facility will meet all of the State's requirements. They do that all the time, so they are not concerned that the requirements would not be met. He suggested, as a condition of approval, it be conditioned on them getting those two permits from the State. There are appropriate mechanisms to deal with the air quality, when they do the burn. This is known to be a very clean burn. This came up at the ZBA meeting and they provided evidence regarding that.

The second criterion is there is no greater diminution of neighborhood property values than would be created under any other use created in the zone. The abutting property values have a value associated with the past use of this property, which was the DPW facility. This is a much less intensive use. The B-3 zone is a business zoned district. They are providing a business to operate on this property. It is only called a flexible use, because it is unique to have a crematorium, so they have to ask for this permit. Nothing would change on the outside of the building. It would be a low-intensity use employing state-of-the-art technology.

The third criterion is there are no existing violations of State or Federal law and/or the Newmarket Zoning Ordinance or regulations on the subject property. The property is currently owned by the Town and they know of no existing violations. In fact, the property itself has been in front of this Board within the last year (for a subdivision), so it complies with all of the regulations for a subdivision or it would not have been approved.

The fourth criterion is the character of the area shall not be adversely affected, as determined by consideration of the project's effect on architecture, transportation, scale of lot coverage, scale of building size and consistency of use in the immediate area. The character of the area shall not be adversely affected, as the existing use was the Town's DPW facility, which was used on a 24 hour basis, with large trucks. This is far scaled down. William Morgan stated they typically have scheduled times for cremations, 9:15, 11:15, 1:15 and 3:15. They are not looking to construct a new building. They are taking the existing building as it is.

On the fifth criterion, it says the granting of the permit will not result in undue municipal expense. Applicants shall be required to offset such expense or the permit will be denied. The intensity of the use will be far less than the use of the Public Works operation. It will be commercial in nature and will not affect the school base. This will add to the tax rolls, getting the property out of the hands of the Town and active again as a commercial entity. This is the B-3 zone, so it would be appropriate to do that.

The sixth criterion says the proposed use will be developed in a manner consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and the Newmarket Master Plan. They believe the use will be suitable considering the surrounding properties and will result in the encouragement of an appropriate use of the land. It is certainly far less intense than the previous use. By promoting reasonable use of the land in the B-3 zone, being a commercial use, it is consistent with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and the Master Plan, which encourage reasonable growth and use.

The seventh criterion is the capacity of existing or planned community facilities and services including streets or highways will not be adversely impacted. They rely upon the plan to suggest that it is self-evident that the community facilities and services will not really see an impact at all and far less than they ever had with the DPW there.

The eighth criterion is that the following impacts resulting from the granting of the permits have been mitigated to the extent practical: noise, light, transportation, and visual effects. The property is heavily buffered, offering a visual and noise barrier. The transportation needs have been defined as very minimal and there is no noise other than maybe the opening and closing of the front door.

The ninth criterion pertains to landscaped or other appropriate buffers of sufficient capacity and materials if deemed necessary for the welfare of neighboring properties or the Town. They will rely upon the existing site plan to suggest there is probably more buffering on this commercial activity than quite a few that you have seen. It is a very restricted use on a 3-acre lot and it is a minimal use on that parcel.

The final criterion is all development shall have frontage on an existing or proposed Class V Town road. This project has 376 feet of frontage on Wadleigh Falls Road, which is a Class V road. Only 150 feet are required for the regulations. They have satisfied that criteria.

With that, he felt they had demonstrated they have satisfied all ten criteria for the Conditional Use Permit. They ask the Board to provide their approval, with respect to that.

Chairman Shelton opened the public hearing.

Edward Scanlon, 7 Scanlon Way, in Newfields, stated he was a friend of Lois Beaulieu's, whose property is across the street from the site. He has owned property in Newmarket before, a four-unit building on Nichols Avenue and a ten-unit building on Chapel Street. He stated he was here for Lois Beaulieu. She is concerned about smells. The state geologist has told her that there are four to six million dollars worth of gravel under her property, directly across the street from the site. The lot in question is only three acres, but there has got to be a lot of value to that land, because of what is underneath it. She is also concerned about noise and traffic. If they are only doing four visits a day, there won't be much traffic. The noise is going to be cut down as much as possible, according to what was stated. What about the smell of the animals, before they are being slaughtered and after. Attorney Bruton stated the animal remains come in and are put into a freezer, which addresses the decay issue right away. They are transferred from one vehicle into a freezer. There is no smell associated with the burning. The incinerator has air filters so no smell is generated. In fact, if you are in Kittery, there is a crematorium in the middle of the adjacent development along Route 1. It does not produce any issue there and it is known not to have any smell associated with it. William Morgan stated, when they deal with pets, most of the time they come from the veterinarian. The vet has to have a chest freezer. They are put into that freezer in body bags and sealed, so there is no leakage of any fluid and smell when they pick them up. When they are transported to the facility, they are put into a huge walk-in freezer until they are scheduled to be cremated. The State requires there be no smoke and no smell coming from the stacks. The crematory companies have to meet those regulations in order to put a unit into any state. Each state has certain requirements. They may differ a little bit. Each company that operates a crematory has their own engineers who submit all of the data about particles that come out of the stack for the State. There are certain parameters the State looks for, such as no smoke and no odor. He stated he has been doing this for thirty (30) years and has never had a complaint.

Caroline Scanlon, 7 Scanlon Way, Newfields, was there on behalf of Lois Beaulieu, who lives across the street. Mrs. Beaulieu just got out of the hospital and could not attend tonight's hearing and asked them to attend. She stated, on the

notice Mrs. Beaulieu received, it said large animals. They are thinking cows and horses: that type of large animal. She asked if these animals were coming up from Massachusetts, too. William Morgan stated, in Massachusetts, they already have veterinary hospitals they deal with at their other facility. They are trying to establish a new facility here that can work with the NH veterinarians.

Mrs. Scanlon asked what they do with the ashes. William Morgan stated there were two things. The owner can have an individual cremation, where his pet is put into the crematorium, cremated and they return the ashes to the owner. Sometimes the owner does not want the ashes back, in which case, there will be more than one pet in the cremation. In that case, they will bring the ashes from the Newmarket facility to the Massachusetts facility and buried them there. In Massachusetts, they have a Solid Waste Permit that allows them to bury the ashes. The ashes would be brought down about every seven (7) days.

Mrs. Scanlon asked if the Town could benefit from the ashes, for example, can the ashes be used as fertilizer. William Morgan stated that was a sensitive subject, because these are people's pets. It would not be right to do anything with the ashes other than what they advertise. He stated he can't do that.

Chairman Shelton stated the best way to proceed would be for the Board to go through each criterion. She stated the first one is the permit is in the public interest. There were no questions, comments, or objections from the Board or the applicant.

She went on to the second criterion, which deals with the diminution of property values. Rick McMenimen asked if a realtor should come in and make that assessment. Chairman Shelton asked the applicant if they had any evidence from an appraiser or commercial broker. Attorney Bruton stated he is a commercial broker. He is licensed in NH and MA. He has been through a lot of these hearings and he knows it is not a requirement that you have that kind of evidence. He stated what they have presented is this location is in the B-3 zone and we have to keep that in mind. Commercial activities are permitted. In the context of what is permitted, which is listed in the Zoning Ordinance, this is a business of "like kind", in terms of the list of permitted uses, and even less intensity. In that context, they are suggesting that you can come to the conclusion that it would not diminish property values. He believes that as a broker, as well. He stated the regulations do not require they produce evidence of this. Chairman Shelton stated the regulation states there will be no diminution of property values. What the Board does not have is any factual evidence. There is no specific data that is presented showing that particular use would not create a diminution of neighboring property. Attorney Bruton stated it is juxtaposed to the other permitted uses. It is in that context that the question is asked. He stated you have Conditional Use Permits coming before you all the time and you have made decisions without a real estate agent coming forward with a report. He has done many variances and one of the criteria addresses diminution of surrounding property. It is rare to have a broker or appraiser come in and speak to that issue. He stated he could offer, as a commercial broker, that it would not result in that. He did not know what the study would be in terms of what any professional would do beyond coming in and giving you that opinion. Rick McMenimen stated it should be an independent appraiser. Elizabeth Dudley stated some of the uses that are permitted in B-3 are warehousing, manufacturing, and light manufacturing. To her, this is not substantially distant from any of those uses. Attorney Bruton stated that is their point. When you look at the uses, particularly manufacturing, the crematory is a low intensity use. When you consider it as opposed to a manufacturing facility, which is permitted by right, is this use likely to create more of a diminution of a property value than a manufacturing facility. That is what this question is about. He stated they have presented a good case that this is far less intense than either what was there or what could be there as a matter of right without the conditional use permit. There has been no abutter input to suggest otherwise at all. He stated they ask that it be considered in that context. Chairman Shelton asked if there was anyone else on the Board who was looking to have this as a condition. Ed Carmichael and Elizabeth Dudley stated they were comfortable with not having a report. Chairman Shelton stated there are also no abutters objecting.

Diane Hardy stated she visited Whispering Pines, an animal crematorium in Dover, in back of the equine veterinarian clinic. Mr. Silva, a colleague of Mr. Morgan's, had invited her to look at the facility. She found that it was very obscure, located way in the back. You would not know it was there. It was a nice building, clean, and well-maintained. There were no visible negative impacts, no odor or anything that would even suggest what the use was in the building. It was a very benign use. Attorney Bruton stated there was a hotel nearby and a large Wentworth Douglass medical facility. Rick McMenimen stated he was okay without the report.

Chairman Shelton stated, for the third item, Diane Hardy has confirmed there are no existing violations. No one expressed any further concerns.

For number four, the character of the area will not be adversely affected. She asked if anyone had any questions or issues. No one had any concerns.

For number five, the issuance of the permit will not result in undue municipal expense, she stated the fact the property is coming onto the tax rolls points to that conclusion. There were no concerns.

For number six, the use will be developed in a manner consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and Master Plan. This is a B-3 zone. Commercial development is the goal of that. There were no concerns from the Board.

For number seven, streets and highways will not be adversely impacted, there were no concerns.

For number eight regarding noise, light, transportation, and visual effects, there were no concerns. Ed Carmichael asked about signage. Diane Hardy stated there was no signage at the Dover facility that she recalled. She asked Mr. Morgan if there would be signage. Attorney Bruton stated they were not asking for a variance. They would comply with the existing sign regulations. It would be like any other business.

For number nine regarding landscaping and appropriate buffers, there were no comments or concerns. Chairman Shelton stated they would probably get into this more in site plan stage of review.

For number ten regarding frontage on the existing Class V road, there were no concerns.

There was no further discussion by the Board

Action

Motion: Elizabeth Dudley made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the crematorium

Second: Ed Carmichael

Vote: All in favor

Chairman Shelton stated there is a 30-day appeal period. For the site plan, Joe Pereschino, from Tighe and Bond, represented the applicant. The property is remaining the same as it is today. The existing driveway, parking area, building and vegetation will remain. There are no site improvements at this time.

He stated, earlier in the week, he had a conversation with Diane Hardy, which was very helpful. They walked through the site plan requirements. The items that she brought up were provided to the Board this evening.

Chairman Shelton asked if he was requesting any waivers. Joe Pereschino stated they were not requesting any waivers.

Chairman Shelton stated Diane Hardy had done a nice checklist on the completed application. She asked if she could identify what was not addressed. Diane Hardy stated she had questions and had reviewed them with Mr. Pereschino. She asked if he could address those issues. She had asked that the reference to the cemetery in the name of the

business be taken off the plan titles, so there will not be any confusion of what they did approve for the crematorium use. Joe Pereschino stated they would change the title on the plan set to Angel View Crematory. The applicant will still be listed as the full name of the business.

Diane Hardy asked if they could have more information about the size of the building. She stated it was roughly 3600 square feet. Joe Pereschino stated they could add that information to the plan. He stated the building was approximately 3200 square feet, 40 feet wide and 80 feet long.

Diane Hardy stated he has shown an area that is currently a parking or loading area. She stated it would be helpful to know the number of parking spaces and where the loading will be. She stated it was not clear if it was a dock, a door, a bay or something else.

Joe Pereschino stated there are no site plan improvements. The existing parking and loading areas are both in front and behind the building. They easily accommodate ten parking spaces, which is two times greater than the number of employees. As far as loading, animals are delivered to the site in a commercial van sized vehicle, so there is no loading dock or anything like that. They would just be accessing the building through the existing garage opening. He passed around a picture.

Diane Hardy stated all projects are required to be in compliance with ADA requirements. She asked if there would be any public use. She stated Attorney Bruton had stated there would be on occasion. Given that, the facility would have to be ADA accessible. Joe Pereschino stated there will be some slight modifications to the interior of the building. Code compliance is part of that. They will meet with the code officer and address any ADA compliance issues as part of the modification process. The exterior is flat and meets all the ADA cross slopes and slopes to the building.

Diane Hardy asked about the existing septic system, as the information is "sketchy". There is not much detail on how large it is or whether it will accommodate this type of use. Joe Pereschino stated that "sketchy" was a good description. There is no existing plan that shows the exact design and layout of the septic system. They cannot find that plan at the State level either. This has been a Town-owned DPW building for many years. There was a use of toilet and hand washing facilities at the building. There is what appears to be a septic tank out there. The approximate location of the leach field is on the back side of the building. You can tell by which way the pipes are going. They know there is a septic system out there and that it functions or did at the last point the DPW was used. There is no reason to believe it has ceased to function. They worked backwards from a minimum design that you would complete for the State, which is 300 gallons per day, which is a low number for any use. That is the minimum the State requires. Two bedrooms is equivalent. With approximately five employees using the building and visitors, you come up to about 100 gallons per day in use, at 20 gallons per day per person. That means they are still far below what a minimum design would be. They are comfortable using this septic system. It would still function under the low demand for this use. There is no other use besides hand washing and water closet use.

Diane Hardy stated they have made modifications to the site plan, so it is clearer where the buffer is and the layout of the driveway and positioning of the building with respect to the septic system. It appears the questions she had have been clarified.

She stated there is a requirement that all applications be presented to our Police Chief, Fire Chief and Public Works Director for their input. She did not see that happened as part of the application process. She suggested a condition of the acceptance be that the application is forwarded to them and they be given the opportunity to comment on it and provide recommendations.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to accept the application the Town of Newmarket/William Morgan/Angel View Pet Cemetery & Crematory at 426 Wadleigh Falls Road, Tax Map R6, Lot 52-1, B3 Zone as substantially complete with the conditions, as stated above.

Motion: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor

Chairman Shelton stated this should go to the Technical Review Committee (TRC).

Elizabeth Dudley stated the DPW should provide the applicants with information about the septic system. Chairman Shelton recommended that the TRC ask the applicant to provide a septic inspection to determine what is there and where by a qualified septic inspector. Joe Pereschino stated they would be more than happy to meet with DPW and walk the site again. Chairman Shelton stated that doesn't give the Board a qualified answer to what exists today and the operational condition of the system.

Rick McMenimen asked if they could do a site walk. Chairman Shelton asked if they wanted to deal with this as a TRC or a full board. Diane Hardy stated she would like to get input from DPW and also the Fire Department with regard to life safety issues. Chairman Shelton stated then they would want it to go to TRC. Diane Hardy stated a site walk would be beneficial for all parties.

Chairman Shelton asked if there were any further questions about the initial site plan, as presented. There were none.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to continue the application to a site walk at 426 Wadleigh Falls Road at 6:00 p.m. on August 28, 2012

Second: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor

Rick McMenimen will coordinate the TRC with Diane Hardy.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to continue the hearing for the site plan to September 18, 2012

Second: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor

Agenda Item #5 – Other Business

Chairman's Report

Chairman Shelton stated she had two items on which to report.

There has been some discussion with the B-1 rezoning subcommittee and they would like to move forward to Town Council all of the changes at once, not just the proposed ordinance changes for the Elm Street area. They would like to deal with Route 108 from the Town line to the car wash. They would like to propose that whole B-1 be changed to M-2. It does fall under the Downtown Overlay District, which is critical, because it deals with multi-family use. That overlay district requires commercial use on the first floor. She would like to have this in September, if possible for the September 18 agenda.

She stated the Town Council meeting tomorrow night is on a proposal for a wastewater and refuse-to-energy proposal with the Town owning a percentage of the business. It is her understanding the Town may be exempt from the Zoning Ordinance which raises a concern. Diane Hardy suggested they get clarification from legal counsel. A solid waste facility would come under the jurisdiction of the State. Chairman Shelton stated her question is whether a proposed business, on a Town-owned property or that the Town has a partnership interest in, has to come before the Planning Board. She asked Ed Carmichael to pass that concern along to Town Council during his Planning Board report. She stated the Board also needs a legal opinion. Ed Carmichael suggested Diane Hardy speak to Chairman Nazzaro about the project. Chairman Shelton stated they are just starting the Land Use and Future Land Use chapter update to the Master Plan and the Town is moving ahead with implementation of the Economic Development chapter. It would be good to know what direction the Town is looking to go in with respect to the future growth along the Route 108 southern corridor and the undeveloped property along Route 152. She stated the Town Council has formulated the Economic Development Committee and she will appoint herself to be the Planning Board appointee to that committee.

Chairman Shelton stated the Municipal Volunteer of the Year awards is accepting nominations. They need to be at LGC by August 31.

Town Council

Ed Carmichael stated they elected two councilors to the Economic Development Committee, Councilor Nazzaro and Councilor Levy. Also, Diane Hardy was nominated to the Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning for the region.

CIP

Jane Ford stated the CIP committee has a meeting on Thursday at the Police Station to hear their proposed CIP budget. Rick McMenimen stated they are also going to the DPW in the near future and the Library had to cancel, because they did not get their report in on time.

Advisory Heritage

Elizabeth Dudley stated there is a meeting on August 23.

Planner's Report

Diane Hardy stated they received an update from Tim Nichols. They are still working on the 13 Water Street project. He has hired a Historic Preservation Consultant to look at the eligibility of the building on the Register of Historic Places and whether it is eligible for a 79E application. They are looking at the possibility of rehabilitating the building, as opposed to demolition and re-building. He is hoping to get information to the Board at the next meeting.

Open full Board member seat

Chairman Shelton stated they needed to fill the remaining term for Peter Roy's open full Board member seat, which is through 2013.

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to appoint Adam Schroadter to fill the position for the remaining term which extends to March 2013

Second: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor

Chairman Shelton stated they will look forward to having Adam back here for the site walk and the next regular meeting in September.

Agenda Item #6 – Adjourn

Action

Motion: Rick McMenimen made a motion to adjourn at 8:28 p.m.

Second: Jane Ford

Vote: All in favor