

Town of Farmington
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 7, 2024
Municipal Building Conference Room
356 Main Street-Farmington, NH 03835

Board Members Present:

Rick Pelkey, Chairman
Bill Fisher, Vice Chairman
Charlie King, Selectmen's Rep
Stephen Henry, Secretary
Mike Day
Rebecca Patton-Sanderson
Roger Mains

Board Members Absent:

Jeremy Squires

Others Present:

Kyle Pimental, Planning Director
Keriann Roman, Attorney
Ron LeMere, Bldg. Insp./CEO
Steve Whitman, Resilience Planning
& Design
Mark Fougere, Fougere Planning &
Development
Eric Halvorsen, RKG Associates
Angela Cleveland, SRPC Planner
Courtney Grugnale, Housing Navigator
Zack Bruzynsky, C N Planning & Design

1). Call to Order:

Chairman Pelkey called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

2). Pledge of Allegiance:

All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Pelkey seated alternate member Roger Mains to the board.

3). Review of Minutes:

January 17, 2024- Public session- No errors or omissions

Motion: (Henry, second Day) to approve the minutes as written passed 7-0.

4). Public Comment: None

5). Non-Public Session A:

Motion: (King, second Day) to enter non-public session under RSA 91-A: 3 II (c, I) Reputation, Consideration of Legal Advice passed 7-0 by a roll call vote (Pelkey, Fisher, King, Henry, Patton-Sanderson, Day, Mains-aye) at 6:05 p.m.

Motion: (King, second Henry) to come out of non-public session passed 7-0 at 6:30 p.m.

6). New Business:

Presentation and Discussion on Work Conducted as Part of the Rt. 11 Corridor Study-

Chairman Pelkey said they were going to have a presentation and then do some hands-on work

with some maps for the Rt. 11 corridor study. He thanked Att. Roman for her time and help and asked to have presenters join the meeting. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Pimental to coordinate the presentation.

Motion: (Pelkey, second Day) to take a 5 minute recess passed 7-0 at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Pelkey reconvened the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Pimental said as a reminder of where we are with this project this was part of our Housing Opportunity Planning Grant that we had to do a comprehensive study along Rt. 11. He said they have talked about it at the Planning Board level for at least 2 years now and taking a look at some potential zoning changes and this was an opportunity to really take a holistic view of this not just the excavation pits, not just a certain area but really the whole corridor and we had a good chunk of funding through Invest NH to put together a team to do just that.

He said they did a pretty comprehensive outreach campaign where there were surveys that went out, there were multiple events held and a market analysis was done that they heard about at their Nov. meeting. He said the purpose of tonight as they start moving towards Phase 3 of this project is to start talking about what this corridor is going to look like in terms of the geography, what districts might come out of it, what the standards should be within those districts, what types of uses should be allowed along with the work that is going to be done in looking at the Tax Increment Financing District which is also part of this project and is to be updated. That is Phase 3 and this is kicking off Phase 3 and hearing from this group and facilitating a discussion on what this corridor might look like in the future and how they might want to think about making some recommendations in the future he said.

He said one of the maps in their packets was something that he put together at a very high level of what 2 areas that may make sense for the mixed use district that they talked about and they can get more into that where there is already water and where there is already water and sewer that comes out to Rt. 11 and that might also be a part of this whole conversation. He said the purpose of this is to have an interactive workshop and have them mark this map up and give them some feedback so they can walk away from this having a better understanding of what they want so they don't go do a bunch of work and come back and they say this is not what we wanted on Rt. 11. This is going to be really important and we really want to hear from you and be as specific as possible to help guide our consultants in this next phase he said.

Resilience Planning & Design Planner Steve Whitman said his firm is one of the 3 firms working with the Strafford Regional Planning Commission on this project and representatives of all the firms are here tonight to listen and asked the members to ask questions and chime in now as they're starting to think about what the right zoning and TIF approaches would be.

Fougere Planning & Development President Mark Fougere said he is a planning consultant on this project, SRPC Principal Planner Angela Cleveland, Eric Halvorsen of RKG Associates said they are doing the market analysis on the TIF District, Zack Bruzynski of C&N Planning & Design said a lot of his efforts are mapped based and SRPC Housing Navigator Courtney Grugnale

introduced themselves to the board.

Mr. Whitman said he hasn't looked the Town's 2005 Master Plan in a long time and he was part of that team when Mr. King was on the Master Plan Committee and the Planning Board at that time but it's interesting to look back at it today just for nostalgia and these are the 2 areas that were talked about for mixed use that they have been talking about.

Mr. King said over the years you think you are going to get something accomplished and you look and it's been 20 years and we haven't made any changes.

Mr. Whitman said they just wanted to have a conversation and they wanted to hear questions and ideas and asked Mr. Pimental to give them an overview and then they could go with the big mixed use district and then the little one and then talk about the other parts of the corridor. He said a worksheet was in their packets which was something he, Angie and Kyle talked about and they don't need to use it per se they are using it to think about when they go back to their offices and they want to capture what they heard from them and think about what would the district standards look like based on tonight's conversation and come back and show them what they heard and what they think. He said having a purpose statement for the district that actually captures what you all agree that we're trying to accomplish there they don't have to word smith it they just want to get the nuggets of that.

He said talking about the types of uses that seem appropriate in a mixed use area vs. a commercial or residential area they can get into some of the standards and they can talk about some of the examples they are aware of but the more they can do in the hour or hour and a half that they have would be really great. He said then we'll fill in gaps we won't just come back with a completely written ordinance what we will do for your next meeting is come in and say in this area currently the zoning says (a) and what we talked about on Feb. 7 was doing something different and here's what it would look like.

He said so they could see this is today, this is what we're talking about and we can make adjustments from there and then the more they can refine that to get closer to what they think would be best for Farmington then they will start writing it up to make sure it fits with the TIF, the Economic Revitalization Zone and their other plans. He asked Mr. Pimental for an overview of why the big blue area is the shape that it is and what it overlaps.

Mr. Pimental said he started on the western side of that area and took a look at where Paulson Road comes down to Rt. 11 just south of the 500 Club moving east towards where the Town's small gravel area is, the area in which the Town owned parcel that is southwest of the Sarah Greenfield area is where he started. He said crossing over from Rt. 153 there are a lot of vacant properties right there that are underutilized that sort of abut against Peaceful Pines Mobile Home Park so he included all of those parcels as well as the large Pike parcel and then all of the other smaller lots that are right up against Rt. 11.

He said you can see on the eastern side which is where the Pike property is just south of Peaceful Pines and then all the way west to get the Town owned parcels out to Paulson Rd. and

then looking across the street from Rt. 11 capturing the area around Aroma Joe's, the Farmer's Kitchen, some of the first lots that are directly behind that and capturing that area and the reason that it stops there is that large pink piece is the Superfund former Collins-Aikman's site and in his opinion mixed use doesn't belong there and if the Town really wants that to be redeveloped as industrial then we should keep that there.

Mr. Pimental said that was the thought process of at least taking a stab at what a mixed use zone might look like. He said the other smaller zone as you go further west is where Tappan St. comes out at the Rite Aid and there is existing sewer and it is the only place where water and sewer are at Rt. 11 and may offer opportunities for some denser mixed use development there because they could advertise they could connect to water and sewer.

He said looking at the parcels that are there it's a little constrained because of the Town's well that is to the east and the cemetery lots so he didn't include any of that he included just a little west of that near the Rite Aid and then several properties that are directly across the street in that area. That area I think could expand a little bit it's mostly residential on the northern side of Rt. 11 there's a little more vacancy on the south side but that was at least a thought process of there is water and sewer here so maybe there are some incentives for larger potential mixed use developments in that area and maybe start to extend that sewer line further in either direction using private investment because of further development and maybe there's a way to capitalize on that he said.

Mr. Whitman asked the members if those 2 areas make sense as mixed use zones and if they have any concerns.

Mr. Fisher said he would agree about it being mixed use along there and he primarily sees more commercial uses towards Rt. 11 than housing back behind it. He said to keep in mind what they have with the Ridge and how they have the entire Ridge developed there and cutting through roads in the back to put housing behind it. He said he didn't see much residential on Rt. 11 itself but there is quite a bit if you go down past where Central Street comes out and go past there and there is some commercial and stuff but there is a lot of residential too along Rt. 11.

Eventually that's probably going to change because people will sell out to commercial businesses 30 or 40 years from now he said.

He said things seem to move at a snail's pace here like Mr. King mentioned it's been 20 years and nothing has changed. He said he moved here in 1986 and things have changed in Rochester but not down here. That's how I see it along that corridor more commercial maybe towards Rt. 153 from Tappan St. on down because there are a lot of vacant lots there now very few houses if any at all but once you get north of Tappan St. it's more residential again he said.

Mr. Whitman asked if that resonates with other people on the board and if they had any thoughts about that.

Mr. Pelkey said he sees the draw of having that section blue over by Rite Aid because of the water and sewer that's available there but he wonders about the topography across Rt. 11

though because it's hilly and there is a lot of elevation off of Rt. 11 on that side. He said the section over by the end of Rt. 153 and going up towards from Meetinghouse Hill Rd. back towards Rochester he can certainly see that too and those are areas that would probably be where eventually the town would like to have water and sewer available up there.

Mr. King said there is water available there and it goes down to Energy Resources.

Mr. Whitman asked for the small mixed use area if it makes sense to shrink it because of the elevation on the south side or left side. He said they don't have to get into details of the boundaries and they can adjust them later too.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said they're going to deal with it how they're going to deal with it if they want it.

Mr. Henry said the Ridge marketplace was a mountain at one time.

Mr. Fisher said Lowe's was a big a mountain and they flattened that out but it took them several years to do it.

Mr. Whitman asked for other thoughts from board members on either place.

Mr. King said on the larger blue area which they're proposing as mixed use topographically where that blue section comes out is pretty high in elevation and is a little too deep into this whole wooded area that goes up the Meetinghouse Hill.

Mr. Whitman pointed to a place on the map and asked if he would stop there or not even go that far back.

Mr. Pelkey said the lines are on different plot lines there too.

Mr. Pimental said that's a good point and he wouldn't have gone that far back if those lots weren't so long and he would have gone with the property line. He said if they want to decrease it they certainly can it just creates a split lot.

Mr. King said currently our zoning splits a lot of lots and if they're more permissive to say that if it's split into 2 lots where the front is this zone and the back is in the AR zone but they want to expand on this lot they're still allowed to do that but they may need to be a little more cognizant of the zone they're expanding into on that lot that's split so they're not prohibiting it on the back of that lot but trying to make that development fit with the surrounding rest of the zone.

Mr. Pimental said what they wrote into the zoning to deal with this last year was commercial uses in the commercial district can expand into residential districts through a Conditional Use Permit process so we have certain criteria that allows for that and it deals with some landscaping and other vegetative buffers that are required. He said they can't allow for commercial development by right that far but maybe cutting that a little closer to where the existing lines are but still allowing for that because the zoning allows for it extend into the residential district.

Mr. King said so that line becomes more of a soft line than a hard line and then to migrate into a soft line based upon a case by case basis to allow for more mixed use where it makes sense.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she wasn't following what he was saying.

Mr. King said say if a parcel is 100 acres and 20 acres are in the commercial zone the rest is in the AR zone which doesn't allow commercial development and a lot of these lots are split by the zone. He said but allowing that if it has split zone that they're allowed to do the commercial into the area that it's not permitted because it's in that lot. He said so that line is not a hard line and it would allow them to take that commercial that is allowed on the frontage and go deeper into that parcel providing there is adequate screening protecting the other zone.

He said say if you had a parcel on there next to it that went back half a mile but you had farms and residential around you to expand into that area that's in that zone you're still permitted to but you have to have more preservation of space for the abutting uses.

Mr. Pelkey said some of these lots push up into the residential district up in here and some of them follow all the way through so what they wanted to be able to do is allow commercial off of Rt. 11 that would expand into these areas that are a residential or rural area with conditions.

Mr. Henry said they might have more lighting or noise restrictions.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said but they would be okay with the rear portion in residential.

Mr. King said right and it could also be commercial provided it's not violating the spirit and intent of the zone for the abutters.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said it seems like a good space for potential mixed use rather than just residential.

Mr. King said when they follow the boundary lines it gets to be erratic where if they have a generalization for allowing that to be a soft line it could be done on a case by case basis instead of trying to follow parcel data which as we know over time has been erratic.

Mr. Bruzynsky said to add some context the map in the middle of the table is based on boundary lines so they can see how far some of those parcels are pushing east and west.

Mr. Whitman said they don't need to finalize the boundaries of this but it does sound like they could bring these districts in a little bit and use that split zoning.

Mr. Pelkey said part of the discussion when they talked about this was the zone was 1,000 ft. off Rt. 11.

Mr. Pimental said that's what it is now.

Mr. King said he was opposed to expanding it but they should pick a line where they want the transition to be. He said on the west side of Rt. 11 there is a ridge there and the ridge goes from where the Ridge is all the way to the top of Meetinghouse Hill and keeps going and there is some more readily developable land on the lower portion and you have some slopes and soils and ledge to deal with so you could pick a line of 1,000 ft., you could follow that ridge line, you could do an offset of that, you could do the parcel data but if we do the parcel data boundaries we get into a lot more detail than we need if we have a soft line instead of a hard line so it would make a couple of different options work.

He said 1,000 ft. doesn't follow that ridge because the ridge is a little straighter and the 1,000

ft. is a little more winding based on Rt. 11. He said he was not saying they couldn't do a fixed amount or do a hybrid. You could say here we're going to follow a 1,000 ft. or 1,200 ft., down here based on the topography we're going to go a little bit deeper and go 1,500 or 1,800 ft. he said.

Mr. Whitman said Zack could play around with it and give them a couple of images to see what it looks like.

Mr. Pimental asked if there is in any context where it makes sense-because they were talking about sort of hybrid approach that following the lot line boundaries does make sense.

Mr. King said if it makes sense based upon that parcel it makes sense but some of these parcels go long and deep into other zones.

Mr. Henry said the back is wrapped by a residential zone.

Mr. Pelkey said to the northeast on Rt. 11 it's fairly flat out through there where the river goes thru and you could probably set it at 1,500 or 2,000 ft. and scribe a line off of Rt. 11 there. He said but on the other side of Rt. 11 where we have the topographic questions Mr. King's point is well made that they could evaluate that based on the topography where the hills are.

Mr. King said say it's an 11 acre parcel and you have 1 or 2 acres in the AR zone and the rest is in the Commercial/Industrial zone and asked how they would handle that. He asked if they would say it could be fully developed because it's more than 75% in that zone that you allow the development of that entire parcel for that use or if they would say that it doesn't have to necessarily follow the boundary line but if it falls to the 75% level then it could be 100% of the predominant zoning of that parcel that's split they could say that's allowed.

Mr. Pelkey said he would be very permissive if somebody said they have a commercial use for it and they have a buyer for it that they're going to permit it but they're also going to put in the same kind of things they put in place in the zoning where you have adequate screening and you have to take into account that the zone you're moving into is quiet it's back country out there we don't hear cars, we don't have streetlights and we don't hear all that stuff.

Mr. King said he was not trying to give direction he was trying to give some thoughts and as they try to apply these options some are going to make sense and some aren't.

Mr. Whitman said they will be able to continue to adjust the boundaries until July.

Mr. King said if everyone agrees that we should have more of a soft line it becomes less of an issue where all of sudden they're disenfranchising a landowner by throwing up a boundary. He said right now it was more of a hard line and they've migrated back from that.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked if he was saying he agrees with Mr. Pimental's outline.

Mr. King said in some areas it's going back deeper than it needs to be based on what's there topographically.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked if his soft line would be within his hard line.

Mr. King showed her a parcel on the map as an example of how the line could be placed to allow further development there.

Mr. Pelkey said the mixed use area doesn't encompass all of the area along Rt. 11 especially to the north. He said the north is only around where it comes out by Rite Aid for mixed use. He said we have some pretty decent land going towards Alton.

Mr. Whitman said this is what is shown in yellow as residential.

Mr. Pelkey said yes and it shows commercial right along Rt. 11 and he believes we allow mixed use in a commercial zone.

Mr. Pimental said to clarify the map he put together that yellow area was a suggestion that that be commercial coming off to go to residential because that is the predominant use on the north side of Rt. 11 and showed the board where he was referring to on the map. He said the orange area is an area which is currently commercial but the predominant land use there is all residential.

Mr. King asked why they would discourage conversion to commercial or commercial along there even though it's residential but to have mixed use to allow some commercial in there. He said that area is also compromised by the brook that goes thru there so there are lots of challenges for development and may stay as residential but there may be some along there that are right for conversion 10 or 20 years from now.

Mr. Whitman asked how far they would spread themselves out knowing what they can attract and they have these 2 blue spots that have water and/or water and sewer and to what degree can you create some level of energy and intensity in these areas and do you want to make them marketable and if they want to have commercial with residential out back. He said they still need to talk about the nature of these places and asked for their thoughts on that.

Mr. Fougere said when they met as their internal team they tried to concentrate the mixed use a little bit because they can always go back and change the zoning years from now if it's really successful. He said they could rezone properties from commercial or residential to mixed use but for now he was thinking it might make sense to create those nodes and prove the market and say this is what's possible. He said then they might get more interest over time and then they could change the zoning.

Mr. Pimental said they can always extend the smaller node a bit more west where there is existing water and sewer he was only looking at the vacant properties surrounding the Rite Aid area. He said that whole area has water and the sewer comes up Tappan St. so that could expand a little bit but he wouldn't necessarily expand it all the way to the New Durham line but they could potentially make it a little bit wider where there are existing utilities.

Mr. Whitman said that area has small lots for the most part and it's mostly residential and it has a brook running thru it so they're not going to get a big retail push there but you have residences sitting on a commercial street with a high traffic volume and asked if it's fair that it's strictly residential. He said you can do hybrid commercial and they did this in Milford with an office with 3 families, the conversion of homes so they recognize this isn't a quiet neighborhood but you're not going to get Rite Aid there either. Having straight residential may not make

sense but having a smaller limited type commercial or a smaller allowed conversion to multi-family with 2 or 3 units would be fair to the homeowners that live there with their small office. Mr. Fougere asked if there is a residential district in the Village Center for comparison. He then said he was thinking about what Mr. Fisher said about commercial out on Rt. 11 with larger multi-family buildings or residential buildings behind that and asked the board if that is a vision they all share. He asked if they see mixed use as residential and commercial mixed together and the reason he asked some of this was his recollection of the market studies is there is not a huge amount of commercial they're probably smaller commercial entities that would be different than the Ridge that they might attract here. He said they do recognize that there are other areas that they will talk about later for the bigger industrial and other kinds of uses. He said they want to get a sense for what the pattern that they pictured- is this still auto oriented mixed use, is it more pedestrian mixed use, are there design standards and incentives for design standards or not and do we drop that. He asked about additional points they would make or questions they would raise for them to consider related to what's the purpose or what's the character of these areas.

Mr. Halvorsen said one thing he thought of was they could and maybe should be different because one has water and sewer and is walk-able to other things. He said the big one feels like it might be more appropriate based on the parcel size and some of the existing development to be different maybe it is more auto oriented instead of vertically mixing uses where you have commercial on the first floor and residential above maybe it's commercial pads in the front with standalone residential to the back something that's maybe more auto oriented vs. the smaller one could be something that's maybe a hybrid of that. I think Steve is right in thinking maybe there's differences between the 2 but I would love to hear what you (the board) think he said. Mr. Pelkey said some of the discussion they've had was about where Rt. 153 comes out to Rt. 11 and they talked about that as being someplace where they're trying to connect to some of the recreational stuff that's out there too-the rail trail and snowmobile trails so that sounds to him that it would be walkable as well. It's kind of a distance for some folks but if you're developing out that way too it gives people a place to move around in as well between downtown and that area he said.

Mr. Fougere said they might be able to do both allow for auto oriented uses and have pedestrian connections to those other places. He said as they create the standards they can allow for whatever amount of density they are willing to permit and a scale of what the market would bring. He said the market might come here and say they don't want to take full advantage of going to that level of density because the numbers don't make sense.

Mr. Pelkey asked for the mixed use density that they are looking for now. He said he was curious because we have something on the warrant concerning mixed use housing density and how that fits in with they're finding.

Mr. Halvorsen said if they are talking about larger scale multi-family or mixed use they would

probably want to be in the 30 dwelling units an acre range if not higher.

Mr. Pelkey said he was curious about the businesses associated with that.

Mr. Halvorsen said he would say it would be in the couple of tens of thousands sq. ft.

Mr. Pelkey said so 20,000 sq. ft. of commercial space and 30 units to get them involved. He said everybody wants housing and they're not losing money in housing right now because the demand is so high.

Mr. Fougere said construction costs are north of \$280 per sq. ft. so it's very challenging and that's why the density is so high. He said in this zone if they gave the developers more density and they chose not to use it and to build a 10,000 or 15,000 sq. ft...

Mr. Whitman said if there's a market and if it's allowed it's possible and the best thing to do is to be as flexible as possible and if the market is there they will build it.

Mr. Fougere said if it's not there they can come back and do it later.

Mr. Pelkey said even if our zoning ordinance says you can't do it if the market is there they're going to come see us about building it.

Mr. Whitman said if it's allowed it's easier and they want to pull down barriers and try to cut to the chase.

Mr. Fisher said Amendment 6 in the Commercial Business District that they talked about at their last couple of meetings is the 1st floor is commercial the 2nd floor is residential and we were thinking that it could possibly draw in some businesses.

Mr. Pimental said what they ran into is our current zoning allows for mixed use in the commercial district but there is no density limit so if someone were to come in and say they want to have "x" amount of units they didn't have a way to calculate that. He said what they proposed for this year is one unit per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial space so a 30,000 sq. ft. commercial bottom floor you could have potentially 30 units.

He said it wouldn't actually work out that way because the minimum size is 750 sq. ft. and hall space and elevators and all that you wouldn't be able to necessarily get 30 but that's the calculation they came up with to hopefully entice them and even if you don't fill the commercial space right away you're going to fill the residential. So that's the change that is in front of the voters in March for mixed use in the commercial/industrial district he said.

Mr. Pelkey said so they had some way of putting the brakes on.

Mr. Pimental said they had nothing there and they would allow for mixed use but they didn't have any way to calculate how many units you would get out of it so now we have at least some uniform way to calculate mixed use developments in terms of density in all districts that allow mixed use.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said in the Village district it's the commercial on the bottom and residential on the second floor but along Rt. 11 she didn't support limiting it to that extent. She said she didn't think it does us any good to say you can only have your residential on top if that is what they are saying.

Mr. Pimental said they didn't they said if you wanted to do a mixed use building with residential on top this is how you would calculate it. He said you could still have commercial up front and residential units behind that if you wanted to.

Mr. Fisher said they could have a 2 story commercial and no residential on the top.

Mr. Henry said they could have 2 story residential and 2 story commercial.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said but you have to have both.

Mr. Pimental said it's the sq. footage.

Mr. King asked in amendment #6 if he was saying somebody could come in and propose 20,000 sq. ft. of commercial and 20,000 sq. ft. of residential and that's in a separate building at ground level.

Mr. Pimental said no.

Mr. Whitman said it sounds like amendment #6 is a stop gap.

Mr. Pelkey said it is and they had the discussion about the fact that they were going to be getting recommendations from them but they still needed something for now.

Mr. Pimental said this is something that they needed in the short term.

Mr. Whitman said he had a meeting yesterday with a man who wants to build 350 units of micro-apartments-300 sq. ft. studios in southern NH. He said it's basically 100 units if you look at the sq. ft. and they're small but this is in an area that has a lot of proposed large industrial development coming in and they need workers, rents are insane and he wants to go to Town Meeting and see if he can get in his industrial park the ability to do this.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she wanted to go back to what he said about the distinction between the small section of mixed use to the west and the larger to the east. She said she liked this kind of separation because she can see the smaller area being more walkable maybe like the Village District whereas the bigger area would focus more on the rail trail and maybe some hiking and walkable areas that were spread out.

Mr. Pelkey said if the rail trail went all the way through it would be great.

Mr. Pimental said they are actively trying to put a project into the Ten Year Plan to extend sidewalks from Canal St. all the way to Rt. 11 at the Rt. 153 intersection. He said that is the long term vision to get people across and get them onto the rail trail.

Mr. Fougere said what they're hearing is that one small blue area is already smaller and it's already denser and it's already closer and more connected to the Village.

Mr. Halvorsen asked at least for the larger mixed use if they're trying to encourage... he would say that's more of a transformative district where it might have the opportunity to go from whatever it is today mostly industrial to something bigger vs. the other one that might have a bit of a different character to it. He asked just from their experience in town and as Planning Board members what they think in terms of what height and density people would be willing to accept there-2 stories, 4 stories or 6 stories.

Mr. Pelkey said 6 stories sounded like a little much to him.

Mr. King said we currently have a 55 ft. height requirement.

Mr. Pimental said that's 4 or 5 stories.

Mr. Fougere said that doesn't seem like too much in that transformative area.

Mr. Pelkey said they didn't want the Town to have to buy new equipment to service it.

Mr. King said typically we are not in line to get a big box store because we don't have the population or economics. He said he is trying to make sure that hopefully we are encouraging development from within, a small business cultivated here whether it's your electricians, plumbers and so forth and some medium scale development of 10,000 to 15,000 sq. ft. He said he was sure people were aware that once you get over 12,000 sq. ft. you have to have fire suppression on hand and some of these areas don't have access to water and there are constraints there.

He said someone says oh they're just going to extend it down to the Town line and that sounds great but when he asked the question and he was 1,000 ft. from the end of the water the quote he got from the Town was \$250,000 for him to get Town water and he said no I'm all set. He said they wanted him to expand their infrastructure to the level they want not just cross country line for water. He said developers are not going to come onto these parcels and say not only am I dealing with the ledge, the slopes, DOT issues, the rail trail system and then all of a sudden they have to put in an excessive amount of infrastructure to do these large buildings so you're not going to see that type of investment because there are easier spots to build on. He said on 1 side most of it is dug out gravel pits which is easier to develop if you have the elevation but a lot of those are dug out too deep and instead of being 6 ft. from the water table they're 2 or 3 ft. because they're old pits.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked him if he could support something that's not so rigidly defined for instance the larger parcel with coffee shops and stores and maybe some apartments or single family units something that's more loose there that's kind of walkable but live and work and dine and shop kind of thing. She said she knew Mr. King didn't like that idea and asked if the rest of the board could see that at all.

Mr. King said you can closer to the 2 nodes and he could support that and then let it fill in from there. He said that's why our Tax Increment Financing District runs out to that with a node to do that to bring that infrastructure to that node. He said when they developed it, it all seemed good but it hasn't moved fast enough to even get any traction and that's why they're rewriting it. Those nodes and work out from those nodes potentially if you have 2 nodes that are readily developed over the next 5 or 10 years your infill will be between those 2 nodes and on either end he said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that means if you were to talk about rewriting the TIF to try to encourage development in this area if that would also possibly be an idea to take a look at adding this area as well to it. He asked if it could all be part of one of piece of legislation or would be 2 separate districts.

Mr. King said it would be 2 separate TIF's and Mr. Pimental nodded in agreement.

Mr. Fougere said he wanted to go back to the development that has the coffee shop, the residential and the mixed use and asked if they have to do something in the mixed use district to make it very clear to the developer that is welcome and that kind of master planning of multiple buildings, maybe multiple owners on 1 parcel is an option and you may also allow a single use on a single parcel. He asked if there is something they should do and to Mr. King's point if it's closer to the intersection can they create greater density within this district or does the market bring the greater density to the intersection.

Mr. King said they have made changes where they allow multiple primary uses on the same parcel even if they're not the same business type.

Mr. Pelkey said there's also density increases in our warrant articles for this year too. He said for today they think they have reached the limit on density but they might want to look at it and evaluate what they've done.

Ms. Cleveland asked about the long thin lots on the southern part and how deep someone could go without the Planning Board requiring a second egress. She pointed out the one that has a stream coming into it which is going to prohibit quite a bit of the frontage piece of that and the other lots are very deep and shallow and then they have trail and after meeting with the snowmobile club that became an issue talking about how much they are going to cut curves to create basic non-continuous trails because they have to keep stopping as they go. Those lots are long and thin and encouraging development way back without a 2nd egress I didn't think you would do that probably she said.

Mr. King said we don't have any restrictions on that. He said in residential we don't allow dead end roads more than 900 ft. without provisions. He said sometimes it's another way out, sometimes it's pull offs and typically if it's a big residential development we would require a second egress at the 900 ft. or something to deal with that. We've had some like the trailer parks where the emergency access is not the primary one it's just gated and in the commercial I don't think we've had any requirement for that he said.

Mr. Pelkey said we don't have anything that's anywhere near that distance off the road.

Mr. King said there could be because some of these parcels are 2,000 ft. and the distance across the blue parcel to Ten Rod Rd. is almost a mile so they could be back in there a couple thousand feet.

Mr. Pimental said the one that the Town does have that he has not seen used and maybe that's because they haven't seen a development that would trigger it but there is frontage roads and rear access drives that are defined by the zoning and that is specifically called out in the access management part of the zoning along Rt. 11 but it's wherever possible. He said in his 4 years here he has never heard the board bring that up as something they wanted to require.

Mr. King said they brought up a good point on the rail trail which runs from where it crosses down by PIP Rental and then it goes all the way to Meetinghouse Hill and all those parcels cross

that and almost every parcel there is on both sides. He said the way to deal with that in the long term is to put an access road parallel on the westerly side and they would have to deal with the DOT and then cut across the rail trail in limited areas to reduce those curves and it would almost be an interior road.

Mr. Pimental said they would have to have so many agreements unless there was some sort of eminent domain.

Mr. King asked if the state has enough right-of-way to just put it in. He said he didn't know how wide it is but say if its 100 ft. there is more than enough for the rail trail because there are no rails there so if you needed to you could push the rail trail over a little bit for a secondary access road. He said it could be on paper like for the future but they could go through the DOT hurdles initially saying this is the development here and we know we are going to need a secondary access, this is what we're proposing and this is how we think you should implement it and give us the nod because we can then say to developers this is already on paper and we want you to do your portion of it.

Ms. Cleveland said that's to Mr. Whitman's point about how they're going to promote that they're open for business right there and that they're setting it up to be able to be developed and not have those issues around a second egress.

Mr. Pelkey said that's a big step towards taking care of the access problems they have on Rt. 11.

Mr. King said that could continue to run up through to the old Davidson Rubber plant on that access which he believes it is possible to have an access road or small street along with that rail trail and preserve the intent of that recreation.

Mr. Fougere said this is a great idea and they will capture this. He said another thought to this idea of a frontage street or a connection across the lots especially on the west side and knowing they have a statement that's been an option could it be a requirement so if Rick develops on a parcel he has to at least allow his parking lot to be connected to the next parking lot to create a frontage street over time so when he comes in next to him he has to connect to Rick and he may have a driveway access that's not worth doing so he is going to connect thru Rick's property and out to the intersection.

Mr. Pelkey said they may not let him have a driveway access because they are trying to limit access to Rt. 11 because they have so many accidents on it now. We want to develop Rt. 11 but at the same time we really have to take a look at the safety on Rt. 11 he said.

Mr. Henry said they won't be able to control what parcels are getting developed so it's too patchwork-y. He said if they put the road in and if it's a state r-o-w it would be better.

Mr. Fougere said if they build it it's outside of the regulatory process it's an initiative that they take on as a Town to do the permitting and get the funding. He said they could potentially do both and if they are trying to find a regulatory mechanism we're going to call...

Mr. Henry said the regulatory mechanism is the road to nowhere and that's a tough sell.

Mr. King said it's a tough sell for the developer but our road to nowhere needs to be picked from

the DOT front and this is their rail trail under the provisions of the DOT, these are the problems on Rt. 11, this is the zoning we want to encourage but they need to have a buy in so somehow they are going to put some revenue into this project that is preserving the rail trail adding some pedestrian and some vehicle traffic and also taking on some load and safety issues and if they don't buy in...

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said like she has said many times before they need to do something about Rt. 11 in the first place.

Mr. King said this would allow enhancement to the rail trail but would also provide some off let of that safety issue and then asked where else they could put a connector road. He said once you get inside that rail trail's 400 ft. you're on elevation and there's a reason Rt. 11 is where it is-because it's right next to all the gravel deposits. They didn't put it over 300 ft. because they would be right in the crappy soils and the rail trail follows along that where it was readily buildable the whole time he said.

Mr. Fougere said if they bear with them it could happen in parallel to cover all their bases and they might be able to give them some language that would show what they could have in place so if the right developers came along they could have it built out and they'd also still be able to pursue working with the DOT.

Mr. Mains asked if their idea is coming in through Davidson Rubber, go behind the rail trail, go parallel to it and come out at the other end where we're picking up. He said that way they don't mess up the snowmobile trail but they're still going to have to put some kind of stop signs in there for the motor vehicle people or the other users.

Mr. King said maybe they would put the paved road in front of the rail trail.

Mr. Fougere said he didn't want to spend the whole night on mixed use and not talk about the commercial and they could tell him if this should wait until next time. He asked about design standards, architectural standards and requirements and are they in favor, do they like to incentivize them if somebody wants to do something...

Mr. King said we already have them and we put them in back in 2004 as optional. He said they adopted these design standards and never really pulled out and once in a while they put them forth to a developer so for them to say they are going to adopt design standards it would be a big shift.

Mr. Fougere said he was thinking more in these new mixed use areas and thinking about some examples such as Point Place in Dover that has some and they don't have to be over the top.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson suggested there should be sight easements at intersections so you can see and they don't put signs or trees so it blocks the view.

Mr. King said for example in the Sarah Greenfield Business Park they have a requirement that there be no steel buildings and that was the intent of what they wanted but that doesn't mean that's what people want to build. I'd like to say build it the way I want but I'm not the one spending the money he said.

Mr. Pimental said maybe something they could do at another workshop would be to look at the architectural design standards for the business node district now in the site plan and subdivision regulations. He said the business node district is the TIF and there may be pieces of the business node district standards that they may want to carry forward or if they don't want that then that should come out of the site plan regulations as part of this whole process because it's confusing because it's there and we haven't ever applied it. He said it may be a useful exercise to go back and look at it and see if there's anything in there that you think makes sense for a walkable mixed use zone and take it out of the TIF District and apply it to the mixed use zone and get rid of it in the site plan regulations.

Mr. Fougere said the question for the 2 guys that often represent developers is to what degree are the design and architectural pieces helpful or do the developers have their own expectations for what is going to sell.

Mr. Halvorsen said it's fine to have design standards but he wouldn't go as far as design guidelines for things like materials and roof lines and that is probably not what they would want here. He said it's fine to say we want buildings that fit within this parameter but you also leave it flexible so the architects and developers have a little bit of wiggle room and you're not saying they have to use this kind of stone and this color brick and this veneer.

He said it's totally fine to say if you're building a transformative building in our community we want it to look nice and we want it to be walkable and have interior sidewalks and landscaping and parking standards.

Mr. Fisher said it sounds like they are talking about form based codes (development regulations that focus on the building's form and relationship to the public sidewalks, streets and streetscapes).

Mr. Halvorsen said it's less than form based codes and this would just be we want to have landscape islands in our parking lots that have trees on them and we want 6 ft. wide sidewalks and the façade of the building could be made up of these 4 materials and you give them a choice with some level of flexibility in there so you don't get corrugated metal buildings you get something that's going to look nicer than that.

Mr. Pimental said they could look at the regulations because he was surprised at how specific some of this is. He said it talks about what style of streetlamps, signage, colors, and materials.

Mr. King said most of that was developed for the Village Center downtown.

Mr. Pimental said this is for the business node. He said there is stuff in there about the landscaped islands, parking and some screening that may be applicable. He said there are some building designs that could be applicable but not making them too stringent. This was in here for a reason and we may want to take a look at it and see if anything still applies and remove this from our site plan regulations if we're not going to use it he said.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked him to send those regulations to the board so they could review them and then discuss them.

Mr. Pimental said he would pull them out of the site plan regulations and send to the board as a PDF.

Mr. Fougere said if it would be helpful if he would share any initial thoughts that come out of that discussion with them.

Mr. Whitman said flexibility is the biggest thing and as long as you don't get too micro-specific you'll be alright.

Mr. Fougere asked about the commercial district and if they are touching it and do they envision adding residential uses to the commercial district and do they want to keep any large mixed multi-family commercial away from the potentially louder, dirtier industries that could actually bring in business.

Mr. Pelkey said we allow for mixed use in the commercial now. He said they have said they were going to be as permissive as they can in all these zones and let the market sort out what's going to come in. We're trying not to preclude things he said.

Mr. Fougere asked if in the commercial district he could come in and just do residential.

Mr. King said no.

Mr. Halvorsen asked if they want to allow that or is it back to the example of somebody owns a commercial business and wants to do residential with that.

Mr. Pelkey said he didn't think they were ready to give away the commercial district quite yet.

Mr. King said the big push is residential based upon the need and making money but if they let some of our more desirable spots go that way we're going to regret it in the future.

Mr. Henry said we've only got 1 big highway through town.

Mr. King said an apartment house doesn't have much long term benefit to the town.

Mr. Fougere said at the Nov. meeting they talked about having places that you can have trucks start at 4 a.m. and not have people live next door. He said they're not trying to say you shouldn't have those they just want to talk about it.

Mr. Henry said if they're looking to increase residential they should look at the lot sizes in residential zones. I don't want to fill up the 1 big highway that we have with residential he said.

Mr. Whitman said so outside the blue area it's non-residential.

Mr. Pelkey said he was more amenable to it out in that area out towards Alton. He said we have commercial that runs down Rt. 11 towards New Durham right now and in that section he would be more amenable to being okay with having residential over there.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said that's residential now.

Mr. Halvorsen asked if they like the idea of that residential corridor.

Mr. Pelkey said he was amenable to residential along that particular piece of it even though right now it's commercial. He said they have commercial through there now.

Mr. Fougere asked if they want the other side of the street to stay commercial.

Mr. King said it should be commercial/industrial and they have an overlay that allows for a mix of industrial and commercial that's what we have and to say we want you to be over and you to

be over there instead of letting the market determine what's going to be where. He said there are existing residential uses, existing industrial uses and existing commercial uses and they're all next to each other in some cases.

Mr. Fougere said to clarify they don't need to deal with the commercial/industrial area if they are going to allow residential as a secondary use on a mixed use parcel.

Mr. Pimental said he wanted to get the pulse of the board and asked if that area where Spring St. is if they feel as though that area makes more sense to convert back to residential maybe expanding that smaller mixed use zone to capture some of the areas that have water and really concentrating on those 2 blue areas as mixed use. He asked if they wanted to keep the mixed use even in the commercial areas or remove that and rely only on commercial/industrial development or keep the door open for mixed use in all of those remaining areas.

Mr. Pelkey said he would like to leave their options open.

Mr. King agreed. He said they're proposing increasing it but they have yet to have somebody come in and it's not like they are getting overrun with mixed use, commercial and residential in that zone. He said they are looking to incentivize and it's probably going to be on a smaller scale based on what we have for land available and development costs and our economics. It would be great if somebody said that a big box store would solve all our problems and it would solve a couple of problems but it would create a few more he said.

Mr. Pelkey said it would be great if we were overwhelmed with all of those applications but we're not.

Mr. King said they increased the density downtown 3 years ago and we've had 3 applications in 3 years.

Mr. Henry said the Village Center is not that big either.

Mr. Pelkey said they have made it easier for people to redevelop older residences in Town but they haven't gotten a lot of people that are looking to do that at this point.

Mr. Halvorsen asked if the board was in favor of allowing standalone residential like multi-family in those mixed use districts or to build residential you have to build commercial.

Mr. Henry said mixed use requires commercial.

Mr. Pimental said what Mr. Halvorsen is saying is in the mixed use district would they allow strictly a residential like a 3 unit apartment because right now in the commercial we do not.

Mr. Henry said that's not mixed use that's purely a residential use.

Mr. Pelkey said he followed what Mr. Henry was saying and he agreed with him.

Mr. Halvorsen said in the use table they could say whatever they want and they could say a standalone multi-family 50 unit residential building is permissible.

Mr. Pimental said it's just the name and it doesn't mean the uses are mixed use on every parcel.

Mr. Henry said right now the lot can be mixed use but the lot has to be mixed use to be residential.

Mr. Pimental said the question is the entire district could be mixed use but a particular lot could be a 3 unit apartment.

Mr. Pelkey said they would have to come in for some kind of relief in order to do that.

Mr. Pimental said right now they would.

Mr. Fougere asked if developer said he could build a 75 unit building of townhomes or whatever but he didn't have any interest in coffee shop and somebody could do that next door would they allow them to do that.

Mr. Pelkey said he would ask them to take a look at this property over here where they think it would fit real well.

Mr. Whitman said in Bedford right near the downtown they have an office building sitting on 1 lot, a 150 unit apartment building on another lot, a restaurant on another lot, a medical office on another lot and it's a mixed use property but each property doesn't have mixed uses on it.

Mr. King said the question is if he is in favor of allowing a multi-unit residential standalone for purpose in our commercial/industrial zone and his answer was no.

Mr. Whitman said they were talking about the mixed use zones and asked if a developer wanted to build 150 apartments could he do it in that zone on a parcel by itself.

Mr. Pelkey added off of Rt. 11.

Mr. Pimental said not all of the parcels in the mixed use zone are off of Rt. 11.

Mr. Pelkey said most of them are.

Mr. Fougere said it's an important question because the standards have to be crafted to allow or not allow it.

Mr. King said the only way he would be in favor of it was if it was set back and not consuming the developable frontage. He said if you had a 4 acre parcel and the frontage is going to be for more commercial uses but because of the law you're not necessarily develop deeper into the lot so in that case in those nodes we could say that would fit.

Mr. Fougere asked how far back.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said maybe they don't want to build commercial or business.

Mr. King said if it's preserving that frontage they developed in the commercial he may be okay with it because it's the backland. He said he is answering his question in saying that they could allow it but do they say there's a setback.

Mr. Pimental asked if within the table of uses for this could they set some standards to allow for a standalone apartment by a Conditional Use Permit and set some standards, setbacks and whatever else.

Mr. King said he was not opposed to looking at that in those nodes and it might make sense in those nodes but spread along Rt. 11 he would not be in favor of. He said he would want to preserve a setback so there's a future for those commercial uses if the parcel allows.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she wanted to clarify what he was saying so if it's one lot and it's got a large frontage on Rt. 11 he would not let that one lot be completely residential without

the commercial in front or he just wants a larger setback.

Mr. King said he would preserve the potential to have commercial in front for the future so it may not be a requirement for them to do residential but the residential isn't in prime space.

Mr. Pelkey said making provisions along Rt. 11 so we don't give away our commercial space along Rt. 11 to residential development. He said if they have a deep lot build some residences back off the road but keep that area along the road for commercial uses.

Mr. King said along Rt. 11 there's an ATV Center and across from that is the Northgate Apartments-not that. He said if that was set back a little further then you could have commercial in front of it and the residential would be in the back and it could have common access points.

Mr. Pimental asked what if the lot didn't allow for that and if they would have to have enough space for...

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said maybe it's a pretty residential development.

Mr. Pelkey said he didn't want to see us give away our Rt. 11 possibilities for commercial and business to residential.

Mr. Whitman asked if they were just talking about the blue area not the whole corridor. He said everything that's not blue there's plenty of land there for commercial development so it's not like you're losing all this property. He said it's providing flexibility for this to happen, it doesn't have to be apartments it could be condominiums.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked what the goal is and if they were going to get more tax revenue.

Mr. Pelkey said the larger blue area is where Rt. 153 comes out on Rt. 11 and he didn't see us building apartment buildings at that intersection which is right in the middle of that so he is opposed to it.

Mr. Henry said what they are sending to the ballot now is the standard of commercial sq. footage next to residential sq. footage-50/50 is what they did so if they stuck with that standard and said to build residential only on mixed use to not build commercial you must show the viability of the commercial construction-where the building would go, there's enough space for parking basically a site for the commercial development so that you could see that it can be built then residential behind. He said so you are not building the commercial but you are showing the site plan that shows that enough commercial could be built to satisfy that sq. footage.

Mr. Pimental said he has not seen anything like that in a regulation before but he has seen it as part of a planned development. It's an interesting idea he said.

Mr. King said in some ways it's not really a concession but it is a concession to allow this type of development in this area of what we want to develop as a commercial node we're willing to allow this and this is one mechanism to do that.

Mr. Henry said it preserves the ability for that commercial development.

Mr. Pimental asked how specific would they have to craft that language and would a developer

essentially have to do 2 site plans and would we require them to meet all the parking, storm water all of that for the commercial development that's not being built to just do their residential.

Mr. Henry said he would say yes because if they don't how do we know that there's enough space to develop enough commercial to justify the residential if they're keeping that one open.

Mr. Pimental asked if that would kill the project by making it too expensive.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she thought they were being too stringent on this area.

Mr. Whitman said if they mandate commercial to a residential developer they're going to say thank you see you later. He said you set aside the space, you say you can't have residential within "x" feet of the corridor because you want that frontage to maximize tax revenue but behind it you come in with a plan there are a couple of pads out front that are future use when the market is there and out back goes residential. He said it doesn't get developed residentially there's no site plan yet because there's no use yet but it's preserved for future non-residential development that's available at that time.

Mr. King said they're not that far apart and he is interpreting that Mr. Henry wants a full blown drainage calculation but that's not it.

Mr. Henry said it is what he said but he needs to be convinced that there is enough room to build.

Mr. King said but that's to a reasonable level not a full engineering analysis.

Mr. Henry said some sites might require very specific "I don't think you have the room" and some parcels are big enough that it's obvious.

Mr. Mains said going down Rt. 1 towards Boston if you look at all those commercial areas in there behind there is houses of all kinds. He said he thinks what we have in mind there is to build that corridor commercial and put the houses in the back.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she knows most of the board disagrees with her but they have this gigantic section of Rt. 11 that's mostly commercial so these small multi-use areas they're restricting it too completely. She said they do have the ability to approve what that developer comes in and builds so you don't get whatever that apartment complex was named and it could be very nice.

Mr. Pimental said he would like to throw a compromise to the board and asked if they would be amenable to the smaller node only whatever the boundaries are, to allow for that node only to allow for residential without this additional frontage needs but the larger node along Rt. 11 and Rt. 153 is more restrictive. He said the reason he asked that is in that area he agreed with Mr. Pelkey about the tax revenue for that, that's where the TIF District is, that's where the Economic Revitalization Zone is, we really do want to encourage commercial development in that area and we don't want that area to get sucked up by residential so maybe they're a little more restrictive in that area but the smaller node that has water and sewer and asked if the board would be amenable to that area only not having any additional restrictions for

residential.

Mr. Henry said water and sewer is also attractive to commercial development and we have 1 big highway going thru town.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said and lots of commercial use along that highway.

Mr. Fougere said they have a busy highway corridor, they don't have a ton of promise that's a bunch of commercial development trying to come here and especially bigger commercial but if they were to have some residential units built in the blue zones now you have people there every day and asked doesn't that create demand for new commercial uses.

Mr. Henry said we have lots of places people could build residential housing but we have limited viable land for commercial development.

Mr. Fougere asked what they want to accomplish with this grant. He said this is a housing grant for Rt. 11 and asked what they wanted to get out of it related to housing that they can give them from a regulatory prospective. He said the focus has been very much on commercial tonight with residential to the back and asked if that was it like they're allowing bigger residential multi-family buildings set back from the highway and then they just leave the corridor for commercial and leave the commercial/industrial zones alone. I want to make sure we've given you what you can get out of this grant he said.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said they said there was a lot of land for residential development and asked where else they could build something with a lot of units in it.

Mr. King said the zoning going before the voters proposes to double and triple the density allowed by zone.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said she couldn't picture 100 units anywhere not off Rt. 11. She said they could take their development and just bring it back and not have it uglifying Rt. 11.

Mr. Henry said he didn't think that apartment buildings are necessarily ugly it's the matter of services vs. tax revenue and if it's a purely residential community...

Mr. Whitman said it would still make you money it's tax positive.

Mr. Fougere said it would make more tax money than the commercial.

Mr. Henry said he disagreed.

Mr. King said he disagreed and this is his 12th year as a Selectman and he has been on the Planning Board for 20 years and we need to have a balance. He said we have most of our people in this community go somewhere else to work so for us to incentivize more people to come here with no place for them to work locally is a disservice to this town to a certain extent. As far as me wanting a 100 unit residential building in this town I think that's not a good fit for our town he said.

He said we have a rural area on the west side of Rt. 11 that's a 3 acre zone that's mostly rural, country and some farms still we have a dense downtown center that we incentivized redevelopment and development for residential structures and he didn't have a problem with adding some multi-units in these nodes where it makes sense not on the frontage. He said he

disagreed with Mr. Henry about the Spring St. one and they could be a little bit more lax there for larger multi-units but still try to preserve some of that frontage because it's not really that commercial there. He said you could say we're going to allow more multi-units in that node. Mr. Fougere asked if that was the small blue node on the east side.

Mr. King said yes.

Mr. Pelkey said and down the yellow one towards Alton.

Mr. King said and then more residential there which we are restricting residential currently we could be more permissive on that side and still preserve on the other side which is typically what's there there's some residential, there's some commercial. I know there's a big push for housing in the state but we don't need to solve it all here he said.

Mr. Pimental said in just sort of hearing folks talk in terms of what we want to accomplish for the housing piece there are a couple of things he is hearing 1). There seems to be some relative consensus that orange/yellow area along Spring St. to convert that back to residential which is the predominant land use there now that doesn't currently allow for any residential as one goal for increasing housing.

Mr. Fougere asked if there was any sense of the density for that and how dense they would allow that golden area to be.

Mr. Pimental said they would probably want to look at the underlying zoning so that area is mostly rural and the area that gets closer to Tappan St. starts to move to suburban so we would either want to be consistent with that or they take that multi-use zone and extend it on the west to capture that whole neighborhood that has water and sewer.

Mr. King said the density in the underlying zone they're putting to the voters to allow an increase. He said if it's a 1 acre lot they allow a single family home, duplexes require two, multi-units would be more and now we're going if it's a 1 acre lot we allow single family, a duplex or a 3 unit so in some ways that's triple the density along that underlying zone and if you have water and sewer you can get a density bonus on each one of those.

Mr. Pelkey said the corridor along Rt. 11 that is yellow that they are talking about allowing residential in there just because of where it's at he would be willing to have a little bit higher density than a rural district.

Mr. Henry said he is fine with high density there it's fairly high density already. He said his concern there is access and a lot of the lots are served by roads that are off Rt. 11 but some of them may not be so we've got access to Rt. 11 concerns for some of those parcels.

Mr. Pimental said the other goal and improvement is if the board is willing to say that residential can go on one of these properties within the mixed use zone so long as the frontage is shown that it could support some form of commercial growth that is an improvement to not allowing it at all and prohibiting it and that their only option is to obtain a variance which is going to be difficult to meet those 5 criteria. He said by allowing to show that you could build the residential and he would leave it to them to figure out how to put that into a regulation if

it's part of a planned development however they want to do that but that is also at least an improvement because they are allowing for residences to be built without having to seek ZBA approval but you have to meet that frontage for future commercial growth.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked if those lots are much smaller there.

Mr. Pimental said he was talking about both of the mixed use zones and some of those lots are pretty big.

Mr. Henry said in the zones that aren't in the blue that we allow mixed use with the regulations they're putting before the voters they're saying residential and commercial needs to be in the same-in addition to the sq. footage max it needs to be in the same structure. He said they need to consider a similar thing the commercial structures could be up front even if they keep that sq. footage max the commercial could be one building and the residential could be another building.

Mr. Pelkey said he agreed they just have to dial in what that the density is going to look like.

Mr. Henry said they have a density they proposed but they said it has to be in same building. Maybe I don't want apartments above my machine shop but I want 2 floors of apartments at the back of the lot and the machine shop up front he said.

Mr. King said that's a discussion for next year.

Mr. Fougere asked if he was saying that for the commercial district as proposed or was he saying there are separate buildings for the separate uses in the mixed use.

Mr. Henry said for every place they allow mixed use right now what they've proposed is the mixed use is in one building.

Mr. Fougere asked if he was saying to allow them in separate buildings.

Mr. Henry said yes. He said he would still want the commercial facing the front with the residential in the back which is how it would probably be built anyways.

Mr. Pelkey said it would be reasonable to say if they are going to make that statement concerning the mixed use area where you want to show the ability to put commercial in that you might want to do the same thing in the commercial district.

Mr. King said they might not allow that in the zoning they may say they're only going to get the residential when you do the commercial. He said we allow the incentive and say no residential until you do the commercial.

Mr. Pimental said right now in the commercial you can't get the residential without the commercial.

Mr. King said next year they could be more permissive to say they're going to allow the same thing and allow the residential units to be not in the same building.

Mr. Fougere asked when Town Meeting was this year.

Mr. Pelkey said Town Meeting is on March 13.

Mr. Henry said a big chunk of land they haven't really talked about that they need to look at the zoning for too are the gravel pits that are nearing end of use. He said a lot of that zoning is

purely residential and some of those lots the bulk of the lot is the residential portion.

Mr. King said in that area it might make sense to encourage some of the larger residential behind that.

Mr. Henry said that soft line that they talked about needs to be further back because he sees opportunity for some larger commercial development back there because this is big open space.

Mr. Fougere asked if this is the part along the river towards Rochester.

Mr. Henry said yes and if he was familiar with the businesses along there behind where NAPA just moved their store to behind PIP Rental all of it in the back there are former or current near end of life gravel pits.

Mr. Pelkey said part of what they were going to talk about is what the viability of those areas is commercially and what they thought they were going to do with that.

Mr. Pimental said what they see in that portion of the commercial area that is closest to Rochester that northern side of the river follows those parcel lines so those parcels that are north of that on Chestnut Hill Rd. and those come all the way down essentially to that line. He said that's not a line that he drew the line is actually following the parcel lines north of the river.

Mr. Pelkey said that was the change they made last year to allow for development on those if it crossed into that property for development that you could develop that based on the front zoning.

Mr. Fougere asked if they wanted to create a different zone there or create different standards for that area to capture the area of the gravel pits.

Mr. Henry said he didn't know if it necessarily needs a different zone but the industrial business zone maybe to expand into that for mixed use.

Mr. Pelkey said those lots are so deep that they would be a decent place for development but also at the back of those.

Mr. King said it's also in the aquifer protection area and the Cocheco River and that's where the Town has a well and they all want to have that built out eventually but it needs to be built out with a lot of consideration.

Mr. Pelkey said the aquifer feeds Rochester as well.

Mr. King said so in that area you have our well, they have two 2 million gallons a day wells on the Rochester side that they have restrictions on so there is a lot of water coming out of that watershed area. He said all of these gravel pits are above that, the Town pit is above that and we lost 2 wells across from the former Collins & Aikman site from the pollution there and that's basically a stone's throw from this aquifer so we do have an overlay protection area but it needs to be for both the commercial industrial or the residential.

Mr. Henry said he didn't know what is viable to be built there given the restrictions and asked if they need to clarify that area is only residential or not developable. He said right now they have

writings that say if you have commercial in the front you can expand back and asked if it needs to be clear they can't expand back we have a well there. I don't know the answers to those but I think we need to answer those questions.

Mr. Pelkey said we have the wellhead protection zone.

Mr. Henry said they could look at that along with the zoning.

Mr. King said that radius is pretty small based upon the impact to our community and the neighboring community.

Mr. Fougere said at one point they talked about planning and development and a conservation subdivision and asked if that is an area they could set up as a performance zone, acknowledge the groundwater protection focus, the wells in the area, maybe it's heavier on the residential use, it's set back behind your commercial area but there are certain standards. He said it's big enough that maybe a developer would come in and do a master plan with inner connective roads and residential uses.

Mr. Pelkey said he thought residential uses would be the least impactful use on the land as opposed to industrial and commercial uses.

Mr. Henry asked what a performance zone is.

Mr. Fougere said just that there would be different expectations of the site plan that you're focusing on the natural elements there and you're going to have more green space, less impervious surface and maybe more flexibility for taller buildings and they could build it out over time. He said they might see the advantage of having water nearby and being able to build out a roadway network out back there.

He said it's a large piece of land with some nice natural resources nearby and they were talking about crossing the river and the challenges and there is the Pike Bridge. He said its setting standards to say it's not a free-for-all in the Wild West and asked if they added anything to that.

Mr. King said we have a cluster subdivision that could be tweaked to allow that density bonus and leaving common area for resource protection in this case. He said we already have that and somebody could apply that in that area.

Mr. Pimental said the pits that are closest to the Rochester line the flood plain that is in that area is massive and it takes up a large portion of some of those lots and he would argue that the excavation that has been done on some of them has maybe altered the flood plain.

He showed them the map of the area on his computer and pointed out the Rochester city line and the areas they were talking about and noted that the maps in Farmington were done in 2005 but the delineations from FEMA were from the 1970's. He said they have not been updated with new LIDAR data and he would not be surprised at all if these have changed because all of these are in areas that have excavated. I'm sure the topography current conditions are way different than what they were so I would imagine this flood plain is different he said.

He said the area with the bridge on Pike is not in this area it is way up here where the flood

plain is not nearly as much of an issue. He said anything over the river is going to be a tough sell and they could extend the commercial zone to the river and they could take a closer look with Zack's maps but he didn't think there was a whole lot of viability because of the flood plain. I think it offers a lot of challenges in that particular area he said.

Mr. Pimental said he thinks that the Pike one offers a tremendous amount of opportunity. He said that is in the blue mixed use area and that has a bridge and there are crossings that cross the river on some of these properties but they may not be built to the same standards as the one that Pike has. He said we know that bridge was built to a standard because of the amount of truck traffic and weight it was carrying so that isn't as much of a concern as maybe some of the other ones.

Mr. King said there are only 2 other ones. He said there is one on the Town property that they just purchased which are basically culverts and the bridge that Packy Campbell owns is a crossing that could be improved but it's not going to meet any standards.

Mr. Day said the Pike bridge is a single wide and it's wide for a dump truck but it's not wide enough for 2 cars to pass. He said it's a haul road and all they did was pave it so they could get the trucks in and out.

Mr. King said but it could be improved and it's in better condition than the lower one.

Mr. Fougere asked if this seems like a good breaking point or if there were other things they hoped would come up tonight. He said it was helpful for them to hash this stuff out and look at the maps and the board will have additional thoughts and they will have additional questions.

Mr. Pimental asked what he thought the next steps were so he can put on the agenda the review of the business node district. He said they have some lighter agendas coming up so they could use the first meeting of the next month or two to continue this conversation and then asked if there is anything they want the board to be thinking about in getting them more information to continue to move forward with this.

Mr. Fougere said if he can get them the dates of the lighter agendas the plan that he shared with Mr. Pimental and Ms. Cleveland when they prepped for tonight is he wants to meet with the rest of the team and talk about what they heard. He said it seems like the focus is on working on the regulations for the mixed use areas and making some adjustments to where they cover and then the residential area that goes towards New Durham. He said they will compare notes and start to pull together what they heard and look at what exists today and create that today vs. potentially tomorrow thing. He said they will come up with a timeline based on everyone's schedules and asked for a draft of that and then they can determine if it's something he sends ahead to Mr. Pimental for the board to take a look at or if he can be here for the meeting.

He said they are in good shape and they know they have to be done in July but the idea is they've been closing in on this vision and they want to give them what will be useful to them. He said he held up the grant because it's so housing focused and he wanted to make sure that

they get what they want for Farmington. He said he knew what Mr. King was saying about the focus in NH on housing units but they aren't trying to force any particular number of units on to them or the kind of housing but there has to be a housing component and he thinks it's here so he thinks they're good. We just want to give you as much value as possible that you can take after July and decide what you want to use if any of it he said.

He said part of this is getting Mr. Halvorsen in to hear this because he is going to be working on the TIF District and we want the TIF plan and the zoning to speak to each other so they will also be talking about a timeline and what they need for that.

Mr. Pimental said they should talk about that sooner than later because Farmington by vote has set up a TIF committee that doesn't exist at the moment so he is going to need some time to find the right members to get that off the ground. He asked Mr. Halvorsen to let him know what his timeframe is so he can get that subcommittee together.

Mr. Whitman said one thing that does have to be addressed that they are mandated to do is workforce housing and there is no dodging that. He said they currently don't have it, they have to or they could open themselves up to litigation.

Mr. Henry asked Mr. Whitman to explain what that means.

Mr. Whitman said the workforce housing statute was adopted in 2008 and mandates that every community provide reasonable and realistic opportunities for workforce housing. He said right now they don't have a workforce housing ordinance.

Mr. King said he believes they had a discussion with Town Attorney Keriann Roman that based upon the economics of the situation the housing we have available meets that standard.

Mr. Pimental said he thinks these are 2 different items. He said when there was a proposal about manufactured housing in the town the argument that the applicant's attorney was making was that the Town was violating workforce housing laws by not allowing for the expansion of manufactured housing. He said the Town's Attorney said that's not true because we allow for manufactured housing on individual lots just not parks and not expansion of parks. He said she was saying we are not in violation of workforce housing when it pertains to the expansion of existing mobile parks but they are talking about the workforce housing law that has nothing to do necessarily with manufactured housing.

Mr. King said he didn't know what the requirements are under that but he was led to believe in discussions that based upon what is available for housing here that we currently provide enough under that requirement.

Mr. Pimental said that Att. Roman did say that what Farmington has to offer was a reasonable or fair amount of housing-the stock that is available in town. He said if the law requires that we have something in our ordinance stating that, then we need to include that. I think what she was saying was Farmington currently has more than their fair share of workforce housing so I don't think we're in violation in terms of what we have provided we may be in violation of what we need to have in our ordinance he said.

Mr. Whitman said the statute says you can do an analysis and if you can show that your existing zoning and existing housing stock meets the regional need you don't need to do anything. But you need to do that analysis you can't just state it you have to have the number of units and the SRPC just completed an analysis that showed that you need to add units over the next 10 or 15 years he said.

Mr. Henry said the Town doesn't build houses.

Mr. Whitman said they don't have to build anything all they have to do is make sure your regulations allow for it at a density that is enough that it's economically viable.

Mr. King asked with the proposed increases going before the town with density which are 2 and 3 times if we would fare better on that analysis.

Mr. Whitman said absolutely and this isn't just multi-family it also has to apply to their rural zones. He said workforce housing has to be available in your largest residential zones which are the light yellow.

Mr. Henry asked how workforce housing is defined.

Mr. Whitman said in this community it's anything under \$407,000.

Mr. King said in the information provided the average cost of a house in Farmington is \$360,000 and Strafford County is \$434,000. He said that's the threshold and asked for the percentage that has to be below that.

Mr. Whitman said the state law doesn't say you have to have 10% or 15% it's very soft. He said there's no number which makes it very challenging.

Mr. Pimental said what they have done over the last couple of years if they can show that what Farmington is allowing now especially if what passes in March we are more than fair share of what we're providing.

Mr. Whitman said if that data is available they could-like the assessor tracks sales.

Mr. Pimental asked if this is something they could provide guidance on how they would show that analysis.

Mr. Whitman said yes.

Mr. Pimental said he would be willing to bet that what we have now especially with what we proposed we would be meeting that statute.

Mr. Whitman said on the rental side its \$1,840 a month.

Mr. Henry said that's hard for a town to control.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked if it's how many homes that are available for sale or how many lots are available to build on.

Mr. Whitman said it's the price point. He said if 60% of your sales for example were under \$407,000 in his opinion they'd be fine but if it was 10% that would be tougher.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said that he said they didn't have enough to meet why they're saying.

Mr. Whitman said the analysis that was just completed noted that...he didn't have the numbers in front of him.

Mr. Pimental said 400 units in the years between now and 2040.

Mr. King said that's based on projected growth.

Mr. Whitman said that's right.

Mr. Fougere said they can look at giving them a path forward where they can calculate what they've done and they don't have to make any changes but it was something that came up when they did the policy audit was that it was missing from the zoning so they feel that it is in their best interest if they talk about it and raise the question.

Mr. Pelkey asked if it's because we don't have the words workforce housing in our ordinance.

Mr. Whitman said if the rent levels are at or below that level today and the sales prices are at that level or below and they had an analysis that showed that from the assessing office then you don't have to do that.

Mr. Pelkey said it's something they totally have no control over.

Mr. Whitman said they have no control over it then they don't have to do anything because he can buy lots of houses when they come on the market if the price point is under that \$410,000 then you don't have to do anything.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked how you even address it.

Mr. Whitman said you address it by making sure that I can build a house for \$400,000. He said the Town doesn't have to build anything but your laws, the zoning has to allow for someone to be able to build for \$400,000 or less and you do that through density.

Mr. Pimental said which he thinks they have done.

Mr. King said he has developed vacant lots and the cost to build a house on a 10 acre parcel is the same as it is on ¼ acre parcel so you can say it affects based on density but that's only for developers who are developing for profit. He said on a case by case development case which we have a lot of with individual houses you can bring 2 people in here and this person says he can't build a house for \$500,000 and an elderly person in his neighborhood is building one for \$200,000. He asked who is developing the standard on what you're building-a \$4,000 mansion or a \$1,800 condo.

Mr. Whitman said it could be a condo it doesn't have to be a single family home.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson asked if they address this in the regulations by saying if the developer is coming in here with proposal for a 10 unit building "x" percentage of that must be workforce housing.

Mr. Whitman said that's what they could do.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said if someone wanted to put in 10 units, 6 of them are expensive top of the line finishes and 4 of them are more moderate finishes.

Mr. Whitman said that's "inclusionary housing" and that is how it could be done. He said he would circle back with Mr. Pimental and they can talk about it.

Mr. King said some of that is more applicable for more affluent or bigger towns because when we look at our economics here he thinks we are well under that. He said they will have to

monitor that and if they need to put something in the zoning to deal with it they can.

Mr. Whitman said like he just said if that's the case and that's the market and you're under it you're fine you don't have to do anything.

Mr. Pimental asked for something he could give to the assessing clerk that says to follow these steps and give us these numbers to see where we're at and if we need to we can circle back. He said he would be willing to bet that we're probably fine but if he would send him that and then he could bring it to the board.

Mr. King asked if he could track down the number of units they say we need to have and if that was based on growth.

Mr. Pimental said its 412 units by 2040.

Mr. King asked what the projected growth was for 2040.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't know and he would have to go back and look.

Mr. King said it may be based on us going from 7,000 to 14,000 people.

Ms. Cleveland said it's not that high and it's only to 9,000 or 10,000 people for Farmington.

Mr. Whitman said by 2030 they mention 93 owner occupied and 38 rentals under those price points. He said they did a 2030 projection and a 2040 projection.

Mr. Pelkey said they didn't build anything since 1950 and now we're going to be stuck with trying to catch up to it all.

Mr. Henry asked what if they don't. He asked what if all of a sudden people like it here and houses are selling for \$600,000.

Mr. Whitman said if they don't they could end up like Windham, Pelham or Brookline. He said Brookline just spent \$1.7 million fighting the Tamposi's on a workforce housing development, they settled for \$610,000, they were sued under the federal fair housing law and they spent \$1.1 million on legal fees.

Mr. King said the developers wanted to come in and put in workforce housing and asked if what they were proposing wasn't allowed by their current zoning.

Mr. Whitman said it was allowed by their current zoning and as soon as the project came in the Planning Board had a conceptual discussion with the developer, they immediately called for a Special Town Meeting and added a growth control ordinance.

Mr. King said the town brought this on themselves it wasn't that they weren't in compliance.

Mr. Whitman said Mr. Henry asked what the ramifications are. He said they didn't have any (workforce) zoning, a gentleman came in who wanted to do workforce and it wasn't on their books at all, they went to the ZBA and were denied, they appealed it to the Housing Appeals Board and the Town lost, they went back and the ZBA approved it.

He said they might be getting ahead of ourselves because if the analysis shows they are in compliance they don't need to do anything.

Mr. Pelkey said his point is a good one because all of the towns he listed are border towns and they've had plenty of people leaving MA which has been driving the value of homes up so

suddenly if we have a big influx of people from out of state and the value of all homes goes through the roof we're going to be in trouble.

Mr. Fougere said 20% to 30% of sales are from out of state.

Mrs. Patton-Sanderson said he said they came in and proposed workforce housing and the town wouldn't let them have it and our issue is more along the lines of...

Mr. Whitman said he wasn't saying that was a mirror example he was saying the ramifications of it is legal.

Mr. Henry said if somebody can't build it we're in trouble. He said if they don't make some kind of an ordinance but don't turn this stuff down they're fine.

Mr. Whitman said they wanted to make sure one way or another they were covered and they didn't want to gloss over it. We're here to raise issues and that's a state mandate he said.

Mr. King said it's a state mandate with state funding so developers can apply under workforce housing and get subsidized whether its tax credits or whatever from the state.

Mr. Whitman said most projects are not tax credits it's just density.

Mr. King asked if there is no current incentivizing through the state through tax credits or tax relief for workforce housing.

Mr. Whitman said there are projects that have used tax credits to build them but most of the projects he is familiar with the zoning was in place that allowed the density to happen and that's how it happened. There were no tax credits and there was no discount he said.

Ms. Cleveland said they haven't seen what the state is putting as far as incentives in the Housing Champions program but in MA which this program is mirrored after inclusionary housing or some sort of work force housing is a requirement so that might be something if the Town was going to go for the Champions program which means that you're eligible for additional funding, not just housing funding but all sorts of other funding.

Mr. Pelkey said we're sensitive when somebody says you need to have a ruling or you're going to get in trouble and we generally try to make sure we have it.

Ms. Cleveland said this program is a very similar one and you get lots of points if you have these types of things in place. She said they are currently creating the rules around the Housing Champions program and she was not sure when they will be done but they're working on it.

Mr. King asked if it is expected to be done this year or next year.

Ms. Cleveland said the state is starting to pick up their lunchtime webinars again and she would check into those because they are going to be starting again soon.

Mr. Pelkey said they learned a lot tonight and thanked the team for coming.

7). Any Other Business Before the Board:

Zoning Amendment Flyers-Mr. Pimental said Housing Navigator Courtney Grugnale is here and he wanted to take a few minutes to note that Courtney worked on the zoning amendment flyers. He said they have been talking about it for a couple of years on how to make the zoning amendments more digestible for the general public other than what they typically do which is

putting the tract changes on the Town website, making hard copies available at the Planning Dept. He said he asked Courtney to take the 7 different amendments and break them down into more digestible ways for folks to look through these and understand them.

Mr. Henry said the block at the bottom of page after Amendment 7 containing the place, date and time for voting on the amendments says at the Old Town Hall and it is now called the Town Hall and some people are touchy about it.

Mr. Pimental said Courtney will make the one small correction to remove the word "old" from that page. He said Courtney did a really good job with summarizing what the article is, explaining why they spent so much time on what the change was, what the outcome of these amendments are and it goes a long way to explain to someone that wanted to know that didn't participate in any of the public hearings, that didn't come to any of those meetings to understand what each of these zoning amendments mean. He said some of them were quite complicated because there was more than one piece to the amendment and Courtney did a really good job with separating this and showing with graphs what this all means. Whether or not this influences voters or has any impact on whether someone says yes or no I don't know the answer to that but I do think we heard the feedback that we need to make these things easier for people to understand so I wanted to give a lot of credit to Courtney that she took this on and that it came out really great he said.

He said they will make that small tweak but they wanted to have at least a month of this to promote it, put it on the website, share it on social media and get it out to people. He said if they have any suggested changes or find a typo they are happy to make those changes but they wanted to get this ready for next week to share.

Mr. King said he liked it and then asked if legal has looked at it and the reason he says that is when you look at the bottom and it says Why Change and the Outcome he wants to make sure they're not overstepping what they should be saying trying to lead voters to make a decision. He read from page 1 as an example "Outcome? This change will ensure high-quality housing developments that reduce impacts to wetlands..." and asked if that language is going to pass muster regarding the legal standpoint that we're not overstepping our bounds. He said he likes what it says, he likes how it's broken down but because they're handing it out to voters they don't want to go beyond where we should.

Mr. Pelkey said to ask the attorney to look at it and one of the questions should be are they going to be allowed to place these in the Town Hall because that would be a fantastic place to put them when people are coming in to vote.

Mr. Pimental said he would send this to Att. Roman tomorrow and ask her to look it over and the intent is to make this available to people so people will understand what they're voting on. The intent was not to influence people but I could see how that could be perceived he said.

Mr. Henry said he was looking at the pictures and they're all downtown in the VC and if he was looking through this he would say this is all for downtown it doesn't pertain to me.

Mr. Day said if they read the big bold letters and it's a picture of the town that's all it is and it says Amendment 1 Agriculture District and they'd say I know where that is.

Mr. Pimental said they didn't have a ton of pictures so if folks have a better picture of the AR district or the SR district they're happy to include it.

Ms. Grugnale said if they think of anything else to let them know and she can make any changes.

Next Meeting Agenda- Mr. Pimental said for their next meeting they have a 2 lot subdivision off of the upper portion of Paulson Rd. right after the bridge. He said this was a property that received a variance last year to have residential so they will be before the board to subdivide into a 2 lot residential subdivision and that is the only thing before them at the next meeting.

8). Adjournment:

Motion: (Mains, second Day) to adjourn the meeting passed 7-0 at 9:20 p.m.

Kathleen Magoon
Recording Secretary


Richard "Rick" Pelkey, Chairman