

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2002**  
**37 NORTH MAIN STREET**

**Members Present:** Norman Russell, Hiram Watson, Marty Chagnon, Jim Horgan, Brad Anderson, Troy Robidas, Kelly Parliman

**Selectmen's Rep:** John Fitch

**Staff Present:** Fran Osborne

**Public Present:** Suzette Richards, Margaret Russell (ZBA), Walter Ratcliffe, Ed Mullen (CC), John McKenna, John & Jane Wingate, Gary White

- Chairman Russell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Marty Chagnon was seated for vacant seat. Minutes of the June 11, 2002 meeting were reviewed. Troy made motion to approve with following amendments, Marty 2<sup>nd</sup> (John Fitch and Jim Horgan abstained), motion carried:
  - Page 1 - 8<sup>th</sup> line from bottom - Norm feels the ZBA has done some "**unplanning**" and feels
  - Page 1 - 6<sup>th</sup> line from bottom - **Norm said** the Commercial Center could have included Two Greeks and didn't.
  - Page 1 - 5<sup>th</sup> line from bottom - **This was not arbitrary and was the zoning district boundary line location which** was done for a purpose.
- Chairman Russell stated he would like to discuss the "Application Review" procedure and that there would be two continuations tonight (William Pete Harvey and Eva Christensen (Earth Tenders).
- Chairman Russell stated a bill was approved for \$311.21 regarding meeting for assistance with CIP refinement and impact fee schedule development training session that he attended.
- Chairman Russell stated our application review procedure "was very interesting" as was evidenced from the last meeting. If we follow our Site Review procedure more closely and complete screening beforehand we would benefit from this. There is a process which allows this prior to public hearing. As you know from the last meeting, there were differences of opinion with the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) and the Planning Board. Norm feels the Planning Board (PB) should review these plans prior to public hearings being scheduled. An initial and preliminary subdivision review can be done before advertising for public hearing. The applicant can be free to be here. A letter can be sent to the applicant letting him know when the public hearing will be scheduled and what is required from them for this public hearing. I think this would save a lot of time. We could then have the opportunity to discuss and review before the scheduled meeting. By our By-laws our 2<sup>nd</sup> monthly meeting is supposed to be a workshop meeting. I feel we may be accommodating the applicants more than doing planning. We could use this 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting for planning reviews which would lead to more organized procedures. Applications already received and in process (Craig Lancey, Packy Campbell, Eva Christensen, Pete Harvey) are excepted. The Harvey Site Review can be dealt with July 23, 2002. Jim Horgan said in the past we have relied on the CEO to put together the package beforehand to bring to the PB for review and this just needs to be pulled together. Hiram asked when the clock starts ticking. Norm said the 1<sup>st</sup> time it is scheduled for public hearing and the application is approved as complete. Norm said the CEO should pre-screen all applicants before the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting for public hearing. The CEO could present the PB the plans and what is being requested to do. John Fitch - the CEO can get all this up front. Jim Horgan - have the CEO make sure all elements are there, but the PB should complete the review process. Kelly - the PB members should be reviewing the plans before the meetings anyway. We are reviewing for completeness including waivers, etc. Brad - written narrative, conceptual plan and completed Site Review Application form are the basics required from CEO. We should not be getting into long discussions with applicants. The CEO should interact up to the point where it comes to the PB as being complete. I prefer the CEO interacting with the applicant and keeping it simple. There are benefits there. Norm - we have received preliminary plans which come before us and we waive some things

if it is not high profile. We may not require some items if we determine so. Troy - discussed the CEO doing the initial screening. Norm - applications already scheduled will be excepted. As a rule, we will set aside the 2<sup>nd</sup> week as a workshop. Brad - do we need to tweak this procedure? Norm - we need to review the Subdivision Regs and Site Review Regs. Kelly - if we are going to follow procedures, we can make notes and incorporate them into place in the regs as they need to be.

**Public Hearing 7:30 p.m.**

- Chairman stated again the following will be continued:
  - Site Review Application continuation by William "Pete" Harvey** for proposed retail store (Antiques, classic cars, guns & boats) on Rte. 11 (Map R64, Lot 9) - continue to July 23, 2002.
  - Subdivision Review Application continuation by Earth Tenders (Eva Christensen)** for owner Pike Industries, 3-lot subdivision at Rte. 11/Paulson Rd. (Tax Map R36, Lot 1, & R32, Lot 30-1 (lot line revision) - continue to July 9, 2002.
  
- **Site Review Application continuation by Craig Lancey for 55 Bunker St.** (Tax Map U10, Lot 37), to add (7) residential housing units to existing (1) unit residence. Norm mentioned to Craig before he started about the Master Plan/Zoning Ordinance Subcommittee meetings. Craig explained he was away in Canada the last meeting. Craig brought in new plans for the board to review with items requested from last meeting. Craig said the 6,000 s. f. of recreation area was depicted, also screen for dumpster, and boundary marker for future sidewalk (these are all noted on plan). A Quit Claim deed for the 10' sidewalk will be made to the Town. Chairman asked for public input - no abutters present and no public input - public portion closed.
 

Chairman asked the PB for input. Hiram - asked about dedicated open space - is it wooded? Craig said it is flat and grassed and eventually woods. John asked about number of units. Norm said 7 - that's the proposal. What about bedrooms in basement? Craig - we also discussed a bump-out or a family room. If it garrisons out, an additional 2 feet would be added to the master bedroom. Two meetings ago we discussed a 32' 1<sup>st</sup> floor and bump-out on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor as a bedroom or family room. This is optional. Kelly - we don't know exactly what is going here. Craig - for purposes of discussion, they will be 3-bedroom units. Troy - as you build, you can't expand. Craig - we intend to pre-lease to long-term tenants. The bump-out is in the back. I would probably alternate bump-outs. My goal is to pre-lease in advance. There will be long-term leases. Norm - these will have potential to be 3-bedroom units. Norm - as part of Craig's application, there will be a total of 21 people (1 per bedroom or 2 in a bedroom if s. f. is large enough) in the building. Jim - I cannot approve a plan that may change after approval whether a bump-out or whatever. We need to define s. f. of bedrooms per person. The bump-out needs to be decided on beforehand. John - 1 bedroom for 2 people needs to be 120 s. f. Craig - the plan calls for a foundation size and I can say all units will bump-out two feet on all units. There is a plan - the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would be 34' instead of 32'. The 2<sup>nd</sup> level is the only thing that will change. Brad - I can't find where it says we have a floor plan. Discussion. Technically there is not room for a 4<sup>th</sup> bedroom. Brad - up to 5 people could be in this unit. John Fitch - no, he has to submit his building permit to show the number of people in the bedrooms. It is a good possibility it would be increased to over 21 people. John - they would have to come before the board again if it is more than 21 people which is what he is requesting approval for. Brad - there are things here that don't add up. Jim - there is potential if the building is in fact going to be bumped out, I want it defined on the plan. John - if someone bought it and revamped it, we still have the plans in the office for what was approved. Craig - I can put the 2 feet bump-out there right now and sign it. Kelly - we should have the total s. f. Troy - who gets the 2 feet? Craig - the master bedroom only in each unit. Jim - the s. f. of the building should decide the total in the bedrooms. Norm - if Craig comes back - many other things would be looked at. Jim - a motion should include anything other than 21 bodies must come back for Site Review. John discussed BOCA code and number of people per s. f. Norm - I can see 3 bedrooms with 3 people in them. I also see potential for more. Norm - if you built the 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom, you need to specify size and that it would not accommodate

more than 5 people. Craig - no more than 2 people per bedroom. Norm - now you are looking at 6 people per unit. Craig - the basement would be restricted to no more than 2 persons, no more than 5 people in a unit. Jim - potential is there for a total of 35. Norm and Troy - no - he has a building total of 21 specified. Norm - the units will be designed so no more than 5 people can occupy a unit. Kelly - this plan has major mistakes. Details are incorrect and need to be fixed - 9 units should be changed to 7 units. Norm - did you change the total s. f.? Craig - no. The 54,202 now existing should be proposed of 53,982 s.f. Troy - Craig should bring a new plan showing the 2 feet bump-out on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor overhang. I will change that. Add size of bedrooms with notation on 3 bedrooms proposed (no more than any one unit based on bedroom size). Brad - Quonset hut - how can this be used for this site and be credible? I don't see how it is credible. Norm - I don't see it as an accessory use to the building. My knowledge of what a tool truck is used for is to go from site to site. I would label this building as a contractor's storage facility. Craig said he specified on the building permit it would be used for general related care of current rental units and storage of equipment and materials. We would be subjecting Bunker St. to added traffic if it is to be part of this proposal. Discussion on use followed. It doesn't add up. Norm - I'm not comfortable with this Quonset hut (garage) being here. It should be where it is permissible. John - can you move the building somewhere else? Craig "no". Norm - building #1 - no stated use. Craig - this will be an office. Norm - "specific to the site"? Also Marty Chagnon saw potential for 18 vehicles. Now I see 14. Nothing is delineated relating to this proposed building and where it goes. Craig - that building s. f. would only be for 1 parking space. If a unit is empty, someone would be coming to inquire. The s. f. speaks for itself. I thought I submitted everything requested by the PB. Kelly - note on the plan what bldg. #1 will be used for. Craig said he asked the CEO about the garage and he gave me the permit. Norm said the CEO is not here to give his opinion. Jim - what is the "list" of items you need? Hiram said "let's make a list."

- (1) need 6/21/02 plan revised to reflect changes as follows
- (2) notation for building #1 use - add dimensions
- (3) change (9) units to (7) units and scrutinize all numbers to reflect (7) units
- (4) note top building #1 - "to be relocated"
- (5) written narrative defining s. f. per bedroom (must meet BOCA code)
- (6) engineered design on detention pond

Norm said Craig should go for a Variance on the use of the Quonset hut (garage). Discussion followed on use of tool truck and others doing the same. Norm - this doesn't fit. It's out of scale with the whole project. It's very visible and affects aesthetics of the neighborhood. John - isn't he having 3 businesses - Craig "no." Norm - It's not an accessory to the primary use. Brad - he could go to the ZBA for a variance or move it or go by what the PB votes on. Norm - I would look for utilities to be installed by an engineer, especially that the detention pond be properly installed and have the engineer sign off at applicant's expense. Kelly - the PB could hire an engineer and do it at the applicant's expense. Did we get an engineered design on the retention pond? Craig said this was presented way back. At this point Craig left the meeting. Brad said the list should clearly show the above list is not complete. Norm said "yes." Norm said we are looking to a motion to continue to 7/23/02. Discussion followed by Jim on the PB getting together to discuss these things coming up before the PB to the extent we can between now and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of July to ease the burden. Jim stressed we need to review these things before the actual meeting for public hearing takes place. Brad said one of his frustrations is we are doing a hell of a lot of site review applications and not doing any planning. We are not doing any planning. Maybe we need to form a subcommittee to start doing some planning and I am against bumping our planning meetings. Troy - then I would schedule this for the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Kelly - it still doesn't allow us time to review - and it is supposed to be a workshop session. Troy - but we already know it's not going to be a workshop session so maybe we should say starting in August. Norm - I agree as I said we would go with those applications already in process. I would like to not have new applications. I think Fran has a feel for the direction that when people come in with what they think is a completed application, and the process is that we are doing a screening for site review and a preliminary if it is a subdivision. Hiram - has his time run out? Norm - yes, his time has run out - it ran out last week (this isn't even appropriate). He has to go to the Selectmen. He can go to the Selectmen and can force us to

make a decision within 40 days. He hasn't done that yet to my knowledge. He doesn't have to resubmit his application. I think if he does that we would be very prepared to make a decision. The 65-day calendar has passed. He was supposed to show up one night and didn't. John made motion to terminate this plan as the owner has left and continue to July 9, 2002, Jim 2<sup>nd</sup>, Troy and Kelly opposed. Motion was amended to change date of continuation to July 23, 2002 by Jim, Troy 2<sup>nd</sup>, all in favor - motion carried. John discussed procedure and what Craig presented and said this is "BS." You go by the plan presented and you don't deviate. Norm - let's move on.

- **Site Review Application continuation by Craig Lancey for 53 Glen St.** (Tax Map U10, Lot 114), to construct (2) buildings housing a (4) unit and a (3) unit on existing open space on lot. Being as Craig has left, Norm said we will have to continue and Troy said Craig is a "no show." Motion was made by Kelly to continue this to July 23, 2002, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Marty Chagnon, all in favor. Brad discussed Craig coming to the CC meeting and there was a split vote on his project "to waive the 50 feet buffer around the wetland there." so it is still not resolved. Hopefully the CC will meet before the July 23, 2002 PB meeting. The Conservation Commission meeting will probably be July 3, 2002 or sometime before the July 23<sup>rd</sup> PB meeting.
- **Earth Removal Regulations continuation.** Norman removed himself from the board as he may have a conflict. Kelly is chairing this portion. Kelly said this is an official public hearing. Copies of the revised final draft were given to board members. This is just the final typed version. No public input was received. Hiram said this covers everything very well. Troy said we have spent a lot of time of this. Kelly has one amendment.

**Page VII - Prohibited Projects**

Kelly - the subcommittee as I remember went to great pains to make sure that all those items were O.K. Under A. **The regulator shall not grant a permit under the following conditions:** (put this above A.)

**A. Where excavations are proposed** within 50 feet of the boundary line

John Fitch made a motion to approve the Earth Removal Regulations to approve as presented and amended above effective June 25, 2002, Hiram 2<sup>nd</sup>, all in favor - motion carried as being approved. This is a minor change. Chairman Russell is back on the board. Forward to the CEO for further action.

- Chairman Russell said we should go back to discuss the requirements for engineering for improvements at the site that are common to the site. I know the Town CEO has hired an engineer to look at the road construction at Cherub Estates for example. It is not something we required as conditional and as part of the process. Some person should be responsible for the manner that they are done as opposed to someone coming in and making a detention pond and not knowing how to do it. Now the burden is on the CEO on this particular pond for Glen St. Jim - the retention pond has engineering specs - isn't that engineer liable. Norm - no, he just spells out the requirements. The houses get built, the project is completed, the road breaks up, sewer line breaks, etc. Jim - are you saying we are going to make it standard to enlist an engineering service who will come in and verify that water, sewer, roads, drainage, etc. is correct. Norm and Troy - applicant should prove that all land work is done according to the plan. Norm - we need someone qualified to do this. John Fitch said if the board members get a chance, they should go check out the detention pond on Glen St. John feels this should be next to the road and not where it is. Norm said this is under other business to come before the board. Norm gave an example of Rochester - they hire an engineering firm to come in and the applicant pays for it. The engineering firm takes responsibility for it being correct. I am suggesting is that we do not have it in our ordinance - we do have it that we can make conditions and I believe that would be prudent to make those conditions. Jim - you didn't mention bonds. If you have an engineer who stamps the plan you have somebody to blame. They should know. Kelly - is the engineer who designs the plan for a site obligated to supervise the construction design. Norm - not the construction. Troy - we could enlist a service to do this. Fran gave an example of a meeting that took place

on Cherub Estates regarding site/road work and SEA consulting firm. Norm - the question is - if someone designs a detention pond, do they have an obligation to see that it was installed correctly - "no." Brad - to me, the question seems, are we going to burden the town or the taxpayers insuring things are done right or are we going to burn the developer to insure that it is done right. An enforcement issue on every new development maybe should have the applicant pay for whatever engineering services are required, employed by us, report to us to insure that it is done right. It is reasonable to assume, given the history of the town, we have a lot of stuff built here. Kelly - I don't disagree with that. Brad - why do we want to burden ourselves with that as the town will suffer. Norm - the CEO as someone to check this out cannot be all places at once - an engineering firm can oversee the construction of all infrastructure improvements. Brad - bear in mind our CEO is not an engineer nor can we afford one who is an engineer. Troy - would it be best to have one person checking all our projects. Norm - we may have to go on a bid basis. Troy - the person who did the original plan could back both the project and drawing. Brad - except that one guy was originally under the employ of the applicant. Troy - they have a license to protect. Discussion on project not mentioning any names. Jim - in regard to who we pick we should have a list and not use one repeatedly. Randomly choose from the list. Discussion. We don't want to be seen as favoring one engineer by using the same one over and over. The PB can ask the Selectmen if this is possible. John Fitch - we have 3 or 4 qualified engineers on the list. Norm - I think we should require this. Brad - is there a reason we wouldn't to develop a relationship with an engineering firm who could be doing this on an ongoing basis for us? They might be biased. Norm - the applicant could say this guy is too expensive. Jim - the town might see we are favoring one over another. Brad - can this be left up to the Selectmen or town administration. On the selection of SEA, the town administrator talked this over with the Selectmen. John Fitch - the PB may request this from the Selectmen. Norm - I think this is really out of bounds for us to require a specific engineering firm. Brad - we can require engineering. John Fitch - the engineering firm would be picked from the list we have. Norm - we will aim for someone to oversee the infrastructure requirements. Norm said Walter Ratcliffe brought up the detention pond at a previous meeting. The engineer is not responsible for the construction, only the design. The CEO should talk with the developer on this issue. Fran said Paul Charron, CEO has talked with Packy Campbell. Norm - the CEO has ample work to do as we all know.

- Chairman said Jim Horgan asked about the status of the "Growth Control Ordinance." We do have letters from the town attorney that basically I can summarize. Essentially it is a very difficult thing to put into motion according to what she said. Before I get into this, I would suggest we have to be very cautious in approaching a growth management ordinance, particularly the interim. He says if we want a growth control ordinance we need to do a lot of homework - some planning and statistical analysis to support your need for a growth control ordinance. The lawyer said she was unaware of a single ordinance that has withstood scrutiny upon legal challenge. Even there are some growth control ordinances in existence in N. H. today it does not mean they have received and withstood legal challenge. RSA's are also referred to in the letter. Alternatives are talked about - unusual circumstances which justify a growth control management ordinance. Conclusion - this town should move very cautiously (letter attached). Jim - can we assume at this time that a limited "Growth Control Ordinance" is a non-issue. First of all we have to have a crisis and then it is only good for as long as you can maintain that crisis. Norm - we are not trying to maintain a crisis, we are trying to get over a crisis. There are a lot of things to consider. Jim - if it is overcome, it is by money, either the contractor, the town or somebody else's. We just need to be sure this is not an immediate reaction to something like the 60-unit development but rather what is in the best interests of the town. We need to balance growth (business and residential) and define growth. Jim - if you can define growth and put in our master plan it would stand up better than a growth ordinance. Norm - John Fitch is the person who actually brought this issue to the table and can speak to the issue. Bill Tsiros had looked into this growth management ordinance issue. John said we can put a 90-day building moratorium on building permits. The building permits in the downtown area or Elm St./Dick Dame Lane and Craig Lancey projects can be limited, but after 90 days we must show probable cause why this is needed - sewer load, police, fire, schools, etc. must be proved - this is only downtown. Out in the country, we can't stop them. John gave an

example of Framingham, MA and a heavy suit that resulted. Norm - I have found other towns which were sued heavily. Troy - if we institute our planning workshops we are going to slow it down anyway because we will not be able to get to everybody who is coming through. Without a growth ordinance we will in effect have our own little growth ordinance by not being able to do everything. Norm - it will only pace growth but not stop it to the extent that we can accommodate it. I don't think there is a judge that will require us to meet more than we do. Norm - I have my own theories why I would like to see an interim growth ordinance. Brad - I wish we could just kind of get this in perspective a little bit - we are not talking about some kind of measure to stop growth or whether there will be a growth ordinance at the end of this. We are trying to give ourselves enough time to do the work already established that has to be done (CIP, Master Plan review, Zoning Ordinance review). We need time to do this. When we asked for this legal opinion, it was very clear the motion was to ask one specific question - "what more do we need to do in order to enact an interim growth ordinance, not a permanent growth ordinance, an interim growth ordinance." That's what we asked of these legal people. When I looked at this letter before - I looked at it in detail, I could find only one place where they answered that question. All this other stuff doesn't even address the issue. They say get your CIP done, yea, we know that and we are working on that. Make sure your Zoning Ordinance is adequate - well we know that, we want to work on the Zoning Ordinance. The one place they answered the question, in Section V. (Brad read from letter). The lawyer goes on to answer the question and recommended we contact the Strafford Regional Planning Commission to assist with general planning advice and to obtain additional unusual facts which can be used and currently affect the Town of Farmington. She strongly urges us to connect the CIP, etc. etc. which we already know. The "Finding of Facts" are not adequate and what you need to do is get some more facts which adequately support the unusual circumstances. We still have a 60-day clock these guys are all under (Norm corrected to 65 days). The Zoning Ordinance just didn't get completed as it should have been. Kelly said it is the Planning Board's fault - the PB as it existed never enlisted a subcommittee to do the work, so it is ultimately the board's fault for not taking responsibility - this board didn't take action. A lack of activity doesn't constitute unusual circumstances. Brad - no I'm not saying it does. In this lawyer's letter, I don't see any reference to the recent Supreme Court case which I believe trumps all our state law anyway (Lake Tahoe). SRPC had this in their recent newsletter where there was an interim growth ordinance which was upheld by the Supreme Court, so I don't understand this opinion and I don't understand why this whole notion of using this set of circumstances - certainly they would have to be comparable. I do know other towns have been challenged. Bow had one and are possibly in court now and it is a strong likelihood we may be taken to court. Troy - this still doesn't absolve us of the obligation and we may spend more taxpayer money than we are saving. Brad - oh yea it is. This isn't necessarily about taxpayers funds, it's about looking at the long-term future of the community and are we going to have time to think about it and deal with it if we don't have something in place that slows the growth. I'm not in favor of stopping growth or spending a ton of money. Norm - litigation is expensive. Brad - I don't want to see that either but the other point I'm confused about that this person (lawyer) goes on about how the people live here and their homes and that stuff (Jane interrupted - what has that got to do with it?) Brad continued we're not talking about that - the interim growth ordinance we would consider would allow building on lots of record - I don't see how it is going to be a problem for those people. The lawyer's letter is a very libertarian kind of opinion that I just don't understand where it comes from. It's not pertinent to this. What are they talking about these individuals who are going to be burned by this. The individuals they are describing at length are not a part of what this would impact. I'm disappointed all that "stuff" is in there when the answer is in one spot. Norm - what I had hoped was that Bill would be here. Kelly - if we are going to spend all our time fighting over something that cannot hold up in court there is no point in discussing this, we might just as well get along with the actual planning. Norm - I think it's important to finish the discussion. John - I think we should have everybody buy 3 acres to build on. Troy - I agree. I think we made a mistake when we lowered the size of the lots downtown and Troy agreed. Norm - these density issues and others will be revisited when redoing the zoning. Norm visited the Selectmen's meeting last night. The reason Norm feels it is important we have a growth ordinance is not to slow or stop growth, maybe as far as building permits, I would not

support limiting building permits on lots or record. Bill mentioned it would be more practical to possibly develop a growth ordinance that limits subdivisions. Part of the reason is we really want to preserve some of the special character that the town has. Our current subdivision regs don't do that. It takes some time to develop some type of alternative subdivision and our cluster subdivision regs are lacking and what we should be keeping in mind is some different type of subdivision possibilities. If we could stop subdivisions until we develop some of these alternatives we would end up with a better town for it. Right now the wave is coming and we are missing out on what a conservation type subdivision would offer and it would be better for the town. I don't agree with the 3-acre logic. We should adopt a different subdivision ordinance. We should require an initial review before the preliminary review. We should require it. What are we going to tell them. We can't make them wait. Logically we need to stop the subdivisions until we have a positive alternative to land consuming conventional subdivision. There are better ways to do things and I would encourage the board to look at them and will look at them at our meetings. I think a year of stopping major subdivisions would be good. I know Jim doesn't agree. Jim said if you can change my mind, more power to you. Brad - this is not a planning tool - it is a way to give an administrative tool. We need to look at this 50% tax increase - this shouldn't happen - what is causing this - obviously it has something to do with the way this town is growing. Planning is about looking at those kind of factors and we haven't done this adequately as a town. Hopefully part of this will be resolved with the CIP, what's the role of the zoning, affordable housing, decrease in population, etc. These things should have been looked at 5 years ago. We should do what the lawyer says and move with caution which we are doing by consulting a lawyer, but I think we should also get some planning assistance - SRPC or whomever who can help us develop a logic to support what the unusual circumstances are, prove the findings of fact, send them back to the lawyers for comment and ask them to keep their comments confined to the questions we ask them. Hiram said we have a committee on CIP, a subcommittee for Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance - what else do we need. Brad - the lawyer told us in that letter that if we want to pursue this any further, we should move with caution and seek additional assistance in establishing our finding of facts and what unusual circumstances there are. Hiram - one thing we are missing is help. Norm said he approached the Selectmen about getting the PB some professional help with the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance committee as we are not professionals and need help. He approached the selectmen as to where the funds would come from so we can actually hire some qualified people in areas we need help. Many of us were on previous subcommittees and agreed this would be helpful. The selectmen through Ernie have committed to giving us an outline - we have \$'s set aside specifically for help with that - he will give us the breakdown of what monies we have and what they are dedicated for. We have the flexibility as a board to rededicate the funds ourselves to different things. The majority, to my knowledge, is to implement development of impact fees and if professional help is needed now then we probably should. We have up to 20 hours of service from SRPC (roughly a year or about \$1,000 worth of service). We haven't used them yet and Hiram suggested they indeed do this. Norm said they can and we are getting this rolling. Hiram suggested putting an article in the paper - Kelly said this was discussed. Kelly and Hiram said they sympathize with Craig Lancey and Packy Campbell. I think it's good and it's a wake up call - too bad we couldn't put that out to the contractors who want to submit plans to us and educate people before they come in - the Dave Berry's. Kelly said there is actually a detention pond detail in the file.

- John made motion to adjourn at 10:15, Troy 2<sup>nd</sup>, all in favor - motion carried. Minutes recorded by Fran Osborne. Taped transcript available in the Code Enforcement Office.

**APPROVED**

---

Norman Russell, Chairman  
 Planning Board  
 Town of Farmington

---

Date

