

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)  
35 Main Street  
Monday, October 21, 2019**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.**

**PROOF OF POSTING**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

**PRESENT:** Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), Paul Scarpetti, David Boutin, Christopher Stelmach, Matt Reed, and Robert Duhaime (arrived at 6:07 pm) (Town Council Rep.)

**ALTERNATES:** Brett Scott

**EXCUSED:** None.

**STAFF:** Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

D. Marshall: Brett Scott will not be a voting member this evening.

D. Boutin: When I arrived here tonight looking for the posting for the meeting upstairs, I found the posting but it did not say what time or where. As far as I am concerned it was an illegal post. You need to put the time and location.

D. Marshall: I would like to publicly apologize for my outburst at our last meeting. It was inexcusable on my part and I do not intend that it will ever happen again.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2019 and OCTOBER 7, 2019**

**September 9, 2019 Meeting** – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2019 meeting, with amendment. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. T. Walsh abstained due to not being present at the September 9, 2019 meeting. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 5-0.**

**October 7, 2019 Meeting** – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2019 meeting. Seconded by T. Walsh. M. Reed abstained due to not being at the September 23, 2019 meeting. **Motion carried with a vote of 5-0.**

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. THE JOCELYN D. SCARPETTI TRUST #19-21**

**7 Marcel Way, Map 36, Lot 31-1  
3 lot subdivision**

P. Scarpetti stepped down.

Open public hearing.

N. Williams: Pending the granting of the waivers this is complete.

Per the applicant the waivers are as follows:

Checklist Item 28 of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances - Show septic systems within 200' of property. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: We do not have the right to trespass on someone else's property; There would be a significant time and cost to do so even if the neighbors allowed us to do this work; and as the septic systems are underground any location would be approximate at best. Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision or conditions of the land in the subdivision indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations: We have shown the abutting houses from various online sources; The proposed houses are far enough from the abutters that the location of the abutting septics will not be an issue.

Checklist Item 30 of the -Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances Show wells and water systems within 200' of property of the property. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: We do not have the right to trespass on someone else's property to locate individual wells; The private water systems are underground any location would be approximate at best; There would be a significant time and cost to do so even if the neighbors allowed us to do this work. Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision or conditions of the land in the subdivision indicate that the waiver will properly earn out the spirit and intent of the regulations: We have shown the abutting houses from various online sources; The proposed houses are located in the section of the area served by a private water system so there should be no issues with wells or setbacks to septic systems

Section 11.13.3 of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances - Well radius must be on own lot. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The well already exists in the current location; The existing well has good quality of water and a good capacity; Drilling a new well further from the lot line or connecting to the private water system would be a significant expense. Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision or conditions of the land in the subdivision indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations: We will provide an easement on new lot 31-3 that will protect the well radius as if it were included in the lot; The 4K area on lot 31-3 is to the front. Between the easement and 4K area, no septic components will be placed in the radius; Private water is available in street should the well ever fail.

***T. Walsh motioned to grant all of the waivers as listed for The Jocelyn D. Scarpetti Trust #19-21, 7 Marcel Way, Map 36, Lot 31-1, 3 lot subdivision. Seconded by D. Boutin. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

***D. Boutin motioned for completeness for The Jocelyn D. Scarpetti Trust #19-21, 7 Marcel Way, Map 36, Lot 31-1, 3 lot subdivision. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

D. Marshall: Would your client like to add anything?

Joe Wichert stated the changes that he made to the plan based on the recommendations of the Board.

R. Duhaime: The waiver form is filled out?

J. Wichert: Yes.

Open to public comments.

Ian Cote (78 Auburn Road): I have a lot that abuts this. I have no problem with this but on Map 36, Lot 27, what will the setback be and where will a house be put on that lot? I don't want it on my abutting line and the trees stripped out. I had this surveyed in January, 2018. Mr. Scarpetti had it surveyed after that and the back lot markers are on my property. I want to make sure my property is not going to be encroached on.

J. Wichert: We do not have an answer to where the house is going to be. Our survey was done in 2017. It predated Mr. Cody's survey. We can go to look at it to see if there is a conflict.

I. Cote: Were you there before December, 2017? I may have misread the stakes. I don't care too much about that. Right now there is a nice buffer of trees. I am hoping the trees can stay so I don't have to look at the back of another house.

R. Duhaime: Mr. Scarpetti could sell this lot. No one can build within the setback but we cannot control the trees being removed.

Close to public comments.

Close public hearing.

***D. Boutin motioned to approve the three lot subdivision for The Jocelyn D. Scarpetti Trust #19-21, 7 Marcel Way, Map 36, Lot 31-1. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

P. Scarpetti returned.

D. Marshall: We will hear the representatives from Southern New Hampshire University next.

## **APPOINTMENTS**

- 2. EVAN LOWRY, SNHU  
2500 North River Road  
Relief from CETA Impact Fees**

Evan Lowry (Assistant General Counsel): I represent Southern New Hampshire University ("SNHU") which, on September 25, 2018, was assessed impact fees associated with the construction of a new College of Engineering, Technology, and Aeronautics ("CETA") building. SNHU respectfully requests-that the Hooksett Planning Board reconsider the imposition of these fees because they are not supported by New Hampshire law or the Impact Fee Article of Hooksett's Zoning Ordinance (Article 30). There is no rational relationship between the CETA building and any approved capital improvement project in the Town of Hooksett that is necessitated by the CETA building. The University does not anticipate any material growth in the number of students on campus. We don't anticipate any traffic increase associated with the CETA building. We have an 80% residential to 20% commuter student population which means most students are walking. We do not see an increase in new trips on Hooksett roads. SNHU has taken many steps to mitigate traffic impact at the universities' expense. If there are an traffic impacts, they will be mitigated by the steps we have already taken to make our campus as reasonably accessible as possible. Without any traffic impacts or a nexus to a town facility, it is our opinion that the traffic impact fees are not lawfully imposed and should be reversed. The town has also imposed public safety impact fees. The letter that sets forth those fees does not identify any town capital improvements associated with public safety that is associated with our construction of the CETA building. The law is clear that impact fees cannot be imposed for ongoing municipal services. The CIP for the Town of Hooksett contains nothing related to improvements with regard to the CETA building. We would like to see those fees reversed. In conclusion, we would reserve the additional arguments that we have made in our appeal letter dated September 6, but we respectfully request that the Board strike the impact fees associated with the CETA project because they are not supportable under applicable New Hampshire law.

D. Boutin: Impact fees are something that are regularly imposed. I am trying to understand why this is now a problem for SNHU and is has not been in the past.

E. Lowry: We would have to respectfully disagree with how impact fees have been handled in the past. We have had to present nearly identical arguments for two other buildings. Those two impact fees were reversed on the same basis we are arguing this evening. I think there is a pattern as to how the impact fee is applied and what we have had to do to get relief.

P. Scarpetti: I would like to get the actual amount of students that you have. You keep saying that you have not added any and don't plan to. You have just added an engineering division that you took over from a school in Nashua.

E. Lowry: Adding the engineering building has made the school more competitive. The 3,500 student body is the same or below as it has been. For the first time we have a wait list.

P. Scarpetti: I would want in writing of what you have for residential students and commuter students.

T. Walsh: A lot of dorms were just ripped down in Manchester and replaced in Hooksett.

Lawrence Yassanye (Project Manager): The total dorms split between Manchester and Hooksett that will be raised are 14 and are slated to all be raised next summer.

D. Boutin: Can you suggest what you believe is an appropriate impact fee. The burden is on you is to prove that the impact fee is unreasonable.

E. Lowry: It is our position that the town has assessed an unreasonable impact fee because there is not an associated clear impact from the building. It is impossible for me to put a fee on something that has not been substantiated.

D. Boutin: Someone has done it. You may not like it but it has already been done.

D. Marshall: Are you aware of how the Town of Hooksett assesses impact fees?

E. Lowry: I have what is publicly available.

D. Marshall: This town makes impact fees based on corridors. Everyone who builds on any one of those corridors get assessed impact fees for traffic and public safety and, in some cases, schools and recreation. Those impact fees can then be used for any improvements along the corridor for which they were collected. Anything that anyone does has an impact. Impact fees also have a life. If we fail to use them within a certain period of time then they need to be returned to you. It is a process of first in, first out. We continue to collect them because the town continues to grow. Everything you do on that campus has an impact on Rt. 3. That is why we have been collecting it. I don't see any reason to fall back from doing that. We have to take your arguments into consideration on whether or not we proceed. Public safety will be based on growth. You are part of that growth. These fees are based solely on the CETA building. Nothing before and nothing after.

R. Duhaime: As a planner I like to see where things have been and where they are going. I would like more substantial information on where the college plans to go in the future. Where was the college in the past and where is it going.

E. Lowry: I think that makes sense.

L. Yassanye: Several years ago we experienced a great boom. We added a significant amount of buildings. Offices used to be at the bottom of a dorm building. We have built building to replace old ones. Our future is we are looking to get our feet back underneath ourselves. We are not growing our student population. We had 3,500 students in the past and we do now.

E. Lowry: There may be some confusion of modernizing our campus. The majority of growth has been with our on-line population. Our expectation is that the Manchester/Hooksett campus is going to remain the same size.

R. Duhaime: A parking garage has been built in Manchester. That is quite a capital expense and you are looking for relief from Hooksett.

E. Lowry: With respect to the investment we are making in both Hooksett and Manchester, we are committed to the work force in New Hampshire. That parking garage went through a significant Planning process with Manchester.

R. Duhaime: I would like to see written numbers of where you were, where you are now, and where you plan to be in the future.

E. Lowry: We would be happy to provide that.

D. Marshall: You have an adopted Master Plan for the next 20 years?

L. Yassanye: We are working on firming one up.

D. Marshall: Every time you have appeared in front of us for the past five years we have asked for that.

E. Lowry: I was not here for that request but will be happy to follow up on it.

D. Marshall: We keep hearing that is it being worked on.

E. Lowry: Is a Master Plan from us a requirement for impact fees on a building.

D. Marshall: No but it lets us judge where the growth is going.

E. Lowry: I have happy to convey that to my client.

D. Marshall: Does this have to go before the Town Council?

N. Williams: No.

E. Lowry: We have presented the legal argument. The majority of the traffic is going to be on foot. I do not anticipate any growth with respect to the actual traffic within the Town of Hooksett.

P. Scarpetti: The requirement, either way, is to get in writing your actual past and present student enrollment.

R. Duhaime: On the fire impact side, I would still like to have the written information. Without it I feel like I am not making an uninformed decision.

E. Lowry: We are more than happy to provide follow up information.

***R. Duhaime motioned to table Evan Lowry, SNHU, 2500 North River Road, Relief from CETA Impact Fees, to the November 4, 2019 Planning Board meeting.***

N. Williams: Without the impact fees the CO will not be issued.

R. Duhaime: Is the building complete?

L. Yassanye: Almost. We are requesting the CO inspections for December 4, 2019.

E. Lowry: We originally requested to be on the agenda at the beginning of October and we were moved back for good reason. The timing of that has caused some concern for the CO. I would at least like some clarity in terms of the effect of the delay of the decision of impact fees and if there is any reason that decision cannot be a condition of the final CO.

N. Williams: I would yield to our Code Enforcement Officer, but typically that has been the case in the past.

***Seconded by Chris Stelmach. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

### **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **3. FASADEx DESIGNS, LLC #19-22 36 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lot 50 Amended site plan**

Open public hearing.

N. Williams stated that there are no issues on any of the waivers and pending the waivers the plans are complete.

An email from Bruce Thomas, the Town Engineer, was written to Nicholas Williams dated 10/16/19 stating that he has no issues with granting the waivers for the referenced site per a letter from Peter Stoddard dated 9/26/19.

It was a consensus of the Board to vote on five of the waivers separating out Section 3.04 & Checklist Item #47 – Landscaping Plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances.

Per the applicant five of the waivers are as follows:

Checklist item #50 - Traffic circulation plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The proposal will not increase traffic flow to and from the site.

Section 3.02 & Checklist Item #49 – Storm Drainage Plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The increase in runoff from the proposed development is negligible. The Town Engineer has reviewed the proposal and found that there is no need for a Storm Drainage Plan.

Section 3.14 & Checklist Item #48 – Exterior Lighting Plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The proposed storage building will be situated at the back of the lot, where it is already partly obscured by the existing building, and will have minimal illumination.

Checklist Item #27 - Site specific soil mapping of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be

contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The proposed storage building will not increase load on the septic system, and the septic system already exists. Soils data would have no bearing on the approval of this application, thus it is an unnecessary burden to procure it.

Item 15.01(5) - Parking requirements of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision or conditions of the land in the subdivision indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations:

The proposal will not increase the amount of parking the existing business will use, and the existing delineated parking is adequate for their needs.

***D. Boutin motioned to approve the above waivers for Fasadex Designs, LLC #19-22, 36 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lot 50. Seconded by M. Reed.***

R. Duhaime: There is nothing changing on the drainage.

**Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

Section 3.04 & Checklist Item #47 – Landscaping Plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances. Strict conformity would cause an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations: The proposed storage building will be situated at the back of the lot, where it is already partly obscured by the existing building, and by the existing plantings at the front of the site.

R. Duhaime: When this building was put in there wasn't a side road going to a residential sub-division. I would like to see some screening on that side of the property. I also don't see any landscaping going down the side of that building.

Peter Stoddard (S & H Land Services): There are some trees and landscaping. There will be no residential buildings.

R. Duhaime: There will be residents going up and down that road. If this building was going in for the first time screening would be recommended. You could put in some mixed pines, evergreens, and/or shade trees. There is not an issue for the front. Just the side view.

P. Stoddard: There is good screening for the proposed storage.

R. Duhaime: If you just want to add evergreens that is fine with me. One every 50'.

T. Walsh: Can you confirm in the regulations that we need screening from a commercial and a town road.

N. Williams: There is no requirement for that.

D. Marshall: This abuts an existing building that is industrial?



N. Williams: Yes.

***T. Walsh motioned to grant the waiver from Section 3.04 & Checklist Item #47 – Landscaping Plan of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances for Fasadex Designs, LLC #19-22, 36 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lot 50.***

The applicant retracted the request for the waiver.

***R. Duhaime motioned for completeness for Fasadex Designs, LLC #19-22, 36 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lot 50.. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

P. Stoddard: This will be a 60 x 42 metal garage storage building. The applicant needs room for construction equipment for his business. On the site are some trailers, cars, and things that should be in storage.

P. Scarpetti: I am requesting that you please choose earth tones.

Close public hearing.

***D. Boutin motioned to approve the amended site plan for Fasadex Designs, LLC #19-22, 36 Londonderry Turnpike, Map 49, Lot 50. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.***

T. Walsh: Are you okay with the trees?

Salih Subasic (Owner, 36 Londonderry Turnpike): Yes.

**Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

## **WAIVERS**

### **4. DAR BUILDERS, LLC #19-24 36 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-30 Waiver for well radius**

D. Marshall: When this sub-division was approved it was stated that the well radius were valid. You are now putting us in a position where they are, one by one, invalid. Why should we continue to grant these waivers.

Nicholas Moreau (RJ Morrow Communities, DAR Builders. and Signature Homes): It wasn't acknowledged that when doing a certified plot plan they have to do it by the metal casing around the well which is an 8" casing. You can't go by the center, you have to go by the edge of the casing itself. No matter on a 155' width of a property it would surpass that property line no matter how it is put.

D. Marshall: Knowing that why are the lots the size they are? Why wasn't a lot withdrawn and the lot lines readjusted.

N. Moreau: I am not the developer of the sub-division. We individually bought lots. The original developer was Mr. Martel from Sterling Homes.

N. Williams: He is still involved with some of these lots.

D. Marshall: All of these lots are now individually owned?

N. Moreau: We own about 10 of them and 6 of them are on the cusp of being over. We are going to have 3 or 4 lots that will have this issue again, but depending on where the well is being located. The septic plan has not been completed yet. This has been an issue.

N. Williams: There have been three instances where a TCO has been requested in the absence of the waiver requirement. The reason we ask for the waiver and the DES paperwork to be recorded with the deed is to ensure that any future homeowners have knowledge of what is going on with their well radius on the lot. We collected a bond to ensure that one of two things happen on those properties. Either the radius waiver was granted or that the bond is pulled to relocate the well to be in alignment with the regulations. As part of the process, the Town Council has to release the bonds that are collected. I won't speak for the Council. Maybe Rob would like to. That has been a difficult process. I think it may be easier going forward given the fact that these lots were approved in such a tight condition that the Planning Board take a look at them and grant any necessary waivers. I know that they want to move people in as quickly as possible, but unfortunately we were put in the position where if we had not granted the TCO we would have been displacing a resident at a great cost. That is the reason we had done that, but I think we need to get ahead of this before it becomes a time consuming issue.

R. Duhaime: At the last Town Council meeting they voted to not release the bond. It is going to come up on our agenda again. One of the members was very upset that this had happened and could not understand how a mistake like this had been made. They did not believe there was enough information to make a decision. We were hoping this would not be happening again and no more of them would be moving forward. I will report this when they come back to release the bond. It is unfortunate this is moving forward. I pointed out that some of the lots there is enough room. These are narrow lots.

D. Marshall: It has been advised to not issue any more bonds.

R. Duhaime: Yes. Please do not issue any more bonds.

D. Marshall: It is easy for us to say to move the lot lines, but with the current ownership that makes it difficult. Some are individually owned and some may be collectively owned.

N. Williams: We won't have this problem going forward because in either 2015 or 2016 the amendment increased the minimum lot size for the conservation sub-divisions.

P. Scarpetti: We did that after this approval.

D. Marshall: This one we are stuck with.

P. Scarpetti: It is impossible. They have 150' and take 8" away from the measurement. It will continue happening. The Town Council needs to know that.

D. Marshall: This is a request for a waiver for one lot. Does this one have a bond?

N. Williams: Yes.

D. Marshall: Are there any others?

N. Williams: No more.

Per the applicant the waivers are as follows:

Item 11.13.3 Private Water Systems of the Development Regulations/PZ Zoning Ordinances: The subject lot in Summit View has the required 150' of frontage and is rectangular in shape. Local regulations require the radius to be totally on the current lot, despite State regulations allowing radii to overlap or be lessened from the 75' radius by recording a release at the Registry of Deeds informing owners. With a 150' width and a 75' radius the placement leaves no room for site conditions or layout deviations. This 75' is intended to distance water wells from septic leaching areas.

Upon final survey it was discovered that the subject well is 74.3' from the lot line and, as such, a 0.7' MAXIMUM depth of the radius overlaps the property line. This is allowable per DES regulations with the recording of the release. Drilling a new well despite conformance with DES regulations would cause an unnecessary hardship as the lot (including driveway paving and landscaping) are complete and established. In addition, a new well drilled 0.7' away from the current well would likely incur capillary action or stability issues within the hole which would result in the new conforming well being less stable within the bedrock and likely drawing the same water as the current well given its extreme close proximity. Most importantly, ENV 1008.04 requires a leach field setback to be a minimum of 10' from a property line. Applying that to the subject well would mean that the closest an abutting leach field could be constructed from our well in accordance with this would be 84.3' from the well, in excess of the required 75'. Therefore the current location does comply with the Spirit and Intent of the ordinance and the drilling of a new well would prove to be an unnecessary hardship.

***P. Scarpetti motioned to grant the waiver for well radius for DAR Builders, LLC, #19-24, 36 Churchill Drive, Map 12, Lot 24-30. Seconded by D. Boutin. R. Duhaime abstained due to being a Town Council member. Motion carries with a vote of 6-0.***

N. Moreau: Would you like us to come to the Town Council Meeting?

R. Duhaime: That would be helpful.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

### **5. ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE Recommendations.**

D. Marshall stated that the 10/16/19 draft of the guidelines should be destroyed and the 10/21/19 draft should be reviewed and that the reason the Board does not have a motion in front of them is because they asked the Town Attorney to review the draft guidelines so that they did not take a step into something that may be illegal. He also stated that the Town Attorney reviewed the latest version of the town's commercial/architectural design requirements and read an email from the Town Attorney to the Town Planner which is dated 10/18/19. He let the Board know that the guidelines do not have to be ready for a Town Meeting because there is no warrant article and the public will never have a chance to vote on them because they only involve the general development regulations of the town and the site plan regulations. This is solely the decision of the Planning Board. However, our Town Attorney is suggesting that the public should be encouraged to attend the public hearings.

D. Boutin: If we post it with the right time and place like we didn't do with the illegal meeting upstairs tonight, that might help.

D. Marshall: The Planning Board requested a consultation with our Town Attorney for his opinion. That has nothing to do with the public. This Board needed to get consultation so that it did not step in the wrong direction. It did not want to get in front of the public with something that was not legal. The intent was only for a consultation with the Town Attorney who would like to keep a running dialogue with Nicholas so that he is involved in ensuring the guidelines are legal and for guidance.

D. Boutin: When you are done with it give it to him. Pay him once.

D. Marshall: Attorney's don't always know what you want, but they want to make sure that what you want is worded correctly and can be done. This Board needs to get your opinions out. I would like to have time for this Board to discuss this.

Board discussion ensued on what suggestions have been made, what may be difficult to make a decision on, the proper way to word things, and how things would be overseen.

David Scarpetti, Alden Beauchemin, and Dan Legeux appeared from the Economic Development Committee and stated the goal is to make the buildings look more pleasing. It is an investment to the Town of Hooksett and the Town of Hooksett properties.

Discussion ensued on suggestions on how that may be accomplished. R. Duhaime stated that people do whatever they want anyway due to there not being any enforcement and provided examples. He stated that it is up to the Planning Board to enforce what they want to enforce and what they don't want to enforce.

D. Scarpetti stated that with the Dome the Planning Board was against the wall, but with regulations there would be standards to go by.

Discussion ensued on consistency and progress that is being made.

D. Marshall encouraged that the Board look over the proposals and make suggestions.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*D. Boutin motioned to adjourn. Seconded by M. Reed. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 pm.**

**Respectfully submitted by,**

**AnnMarie White  
Recording Clerk**