

Official

MINUTES
HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, July 18, 2022
6:00 PM

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:04 P.M.

PROOF OF POSTING

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: Tom Walsh (Chairman), Chris Stelmach (Vice-Chairman), Mike Somers, Don Winterton, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)

ALTERNATES: Denise Pichette Volk, Robert Duhaime, and Sheena Gilbert

EXCUSED: Paul Scarpetti

NOT PRESENT:

STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

D. Boutin motioned to recommend T. Walsh to the Hooksett Town Council as Chairman of the Hooksett Planning Board. T. Walsh accepted the nomination Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 8-0.

D. Boutin motioned to recommend C. Stelmach to the Hooksett Town Council as Vice-Chairman of the Hooksett Planning Board. C. Stelmach accepted the nomination.

D. Pichette Volk motioned to recommend D. Winterton to the Hooksett Town Council as Vice-Chairman of the Hooksett Planning Board. D. Winterton accepted the nomination.

ROLL CALL VOTE FOR EITHER C. STELMACH OR D. WINTERTON

D. Boutin - C. Stelmach

D. Winterton - D. Winterton

M. Somers - C. Stelmach

R. Duhaime - C. Stelmach

C. Stelmach - C. Stelmach
S. Gilbert - D. Winterton
D. Pichette Volk - D. Winterton
T. Walsh - C. Stelmach

*D. Winterton motioned to recommend C. Stelmach to the Hooksett Town Council as Vice-Chairman of the Hooksett Planning Board as a unanimous vote. Seconded by D. Boutin. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 8-0.***

D. Boutin motioned to recommend D. Pichette Volk to the Hooksett Town Council as a full board member of the Hooksett Planning Board. Seconded by S. Gilbert.

ROLL CALL

D. Boutin - Yes
D. Winterton - Yes
M. Somers - Yes
R. Duhaime - Yes
C. Stelmach - Yes
S. Gilbert - Yes
D. Pichette Volk - Yes
T. Walsh - Yes

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 8-0.

R. Duhaime and D. Pichette Volk will be voting members this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF June 20, 2022

*D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2022 meeting. Seconded by D. Winterton. R. Duhaime abstained due to not being at the June 20, 2022 meeting. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. THE DUBAY GROUP, INC.
Black Diamond Auto Wash
1554 Hooksett Road
Tax Map18 Lot 2
Commercial Site Plan for Car Wash**

D. Boutin recused himself due to being an abutter. R. Duhaime, D. Pichette Volk, and S. Gilbert will be voting members for this matter.

Doug MacGuire (The Dubai Group, Inc./Representing the applicant): This property is 2.3 acres. It is located at the corner of Hooksett Road and Memorial Drive. The property was previously a commercial development. It was a two-story structure with an associated parking lot. It had full access onto Hooksett Road and Memorial Drive. We are proposing converting this to a car wash. It is proposed to

be a four bay car wash. This lot is shaped in a good way to support this. These types of car washes are proposed to have two in bay automatics and two self-serve bays. This would be designed to accommodate some larger vehicles. The self serve bay would have two wand set ups. There would be a long enough bay to pull in a small trailer, such as for snow mobiles, a sprinter van, or a larger truck. To accommodate that we designed the site to be able to have more cueing on the inside and as you are leaving. The last self serve bay has a significant amount of area to not clip the side of the bay and make that maneuver. It is a circulation item you don't always see at these car washes. None of the bays would be in the drive isle. As you go to the self-service bays you would have upwards of 40' to pull out. There would be overhead vacuum lines. Another amenity would be a dog wash facility in the front corner building. There would be a double gate. One gate would close before another opens for dog safety. You would be going through three doors to get your pet in there. There would be a right turn in only with no out onto Hooksett Road. There would be full access on Memorial Drive. There would be a closed drainage system. We are adding in some treatment facilities. We have a collection area and some chamber systems to promote recharge on the site. We are improving upon the existing site condition. The existing site condition did not have any drainage improvements or closed drainage. Everything sheet flowed. We will be accommodating any drainage on Memorial Drive. The existing condition on north side of the road didn't go anywhere except the green area. We made it so that we can accommodate that flow to drain through the site and the abutting property, where it naturally goes now, to drain through and across to the north. Utility plans have been thoroughly vetted. We have met with the water and sewer commission and presented applications to them. Water has approved the plans as proposed. We have satisfied any comments. There is existing sewer access on site. We are proposing two new man-holes to collect our drainage on site and direct it towards Hooksett Road. We would tap off of a tapping valve on Memorial Drive to bring water into the property. We have a pretty robust landscape plan with perimeter trees and heavier landscaping along the pet wash area. There would be lower plants and street trees at the entrances and a larger amount of trees along the Memorial Drive frontage and ever-green trees towards abutter to the north. There will be standard LED fixtures and the site will be well lit. Erosion control measures will be taken to protect any slope areas. The stabilized construction entrance will be coming off of Memorial Drive with silt fence controls. The building is attractive with character and varying roof lines.

T. Walsh: We are going to start with staff. Nicholas? We have our engineers comments. I would like to know if those were addressed. Have water and sewer both signed off?

N. Williams: Water and sewer have signed off.

D. Boutin: Some of my neighbors have asked if there will be any icing conditions either on Memorial Drive or Hooksett Road due to the car wash.

D. MacGuire: The car wash bay has internal drains and the intent is for the majority of the water to stay in the bay. There will be some residual water on the cars. All of the internal areas to our site are internally drained so that water will not be directed to either roadway. We are pulling some drainage from Hooksett Road into our site. You will not see any water outflowing from this site.

T. Walsh: I heard the question and the concern also. I don't see a major issue with our other car washes including one that is above grade. Most of the water comes off of the vehicles in the car wash itself. The reason the question is being asked is because we do have people are concerned with the school right there and in icy conditions the buses coming around the corner.

D. Winterton: Will there be any other signage than what is on the building?

D. MacGuire: At this point there will not be any additional signage except for the pylon sign on the side of the building.

C. Stelmach: Are the self serve doors are 12' x 12'? It says 12 wide but does not give a height. You said large trucks. Does not mean no commercial trucks? No bigger than a one ton?

?: 12' x 12'. There will be no air break trucks.

D. Pichette Volk: Where are we with the status of approvals? There is action on the site already. How is that allowed?

T. Walsh: They can proceed with the plans but don't get a CO until all of the approvals are in place.

D. Pichette Volk: What happens to the soap and is there a risk to the pond.

D. MacGuire: The soap and dirty water will be collected in the drainage system in the building which is directed to the sewer system. The oil and water separator will hold some of that back so you aren't getting the same concentration. It will be treated at the sewer treatment plan facility. There is no crossing along Memorial Drive. No water from our site that would make it to Hanna Ho Hee Pond.

R. Duhaime: They are cleaning up the property and I thank you for that. Have you gotten the DOT turning lane permit?

D. MacGuire: No we went through the TRC process. We wanted to put together a traffic study and wanted some evaluation on the signal. We addressed that with the traffic study. There were no backups associated with the right turn. They evaluated Memorial Drive during school time. During pick up there is some back up in that area. They determined that very occasionally there would be back up on Memorial Drive exiting. It was noted that entire cue was cleared on every cycle. If someone was waiting at the driveway, at the worst case they would wait for that cycle to clear out and then be non impeded.

R. Duhaime: You have a driveway there now but you still need a permit?

D. MacGuire: Yes DOT wants to see an amendment to the driveway permit. We are making the right turn in more restrictive because we are eliminating the out onto Hooksett Road.

R. Duhaime: The school bus is taking a right hand turn in. That is where I see the issue because cars will be stacking up trying to leave. As long as DOT approves it. As far as the landscape plan, it looks like erosion stone on the north side in that retention pond. What is that?

D. MacGuire: We want those areas to naturalize. We are proposing a Vermont wildflower mix.

T. Walsh: Is that the same mix they use at the corner of Smyth Road and 28 bypass? The contractor bay up on the hill.

D. MacGuire: I am not sure what they used. I think in that location it may not be the best choice. In a low area where drainage is collected a better choice.

R. Duhaime: Any elevations to the dog wash?

D. MacGuire: It is a modular pre fab little structure. It is a very low roof less than 10' total. It is a small building with a lot of glass and is out front to provide advertisement but not to overtake the big building.

T. Walsh: Will it complement the rest of the property?

D. MacGuire: Yes. You will only see about half of it because the shrubs will take up part of it.

R. Duhaime: The border is being left on the left side of the property. You don't own the corner by Memorial Drive so you can't cut that. You have the windows facing the south and I would like to see something there. It is nice to see something fit in this space.

D. Pichette Volk: What are the hours of operation?

D. MacGuire: I think it is going to be a twenty-four hour facility. It is technically not a manned facility.

T. Walsh: The two times of the day when school is dropping off and picking up, is there large car wash business during those hours?

D. MacGuire: The peak hour demand of a car wash does not collate to school hour or peak hour times. They counted the car wash up the street and were able to get representative traffic numbers. At its peak on a Saturday they had 142 vehicles total. That is spread out over more than an eight hour period. We are anticipating 190 due to the extra bay. The total on a weekday was 79. This is not a heavy peak hour use.

T. Walsh: This might be a good service for people dropping off and picking up their kids at school. Is this manned?

D. MacGuire: During the day but not 24/7.

T. Walsh: Is there an office or restrooms?

D. MacGuire: Yes. In the center corridor.

T. Walsh: You were originally proposing a friction bay. Is that soft cloth or soft touch?

D. MacGuire: That is a different type where where you put your wheel in and it pulls you through. They are not doing that as it was 18 months to get that equipment. They will be touch free bays.

R. Duhaime: Are there some vacuums?

D. MacGuire: Yes. It is an arm that comes over the top. You can spin it from one side of your car to the other. There will be eight vacuum stations.

S. Gilbert: Regarding dog washing station is there an overhead sprayer and steps up for smaller animals?

D. MacGuire: You can attach them with a leash. It has a multiple washing head with different scented soaps and add ons. There will be stainless steel steps to a stainless steel tub.

C. Stelmach: The water usage is 5,500 gallons on a weekly basis?

D. MacGuire: We are assuming 5,500 gallons which was a conservative estimate. Each bay uses 45 gallons per vehicle.

T. Walsh: Nicholas, is the plan complete?

N. Williams: Yes.

D. Boutin motioned to find the commercial site plan for car wash complete for The Dubai Group, Inc., Black Diamond Auto Wash, 1554 Hooksett Road, Tax Map18 Lot 2. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

N. Williams: There is a waiver request for site specific soils.

D. Winterton motioned to grant the waiver from item Appendix II: Checklist for Site Plan Review: The existing developed site has access to public water and sewer and does not require a NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit and therefore site-specific soils are not necessary for the site design. Seconded by C. Stelmach.

T. Walsh: The engineer concurs with the waiver?

N. Williams: Yes.

N. Williams stated this property is located within the groundwater conservation district. He referenced correspondence from the Hooksett Planning Board dated June 19, 2007, written as a result of a test boring conducted by Stantec, stating that after the required public hearing motion this property was removed from the groundwater protection district.

Open public hearing.
No public comments.
Close public hearing.

R. Duhaime motioned to approve the commercial site plan for car wash for The Dubai Group, Inc., Black Diamond Auto Wash, 1554 Hooksett Road, Tax Map18 Lot 2. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

D. Boutin returned. D. Pichette Volk is no longer a voting member.

BOARD DISCUSSION

2. PORT ONE COMPANIES

47 Hackett Hill Road

Board Review of Conditions of Approval/NHDOT Memorandum of Understanding

N. Williams referenced the official notice of decision that is reflected in the meeting minutes from September 1, 2021. He stated one of the conditions of the approval is: “The applicant will provide all fully executed agreements among and between all state and local agencies detailing the scope, cost and financial responsibility for all offsite improvements including but not limited to roadway and traffic improvements at the Hackett Hill Road to toll booth intersection and the Hackett Hill Road, Route 3A intersection as well as the extension of municipal water and sewer to the site and pump station, prior to issuance of building permit.” He stated the town council has reviewed and subsequently entered into an agreement regarding the sewer and water hookups and they a MOU for that portion of it. He brought the Board’s attention to a letter from NH DOT dated July 13, 2022. He stated staff met with representatives from NH DOT as well as the applicant on June 30, 2022 to talk about this condition that was placed on the approval. He mentioned the applicant will be looking to request building permits as soon as possible. He requested the Boards input to let him know if this letter meets their condition on the approval.

T. Walsh: This whole thing started because we did not accept the \$1 million as their fair share for the improvements that were needed based on the information from their own engineer. Their own traffic study that said the glass was full and any improvement are going to need some substantial changes. That is how this whole conditional approval started. We cannot accept the \$1 million because we do not know what the total price for the improvements is. How can we establish what your fair share is until we know what the dollar amount is? That is when we kept saying where is the DOT. They are the ones that have to give us the number because it is their design and they are their roads. We are fair in Hooksett and we gave them a conditional approval because they claimed that DOT does better with conditional approvals than they do with concepts so we did that. To me this means nothing. We are back to the same place. We have no answer. I don’t know what this does. A fair share case contribution. That is what we did not know before and we still don’t. I don’t even know how Council can determine that until they get what we need from the DOT.

D. Boutin: Who’s responsibility is it to establish what the fair share cash contribution is?

T. Walsh: As far as I know Town Council. They are going to come up with the MOU.

D. Boutin: This has never come before the Council that I am aware of. We can’t act on this.

T. Walsh: I agree. I don’t think there is anything to act on.

D. Boutin: I think to move this along would be for the Planning Board to vote to send this question along to Town Council for the next meeting along with our comments.

T. Walsh: Getting back to that question I don’t know who’s responsibility this is. In a lot of cases the Planning Board could say yes to whatever road improvement are necessary.

D. Boutin: I have never know the Town Council to be involved. This is a Planning Board matter. It seems to me we either have a traffic engineer tell us what the number is and then have the applicant give us a letter for our file that says they will come up with that number. DOT has no role in that. They will approve whatever the design is for the intersection of Hackett Hill Road and 3A.

T. Walsh: There are a couple things at play. It is back on the 10-year plan so that DOT is involved to a degree. They have jurisdiction over their roads.

D. Boutin: I don't think they will interfere with that intersection improvement. Do you?

T. Walsh: No. I think they would be in favor of it. This all started because Port One offered us \$1 million. We were supposed to deal with the rest of it full well knowing the DOT may take care of it but it will require a town contribution. We have already seen the warrant fail twice.

D. Boutin: Has DOT given any indication of what they want to see at that intersection?

T. Walsh: I have not heard specifically, but our Administrator is her an Rob wants to get a question in.

D. Boutin: Who is to decide what that design would be?

T. Walsh: We were surveyed as a Planning Board last time they proposed the roundabout. I believe Council determined the roundabout. There is town input when the state does the designs in the area.

D. Boutin: That should be the first step. Next should be how much that will cost. Next we would need something from the applicant stating they will pay that amount. Who's responsibility is it to move this along?

T. Walsh: The applicant in this case.

R. Duhaime: This is the Planning Board. We are supposed to have a plan. We put two conditions on this site. One was the sewer MOU. The other was the traffic MOU. If sewer doesn't approve it, it is not approved. If the Planning Board does not approve this, it is not approved. Our condition is final. We are supposed to see a traffic plan. That is why we put the condition on the plan. This is not a plan. The state of NH wanted a \$1 million for an easement to put Cabela's on Hackett Hill Road. This guy threw \$1 million at us. The Town of Hooksett has already spent almost a quarter of a million engineering it and the state changes the design, postpones it, and we still don't have an approved design. Now we have an applicant coming in, is going to approve the tolls, going to put trucks through there, more traffic, and this is our MOU. This is not a plan. This is ridiculous.

T. Walsh: Point taken. I agree.

C. Stelmach: There is still some uncertainty on exactly where the town state line is. Where he would put his driveway. From what Mr. Bartash said it is where the guardrail is across from the old Belletetes building. He said that was town land but two years ago the state paved right by there and went almost to Cate Road by Chucksters.

T. Walsh: You brought this up before. It still needs to be verified.

C. Stelmach: That needs to be verified. We have not gotten a specific answer on where that town line is.

T. Walsh: Last I knew he did not have a driveway location either.

Andre Garron: We had a phone discussion with DOT with regard to the left turn lane that was part of the approval. I think that MOU only addresses that part. The other thing that concerns me is we were successful in getting the Hackett Hill/3A intersection and the Main St./3A intersection on the 10-year plan for 2026. They want to move now. I won't know what the actual cost for that intersection will be for some time. It is a municipally run project so we are taking the lead. DOT won't take the lead but they will be a heavy part of this. With regard to your question of where we get the number? The Council will not know. It is working with the state and asking when we can begin discussions on it. If we can start discussions now great. When will we have access to the \$4 million they put aside for this project?

T. Walsh: You talk about not having the numbers for the traffic now. For the Planning Board, we were more concerned with the traffic than we were with the sewer because they could have build these types of buildings, by right, with a septic and a well. From my own simplicity, instead of starting with the sewer project last September and perhaps starting with the traffic, which is the genuine issue, we probably would have numbers by now. I don't have a whole lot of sympathy for the applicant for their selection of priorities. The reason 3A was included in our conditional approval is not just the ramp. Their own traffic engineer said and admitted that at least 30 percent of the traffic generated here is going to go by the highway and down. It was that same engineer that said if you look at a glass of water it is already overflowing now. We as a Planning Board looked at it and said everybody in this room is fine with the development, we would love to see something happen there, we gave them a conditional approval which we do not like doing, but yet we just don't see any movement on the applicants behalf and it was from the information of their own engineer.

M. Somers: Our condition says they will have executed agreements among and between all state and local agencies detailing the scope, cost, and financial responsibility of offsite improvements including but not limited to That doesn't come close.

T. Walsh: No. We actually got the town attorney to draft this language so that we were iron clad to not give a conditional approval with leaks in it. I don't know what this is. To me it does nothing.

R. Duhaime: Why was the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Board not invited to this meeting? Shouldn't one of these two men be attending?

T. Walsh: I would have gone if invited.

R. Duhaime: Can we see the a copy of the left hand turn lane?

M. Somers: Even DOT's letter says design and construction of a left turn lane.

T. Walsh: There is none. This is unfortunate because we have been looking at that hole for 30+ years. It is not supposed to be this difficult. For the love of God, I don't understand why sewer was a priority but the real problem was ignored and now the pressure seems to be on us to bend on the traffic because we have this big MOU which everybody was so highly seeking. I am no different than I was before about the traffic problem. I hear from constituents all the time plus I do have eyeballs as well. The place is a mess over there and if we are going to see some development they are going to have to help us. Andre have you seen this in the past in other towns? I also have a fear, and I did bring it up in those meetings as well, even if we came up with a fair share contribution for them, if there was going to be a large sum from the taxpayers and the warrant failed where would that bring us again? I know you have done larger developments. Have you ever seen situations where the developer would actually take care of the town's fair share for the town's portion of the development and as more development occurred they would be reimbursed for the money they have got in terms of working out their fair share later with the other industries. Does that occur because we are going to be in the same problem if the warrant fails and we have an approved and build 500,000 sq. ft. building. This is a tough one.

A. Garron: There are a lot of moving parts. The key part is you are dealing with a state highway and you have little control over that. The good thing is that it is an approved plan on the 10 year plan. It is the timing. If I hear the board the intent of your condition was to see and approve the scope and proportional share of the funding. You will need to know the full cost. Right now all they are going with is \$4 million because that is what is on the 10 year plan. With the scope of the project itself, that still needs to be determined.

D. Pichette Volk: Port One got this letter. What to they think will happen?

T. Walsh: They are trying to get a building permit based on this.

D. Pichette Volk: Is it as simple as saying we cannot consider a building permit until our questions are answered?

M. Somers: It is in the conditions. They have not met the conditions yet and don't have a right to pull the building permit.

T. Walsh: Historically what happens with a large scale project, or even a smaller scale project, even when it deals with state roads, say they are requiring a turn lane. It is the applicant that has the plans generated that the DOT signs off and they bring it back to us. They are eliminating all those steps by doing this. I don't know how they expect us to say yes.

D. Pichette Volk: Maybe we have to remind them of the process.

D. Boutin motioned to authorize the town administrator to work with town planner, DOT, applicant, and Chairman of the Planning Board to put a meeting together with all of these individuals and report back to the Planning Board. Seconded by D. Winterton.

D. Winterton: The impetus for that motion would be to reiterate what the minutes from the September meeting state. The requirements we asked for have not been met.

S. Gilbert: Is a meeting necessary? Why can't we just tell them they have not met the conditions.

M. Somers: Someone needs to communicate to them they need to have plans, we need to see those plans and the estimate of construction costs. That is what is in the conditions. This is not the spirit of the conditions. Clearly someone needs to explain it to them because if they think that will get them to a building permit they are misunderstanding the process.

S. Gilbert: In my mind it makes sense to communicate that first and if there is continued murkiness in that conversation and they are not clear a meeting would make sense.

T. Walsh: Because of the scale of this I don't think a meeting is premature.

D. Winterton: This letter is from DOT saying it is okay for them.

Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Recess 7:17 pm. Reconvened at 7:26 pm

3. TOWN OWNED PROPERTIES

Phase I of Town Owned Property Inventory

Plan to inventory and retain/dispose of properties currently owned by the Town

N. Williams: Internally I have provided you a list of 19 properties to look at as Phase 1. Ultimately we are soliciting from the land use boards and taking the recommendation to Council of the properties they would like to get rid of. The first five lots are off of Pleasant Street. I am not sure town would have any interest in these. For some reason it never got built out. These are MDR lots. It is not paved. It is a paper street/recorded right-of-way.

D. Winterton: The two in the front are owned by somebody but nothing is being done?

N. Williams: That is correct.

T. Walsh: That is a buildable plan and could go on the rolls.

D. Pichette Volk: Are these 19 100% owned by the town?

N. Williams: They are. They have been deeded by the town.

T. Walsh: St some point the tax burden to the town exceeded the property value?

N. Williams: I am not sure that is the case for all of them. Some have been deeded for non-payment of taxes. I will have to verify if the larger one was deeded. As far as the amount of arrears exceeding the value of property, I do not have enough information to speak to that.

T. Walsh: I have dealt with two of them in the past. At the time when the back taxes got to a point the town started seizing and taking over. They did go to auction. The sale was made, the town got its taxes, and anything over that went back to the owner. I didn't think you could seize properties for partial payments and take assets at the same time. I am trying to understand the operation, the MO.

D. Boutin: These five Pleasant Street lots are owned by the town. Apparently there is no opportunity for the previous owners to get the land back, correct?

A. Garron: As part of being deeded, the owners were given the opportunity to pay the back taxes. I am guessing this happened over several years to a point where they took the property for non-payment. If it does go to auction, for any surplus lots the money for back taxes and administration fees are kept by the town. Anything above that is held in abeyance for a minimum of three years to see if there are any heirs or assigns.

T. Walsh: So they do have the rights to their assets?

A. Garron: If there is anyone to claim them, correct.

D. Boutin: Andre, you used the word auction. Is there any reason why the town could not engage a realtor to sell the lots?

A. Garron: We have to follow RSA 41-14. In my experience auctions are the better way to go.

D. Boutin motioned to recommend the five lots on Pleasant Street go to auction. Seconded by M. Somers.

R. Duhaime: Conservation looked at their properties. RSA 41-14 targets Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Heritage Commission, and Historic District Commission. Town Council determines the mode of which we dispose of the surplus land.

T. Walsh: I am apprehensive with deciding on these tonight. How many do we have?

A. Garron: We have a lot of land. This has been milling over the past three or four town administrators.

D. Winterton: I think it is the scope of the project. Some of these have severe value to somebody or the town. They are not being taxed now. On the tax map for the locations off Pleasant Street, they do not meet current zoning regulations.

N. Williams: We would have to look to see when the sub-division was approved. They are untaxed now. Maybe we could send ten a month to auction?

A. Garron: We are trying to get it going. I think we spent enough time researching what we have. There has been a lot of interest in town owned property. These 19 are the ones that have had interest. We are also looking at the possibility of roadways, conservation, playgrounds, etc.

D. Winterton: I think that is important. In hindsight you don't want to say "I wish we had."

R. Duhaime: I would like to know how these are zoned, if they are buildable lots, etc.

T. Walsh: Would anyone be opposed to taking these 19 and doing research?

D. Pichette Volk: Just the Pleasant Street ones? I would like to see the complete list before we move in any direction.

T. Walsh: Decisions made in hast are usually done wrong. I won't be supporting this tonight.

D. Winterton: My concern with the motion is I would like to have feedback from the other boards to see if these properties have any value to the town.

ROLL CALL

D. Boutin - Yes
D. Winterton - No
M. Somers - Yes
R. Duhaime - No
C. Stelmach - No
D. Pichette Volk - No
T. Walsh - No

Motion fails with a vote of 5 - 2.

BUSINESS OCCUPANCY/TOWN DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 7:42 pm. Seconded by M. Somers. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held August 1, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ AnnMarie Scott

**AnnMarie Scott
Recording Clerk**