

1 **Official**

2

3 **MINUTES**

4 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
5 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

6 **35 Main Street**

7 **Monday, August 15, 2022**

8 **6:00 PM**

9

10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:23 P.M.**

11

12 **PROOF OF POSTING**

13

14 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

15

16 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

17

18 **PRESENT: Tom Walsh (Chairman), Chris Stelmach (Vice-Chairman), Mike Somers, Paul**
19 **Scarpetti, Don Winterton, Denise Pichette Volk, and David Boutin (Town Council**
20 **Representative)**

21

22 **ALTERNATES: Robert Duhaime and Sheena Gilbert**

23

24 **EXCUSED: None**

25

26 **NOT PRESENT: None**

27

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

29

30 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 18, 2022**

31

32 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2022 meeting. Seconded by C. Stelmach.***
33 ***P. Scarpetti abstained due to not being at the July 18, 2022 meeting. Motion carried unanimously***
34 ***with a vote of 7-0.***

35 **NEW BUSINESS**

36

37 **1. PORT ONE COMPANIES**

38 **47 Hackett Hill Road**

39 **Warehouse and Distribution Facility**

40 **Board Review of Conditions of Approval**

41

42 Peter Bartash (Port One Companies/Manager of Granite Woods Development LLC: My understanding
43 is this is a meeting with regard to a specific component of the conditional approval. At the time of the
44 conditional approval a year ago, a major concern during the Planning Board and ZBA review was the
45 potential of traffic from the proposed warehouse, and existing traffic at the intersection of Rt. 3A and

46 Hackett Hill Road and the toll road. The conditions the board placed and the dialogue with NH DOT
47 was to help move the ball down the field to bring improvements to those intersections and make sure
48 they were enacted. We worked with Nicholas and other members of staff to understand what the impact
49 fees would be statutorily. We spent time with our traffic engineer to discuss long term costs statutorily
50 and allowed contributions that would be adequate to improve those two intersections. We agreed to
51 provide a one time fee of \$1 million which is double the statutory requirement. We had traffic engi-
52 neers look at the anticipated traffic and where the traffic would travel based on type of vehicle and
53 time of day. There would likely need to be improvements on Hackett Hill Road and the toll would need
54 a new turn line to provide cueing for tractor trailers. Improvements would need to be made at the inter-
55 section of Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A. A lot of parties would be involved. This is a state controlled
56 road. It would be difficult for us to control the process but we can focus on the areas that we can con-
57 trol. We are looking at if the improvements at Rt. 3A and Hackett Hill Road would be a round-about,
58 what that cost would be, and what the 10 percent contribution would need to be. The 10 percent match-
59 ing contribution would be almost identical to the contribution amount we contemplated from the begin-
60 ning. The language of the Planning Board approval was clear that this has been a significant problem
61 for a long time. We gave verbal assurance we would see this through. The town wanted something in
62 writing. We have been undergoing other approvals with other agencies at the state and federal level
63 working with town counsel and staff on a TIF agreement on water and sewer approvals. We have been
64 coordinating with DOT since February, 2022 regarding road improvements. Hooksett approved a corri-
65 dor study for Rt. 3A. Solving the traffic issue at Hackett Hill Road and 3A would not be a silver bullet.
66 There still might be impacts along the corridor. The town and DOT communicated about that and I am
67 not aware of that study. I have learned that a round-about at Hackett Hill Road and 3A may be a solu-
68 tion and it would be the most costly solution. Another solution may be a five lane intersection that
69 might be slightly less costly. That improvement is on the 10-year plan with DOT and anticipated for
70 2026. Additional engineering and study work has to happen between the town and DOT. My conclu-
71 sion is when the improvements to the Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A failed to move forward it failed be-
72 cause of funding. The voters in Hooksett did not want to foot the bill on that. We are proposing to solve
73 that for the town in the way of this one time contribution. We have operated in good faith. Factors have
74 changed based on a coordination study. We are asking the board to review the work we have done to
75 date to see if we have satisfied that condition and if not to implement a modified condition. This has a
76 lot of moving parts to it. We are intending to start construction as soon as we can. The shell would not
77 be delivered until 2024. When we look at the time line of potential traffic impacts there is not a signifi-
78 cant delta between those two. By making that a one time contribution they can move forward knowing
79 there is no addition of cost to the town's taxpayers or constituents. The impacts this project will poten-
80 tially have on Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A would be less than a 20 percent increase to lead time at
81 peak times on weekdays. Most of our project's traffic will be going directly to and from the highway.
82 Other members of DOT may be willing to provide more information to the town.

83
84 D. Boutin: Could you step back and itemize the points that you would include in a letter to address this
85 issue?

86
87 P. Bartash: We would: 1) Define the improvements that were contemplated for the conditions of
88 Hackett Hill Road and the toll road to the Rt. 3A intersection 2) Define which would refer to the letter
89 issued by DOT defining improvements that are conditionally approved by DOT and the Hackett Hill
90 Road intersection (left turn lane) scope and requirements. DOT has agreed they will work with our en-
91 gineers to review and approve the design we prepare for those improvements and we will be able to
92 contract it. 3) Estimate for the cost of that work is between \$250,000 and \$400,000. We would speak

93 specifically to the cost in that letter would design and construct that. We have a commitment with DOT
94 for that. 4) Summarize our understanding of the conversations that were held with DOT and members
95 of the town over the last few months and define the conclusions of those conversations. The two poten-
96 tial improvement options, the 5 lane turning T and round-about corridor study are underway and sched-
97 uled on DOT's 10 year plan scheduled for 2026. Funding is available for that. Cost estimates would
98 result in an expected 10 percent match from the town of \$600,000 to \$800,000. A summary of the letter
99 would be that with the anticipated cost profile, one improvement we can control is Hackett Hill Road
100 and the toll road. We cannot control Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A. We can control providing a one
101 time funding to cover the town's cost of the improvements. We would state effectively the plan for im-
102 provements, the cost and expected timelines, and include an attached letter from DOT referencing the
103 same.

104
105 T. Walsh: Are you still looking at a one time contribution of \$1 million would you be amicable to
106 guaranteeing the town's 10 percent. if the \$1 million comes up short would you make up the differ-
107 ence?
108

109 P. Bartash: We assume by installing water and sewer other projects may come to light between now
110 and 2026. If we are asked to guarantee the towns 10 percent and the town levies impact fees to those
111 other projects at what point is it reasonable for our project to be reimbursed for what we have done
112 over and above our contribution?
113

114 T. Walsh: I see your caution.
115

116 C. Stelmach: You said you would not start to build until 2023 would the state be starting their intersec-
117 tion with their contractor at the same time.
118

119 P. Bartash: We are intending to start site work in September, 2022, if possible, to prepare the develop-
120 ment pad for the site. We would do the vertical work in March 2023. The applicant would do the im-
121 provements at Hackett Hill Road and the toll road. The turn lane would be completed with the core and
122 shell delivery of our building.
123

124 C. Stelmach: Will the access easement be relocated before going out back?
125

126 P. Bartash: The access easement has been agreed to in concept and has gone through the last stages of
127 red lines. That is anticipated to be done next month. We anticipate construction of the new access ease-
128 ment with the construction of the site. Once the new one is constructed we would abandon the old one.
129

130 C. Stelmach: Are the owners up front okay with this.
131

132 P. Bartash: We are trading red lines with those owners.
133

134 CR Willeke (Municipal Highway Engineer - NH DOT): The Rt. 3A intersection would be locally man-
135 aged with DOT funds coming in. Hooksett will be in the lead of locally managing that with DOT over-
136 sight.
137

138 C. Stelmach: Would there be a temporary improvement such as a light?
139

140 CR Willeke: I am not sure how much benefit a temporary improvement would be. I don't think that
141 would be plausible or feasible.

142
143 D. Boutin: You said you would provide a one time contribution to cover costs of Hackett Hill Road/Rt.
144 3A. Can you explain the number and timetable?

145
146 P. Bartash: A significant portion of funding would come from the state. The town is required to put in
147 10 percent. The cost would be between \$4 to \$6 million. There would be a \$600,000 to \$800,000 cost
148 to the town. I am suggesting we provide a one time contribution to pay for the turn lane. Whatever is
149 left would be in an escrowed account to fund the improvements to Hackett Hill Road and the toll road.

150
151 D. Boutin: How much are you expected to allocate to the toll road left turn?

152
153 P. Bartash: A reasonable estimate of cost is \$250,000 to execute that improvement with contingency
154 factors and knowing price fluctuation is rapid. That cost could be \$350,000 to \$400,000. The team of
155 people involved in these conversations can make a reasonable guess but the cost could fall within a
156 range. There would be an escrow of about \$800,000. If the contribution is more the town could do what
157 they want with that money. We are putting in enough money these costs should be covered.

158
159 D. Boutin: When would the town see the \$650,000?

160
161 P. Bartash: At the time we request the building permit. We are starting construction in 2023. We are
162 intending water and sewer improvements will be installed and complete the first part of 2024. Other
163 projects may come into the town that could be applied to this intersection that needs improvement or
164 fixing. In August, 2020 one of the first comments I heard was there has been a major traffic concern on
165 Hackett Hill Road and Rt. 3A that predates our project. We have never fought the idea that money
166 needed to be paid to address that issue. We have followed through on that to date.

167
168 P. Scarpetti: The timeline is 2026-2027 for engineering and construction. That starts at the local level.
169 What can we do to expedite getting this going?

170
171 CR Willeke: The funding in 2026 begins October 1, 2025. If you are ready soon we will likely find a
172 way to fund it sooner. If the project is ready to put out to bid in 2024 or 2025 we can work with the
173 town to accelerate that time line. You could start working toward soliciting engineering services and I
174 could work on getting a project agreement between DOT and the town. We can take what has already
175 been done, if it makes sense, and what the best solution would be.

176
177 P. Scarpetti: When would you be looking to get the occupancy permit?

178
179 P. Bartash: The first quarter of 2024 for the core and shell. That would be a limited occupancy permit.
180 The final would coincide with interior development. We must complete the turn lane before we can re-
181 ceive the corn shell CO.

182
183 R. Duhaime: Last September we gave you conditional approval. We have not seen anything. The
184 whole idea was to get something. The toll booth is the elephant in the room. They are talking about do-
185 ing a widening project on Whitehall Road and Rt. 93. They better make sure these two projects are not

186 going on at the same time. The town has spent money on improvements and what do we have? I
187 thought we would have something by now.

188
189 D. Pichette Volk: The documents from September 2021, have conditions. What do you want changed
190 so that you can start building?

191
192 P. Bartash: The language in the 2nd and 3rd conditions of the approval can be interpreted in different
193 ways.

194
195 D. Pichette Volk: What would you want that to say?

196
197 T. Walsh: By advice of our counsel, we should give them an opportunity to put their proposal in writ-
198 ing in advance of our next meeting. Once they have a chance to do that it will answer your question.

199
200 D. Pichette Volk: Perhaps you could write the changes down so they can be looked at objectively.

201
202 T. Walsh: Once we see their proposal for a change I suspect we would have the ability to make
203 changes to it before we vote on it. Are we able amend it on the spot or is it all or nothing and try again?

204
205 N. Williams: Once we post it for a public hearing it would have to be in the form of voting on.

206
207 T. Walsh: We will get an answer on it?

208
209 D. Boutin: We need to get something in writing from Peter.

210
211 D. Winterton: There could be a round-about or maybe two synchronized traffic lights. Who makes that
212 decision and prices it out? What is the timeline to know what that might be?

213
214 CR Willeke: Local management at the town will be in control of that. The town can steer that ship.

215
216 D. Winterton: The town would have to come up with 10 percent.

217
218 CR Willeke: Yes. I have sent the town a sheet. In general it is 10 percent.

219
220 D. Winterton: You have been cooperative with the town especially on the sewer side. Could you create
221 an MOU with the town to say you would provide the 10 percent and, if the cost ends up being more,
222 you would put in the additional funds and the town would reimburse you as additional impact fees
223 come in.

224
225 P. Bartash: The issue is the timeline of that process. We would be seeking to provide a written sugges-
226 tion of modification of that approval and work on that type of agreement with the town. If we don't
227 start construction in September we will miss another year and that will render this unfeasible for us to
228 do.

229
230 D. Winterton: I understand.

231

232 S. Gilbert: CR, there are a couple of options and the town would make the final decision in collabora-
233 tion with DOT. When would that be finalized?

234
235 CR Willeke: At about 18 months in. The town is in the lead to design the improvement and there are
236 several steps to reach the final design.

237
238 S. Gilbert: What is the risk?

239
240 CR Willeke: There is very low risk. There is dedicated funding and federal funding is better these
241 days. We are competing with not enough resources or engineers, but there is funding for it. We don't
242 have the funding do Main St./3A in the 10 year plan, but 3A/Hackett Hill Road is the priority.

243
244 S. Gilbert: If you don't get the approvals to start in September do you have additional properties to
245 work on if this does not take place?

246
247 P. Bartash: No.

248
249 R. Duhaime: We have the project of the widening of Rt. 3 from Whitehall Road to 3A. When are both
250 going to happen? How long will it take to do the widening on DW Highway?

251
252 CR Willeke: That is not locally managed. We look statewide at our network and that is a routine thing
253 for us to do.

254
255 T. Walsh: Could either project interfere with any other projects?

256
257 David Rodrique (NH DOT): These projects are 100 percent independent. We can get you information
258 for the Rt. 3 widening project.

259
260 *D. Boutin motioned to have the applicant provide a letter that discusses the 4 items he discussed and*
261 *any other proposal in writing. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote*
262 *of 7-0.*

263
264 **WAIVER REQUEST**

265
266 **2. CHRIS MASTRIANO**
267 **108 Mammoth Road**
268 **Tax Map 41 Lot 10**
269 **Request for a waiver of Development Regulations Section 11.15 to permit Overhead Elec-**
270 **tric Service Line**

271
272 David Jordan (Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.): I am representing the owner of project. This is for a 4 unit
273 townhouse. The utility lines would be overhead rather than underground. Driving this is cost. It would
274 be \$5,300 more to go underground. The utility pole is located in the center of the site driveway. There
275 is an existing water service where underground utility was supposed to go. They are going to put it on
276 the north side instead of south side of the driveway. We would have to cross over underground. It is
277 easier to go overhead.

278

279 D. Winterton: Are the services to exiting houses underground or overhead?
280

281 D. Jordan: Overhead.
282

283 P. Scarpetti: The pole will be on the north side of the driveway? Will it cross to south side when it gets
284 to the building?
285

286 D. Jordan: It will cross at the entrance on our property and continue west to another pole out by the
287 building.
288

289 R. Duhaime: You are not proposing to put it between the driveway and bring the wire to the side of
290 building instead of going underground.
291

292 D. Jordan: Yes.
293

294 T. Walsh: How many poles and how many feet?
295

296 D. Jordan: Three poles and 230' overhead. The last 50' will be underground.
297

298 T. Walsh: 230' of pole through the neighborhood?
299

300 D. Jordan: Yes.
301

302 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the request for a waiver of Development Regulations Section 11.15 to***
303 ***permit Overhead Electric Service Line for Chris Mastriano, 108 Mammoth Road, Tax Map 41 Lot***
304 ***10.***
305

306 T. Walsh: It concerns me that this isn't a public hearing.
307

308 ***Seconded by P. Scarpetti. T. Walsh voted no. Motion carried with a vote of 6-1.***
309

310 Recess at 7:28 pm.

311 Reconvened at 7:35 pm.
312

313 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING**

314 **3. SIRON DEVELOPMENT, LLC**

315 **3 Dartmouth Street**

316 **Tax Map 18 Lot 29**

317 **6 Lot UDR Subdivision**
318
319

320 T. Walsh: Are the plans complete?
321

322 N. Williams: Yes. They are stamped by the sewer commission and signed off by water. They have met
323 all of the items. They have also been reviewed by fire and Bruce Thomas who did not have anything.
324

325 ***D. Boutin motioned for completeness for a 6 Lot UDR Subdivision for Sirron Development, LLC, 3***
326 ***Dartmouth Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 29. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously***
327 ***with a vote of 7-1.***

328
329 Joe Wichert: Norris Viviers is in the audience. Jeff Merritt is with me. There is 326' of frontage on
330 Dartmouth Street and the Hunt Street parcel is 3 acres. This is zoned PZ. In March a waiver was ap-
331 proved to have this residential in PZ using UDR for rules. There would be 3 lots with frontage on Hunt
332 Street and 3 lots with frontage on Dartmouth Street. Sewer and water are available on Dartmouth
333 Street. Only water is available on Hunt Street. The proposal is to extend the sewer main from Rt. 3 to
334 Lots 3 and 4. We are asking for waivers on surface water, wetlands, and vernal pools. There are no ob-
335 vious wetlands but we are asking due to being serviced by municipal water and sewer. We have ap-
336 provals from water, sewer, and DES.

337
338 D. Pichette Volk: This was going to be 4 lots plus the existing one when you came in March.

339
340 J. Wichert: We talked about trying to salvage the existing house. As they got into the renovations they
341 realized it wasn't worth it. We met with N. Williams, and are adhering to UDR requirements.

342
343 P. Scarpetti: I have no problem with the sub-division but there is a commercial property in front of it.
344 If they develop they should not be penalized because of the sub-division. They should have the buffer
345 they would have had in the original sub-division. If he comes in with commercial he has to now have
346 the buffer. It should be noted right now.

347
348 N. Williams: The buffer between commercial and residential is 50'. The sub-division plans should
349 note the existing wooded buffer area is between the residential lots and commercial. If it is the intent to
350 clear cut those lots any existing vegetation should remain.

351
352 T. Walsh: How do we document this for the sake of the other lot?

353
354 N. Williams: It is hard to grant a waiver when we don't have a development plan in place. It can be
355 another type of buffer that would not limit them by 50'.

356
357 T. Walsh: What is your plan as far as the buffer?

358
359 J. Wichert: We can move the houses to the east side of the lot to maximize the buffer along that lot
360 line. We would be agreeable to leaving as much of the existing buffer as possible.

361
362 Open public hearing.

363
364 Holly Mokrzecki: We purchased 7 Dartmouth Street. We are a commercial licensed facility. Six
365 houses that want to go in between us and another commercial property.

366
367 J. Wichert: We would be willing to do that same thing on the west side. That building only goes back
368 half way. We will shift over and retain as much as we can.

369
370 Susan Piche: They are stating there will only be 13' between our building and their lot.

371

372 J. Wichert: We were asked if we could say how far our building is from the lot line. We were not
373 thinking buffers.

374
375 T. Walsh: What is the zoning ordinance proposal on dog kennels?
376

377 N. Williams: The proposal for the kennel business is for the outdoor component. Additional buffers
378 will be required for the noise.

379
380 Close public hearing.

381
382 ***D. Boutin motioned to approve the 6 Lot UDR Subdivision for Sirron Development, LLC, 3 Dart-***
383 ***mouth Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 29.***

384
385 D. Winterton: Sometimes walls or other types of buffers are put up. This might be an appropriate place
386 for a fence.

387
388 J. Wichert: We would switch the houses away from the two commercial uses and not do any clearing
389 in the side yard set back which is 15'.

390
391 C. Stelmach: Just make 4 lots so you have your buffer on each side.

392
393 J. Wichert: That would create a problem with the economics and this being viable. We talked about the
394 commercial use on the west side and Rt. 3. If we gave 15' that only leaves 35' on our side. If the board
395 is not comfortable with that what would the board be thinking of. We don't know what is going on with
396 Rt. 3 at this time.

397
398 T. Walsh: I am not concerned with the Rt. 3 end of it. The buffer will be drastically cut on Rt. 3 when
399 that gets developed. It is residential use between two commercial lots.

400
401 R. Duhaime: The previous use was a home. Residential use with a residential home. We put it in the
402 PZ hoping it would flow. There is residential across the street. It fits. Without the 50' setbacks I don't
403 see this moving forward.

404
405 P. Scarpetti: What if they do 25' setbacks on the sides and a 15' no cut and have it put on the deed? On
406 the 50' setback on the commercial it is 50' from the property line not 50' from the building.

407
408 J. Wichert: We are trying to mirror the existing area. If we reduce the width of the middle lot, instead
409 of doing a 15' no cut buffer on the east and west side we could up that to 20'. That would reduce the
410 width of the middle lot, still be over the 90', and then we could do a 20' buffer against both commercial
411 properties.

412
413 R. Duhaime: We have spoken about mixed-use. 25' would be better in my opinion.

414
415 J. Wichert: 20' buffer and 25' setback?

416
417 P. Scarpetti: I would rather keep the lots uniform.

418

419 T. Walsh: Would you have an objection to having this continued in order for you to redraw this?

420
421 N. Williams: Could the existing setback be planted with evergreens?

422
423 *D. Boutin motioned to approve a 6 Lot UDR Subdivision for Sirron Development, LLC, 3 Dartmouth*
424 *Street, Tax Map 18 Lot 29 with the condition of a 20' buffer and 25' set-back on the outside lots. Se-*
425 *conded by M. Somers.*

426
427 P. Scarpetti: Describe what the 20' buffer would be.

428
429 J. Wichert: We would treat it as a no cut.

430
431 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

432
433 **BOARD DISCUSSION**

434
435 **4. RICHARD FITZ**
436 **26 Chester Turnpike & 347 Whitehall Road**
437 **Conceptual Discussion for LDR Subdivision/Groundwater Testing Requirements**

438
439 Richard Fitz: We would like to have a discussion regarding a 4 lot subdivision at the corner of White-
440 hall Road and Chester Turnpike. I was told I would have to have water testing done and I don't know
441 what that means. I am looking for information on what that would consist of.

442
443 Joe Wichert: We started this back in 2014. It did not go forward because there used to be a land fill.
444 Dick's father purchased that from the town. The concern is that if this is serviced by on site well and
445 septic.

446
447 R. Fitz: The land fill was for household trash and was burnt on a weekly basis.

448
449 J. Wichert: If we got abutting well samples would the board be okay with that? Would the board want
450 a sample from the property?

451
452 R. Duhaime: You are looking for a 4 lot sub-division?

453
454 J. Wichert: Yes.

455
456 T. Walsh: Wouldn't it behoove you to test it before you build?

457
458 J. Wichert: There is an abutter across the turnpike and their's is fine along with properties to the west
459 and a couple across Whitehall Road. If there was any contamination it would be localized. The landfill
460 site will be listed on the deed. Is the board looking at this as the water source being a function of the
461 buyer or the property?

462
463 R. Duhaime: If you put in a central well are you servicing 3 or 4 lots.

464
465 T. Walsh: You said you did test the abutters wells?

466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512

J. Wichert: If we were to test the abutters wells would that suffice?

P. Scarpetti: How accurate are you as far as the land fill?

J. Wichert: We have not found any records or the size of it.

P. Scarpetti: My first thought would be testing a well radius. Mr. Fitz has to worry about it being on original ground or you have to do a piling to get to the original ground. I would want to get a water test from the abutting neighbors and PFAS should be part of that testing.

D. Winterton: Are we putting the town at risk?

N. Williams: There is a legal right to sub-divide the property. The question is to what extent do we want them to explore the water because there will be no building permits issued if the water is not quality.

C. Stelmach: Could you test the water next to the swamp? Would that tell you anything?

J. Wichert: Part of that is on the opposite side of the brook.

S. Gilbert: Nicholas, what is the precedence of this? Are we looking at the land use prior to this?

N. Williams: It is local knowledge there was a land fill and there is speculation of what might have been in the land fill. Maybe shingles.

S. Gilbert: You would have to test the water supply before building.

J. Wichert: I believe that is something the builder does. It would be on the deed and not hidden. There will be an expense that is not a normal development expense. A lot of this is municipal wide precedent and size of the lot. These were cautions given to use by prior staff.

T. Walsh: One way or another the lot will need to be tested. Do we think the developer/owner needs to have the onus or should it be the buyer?

D. Pichette Volk: As a starting point I would think you could test the abutters. I can't imagine supporting the 4 lots without the onus being on the developer.

D. Winterton: I agree. I would not want to put my land on the market knowing it might not be buildable land.

P. Scarpetti: If you had the 4 lot sub-division it could be subject to drilling the lot before selling the lot. You could drill one, if it clears move onto the next one. If it doesn't clear you don't get a building permit.

5. TOWN OWNED PROPERTIES

Phase I of Town Owned Property Inventory

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

D. Boutin motioned to move this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Seconded by D. Pichette Volk. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

BUSINESS OCCUPANCY/TOWN DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 8:23 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 September 19, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ AnnMarie Scott

**AnnMarie Scott
Recording Clerk**