

Candia Zoning Review & Revision Committee
Minutes of September 21, 2016
APPROVED

Present: Sean James; Scott Komisarek; Mike Santa; Carleton Robie; Susan Young; Boyd Chivers; Dick Snow and Dave Murray, Building Inspector.

The purpose of this volunteer committee is to review potential changes to the Town of Candia Zoning, Subdivision and Site Plan regulations and make recommendation for changes or additions to the Planning Board. This meeting is open to anyone that wants to participate.

No Minutes were Reviewed

Accessory Dwelling & Zoning:

B. Chivers handed out his document entitled “*Proposed changes to Section 15:04 E to conform with SB 146*” to the Board. The top half here is the ordinance as its written and the bottom half is the proposed change to that ordinance. So it follows the same format as our ordinance does now but it adds eliminates the restrictions that violate SB 146 and it adds a couple of things permitted by SB 146.

Page 1:

Present text: *Any dwelling in a residential zone may be converted or built to contain one Accessory Dwelling Unit on the following conditions by Special Exception:*

1. *There shall be only one bedroom in the accessory dwelling unit*
2. *Adequate sewer and water service shall be provided. One septic system shall service the entire property.*
3. *There shall be a maximum of 600 sq. ft. of heated living space in the accessory unit. (3/10/2009)*
4. *On-site parking for one additional vehicle shall be provided.*
5. *All existing set back ordinances shall be met.*
6. *The accessory unit shall be within or attached to the main dwelling unit or located in an accessory building that exists on March 15, 2003, located on the same lot as the main building.*
7. *Density requirements of Article 14:04 C will not apply*
8. *So long as an accessory dwelling is occupied, either the primary dwelling unit or the accessory dwelling unit shall be occupied by the owner of the property. (Rev. 3/2002, 3/2003, 3/2009)*

Proposed Revision: *(Revised August 31, 2016) Any dwelling unit in the residential or mixed use districts may be converted or constructed to provide for one accessory dwelling unit subject to conformance with Section 15:02 Special Exception Standards and any additional requirements imposed by the Board of Adjustment under Section 15:03, Special Exception Conditions and further subject to the following restrictions:*

1. *There shall be no more than one accessory dwelling unit for any single family dwelling.*
2. *There shall be a maximum of 750 square feet of heated living space for the accessory dwelling unit.*
3. *There shall be no more than two bedrooms in the accessory dwelling unit.*
4. *Adequate water shall be provided. One septic system shall serve the entire property and the adequacy of the system shall be certified by a licensed septic installer.*
5. *On-site parking for one additional vehicle beyond the setbacks shall be provided.*
6. *All existing set back requirements shall be met.*
7. *Architectural enhancements will be employed for the purpose of maintaining aesthetic continuity with the principal dwelling unit resulting in both units appearing as a single family dwelling unit.*
8. *The accessory unit shall be within or attached to the main dwelling unit.*
9. *Either the primary or the accessory dwelling unit shall be occupied by the owner of the property.*

B. Chivers said for example number 7 it says, and this is permitted by law; Architectural enhancements... *Architectural enhancements will be employed for the purpose of maintaining aesthetic continuity with the principal dwelling unit resulting in both units appearing as a single family dwelling unit.* In other words you can't just have a building and slap a 750 addition on the end of it. You have to try to integrate it into the architectural features of the house.

C. Robie said you have a ranch style house that's 70 feet long and you want to add on 70 feet, that's good, right. B. Chivers said sure if it stays with the architecture of the principal dwelling. S. Komisarek agreed. B. Chivers said there are really only two changes that are essentially made to our ordinance; increases it from 600 sq. ft. to 750 sq. ft. and there's one here, you can strike #3. That's something this committee can discuss. Everything else pretty much follows what we have now.

D. Snow said he didn't like #8, I don't see a reason why you couldn't have a separate accessory building. Zoning Board of Adjustments approved accessory buildings that are not attached to the building, there's a variance. B. Chivers said well if you want to detach it you can perhaps get a variance. D. Snow said #8 requires it be attached to the main building? I'm saying why can't you just build another small 750 foot building. D. Murray said you'd have to change the ordinance that we have. D. Snow replied this is a change to the ordinance. D. Murray said this is a different one though. D. Snow said you'd have to change the ordinance. D. Murray said no there's another one, you can't have two dwelling units on one piece of property. D. Snow said this is an exception to that. C. Robie responded but they're attached, this is attached. You can't have detached. D. Snow said then we'd have to change it. B. Chivers asked but why would you be against requiring them to be attached. D. Snow because that restricts it, you'd have to get a variance if you want to put in a smaller one or had a barn out back to convert. C. Robie said because you end up with houses, built behind somebody else's house that they have no way to get to, somebody passes away in the front house and the family wants to sell that and you have a younger family in the back house and it turns out to be difficult for everyone involved and we have a whole bunch of these cases in our community right now. That's why we don't do that. The best thing to do is to change the zoning and put in 60 foot easement or right of way and let somebody build a house on the back land. Mrs. Richter for example wants to grant her son an easement 60 feet or whatever, put a number on it, and there you go. But if we say 100 feet and she has 295', 200' for her house and 95', then she fails again because it's gotta be the same for everybody. If he goes out back and builds an accessory dwelling, what happens when his mother is no longer here, to the front dwelling and his siblings want to do something with it, it becomes a mess. B. Chivers suggested I think you're better off Dick integrating these buildings into one unit.

S. James said I agree with you Carleton but a question, if it's attached or detached doesn't you have the same problem if they sell and kick the other person out? C. Robie, said no, then it's one property. D. Murray agreed its one driveway; a shared driveway is always a problem. C. Robie asked if the description for an in-law apartment and accessory dwelling were the same. All agreed yes. Are we adding kitchenettes in accessory dwellings now, we've changed that. D. Murray said sometimes they add on an apartment and try not to call it an apartment with no kitchen. An apartment and accessory dwelling is the same thing. Accessory dwelling, relatives living there, relatives move out, it becomes an apartment. What's the difference, it has a kitchen. If there's no kitchen, it's an addition or extra bedrooms. S. James said the definition of the RSA (*RSA 674:67 Accessory Dwelling Units*) it says *the unit that is appurtenant to a single family dwelling, and that provides independent living facilities for one or more persons, including provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel of land as the principal dwelling unit it accompanies.*

M. Santa said Boyd I thought the object here was to look at our ordinance now and compare it to the law and decide whether we have to do a modification, what modifications we make or is it good the way it is. B. Chivers responded the minimum went from 600 sq. ft. to 750 sq. ft. M. Santa said that would be one. Two bedrooms from one. One was permitted before, two are permitted now. S. Komisarek said it makes sense to have a maximum of two bedrooms. C. Robie said 800 square feet is what most of us grew up in.

S. James agreed that number 3, there shall be *no more than 2 bedrooms* in the accessory dwelling unit sounds reasonable. It does say the *accessory dwelling counts as work force housing*. B. Chivers agreed, it does. It relieves the Town of the burden of demonstrating that we're meeting that requirement because every house now in Candia is potentially a multi-family house.

S. James said I think it was good, thank you for preparing it. The next step is we'll bring it to the Planning Board. I think we have the attorney look at it first, then the Planning Board. So I'll send it to the Attorney, have him look at it, go to the Planning Board, then we can recommend it as a warrant and then if we have any more, we'll bunch them together, we have to have a public hearing. But we have a little bit of time.

Exit 3, Warrant Articles & Charette:

S. Komisarek said I want to mention Exit 3. In an informal way I think we're in agreement that we need to address the fact that the Town owned parcel can only be used to construct a 40,000 sq. ft. grocery store. Can we ask SNH Planning if they will write the warrant article? S. James said no, they can't. It has to be a petition or a Town Board. S. Komisarek said no as a Planning Board we would write our own warrant article as a Planning Board and we don't need additional assistance. Ok.

B. Chivers said I asked Bart a question on this same thing. This is what the warrant article would say, vote to see if the Town would authorize the Board of Selectmen to dispose of the property and describe it, have the lot note; subject to the following conditions...and you just fill in the conditions. C. Robie said we already have those. B. Chivers said those conditions are too binding. C. Robie agreed. B. Chivers continued, what you want to do is rescind those conditions and pose new conditions. According to Bart, that would do it. This would supersede the prior. What are the conditions, it's getting close to warrant article time, and we need to come up with what those conditions are. We can't tie our hands. C. Robie said someone has to bring the conditions to the Board of Selectmen. That's how the first warrant article is written. If someone brings the conditions that meet the criteria, you can sell them the land. But we don't know what the conditions are until someone brings them to you. S. Komisarek said so it's a Board of Selectmen issue. C. Robie continued it has to be a decision once that option comes to you. And it can't wait for a whole year or 15 months to back to the people to vote. The Selectmen need the authority to make that decision. We won't know what the conditions are until someone brings them to us with a plan. That seems like five Selectmen should be able to make that determination if this is right for the community, if the community votes for you to do that. B. Chivers agreed. But first you need to define what those conditions are so the Town grants us the authority to sell it. C. Robie reiterated you don't know what the conditions are until the developer comes with a plan.

S. James asked why we need any conditions on it, because it won't pass. Tax deeded property there are no conditions. C. Robie said put in a warrant article and see if the people authorize the Selectmen to sell the property with their discretion is the right thing. B. Chivers said rather than pose conditions on the warrant article. D. Murray confirmed rescind all the previous conditions right. S. Komisarek commented but being Town owned land, we want to make sure we end up with something that's beneficial in the long run, to the Town. C. Robie said that would have to be up to the discretion of the Selectmen and it's up to the people to give them that discretion.

S. James commented in the past there was a warrant to buy the surplus land that the DOT had down at Exit 3 and it failed because the people I spoke with said there was no plan for it. S. Komisarek said what SNH Planning suggested doing a charette for Exit 3. So we're going to do a charette and I've heard corporate office park is one idea, some commercial if we had to have a drug store or something, it's already zoned where it's zoned. I think as part of that charette process, we look at the entire thing and assume that it aggregated and look at the curb cuts and get a rough idea of how many square feet of office space can we get there, how many sq. ft. of commercial and what the assessed value might be to the Town and then people can come and have a concept. I want to know this. This is a strategic opportunity we have at Exit 3, how are we going to maximize the benefit to the Town and what do

residents want. D. Snow asked are you talking the entire Exit 3 or just the Town land. S. Komisarek replied I think the Hobb's piece would be a fit when you look at curb cuts and master plan to layout it all out. At least if we have a concept plan, it will answer some fundamental questions like what do we really have there? The land slopes and there is high development costs. There might not be a tremendous value to the land but could be tremendous tax revenue back to the Town.

S. James said as far as solving the problem I think Boyd's right. We need a warrant article and maybe the condition is just any allowed use currently in the zoning. To Carleton's point, when someone comes in, "hey I want to put something in that's not allowed" we say no it's not allowed we can't do that, or if it is allowed, the Select Board would have the latitude to deal with it. C. Robie said the property doesn't have a lot of value until it's developed. And the revenue is what is important to the community. The revenue goes on forever. S. Komisarek said so it's a Board of Selectmen issue not a Planning Board issue. C. Robie said that's what I think. S. Young said I would use the Planning Board as a resource though. C. Robie said the Selectmen are the ones that sell property. The Planning Board can't sell Town property. B. Chivers said but we would sell it with your recommendations based on the criteria that you establish. This would have to be a joint effort between the BOS and the PB. C. Robie said you send them a letter like you send the Fire Chief and the Police Chief if there would be any adverse effect if we sold this land to so and so to do such and such and come back with a recommendation. S. Komisarek reiterated the whole point of having a plan, if we come up with something well thought out, close to what might be able to happen, people can say "ok" they can start to see and then they can vote. You're going to get the public input. D. Snow said you need to have some kind of plan. Somebody comes up with \$500,000, ok; somebody wants to build a grocery store down there, ok. B. Chivers asked Scott will that charette, will it be in depth enough to determine what that site is capable of supporting. S. Komisarek said we could take the extra step to do a basic fiscal impact analysis. Laura Scott that worked with the Town of Windham and they had no water and sewer down there, I thought I could talk with her. Try to lay this thing out, no money on engineering but what will this look like, what's the footprint. Based on that sq. footage this is what the assessed value would be.

S. James said back to your original question, the change that you were taking about should come from the Select Board. As far a warrant article; it's a commercial use. Sell if for commercial. C. Robie said if you promote that property, if the Town had money, there are companies that will bring you a list of people in a charette, like Scott talks about; I met with a gentleman a few years ago, Eric Brown with the Buxton Company. He was working in Farmington on a project, similar to Exit 3, Rte. 111 and 125 or whatever it is over there. They bring business to the community. You pay for that expertise. If the Town wanted to spend \$30,000 they'd give you a list of what would work there and what wouldn't. Then you would know and you could offer it up as.

D. Snow commented the concept of a charette is you get someone to do it for nothing. Put in a warrant article and say I want to get \$30,000 to do a study of what would best fit in Exit 3. C. Robie replied and they are going to say no because they don't have the long term vision of the revenue coming in for next generations. In our little Town, we are going to be in big trouble pretty soon because the Town is going to need a million dollars in their budget. Dean Young is getting to retirement age from the Fire Department. With the effort he puts in, you aren't going to get a Chief to do what he does for free. And when that happens, you're going to need a couple firemen and some rescue people. So you add that up, and to put on somewhat of a Fire Department, it's \$400,000. And we talk about our Town roads falling apart and being depleted and we don't have anything in the budget for highways but every year we talk about how bad they are. Sooner or later it's going to have to be another \$500,000 to take care of what we're not doing. So \$400,000 and \$500,000 is a million dollars the way I do math and that's in the next 10 years. If we don't figure out a way to collect some revenue, that revenue is coming from guys like me and you and you that are going to be close to eighty, seventy, sixty and ninety. I don't know where we're going to get the money, but our budget is going to have to increase by a million dollars in 10 years. Accessory dwellings: and Mr. Chivers seems

to think that's going to take care of our work force needs for housing, but Mrs. Richter just came in, looking to get a piece of her land subdivided off for a right of way for her son so he could work around the community and live in affordable housing in Town. I think we really need to look at that and see if we're going to write a warrant article to change some of that zoning or regulation, to do something about this. It comes up, it goes away. M. Santa said I thought we were going to talk to legal about that. C. Robie said we know what legal is, 200 foot frontage. If we start writing a waiver, why don't we just change the zoning and do away with the waiver. All these plans come in, everyone comes in with waivers and it's the same thing every time. Why do we ask them for a waiver when we grant them, let's do away with it.

S. James said tonight was different. It wasn't about the lot size, the lot size isn't the issue, the frontage is the issue. C. Robie said we know that. S. Komisarek said how can we help this woman. C. Robie said so let's do something and help her and others. Her case is irrelevant at this point.

S. James continued it is irrelevant, but if we made it 100 feet it wouldn't help her. S. Komisarek said she had 200 there. C. Robie said pick a number, a driveway width of 35 ft to get to the back land.

D. Murray said she has 305. S. James said 305 but she has the house there. That still wouldn't help her because she doesn't want to cut her lot up the middle, she wants access to the back. D. Murray I find it ironic because she had her hand in writing a lot of these regulations. B. Chivers said she was on the Zoning Board for 35 years. S. James so Carleton, you're specifically saying that we should be looking at the lot size, the frontage or what. C. Robie replied lot size is fine, frontage may be an issue.

Master Plan & Warrant Articles:

S. James said denser zoning has come up a lot. We've been talking about it on the Steering Committee for the Master Plan. It's tough. We have some main roads, if you have frontage on the main road, you can have denser development. C. Robie responded Mrs. Richter has frontage on the main road, but I guarantee you she doesn't want 7 houses in her backyard. So we're going to lose that parcel. The Town and the Planning should be looking at those parcels where Mrs. Richter wants to give her son a piece of land and we should make it, look Arlene, if you work this into our Village District, your son can have a house over here that's legal. He can have that lot that fits in our criteria now. S. Komisarek commented the whole thing comes down to the idea of planning is fearful, people are afraid of change. We've developed a culture in Candia where we don't plan or look at the major issues. We have a Master Plan that gives us guidance, we have timetables that say one to three years high priority but it's been difficult. When you only have a couple of people show up at a meeting and all three of them say we don't want anything, that's pretty much what's guiding this Town. We need an objective Planning Board that can isolate the noise, we don't want pressure from developers, we don't want people way on the other side that doesn't want anything for 400 years, and just as planners, what makes sense for Candia. What's going to make it sustainable and viable? That's what we need to do and I think we haven't because of our culture. We get tremendous push back and it takes a little bit of courage to say what is best in the long run for Candia? That's step one. Let's just do good planning. As a Planning Board, we should take out and look at the Master Plan from 2004, these are the main issues that we need to address right here, not because Scott Komisarek owns acreage there and not because Carleton wants to build houses and not because Boyd doesn't want anything, but that's what planners do. It's planning though; when I heard what Tom Giffen said about this is what makes sense to him from a planning standpoint that is what we need to do.

S. James said the way this group works is the exactly the way Boyd did it tonight. We have a group, Boyd had an idea for a suggestion, he brought it to the group, we're going to bring it to planning, it goes to warrant article. In order for what you're talking about to happen, someone needs to bring it here. We could put a warrant article in "we want \$10,000 to pay someone to do what you're saying, and maybe it's \$15,000, in the absence of that, if someone brought in "hey I read about an agricultural subdivision, I think that's great, here's a model ordinance, what do you guys think," and we'd react to it. Lacking that, it's not going to happen. We either need to pay someone to do this for us

or someone needs to do it. S. Komisarek said I have this conflict of interest, having ownership interest, at this point, I can't be that guy, I need good planning to take over and say this is what makes sense, I can't drive that process. Even with SNH Planning, \$5,000-\$10,000 if we had that money, what would a planner, look at Candia and say what would they do. S. James said they'd do what we're doing, they'd go to the Master Plan and see what it says and try to make it happen. Part of that is the Village District. C. Robie asked if they put money in the budget for planning in 2017, Master Plan money to continue phase 1, phase 2? S. James said no. SNH is done. C. Robie said can we bring in a planner to see why our Master Plan has failed us so bad as far as what it recommends. S. James commented I don't think it's failed us, I think it's done exactly what people wanted. C. Robie said it says here we should accommodate between 39 – 63 new residents annually, that's about what we're losing annually. 2004 plan, thirteen years old. S. James commented there's also a section that says we should limit growth to a certain number. C. Robie said we've extinguished growth, we're declining. When you lose 300 people in a Town in Southern New Hampshire, from the last census, that's what we lost, 300 people. From 4,200 to 3,900. D. Snow commented census to census, we're the same, 3,909. C. Robie continued and the medium age has gone up about 8 years in the last 13. So we're going to be a bunch of old people in wheelchairs and nobody to push us. S. Komisarek stated it's the proper balance. We've acknowledged that Candia is stagnant and even on the Master Plan Committee Carmelle Druchniak said we need to be sustainable and viable but we don't want rapid and crazy growth. We're trying to strike a balance, we need to ramp it up gradually and slowly but also be able to come like this. S. James commented part of my concern, and I'm glad it passed, is Pinkerton. Since Pinkerton has passed, last month we approved 15 new lots in this Town. That's going in the other direction and that's not changing. We have seven, 3 lots going to 7 here. Four more. We have a road we can't maintain and it's horrible. The Town doesn't want to put any money into it and we're putting more houses on it. In that road in particular, the Town voted down the warrant article. C. Robie said it was the way it was presented. It shouldn't even be a warrant article. If the road agent and the Selectmen feel that the road is a negative to our community and it needs to have \$150,000 spent on it, it should be in the budget. Manchester doesn't vote on what roads they fix. The State of NH doesn't vote, when a road is incapable of handling the traffic that's on it, they propose the money in the budget and go get it fixed.

S. James said we can either propose something, amend the budget to put some money in there. As far as the Master Plan, Southern NH is done.

D. Snow suggested if you want to adjust the budget now, the Planning Board should put a warrant article in to say we want to do some planning and put the price on it that would be the appropriate way to do it since they've done the operating budget, basically.

S. Young stated on the operating budget, the reason there was no more money give, because we weren't sure what we got for \$10,000 for this year. That was my opinion and I think the rest of the Board agreed. C. Robie commented Scott's been involved with that completely. S. Young said we know where the \$10,000 went but you're talking about concrete things, I don't know where that 10K went. S. Komisarek replied by law we have to update the Master Plan every 10 years and typically they'll charge towns, like Bedford will pay \$30,000 so \$10,000 was the bare bones basic. S. Young asked so we have an updated Master Plan? S. Komisarek said yes.

S. James at the end of the day, when the money is spent with SNH, we'll have an updated Master Plan. That's what it's for. B. Chivers said I confirmed that before we submitted our budget. We've already spent \$10,000; they'll deliver a Master Plan for that. C. Robie replied why didn't we add another \$10,000 to do an analysis on Exit 3? Pick a project to keep moving our community forward. That's planning, that's the Selectmen doing the right thing for the community. The Planning Board submitting stuff to the Selectmen, gee we have our Master Plan updated, let's do a survey on Exit 3 and see what works. B. Chivers commented not to make excuses for the Board of Selectmen but we were waiting to see the finished product, the Master Plan and see what their recommendations were for Exit 3 and the other zoning because we don't know what it's going to be in that finished project. C. Robie commented but put the money in the budget and if you like the finished product then you have

some money to operate on instead of waiting another whole cycle. M. Santa replied I agree with you Boyd, I'd like to see the results of our Master Plan and the updated Master Plan, then based on the Master Plan we have in hand, then make some recommendations. It seems a little premature. S. Komisarek said I'd add that, because we had such a small budget and SNH Planning looked at it let's do a strategic Master Plan update. So there not going through every single thing. They are saying, "We've already done this. It's sitting here, we've had the visioning. We've come up with the same fundamental things." People want a sense of place, vote for the Village and strategic opportunity at Exit 3. Those are the things that came up in 2004 and have come up again. M. Santa replied with that said then maybe we should have put some money in for the next year. C. Robie asked you work for the City of Concord Mr. Santa; doesn't the City of Concord put money in their budget every year for planning? M. Santa said the planning staffs, which happen to be full time professionals... C. Robie said there you go. M. Santa continued they would come up with something they want to study, based on the Master Plan, and then they would, yes, they would go to the City Manager and say "City Manager we want to study this or do this report" but that being said, they don't always do all the work themselves. They hire our other people. C. Robie said we don't have a planner. We have nothing so if we have \$10,000 to give to SNH or Buxton Co. to do a survey at Exit 3, well spent. S. Young commented if I hire someone to do something, say a bathroom, say Dean, I hire him to do a bathroom and he hasn't finished it yet, so I'm not sure of the workmanship or quality yet, I'm not going to pay him to do my bedroom, until I've seen...C. Robie interjected but you might save up the money and have it ready.

S. James commented Scott you said it very well, a lot of what was in 2004 in the Master Plan is coming up again and what really seems to happen every time in the room. We have two things in Town. A lot of people want what Carleton's talking about, a lot of people are talking about we need denser development, we need affordability, however we do affordability, but we want that but we don't want to be...we want rural character and the two clash. There are very strong people on both sides, it makes it difficult. C. Robie agreed it does make it difficult but at the end of the day, the people have to vote and it's up to the Planning Board to get it before the people to vote on.

S. Komisarek commented and Sean, I think the key to this is you need to listen to both sides. We love our rural character, I live here, I love it, I want it to stay but when I look at Candia and I look at the aesthetics, I see a community that could be better. I think we can make it more aesthetically appealing, the idea of the Village...the whole idea of planning though, is you look at it. Nothing's going to happen out on these roads, winding, narrow roads, but you do a couple of things but you have the architectural controls, like you had in the accessory unit, if you are a good planner, somebody comes to Candia and they say "hey, look what they did. It looks better and they have revenue coming in and they've addressed these concerns and they have a viable, sustainable community." Can that be done as planners? That's what we're trying to balance those things, absolutely we have to keep that aesthetic appeal, it's very important. B. Chivers replied but Scott, that requires private initiative. You can't tell my neighbor, Nick Broadwater that his house needs to be aesthetically improved, that's not going to happen. S. Komisarek said no, I'm talking about new. Anything that's new, new ordinances that would have to address aesthetics, anything that's built new. B. Chivers said so you want to put architectural standards in new construction. S. Komisarek replied sure. If you were doing a village up on Depot, you'd have certain historic...you're not going to build a contemporary home right in the middle of some village. B. Chivers commented you're going to tell people that? D. Snow said in 1961 when they passed the zoning ordinance that was because Sue's father, who was a real estate agent, said I don't want no more tar paper shacks up on Tower Hill Road. Well there's no more tar paper shacks on Tower Hill. One piece at a time.

S. James reiterated so to me adding \$5,000 or \$10,000 into our budget, which is \$3,000, seems a bit outsized but perhaps a warrant article so is the idea that the Planning Board should put together a warrant article to continue to develop, however you want to word it, but basically assist us in developing what comes out of the master plan. What if we bring that up at the next Planning Board?

We already submitted the budget; money for planning never came up. D. Snow said you're talking about something on Exit 3 to give the Selectmen more, you run that into the same warrant article; we need a study on Exit 3 to determine what conditions are necessary to be able to sell it. The warrant articles haven't been written yet. C. Robie commented it doesn't need to be in a warrant article, it needs to be in the budget so when the time comes, you have money to spend. Like what Mr. Santa said, he doesn't have to go to the warrant article to the ballot to know if they're going to do the project. I got behind planning after the Planning Board got rejected two years in a row for a measly \$5,000. The Select Board got behind Planning. You got your planning for our community passed two years in a row, outstandingly and then you just give up. I can understand if you want to wait to see it but when you see it, you have the money to move to the next step instead of waiting another whole cycle. Just like trying to sell Exit 3, have it ready so when somebody comes, you can act on it. But that's what we do here, push it down the road, make it longer out. We do that over and over. We've done that my whole life here and I don't think it's done right. S Young said we have a bottom line budget and I'm sure it can be addressed if that's what you guys would like.

B. Chivers said what's the project for the next month? We're going to run out of time, so do we have a project that we can take up and accomplish and complete in the next month? A warrant article for selling Exit 3? D. Snow said if you want to do something that changes the conditions you need to put in a warrant article. The warrant article could be I want to change the conditions or it could be I want to study Exit 3 to see what the best use of it is, something like that. B. Chivers asked Carleton what's your recommendation for a warrant article? C. Robie replied I think we should look at the zoning issue to accommodate people like Mrs. Richter and her son. That's the only way you're going to change the zoning. Changing the zoning so we can accommodate Mrs. Richter because that's the only way we can do it unless we start granting waivers in her case and if you grant her one, I'm coming in for one. Sue wants one. I know a whole bunch of people that want one.

S. James said if we had the money right now, I think we'd have someone put together the warrant article, a proposed village district ordinance. That's the one that comes out of the zoning, the charettes, its' been talked about forever. Come up with one and put it out there.

C. Robie said what about the grant for \$5,000 from the housing finance authority? S. James said that is specifically to develop work force housing. If we're interested in that, then yes. S. Komisarek read from the Housing Education and Advocacy Community Min-Grant Program: *This grant assists community leaders in efforts to promote an adequate and balanced housing supply. The mini-grant is also available for local economic development groups, business groups, governments, service organizations, and regional economic development corporations. Grants of up to \$5,000 may be awarded for the development of information and educational materials, targeted advertising, locally focused research activities, or other innovative methods and outreach activities designed to help reduce local resistance to housing development.* C. Robie said that sounds like what I'm talking about. George Reagan.

S. Komisarek said I'll call him. Boyd, we've waited since 2004. We're ten years behind. We can't put it off. It's the same issues, Master Plan. You want objectivity, some planner. These are your challenges, this is what you're facing, this is the direction. We need that facilitator.

S. James said Scott will look into that, Boyd homework, take a look at the zoning and come up with something specific, I want to change such and such from x to y. Come in with that and we'll talk about that, not generality's. We're adjourned.

The next ZRRC meeting will be October 19th.
Meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Bickum
Land Use Secretary