

**CANDIA PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES OF
October 2, 2019
APPROVED**

PB Members Present: Rudy Cartier, Chair; Scott Komisarek; Brien Brock, BOS Rep.; Josh Pouliot; Mark Chalbeck, V-Chair; Judi Lindsey; Robert Jones, Alt.

PB Members Absent: Joyce Bedard; Mike Santa, Alt.

Audience Present: Nate Miller (SNHPC), Dennis Lewis (Road Agent), Boyd Chivers, Rick Sullivan (Eversource Rep.), Art Gosselin, Gary York (applicant), town residents.

*Rudy Cartier, Chair called the Work Session to order at 6:00pm immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Village District (Four Corners):

N. Miller starts by presenting the Board with a draft packet of the Analysis of Development Potential, that will later be used in the public hearing presentation with the approved items from the combined work sessions with the Board as well as the sub-committee. He notes that the presentation was all based on the initial report prepared by Carl Ogilvie in January 2018.

*M. Chalbeck is excused from the meeting at 6:08pm to handle a work situation.

N. Miller reminds the Board about the main concerns raised in the past regarding the Village District were the size of the District was too large, the result of the development characteristics may not be to Town standards of a rural village center, and that the area was going to be solely for mixed use only. In response to those items, the Board has agreed to reduce the size to approx. 239 acres, which includes a 500ft buffer area where within the 500 feet it will be non-residential and mixed use and outside that area would be mixed use with residential. Further, buildings lots developed only for residential uses w/in the 500ft area will only be permitted by a Conditional Use Permit. This language will also be changed at the bottom of page 2 under footnotes: 1 of the Draft Zoning Amendment. Provisions for required building materials and fenestration utilized in the District have been made to be more consistent w/rural New England architecture. N. Miller will update the presentation for the public hearing with additional photographs for visual interpretation of future Village District structures. He also included the constraints on the land that will be developable in the District area which include public, quasi-public (Privately owned but current public use) and environmental lands. These constraints minimize the total 239.02 acres of the District to 134.76 acres that have some type of constraint for development and only 104.26 acres that have no constraints.

*M. Chalbeck returns to the table for the remainder of the meeting at 6:23pm.

N. Miller notes that this potential analysis is not something that will happen overnight. The development under the proposed zoning ordinance could be a total of 417 dwelling units of housing, w/ approx. 953 people and of those, 82 school-aged children and 424,937sq.ft. would be non-residential floor space. This is all based on a long-term mathematical potential theory. The next steps will include a complete fiscal summary of the build-out results, compiling a final report and preparing for the public hearing which N. Miller confirms will be scheduled for 11/6/19, at 7pm, tentatively in the Moore School gym.

MOTION:

J. Pouliot **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 7:03pm. R. Jones **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

*Rudy Cartier, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:07pm.

Informational:

Applicant: Gary York -Trustee, 39 Hemlock Drive, Candia, NH 03034; Owner(s): Neil Sieminski Irrevocable Trust, c/o Gary York, 39 Hemlock Drive, Candia, NH 03034; Property Location: North Road, Candia, NH 03034; Map 406 Lot 38.

Intent: To subdivide 28+ acres and create 2 new additional lots, for a total of 3 lots.

G. York starts his presentation to the Board by stating that he has hired an engineering and soil analysis firm and done some preliminary concepts of the land and is presenting the one he is interested in obtaining future approval on from the PB. He also states that he and S. Komisarek had been in discussion with a possible piece of land in the past in case the Board wants him to recuse himself based on a conflict. The Board agrees that it is not necessary at this time since there will be no decision making happening at this meeting.

G. York goes on to state that there is enough frontage to have 4 lots but based on the wetlands impact and test pit information, the 3-lot configuration would be the best use for the property. He has contracted with Fuss & O'Neil to work with on the engineering and surveying. He is also going to have a forester look and see if any timber can be removed and split with the beneficiaries of the Trust. He notes that he also made a possible lot line adjustment in the future to make sure that the largest lot of 14.8 acres will stay at least 10 acres for the potential of being in current use.

R. Cartier notes that a concern of the Board may be that the 14.8-acre lot may be subdivided in the future. He states that some applicants in the past have agreed to have such restrictions on the land as only having 1 residential dwelling or no future subdividing noted on the final plans for future development.

G. York states that he wants to potentially have some open space based on Neil Sieminski's interest in conservation or current use.

R. Cartier asks what the frontage is on the 14.8-acre lot and G. York states it is 253 feet. R. Cartier states that the lot may have a 50ft right of way to the back lot but B. Brock notes that would have to go before the ZBA. B. Brock states that the Board can not create non-conforming lots.

R. Cartier states that the note being placed on the plans regarding no further subdividing of the lot will also need to be added to the new deed for that particular lot.

G. York asks what is needed to do potential house orientation, test pits with 2 or 4 test pits per lot? R. Cartier notes that it looks like the applicant has enough contiguous dry land and the applicant confirms that based on the wetland's delineation. R. Cartier states that the notes from the Wetland Scientist will need to do the wetland delineations and the surveyor doing the soils. G. York states that the wetlands have been delineated by GPS and the soil analysis has been done by Gove Engineering.

R. Cartier states that with the understanding that the 3rd lot (14.8 acres) has a notation that there will be no further subdividing, it looks like this will be a minor.

R. Cartier noted that the applicant will need to look at the steepness of the grade so it isn't more than 25%.

G. York says he thinks the engineer looked at that already but is not sure of the details at this moment.

Land Use Secretary requests a PDF version of the plans that the applicant brought in for the Board tonight.

G. York asks if anything else is important to be looking at? R. Cartier notes so make sure that drainage on properties will not wash out North Road. G. York notes that there is already a culvert going across the property.

G. York asks what the timeline is for this property. R. Cartier states that a Checklist Review meeting will take place to make sure the application is complete prior to the scheduled agenda date. If at the scheduled public hearing the application is voted to be complete and accepted by the Board, the potential of approval of the plan could take place that night or be continued to another. It does not usually go beyond 1-2 meetings plus the checklist review.

R. Cartier also notes to the applicant that the engineer will need to go to the Registry of Deeds prior to the scheduled hearing for pre-approval of the plans. The Registry has very specific criteria and that can help the process along.

*M. Chalbeck recuses himself for conflict of interest as he is currently employed by Eversource

Scenic Road -Tree Trimming/Removal:

R. Sullivan, an Arborist from Eversource presented the Board with a list of information regarding the ongoing tree trimming and removal of trees on designated scenic roads in the Town of Candia. This occurs yearly to minimize safety concerns for the town and its residents. Eversource has notified the residents on the designated roads that this work will be taking place and asked if they wanted to keep the wood or have the company pick it up. To date, 164 of the 184 residents have responded to the notices.

J. Pouliot asks what happens if the resident doesn't provide consent to cut? R. Sullivan states that if there is a safety issue, they must cut the tree but if there isn't a safety issue, they will just trim back the tree and leave it in place. He goes on to state that Candia has an abundant amount of Ash trees in particular on the list this year. These trees can be very destructive and unsafe.

D. Lewis (Road Agent) notes that last year wood was left in many places and when the snow melted, it fell into the roads and became unsafe for traveling. He notes that it is not the Town's job to clean up that wood and it can potentially put the residents in danger. R. Sullivan asked that D. Lewis provide him with a list of those places, and he would make sure a truck came to dispose of the miscellaneous wood. R. Cartier states that based on the Road Agents information, the PB will draft a letter to Eversource with the stipulation that the wood will be disposed of so no issues or responsibility falls on the Town of Candia.

Dick Snow (resident) asks if the trees have already been marked or will be? R. Sullivan notes that they have already been marked with pink or orange ribbons and also use pole #'s and addresses to locate the trees.

B. Brock made a **motion** to authorize Eversource to trim and/or remove trees based on their letter dated August 22, 2019. J. Lindsey **seconded**. M. Chalbeck was **excused**. **Motion passed**.

*M. Chalbeck returns to the table for the remainder of the meeting.

Minutes -September 4, 2019:

M. Chalbeck made a **motion** to accept the minutes as presented. B. Brock **seconded**. S. Komisarek & R. Cartier **abstained**. **Motion passed**.

Minutes -September 18, 2019:

B. Brock made a **motion** to accept the minutes as presented. S. Komisarek **seconded**. R. Jones, J. Lindsey & M. Chalbeck **abstained**. **Motion passed**.

The PB signs the final plans and mylars for the below cases for recording at the Registry of Deeds at the end of the meeting:

- Case #18-012 (Holt -Major Subdivision);
- Case #18-013 (Robert Johnston -Minor Subdivision);
- Case #19-004 (Eric Baker -Minor Subdivision).

Other Business

- Art Gosselin is invited to the table with the Board and R. Cartier informs the Board as well as B. Chiver (ZBA member), that A. Gosselin spoke with the BI and Land Use Secretary regarding the possibility of building a dwelling unit on the 3rd floor of his barn. After further review of the regulations under accessory dwelling units (15.04F), R. Cartier notes that the barn is under commercial use and not residential but wanted to get the view of the full Board before telling the resident he may have to appear before the PB or the ZBA. The PB and B. Chivers all agree based on the definition of the commercial use of the barn is not an additional residential building on the lot and thus the living area would be allowed.
- R. Cartier presents the Board with a letter from the DOT regarding Transportation Improvement Projects and the public hearing date of Wednesday, October 23, 2019 at 7pm. R. Cartier will be attending that meeting and is open to any other member if interested.

Review current Rules of Procedure for potential updates and/or modifications:

The Board talks about the alternates policy as to what they are allowed to do and when. That is very important to be clear that they are encouraged to sit at every meeting but can not vote unless specifically asks to step in for another full member. The Board agrees that further discussion on this topic is necessary for the future. R. Cartier states that he has made some notes on the older version and he will have the Land Use Secretary type them up and distribute to the PB members for review as a draft.

Review Zoning Ordinances for potential Warrant Articles:

B. Chivers submitted a Memo with a consolidated write up from 5.03D for the Home Service Contractor. R. Cartier questions why there has been other items eliminated, such as the 3 levels from the last version submitted to the Board. B. Chivers states that the Board had recommended some of the provisions from last time be eliminated from 5.03D level 3 such as minimum acreage, lot size and dimensional restrictions, it was clear that the 5.03D could become similar to the preceding part of the ordinance in 5.03C. This would make the new ordinance more consistent with the preceding section.

The other part eliminated is the Special Exception requirement. This is a condition that runs with the land forever. As an example, if someone comes in and applies for a special exception to run their business, they can sell the land and then the successor can use the land for that purpose forever with no regard to others. After speaking with Dave Murray (BI), it would be easier to enforce the ordinance if the right doesn't go forever with the land. If the owner/occupant is not in compliance with the requirements of the ordinance, the BI can revoke the Certificate of Compliance.

The Certificate of Occupancy was also a change that was agreed upon by the BI. Occupancy is not what the applicant is applying for, it's is to comply with the requirements of the ordinance.

R. Cartier asks what the specific requirements are for 5.03C and B. Chivers reads out that list as well as the Special Exception Standards in section 15.02 from the zoning regulations (online if anyone wants to review). He notes that by making 5.03D permitted by right, it would 1st, eliminate a multitude of residents being violated and possibly brought to court for something they have been doing for most of their lives because the ordinances have either not been in place or removed for reasons unknown. 2nd, it would hold people accountable because they all would have to come in to get a Certificate of Compliance from the BI to continue their use legally. If they didn't abide by the ordinance at that time, the BI would have no something to enforce and move forward with a violation if necessary, at that time. 3rd, it would reduce the number of residents having to spend hundreds of dollars to go before the ZBA for a Special Exception. R. Cartier questions that as of right now each individual would have to go before the ZBA to get a special exception and B. Chivers states that the way it is right now, there isn't any provision in place for anyone to do anything. B. Chivers said there would be 40+ cases before the ZBA in the first year and that's unreasonable. If it's made permissible by right, provided they meet the requirements, the BI can certify that when he issues the Certificate of Compliance.

R. Cartier notes his concern of not having input from abutters before just saying to go ahead and do this. He understands that the Special Exception would follow with the land, but somehow would like to have public or abutters input. B. Brock questions that on a new one, they would? B. Chivers states that the abutters will not be notified specifically of anyone that has this, but the remedy available to the abutter is that they can appeal the administrative decision by the BI to allow this use of property. They can come in and argue that it doesn't conform to the ordinance because of certain items they might list. They can go before the ZBA and the Board would consider it and could potentially overturn the decision of the BI where necessary. R. Cartier states that he would rather avoid that but the way it looks now, the issues that were voiced in the original public hearing, who's going to say there's a problem with tractor trailers in their yard? B. Chivers states that if an abutter wants to challenge the BI's determination, they can bring the case to the ZBA and let them decide. R. Cartier states that is more of a reactive approach instead of a proactive one.

D. Lewis notes that there is no current provision to prevent someone who's working for someone else, to bring that tractor trailer home so it just a matter of who owns it. So how do you deal with that part of it? R. Cartier states that they can also amend the zoning ordinance to prohibit large vehicles like they did for campers in front yards. There are alternative remedies to address that problem.

R. Cartier states that he is concerned the way this is drafted, it doesn't seem like it would go well. The other draft that had more requirements in addition to the special exception, so that it was required for someone who wanted to do that would have to come before the ZBA and they couldn't do certain things. This may seem that people can do whatever they want, and others will have to bring it before the ZBA and spend the funds and time to challenge the decision. B. Chivers states that the individuals must put in an application through the BI and it's his determination whether they meet the requirements of the ordinance. R. Cartier asks if the BI will have the opportunity to put restrictions such as the sizes of vehicles, how many vehicles are allowed, where storage will be? B. Chivers refers to the drafted version of the new language to the proposed ordinance and reads the restrictions, which notes no outdoor storage or processing of materials, and it's unlikely that someone will have a fleet of trucks on the premises with not more than 1 outside employee.

M. Chalbeck notes his concern that plumbers, electricians, etc., are going to hang their ladders, extra materials, etc. on the back of the shed or wherever and now they're going to be in violation? I don't want to alienate those people or make them criminals. B. Chivers states that we are trying to make some of these uses that already exist in town conform to the ordinance, not criminalize them. How would you fix that? M. Chalbeck said as long as it's not visible from the road. B. Chivers notes that issue was a previous objection from the Board, so that was taken out of the requirements. B. Brock agrees with B. Chivers on that statement. He further states that the spirit of the ordinance would be to legalize what we know exists in the Town already, so it doesn't become an issue. We've got a # of them out there and if the neighbors haven't complained at this point, they probably aren't likely to. This was to make it simple but also to give the BI some information to

fall back on in case someone does complain or a new person moves in and he can then review the ordinance and if not in compliance, he can correct the situation with this set of guidelines. The whole idea is to not make criminals but de-criminalize what is already happening and have something in place for new residents to follow going forward. B. Brock further notes that this will ultimately fall back on the BI and he has always indicated that he needs something to do his job properly, and if he has reviewed this and feels comfortable that this allows that and he feels he can do his job now, then that to me, says a lot. M. Chalbeck is still not comfortable with the language. R. Cartier states that the current language will require every single person that is currently doing something like this to come in and see the BI to become compliant.

The Board discusses further language changes, making people already in use come in and get compliance, the relief of the “violators” and the abutters and what may be necessary when or if this ordinance passes. The Board agrees to table this agenda item and continue it until the next scheduled PB meeting on 10/16/19. B. Chivers notes that he also included the definitions for “Special Exception” and “Variance” as requested for the ballot. The Board thanks him for his assistance.

The Board asks Jenny Tyler (resident) up to the front as a representative for the Agricultural Commission to discuss the concerns of the residents.

R. Cartier states that the definitions between small-scale and large-scale operations have been in question and the Board has talked about the BMP’s as well. To make things simpler, the definition will be amended to use the current definition under RSA 21:34-a, which was presented to the Board by the Agricultural Commissions Chair, Dr. Cobb. In addition, all agricultural and farming activities will be conducted in accordance with the NH BMP’s. Another option was to get rid of small and large scale completely or just limit agricultural operations that are under 3 acres to not allow horses, bovine or swine unless under special exception. J. Tyler states that the Agric. Comm. did not say that. R. Cartier confirms that and notes that these are just options to present to the Commission for their feedback. R. Cartier states that these are ideas to remove the “small and large scale” wordage and replace them with more agriculture friendly meaning. He references RSA 674:32 and states that the law protects uses that are in place currently. Anyone wanting to develop a new operation would have to abide by the amended ordinances. This will assist the BI, Health Officer, Code Enforcement with more guidelines when someone new wants to have animals that may be on this list under special exception. J. Tyler asks where the 3 acres comes from and R. Cartier notes that size was provided by the Chair of the Agricultural Commission. R. Cartier states that he believes that came in place because the Town has 3 acre minimum building lots in Candia and that stays consistent with what we currently have. J. Tyler says so unless you have 3 acres you’re telling me I can’t have horses? I guess I’m looking for the scientific data with where you came up with 3 acres. It seems like a random number. R. Cartier states that it’s consistent with the other parts of the ordinances have for minimum building acreage. Therefore, if it’s under 3 acres, that’s where it would come into play. J. Tyler asks why? J. Pouliot states that the Code Enforcement Officer has said the problems that he’s seeing is with too many animals on smaller acreage lots. He gives the example of a person having a 1 acre lot with 6 horses and how it can become excessive. J. Tyler states that isn’t a thing in Candia, so that’s why I’m asking for specific...3 acres is a very random number. I have 2.5. R. Cartier states that it is but only to a certain extent. It was put into place when the zoning ordinances were created that 3 acres was determined to be what the minimum building acreage was going to be in Candia. Your development was created before the zoning ordinances were put into place. J. Tyler states that there is a protective covenant that specifies I am not allowed to have livestock but can have up to 2 horses, so the acreage thing is one of my concerns because it kind of goes against the BMP’s. I think definitely everyone should be following BMP’s, no question at all. But the 3 acres doesn’t make any sense. R. Cartier notes that it was suggested by Matt (Matt Cobb), and the consistency was there with the rest of the zoning ordinances. J. Tyler states that did not come from the Agric. Commission. The Land Use Secretary reads the notes from Dr. Cobb: “if you have a property in high density areas, and have animals, then keeping large animals may be inappropriate”.

J. Tyler reads RSA 672:1(3-B) to the Board, and states that is why she’s asking about the 3 acres, because it seems unreasonable from somebody who understands agriculture. She asks again, where is the scientific data? R. Cartier says if you look under RSA 674:34c, it’s not inconsistent. and agricultural operations are not appropriate in high density areas. Legislature is very clear in the fact that agriculture is something that NH should have and is codified in law, but it can’t be unregulated totally. The Board can’t be unreasonable in regulating such things, but that determination is made based on different aspects such as having agriculture in the Town but also making sure someone else who wants to come into Town and not have agriculture is protected as well. J. Tyler says isn’t that the purpose of an HOA or protective covenants, is to protect those

people so they can be in those areas and not move to Candia probably? R. Cartier states no, because if it's a single-family residence, they won't have an HOA.

J. Tyler asks, so we are going to restrict all the community that is under 3 acres and R. Cartier confirms this. S. Komisarek states that he doesn't consider 2.5 acres as high density. If you look at a lot of our surrounding communities that have for instance, a 2 acre minimum. He says to J. Tyler, you are asking us what scientific data we've used, you're implying that you understand, can you share with us what you think is appropriate? J. Tyler states for example, the small scale/large scale you probably have a better understanding of why that doesn't really work because you can't really define it. So, by saying under 3 acres of land, no horse, bovine and swine, it's kind of going right back to that. I guess there's a barrier of entry, because how many people are going to be able to come to Candia...look, if I could have 20, 100 acres, Awesome, I would, but it's just financially not going to happen in Candia, NH. I would hate to restrict people when we have state laws and BMP's under 3 acres.

J. Pouliot states that any number the Board picks is going to seem random and not scientifically driven and ask J. Tyler if she has a suggestion. J. Tyler states that she called Bedford PB this morning and they have their zoning set at 95% residential/agriculture, and they get variances for people. Residential is 1/8 of an acre to 1.5 acres. So that means 1.6+ acres you can get anything you want. They do restrict commercial swine. I thought it was interesting because a town like Bedford, really nice, they are not restricting any of that at all. I don't have a certain acreage at all. I don't know how that's possible. R. Cartier notes that things on a smaller lot can be approved, but with special exception. You are a good example of this because you have under 3 acres and have 2 horses and follow the BMP's. So if you came before the ZBA for a special exception, they would see the environment is acceptable and would be more likely to approve it. It gives the Board a chance to look at these specific situations and determine the course of action based on what's presented. J. Tyler says the PB doesn't police that so they won't know what's going on, that's the state. R. Cartier states that they will be able to in a way because the complaint that comes into the BI will be checked on and if BMP's are not being followed, he will have to report the situation to the state and they will come to the residence as well. J. Tyler notes a situation in the past where an owner had over 60 acres and was not following BMP's and it was not reported. R. Cartier states that was before it was in the regulation, so no reporting was necessary. If we put this in our Town of Candia regulations, the BI will have a solid ordinance to use and can ask about BMP's or get the state involved if necessary. We want to allow people that are doing things the proper way to continue but if they are not, we have something in the ordinance that can assist with that.

S. Komisarek notes that he doesn't agree with 2-2.5 acres being high density and should depend on the situation. J. Tyler asks, if you are following BMP's is the concern with the 3 acres if you have a horse, bovine or swine, the manure? Is that why you're trying to restrict people? The Board agrees that is usually the main issue that the BI has come across and is trying to be avoided. There is also odor, flies, runoff and the overall appropriateness of this happening in a residential area.

J. Tyler notes that she is in the equine industry and her fiancée is a farrier. She's been to many residences with owners from a wide range of incomes (billionaires to regular people), that have horses and it's all interpretation. I don't want to restrict people from agriculture. R. Cartier states that we only have what's available to us and in the regulations right now, that is anything under 3 acres is considered high density. The Board will look over it and if changes need to be done, we can determine that. It has been suggested and is even mentioned in the MP, is to create a new rural agricultural zone with similar standards to the existing residential district but also include agricultural friendly regulations, which enhance the rural character. We want to have something to enforce BMP's and get rid of the situations where people are not practicing that and infringing on their neighbor's rights. This doesn't prohibit people from having the chance to get approval, it gives the Town a chance to look at it and make sure these people know and understand what the BMP's are and have you read them. R. Cartier notes that this will not specifically affect J. Tyler and she acknowledges that but states that she doesn't want it to restrict others based off a one jerk that ruined it. R. Cartier states that this will give the Town the leverage to do something more in those unique situations that have and do arise.

R. Jones asks the Board if this is different in that some of the agricultural things are grandfathered in? The Board confirms that, and R. Jones notes then J. Tyler wouldn't have to worry about this or anyone who already have this on their property because they are protected, unless there was a problem, but it's more concern going forward? J. Tyler states her concern is for the future of Candia and agriculture, not just about her. R. Jones says yes, this is about going forward and as far as BMP's, do they make a recommendation as far as animals per acreage? J. Tyler states that animals per acreage is based on feed, it's not based on manure. People in the past were able to feed their animals based on acreage so it's 1 horse per 2 acres. That's not realistic anymore

so there is no standard for how many horses or goats, etc. you can have. Another point is a resident could have 250lb horses and I have 2500lb horses, so a horse is not a horse is a horse. R. Jones says we've gone back to the scientific proof thing a couple of times and asks, is there a resource for us that will tell us what that is other than us going by our zoning guidelines? J. Tyler says no. R. Cartier re-states that the 3 acres is what we currently have in the zoning ordinances for consistency. Could that change, yes, depending on what comes up and working with engineers. This is a starting point, it's not retroactive. If someone calls up the BI and wants to know what they can do, he has something to refer to and give that basic info. to them. S. Komisarek notes that when M. Cobb was here, we were moving right along and respecting his expert testimony and credibility but when he said high density...I would rather have something less. We have all these existing smaller lots and now we're going to have them go before the ZBA for a special exception? R. Cartier confirms that and says that M. Cobb agreed with the 3 acres. J. Tyler says this is not going to fly with the agricultural community in Candia. R. Cartier states that was the final thing that was agreed upon in the discussion with M. Cobb. S. Komisarek asks what criteria will the ZBA use? The Land Use Secretary notes that would be under Special Exception Standards, Section 15.02 & 15.03. R. Cartier states that this seems to be a reasonable compromise because it protects people like you and also protects other people that would want to but doesn't understand what BMP's are. J. Tyler says there will still be the same issues with 60 acres and 2 horses you don't take care of. R. Cartier says that is understood, but there has to be something that differentiates between accessory agricultural operations and primary agricultural operations. J. Pouliot says maybe we can keep it how it is right now but give it to the Agricultural Commission and see if they can come up with something better. R. Cartier states that this will be sent to them for review. J. Tyler notes that the Commission knows about it already and they are not happy. S. Komisarek asks if she talked with M. Cobb and she confirms this. S. Komisarek asks what he said and she states that they just have notes an a mention about 3 acres and everyone else was like No. It the same thing as saying small scale/large scale, 3 acres. It's such a random number. R. Cartier notes that is why they changed it to accessory and commercial. J. Pouliot states that we know what the problem is and maybe the Agricultural Commission can come up with a solution and the Board will listen to that. J. Tyler states that their meeting is tomorrow, and it will definitely be brought up. The Board discussed the grammatical language briefly and thanks J. Tyler for her time.

MOTION:

J. Pouliot **motioned** to adjourn at approximately 10:15pm. J. Lindsey **seconded**. **All were in favor. Motion passed.**

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Galica
Land Use Secretary
cc: file