

Town of Plaistow, NH
Office of the Planning Board
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES (***DRAFT MINUTES - Subject to change once approved and amended by the board at its next meeting on Dec. 1)***)

Nov. 17, 2021

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

1. ROLL CALL:

Tom Alberti, *Ch.* – Present at Town Hall
Tim Moore, *Vice Ch.* - Present at Town Hall
Laurie Milette - Present at Town Hall
Karen Robinson – Present at Town Hall
Greg Taillon, *Selectman's Rep.* Present at Town Hall
Maxann Dobson, Alternate – Present at Town Hall
Bill Coye, *Selectman's Alt.* - Present at Town Hall
John Cashell, *Planning Director* –Present at Town Hall (non-voting)

Also Present: Charlie Zilch, SEC Associates, Inc.
Joseph Peznola, Hancock Associates
Elder Baror, Eldy's Automotive
Bill Hall, Civil Design Consultants
Stephen Doherty, DC Development & Construction
Daniel Koravos, DK Engineering LLC
John Moynihan, resident

2. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 3, 2021 MINUTES:

Draft minutes of the November 3, 2021 meeting were included with the meeting materials.

G. Taillon moved, second by K. Robinson, to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2021 meeting as issued.

The motion to approve the minutes as issued passed 4-0-1 (L. Milette)

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PB 21-15: The completeness of an application from Dalton Cyr for a Lot Line Adjustment that proposes to transfer equal parcels of +/-1,275 SF between 9 Carli's Way, Tax Map 32, Lot 29-9 and 11 Carli's Way, Tax Map 32, Lot 29-11, both in the RC2 Zoning District. Dalton L. Cyr is the property owner of record for 9 Carli's Way; Michael R. Leavitt is the property owner of record for 11 Carli's Way. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.

Applicant's Representative Charlie Zilch, SEC Associates, Inc., Plaistow, NH said the application is a straight forward lot line adjustment. He said it is a recently constructed PRD behind the recreation facilities and that both the abutting lots are the same size 0.52 acres, each has its own home, septic system and driveway with community water. He noted the skewed lot lines on the plan and noted the applicants want them to be perpendicular off the roadway with an equal area exchange. He noted there is no minimum frontage requirement so the reduced frontage on Lot 9 still qualifies the lot and there are no variances required or waiver requests or additional State approval. He noted they made a utility easement benefiting Lot 9 so the electrical box did not need to be relocated.

T. Moore moved, second by G. Taillon, that the application for a lot line adjustment, proposing to swap equal land of 1,275 SF between 9 and 11 Carli's Way, Tax Map 32, Lots 29-9 and 29-11, be accepted as complete.

The motion to accept the application passed 5-0-0.

Ch. Alberti opened the Public Hearing and invited questions from the Board or comments from the public. . There were none. Ch. Alberti noted the staff recommendation to condition approval on the receipt of fees.

T. Moore moved, second by G. Taillon, to approve the lot line adjustment, proposing to transfer equal portions of land area of +/-1,275SF between 9 Carli's Way, Tax Map 32, Lot 29-9 and 11 Carli's Way, Tax Map 32, Lot 29-11 with the following conditions:

- Receipt of \$40 Recording Fee*
- Receipt of \$75 Tax Map Update Fee*

The motion to approve passed 5-0-0.

PB 21-17: The completeness of an application from Eldy's Automotive, Inc. for an Amended Site Plan. The Amended Site Plan proposes to re-establish the previous Salvage Yard Use, and includes related parking, drainage, lighting and landscaping. The property is located at 233 Main St, Tax Map 31, Lot 21, in the MDR Zoning District. The property owners of record are the Lori E. Thomas Rev Trust, Lori E. Thomas TR (1/2 interest) and Stephen R. Thomas and Judith R. Thomas Rev Trust, Stephen R. Thomas and Judith R. Thomas, TR (1/2 interest). If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.

Applicant's Representative Joseph Peznola, Hancock Associates introduced himself and applicant Eldy Baror. He noted the location was a former salvage yard, and that they went to the ZBA and received a use

variance to reestablish it as an auto salvage yard. He noted it had been abandoned for more than two years and the use went away because it is in the MDR district.

T. Moore moved, second by K. Robinson, that the application for an amended site plan for a Salvage Yard use at 233 Main Street, Tax Map 31, Lot 21 be accepted as complete.

The motion to accept the application passed 5-0-0.

J. Peznola said they are implementation of storm water management plan as the site is pitched back towards Kelly Brook. He said that they will establish a large rain garden to intercept all the water running to the brook. They also plan to rehab the existing buildings and there will be a small retail component for customers looking for an auto part. One of the buildings will warehouse parts and there will also be a production area where they will take in a vehicle, drain the fluids and prepare the vehicle for exterior storage. He noted customers will not be allowed in the yard in the back. There is a 25 foot buffer to the residential abutters and to the south and east there is a 10 foot buffer and they plan to build a wall or fence there. They plan to take the front fence down, put up a gate separating the customers from the back, and add striping for customer parking; employee parking will be in the back. He noted there is an existing residential rental unit on site which has two units in it and that use will be continued. He said the existing septic system is in good function as well as an existing well which serve both the residential and business uses.

J. Peznola said any lighting changes will be compliant. Discussing the landscaping requirements, he noted a cut in the topography on the residential side so that the salvage yard is much lower than the surrounding residential uses and suggested a naturalized buffer makes more sense than a formal buffer. He said they want to introduce some vertical screening to supplement the existing forested areas utilizing white pine. He noted there is a salvage yard to the north and asked whether any formalized screening would be needed there.

J. Peznola said the plan has gone to Keach-Nordstrom Associates (KNA) for technical review and that they are expecting to get a continuance so they can get that report and address any issues. They will address the comments in the Staff Review as well.

Ch. Alberti noted there is a lot of work still to be done and he asked the Board to give the applicant suggestions and ideas to work with. K. Robinson noted the landscaping is very important and there isn't very much there; she asked about landscaping for the front. J. Peznola said they plan to take the front fence down and introduce landscaping. He said the requirement for seven trees might be hard and they would like to cluster three trees in the corner and then spread them out so they are not classified as street trees equally spaced but would green up and beautify the frontage. He said the ordinance allows a four-foot wall as part of the buffer which might help them. They could eliminate the fence in some spots, put the wall at the 25 and backfill to get some height and then plant that.

Ch. Alberti asked if they will go before the Conservation Commission (ConCom) to discuss the water impact and any mitigation. J. Peznola said they are working through the details, are a good distance from the wetlands and have traded out some salvage area for the rain garden. He said they will be going to the ConCom. J. Cashell asked if they are planning to put new fencing up; J. Peznola said they are grappling with some security issues and will be doing landscaping that complies with the required number of trees, but might like to space them differently as there are two existing curb cuts to work with. J. Cashell noted it is a residential zone and there is an opportunity to retro-fit, and that the Board would like to work with the

applicant on a good landscaping plan. It was agreed to work together to come up with the best possible result. J. Cashell asked about upgrading the fence and gate; E. Baror said the entrance will look much better, and the property will be fenced all around, about 1100 feet of fence. J. Cashell noted the hearing will be continued and asked if the applicant could produce a schematic plan for the next meeting and was told they intend to. Ch. Alberti asked if the existing structures on the plan are all staying and if there are any construction changes to be made to them. J. Peznola said they need to assess the existing structures and any changes needed to them, though there will be the same number and type of buildings. G. Taillon asked about new signage; E. Baror said yes there will be and they hope to open by July of next year. J. Cashell asked if there are any plans for the back property and was told that is where the cars will be put. They are buffering 25 feet for residential abutters and 10 feet for commercial abutters. J. Cashell noted the cars will be dry wrecks and they will be doing everything to ameliorate any environmental impact J. Peznola noted this is all regulated; E. Baror said they dispose of the bad gas and use the other fluids. He said he is working with his vendor to get the storage tanks and noted fluids are picked up once a week.

Ch. Alberti invited questions from the Board or comments from the public. There were none. He reminded the applicant they would be submitting new documents and to reach out to Dee Voss for additional items.

K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon to continue the hearing to December 15, 2021.

The motion to continue passed 5-0-0.

Ch. Alberti noted there will be no additional written notice of the continued Public Hearing will be provided.

Continued from September 18, 2021 and October 20, 2021

PB 21-13: The completeness of an application from DC Development & Construction, LLC, for a zero lot line, non-age restricted, condominium style, Planned Residential Development (PRD) subdivision. The plan proposes 16 units, built on a public right-of-way, with on-site shared and individual septs, and a community well, with proposed connection to municipal water when it becomes available. The applicant is also seeking a Conditional Use Permit for a roadway crossing. The property is identified as Sweet Hill Road Rear, Tax Map 41, Lot 83 in the MDR Zoning District. The property owner of record is John Alden Palmer, Jr. Revocable Trust of 2006, Janice Palmer, Successor TR. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing.

Charlie Zilch, SEC & Associates and Bill Hall, Civil Design reviewed the background on the plan and its current status. He said they had received comments from NH Alteration of Terrain and received a Wetlands permit. They addressed the Terrain comments and are waiting on a final report. B. Hall said the State was waiting on some comments from Fish & Game; C. Zilch noted Fish & Game had said in a previous email they had no involvement so he will send that to Alteration of Terrain and hope that will lead to approval. He said the submitted revised plan had many minor detail changes but the plan itself has essentially stayed the same. He said they had received their second review from KNA and received two comments related to the plan, one being getting rid of the two community wells to be used until the switch to municipal water as it appears the water will come online about the same time as the project is being constructed. They are in the process of providing a full design on the water system to KNA and to show some monuments on the right-of-way to the abutting property.

C. Zilch said he met with the Conservation Commission (ConCom) and they submitted a letter of support for the Conditional Use Permit and feels they are in good shape to meet the necessary timeline. Ch. Alberti said the clock expires on December 19 and noted the Board had received the letter from the ConCom. T. Moore said the ConCom had met with the applicant several times and they did a lot of work to mitigate wetlands impact. Ch. Alberti noted the largest impact to abutters appears to be Lot 52-06 as well as 52-08 and 52-09 and asked how close the structures would be to those lots. C. Zilch said there is a 50' buffer all around the property and that Unit 16 is likely the closest at about 100' from the property line and that as much open space as possible has been incorporated into the project and that tree clearing will be limited to what is needed for the units, septic and small yards. K. Robinson asked about landscaping along the boundaries to the cemetery and elsewhere. G. Taillon said the BOS has been working with the sextant and C. Zilch on a plan for the cemetery expansion and hope to bring to the Planning Board before any tree cutting. He noted that will be some time in the future. C. Zilch noted there is a wetland in that area which will also provide some natural buffering.

Ch. Alberti noted the applicant had suggested LED carriage lamp fixtures for road lighting but the Town response was that if it is a Town Road there could be an added maintenance cost since it is not what the Town uses. He suggested that if the applicant wants to use these fixtures it become part of the homeowners association's responsibility to maintain and repair. S. Doherty, DC Development & Construction, LLC said they will provide lighting maintenance. When asked, T. Moore said his only concern would be that the fixtures comply with the full cutoff requirement. C. Zilch suggested it would be nice to allow the developer that flexibility. T. Moore said there should be a note on the plan and documentation in the condominium association documents.

Ch. Alberti asked about the potential road off the cul de sac to give access to the abutting property. C. Zilch said the abutting property owner Bill Bartlett owns several parcels in that area and asked for this access and would be responsible for any road build within that area; he noted it is a wetlands area that would require mitigation. J. Cashell asked if this was a gentlemen's agreement or if any of this was a regulatory requirement. C. Zilch said it would need to come to the Planning Board if anything were to happen, and that it only exists now on paper. G. Taillon asked if B. Bartlett will be given a legal right of way for the future, and that the Town will own the right of way. When asked, T. Moore said he did not recall any such 'paper rights of way' but somewhere in the regulations it states that is a desirable to have Town roads connect rather than a series of cul de sacs.

There was discussion of whether the parcel is land locked or if B. Bartlett has access through additional parcels on Sweet Hill Road. J. Cashell said this particular agreement is a gentleman's agreement because there is no inherent obligation on the developer's part to provide a right of way because the abutting property already has frontage on a roadway. He said it is accepted practice everywhere to provide for access to land locked property. He noted that on the plan before the Board a curb cut should be developed for the potential road. He also said the right of way would belong to the Town and if a road is ever built on it that would be the responsibility of the developer of the abutting lot. He noted this could also be designated as an easement over the right of way granted to the abutter. There was concern about the right of way going over the wetland and what would the likelihood of approval when it is developed. J. Cashell said with best management practices a crossing would be permitted.

C. Zilch said that an easement would remove the area from the Town's right of way which would make it a bit more difficult for a developer of the abutting property. J. Cashell said it would then become that developer's right if desiring to pursue it. C. Zilch said it would be an easy change to the plan it would no longer be the Town's right of way but part of the current development. The Board agreed to an easement. C. Zilch said he could put a note on the plan cover sheet that any proposed use of the right of way easement would require Planning Board approval. This was agreed to.

Ch. Alberti invited public comment. There was none.

Conditional Use Permit:

G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore, to grant the conditional use permit for the roadway access as shown on the 16-lot PRD Subdivision Plan for the parcel known as Sweet Hill Road Rear, Tax Map 41, Lot 83.

The motion to grant passed 5-0-0.

Subdivision – Conditional Approval:

K. Robinson moved, second by G. Taillon to approve the 16-lot PRD Subdivision plan for the parcel known as Sweet Hill Road Rear, Tax Map 41, Lot 83 with the following conditions:

- NHDES Approval of the Subdivision/Condominium Plan*
- NHDES Approval of Alteration of Terrain Permit*
- Plan notes updated to show dates of State Approvals*
- Final Approval of HOA/Condominium Documents by Charles Cleary*
- Final Review letter from Keach-Nordstrom noting all issues of Review Letter #2 have been adequately addressed*
- Streetlights shall be pole lights to match existing Town lights, not specialty carriage lights*
- The proposed right of way to abutting property Map 52 Lot 6 shall be established on the final plan as an easement access only. Any future use of the easement shall require Planning Board approval.*
- Final Plan has all appropriate Professional Stamps as required for recording*

The motion to grant passed 5-0-0.

Impact Fees:

- Prior to acceptance of the roadway by the Board of Selectmen, the developer shall pay a New Roadway Impact Fee of \$3,675.00. This is based on a calculation of \$5.00/LF times 735 LF of new public roadway. If the dimensions of the roadway length should change, so too would this assessment. There will be additional impact fees (school, recreation and public safety) assessed to the individual dwelling units at the time of construction and collected prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for each unit.*

Pre-Construction/Bonding:

- All information regarding bonding requirements and pre-construction meeting(s) information will be included in the Notice of Decision.*

PB 21-16: The completeness of an application from George Semaan for a Site Plan for a retail use. The Site Plan proposes to raze the existing building and construct a new 3,550 SF, 2-story, retail building, with related parking, drainage, lighting and landscaping. The applicant is also seeking a Conditional Use Permit for a wetlands crossing. The property is located at 27 Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 25, Lot 33 in the C1 Zoning District. The property owner of record is Semaan Properties of NH, LLC. If the application is found to be complete, the Planning Board may immediately conduct the public hearing

T. Moore moved, second by K. Robinson, that the application for an amended site plan for a retail use

The motion to accept passed 5-0-0.

Applicant's representative Daniel Koravos, DK Engineering LLC, 59 Granite Lane, Chester, NH noted the applicant was unable to make the meeting. He discussed the project, which had gone through a conceptual review with the Planning Board in April 2021. He said the existing building is in bad shape and will be razed and replaced, that the parking lot is inadequate and has been extended. He noted the front and back setbacks are 50' and the sides 35'. The septic system will be replaced, the well is in fine shape, and the drainage will be collected and put into a new infiltration system which will handle the run off on the site; that with a 50 year storm there is a little that would flow out but there is a rip rap swale in the back to prevent an increase in volume. He noted that new curbing will be all around the parking lot to direct the runoff to the catch basin in the back which will direct it to the infiltration system. He reported the ZBA has granted variances for the non-conforming setbacks.

D. Koravos said they are asking for three waivers: datum, landscaping and fire lane. The first waiver request is regarding the requested NAVD88 datum but they used the benchmark for the construction of Route 125 which differs by about a foot. The second request is for landscaping; there is no landscaping long the northerly property line, but there is a fence. He noted the parking is up to the fence and that was originally approved. They would like to replace the fence; he noted it is currently wooden and trees are growing under it and moving the posts. He said where a 10' landscaping is required they only have seven. He noted there is a retaining wall and about a nine foot difference in elevation. He said he added space in the back so vehicles could turn around and it did not seem to be impacting the abutting property very much. The third request is for the fire lane. He noted a letter from the Fire Department was fine with the plans.

D. Koravos said they had addressed the comments from KNA. He said if the waivers are approved he believes everything has been met. Ch. Alberti mentioned the things to be addressed in the staff report. J. Cashell said he had time to go through everything just before the meeting and just about everything has been taken care of and the conditions for approval from the previous application have been met except the State driveway permit. D. Koravos said DOT had initially said a permit was not needed since the driveway was not being changed, but he called them again and they said he does need a permit. He called a third time and they explained that the building size is changing.

J. Cashell suggested putting this one property on the December 1st meeting agenda. T. Moore suggested addressing the waivers this evening and give D. Koravos a chance to update the plan with those results and then continue the hearing to December 15th.

Waivers: D. Koravos read the waiver requests into the record:

Article I §230-14.1.Z: to waive the requirement for the datum to be North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88).

The site benchmark was based on plans prepared for the Federal Aid Primary Project FG-F-019-1(14), NH Project No. S-3337 for the construction of Plaistow Road. The note is indicated on the site plan. The side benchmark and the NAVD 88 elevations are also shown on the site plan. The spirit and intent of the regulations is to restrict the use of multiple datums which is accomplished.

It was noted this same issue was encountered in another plan that came before the Board several months ago and the Board had no concerns with using the Plaistow Road benchmark.

T. Moore moved, second by K. Robinson to grant the waiver for Article 1 §230-14.1.Z

The motion to grant the waiver passed 5-0-0.

Article III §230-23: to waive the side yard landscape setbacks and planting of shade trees in a 12' wide strip running around the frontage of the property.

There is currently a fence along the northerly boundary of the property which will be replaced; on the south side of the parking lot there is a slope up to a retaining wall with an elevation difference of approximately nine feet. Screening is provided by the difference, existing vegetation and fence. The spirit and intent of the regulation us to provide screening between the parcels.

Ch. Alberti asked if there will be anything on the south slope; D. Koravos said the slope has trees which will remain, the grading from the parking lot would be landscaped with grass or whatever is needed, and the trash bin will be screened with shrubs and such. T. Moore asked if there were any plans for the front landscaping buffer. D. Koravos said they'd asked for a waiver for the 12 foot strip with evergreen planting because there would be an issue with the sight distance looking south and a safety issue with the elevation discrepancy. He said there will be landscaping around the building

G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore to grant the waiver for Article 1 §230-23

The motion to grant the waiver passed 5-0-0.

Article I §230-14.1.NN: to waive the location of Fire Lanes.

Through discussions with the Fire Department, no vehicles will enter the rear of the building during a fire. The Fire Department does not have any objection or concerns of the proposed site plan at 27 Plaistow Road.

G. Taillon moved, second by T. Moore to grant the waiver for Article 1 §230-14.1.NN

The motion to grant the waiver passed 5-0-0.

Ch. Alberti asked if there was any public comment. John Moynihan, owner of 28 Chandler Avenue Unit 6 said he was speaking president of the condominium association. He asked what type of retail establishment was coming in and was told it will be a jewelry store. He also asked about the wetland crossing and was told it was not a crossing but an extension of the parking lot into the buffer zone. He said his concern is how wet the area is where they abut and asked where the drain off will go; he was told the runoff will go into a new infiltration system and it will infiltrate into the ground. D. Koravos said that currently some of the runoff

goes into the Bank of America and some into the wetlands, but the part that goes to the bank ends up as a puddle in their parking lot and this will be cleared up. J. Moynihan asked if the gully would be filled in and was told that the only work would be done within the bounds of the property. Ch. Alberti added that the Planning Board is always concerned with the environmental impact and the T. Moore is also a member of the Conservation Commission. He noted the Conservation Commission met with the applicant and read the ConCom letter into the record:

“At its August 5th meeting the Conservation Commission reviewed the proposed site plan that would convert an existing retail use into a slightly larger retail use (a jewelry store). The existing conditions at the site show an extensive intrusion into the wetland buffers. The proposed plan still intrudes into the 75-foot buffer but slightly reduces the amount of intrusion. The proposed plan also provides for the treatment of stormwater run-off that currently flows into the wetlands untreated. The Conservation Commission supports the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit for the intrusion into the wetlands buffer for 2 reasons: 1. The proposed stormwater management provisions will provide for only treated stormwater to flow into the wetlands, a vast improvement over existing conditions. 2. Because of the topography and size of the site, there is no change to make a significant reduction in the buffer intrusion because the intrusion is an existing condition.”

There was no further public comment.

Ch. Alberti noted the Board has not granted the Conditional Use Permit. J. Cashell note that with the DOT permit pending nothing could be done. Ch. Alberti continued the hearing to December 1, 2021 and no additional notice will be sent regarding the continuance.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:32 PM.

4. ZONING/SUBDIVISION AMENDMENTS:

Ch. Alberti asked if the timing is correct for completing the Zoning amendments. J. Cashell said the Board could potentially hold the public hearing for the amendments on December 15th though there are two projects that have been continued to that date and must be dealt with. He said there would be less stress if the zoning amendments public hearing was conducted on Jan. 5, 2022. There is not enough time to schedule the public hearing for December 1 and get input from Atty. Cleary. J. Cashell asked T. Moore if input was still needed for MS4; T. Moore said there was a list of some 20 items that need checking but they will have the language ready for the Planning Board on Dec. 1st. He said the hearing could be done of Dec. 15th if all the language is dealt with in Dec. 1st. He noted that substantial changes to the language arising from a public hearing will require a second public hearing. It was agreed to try for Dec. 15 for the public hearing on the zoning amendments.

Ch. Alberti asked for a quick review of the zoning amendments.

Z-22-A: Ch. Alberti asked if the warrant would contain all the verbiage on the worksheet; T. Moore said it is there as a point of reference for the Board to insure there is no contradictory language. Ch. Alberti asked about the definition of Rooming and Boarding house which requires compensation and how a homeless shelter which does not require compensation from the individual fits, and if language would be required. T. Moore suggested that compensation would come from some place.

Z-22-B: Ch. Alberti asked if anything new is needed. It was agreed it was fine as written and there would be no legal issue with using either. Page 2, second paragraph, 4th line should read roads and streets not states.

Z-22-C: Second paragraph, third line wetlands buffer should read wetland buffers. This should also be changed in the fourth paragraph 2nd line

Z-22-D: T. Moore said he was not entirely comfortable with a blanket 75 feet for several reasons: in all the existing buildings along Rte. 125 if there is not a 75 foot setback they become nonconforming lots which can be a red flag when looking for financing. He wondered if this could be modified as only applicable to buildings constructed as of April 1, 2022 but was unsure if it was legal to do that and Atty. Cleary should be consulted.

K. Robinson said she would like to change the 75' setback to 80'. J. Cashell suggested increasing the landscaping requirement of these buildings.

Table 220-32 I two instances of lot size 120,000 square feet (C1 and C3) should be changed to 100,000 square feet; the two instances of 75 feet setbacks should be changed to 80 feet; and the last table line Commercial 3 (C3): All other C1 lots should be changed to C3. The Voters Guide Information should change the large lot size from 120,000 SF to 100,000 SF. Also the second line of the explanation should read 'and/or a large building size' rather than 'or a large building size'

Z-22-E: It was agreed all were comfortable with the language and no changes were needed. L. Milette asked if a second curb cut would be determined by the building inspector and it was agreed that had been the decision.

Z-22 F: It was agreed all were comfortable with the language and no changes were needed.

Z-22-G: It was agreed all were comfortable with the language and no changes were needed.

Proposed Subdivision Amendments for 2022: Ch. Alberti asked for questions or suggestions; there were none.

Ch. Alberti asked the Board to be prepared to review the final wording on Dec. 1st. It was agreed Dee Voss could ask Atty. Cleary about the issues the Board wanted addressed.

5. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS/ COMMUNICATIONS/UPDATES/ FYI'S AND OTHER

L. Milette asked about the BOS discussion on creating a new Capital Reserve Fund for transportation infrastructure. T. Moore said the reserve fund has been around but the rationale for putting more money into it was that calming Main Street from the railroad tracks to the library their estimate was either \$800,000 total cost and they would only provide \$600,000 or the total cost was going to be \$600,000 and they would provide \$400,000 so there is a \$200,000 differential the Town would need to raise. The calming construction would be scheduled for 2024-2025. G. Taillon said they still have questions and nothing has been voted on. There is also the Federal infrastructure money; several members said they had heard New Hampshire would get the least amount of money in the country. T. Moore said if that is true it is probably the least per capita.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charlene A. Glorieux
Minute Taker