



**Town of Plaistow, NH  
Office of the Planning Board  
145 Main Street, Plaistow, NH 03865**

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**January 16, 2019**

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

**ROLL CALL:** Tim Moore, *Chair*  
Lisa Lambert, *Vice Chair*  
Laurie Milette  
James Peck  
Francine Hart, *Selectman's Rep*  
Geoffrey Adams, *Alternate*  
Steve Ranlett, *Alternate Selectman's Rep, excused*

Also present: John Cashell, *Planning Director*

**Agenda Item 2a: Minutes of the December 19, 2018 Planning Board Meeting:**

**★ J. Peck moved, second by L. Lambert, to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2018 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-1 (F. Hart abstaining).**

**Agenda Item 2b: Minutes of the January 2, 2019 Planning Board Meeting:**

**★ F. Hart moved, second by L. Milette, to approve the minutes of the January 2, 2019 meeting. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 4-0-1 (J. Peck abstaining).**

**Agenda Item 3: Public Hearings:**

**Continued from December 5, 2018:**

**a. PB 18-25: Amended Site Plan: An application from LAPLUME NH NOMINEE TRUST for an Amended Site Plan. The amendment proposes to incorporate consolidated lot/parcels for commercial/residential use and establish on-site storage areas for portable box trailers, building materials, and aggregate. The property is located at 117 Newton Rd, Tax Map 70, Lot 26 in the ICR district. The applicant is the property owner of record.**

Charlie Zilch, SEC & Associates, and Ronald LaPlume, property owner, were present for the application.

C. Zilch offered a brief over view of the application to date:

- The Site Plan was accepted as complete by the PB on December 5, 2018.
- There was a PB Site Walk that took place on December 15, 2018.
- Two (2) variances have been approved by the ZBA as of January 3, 2019:
  - a) 220-17.3.A : Setback for storage trailers
  - b) 220-321: Setback for concrete aggregate storage bins
- No engineering review or State permits were required.
- There is one (1) waiver requested for landscape buffer between two (2) commercial properties.

T. Moore asked if the Board had any questions.

**★ L. Lambert moved, second by L. Milette, to grant the waiver requested from Article II, 230-23, landscape buffers for the reasons stated in the request, for the Amended Site Plan for 117 Newton Rd. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 (U/A).**

**★ L. Lambert moved, second by J. Peck, to approve the Amended Site Plan to incorporate consolidated lot/parcels for commercial/residential use and establish on-site storage areas for portable box trailers, building materials, and aggregate at 117 Newton Rd., Tax Map 70, Lot 26, in the ICR District with the understanding that a \$5,000 bond, with a signed Federal W-9 form, will need to be submitted prior to the work being started. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 (U/A).**

**b. PB 18-27: A request from Jason Settineri C.O. Casset Holdings, LLC for acceptance and consideration of an Amended Site Plan Application for 73 Newton Rd, Tax Map 69, Lot 12 in the ICR District. The Plan Amendment proposes to remove an existing shed and replace it with a 30' X 50' equipment storage structure that will overlay and extend the footprint of the existing shed. The owner of record is Casset Holding, LLC.**

There was a discussion that per written request submitted by Jason Settineri, applicant, PB 18-27 will be continued until the February 20, 2019 meeting.

**c. PB 19-01: A request from the Estate of Roscoe N. Kidder, 245 Main St, Tax Map 31, Lot 17 (Parcel 1) and Ronald and Debra Davis, 243 Main St, Tax Map 31, Lot 18-1 (Parcel 2) for a lot line adjustment. The Plan proposed adjust the lot line to equally swap 2,543.3SF (0.10A) from Parcel 1 to Parcel 2 and 2,543.3SF (0.10A) from Parcel 2 to Parcel 1. Both parcels are located in the MDR District. The applicants are the property owners of record.**

Tim Lavelle, James M. Lavelle, LLS was present for the application.

T. Lavelle offered the following information regarding the application:

- The Site Plan has been corrected as of January 9, 2019 per staff comments.
- The application is proposing to swap 2,543.3 SF/0.10A from one parcel to another.
- There is a fenced in area that has been being utilized by Lot 17 which is part of Lot 18.1.
- The existing lot line is close to the dwelling on Lot 17.
- The lot line adjustment will straighten out the lot line while allowing for more room for the existing well on Lot 18.1.

T. Lavelle asked if the Board had any questions.

T. Moore offered that the process is such that the Site Plan needs to be approved as complete and then the Board can open the Public Hearing.

There was a discussion regarding pending confirmation from the two (2) lien holders regarding their agreement with the lot line adjustment application. It was discussed that the PB cannot consider the application as complete until the documentation is received.

T. Lavelle offered that both properties have a lien and that the bank won't discuss anything or offer the letters of confirmation until the PB approves the Site Plan as complete. However, the PB in turn can't accept the Site Plan as complete until the lien holder documentation is received. Therefore, from the applicant's perspective, there is a deadlock. He offered that in the thirty (30) to thirty-five (35) years that he has been coming before the Board, he has never been presented

with the issue of having to get confirmation letters from the lien holders before the Site Plan could be accepted as complete.

J. Cashell offered that he spoke with the PB Chair to address this issue. It was discussed that the law referenced in the Staff Report is subject more to subdivisions of property rather than a simple lot line adjustment which offers a simple lot line relocation to correct a long-standing issue.

J. Cashell offered that he feels that the PB is in a good position to be able to accept the Site Plan as complete.

**★ J. Peck moved, second by L. Lambert, to accept as complete the Lot Line Adjustment Plan that proposes to transfer equal-sized parcels, 2,543.3SF (0.10A) between 245 Main St., Tax Map 31, Lot 17 and 243 Main St., Tax Map 31, Lot 18-1 in the MDR District. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

T. Moore asked if the Board or anyone in the audience had any questions.

T. Moore offered that there are not any waivers or variances required for the Lot Line Adjustment.

**★ J. Peck moved, second by L. Millette, to approve the Lot Line Adjustment Plan that transfers equal-sized parcels, 2,543.3SF (0.10A) between 245 Main St., Tax Map 31, Lot 17 and 243 Main St., Tax Map 31, Lot 18-1 in the MDR District. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

**d. PB 19-02: A request from ProQuip for a Preliminary Design Review of a Proposed Site Plan. The Plan proposes to combine two (2) existing parcels (143 & 145A Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 30, Lots 72 & 73, in the C1 District); demolish existing structures on the properties; and construction a 12,000SF equipment rental and maintenance facility, 1,800SF equipment wash building and related equipment storage and display areas, landscaping and storm water management. The property owners of record are Sanborn Realty Trust and William H. Sanborn Revocable Trust.**

Brad Ferrin, Corporate Facilities Manager for Milton CAT, and Lee Allen, Civil Engineering Dept. Head for Colby Company Engineering, LLC (CCE) were present for the Conceptual Design Review of the Proposed Site Plan.

B. Ferrin offered the following information for discussion:

- ProQuip is currently located at 22 Old Rd.
- The goal is to make the new Plaistow location the site of the Corporate Headquarters.
- A Purchase and Sale Agreement has been signed for the new location. However, the information and feedback gathered from discussions will determine whether the applicant continues with the Purchase and Sale Agreement or not.
- The applicant is currently consulting with L. Allen, CCE, and Charlie Zilch, SEC & Associates in regard to working on the concept planning and design, gathering information, and working through the application process and requirements.

L. Allen offered the following information about the proposed location and the intent of the plan:

- The plan proposes to combine two (2) existing properties with a total of nineteen (19) acres.
- The existing buildings will be demolished.
- There is currently two (2) acres of cleared land. The rest of the property is either paved, grass, or wooded.

- The goal is to clear seven (7) additional acres with a portion to be paved and a portion to be gravel which will store construction equipment.
- The intent of the Plan is to conceptually show a 12,000SF rental/maintenance building, a 1,800SF equipment wash building, and approximately nine (9) acres of display/storage space.
- There is a 2,000 gallon above ground diesel tank on site.
- Of the nineteen (19) acres of property, nine (9) to ten (10) acres consist of wetlands. There is no intent to impact the wetlands.
- There will be a storm water pond to treat water runoff.
- There have been preliminary meetings with NH DOT.
- There will be a number of permits needed:
  - o NHDES Alteration of Terrain (AOT)
  - o Above Ground Storage Tank Permit
  - o NHDOT Driveway Permit
  - o Permits for three (3) 275-gallon waste tanks
  - o Site Plan approval from the PB

L. Allen offered the Board a handout to show what the proposed buildings will look like.

There was a discussion about the proposed gravel storage area being close to abutters.

L. Allen offered that there is to be a six (6) foot tall fence and a proposed landscape butter between the business property and the abutters. He also offered that there is a 4% downward slope to the property which will offer an additional two (2) foot buffer.

B. Ferrin offered that there have been challenges that have presented themselves regarding the proposed property such as only nine (9) acres of the nineteen (19) acre property being usable due to the wetlands.

There was a brief discussion regarding snow removal.

L. Allen offered that there will be designated areas for snow storage.

F. Hart asked if any accommodations have been made for a possible diesel spill.

L. Allen offered that in order to get the appropriate permit approval a reaction plan will need to be provided.

There was a brief discussion about the hours of operation.

B. Ferrin offered that he will follow up with a definitive answer. The hours of operation are expected to be 7:00am to 5:00pm.

J. Cashell offered that there is a substantial area of natural vegetation that needs to stay in place because of the wetlands, and a landscape buffer needs to be maintained at the rear of the property between the business and abutter properties. Has additional landscaping, soundproofing, etc. been taken into consideration to maintain the quality of life for the abutters?

L. Allen offered that the activity in the back of the property will not be nearly as extensive as the activity in the front.

There was a brief discussion about the entrance and exit onto Route 125 and the turn radius needed.

L. Allen offered that there is to be a wide-open curb cut with a thirty (30) to forty (40) foot radius.

T. Moore asked if the Board had any additional questions.

There was a brief discussion about impervious areas. It was stated that NHDES guidelines and recommended materials will be used.

T. Moore asked if anyone in the audience had any questions. He asked the audience to keep in mind that the current discussion is conceptual only and that no decisions will be made at this time. He stated that the applicant will have to make a full application, including detailed plans and all other requirements of the Site Plan Regulation at that time. Staff will do a checklist review and the Plan will also be reviewed by the Planning Board Review Engineer. Abutters will be re-notified of the application and will have the opportunity to see the full Site Plan at that time.

There was a discussion about the storm water pond and how the water runoff will be directed to it.

L. Allen offered that there will be swales introduced to direct the water runoff. There will be some areas that are surface directed only and then there may be some areas where the design will require piping. There will be an outlet control structure for high water level drainage to make sure that the water flow does not exceed the eighteen (18) inch culvert pipe.

Abutters present for the discussion:

Sanaz and Richard Anthony, 4 Village Way  
Pat Lohnes, 1 Village Way  
Pierre Sader, Quick Stop Tire Shop, 147 Plaistow Rd.  
Roy Walling III, 12 Village Way  
David Tuell, 2 Village Way  
Doug Meteisis, 3 Village Way  
Peter McGrath, 9 Stonebridge Drive

Many of the abutters expressed their concerns about the proposed site's storm water pond, runoff in regard to groundwater contamination near the Little River Water Shed where residents get their drinking water from, and the eye sore and noise that they feel the introduction of ProQuip to their "village style" neighborhood would create. There were concerns that having ProQuip near their neighborhood would also cause a loss in property values. Many abutters felt that the proposed landscape buffers would not be high enough to inhibit them from having to look at ProQuip's machinery and equipment. There were also concerns regarding diesel and petroleum storage being in proximity to the wetlands. The majority of the abutters expressed deep concerns about an industrial site being introduced next to an area that was expected to be strictly residential in nature.

Pierre Sader, Quick Stop Tire Shop, 147 Plaistow Rd. expressed concerns that ProQuip will block his business from being seen by potential customers. He also expressed concerns about ProQuip pushing snow up against his business in the Winter.

Peter McGrath, 9 Stonebridge Drive, offered that the area that ProQuip is looking to build near is in a sanitation protection area that encompasses the public water supplies for three (3) area communities: Stonebridge Village, Tuxbury Rd., and the Little River Project. His concern is centered around the potential of groundwater contamination from oil or gasoline seeping into the public water supply from the runoff collected in ProQuip's proposed storm water pond.

There was a discussion that Village Way has separate septic systems but they are on a shared well system that gets its water from the Little River Water Shed. It was discussed that this design allowed the lots to be built a little smaller and make the roads a little shorter.

D. Johnson, Plaistow Consultants, offered that he was involved in much of the development of Little River, Tuxbury, and Village Way. He offered that the concern for groundwater contamination is there, but also stated that the State is very thorough in their review of ground water discharge.

T. Moore and J. Cashell reiterated to the audience that the purpose of the Public Hearing is to gather information and allow the abutters to express their concerns. No decisions would be made at the current Public Hearing. They offered reassurance to the audience that the applicant(s) would need to go through the regulated application process, create a thorough Site Plan to show a visual projection of what the project site would look like, go through an extensive review with the Town engineers and Staff, and ultimately have the Site Plan approved by the PB before any construction can begin to take place. The entire project will be extensively reviewed to make sure that there are no adverse impacts to the abutters.

B. Ferrin offered that ProQuip does not want to get off on the wrong foot with abutters and expressed that they will take all of the abutters comments and concerns into consideration.

J. Cashell offered reassurance to the abutters that anything to do with storm water is extensively reviewed by Keach-Nordstrom Associates which is the civil engineering firm that works with the Town.

J. Peck offered that it might be beneficial for the applicant(s) to meet with a group of abutters to further discuss comments and concerns.

T. Moore asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the Board or audience.

T. Moore closed the Public Hearing.

***e. PB 19-03: A request from Daniel Johnson, on behalf of Gerald Carbone for acceptance and consideration of an Amended Site Plan Application for 93A Plaistow Rd, Tax Map 27, Lot 26 in the C1 District. The Plan Amendment proposes add six (6) motel units to the existing building. The owner of record is Gerald R. Carbone.***

Daniel Johnson, Plaistow Consultants, representing Cottage Plaza Condominiums, and Gerald Carbone, property owner, were present for the application.

D. Johnson offered that the Amended Site Plan has been revised to remove “extended stay” and now just offers “motel” usage.

There was a brief discussion that the original Site Plan review with the Board took place “a few months ago”, on September 19, 2018. At that meeting it was discussed that there is no specific language in the Zoning Ordinance to address “extended stay” motels. The Zoning Ordinance only provides language for a “motel”.

There was a discussion that the Amended Site Plan presented is substantially complete enough to allow for PB review even though there are a few items missing that will need to be completed later.

J. Cashell offered that he went out to look at the site in question and that the site has a rather unique mix of miscellaneous uses on site such as a variety store, a gas station, a restaurant, and apartments. He stated that he has never encountered such a mix of uses on one (1) site before.

T. Moore offered that the Board needs to decide whether to accept the Amended Site Plan application as complete or not.

G. Carbone offered a review of the revised 3,000SF area, bordered in blue on the Amended Site Plan, to show the area that he is looking to convert into six (6) motel units.

**★ J. Peck moved, second by L. Lambert, to accept as complete the Amended Site Plan application that proposes six (6) motel units at 93 Plaistow Rd., Tax Map 27, Lot 26 in the C1 District.**

***Discussion:***

***There was a discussion that there are still too many unanswered issues and discrepancies for the majority of the Board to feel comfortable accepting the Amended Site Plan application as complete.***

***The vote was 2-3-0 (F. Hart, L. Milette, and L. Lambert opposed).***

***Review of PB concerns:***

- There is a discrepancy with the number of units presented. The existing Site Plan shows seven (7) units where the Amended Site Plan shows six (6) motel units.
- The proposed use is allowed in the C1 District. However there are questions as to whether there is sufficient parking, are there areas marked as travel lanes and for pedestrian safety?
- There are a lot of site features that are left to be desired. If this were a new Site Plan lighting and landscaping would need to be included as well as a number of additional details to be shown.
- Where the proposed motel usage is significantly different than what the site is currently used for, the PB has the right to request a number of Site Plan improvements. Improvements discussed should be represented on the submitted plan so that the PB can physically see the improvements to be made. The question to be asked is, “What does the Town get out of the project that will show some value to the Town”

G. Carbone offered that the building on the site is thirty (30) years old. The restaurant has been vacant for over five (5) years. He expressed that if he was to be able to get the six (6) motel units approved that it would allow him the opportunity for improvements to be made during the construction of the new units.

D. Johnson offered that most of the improvements to be made will be seen on the interior with limited improvements to the exterior of the building.

J. Cashell offered that although the change that is being applied for is an acceptable use and the application is substantially complete, it would be nice to have a Site Plan that shows improvements that show aesthetic value for the Site Plan review by the Board.

F. Hart offered her concerns and opinion that it looks like the Amended Site Plan might be a “back door” approach at introducing the previously presented “extended stay” motel model. There appears to be no significant changes and the Amended Site Plan still shows kitchens which is not allowed under the Zoning Ordinance and definition of “motel”. There needs to be much more clarity and assurances presented. Also, there are not bookings, showings, or appointments for motels. She offered a review of the Zoning Ordinance definition of “motel”. She offered that the business plan being presented goes against current Town ordinances.

L. Milette offered that per the previous meeting and presentation, the applicant was instructed to go before the ZBA for review, which never took place. She also expressed concern that the Amended Site Plan is dated 2003.

J. Cashell offered that perhaps G. Carbone should consider converting the entire building to a motel or go before the ZBA to ask for a variance for apartments since there are already

apartments “grandfathered” and existing on the property. He stated that there seems to be an impasse with the application submission. If the application is not going to be accepted because of missing items being too substantial to accept, then the applicant may want to consider withdrawing to allow time to complete the missing items. The missing items need to be addressed before the proposal will move forward for a motion of approval.

***Additional PB Concerns:***

- The site should have proper lighting.
- The site should have proper landscaping.
- The site lacks updated fire protection and egress access

J. Cashell reiterated that the formal application submitted needs to meet PB standards before any approval will be given. The site is an incredibly valuable site located on Route 125. The site needs to be redeveloped to bring value to the Town. It is recommended that the applicant start new due to their being a substantial change in use.

T. Moore offered that the PB does not have the ability to approve apartments as a use, as residential use is not currently permitted in a C1 District. However, the ZBA has the ability to approve or deny a certain use.

There was a brief discussion that there are currently apartments on the site due to the building being constructed prior to 1988 when there was a major update to the Master Plan. After 1988, the ZBA was reintroduced to align with the Master Plan. Apartments are not currently a permitted use in a C1 District under the Zoning Ordinance. The site is approved for what is there now. However, it is not approved for the newly introduced substantial change of use.

G. Carbone offered that he spoke with a lawyer that was recommended to him by Mike Dorman, Chief Building Official.

D. Johnson offered that the application was reviewed with Dee Voss, PB Administrative Assistant, and Mike Dorman, Chief Building Official.

There was a discussion that no one person can speak for or represent the PB as a whole. If one (1) person did, then they spoke out of turn.

There was a brief discussion about multi-use sites such that some strip malls are introducing a more “Village” setting to modernize Commercial space. G. Carbone was encouraged to think about what he would really like the property to become, take into consideration uses that are currently in demand, and look to upgrade and modernize to open up new possibilities and create a Site Plan to be proud of.

There was a very brief discussion on whether changes to the Zoning Ordinances need to be considered to allow for more modern uses.

T. Moore offered that there are Fire Suppression changes coming in 2020. He also offered that if G. Carbone decides that he would like to go the route of converting to apartments he would have to go before the ZBA for a variance due to apartments currently not being a permitted use in a C1 District.

It was discussed that the primary concern of the PB regarding the introduction of apartments is that the property needs to be proven as a safe property.

There was a brief discussion that when the PB supports a plan and submits a letter of support to the ZBA to help an applicant apply for a variance, it helps considerably. The letter would have to state that with conditions, the PB would support an application for a variance for apartments



(Residential use in a C1 District). Once the ZBA approves the variance, then the applicant could return to the PB for approval. If the applicant submits a plan for a proposed use and it is denied, a letter of denial from the Building Inspector would allow the applicant to go before the ZBA with support from the PB.

T. Moore offered that once the motion to accept the Amended Site Plan as complete was denied, the discussion is really over.

J. Cashell offered that the PB was just having an open discussion.

G. Carbone asked if “motel” is considered a bad word to the PB.

J. Cashell offered that “permanent, quality housing” is more favorable.

It was discussed that D. Voss will need to write up a Notice of Decision showing the PB’s vote for denial, 2-3-0, due to lack of sufficient information.

Abutters Present:

Mark Marino, 95 Plaistow Rd.

M. Marino expressed his concerns that there is a school and a daycare located at 95 Plaistow Rd. which is right next door to the motel units proposed by G. Carbone. He questions the need for a motel in Plaistow. He also stated that he has looked into the history of 93 Plaistow Rd as far as criminal activity and has seen motor vehicle related arrests, sex offenders, heroin use, etc. He expressed that as a former DCYF representative he has seen all kinds of criminal activity taking place in motel-type properties. He expressed his opinion that a motel would not be good for the abutters or the Town.

T. Moore thanked M. Marino for expressing his concerns, but offered that there cannot be discussion back and forth as the applicant is no longer present.

**Agenda Item 4: Bond Setting – 157 Plaistow Rd (Skip’s Garage):**

T. Moore offered that the PB was provided with a copy of the Bond Setting Memorandum for 157 Plaistow Rd. He stated that there is an error in the amount of the bond shown on the Memorandum, and that the figure should be \$22,307.00.

**★ F. Hart moved, second by L. Lambert, to set the construction bond for S&L Garage, 157 Plaistow Rd., at \$22,307.00 There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

**Agenda Item 5: Acceptance of Hoyt Farm Road – Recommendation to the Board of Selectmen:**

T. Moore offered that the PB was provided with a copy of the Hoyt Farm Road Acceptance Request - Recommendation to the BOS and provided a brief review.

It was discussed that if a Subdivision Plan is approved by the PB with the intention of the roadway being accepted as a Town-owned road, the PB turns to the BOS to have the documentation reviewed by the Town Council and to set the performance bond. (The performance bond is determined by regulation and is 10% of the total of the bond estimate sheet for the project.) The PB then makes a recommendation to the BOS to accept the roadway as a Town-owned road.

There was a brief discussion that Carli's Way has not yet been accepted as a Town-owned road because it has not yet been top coated. Once the top coat has been completed it will be reviewed for acceptance as a Town-owned road.

It was discussed that sometimes a road will be proposed as a private road, but once the applicant finds out that they need to plow and maintain the road themselves they decide to come to the Town Hall to see about changing it to a Town-owned road.

**★ L. Lambert moved, second by J. Peck, to request that a letter of recommendation be sent to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) for Hoyt Farm Rd. to be accepted as a Town-owned road and that the recommendation include legal review by Town Council and a performance bond of \$28,868.60. There was no discussion on the motion. The vote was 5-0-0 U/A.**

#### **Agenda Item 6: Old Business:**

There was no Old Business presented.

#### **Agenda Item 7: New Business:**

L. Milette offered that Haverhill has approved the medical marijuana overlay location at 101 Plaistow Rd. in Haverhill, MA.

It was discussed that since marijuana is still not legal in NH buyers will still not be able to buy it in Haverhill, MA and then cross over the NH border into Plaistow legally.

#### **Agenda Item 8: Communications, Updates and Other Business:**

L. Lambert asked if the PB is moving toward setting PB Workshop Meetings for the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of every month and Public Hearings for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of every month.

J. Cashell offered that the PB is still working toward that type of schedule. However, in some cases it is difficult to handle all legal affairs in one (1) day per month. He suggested that the PB may want to consider forming a sub-committee to handle issues behind the scenes before the regular meetings take place. He offered that Hudson, NH typically had one (1) Workshop Meeting and two (2) Public Hearings per month.

T. Moore offered that Workshop Meetings will be scheduled in regard to the Master Plan.

J. Peck offered that in his opinion the rezoning of the C1 District was not fully understood by the voters. What can be done better to help residents/voters better understand Zoning Ordinances?

J. Cashell offered that Zoning Ordinances are not discussed at the Deliberative Session. He also stated that he will not be able to be at the Deliberative Session first thing in the morning on February 2, 2019.

There was a discussion that every Zoning Ordinance has a Public Hearing associated with it. It was discussed that the voters will typically read the Zoning Ordinance and try to understand it and then will review how the PB voted to make their decision. It was stated that the PB votes will be included on the ballot for 2019.

F. Hart asked if the Board could introduce a Voter's Guide for Zoning Ordinances.

T. Moore offered that the sign-ups for office begin January 23, 2019 and will run until February 1, 2019. There are openings for anyone who wants to sign up for one (1) 3-year term for Planning Board. There can be up to five (5) alternates.

**There was no additional business before the Board and the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.**

**Respectfully Submitted,  
Samantha D. Cote  
Recording Secretary**