

Approved July 20, 2006

Call to Order: 7:35 p.m.

Present: Jeremy Dube, Jim Bureau, Pam McLeod, Bruce Holmes, Tom Hoopes, Cynthia Balcius, Cris Blackstone, Jeanne Crouse, Bonnie Dunbar, Monica Jerkins and Carolyn Schaeffner Recording Secretary

Appointment of Alternates: none to appoint.

Approval of Minutes: May 10, 2006, May 16, 2006, and May 22, 2006.

A majority of the Board members did not have an opportunity to review the minutes. It was agreed that the proposed minutes will be reviewed approved at the Planning Board meeting on June 21, 2006.

Approval of Agenda: One amendment to the agenda. The Planning staff received a request from the Gillan's counsel on Case P05-09 for a continuance. However, they are present tonight expressed an interest in addressing the Board. The abutter's attorney was notified regarding the request for a continued, hence they are not present tonight.

Motion by T. Hoopes to not hear the Case P05-09 tonight due to the fact they notified the Planning Office asking for a continuance and proper notification went to the abutter's attorney. Second by P. McLeod. No discussion. Vote Unanimous.

T. Hoopes feels with the advice the Board has received from the Town Counsel this applicant should be directed to the ZBA to request a variance.

J. Dube stated the Board cannot address this case because the case is not open in front of Board.

M. Jerkins noted there the number of applications this month and have decided to continue to a second night for several of the cases on the agenda. Cases that will be heard on the second night are:

Case P06-51, Map 32, Lot 43 Conceptual, Dunn

Case P06-39, Map 11, Lot 25-49-1 Compliance Hearing, Carpenter

Case P06-36, Map 15, Lots 56 and 60, 19 Lot Subdivision, Norby and Reynolds

Case P06-45, Map 12, Lot 21-8, Condo Conversion, DiFillipo

Case P06-46, Map 12, Lot 21-8, Condo Conversion Subdivision, DiFillipo

Case P06-47, Map 12, Lot 21, Condo Conversion Site Plan Review, DiFillipo

Case P06-48, Map 12, Lot 21, Condo Conversion Subdivision, DiFillipo.

All these cases will be heard on Wednesday, June 28 at 7:00 p.m.

Motion by T. Hoopes to approved the agenda as amended. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

C. Balcius noted she would like to discuss under Other Business tonight the Planning Board routine on notification of continuing the agenda for an additional night.

T. Hoopes added he would also like to discuss the Town Planner position under Other Business.

Approved July 20, 2006

Roger Burlingame approached the board for clarification regarding the previous vote on Case P06-49 Gillan and the Board's reasoning to continue.

J. Dube explained the Board decision with regard to the letter received in the office and documents that have not been received.

C. Blackstone stated she was told they would not be here tonight.

T. Hoopes informed Mr. Burlingame to direct their future contacts through Monica Jerkins.

Public Input: Alden L. Norman to address the Board regarding concerns with Zoning Ordinances. Alden Norman from Watson Point Road. Has registered concerns regarding the new cell tower ordinance. Board of Selectmen told him they do not have responsibility with Zoning Ordinances. Concern that the voting ballot on the cell tower ordinance was an 8 line single paragraph without definition. Spoke on his cherished opinion of Lake Winnepesaukee. Feels this new ordinance will damage the view of landscape.

J. Dube stated he was sorry he was unhappy but this needs to be discussed when the time comes to review ordinances.

A. Norman asked what concerned citizens can do to begin a class action.

J. Dube suggested he speak with the Town Administrator.

Applications for Public Hearing:

Case#P06-44

Map 29, Lot 76

Site Plan Review/Change of Use

Stacie Hubbard

5 Monument Square

Application submitted by Stacie Hubbard for a site plan review of a proposed spa/beauty shop. The property is located within the Residential Commercial Zone.

M. Jerkins distributed one abutter's comment regarding the driveway use.

J. Dube noted that to accept the application for change of use a blanket waiver is needed.

Motion by T. Hoopes to grant the blanket waiver and accept the application for Case P06-44. Second by B. Holmes. No Discussion. Vote unanimous.

Stacie Hubbard present for this case. Presented that this structure she is renting will be a change of use for a day spa including manicures, pedicures, facials, massage therapy, body wraps, waxes.

J. Dube asked the Board for their opinion on the private way as noted from the abutter letter received.

T. Hoopes questioned driveway whether it is a private way or public. Referred to document noting Paula Brooks call to the Planning Office expressing her concerns as to the ownership of the street. Noted she has no concerns to the type of business but does have concerns on parking and plowing.

Approved July 20, 2006

Nancy McFarlane, owner of the building, feels that this driveway is public.

S. Hubbard noted that there are three spaces in front of the structure and will not have more than 3 customers at one time.

J. Dube feels that the abutters question does not pertain to the change of use to the building.

B. Holmes asked if there is parking behind the building.

S. Hubbard confirmed.

Open for public input.

None seen or heard.

Public input closed.

Motion by C. Balcius to approved Case P06-43 for change of use. Second by J. Crouse. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

C. Balcius recused herself for the next two cases.

Alternate appointed for Case P06-43 Bonnie Dunbar.

Case#P06-43

Map 21, Lot 5-5, 5-6

Boundary Line Adjustment

Robert and Sandra Bahre

Hopewell Road

Application submitted by Richard D. Bartlett and Associates, LLC on behalf of the property owners Robert and Sandra Bahre for a proposed Boundary Line Adjustment. The property is within the Lakeshore Residential Zone.

Motion by T. Hoopes to accept the application for Case P06-43. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Present for this case are Robert Bahre and Mark Sargent.

M. Sargent presented the site located on Hopewell Road, Lot 5-5 and Lot 5-6. Lot 5-5 has Mr. Bahres home located on this with a area of 8.04 acres with 572 feet of lake frontage. Lot 5-6, located to the west of the Bahre's home has an area of 2.87 acres with 538 feet of frontage on the lake. The lot line adjustment is to annex .91 acres of Lot 5-6 to Lot 5-5. This gives a new area for Lot 5-5 of 8.95 acres and leaves the remaining area of Lot 5-6 of 1.96 acres. They have applied for state approval and is still pending and ask this be a condition of approval.

J. Crouse asked if the road frontage is being decreased on Lot 5-6.

M. Sargent stated yes.

J. Dube stated they are only required 30 feet on Lakeshore Residential and meets all the footage requirements.

Approved July 20, 2006

Open to public input.

None seen or heard

Public input closed.

Motion by T. Hoopes to approved Case P06-43 for a boundary line adjustment subject to all state, local and federal permits necessary. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

J. Bureau appointed as alternate to this case.

Case#P06-49

Map 8, Lot 5A & 7-1

10-Lot Subdivision

Dennis and Susan Gray

Frank C. Gilman Highway (NH Rte 140)

Application submitted by Karen O'Rourke, PE, on behalf of the applicants, Dennis and Susan Gray for a proposed 10-lot subdivision with an interior road. The property is located within the Rural Zone.

Present for this case, Dennis and Susan Gray and Karen O'Rourke

M. Jerkins presented large set of plans along with 10 photographs that were taken by members of the Conservation Commission when they did their site inspection. Noted there were no waivers requested but the staff review of the plat indicated that waivers from the following are required:

Section 7.2.13 Signature block, a notice provided by the applicant on the check list indicating that a signature block will be provided on the final mylar, however no formal waiver request was submitted.

Section 7.2.27 Elevations, contour lines are provided but no elevations are shown.

Section 7.2.3 No Flood plain data provided.

Section 9.14 Parcel size ratio. Proposed Lot 8-5a-1 does not meet the length to width ratio.

J. Dube asked about the plan for future development.

M. Jerkins stated there was not a plan submitted for future development.

Susan Gray stated there was no plan submitted for future development.

J. Dube noted this was a requirement to have this.

S. Gray stated there was no plan for future development.

J. Dube stated there was no plan last year either and informed Ms. Gray this was time for the Board to deliberate and she is not allowed to interject the Board's discussion. Once the application has been accepted they can discuss this with her.

J. Crouse stated she asked to have Planning Office make copies of the minutes from last year's meeting with regard to future development and the applicant's comments made that were relevant to the total lack of future development for this property.

Approved July 20, 2006

T. Hoopes noted the Planners recommendations regarding non-conforming lots proposed the Board cannot accept the application with non-conforming lots and since the application has been noticed the Board may want to offer the applicants the opportunity to convert the current application to a design review or it can then discuss with the applicants and their agent the Board's concerns about the application and make recommendations regarding changes that the Board would like to see on the subdivision plan. The Board can also advise the applicants on how the Board wants the subdivision plan presented with regard to the voluntary lot merger issue discussed in the paragraph above. Concluded there are several issues here that do not make it possible to accept the application.

S. Gray stated they are disputing the items in the Planner's report.

J. Dube once again noted to the applicant that this is not the time for her to speak. She can only speak if she is asked a direct question. He also affirmed the Board will make everything clear that they will need to provide.

General discussion by the board with regard to changing this application to design review and not accept the application.

M. Jerkins noted the applicants can choose to withdraw application and go before design review.

S. Gray asked question regarding for acceptances. Feels there are no gray areas. Would like to table the application and go into design review.

J. Dube stated the two choices tonight will be either withdrawn or dismiss without prejudice. There is no such decision to "table" her application in this process.

J. Crouse feels they submitted the application and knew what the requirement were and now are refusing the requirements and feels the fees should not be waived.

C. Blackstone discussed the Technical Review Committee and that they did not get a chance to review this application.

J. Dube asked about the amount of review for a subdivision and design review are very different.

M. Jerkins noted that the same amount of time is used for subdivision as design review.

P. McLeod would like a concrete reason for refunding application fees.

General discussion of past decisions to refund application fees.

General discussion on the Technical Review Committee.

Motion by J. Crouse to deny acceptance of application for reasons listed below:

1. Parcel A is a non-conforming lot
2. 8/5A-1 does not comply.
3. 8/5A-8 does not meet the length to width ratio

Approved July 20, 2006

4. Parcel B should be attached to the other lots.
5. 8/5A-3 slopes looks greater than 25% and the 4K area is on the side of the slope.
6. 8/5A-2 slopes looks greater than 25%.
7. The hammerhead is insufficient.
8. There is a drainage issue from Route 140 to Youngtown Road.
9. They need to submit for an updated road cut with DOT.

Second by C. Blackstone.

Discussion. J. Dube for not granting the waiver for length to width ratio is for parcel 8-5A-1. He was present when the Town Planner scaled that out. It needs to meet 3 to 1 and it does not. [Noted that the applicant does not agree with this.] Suggestion from J. Crouse for applicant discuss their discrepancies with Planning Board staff. M. Jerkins noted they are prepared to meet with the applicant.

Vote 3 in favor and 4 opposed. Motion failed.

S. Gray stated she spoke with Attorney Sessler and Russ Bailey and stated her fees were “not at risk”.

J. Dube stated that it is the decision of the Board to not refund application fees and this has been discussed with Attorney Sessler and Russ Bailey. Stated the Board needs to decide what to do with this issue. Polled the board for their opinion.

C. Blackstone discussed her opinion regarding her view as Selectmen representative and responsibility to the Board in representing the town department recommendations as presented to the Planner. The list mentioned in the failed motion are all valid and need to be supported.

T. Hoopes noted the application was not acceptable and that the Planner had spoken with the applicant. Feels these problems need to be brought out into public view so the applicant can work on these.

J. Crouse feels the applicant new about the problems and chose to come tonight anyway and dispute those issues that needed to be corrected.

Motion by T. Hoopes to deny application, have the applicant to come to the planning staff for discussion of what is necessary with regard to the Planner’s Comments (listed below) and including the waivers (listed below):

Section 7.2.13 Signature block, a notice provided by the applicant on the check list indicating that a signature block will be provided on the final mylar, however no formal waiver request was submitted.

Section 7.2.27 Elevations, contour lines are provided but no elevations are shown.

Section 7.2.3 No Flood plain data provided.

Section 9.14 Parcel size ratio. Proposed Lot 8-5a-1 does not meet the length to width ratio.

“The applicant has submitted an application for the subdivision of two separate lots of record. Each lot is owned by a separate entity. In previous applications involving the combined subdivision of separate but adjoining parcels, the Board has required the applicant to submit a Voluntary Lot Merger (VLM). The Board first acted on the VLM and approved it subject to Planning Board approval of the proposed subdivision. The owner and agent were advised of this, but the owner did not want to submit the VLM until requested to do so by the Planning Board. With previous applications, because of the VLM, the lot number sequence for the proposed lots was based on one of the original lots; the lot numbering sequence on this application is based on the lot numbers of each of the original lots.

Approved July 20, 2006

Staff review of the plat found that the following lots are non-conforming.

- ▷ Parcel A with 4,129 sq. ft. where 87,120 sq ft. is the minimum required lot area.
- ▷ Proposed M/L 8/5A-1 exceed the allowable length to width ration. Where 3:1 is allowed, this lot is approximately 4.5:1.

Since the Board cannot accept an application with non-conforming lots and since the application has been noticed, the Board may want to consider offering the applicants the opportunity to convert the current application to a Design Review. The Board can then discuss with the applicants and their agent the Board's concern about the application and make recommendations regarding changes that the Board would like to see on the subdivision plan. The Board can also advise the applicants on how the Board wants the subdivision plan presented with regard to the Voluntary Lot Merger issue discussed in the paragraph above.

Proposed M/L 8/5A-8 does not meet the intent of the length-to-width ratio requirement. This lot is approximately 948 ft. long and ranges from 40' deep at one location to a maximum depth of 170'.

The Board needs to give careful consideration to proposed lots M/L 8/5-A2, 8/5A-3 and 8/5A-4. Each of these lots is heavily impacted by steep slopes and each lot shows impact to steep slopes by either the proposed well location or the 4K area. In addition, the steep slopes depicted on the plat will be further compromised by the site work necessary to connect water and septic to a residential structure. Development of proposed lot M/L 8/5A-2 is further hindered by the expanse of steep slope along the lot's frontage on the proposed subdivision road. Locating a building envelope on proposed M/L 8/5A-3 will be difficult due to the predominance of steep slope at the front parcel; the proposed locations for the well and 4K take up the majority of the buildable area on the front of the parcel. Access to the buildable area in the middle of the proposed lot is impeded by extensive areas of steep slopes. The Board should note that these comments are based on the review of a plat that provides contour lines but no information regarding elevations. Staff can complete a more thorough review and provide better comments to the Board once elevations are labels on the plat.

Another consideration for the Board: The proposed lot at the westerly end of the proposed subdivision is identified only as Parcel B; no lot number is assigned. The Board should note that this lot is bifurcated by an existing gravel road that leads to a third parcel owned by Susan Gray, a trustee of the Gray Schoppmeyer Realty Trust, the owner of record of one of the parcels that is the subject to this application. Should Mrs. Gray decide to subdivide the third parcel and extend the road proposed as part of this subdivision, Parcel B will then be bifurcated by a Class V road. The Board should give this lot very careful consideration. As this is a new subdivision, the subdivision should be designed to avoid this type of lot configuration.

The application has requested a waiver from Section 327 – Setback Requirements pertaining to wetlands. Section 327 allows the Planning Board to grant relief of specific situations. That section of the Zoning Ordinance states:

For lots created after March 14, 2006, buildings, driveways and structures, excluding septic systems shall conform to the following Wetland Buffer Requirements:

1. *A 25' natural vegetative buffer shall be maintained from all wetlands, > 10,000 sq. ft. in size.*
2. *Relief from the 25' natural vegetative buffer may be granted by the planning board when the following circumstances exist:*
 - a. *The natural vegetative buffer has been removed previously.*
 - b. *A dredge-and-fill application for wetland impact has been applied*

Approved July 20, 2006

for by the applicant to the NH DES Wetlands Bureau.

- c. An applicant can present a plan that shows environmental mitigation for any proposed buffer impacts.*
- d. In all the above cases, a soundly designed planting plan using a combination of native trees, shrubs and herbaceous species shall be submitted in order for consideration of relief.”*

Second by J. Crouse. No discussion. 6 in favor, 1 opposed. Motion passed.

The Board took a brief recess.

Cynthia Balcius resumed her seat on the board.

Case#P06-30

Map 11, Lot 25

2-Lot Subdivision

Peter and Tracy Long

Lakewood Drive and Spring Street

Application submitted by Brian Bailey Associates, Inc., on behalf of the property owners, Peter and Tracey Long for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. The property is located at Lakewood Drive and Spring Street and is within the Rural Residential Zone.

Present for this case are Brian Bailey, and Peter Long

M. Jerkins noted there are two waivers requested. Section 7.2.33 for Wetland delineation and Section 9.14 on parcel size ratio. Staff review of the plat indicates waiver is required: 7.2.15 the locus, there are no tax maps and lot numbers on the locus.

Motion by T. Hoopes to accept application for Case P06-30 with a partial waiver for Section 7.2.33 Wetland delineation, 7.9.14 parcel size, and temporarily waive 7.2.15 requiring tax map and lot numbers to be on the locus eventually. Second by C. Balcius. Discussion. Question by P. McLeod for clarification with the parcel size ratio. J. Dube explained the parcel history for new members. This has come in for a design review, the problems were discussed with regard to the acreage for this lot. This does on apply because of the steepness problems. It was hashed out for the best possible way to access the lot. Vote unanimous.

Brian Bailey presented application. This particular tract has problems. Property fronts on two roads. As noted before steep slopes and odd layout of the lot and remainder lot. Been before the ZBA and obtained a variance for one of the lots to be along the street that is not requisite to have the 150 feet frontage on a Class V road (shown as Map 11, Lot 25-53, the 10.8 acre lot). Noted the Board would not support a common driveway but only a common entrance for the first 50 feet. The frontage along the southern portion of the lot at Lakewood Drive is extremely steep. Using the existing wood road and this will be driveway for the large 19 acre lot. Property line has been established between the two lots adjacent to the driveway to afford the 10.8 acre lot the maximum buildable space up on the upper shelf were the slopes are not steep. The contour lines on sheet 2 of 3 are 5 ft contours with a significant and very flat area. Appended to the plan are details on septic design plan showing proposed home and 4000 sq ft area typically shown to NH DES as their review process go forward on lots of less than 5 acres. This is more than 5 acres. DES review is not required but have shown this as requested by the Board to see the test pits and that those criteria are also met. Also provided the actual approved copy of the septic design plan and house location for both lots. First is a 4 bedroom home with approved septic and

Approved July 20, 2006

second is a design for the new 10 acre lot and has been approved by the State showing location of the leech bed, driveway, house location, and the well. Noted letter from Katie Surwick, dated April 10 regarding information of a partial wetlands survey. There are no wetlands uphill of the limit of wetlands study as shown on the final recording plan. This is encompassing the two building sites and quite a bit more. There was condition of approval when this lot was created. The remainder lot of the original subdivision that it could not be further subdivided beyond two lots and this presentation will satisfy that.

T. Hoopes asked if this will be noted on the plat, (referring to further subdivision).

B. Bailey noted this can be added on the notes section of the recorded plat.

C. Balcius noted on legend remove wetland brook line.

T. Hoopes asked about erosion control from up on the hill that would affect Spring Street.

B. Bailey noted lot has already been cut 6 years ago.

T. Hoopes would like to know what is being done to replace cut vegetation.

C. Balcius clarified what type of vegetation or replanting that should be done.

J. Dube asked about tree line and what is cleared.

B. Bailey noted this is already cleared, and stumps are still there.

Discussion and what should be suggested on what is cut and what should be planted.

P. Long stated there are no plans for further cutting.

Open to public input.

None seen or heard.

Closed public input.

J. Crouse suggested a site walk.

J. Dube well aware of the property.

C. Blackstone suggested a site walk as well.

P. Long suggested looking at the site from 28.

Discussion of dates for a site walk

Motion by T. Hoopes to continue case until the following meeting in July 18 and a site walk scheduled for July 5 at 6p.m.. Second by J. Crouse. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Approved July 20, 2006

Case#P06-38

Map 15, Lot 25

2-Lot Subdivision

Marjorie O'Blenes

Chestnut Cove Road

Application submitted by Brian Crockett, LLS on behalf of the property owner Marjorie O'Blenes for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. The property located on Chestnut Cove Road and is within the Rural Zone.

M. Jerkins noted Waivers requests, Section 7.2.2 details on abutting properties, 7.2.23 natural and cultural features on remaining lot, 7.2.27 elevations and contours on remaining lot, 7.2.33 wetlands on remaining lot. The applicant has provided information on the plat for those areas of the parcel that are most directly affected by the proposed subdivision. Staff review notes that the following waivers are also necessary. Absence of revision chart on the plan, no tax map and lot numbers on the locus, no USGS coordinates provided, no flood plain data provided and no wetlands stamp and signature.

Present for this case are Brian Crockett and Marjorie O'Blenes.

C. Balcius noted that key items are missing the plat and additional information regarding the slopes greater than 25% as well as a wet spot is shown and it is not delineated by a wetlands scientist as required in the rules.

J. Dube agreed and feels they need to be addressed.

T. Hoopes asked if this property is near the old Chamberlain cemetery.

B. Crockett stated it was on the adjacent property.

T. Hoopes asked if this is not accepted what happens to the applicant's fees.

J. Dube stated he has done extensive research on this and it is non-existent as to any rules.

T. Hoopes noted it has been done in the past.

J. Dube agreed it has been done in the past but it is not in the rules.

Motion by C. Balcius to deny acceptance of the application for Case P06-38 for missing information. Sections 7.2.20 details on abutting properties, 7.2.23 natural and cultural features on the remaining lot, 7.2.27 elevations contours on remaining lot, 7.2.33 wetlands on remaining lot (and on the lot shown by a wetlands scientist with signature and stamp), 7.2.12 the plat date and no revision chart shown, 7.2.15 locus, no tax map and lot numbers in locus, 7.2.19 location – no USGS coordinates provided, 7.2.30 flood plain data not provided, 7.2.33 wetlands stamps and signature not provided. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Discussion with applicants a description of the items needed.

C. Balcius noted on the natural and cultural features on the remaining large lot, the 27.53 acres, after the portion up front, that waiver is consistently given understanding that this is large parcel. Also the

Approved July 20, 2006

wetlands need to shown by a wetlands scientist and with their signature and stamp. The other items noted by the Planner are fairly standard items that should be shown on the plan.

J. Crouse noted that the words "subject to change" be removed from the plan. Once it is approved it should not be subject to change.

General discussion with applicant on explanation of waivers.

Motion by T. Hoopes to continue past 10 p.m. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Case#P06-40

Map 8, Lot 8

2-Lot Subdivision

Gary R. and Paula M. Gagne

NH Rte 140 & Youngtown Road

Application submitted by Bryan L. Bailey, LLS on behalf of the property owners Gary R. and Paula M. Gagne for a proposed 2-lot subdivision. The property is located on the corner of NH Rt. 140 and Youngtown Road within the Rural Zone.

Present for this case Bryan Bailey and Gary Gagne.

M. Jerkins noted there are no waivers requested and staff review of the plan shows that no waivers are required, however, the Planner has a question regarding the calculation of the 25% lot coverage.

Motion by T. Hoopes to accept application for Case P06-40. Second by C. Blackstone. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

B. Bailey presented the application. 6.01 acres, 2 existing dwellings. Wetlands have been delineated. Test pits have been dug on 8-8, lot that fronts 140. No record of septic systems and submitting as if none existed. Mobile home on Youngtown Road has approved septic on 1990.

C. Balcius question on calculation, square footages are not matching up.

B. Bailey doesn't know why they do not match. But will run these numbers again.

Open to public input.

None seen or heard.

Public input closed.

Motion by T. Hoopes to approve Case P06-40 with condition that the calculations for the lot coverage be re-run. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Other Business:

1. Old Business:

Paul Becket proposed subdivision on 28. Last here on March 22. Question on use of the property before the current owner. Withdrew application and would like to have the application fees refunded. J. Dube noted action was taken on this. Was not aware of a conditional

Approved July 20, 2006

withdrawal. T. Hoopes noted that the board voted 6-1 to not return the funds at a workshop meeting.

2. New Business:

a. Memo regarding Master Plan work session dates (informational only) J. Crouse would like to review dates. The Wednesday sessions are on the same week as planning board meetings.

b. C. Balcius discussion on splitting the meeting with large number of applications. Concerned that asking the applicants to be moved and heard at the second meeting. M. Jerkins will research the legality of this procedure.

c. The Selectmen would like input from the Planning Board regarding the Craig Nichols building permit on part of Chamberlain Road, which is a Class VI road. Question on location on Chamberlain Road.

Correspondence: Letter from Alden L. Norman requesting input from the Board regarding procedures to initiate changes to the Zoning Ordinances, Invitation from Lakes Region Planning Commission to the Annual Dinner, Letter regarding New Hampshire Electric Coop requesting a continuance to July, Letter withdrawing Dotter request for conceptual review, Letter withdrawing Jeddrey request for conceptual review, and LGC Workshop information. Noted by M. Jerkins to the Board.

Any other business that may come before the Board.

a. Need to chose a member to be on the committee to search for a planner. M. Jerkins to find out how many can be on the committee. C. Balcius would be interested in being on that committee.

b. Excavation regulations discussions.

Motion by B. Holmes to adjourn. Second by B. Dunbar. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn B. Schaeffner
Recording Secretary