

Town of Farmington
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 20, 2024
Selectmen's Chambers
356 Main Street-Farmington, NH 03835

Board Members Present:

Rick Pelkey, Chairman
Bill Fisher, Vice Chairman
Charlie King, Selectmen's Rep
Jeremy Squires
Stephen Henry

Board Members Absent:

Rebecca Patton-Sanderson, excused
Mike Day, excused

Others Present:

Kyle Pimental, Planning Director
Randy Tetreault, Norway Plains

1). Call to Order:

Chairman Pelkey called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

2). Pledge of Allegiance:

All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

3). Review of Minutes:

March 6, 2024-

Motion: (Henry, second Squires) to approve the minutes as written passed 5-0.

4). Public Comment: None

5). Old Business: None

6). New Business:

A. Election of Officers- Chairman:

Motion: (Squires, second King) to nominate Rick Pelkey for Chair;

Mr. Pelkey accepted the nomination and then asked if there were any nominations for Chair.
Hearing none he called for the vote.

Vote: the motion passed 5-0.

Vice Chairman: Mr. Pelkey said Mr. Fisher is leaving the board and the Vice Chairman position.

Motion: (Fisher, second King) to nominate Stephen Henry for Vice Chairman;

Mr. Henry accepted the nomination. There were no other nominations.

Vote: the motion passed 4-0-1 (Henry abstained).

Secretary: Motion: (Henry, no second) to nominate Jeremy Squires for Secretary;

Motion: (Squires, second Pelkey) to nominate Mike Day for Secretary;

Mr. Day was not present to accept the nomination.

Vote: the motion passed 5-0.

B. Results of Zoning Amendments- Mr. Pimental said the results were included in their packets but he just wanted to let folks know that all of the proposed zoning amendments passed. He said they were relatively about the same and one of them that was more supported than the others was Article #2. He said the others were pretty similarly split throughout so there wasn't anything that stood out with overwhelming support or not in support of so they were pretty consistent.

Mr. Pelkey thanked the citizens of Farmington for supporting the board. He said they think that they're trying to do some things to make the town a little bit better and it looks like they agree with us this year anyway.

Mr. King said that usually they have some people that may not understand what they're asking for and they'll vote no but he did get some feedback that some people were not in favor of the increased density. He said hopefully their changes are when people use the density increases that they're implemented well and well received by the public. Only time will tell he said.

Mr. Pelkey agreed and said they are here if it doesn't work right to try to straighten it out but he thinks they are trying to take little steps and hopefully that's what they'll be.

C. Conceptual Consultation with Randy Tetreault of Norway Plains Associates, Inc. to Discuss Bean Farm and Partnership with the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests- Mr.

Pelkey said this is a conceptual discussion so they need to make sure they don't get too deep into the weeds on this. He asked if Mr. Pimental usually has the disclaimer on this.

Mr. Pimental said in the memo it speaks to what the RSA states and he and Mr. Tetreault went back and forth on what they felt was appropriate documentation that wasn't anything that was engineered or any drawings but still gave the board enough of an idea of what area they're talking about to make the conversation worthwhile but they didn't feel as though what Mr. Tetreault provided would trigger a design review which would have then triggered the notification. He said they were comfortable with this is still staying under conceptual with what was presented.

Mr. Pelkey asked if this is one of those lots that's been around forever.

Mr. Tetreault said it has and the reason he wanted this conceptual hearing was twofold-one is they are in a timeframe, not crunch but request to be able to get something approved by summer so they could sell the out sale parcels to get their money back for their overall purchase or something like that. He said luckily, we had an easy late winter so they could get to some of the stuff he was afraid they couldn't get to. He said originally when he said they could get to it they had a window between snow melt and leave on to be able to use some of the equipment to get to it which they ended up being able to do.

He said the second part to that is they are taking title to it in April so he didn't want to submit a formal application like the Bean Estate and then have that complication once it transferred and when he scheduled this meeting he wasn't sure how that was going but it looks like they're going to be taking title in April which means if he wants to submit for the May deadline for a

June regular subdivision that's probably what they are shooting for. He said he had some questions for the board tonight and probably some questions they have regarding the pieces they are taking out.

He said they are reserving them and they pretty much look like what you see there (on the aerial photo). He said they are reserving them and there will be a deed restriction on them that they can't be further subdivided that's part of what they do (SPNHF). He said one of them has a right-of-way location through it because the remaining land will still be timbered over time. It currently was and that's how they manage all their properties he said.

Mr. Tetreault said what would be the side of the road that has the farm house on it they're going to try to do that. He went to display map and pointed out this is the plan they have and the only difference on their plan is there is a little area here, this is an homestead and Miles is the caretaker and he is using a little extra in there so they want to straighten that out and part of this process would be a minor lot line adjustment that he would try to take care of at the same time but that would be a separate application because it's different people.

He then showed the board an overall plan that shows the whole thing and where the pieces are coming out. He said it's generally on the farm house part of the road it's going to be 11 acres so right now on that side of the road there's about 112 acres so the remaining land on that side of the road would be 100 acres.

He said on the side of the road that has the barns and the garage if you go through, that side of the road they want to cut a minimum of 5 acres it might be a little more depending on how much of the field they want to keep. He said they were trying to hold the old stone walls in there but the foresters want to leave an area for their log landing in the field and they tried to do it by easement but they've done that before and it hasn't worked out because they rut up the field. He said they want to own that part so if they're wondering why it cuts across the field on that side that's the reason. He said what they're ultimately going to do is to stake out where they want it in the field and he will walk out there with the guy and then they'll move it around accordingly.

Mr. Tetreault said that segways into they are a little worried that the Planning Board wouldn't entertain a waiver to full survey it's 337 acres or whatever and they actually got around it already but it probably won't be done until sometime in the summer so if they apply in May for the June he may ask for the waiver for a full survey. He said sometimes they have an old survey of it which in this case they don't they just have this document from the WPA that was done in the 1930's and 40's.

He said the soil conservation service and the state archives have them on file and they were done because of blister rust anywhere from the 1930's, '40's and '50's. He said pine blister rust was a disease that affected and killed most of the white pine trees so it was a federal work project for that. He said the reason he showed them this is it gives them a good idea of the stonewalls and fence lines and they did the whole state so it's a good reference for surveyors. He said they held as many stonewalls and existing monuments in the area because sometimes

it's easier and people think they see a wall and it's not the property line sometimes they still use it. He said there's a lot of interior ones but only in that one spot. He returned to aerial photo and pointed out where when you look close on the tree line you can see the wall and where they're cutting across it.

Mr. Tetreault then said the other question he wanted to fess up with them was they are obviously over 5 acres and they probably aren't going to get state subdivision approval. He said the side of the road that has the existing farm house has a well and a septic now but of what vintage he was not 100% sure. He said that piece is going to be 11 acres so the normal checklist would be do a new test pit, put a 4k area around it and he is going to take another look, he walked it once but there was still snow a little bit. He said he was going to take another look for wetlands but it doesn't look like there are any major wetland areas on there.

Mr. Pelkey asked about the top of the hill.

Mr. Tetreault said he has to look on the other side of the stone wall on the north and west side of it once he knows exactly where that is. He said his point to the board is he doesn't want to ask for a waiver to site features necessarily because he can pull in the topo because they did the GPS end of it so they can put the topo on a second sheet that's not recordable and if there's any wetlands he can show that.

Mr. King asked if he was talking on the entire parcel.

Mr. Tetreault said no he was going to ask for a waiver for the entire parcel but that was a good point because technically they could ask for it on the entire 340 acres. He said on the 11 acres and the 5 or 5.5 acres whatever it ends up being the side of the road that has the farm house is already kind of situated he didn't know what extra they would want him to do on that like dig a test pit and put a 4k area in or something.

Mr. King asked if there's going to be a covenant so there's no future development.

Mr. Tetreault said that's right so it's just the lot itself.

Mr. King said if they did nothing and they needed a new well and septic they'd have to just follow state regulations.

Mr. Tetreault said if you have ever driven by there you can see 2 wells sticking out.

Mr. Pelkey asked if the 11 acres is the existing house site.

Mr. Tetreault said yes it already has existing.

Mr. Pelkey said he didn't see a lot of issues with that.

Mr. Tetreault said the other side is 5 acres and it he thinks it is just barns and a garage and he didn't know if there is a well over there but he doesn't believe there is but he'll double check that.

Mr. Pelkey asked if they had power to the buildings.

Mr. Tetreault said they have power and would double check on the wells. He said he guessed the board could require them to prove a septic area somewhere on the lot and they'd have to dig a test pit.

Mr. Pelkey said if it's going to be a house lot that's what they would expect and they usually

want to see the well circle and the contiguous acreage.

Mr. Tetreault said he would find out and he doesn't think there's one on that side of the road. He said those are the kinds of things he wanted to ask to make sure but he kind of felt he knew what they'd want. That was the reason for the meeting and to give you a heads-up that's what's going on he said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if that big lot was going to be divided as well. He said the print one has red lines running down the road and asked if they are going to take...

Mr. King asked if they were going to split the lot into 2 lots basically.

Mr. Tetreault went to display photo and said it already is, it's 2 map and lot numbers. He said it's divided by the road now so that's why he gave them the two.

Mr. Pelkey said so really they're going to be subdividing 2 different lots.

Mr. Tetreault said the 112 acres, there's 11 or 12 acres coming out of that so it would be 100 left on that side of the road and on the other side of the road towards the tower right now there's 225 over there so if they take out 5 or 5.5 or whatever it is when they finalize the perimeter. He said they are doing a final boundary plan for them which they're going to have to do a conservation deed for but in this case the pieces that are coming out of the fee they are going to sell them.

Mr. King asked if all of that is in Current Use that he knows of.

Mr. Tetreault said he didn't know. He said if it is and they're pulling that out they're going to pay a penalty and they know it.

Mr. Pelkey asked about the small lot, the caretaker's lot and if that's a non-conforming lot now because of its size.

Mr. Pimental said yes it's only an acre.

Mr. Pelkey asked because it's non-conforming by moving the lot line they're not doing anything that says they can't do anything to create a non-conforming lot.

Mr. King said it's less non-conforming.

Mr. Pimental said they're giving more and they would advise against moving it in the other direction making the lot smaller.

Mr. Pelkey said he was saying if they're going to touch it we have rules that stop us from making it still non-conforming.

Mr. Tetreault said that was a good question because sometimes people feel you have to bring it to full conformity which would be 3 acres.

Mr. Pelkey asked if the r-o-w is off the road into the back acreage for logging purposes.

Mr. Tetreault said that's exactly what it's for. He said it's existing and there's another woods road that goes all through the farm house side and the r-o-w goes up back. He said they haven't said they want to leave anything on the other side because they can already get in and they have plenty of frontage remaining.

Mr. Pelkey said he wanted to hear what they want to do with it when they're ready to say.

Mr. Tetreault said they're going to sell the pieces is what he is being told.

Mr. Pelkey said the parcels he understood but the remainder of it.

Mr. Tetreault said that's going to be in conservation and there are trails out there now.

Mr. Pelkey said it's a really great property to put into conservation and it's really fantastic.

Mr. King asked if the approx. 5 acre parcel when it's sold if that's going to allow no future development or if somebody is going to be able to put a house on it.

Mr. Tetreault said they can put a house on it but no further subdivision is what the guy told him would be the deed restriction. He said when they sell properties they put no further subdivision on both of them.

Mr. Pelkey said the minimum lot size there is 3 acres so it wouldn't be big enough to subdivide anyway.

Mr. Tetreault said one of them would.

Mr. Pelkey said the other side would be.

Mr. Pimental said if they have the frontage.

Mr. King said our zoning could permit another residential dwelling on that 11 acre parcel.

Mr. Henry said without subdividing.

Mr. Pimental said they would have to show that it could be subdivided.

Mr. Tetreault said he didn't think they realize that.

Mr. King said and it has a covenant that says it can't be subdivided and asked if that would prevent it.

Mr. Squires said no because they're not subdividing it.

Mr. Henry said he would say no if there's a covenant that says it can't be subdivided then they can't show that it could be subdivided.

Mr. Squires asked if they could put an additional dwelling on there and if that is subdividing it.

Mr. Henry said no but to put an additional dwelling on it you have to show that it could be subdivided.

Mr. King said the only reason he posed that was because of the historic nature of Dottie Bean's house and somebody could say they're going to do something with that historically and they're going to build a house on the back.

Mr. Tetreault said his take on Farmington recently with having to deal with this over the years with this rule-you used to have to have your land area and double the land area and double the frontage but you also had to show a sketch to show that physically it could be subdivided because you could still have double the acreage and the frontage and not be able to configure it right. He said he thinks they got away from that in both Farmington and Rochester.

Mr. Pelkey said you still have to show it can be subdivided.

Mr. King said a second residential dwelling does not come to this board.

Mr. Tetreault said it goes to Codes.

Mr. Pimental said we still do require a sketch though.

Mr. Pelkey said he didn't see an issue with it if that's what's allowed.

Mr. Tetreault said if they know about that they may put an extra condition in there.

Mr. Henry said he wanted them to be aware of what they may run into.

Mr. Tetreault said he will bring that up with them because he wanted to make sure that he told the board that they were going to put that deed restriction in.

Mr. King said he wasn't expressing an opinion one way or the other but when you see the size...

Mr. Tetreault said he just had one where the guy had the land area but he was short 35 ft. of frontage and he could physically do it but he didn't want to subdivide and they were going to try to get a variance and he said they can't get a variance because they're not subdividing. He said you have to be able to actually fit it so Ron (Bldg. Insp. Ron Lemer) said show me a sketch that it will meet the setbacks, the second dwelling which he could do and that fit, but he just didn't have double the amount that he needed so he said he would get a variance but you only get a variance to the frontage required not to the hypothetical.

Mr. Pimental said if someone was in a zone that requires 150 ft. of frontage and they want to put 2 homes on it and they've got 270 ft. we can't allow them to go to the ZBA to get a variance for a theoretical subdivision that's not being conveyed you can't do that. He said that's the one circumstance that they can't actually give zoning relief for because it's black and white-either the lot can be subdivided or it can't be.

Mr. Squires said that back lot loophole that takes away that frontage and asked how could they hold them to the frontage when they already have it so that doesn't make sense to him.

Mr. Pimental said the board has the authority to deny a rear lot subdivision if it doesn't meet the rest of the requirements.

Mr. Tetreault said it wouldn't be the board it would be Codes and he could draw a sketch and they could subdivide it with that frontage.

Mr. Pimental said rear lots still have to come before here. He said the intent was it has to meet the traditional subdivision and he would not interpret someone being able to show a rear lot subdivision for 2 principal structures on the same lot. He said he would say they're not meeting the intent.

Mr. King said he would play Steve Henry and disagree with that.

Mr. Pimental asked if he thought he could show a rear lot.

Mr. King said that's allowed in our current zoning so he could do that so he could prove that it's readily subdividable under current zoning.

Mr. Henry said to him a rear lot subdivision is a subdivision.

Mr. Pimental said he looks at it differently too and he looks at a rear lot subdivision where the intent is where you have a large amount of backland but you don't have a ton of frontage. He said what an applicant is asking for is to put 2 principal structures and to him it's 2 different things. He said someone could make the argument that while a rear lot is still a subdivision it's just a different kind of subdivision. He said he would argue that the intent of when they put that in there was you had to follow the traditional subdivision path but someone could make an argument the other way.

Mr. Tetreault said in this case they're right that there's plenty of ways they could do the 11 acre

they just couldn't do the 5 acres so he may want to put an extra restriction on that one. He said he didn't know, maybe not, maybe they're selling it to someone and let them deal with it. He said they know they want it subdivided because they still own the land that's in conservation and they want it the same way so his guess is if there's an extra deed restriction, he might want to put on there he'd probably be in favor of that. I'll certainly discuss it with him he said. He said he was glad they had that discussion because there's been a couple of questions about that recently and he didn't really know the answer to it.

Mr. Henry said he believes their subdivision regulations specify that a lot should be generally rectangular and he thought it would be hard to argue that that 5-acre lot is generally rectangular.

Mr. Fisher said he was thinking the same thing and actually neither lot is generally rectangular.

Mr. Squires said he didn't think it says it has to be and he thinks "should be" are the words.

Mr. Henry said it clearly is a triangle and the lines probably fit the physical land well with the hills and stuff.

Mr. Tetreault said it's the way they want to sell it that's all it really amounted to. He asked if generally the lot shape thing is a subjective thing for the board.

Mr. King said when they come back, they may want to address that in a request for a waiver.

Mr. Tetreault said if it's set in stone then yeah, he wants to request a waiver for it because that's the way they want it.

Mr. Pelkey said if they want to keep the entire field as part of it too then that would square that right off.

Mr. Tetreault said they didn't want it that's the way they had it and like he said earlier the reason for that has to do with their log staging and stuff they've already done and they want to be able to have that area and not have the landowner in charge of it.

Mr. Pelkey said they're taking it out to the road along that opening.

Mr. Henry said he understood that reasoning and now he'll be Charlie (King) here and we need to produce quality lots.

Mr. Tetreault said with a lot that size they could probably fit some nice 1 acre rectangles in there.

Mr. Henry said the minimum lot size is 3 acres.

Mr. Fisher said they have plenty of land around that to put in a new landing and a new access. He said they have plenty of frontage to play with to make that a rectangular lot and give up that field. He said they just won't do it because it appears to him that they're just too damn lazy to do what needs to be done.

Mr. Tetreault said they don't want to make a new spot.

Mr. Fisher said if they don't want to make it then don't sell any of it keep it all and put your landing where you want.

Mr. Tetreault said he was talking to the person who does not get to make those choices.

Mr. Fisher said he understood that it's not him but if he was still going to be on the Planning

Board and this came before him besides conceptual he would be totally against it.

Mr. Tetreault asked him what his rationale was for having it be square because it feels better.

Mr. Fisher said it's in our codes.

Mr. Tetreault asked what's the reason for it.

Mr. Fisher said they have done that in the past since he has been on this board they have tried to keep it and people voted on it. He said that's the reason-the town wants general rectangular lots.

Mr. Henry asked if that is codes or regulations.

Mr. King said that's a regulation.

Mr. Pimental said what it says in the subdivision regs is that they generally be configured as rectangular or square.

Mr. Tetreault said which is why it's in there because they could waive it if they wanted to.

Mr. Fisher said he would be in favor of waiving it if there was some geographical reason for it-a mountain, a river or something like that. There's no real reason to make a triangle pizza-shaped piece of property here other than they want to keep part of the field for use as a log landing once every 5, 10 or 15 years when they clear land or cut logs out there. They don't cut logs every year and then they're going to have 200 something acres over there anyway. Move down the road a little bit, cut a little road in there and make a new landing spot he said.

Mr. Tetreault said they could make that argument to them.

Mr. Squires asked why blaze down another piece of the forest to make a landing that doesn't make sense to him.

Mr. Fisher asked why make a triangular piece when they're trying to keep lots rectangular.

Mr. Henry said when you look at the big piece and what's going to remain as conservation those lines keep that with the remaining piece generally rectangular if you look at what's cut out of there. He said there's a road in the middle and the remaining lot has right angles. He said if you squared off the triangle lot they're going to have triangle lines in the back lot.

Mr. Tetreault said no disrespect to anyone but he has built lot shapes for a long time and he has seen everything from general preference, luckily, it's in the subdivision regs so they can look at everyone individually but sometimes if it's in the zoning you can't they need a variance to it. He said and then what's reasonable all the way to Wolfeboro who has this quadratic equation for form factor and form factor is the perimeter squared times the square root of the area. He said what that does is the bigger your perimeter area the squarer your lot can be so they put a number in there, they wanted to go 35 and he talked them down to 25 and a perfect square is 16 and he told them that everyone that comes in there isn't going to meet that the land is not made that way.

Mr. King asked how long they have had that.

Mr. Tetreault said they've had it for about 10 years.

Mr. King said they must like it.

Mr. Tetreault said say you had a lot that was perfectly square but it had a rat tail on the end just

the way the lot was created because there was an old railroad r-o-w that would throw your lot shape out by that number so he brought in a couple of examples of that and he said so why should the rest of it be scrutinized just because you don't like that it's shaped like a pipe on one side. He said he never has agreed with it and he understands one of the reasons they put it in was because people were Jerry-rigging lots which is why Wolfeboro put it in because somebody Jerry-rigged some lots all the way down to the lake and they wanted the right to be able to say so which is what this board did.

He said he didn't have a problem with that but if you have a piece of viable building area with viable access to it and it's sufficient where you put the lines around them is immaterial to him and you could put the lines wherever you want them around a good building site. When you get into site loading for soils and wetlands and slopes and stuff then it matters but the shape of it doesn't necessarily matter he said.

Mr. Squires asked what it takes to get a property out of conservation.

Mr. Pimental said it's hard-almost impossible.

Mr. Squires said they didn't have to worry about house lots ever being there.

Mr. Pelkey said it's not likely to have an abutting house built there.

Mr. King said that's way past a conceptual discussion.

Mr. Tetreault said it would make a difference to him because other than tweaking it a bit more perfectly this is what it's going to look like.

Mr. King said he heard some different opinions tonight and depending on who is sitting here that night there might be some discussion.

Mr. Fisher said this is his last night but if he was staying here he would be against it.

Mr. Pimental said he would also be of the opinion that if that line shifts slightly they could make the argument that the way the road curves like that is throwing it off.

Mr. King said if that's where they put the landing that becomes a concern for traffic safety if they're going to put it right on that corner.

Mr. Pelkey said that is wide open on top of the hill.

Mr. Tetreault said he didn't know where they staged it before. He then pointed to a little shape below the barn on the display photo and said that's where they had it and then pointed to the sections they said they needed.

Mr. King said the problem is there's a significant amount of wetlands between that lower area and that field.

Mr. Tetreault said that's why he wanted to have the property line up here because that's not the greatest down in there. He said they were trying to keep it up in here plus if they have to stake it out they can't stake out through there so why not hold the wall.

Mr. King said if they are going to come out on that corner they need to consider what happens out there on a daily basis and there's a lot of traffic and it's tight corner and we have a speed limit sign there that says 20 mph recommended.

Mr. Squires said but it's usually 45-50 mph or so through there for most people.

Mr. King said if you can take that corner at 50 you're doing pretty good.

Mr. Tetreault said he didn't know as he hasn't asked him but he could probably get someone here to answer whatever questions because he doesn't know the answers to some of them.

Mr. King said typically that access is a temporary access once every 5 to 10 years and those are slow moving vehicles coming out onto the road that's right on that corner so he would have that a little bit more down the straight section where it straightens out to give them the opportunity to turn either way but that's further down the line.

Mr. Tetreault said he can ask him about that kind of stuff he doesn't really know how they've handled that in the past and Brian and Miles would know that.

Mr. King said he didn't think they ever came out here and he thought they came out between the buildings.

Mr. Squires said he remembers them having a landing over here but he thought they did one other one.

Mr. Pimental said he wanted to circle back to the original 2 asks one was the survey work for the whole 2 parcels which he thought the board would be open to waiving that as not having to do that for the 300 plus acres and just concentrate on the areas in which the 5 and 11 acre parcels that are being subdivided. He said the other question he had asked was what they would require for the 11-acre parcel for the existing home for test pits and septic. He said for that specifically how they have handled that prior when there's been an existing home on it is just a letter saying that the septic is functional. We didn't require test pits or anything like that it was just something that said this septic system is functioning and was installed by a licensed installer he said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if they don't have occupancy for that house any more.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't know.

Mr. King said he didn't think they could put the requirement for a licensed installer on there because it may have been built before a licensed professional was required so it may not have a plan on record and if you call the state if you don't have the original approval number they can't help you.

Mr. Tetreault said you have to have the construction approval number and you used to be able to give them a name, a time period and a town but not so much. He said they have query online where you can look but it doesn't go back that far.

Mr. Pimental said it only goes back to 1986 or '87.

Mr. Tetreault said he could get a letter from the caretaker that says that but he didn't know if that would be prudent.

Mr. Pelkey asked if they haven't lost their occupancy why do they need to prove these things.

Mr. Pimental said that's just how they've handled subdivisions.

Mr. King asked by what mechanism would they lose their occupancy.

Mr. Pelkey said this isn't a newly created house lot this is an existing house lot.

Mr. Tetreault said he planned on doing was showing the existing thing with topo with showing

the wells and showing the approx. location of the septic.

Mr. Henry said the 2 sides of the road are 2 totally different lots.

Mr. Tetreault said yes 2 map and lots.

Mr. Henry said so they are not taking a house lot off of an existing house lot. He said one lot has no house on it that's being subdivided.

Mr. Tetreault said it just has barns and a garage.

Mr. Pelkey said as far as the rest of the boundaries on that land when they get ready to put that into conservation that have to have that anyway that's going to be something that's going to follow it and they'll have to show all those boundaries then so he was not worried about that.

Mr. King asked if he was doing a full boundary survey.

Mr. Tetreault said yes it's just not done yet. He said a lot of times when he has asked for a waiver for that he has an old map of it or a compass and tape of it not to survey standards for a subdivision but something that there's a plan on file at the Registry but in this case, there isn't a perimeter survey other than the old map.

Mr. King asked what year the blister rust map was from.

Mr. Tetreault said it was from 1950-something. He said that that's actually a combination of all these little maps.

Mr. Pelkey said as long as whatever it is that they're taking and it's dividing off the parent lot as long as they have a good on that...

Mr. Tetreault showed some of the little maps to the board and noted the date on one of them was 1938 and so what they did is they have all of them.

Mr. King asked on the research if he found when her father bought that and when that was.

Mr. Tetreault said yes and the guy before that's name was Merrill and it's in the research but he didn't remember. He said his guys showed him the change and the Merrill cemetery is the cemetery that's there and they showed him where it was but it's going to show up on the stuff.

Mr. King said if you drive by there, you'll see it, it has a piped-in fence.

Mr. Tetreault said he walked around the farm house part out to the big field and he went around where the barns are, looked over that stone wall where they wanted to move the line over there and that's as far as he got. He said he appreciated their comments and he will ask the questions about the logging part and that he was just told that so he didn't know the answers to any of that. He said it's preference on their part as long as it meets it and they know more about how they want to manage it than he does.

He said the plan is to have the perimeter plan done by mid-summer but they're not going to have it all marked. He said they make them mark the whole perimeter so that's going to be probably a fall thing. He said he will probably be asking for a waiver to site features and full survey for the remaining land and the rest of it he's probably going to show anyway.

He said he would probably do a new test pit on the barn side and he didn't really want to dig around the house and do a test pit around there if he could help it.

Mr. Henry said this is an existing house lot, it's going to be a smaller house lot but still a big

house lot.

Mr. King said because it's an existing house even if it had issues the state would still have to allow something.

Mr. Henry said if you were subdividing it to create other house lots the fact that one house that was there wouldn't prevent creating the other house lots if there were problems with this house.

Mr. Pimental said there's a little bit of leeway and this is how they've handled it: what it says in the subdivision regs is when subdividing parcels with existing dwellings, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the board that the existing septic system is in good working order. He said they have received letters, they've taken written testimony, they've taken it a couple of different ways. He said in an ideal world they'd have a licensed septic designer that signs off on it and in some cases like this it might be a little bit difficult. He said the way that it's written so long as the board is satisfied it meets the intent of the subdivision regs.

Mr. Henry said if his system has failed and he needs to replace it and he has to subdivide and sell some land to fix his existing house he can't do it.

Mr. Squires asked what that has to do with this scenario.

Mr. Henry said it's not this scenario.

Mr. Tetreault said most likely if someone buys that unless they waive all the inspections, they're going to have to have a septic inspection.

Mr. Henry said that's private for their financing that's not for them.

Mr. Tetreault said but that would end up happening anyway but on the other side of the road if someone decides to build there, they're going to have to do a septic design so they can do a test pit somewhere in a good area and put a 4k area around it and put it on the plan. He said if there is not a well over there already, they can show a potential spot and put a radius around it but that doesn't mean that's where they'll do it.

Mr. Squires said but it's capable of providing it.

Mr. Pimental there's 2 things he wanted to mention because he thinks it will be important. He said this will probably be depending on the timing be their first subdivision with the new changes that were approved at the Town Meeting one of which would play a role in the 5-acre lot and that is that 40,000 sq. ft. of contiguous area- that square, circle or whatever, the board changed the regs that it's now that you can't just show that anywhere within the subdivision the development needs to take place in that 40,000 sq. ft. He said what some applicants were doing was they were showing it way off in the middle of nowhere that had uplands but then they were showing the home was going to be built nowhere even remotely close to that.

He said the reason he brought that up was in terms of that triangle, that 40,000 sq. ft. may...

Mr. Tetreault said you just put the 40,000 because that's 5 acres and put a square in the middle.

Mr. Henry said but that's where the house has to go.

Mr. King said this is the issue typically they run into where say they have finger wetlands and people go I'm going to put a house right there in the middle of all these and there's not going to

be any wetlands encroachment and it's not possible and they know what's going to happen over time. He said they need to demonstrate 40,000 sq. ft. and now they're saying they need to show the proposed structure in that readily-buildable uplands, not over in a corner in amongst a bunch of finger wetlands.

Mr. Tetreault said they don't know where a structure is going to be they don't even know who they're selling it to.

Mr. King said when you look at the wetlands that are on this lot you really don't have any so it's not really going to have an impact on this lot. He said he thought the only wetlands would be down in this fringe and the rest is all field.

Mr. Tetreault said Mr. Pimental told him on that 5-acre lot he is supposed to show 40,000 somewhere so it's 100' x 400' or 200' x 200'.

Mr. Pelkey said a minimum of 40,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Henry said his question was looking at that lot, if he can show 150,000 sq. ft. then it's going to be in that 150,000.

Mr. Tetreault said but it has to be a box.

Mr. Pimental said a box, a circle or a rectangle. He said they have so much room on this lot and they could show 60,000 and it could be in that area.

Mr. Henry said it's on the books now and they don't know what the buyer is going to do or where the buyer wants to build so if they say we've got a big chunk here it's got to be somewhere in this 200,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Pimental said it meets the intent of making sure that you have contiguous area.

Mr. King said they're showing all of it as contiguous uplands and it's obvious the 40,000 falls somewhere within that.

Mr. Tetreault said they have the 40,000 and 4,000 in it for the septic. He said that doesn't have to be there it can be wherever they can make that work if they do a new test pit or whatever.

Mr. Henry said as big a box that you can show that you can build a house and then as long as it's within that box you don't run into any issues.

Mr. Squires said he wonders how they're going to police that.

Mr. Pimental said probably through the Building Inspector.

Mr. Tetreault said they don't have foundation certs which he didn't like and asked how do you know they're in it.

Mr. Pimental said they did discuss the process for that and Mr. Lemere responded but he couldn't recall what he said.

Mr. Pelkey said they left it up to the discretion of the Code Enforcement Officer.

Mr. King said some need to be done to make sure you're not on somebody else's land because there's no land there like in Lancelot Shores where you have 1.8 acres on some of those lots so it should be a requirement because we know many issues are over there because of this small lot and somebody ends up putting a garage not within the setback or in somebody else's yard. He said but if they have 40 acres and they're showing this is where my building permit is and

the Building Inspector goes out there and says 1 neighbor is over there and the other neighbor is over there obviously, he doesn't need a foundation cert here so that's why it's up to him.

Mr. Tetreault said so someone goes for a building permit, you guys approve a subdivision plan with a certain area that they're supposed to build in so usually there's no foundation certs it's a septic design and they draw it in there and then Mr. Lemere looks at it and on the big ones it doesn't matter but on the ones where you approved the subdivision plan where there's an area someone's going to have to figure out did the septic designer put it in that area, does he even know and did he look at the subdivision plan.

Mr. Pimental said that Mr. Lemer had said- this all went back to the question of whether or not they were going to require as-built plans prior to the certificate of occupancy, so he was in favor of that and he said going forward it would be good to develop a policy about a certification for this very issue in terms of at what point in the process does he make sure that they are building within that contiguous area, what makes the most sense and the earlier on the better.

He said Mr. Lemere didn't say exactly what that would be but he said they should develop a policy for this and we were waiting to see if it would pass. He said the next step is to make sure for the next one it gets put in the Notice of Decision on how they're going to do that.

Mr. Tetreault said if you have the requirement, he understood why they want it but asked how they would know if anybody is ever going to do it. They just submit a septic design and it's like is it in it. He said he sees it all the time and they don't even know it.

He gave the example of a guy who did a sketch on a tight lot in downtown Wolfeboro and the house is almost the whole lot. He said the builder drew a nice plan showing the old house and the new house but he just drew a property line on his sketch with distances from it but you don't know. He said he tore down the old house and the guy called him and asked him to put the house on the lot in the right place. He said you see the semantics there and how he would do that he didn't know. Now there's a big hole there, the ZBA Chairman is on their butt, the neighbors are on their butt and he got a letter saying they're going to appeal the decision for the building permit. That's the kind of stuff that can happen if it isn't verified and it does happen he said.

7). Member Comments:

Mr. Henry thanked Mr. Fisher for his years of service. It's been fun working with you he said.

Mr. Pelkey said he was glad the Town took the opportunity to say something at the Town Meeting and to thank him for his time on all the boards he served on and all of the places. There's going to be a lot of holes to fill he said.

Mr. Fisher said at Monday's Board of Selectmen meeting they said some nice things and they even remembered his southern accent so that was good.

Mr. Pelkey said all the guys he works with on a semi-daily basis all remember him too and they ask about him quite often.

Mr. Fisher joked and are glad he's not there.

Mr. Pelkey said the town is going to miss him, he filled a lot of roles.

Mr. Fisher said he would still be around doing things. He said he is still going to try to work with the Conservation Commission he just won't be a board member.

Mr. Pelkey said he certainly deserves the break, he earned it.

8). Any Other Business before the Board:

Rear Lot Discussion- Mr. Pimental said he wanted to close the loop on that discussion and he went back and looked at what it says specifically in the zoning. He said for the 2 single family dwelling units to be allowed without site plan review the dwellings have to be located and meet all dimensional requirements for subdivision whereas the purpose statement of a development of rear lot says that for a subdivision where the parent lot does not have the adequate frontage along a class V road.

He said in his opinion, by stating that the lot lacks frontage, it doesn't meet the dimension requirements so he would interpret that as if someone where to say they want to put 2 lots on here but they don't have the frontage and they're going to use the rear lot provision he would say they can't do that because it states that your parent lot has insufficient frontage and our definition of having 2 structures or single family homes on a lot you have to meet all dimensional requirements.

He said he sees it as relief-the rear lot subdivision is already relief to the dimensional requirements, That's how I would interpret it he said.

Mr. Pelkey said but you have to go through the process of doing a subdivision in order to accomplish that. He said if you want to put a second dwelling on that lot then you have to go through the rear lot subdivision process.

Mr. Pimental said then go through the rear lot that would be your other option because we're not saying that you can't do it but you'd have to actually do the rear lot subdivision. He said in order for you to have 2 homes on the same lot without subdividing we have to be shown that it meets all dimensional.

He said someone could challenge that and say that the rear lot provision is still a subdivision but he would argue that it's already providing relief as a provision. If that ever shakes out, I guess we would see how it works he said.

Mr. Pelkey said they're not allowed to interpret those things anyway.

Mr. King said if he makes an interpretation and the resident didn't like that they can go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for an appeal of an administrative decision.

Drainage Study Update- Mr. Pimental said the Farmington Drainage Study Update is kicking off tomorrow so the folks from Tighe & Bond will be here, him, Highway Dept. Supervisor Ed Brannan, Town Administrator Ken Dickie and they also have someone participating from the Coastal Adaptation Workgroup where they have been involved with where this funding came from thru the Great Bay 20230 Initiative. He said Tighe & Bond submitted a final work plan with everything they're going to be doing so hopefully we will hear from them on what work has already been done, the review of the Jacob's plan that was done in 2011 and the next steps. He said he would keep the board apprized as they move forward with that.

ZBA Decision- Mr. Pimental said the ZBA made a decision at their March 7 meeting to approve an equitable waiver. He said we don't see a ton of those, it's usually a Variance or a Special Exception so for folks who may not know what an equitable waiver is it's usually for a dimensional requirement for something that wasn't intended.

He said there is a shed that existed in this case within the setback, the property owner didn't know about it and he replaced the shed in the same exact footprint. He said it was brought to the Code Enforcement Officer's attention that it was within the setback, he didn't know and they brought it to the ZBA for an equitable waiver. He said that also raised a question as to whether or not accessory structures should have different setbacks than principle (structures). That's something for this board to consider-right now we don't he said.

He said Mr. Lemere said what he has seen in other communities is that if it triggers a building permit then that's when the trigger is. He said 125 sq. ft. is what triggers a building permit and if it's less than that like a 10' x 10' shed let that be closer to the property line because in some of these smaller lots the setback is 15 ft. and that has an influence on a shed. It may be something we decide to take a look at moving forward is whether or not we want to differentiate between a principal structure like a house and treat a shed differently than that he said.

Mr. Pelkey said if the thing can fall over and hit the property then it's too close.

Mr. King asked what happens when that shed becomes a drum house.

Mr. Squires said he didn't think 10 ft. would drop the decibel level very much.

Mr. Pimental said it may be something that is looked at differently in different zoning districts. He said in this particular case the thought it was in Suburban area and the lots were close to each other but it's just something to think about. He said a lot of the conversation was they agreed to amicably solve the problem amongst themselves during the course of the meeting. He said the ZBA approved the equitable waiver but it was also with the condition because there was a second shed that was also in the setback, that one was actually over the property line. Mr. Fisher (who was also a ZBA member) said it crossed the property line and there's probably 10 sq. ft. of the other shed on her property and that's what triggered the whole thing all together but that's not how she filed her paperwork. He said at first several of them were thinking the old shed came down because it was rotted, it was on blocks and it was his responsibility to build in accordance with the codes and move it 15 ft. into his property. He said it was on blocks and it wasn't a permanent structure and there's nothing that would stop him and he thought that's the way the board was going-move it.

Mr. Fisher said but they got to talking and he said how about if I just move it 10 ft. and she said if you move the other shed 10 ft. off also and they talked back and forth, they agreed upon it so they gave them the equitable waiver because the neighbors worked it out and they're going to move 10 ft. off the property line instead of 15 ft. and there's also a bunch of trees between her property and his property so it's going to be screened.

Mr. Henry said another mechanism they need is for neighbors to say I don't care if he puts his shed there, I've got mine close to the line, he is going to put his close to the line, we're happy

and for people to agree and not be told by us how they can live next to each other.

Mr. Pimental said in an ideal world this would have been settled civilly without the need of the ZBA but they just weren't talking to each other so the ZBA acted as somewhat of a mediator and solved it for them. It worked out but it could have also probably been done differently he said.

Mr. Fisher said they were happy, the board was happy and it was his last meeting so he left on good terms.

Change of Use Approvals- Mr. Pimental said he wanted to start giving the board updates on when they have change of use approvals because it's important for the board to stay aware of on whether or not they want to continue with the sort of leeway that provides staff with approving some of these. He said this particular one was the old medical facility off of Rt. 11 someone had come in who was buying that and the proposed change was for a childcare facility at that location.

He said there are no changes to the exterior of the building, there are no changes to the parking, they got their DOT driveway permit which they made a condition and he put in the notes that all the conditions as part of their DOT permit had to have been met prior to any certificate of occupancy but in terms of that section in the zoning they met all of those requirements. He said they sent out abutters' letters, they waited 7 days to see if anybody would request a public hearing for more information and nobody did.

He said he wanted the board to be aware of that because that's a change and that they were thinking about 60 or 70 kids at that daycare facility and on Rt. 11 there's a Coast Bus stop that's right there so he didn't want these things to be approved at the staff level even though they're allowed to without the board being aware of them. He said if they feel something like this requires the board's input on it then that zoning needs to change because right now there are no exterior changes because they're not adding any units so it doesn't meet the threshold that is set in the zoning for it to come back through site plan in front of the board.

He said they are seeing a few more of these for buildings that aren't doing anything just the use is changing so they're approving them. He said when this happened, he wanted the board to be aware of it and he is going to continue to give them an update each time it happens.

Mr. Henry said this is great and he liked knowing when it happens if for nothing else when the public says the Town chases business and makes it hard for business and he can say well no as a matter of fact here's what going on. I like to know what's going on so I can share that and let people know we're not anti-business and we're making it easy for this to happen. I wish them luck and I think they'll be full before the doors open because there's a real demand for this service he said.

Mr. Pelkey said he was pretty pleased to see it because there is a great demand for childcare right now especially with some of the big ones that just closed. He said he was curious when he saw the plan that they have for what they're going to do on the ground obviously they have to have fencing installed with kids because of the proximity to Rt. 11

Mr. Pimental said the area that's in back will be a little playground area.

Mr. Pelkey said they'll need that to meet the state licensing requirements anyway but he didn't know if they brought that when they came in.

Mr. Pimental said they haven't seen that part of it yet but what they have seen is the traffic study that was provided by their engineer as part of their DOT driveway permit.

Mr. Pelkey said their traffic impacts will be, unlike the medical facility which was all day sporadic, theirs will be more concentrated in the morning and in the afternoon.

Mr. Henry said the DOT permit being a condition of approval was necessary because it's a very different traffic pattern.

Mr. Pimental said they'll make sure that anything off of Rt. 11 or a state road will have to require a driveway permit. He said if they were okay with this, he will continue to keep them posted on these.

Mr. Pelkey said he was okay with it and he was glad he brought it up so they had a chance to ask questions because when he first saw it, he wondered if they looked at this or that but they answered his questions.

Abbey Lane- Mr. Pimental said the Abbey Lane letter is currently at legal he wanted them to take a quick peek at it but it should go out next week. He said if folks want to see it, he is happy to share it but he spent some time tailoring it from the Board of Selectmen's memo and making it very clear to the applicants what happened, what precipitated this whole thing, what they've already done, the discussions they've had and how they've already changed the E-911 address that they may be unaware of that that has changed. He said they let them know that they made that change as well as the recommendation that they come forward and work together to submit an amended subdivision plan.

He said that letter has been drafted but he wanted Att. Keriann Roman or somebody to take a quick peek at it to make sure there wasn't anything in there that had any legal issues. He said as soon as he hears back from her, they will get those letters in the mail and if they hear back from that they want to participate in that. He said they let them know the board would likely waive fees and that they had recommended that this could cause some issues when selling the property because of the way their deeds are read on the road maintenance agreements that are in their deeds that maybe they didn't catch.

Mr. Henry added and who owns the road.

Mr. Pimental said they made the case that it's in their best interest to come forward and clean this up but they also made it clear that this is voluntary. Those letters will hopefully go out next week he said.

Auction of Town Owned Property- Mr. Pimental said this happened on Monday a decision at the Selectmen's level. He said the Town is in the midst of working with its auctioneer to sell off a bunch of Town owned properties and in that analysis, they're finding that there are some properties that have challenges. He said one of which that they found was there was a parcel that was between Farmington and Milton and that the parcel came across the line and it was categorized as 1 lot but it was broken out to 6a and 6b as part of the subdivision that was

approved. He said the 6a and 6b were really only for tax purposes the lot was all one but they needed to be able to tax the section that was in Farmington not the one that's Milton. He said in that subdivision that was in 1985 it clearly stated that the lot 6a and 6b should be conveyed together and are not to be subdivided into 2 separate lots. However, the Town of Milton decided to sell off 6b which was in Milton...

Mr. King asked if they owned the lot and took it through tax deed.

Mr. Pimental said that's correct but Milton used the Town line essentially as the boundary and it acted as a de-facto subdivision so when they sold it they cut off the piece in Farmington which has now created a lot that has no frontage and is just sort of this nebulous lot. He said the way our legal counsel has advised that we move forward to correct this is to go to the Milton Planning Board and request that the 1985 approval, the condition that's in there that says these lots cannot be conveyed separately be eliminated. He said once that happens it will clear up that title issue and the Town can proceed with selling that lot with that issue resolved.

Mr. Fisher said but there's no access to that lot.

Mr. Pimental said the lot right next to it the Town also owns which has frontage so the Town could merge these 2 together if they decide to do that and it would then have frontage. He said the other option is there is a property owner just to the south of this that is interested in buying that lot-not doing anything with it but they just don't want it to be developed, they could buy that lot.

He said it is up to the Selectmen on whether or not they want to do that or if they want to combine those 2 lots and sell the larger part off that actually has frontage that might have more value. He said that's entirely up to them and what we needed to do was fix the title issue so the lot can be sold.

Mr. Henry asked when the subdivision was done, did Milton have to approve the subdivision as well and was their Planning Board involved or was it purely approved by Farmington for land that wasn't in Farmington. He asked who approved the original subdivision, Milton and Farmington or just Farmington.

Mr. Pimental said that's a good question because the subdivision says Milton and Farmington but it's signed by Thomas Moran in 1980 so he didn't know if that rings any bells. He said it's unclear from the subdivision because it says the plans for Roy H. Borden and Irene Head, Milton and Farmington, July 3, 1979. He said it's signed but it doesn't say Farmington Planning Board or Milton it just says Thomas Moran.

Mr. King asked if it was in 1979 or 1980.

Mr. Pimental said the plan is 1979 when it was actually approved was December 19, 1980.

Mr. King said the Town adopted zoning in 1979 so it may have been when we didn't have an active Planning Board.

Mr. Henry asked who would have approved subdivisions and stuff.

Mr. King said before that he believes it would just be the state.

Mr. Pelkey asked if there was no Selectmen action back then.

Mr. King said he wasn't sure.

Mr. Henry asked Mr. Pimental what he needed from them to clean it up.

Mr. Pimental said nothing other than just to be aware that they're doing that.

Mr. King said and that may take months.

Mr. Pimental then read from his computer that the subdivision was approved by the Milton Planning Board. He said the 1980 plan was the parent parcel, the 34 acres. He said it wasn't actually subdivided until 1984 so that was signed on Oct. 30, 1984 and that's approved by the Milton Planning Board and the survey and subdivision was provided by Randy Orvis that shows lot 6 crossed into the boundary and saying that those 2 lots, even though they're not 2 lots, they needed to be conveyed together even though they had different names for tax purposes. Mr. Henry said they're 2 lots now though.

Mr. King said the other remedy is to say that should have gone with that lot, we're owed back taxes on it and asked if somebody made good on the taxes does the Town offer it to the people that should have gotten it and if Milton sold that in 2021.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't know when they sold it.

Mr. King said he didn't know when we took it for taxes.

Mr. Henry said but they only bought their portion and only made good on the taxes for their portion.

Mr. King said but if you wanted to stay with the intent of what the original was you would say it was potentially for the board to consider based upon how it happened. He said they talked about this a little bit last night and gave the approval to try to resolve it, either way it has to get resolved and clarified before we do anything.

Mr. Henry said if that happened, if they say we appreciate your first offer we're going to pay the taxes we'll take it then the fact that they need to be conveyed together could stay in effect.

Mr. King said it still has to be conveyed because we own it we took it. The Town owns it we took it thru tax deed so we own it so we'd have to convey it to them back into 1 parcel in 2 different towns he said.

Mr. Henry asked if that covenant requirement essentially dissolved or would it be reinstated if ownership of the parcels were the same again.

Mr. Pimental said he didn't know and they were going to move forward with trying to get this as it's separated and they're going to eliminate that and then the Town can decide how they want to move forward with that lot whether it's going to get combined with the abutting lot that the Town owns or if they're going to be sold separately. He said that's not his decision that's the Selectmen's we're just going to clean it up and then let the Selectmen know.

He said the other thing he is waiting on and he talked to Mr. Dickie about this today and he thinks this is important. He said that we asked that Milton waive all of the fees. He said we may still have to pay for the abutters' notices, there may not be a way around that piece but all the application fees and everything else we've asked for them to waive. He said if they say no to that, they're not going to move forward with the application they will bring it back to the board

to decide.

Mr. King asked what potentially could be the application fees.

Mr. Pimental said he thought it would be a couple of hundred bucks maybe.

Mr. King said if it's unresolved the Town can't sell the property. He said we're saying it's unresolved now but maybe they could get a legal opinion that says it's unresolved but you can still sell it.

Mr. Pimental said Mr. Dickie just wants to bring it back to the board and say Milton has denied waiving the fees and ask if they still want to move forward with that.

Mr. King said he thought it's unlikely and they may have to pay for the abutters' notices which are required and has costs that they can't really waive. He said he hasn't seen in the past where neighboring towns haven't worked together but if the Town has to say we need to spend a few hundred extra dollars to clear this up we're probably going to do it because of the value of the property and the Selectmen want to get some of these properties back on the tax rolls. He said the list they went over had some lots that needed to be straightened out but there are a bunch of other ones that are going to be sold because we put them back on the tax rolls and use the revenue to offset some of the costs that we have.

Mr. Henry asked how big the 6a lot is.

Mr. Pimental said it's 3.9 acres. He said when you combine it to the other lot, the other lot is significantly bigger (8.5 acres) and it has a small piece of frontage off of Charles Street.

Addressing Housing Needs Presentation-Mr. Pelkey said next week on Wednesday Mr. Pimental would be having guests to Farmington to talk about some things that we're doing here in Farmington to address housing needs and charges in this state. He said people from all over the state are coming and Mr. Pimental is going to be putting on a show.

Mr. Pimental said it's a virtual meeting and it's just a presentation.

Mr. Pelkey said if you're interested let Kyle know and he will send you an invitation to the Zoom meeting scheduled to take place from 12 to 1 p.m. on March 27th. He asked him to put that out to the board members and added that he will be hanging on every word. It's another opportunity for Kyle to make Farmington shine he said.

Mr. Pimental said that's the goal.

Mr. Fisher said it's been fun gentlemen and he really enjoyed working with each and every one of them. He said he'll still be watching and he might even come up here and sit if he is bored or would watch it at home. He wished them the best and said they have done a lot of work for Farmington these past few years and we've gotten some things changed and corrected that he thinks are for the better of Farmington. I look forward to seeing what's coming up for the next vote next March he said.

We thank you Bill for sure and we enjoyed working with you Mr. Pelkey said.

9). Adjournment:

Motion: (Fisher, second King) to adjourn the meeting passed 5-0 at 7:34 p.m..

Mr. Fisher then said "Good Night Farmington".

Kathleen Magoon
Recording Secretary

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Pelkey", written over a horizontal line.

Richard "Rick" Pelkey, Chairman

