

Town of Farmington  
Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, August 7, 2018

**Board Members Present:**

David Kestner, Chairman  
Martin Laferte, Vice Chairman  
Bill Fisher, Secretary  
Stephen Henry  
Charlie King  
Rick Pelkey  
TJ Place, Selectmen's Rep.

**Board Members Absent:**

Brandy Sanger, Alternate

**Others Present:**

Dan DeSantis, Town Planner  
Kelly Heon, Assessing Clerk  
Chad Roberge, Avitar Associates  
Mary Pinkham-Langer, NH Dept. of  
Revenue Administration Gravel Tax  
Appraiser  
Stuart Arnett, ADG Development  
Group

**BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD:**

**Call to Order:**

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

**Pledge of Allegiance:**

All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Review Meeting Minutes:**

July 17, 2018 – No errors or omissions

**Motion:** (King, second Laferte) to accept the minutes as written passed 7-0.

**Discussion with Assessing:**

**A). Excavation** – Map **R35, Lot 007, Paulson Road** – Mr. Roberge said that a pit owned by Pike Industries is supposed to be reclaimed but has not actually been reclaimed. He asked if the reclamation will be enforced, if the pit will be left open or if there is some issue with the pit. Ms. Pinkham-Langer said she went through the files with assistance from Mr. DeSantis and anything inconsistent or wrong with the pits was noted. A letter was drafted and sent out to property owners with specific information pertaining to the problems with the pits and what needed to be done she said.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the permit for this pit expired in 2015 and they have continued to file a Notice of Intent to Excavate but nothing is happening at the site. She said that after receiving the letter they said that their plan is to reclaim the pit but RSA 155-E: 5 states that the excavation shall be reclaimed within 12 months from when the permit expires or when the excavation ceases. If the Town does not stay on top of it and force the issue nothing is going to happen she said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if the owner has ever requested an extension.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said she was not aware of any request for an extension and that RSA 155-E: 8 states that every permit must have an expiration date and there is nothing in the statute that says the board can grant a renewal or an extension. The owner must go back through the whole process which involves abutter notification, updated maps, etc. she said.

Mr. King said there was a motion by the board to draft a letter to Pike and asked if the letter was sent out.

Mr. DeSantis said a letter was sent to Pike but there was no response. He said the authority to enforce the regulations does not lie with him but with the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO). He said all he can do is communicate the matter to the CEO.

Mr. King said Pike's approval was very specific as to what the conditions were and when the time period was to reclaim. We sent them a letter and they did not respond he said.

**Motion:** (King, second Fisher) to request that the Code Enforcement Officer send a certified letter of non-compliance to Pike Industries and to cc the letter to the Board of Selectmen and Mr. DeSantis;

**Discussion:** Mr. King said if they need to come back to the board for a compliance hearing then that is what they need to do.

Mr. Kestner said they should go a step further and not only have the CEO go after them but to also request a letter co-signed by the Selectmen to put them on notice that their excavation permit has expired and that per the RSA's they need to get started on the reclamation.

Mr. King said this should have been done 2 years ago. The last time we had issues with them it took a lot of "corralling" to get them in here to get them into compliance and it will probably be the same way this time he said.

Mrs. Heon said there has been some staff turnover at Pike and that someone from Pike did come into the office.

Mr. DeSantis said he did not come in to respond to this specific issue or to respond to the letters sent to Pike. He said the man claimed that Pike is double bonded on a couple of their properties and that he is researching the matter.

Mr. Henry asked what reclamation looks like.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said unless there is something specifically included in the permit, there are minimum reclamation standards under RSA 155-E: 5 which states that where the slopes have been excavated they will be brought to a state of natural repose for the type of soil there, suitable of sustaining growth and with no erosion. A good percentage of that pit has naturally reclaimed itself but there are other areas that need to be reclaimed and the plan has to be approved by the Planning Board she said.

Mr. Pelkey said that the Town's Site Reclamation Standards are found on Page 8, Section X of the Earth Removal Regulations.

Mr. Pelkey asked if Pike refuses to bring the site into compliance if the Town can do the work

and bill the property owner.

Mr. Kestner said the Town does have that opportunity.

Mr. King said he did not think the Town has ever done that or that it is normal for towns to do so and it ends up in litigation.

Chairman Kestner said the first step is a certified letter putting them on notice for non-compliance. Even though they have had a change of players at Pike Industries someone will have a file there they came pull up and address the issue appropriately he said.

Mr. Henry said the regulations require the submittal of a performance bond and asked if there is a bond on this pit.

Mr. DeSantis said he did not know about the bonds and that he has not heard from them since they requested the meeting to discuss the potential double bonds issue.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said if there is a bond for this pit and it is still active the Town could include in the non-compliance letter that if they don't respond the Town will call the bond.

**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. DeSantis said he will research the status of the bond, communicate the board's action to the CEO and also cc the letter to the Town Administrator and Town Attorney.

**Map R03, Lot 02** - Mr. Roberge said the second issue involves a Pike lot which was excavated by an adjacent lot owner. The Town notified Pike and then Pike sent a cease and desist letter to the adjacent lot owner who has stopped the process. He said the pit had been reclaimed but now needs to be reclaimed again and asked about the reclamation process for this situation.

Mr. DeSantis said he received a copy of the cease and desist order and sent a letter asking about the reclamation plans but did not receive a response from the pit owner. He said he did not know who will be responsible for the reclamation and advised the board not to get into the middle of this issue as it will probably end up dragging the Town into court.

Mr. King asked if Mr. Bradsher has refused to reclaim the pit the owned by Pike.

Mr. DeSantis said Mr. Bradsher was told he was claiming a Pike pit and stopped work for about a week and then started back up again. That's when Pike's lawyer got involved and sent Mr. Bradsher the cease and desist letter he said.

Mr. Pelkey asked if Mr. Bradsher was violating his state permit by excavating on someone else's property and if there are any state penalties for this action.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the parcel was owned by Pike for many years and in 1998 they reclaimed the property. She said it then sat there for years and around the time that Mr. Bradsher bought the abutting properties, in 2012 or 2014, disturbance to this lot had begun. She said she notified the Town there was excavation on this lot and no Intent to Excavate was filed and asked who owns the property. It was determined that Pike owns the property so they were notified and said they had no idea someone was excavating on their property she said.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said Pike was told they needed to file the Intent to Excavate forms on the property for all the years when material was removed from the site even though Mr. Bradsher

was the one removing the materials and they did so. She said Pike and Mr. Bradsher were talking about Mr. Bradsher purchasing the property but she didn't know the results of the talks. Mr. DeSantis said the talks fell apart.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the property owner is responsible and in her opinion it is the Town's position to say the excavation has occurred on Pike's property, it was not legal and we want it reclaimed. She said under RSA 155-E the Town also has the ability to issue a cease and desist order on the property through the CEO but she was not sure if it should be issued to both parties involved and advised the board to consult with the Town Attorney on the matter. She added that the Dept. of Revenue can issue a cease and desist order on the property for non-compliance but the Town must take action first.

**Motion:** (King, second Henry) to request that Town Counsel and Code Enforcement issue cease and desist orders to both Malcolm Bradsher and Pike Industries on this parcel, Map R03, Lot 02 if they feel that we're legally able to issue cease and desist orders to both of them;

**Discussion:** Mr. Henry said he was going to recommend they seek the advice of the CEO and the Attorney and ask if they felt it was it was advisable to send the letter.

Mr. King requested that Mr. DeSantis communicate the board's motion to staff and if they feel it is correct to proceed then they should proceed.

Mr. DeSantis said he has no authority to enforce it and he will communicate the motion to the CEO and the Town's lawyer.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the other aspect of this issue is the reclamation and there are/were people actively excavating on the property and asked how the board planned to address it.

Mr. Pelkey asked if Mr. Bradsher has a permit to do the excavation.

Mr. King said he has a permit to excavate on his own parcel but this is not his parcel.

Mr. Pelkey said Mr. Bradsher is violating the terms of the permit the board gave him.

Mr. Kestner said Mr. Bradsher is intruding on Pike's property and the board currently has no authority on the violation of his neighbor's property. He said the first step is to get advice from the attorney about getting a certified letter to both parties involved and then address the reclamation issue.

Mr. DeSantis repeated his concerns about the taxpayers paying for expensive litigation because both parties will deny responsibility and the matter will have to go to court to be resolved.

Mr. Laferte said Page 14 of the Earth Removal Regulations, Section XVI, A-1 says a permit is only issued to the property owner and is not transferable without written consent of the board.

Mr. Kestner said Mr. Bradsher is on the property with no permit so they are beyond that step.

**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Henry asked if the taxes have been paid on the gravel being removed from the Pike parcel.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said that Mr. Bradsher had reported the excavated earth on the parcel located across the river from a Town well on the Intent to Excavate forms that were filed. He thought that it was all part of his parcel but in reality it was Pike's property. The money has

been paid and he is up to date on the taxes.

Mrs. Heon said Mr. Bradsher was reporting all along but was reporting on the wrong parcel but they have the billing straightened out now. Mr. Bradsher said he was confused about where the boundaries were when he purchased the property and that he didn't know that parcel was not part of his property she said.

Mr. Henry asked if it would make sense to give the pit owner the opportunity to apply for an excavation permit instead of jumping right to requiring reclamation of the site. He said if there is material with commercial value there Pike could then decide whether to sell the land, let Bradsher excavate it as their agent or to excavate it themselves. The damage has been done as far as re-opening the pit he said.

Mr. DeSantis said he didn't think that was within their planning purview.

Chairman Kestner asked who they would give the permit to.

Mr. Henry said they would have to give the permit to Pike as they own the property.

Mr. Kestner said Pike will not take the permit because they are not excavating there. He said that until there is some legal opinion on this matter he didn't think the board could jump to deciding who is responsible for the Intent to Excavate and a reclamation plan.

Mr. Henry said the property owner is responsible for those things and whether they go after Mr. Bradsher or sell the property to him is out of the board's jurisdiction and up to them.

Mr. Kestner said the board should not enter in as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party in this situation at this time.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer advised the board to consult with an attorney about how to proceed.

Mr. Pelkey asked if once the parties have been notified it is out of the Planning Board's hands and into CEO's hands.

Mr. Kestner said it is then in the CEO's and the Attorney's hands.

Mr. Henry said the acceptable remedies are after that.

**Map R14, Lot 12** – Ms. Pinkham-Langer said Mr. Bradsher owns and excavates on this property and is not in compliance with the plans. She said he is within the 150' setback of the existing house on an abutting lot and he indicated he would talk to the homeowner's son about the encroachment. We indicated at the meeting if the owner is agreeable there must be some kind of written agreement between the owner and Mr. Bradsher pertaining to this issue she said. Ms. Pinkham-Langer said there are also some other issues with the plan, one of them being where the excavation occurred in relation to the seasonal high water table because there are restrictions on how deep you can go.

Some members said that a letter had been sent out regarding this property as well.

Mr. DeSantis said that the abutter came into the office and said he doesn't have a problem with the excavation but he did not receive a written agreement between the 2 parties.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said she was not involved in that meeting and was not aware of this and that it would behoove the Town to have a written agreement and that the plan has to be revised. There is a minimum 10 foot setback by an agreeable abutter and a 50 foot setback for a



disapproving abutter and right now the plans shows a 50 foot setback so you have to have a new plan she said.

Mr. DeSantis asked if they have the authority to prohibit Mr. Bradsher from doing any more work in the Town of Farmington.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the Town does not have that authority. When a plan has been changed so that it affects the rate of removal or the reclamation plan there has to be a re-hearing on that. She said these items and what needs to be done have been discussed previously and she did not know what happened after that.

She said she will not be coming back again to straighten this out so she wanted to make sure the work that was done years ago and the work that was just done does not get buried. Certain things have to be done in accordance with the law. If Mr. Bradsher and the abutter have come to an agreement then the reclamation plan has changed and a new plan has to be done to show that she said.

Chairman Kestner said there is a similar issue of non-compliance in regards to this parcel.

Mr. King said if Mr. Bradsher is deviating from his excavation permit then he needs to get an amended permit.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said he needs an amended site plan approved by the board.

Mr. Henry asked if the Town could say the setback is 50' whether or not it is agreeable to the abutter.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said the Town could do that for permitting purposes but the encroachment has already happened. She said this parcel was grandfathered so it wasn't permitted but it does have a reclamation plan which is required.

Mr. King asked if they could recommend that Mr. Bradsher come before the board to amend his approval and provide all of the required information and the agreement for an amended excavation permit.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said there is no permit because the lot is grandfathered but the reclamation plan needs to be adjusted. Grandfathered pits must comply with the minimum standards as set forth in RSA 155-E and part of that is to supply a reclamation plan for those areas not yet excavated and that is what is on file. That plan does not now reflect the actual excavation as he is not within what was approved by the Planning Board she said.

**Motion:** (King, second Henry) to request that Code Enforcement send a letter to Malcolm Bradsher regarding the non-compliance to his reclamation plan for Map R14, Lot 12 citing the encroachment to the setback of the abutter and putting him on notice of the options he has to either to come back before the board for an amended reclamation plan or to restore the parcel back to the previous approval condition;

**Discussion:** Mr. Pelkey asked if the reclamation plan would have to address that his excavation went below the level he was approved for.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said it is unknown what the excavation level to the seasonal high water

table is. There were no tests pits results at the meeting she attended so it is unknown if he is above or below where he was supposed to be at that point.

**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer said that on one of the other Pike properties the plans indicated that the test pit they had done was done on an upper level and the actual excavation was occurring at a lower level so the test pit did not necessarily reflect the location of the excavation in relation to the water table. She said she did not know if this issue was ever addressed.

Mr. DeSantis said he has not received any response regarding this issue.

Ms. Pinkham-Langer suggested the letters that were sent out be reviewed and if no responses were received they need to be followed up on.

Mr. DeSantis said he would go through the files.

Mr. Kestner thanked Ms. Pinkham-Langer for her expertise.

**Motion:** (Kestner, second Laferte) to take a 5 minute recess passed unanimously at 6:55 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:08 p.m.

**B). Zoning -** Mr. Roberge said there are some neighborhoods in town where you have neighboring parcels in 2 different zones in the same neighborhood which can create a problem in assessing because of the potential different land values and for allowed uses. He said once such neighborhood is on Pine Knoll where 5 of the lots are zoned as Urban and the rest are in the Suburban zone.

Mrs. Heon pointed out on a map how the Urban Residential Zone “fingers out” up to into the Cameron’s development splitting some of the area into 2 zones.

She said the same thing occurs in Farmington Ridge on Ivy Lane where there are a few lots in the Urban Zone and a few lots in the Suburban Zone. She said there a few places in town where this happens and they wanted to bring it to the board’s attention.

Mr. Fisher recused himself from the board after finding that one of the zones goes through his property.

Mrs. Heon said they were aware that the Planning Board sometimes makes recommendations for zoning changes and wanted to bring the information forward in time to propose a warrant article for Town Meeting if they chose to do so.

Mr. King suggested Mrs. Heon and Mr. Roberge meet with Mr. DeSantis about this issue and if Mr. DeSantis would like to make a recommendation to the board they could consider it.

Mr. Pelkey said he would like to see a little specificity about the lots they were talking about.

Mr. DeSantis said he would speak with Mr. Roberge and suggested they do a land use analysis of the areas in town where this has occurred.

### **ADG Development Group Project Update**

Mr. Arnett gave the board copies of some background information on the Project Team at ADG, LLC, their mission statement and the results of the preliminary review of the 2005 Master Plan. They are working on 2 projects which may affect the zoning going down the road he said.

He said one project is a PLAN NH Housing Finance Authority funded project where ADG was selected by the RFP process to look at the downtown and come up with suggestions for an overlay or zoning changes. We wanted to convince everyone of what this area can be and to demonstrate how a new way of thinking about mixing some things together could create more vitality downtown he said.

Mr. Arnett said they are putting together a proposal based on a market analysis, a site analysis, potential funding sources and a fairly extensive interview outreach process led by the UNH Cooperative Extension parallel to this process.

He said they plan to have the proposed zoning changes completed by December so it can be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board and Selectmen in time for submission to the warrant for the 2019 Town Meeting in March.

Mr. Arnett said his group has also been contracted to work on the 2005 Master Plan revision over a 2 year period. He said the memo received by the board contains a preliminary review of the plan's vision and goals by chapter for the first 4 chapters and they will need to know what goals have been accomplished and are still outstanding but still relevant and should be included in the new plan.

He said the same process will happen for the remaining chapters which will be received in Sept. and they also plan to recommend the addition of some new chapters to the plan. That process will happen between now and Sept 2019 he said.

Chairman Kestner suggested they plan for a November completion date for the proposed zoning changes because the Planning Board must hold 2 Public Hearings on the matter and submit warrant articles at least 90 days before Town Meeting (by mid-Dec.). He added that the board only meets twice a month with the exception of Sept. due to Labor Day.

Mr. Arnett then made the following presentation:

**Power Point Presentation: Farmington Downtown Project Site Analysis June 2018**

Site Identification- the project site is centrally located within Farmington and was formerly the location of the town's fire station.

Downtown Location – the project site's downtown location places it within easy walking distance of many amenities including ball fields, the Post Office and a bank

The Site- the project site consists of 3 parcels all owned by the Town (Map U06, Lots 022, 023 and 025). Mr. Arnett added that the Green house located on an adjacent property has gone into foreclosure and could be an asset or detriment to the project depending on whether a compatible non-compatible use exists on that lot.

Major features- parking lot, Park and Ride, Coast bus stop, access out to Garfield Street, right-of-way access to the landlocked parcel

Site Analysis- the site is relatively flat, has internal storm drains, the north side has trapped water which must be addressed before a wetlands area is created

Street Right-of-Way- 2 are recorded on the property line as you enter the site so they must be



maintained, a dotted line depicts a verbal access easement into a landlocked parcel across the alley way

Photos- 3 of the rear of the lot depicting the drainage issue, 3 of the location of the verbal easement access to Lot 021 which was not recorded but has long been used and there is no other way to that lot other than the easement.

Initial Thoughts- Traffic and parking- sight lines south and north, 2 accesses, shared parking sites close by, Farmington as a destination- off the beaten path for traffic but significant traffic in the area with disposal income, destination, theme, brand, a larger site and site control, who will be the developer-private or public or both and photos of White River Junction, Vermont

Site Access/Egress- the site is currently accessed off Main Street. A gravel drive provides access off of Garfield Street. Egress onto Main Street is dangerous due to poor sight lines for traffic coming from the south along Main Street. Observed traffic speeds varied but it is estimated traffic generally travels at between 30-40 mph. This is a concern in the downtown area where there is a high percentage of pedestrians. But even if traffic traveled at 25 mph egress onto Main Street from the existing curb cut is considered dangerous.

Easements- to ensure safe access from the project site it is recommended that the existing curb cut on Main Street be shifted to the north to provide adequate sight lines for traffic coming from the south. However, a strong consideration should be given to limiting access and egress to Garfield Street where safe sight lines are easily achieved.

Photos - looking south and north along Main St.

Potential Downtown Parking Agreements- there are 4 sites (Union Telephone, TD Bank, Peaslee properties and the US Post Office) with potential for developing a shared parking agreement to augment downtown parking. Each would offer some challenges but if the downtown does revitalize parking will become an issue. Planting the seeds for future solutions might not be a bad idea. Mr. Arnett said the idea is to have people park once and visit 5 sites rather than parking 5 times to visit those sites.

Thoughts-Connecting Things by Pathways- recreational trails and amenities are close but disjointed, a path system is easy to envision- summer night socials, child bike rides, Halloween fright nights, families with strollers and lower mobility walkers.

Designated Downtown Walking Loop- preliminary map of the project site surrounded by a proposed walking loop from the golf course area, past the ball fields, the cemetery, the levee, and then to downtown or to a shared use proposed bike path/walkway to the school district property. Mr. Arnett said UNH co-op has brought in graduate students to walk the paths and better define the locations and elevations of the paths through use of the GPS tracking system. Amenities could include restrooms, baby changing sites, benches, water coolers, shade, restaurants and ice cream shops he said.

Mr. Henry asked if they were envisioning the use of eminent domain for anything here.

Mr. Arnett said they don't plan to use eminent domain as it is slow, costly and doesn't work.

Mr. Fisher said the new McCarthy Trail comes close to proposed downtown loop and they are looking at extending the trail up to the 500 Boys and Girls Club property on Paulson Road. He said one big problem for the loop is that The Army Corps of Engineers control the use of the levee and they are not allowing it to be used for anything. If there is any damage to the levee they could pull their funding for the Town's flood plain protection in the area he said.

Mr. Arnett said he was not surprised to hear it and they would look at someplace other than the levee.

Mr. Arnett said the end product will be something the Town can market the site with and will contain low, middle and high impact development uses for the site with all of the concepts having some mix of parking, retail and maybe housing. He said at Hay Day there will be 3 conceptual posters showing the low, middle and high impact uses, some concept photos and some examples of the language for the zoning change options at the Town booth.

Mr. Fisher said the Selectmen approved distribution of handouts from the Steering Committee at Hay Day at their last meeting.

Mr. Arnett said they suggest that the new development be sidewalk oriented which will require a zoning change. He said putting development at the rear of the lot is a bad idea because it is harder for police to patrol, people don't like to walk into deep areas and tend to get lost while doing so. He suggested the housing and parking should be behind the retail space.

Mr. Kestner said he thought the project would be a 2-3 story mixed use operation and that Mr. Arnett had only mentioned single family cottage style homes behind the retail sites.

Mr. Arnett said that is one of the 3 options he mentioned and explained that the low impact/low cost option would consist of 1 floor retail with just parking in the rear, the middle impact/middle cost option would have 1 floor retail and cottage homes in the rear and the high impact/high cost option would consist of first floor retail space, residential space on the second floor and multi-floor residential spaces in the back.

He said they will not be showing what they think are bad ideas such as the "big box" retailer, a stand-alone community center as the last thing you need is another publically owned/maintained building that is used a day and a half a week and takes up one of your prime spaces downtown or just a pure green space or park because it will be used as a dog run and a place to have beverages late at night. It's too deep, too hard to see into and it would be a shame to turn it into a single purpose box or a piece of turf he said.

Mr. Kestner asked if they were considering an overlay for the Village Center as this almost sounds like spot zoning.

Mr. Arnett said they have been considering both an overlay and to revise the zoning.

Mr. Kestner asked if the zoning changes would include the entire downtown or just the old fire house parcel.

Mr. Arnett said he did not know the answer to that question yet.

Mr. Henry said it is already a Village Center zone that is fairly small when it comes to zoning.

Mr. Kestner said the square footage/setback requirements are quite different and was the reason he asked if an overlay or a complete change to the Village Center zoning was being considered.

Mr. Arnett said that Will Parker will be writing the proposed zoning language and he will want to listen to what the board has to say about it first.

Mr. Fisher said he wanted everyone to understand that the process is in its very initial stages. He said they hoped to get more input from people at their booth on Hay Day which will be located near the TD Bank. We want everybody to come by the booth and tell us what they want to see for the downtown and at the old fire station lot he said.

Mr. Arnett said there will also be more public outreach at the Community Forum scheduled for Oct. 10 at the Public Safety Building.

Chairman Kestner and Mr. Arnett then discussed meeting dates and the possible agendas for the September and October meetings.

Mr. Arnett suggested they plan to discuss the potential zoning changes and the memo on the revision to the Master Plan in October. He said they will be sending information on the suggested zoning language to the board between now and the next meeting.

Chairman Kestner asked the board members to revisit the Village Center zoning ordinances and the preliminary review of the Master Plan in preparation for the upcoming meetings.

#### **Correspondence:**

Mr. Kestner asked about the copy of the FEMA letter that was included in the board member's packets.

Mr. DeSantis the letter was sent to the Selectmen and they sent it to the Planning Board regarding a flood risk review and when there will be meetings regarding Farmington. The Farmington meeting is scheduled from 10 to 11 a.m. on Aug. 21 he said.

Chairman Kestner asked if someone would be attending the meeting on behalf of the Selectmen.

Mr. Place said he did not know.

Mr. Kestner asked if Mr. DeSantis has seen any revised maps concerning the hazard analysis.

Mr. DeSantis said he has not seen any new maps regarding this issue.

There were no board members available to attend the meeting.

#### **Any Other Business before the Board:**

Mr. Henry said there have not been any alternate board members at the board meetings for quite some time and asked if there are bylaws or state laws regarding member's attendance at meetings and if those rules apply to alternate members.

Mr. King said the board visited this issue about 4 or 5 years ago and that alternates are expected to be in attendance at board meetings. He suggested they review the rules of procedure and to request that the Town post a request for alternate members to the board.

Chairman Kestner asked the members to read the rules of procedure for discussion at the next board meeting.

**Adjournment:**

**Motion:** (Laferte, second Henry) to adjourn the meeting passed unanimously at 8 p.m.

Respectively submitted

Kathleen Magoon

Recording Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Kestner, Chairman