

# **TOWN OF EAST KINGSTON PLANNING BOARD**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

June 15, 2023

Pound School  
41 Depot Road  
East Kingston, New Hampshire

Josh Bath, Chair  
Tim Allen, Vice Chair  
7:00PM

### **AGENDA**

Steve Morrison – 1 Main Street – Site Plan Review – Public Hearing (Case# 2023-08)  
Alexa Comerci – 10 Squire Way – Invisible Home Occupation (Case# 2023-04)  
George Whitman JR - 18 Rowell Road – Invisible Home Occupation (Case# 2023-07)  
Jennifer Silver – 27 Joslin Road – Invisible Home Occupation (Case# 2023-09)  
NH Housing Needs Assessment Project

Board Members Present: Tim Allen – Vice Chair, Josh Bath - Chair, Ellie Cornoni, Bob Nigrello – Ex-Officio, and Janet Smith (7:15pm).

Others Present: Victoria Healey – RPC Planner, Jennifer Rowden – RPC Land Use Program Manager, Matt Gallant – Deputy Fire Chief, Julie LaBranche (NH Housing Grant Planning Consultant), Nick and Alexa Comerci, Jennifer Silver, Steve Morrison, and Dan Bodwell.

Chairman Bath opened the meeting at 7:00pm followed by the roll call. He then modified the order of the agenda to allow for Grant Planner Julie LaBranche to present an update on the NH Housing Needs Assessment Project.

### **NH HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROJECT**

Planner LaBranche began her presentation by distributing copies of the project timeline and the NH Housing Needs Assessment survey and findings which was conducted both online (town website, town Facebook page) and in paper copies (town offices, library) and reviewing her memo to the Planning Board dated June 12, 2023.

She reported there were 45 responses to the survey, with six responders expressing an interest in serving on a housing needs discussion group which would be convening after the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday in which both the members of the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen will be invited. The regulatory phase is slated from July through August which will focus on selected topics and supporting informational materials.

With respect to the timeline, the starting time of the project was pushed back a month because contracts were not yet signed; thus, instead of a March start time, the project began in April. She does not anticipate the delay in the start time to affect the deadlines associated with the project. Fielding board questions, she noted the color codes to the timeline were delineated by task. She also noted no one from the board has yet taken advantage of the housing training opportunities offered by the state. There may be one or two sessions left; some in person and some online with the possibility that the \$250 stipend could still be issued should an individual demonstrate they have read all the materials associated with the training.

Planner LaBranche then reviewed the survey results beginning with survey question number 11 as it allowed survey responders to provide additional thoughts or comments about housing in East Kingston. A common theme in the comments related to preserving the rural character of the town.

Questions 1-10 responses were then reviewed with some relating to zoning, extended family living situations and those working from home. She spoke to combining responses for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in both attached and detached dwelling designs with 61% in favor of increasing the number of units in town; 60% not in favor of increasing

the 2-acre minimum to accommodate more housing units; and 66% not in favor of changes to the zoning to permit more multifamily units.

Planner LaBranche then offered to provide narrative content for the responses so that the layperson can understand the context of the questions as it relates to the zoning regulations on the book, and the implications of that change/initiative. She would have something out to board members next week with a goal of a draft for the July meeting. Since the survey would also be part of the completed housing needs assessment report, the content narrative would be useful.

Vice Chair Allen spoke to questions 6 and 7 noting the results of both 60% and 66% respectively, translate to the desire of keeping to a 2-acre lot minimum but tweaking the ordinance to allow for ADUs on the property.

Mr. Nigrello noted that the survey resulted in 45 responses out of 1200 households and 2200 residents. All seem to be leaning towards not making any changes to the zoning.

Planning LaBranche noted the survey expired on May 26<sup>th</sup>. She then spoke to question number 6 noting the responses did not accurately reflect the question and then reiterated her plan to provide narrative content. Going back to question 11 (comments) she noted comments about the high tax rate and not allowing for section 8 subsidized housing which caused her to think there is a misconception about what affordable workforce housing is – it is not subsidized housing. Board members concurred that this was not the intent nor is there an interest in these types of housing opportunities. Planner LaBranche also noted an interest in tiny houses and duplexes. She will now look to the National Resources and Inventory for some data in preserving the natural resources and its conclusions as well as zoning maximums (insert the town's zoning maps) to show the majority of the town is residential/rural agricultural.

She stated she is also pulling together some barebones statistics that will be included in the draft document in July, and she is working on the Regulatory Audit and will provide some recommendations since she is very familiar with the town's zoning. She would also like the board to be thinking about applying for phase 3 of the grant as the audit will likely yield some suggestions of how the phase 3 monies can be used. She will also look into how flexible the state will be on how the phase 3 monies can be used.

She will send out the narrative work in the next week or so for board members to provide comments in time for a draft document in July with final version completed by September.

Vice Chair Allen noted the data from the survey is very good and would have liked to have seen more responses. Planner LaBranche stated the discussion groups will be held in July and August along with a public event that might solicit more public input.

Discussion ensued on how other states mandate housing quotas while the State of New Hampshire seems to be working to get community buy-in by way of the grant incentives and that the NH Fair Share Housing Table is not attainable for a small community like East Kingston.

Vice Chair Allen inquired if ADU under affordable housing need to be owned or rented as it seems no one wants to touch density housing but ADUs would be okay – would these types of units meet affordable housing quotas?

Planner LaBranche responded they might; but affordable housing has to do with pricing and has to be contained within the parameters of the rental market. The cost of constructing an ADU (outside of a typical over the garage/in the basement models) may be cost prohibitive as it takes too long for the property owner to recoup the cost.

Resident Dan Bodwell spoke to the comments made about East Kingston being mostly residential/agricultural in that as a resident for the past 58 years, he sees the town being mostly residential and not favorable to farming. He noted a few standing farms in town (Monahan's, Marston's, his own) but that towns and the federal government are working against the farmer – the typical New England farmer has a difficult time. He thinks calling East Kingston an agricultural community is misleading. He then inquired about provisions for solar farms.

Chairman Bath offered to invite Mr. Bodwell to the next board meeting to discuss the matter further as there was a full agenda at hand. Mr. Bodwell accepted the invitation.

#### **STEVEN MORRISON – 1 MAIN STREET – SITE PLAN REVIEW PROPOSAL – MBL# 09-07-01 (Case # 2023-08)**

Chairman Bath opened the public hearing on Mr. Morrison's proposal to operate a commercial business (Middleton Supply LLC) in the town center district located at 1 Main Street, MBL# 09-07-01 at 7:32pm. Mr. Morrison is seeking approval to operate a grain/feed/hay/shavings wholesale and erosion control supply business from his residence utilizing the existing barn and a portion of land behind the barn. He is requesting waivers from Site Plan Review Regulations Section IV – Submission Requirements, Section V – Required Exhibits and Data, Section VI – General Standards (except for subsection D – Parking), and Section VIII – Site and Building Design Requirements (except for subsection F.5 – Signs).

Mr. Morrison read through his application letter stating he is requesting a permit to utilize his current property to operate his business out of his existing barn, that his business is zoned Town Center which allows for commercial uses. At current the property is used residential/agricultural, and he is asking to use the front portion of the existing barn and some land behind the barn for the business. He will continue to use the remaining portion of the property as agricultural and residential as this is his primary residence.

He then provided an historical account of the business (originally owned by his father, has worked with him over 30 years, originally located in Middleton, MA, then moved to Salisbury, MA). He stated he is a grain/feed/hay/shavings wholesaler along with some erosion control supply (mainly silt fence/sock wattles for wetland). The main part of his business is erosion control and installation. Hours of operation would be Monday through Friday, 8am to 4pm with drive-in customers averaging one to two people a day. He also runs four to five deliveries per day with 90-95% of those deliveries with a box truck and one-ton trucks. There are two to three trailers which would be parked out back along with a two-yard dumpster. There are no hazardous materials on site. In addition to the two to three tractor trailers, he has two mid-duty delivery trucks, one tractor truck, one skid steer, and one forklift. No changes to the lighting, and they will use smoke detectors and fire extinguishers for fire protection.

He then read through the waiver requests from Section IV – Submission Requirements, Section V – Required Exhibits and Data, Section VI – General Standards (except for subsection D – Parking), and Section VIII – Site and Building Design Requirements (except for subsection F.5 – Signs) noting they would be using existing structures and not altering the existing property and using the existing driveway with no new pavement. He will be installing a stop sign at the top of his driveway as the DOT says they cannot place signage within the 26-foot road right-of-way.

Chairman Bath inquired about the stop signs placement to which Mr. Morrison noted the need for a stop sign came from the Planning Board during his conceptual consultation back in April. He is still working with the state on this.

He went on to say the Fire Department stated there would be no problem with them using the driveway that crosses town property as they have an easement for that and that the sign will not exceed 32 square feet – the photo of the sign submitted with the application is the current sign in Salisbury; the actual sign will be about 1/3 that size. They are invested in the community and want to keep the place looking nice and maybe get some bark mulch at some point.

Chairman Bath then reviewed the application noting a total of three employees, the hours of operation (Monday-Friday, 8:30-4pm), no additional lighting, no hazardous materials or chemicals used or stored on site, two to three trailers to be stored behind the barn, no ventilation system, 2-yard dumpster for disposal from Innovative Waste, utilizing smoke detectors and fire extinguishers, no objectionable odors, no noxious, toxic fumes, no smoke or dust, no heat glare, no external speakers, no employed generate vibrations, and no detectable radiation. For equipment: one skid steer, one forklift, 2 mid-duty trucks or deliveries.

For clarification in the minutes, Mr. Morrison stated he is more of a wholesaler – he has Canadian guys come down with hay and has a set number of customers he sells to (recently dropping about 40 customers); he is downsizing

because it's too expensive to operate the hay/grain/feed portion of the business. He mostly does erosion control, noting his main customer base is utility companies (Bond Bros., RH White, Bucco). He still has a couple of customers who come in with their horse trailers to pick up 40 bales of hay at a time. He has been trying to downsize the business to himself and one other guy. He buys hay and grain wholesale and then sells retail.

With respect to waivers, Vice Chairman Allen read through the waiver requirements cited in Site Plan Review Regulations Section VII:

*A. General. Where the Board find that extraordinary hardships, practical difficulties, or unnecessary and unreasonable expense would result from strict compliance with the foregoing regulations or the purposes of these regulations would still be served, it may approve waivers to these regulations. The purpose of granting waivers under the provisions of these regulations shall be to insure that an applicant is not unduly burdened as opposed to merely inconvenienced by said regulations. Such waivers will be entertained and acted upon by the Board only at a properly noticed public hearing, or for a lot line adjustment, at a duly noticed public meeting.*

*The basis for any waiver granted by the planning board shall be recorded in the minutes of the board. The Board shall not approve any waiver(s) unless a majority of those present and voting shall find that all of the following apply:*

- 1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest.*
- 2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary the provisions of the East Kingston Zoning Ordinance, Master Plan or Official Maps.*
- 3. Such waiver(s) will substantially secure the objectives, standards and requirements of these regulations.*
- 4. The Planning Board may only grant a waiver if the board finds, by majority vote, that:*
  - (a) Strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations; or*
  - (b) Specific circumstances relative to the subdivision, or conditions of the land in such subdivision, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.*

*B. Conditions. In approving waivers, the Board may impose such conditions as it deems appropriate to substantially secure the objectives of the standards or requirements of these regulations.*

*C. Procedures. A petition for any such waiver shall be submitted in writing by the applicant with the application for Board review. The petition shall state fully the grounds for the waiver and all the facts relied upon by the applicant. Failure to submit petition in writing shall require an automatic denial.*

Chairman Bath stated there is some concern with the number of waivers requested and then took the opportunity to read a letter submitted by abutter Jennifer MacPherson stating her concern for the additional traffic at an already dangerous intersection and of her request the Planning Board require an in-depth application and site review so that abutters could get a sense of the actual scope of the business.

Chairman Bath concurred with the statements of concern about the intersection as well as the location of the train tracks – it is already a congested intersection. The board will need more detail than what was provided. He noted that other establishments in town have been required to submit an official site plan when they, too, were not proposing construction or alterations to the property. A detailed site plan would allow the board to have a substantial review of the proposal.

Vice Chairman Allen added that some of the items in the site plan review are not needed for this plan; however, there needs to be a current and accurate depiction of the existing conditions of the property. Twenty years from now there

needs to be some documentation of what was approved. Adding setbacks, providing dimensions to the placement of the trailers, etc. is necessary. It was noted the parking would need to be at least 25 feet from the railroad.

The board then went through each of the requirements for site plan review noting which items were met, would be required, would be considered for waiver, and not applicable to the proposal.

SECTION III	PROCEDURES	MET	REQUIRED	WAIVER REQUIRED	N/A
	Escrow Account				X
SECTION IV	SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS	MET	REQUIRED	WAIVER REQUIRED	N/A
	Application Complete ( <i>pending site plan and waiver requests</i> )		X		
	Site Plan		X		
	Copy of Property Deed	X			
SECTION V	REQUIRED EXHIBITS AND DATA	MET	REQUIRED	WAIVER REQUIRED	N/A
	A. Natural features ( <i>water, trees, vegetation</i> )		X		
	B. Location of buildings, size, setbacks		X		
	C. Elevation view of all buildings				X
	D. Off street parking and loading spaces		X		
	E. Access and egress		X		
	F. Water, sewage locations with setback		X		
	G. Location of waste disposal facility		X		
	H. Stormwater management/drainage ( <i>show gravel road runoff mitigation</i> )		X		
	I. Contours and finished grade elevations			X	
	J. Landscaping, buffers, open space ( <i>show vegetation along RR and Fire Department</i> )		X		
	K. Size, design, location of signage		X		
	L. Location of public services (gas, power, etc.)				X
	M. Lighting ( <i>No new lighting being proposed</i> )	X			
	N. Streets and roadways		X		
	O. Property lines		X		
	P. Roads, boundaries, easements (subdivision)				X
	Q. Any other exhibits/data required by the Board				
SECTION VI	GENERAL STANDARDS	MET	REQUIRED	WAIVER REQUIRED	N/A
	A. Design: minimal disturbance, natural landscaping, etc.		X		
	B. Buffers: 200 ft between use and residential zone ( <i>show direction of closest abutter</i> )		X		
	C. Screening: storage and waste disposal ( <i>show natural vegetation as being proposed</i> )		X		
	D. Parking, Loading, Pedestrian Safety		X		
	E. Erosion and Sedimentation Control ( <i>Add notation to plan outlining use of erosion and sediment control</i> )		X		
	F. Post-Construction Stormwater Management			X	
	H. Access to Public Streets		X		
	I. Water supply and Sewage Disposal Systems		X		
	J. Flood Hazard Areas			X	
	K. Inspection of all site improvements by Town Engineer ( <i>road to be constructed to access rear of barn</i> )		X		
	L. Performance Bond			X	
	M. Final Site Plan to be recorded at Registry of Deeds ( <i>Board to consider recording of affidavit</i> )			X	

SECTION VI		GENERAL STANDARDS	MET	REQUIRED	WAIVER REQUIRED	N/A
	N.	Fire Suppression Provisions ( <b>based on the existence of 2 ponds located on the property</b> )			X	
SECTION VIII		SITE AND BUILDING DESIGN REQUIREMENTS				
		Consistent with rural/agricultural New England Character (pg. 12)	X			
		Signage: material and lighting (pg. 14)		X		
		Landscaping (pg. 15)				X
		Parking (pg. 17)		X		

Discussion ensued on the process for requesting and granting waivers resulting which resulted in holding off on the current waiver requests as they need to be more specific to the actual requirement being waived (not general waivers from whole site plan review sections). The Land Board Secretary will provide Mr. Morrison with an outline of all the items to be included in the site plan as well as which specific requirements he would need to request waivers.

Mr. Morrison agreed to redo the site plan and submit specific waivers noting it would be the cleanest way to move forward.

Chairman Bath then opened the meeting to abutter comments and questions. There being none, he closed the public comment portion of the hearing. He then asked Mr. Morrison if he'd like to continue the public hearing to next month. The availability of a professional engineer and the timing to have a site plan drawn up in time for the July Planning Board meeting were discussed as was the level of site plan to be submitted. Noted were the costs associated with a professional plan which would likely be recorded at the Registry of Deeds, as is the practice for site plan review. RPC Planning Manager Jenn Rowden noted in lieu of a recorded plan, the board could record an affidavit which is a single-page document that outlines with specificity what the board approved and references the plan being on file with the town – this is a good middle ground when the board is on the fence about recording the full plan. She agreed that having a site plan recorded is best practice as it protects the town and only a recorded plan can be revoked. She then offered to send an affidavit template that could be used for such purpose.

Chairman Bath suggested Mr. Morrison speak with Dennis Quintal (professional engineer and Town Engineer) for advice on lead times for professional drawings - this was not a requirement or promotion to hire him, but a recommendation to seek his professional advice since he is very familiar with the property. Mr. Morrison was asked if he was opposed to doing a professional site plan, to which he responded he was not and that a professional plan would be much better than his attempts to draw the items out himself. Chairman Bath agreed and further noted the board can continue the public hearing at the July and subsequent meetings if needed to allow for a plan to be drawn up.

Mr. Nigrello inquired if Mr. Morrison could begin operating his business from his property prior to board approval as it could take a year to get a site plan drawn up. Chairman Bath responded his business in Massachusetts is only waiting 4-6 weeks for a surveyor and he does not believe it will take a year to get a plan done.

Vice Chairman Allen reiterated the plan moving forward is to inquire with Mr. Quintal on the timeframe for a professional plan, the board will meet at their next meeting in July to discuss those findings and go from there, keeping in mind the board's preference is a professionally drawn plan that can be recorded like all the other site plans are handled. Once everything is submitted, the board will take jurisdiction and review the proposal – this is the process that will need to be followed.

Going back to the proposal and noting the dangerous intersection, Vice Chairman Allen asked about the tractor trailer units entering and exiting the property. Mr. Morrison stated the tractor trailer deliveries are typically once a week and they would be utilizing the driveway by the fire station as that is the only driveway a tractor trailer unit could navigate. Vice Chairman Allen instructed Mr. Morrison his proposal will need to include a traffic safety plan that shows how he is going to minimize the risk at that intersection, whether it be on the plan itself or in an affidavit explaining how he would address it – he will need to depict the traffic flow into, around, and out of the property. Mr. Morrison stated

it's typically a single tractor trailer coming in, dropping off one trailer and picking up another. By moving the operations to his home, he is downsizing the business.

Discussion about the driveway easement ensued noting 1 Main Street's driveway access through 3 Main Street is written in the deeds to the property. This easement will need to be noted on the plan as well.

**MOTION: Chairman Bath motioned to continue the public hearing for Steve Morrison's site plan review proposal for property located at 1 Main Street, MBL# 09-07-01, to July 20, 2023; seconded by Vice Chair Allen. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

With no further discussion Chairman Bath closed the hearing at 8:21pm.

Chairman Bath opened the meeting to invisible home occupation proposals noting invisible home occupation proposals are not required to undergo the full public hearing process (meaning no public hearing notice and no abutter notification); just completing the application and presenting the proposal to the Planning Board who will then make a determination the business is truly invisible. Once determined invisible, recommended by the Board, and approved by the Selectboard, the applicant would only need to pay the annual invisible home occupation permit fee of \$25. Should the home occupation not be deemed invisible, the applicant will be directed to undergo the full public hearing process with associated costs.

#### **ALEXA COMERCI – 10 SQUIRE WAY – MBL# 01-01-26 – INVISIBLE HOME OCCUPATION (Case 2023-04)**

Chairman Bath opened the Invisible Home Occupation proposal for Alexa Comerci (Case# 2023-04) to operate an online retail business (The Quinn and Company) from her home at 10 Squire Way, MBL # 01-01-26; this is a continuation from the May meeting.

Ms. Commerci introduced her husband Nick Comerci to the board, apologized for missing last month's meeting, and then presented an overview of her business, which was established in 2018 from her apartment in her parent's home in Malden, MA. They moved to 10 Squire Way in 2020, still operating the business from the Malden location until this past year. The main part of her business is designing and making custom wedding décor, similar to what is sold on Etsy. Production is on an order basis only, she gets a few deliveries (shipping boxes once every ten months), based on the number of orders she gets – right now it is wedding season, so production is up. She works out of her home office, using the downstairs basement for storage of acrylic which she picks up from her supplier in Malden. When there is a larger amount, she will rent a U-Haul.

Chairman Bath then reviewed the application noting:

- The use is not grandfathered.
- One employee who is the resident of the home.
- Gross floor area of the home is 3100 square feet, 500 square feet used for the business.
- The business is located in the main dwelling.
- No signage is proposed.
- The business is not visible to the neighborhood.
- There are no customers to the home, deliveries are once a month for vinyl, wood, and cardboard shipping boxes and USPS pick ups four times a week.
- Use own vehicles, no business equipment proposed.
- Shipping boxes, vinyl, and acrylics to be stored on the premises.
- No use of the outside of the home is proposed.

He then polled board members on whether they deemed the business was invisible. Vice Chairman Allen noted an invisible home occupation is one with no visible activity conducted outside of the home – all agreed the home occupation was invisible.

Chairman Bath reviewed the checklist for invisible home occupations and noted the home occupation is located in a residential dwelling unit – requirement met. The business is not located on a state road; thus the exceptions are not applicable. The home occupation shall include administrative support for the business.

With no questions or comments raised by the board,

**MOTION: Chairman Bath motioned to recommend the Board of Selectmen approve an invisible home occupation permit for Alexa Commerci to operate The Quinn and Company from her home at 10 Squire Way; seconded by Mrs. Smith. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

Ms. Commerci was advised a notice of decision would be forthcoming, that the Board of Selectmen will make the final decision to approve, and that in the event the scope of the business changes (signage, showroom, customers to the premises, increase of deliveries) and it becomes evident a business is being conducted from the premises, the applicant will be required to apply for a visible home occupation permit and undergo the full public hearing process as prescribed under Zoning Ordinance Article XVI – Home Occupations. The case was closed, and no further discussion ensued.

**GEORGE WHITMAN JR - 18 ROWELL ROAD – MBL# 10-17-02 – INVISIBLE HOME OCCUPATION (Case 2023-07)**

Chairman Bath informed the board Mr. Whiteman has submitted a request to postpone his application for a period of 90 days.

**JENNIFER SILVER – 27 JOSLIN ROAD – MBL# 17-01-12 – INVISIBLE HOME OCCUPATION (Case# 2023-09)**

Ms. Silver proposes to operate the clothing-making portion of her retail business (Hum+Bee) located in Amesbury, MA from her home at 27 Joslin Road. Clothing is also sold through a website.

Ms. Silver presented an overview of her business noting the physical location of the store is in Amesbury where items such as women’s clothing and jewelry are sold. She makes handmade clothing, jewelry and wall sculptures from the home and sells them at the store and online. There are no shipments to her home, all is shipped to the business, then transported by her car, she makes about 24 garments per month along with jewelry which is sold at the store or online or through special events using a small space in her house. She noted she amended the square footage calculations (copies provided to the board).

Chairman Bath reviewed the application and noted:

- The use is not grandfathered.
- One employee who is the resident of the home.
- Gross floor area of the home amended to reflect 12% of the gross floor area to be used for the business.
- The business is located in the main dwelling.
- No signage is proposed.
- The business is not visible to the neighborhood.
- Clothing is made at home and sold at physical store in Amesbury and online.
- Use own vehicles, no business equipment proposed.
- Small amounts of clothing are transported to and from the home using her personal vehicle.
- No use of the outside of the home is proposed.



With respect to the determination of it being an invisible home occupation, he noted the proposal has no visible activity outside the home, it does not create any traffic, visual, or other impacts on the neighborhood and then polled the board – all agreed the home occupation met the invisible standard.

**MOTION: Chairman Bath motioned to recommend the Board of Selectmen approve an invisible home occupation permit for Jennifer Silver to operate the handmade portion and online activities of HUM+BEE from her home at 27 Joslin Road; seconded by Vice Chair Allen. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

Vice Chairman Allen stated the same conditions apply as the previous application (Comerci) with respect to changes to the business that would warrant a visible home occupation permit.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Board members reviewed the minutes from May 18, 2023 meeting as transcribed by Vice Chairman Allen. Commendations were made on the detail the minutes.

**MOTION: Chairman Bath motioned to approve the May 18, 2023 minutes as published; seconded by Vice Chairman Allen. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Land Board Secretary Belcher presented several items under other board business:

1. **LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PARK COMPLAINT UPDATE:** The Building Inspector has investigated the complaint of an abutter who alleges trash and debris, along with brush and gravel, have been pushed onto his property from the LIP. The Building Inspector is seeking the board's confirmation of a 30-foot buffer to determine if the LIP property owner is in violation of its approved site plan. – The board reviewed the plan on file and directed the plan be reviewed by Dennis Quintal for interpretation of the 30-foot buffer. Vice Chairman Allen noted the board had previously made a recommendation to the Selectboard to take action on the general clean up of that parcel; if this activity constitutes a violation of that site plan, the Selectboard can take action.
2. **SITE VISIT FOLLOW UP:** The board noted the findings from the April 9, 2022 site visit to the Light Industrial Park were forwarded to the Board of Selectmen for enforcement and that this property owner will make strides to correct items and after a period of time will need another reminder to stay in compliance with the original site plan.
3. **9 BOWLEY ROAD:** Complaints about land development and the Building Inspector's findings – report provided as information only as well as an update on correspondence from the property owners about the waiver process.
4. **PLANNING BOARD FILES:** Update on the process of digitizing Planning Board case files.
5. **BOARD RESOURCES:** Reading materials available regarding farm sustainability and managing stormwater.

Chairman Bath then formally welcomed RPC Planner Victoria Healey to the board noting the rationale for doing so at the end of the meeting versus at the beginning.

He then informed the Board that Dennis Quintal has been awarded the James Hayden Award from the RPC for his commitment and dedication to the conservation of natural resources. Board members commended those efforts. Mr. Quintal was not present to receive the plaque; however, it will be presented to him at an upcoming Board of Selectmen meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Chairman Bath motioned to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Cornoni. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

The meeting ended at 8:47pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Belcher, Land Board Secretary

Minutes approved on July 20, 2023.