



PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF EAST KINGSTON
NEW HAMPSHIRE

2007-2008
David F. Sullivan, Chairman
Edward Warren, Vice Chairman

MINUTES
(Public Hearing of 19 June 2008)

AGENDA:

- Secretary's Report on Circuit Rider Contract
- Proposal to revise EK ZO Art II – Definitions
- Proposal to revise EK ZO Art VIII – Uses Permitted
- Discussion on Wind Energy
- Inclusionary Housing
- Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER: The regular meeting of the East Kingston Planning Board was called to order at 7:05PM.

ROLL CALL: Mrs. White called the roll.

Members present - Mr. RF Morales, Mr. DF Sullivan, Mr. E Warren, and Mr. D Pendell, ex-officio.

Alternate members present –Mr. R Forrest and Mr. J Cacciatore.

Advisors present – Eric S. Steltzer, Planner, Rockingham Planning Commission (RPC)

Voting members – Chairman David Sullivan appointed Mr. Cacciatore as a voting member in place of Dr. Marston until he arrived. Dr. Marston arrived at 7:20pm

Mr. Sullivan reminded the Board members to contact either him or Mrs. White and let them know if they were not going to be able to attend the meeting.

Minutes. Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any changes or corrections noted to the 15 May 2008 minutes. There were no changes noted. Mr. Sullivan entertained a motion to approve the minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Morales **MOVED** the Planning Board approve the 15 May 2008 minutes as written. Mr. Pendell seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

RPC Commissioner. Mr. Sullivan announced that Mr. Warren had stepped up to the plate and had informed the Selectmen that he would be happy to serve as the RPC Commissioner for East Kingston. The next step was for the Planning Board to nominate him and send a letter of recommendation to the Board of Selectmen.

MOTION: Mr. Pendell **MOVED** the Planning Board nominate Mr. Edward Warren for the position of RPC Commissioner for East Kingston. Mr. Morales seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Mrs. White will send a letter of recommendation to the Board of Selectmen.

Secretary's Report on Circuit Rider Contract. The Board had asked Mrs. White to find out if the Circuit Rider Contract amount for 2008 had gone up from last year. She reported that it had stayed the same as 2007, and that \$4,650 was due on April 2008 and \$4,650 was due in December 2008. This year, the RPC has requested an additional \$2,325 to be paid in April of 2009 to enable the contract to be aligned with the RPC's

fiscal year, which runs from July 1 to June 30. The Selectmen's Office recommends that the Planning Board budget a total of \$11,600 for their Circuit Rider 2009 budget item as opposed to splitting the cost between 2008 and 2009. The Planning Board agreed with that idea and will budget \$11,600 for the Circuit Rider contract in their 2009 budget

Mr. Pendell asked if the previously noted confusion in the availability of the Circuit Rider had been corrected on the contract, and if it had been re-worded to state 12 night meetings per year and 13 hours of work per month. Mrs. White reported she had contacted the RPC about that discrepancy and they had noted they would make the change. She was fairly sure it had been corrected, but would double check next week and report back to the Board. Mr. Steltzer remarked he had seen the contract and the wording was now much clearer.

LGC's Take on Abstaining. As there had been a question on abstaining at a previous meeting, Mrs. White had contacted the LGC and asked what their opinion was on a Planning Board member abstaining from voting. She reported according to the LGC, a member should always give an applicant the benefit of their opinion and vote, and that if an applicant met all the requirements as set forth by the Town, the members should vote as such. If a member felt they could not vote, they should step down and let an alternate be designated to vote in their stead.

Keri's Marshall's suggestion that SPR. A.1. is against the law as written. Mrs. White had contacted the Town Counsel for clarification on Mrs. Marshall's suggestion. Mr. Mayer stated that since the Planning Board is not seeking to invoke site plan review jurisdiction merely due to a change in ownership, there is nothing wrong with the regulation. Mr. Mayer stated, "It provides a good opportunity for the Planning Board and the property owner to become familiar with the intended changes, if any, and whether site plan review will be required."

Mr. Pendell suggested the Board inform Keri Marshall of Town Counsel's opinion. Mr. Morales agreed that it would be a good idea to let her know the Board had addressed her concern. Mrs. White will send a letter to Ms. Marshall informing her of the Town Council's opinion.

Final Inspection of Carmen's by the Fire Chief. Chief Richard had provided Mrs. White with a letter informing the Planning Board that he had re-inspected Carmen's Restaurant and that all the previously noted deficiencies had been corrected and that he had issued a "Permit to Operate a Place of Assembly" to Mr. Dunlop.

Subdivision Approval from the State Question/Confusion. Mrs. White reported that any lot created, whether by subdivision or lot line adjustment, that is less than 5 acres in size is required to have State Subdivision Approval and have a subdivision number assigned. She enquired if a note to that effect should be added to the *Application for Subdivision Approval* and the *Application for Lot Line Adjustment*, and suggested the note state: "For lots created which are less than 5 acres, please attach a copy of the State Subdivision Approval."

The Board agreed that more clarification was better than less and that it could make the difference between an applicant having to come back to the Planning Board a second time because of not having all the information necessary the first time. Mrs. White asked if there needed to be a public hearing to make that change to the forms, and the Board decided that a public hearing was not necessary. Mrs. White will make the change to both the forms.

Mr. Steltzer reminded the Board that although it would not be necessary to have a public hearing for this change to the forms, *any change to the regulations would need to be presented at a public hearing*. The Board agreed.

Proposal to Revise East Kingston Zoning Article II – Definitions. Mr. Sullivan reported that the Zoning Board Chairman had requested that the Planning Board consider adding the definition of *Living Space* to ZO Article II – Definitions. He also suggested that the definition used in Article XII.B.7. – Elderly Housing, be used as a matter of continuity.

Article XII.B.7. states: “*Living space shall be defined as any space in the unit which could be used for sleeping, working, dressing, cooking, dining, or other normal life activities, and shall include unfinished as well as finished space. Hallways, closets, storage space, bathrooms, lofts, bedrooms and all other rooms or areas shall be included in living space. Attic storage spaces with a ceiling height of lower than five (5) feet as measured from floor to ceiling shall not be included as living space.*”

Mr. Warren asked why the living area configuration counted closets and bathrooms, and Mr. Morales explained that the definition had been refined as the intent of elderly housing was for downsizing, not just to build another large house on a smaller lot.

Board discussion ensued, and it was the decision of the Board that the definition of living space as presented for Article II - Definitions should be added to the definitions. The addition will be noticed as a Public Hearing, to then be placed on the Town Warrant for the public to vote on in March 2009.

Mr. Steltzer reminded the Board that there was a specific timeframe in which to have public hearings for items to be placed on the Town Warrant in March. This timeframe will be determined by the RPC calendar later in the year, which will denote the exact times allowed.

Proposal to Revise East Kingston Zoning Article VIII – Uses Permitted. The Zoning Board Chairman also asked that the definition for living space be added to ZO Article VIII – Uses Permitted, paragraph F. *Accessory Dwelling Units*, as the article presently states that the configuration should not exceed 500 square feet, but does not include any definition to clearly state what areas are actually being considered as “living space.”

Mrs. White had prepared a sample of Article VIII.2. which reads: (Refer to Living Space Definition – Page 1) in place of the entire definition being inserted. The Board agreed that was adequate.

Board discussion ensued, and it was the decision of the Board that the reference to the living space definition should be added to Article VIII – Uses Permitted, paragraph F., and the change will be noticed as a Public Hearing, to then be placed on the Town Warrant for the public to vote on in March 2009.

Mr. Steltzer asked if all definitions were referred to in the body of the ordinances and regulations. Mr. Morales answered that it was not normally the practice to do that, but since living area tends to be a debatable issue, especially pertaining to in-law apartments, it was for the sake of clarification. The Board agreed it would be a good thing to have it included, and Mr. Steltzer reflected that since Boards change and requests for in-law apartments may happen on a sporadic basis, it would be good to clarify the definition.

Mr. Cacciatore asked if you finished off a basement, was it considered living space? Mr. Morales answered that it was, according to the assessors. Mr. Cacciatore answered that banks do not consider it living space. They do not consider anything below grade level/ground level as living space.

Denials and the ZBA. Mrs. White also reported to the Board that the ZBA Chairman had noted that there does not need to be a denial for an applicant to come before the ZBA for a variance. The Board discussed this and agreed that in certain instances, it would delay the applicant rather than hastening the process along, but also noted that in other instances, it was necessary to vote for a denial.

Mr. Steltzer noted that there was a difference in the hearing procedure within the ZBA for a special exception versus a variance. Mrs. White clarified that Mr. Daly had noted the need not to come before the Planning Board first for a denial had specifically pertained to the Granite State Gas case of last month.

Mr. Steltzer noted that in other towns, they had a Technical Review Committee set up to review applications and make sure they were complete and decide if they would need to approach the ZBA for a variance before coming before the Planning Board. A TRC could consist of the Building Inspector, the Fire Department, a Planner and Planning Board members. Other towns use the Building Inspector, who would decide if a variance is needed.

Discussion on Wind Energy Ordinance. Mr. Steltzer reviewed the draft wind energy ordinance, stating that there had been amendments made to HB 310 and that the ordinance as written would need to be changed to meet those amendments.

Newspapers report about global warming, the energy crisis, and advertise green products, and there is a growing demand for renewable energy systems, specifically distributed energy systems such as wind turbines. As far as renewable energies, wind technology is one of the more affordable options if you have a well-sited location. You could generate your own electricity for 3-5 cents per kw hour as opposed to the utility company's 8 ½ to 9 cents per kw hour, and with distribution and stranded costs it goes up to 14 ½ cents per kw hour.

Within many towns in New Hampshire, there is currently an inadequate review process for wind turbines. Currently in East Kingston, no building or structure can exceed 35' in height. As such, if someone wanted to put up a wind turbine in East Kingston, the Building Inspector would see that the proposed height did not meet the restrictions and notify them they would need to go to the ZBA for relief. In that ZBA hearing, they would not necessarily be looking at all the issues as far as the impact that would be occurring with a wind turbine. This ordinance is working with legislation to create a framework for municipalities to begin permitting and regulating wind turbines, and the State is encouraging them to be used. A private property owner has every right to use the wind resource that is on his land.

The ordinance is creating a process, through conditional use permits, that is helped by the Planning Board to review an applicant that is interested in putting up a wind turbine. The ordinance is thorough and will need to be adjusted with the changes in HB 310. The final technical review bulletin will be issued by OEP by the end of September. The model ordinance is very detailed and will be a beneficial ordinance for towns with a lot of wind in their location.

He stated that since the ordinance could be overkill as written, towns that do not have a large wind resource should customize it. For example, in the conditional use permit process, it outlines the plan requirements in order to accept jurisdiction; one of those requirements is that a Professional Engineer's seal be put onto those plans. This is quite expensive and towns want to encourage an applicant to put up the wind tribunes. The Engineer's seal might be a burden to the applicant, and the Town might want to change that requirement.

Mr. Steltzer reviewed the standards for small wind turbines with the Board, and stressed that there is a difference between small turbines and utility turbines. Small turbines, as the ordinance defines it, are 60kw or less. Any individual resident can net meter up to 100kw back into the grid, meaning they can sell the power generated back to the utility company. It is also necessary to have a structure that the electricity generated is powering and not just be a turbine in the middle of a field. Areas with large amounts of wind are recommended to have 100kw units to take the most advantage of the wind power. A typical household would install a 2.4kw unit

Standards reviewed.

1. *Setbacks* – Setbacks are to be 110% from any driveway, parking lot, sidewalk, utility line, or property line, as measured from the center of the tower base. This will help also create constraint for the tower height. Some national models state that a 50' turbine is permitted on a ½ acre lot, and a 100' turbine is permitted on a 1 acre lot or above.
2. *Tower* – Tower height cannot exceed 150', and needs to meet the manufacturers recommendation. A typical sized residential turbine is 2.4kw and would not be installed on a 150' tower if a 60' tower would work.
3. *Sound Level* – The sound level should be customized to be in compliance with an individual towns' noise level. If there is no noise level compliance, the recommended noise level is 60 decibels, and the state will not allow towns to require less than 55 decibels. There is a real distinction between *sound* and *noise*, and it is very subjective.
4. *Shadowing/Flickering* – No significant shadowing or flickering impacts are allowed, and the applicant will need to prove there is no adverse impact on neighboring or adjacent uses.
5. *Signs* – Only the turbine manufacturers sign will be allowed; advertising signs are prohibited.
6. *Code Compliance* – The system shall comply with the New Hampshire State Building Code.
7. *Aviation* – The energy system shall comply with all aviation requirements, and shall only be lit if required by the FAA.
8. *Visual Impact* – The color of the wind system shall be the stock color from the manufacturer or painted with a non-reflective, unobtrusive color that blends in with the surrounding environment.
9. *Utility Connection* – If the wind system is to be connected to the power grid through net metering, it must adhere to RSA 362-A:9.
10. *Access*- All ground-mounted equipment shall be secured to prevent unauthorized access.
11. *Approved Wind Turbines* – The wind turbine installed needs to be on either the California Energy Commission list, the New York State Energy Research Authority list, or any list approved by New Hampshire. At the present time, New Hampshire does not have its own list. This will prevent homemade turbines from being erected.
12. *Clearing* – More clearing of land than is required for the construction, operation and maintenance of a wind energy system is not allowed.

Mr. Steltzer stressed that the four most important standards were: 1. Setbacks, 2. Tower Height, 3. Sound Level, and 11. Approved Wind Turbines.

Abandonment – This defines what constitutes an abandoned turbine, and what action a Town would need to take to get the turbine to be removed if the owner is not cooperative. Also, if the Town sees fit, it can require a bond or surety for abandonment. Mr. Steltzer does not recommend this for a 2.4kw system, as it would be an undue burden on the applicant; the need for such a bond or surety could be appropriate for larger systems.

Mr. Steltzer stated that he did not foresee a great rush for people to install wind turbines in East Kingston, as usually a Class 2 wind force is needed to operate the turbines and the wind resource in East Kingston is mostly Class 1. He felt it would be good for East Kingston to have this in their ordinances as there is a growing demand for sustainable energy, but perhaps not as stringent as stated in the model ordinance as the purpose is to encourage the use and not make it too difficult a process and inordinately expensive. The model ordinance was actually geared more to commercial-type turbines and therefore contains more stringent controls. Only two other towns in New Hampshire presently have wind ordinances, one of those two towns is Kensington. Exeter is considering choosing the route of making it a special exemption through the ZBA rather than making it a conditional use permit coming before the Planning Board.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Morales asked if the model was something Mr. Steltzer was writing at the RPC level, or was it coming out of the legislature. Mr. Steltzer answered that he had written it through the RPC, but it was in adherence with State legislation. HB 310 has been amended and there will be some changes that need to be made. OEP will be doing more work in the next two months in getting an Official Technical Bulletin out to the towns.

Mr. Morales suggested that *owner* be added to the definitions, as he felt it was important especially in regard to abandonment to identify who the owner was. He asked about a scenario in which you would sell your house but still retain the power system; in that case who would you go after in the case of abandonment – the property owner or the owner of the turbine? He surmised that there could be creative ways of retaining the wind tower without being the homeowner.

Mr. Steltzer answered that the applicant would be the one wanting to install the turbine, and the definition of a small wind energy system states that the energy used will be to offset the consumption on that person's property. This is so you don't have people trying to get in to the business of selling energy back to the utility company. Mr. Steltzer did not envision Mr. Morales' scenario happening, as there was quite an intensive process for the developer to go through with the PUC in order to sell that electricity to the grid as a business. It would not be financially feasible for the developer.

Mr. Morales stated that there is municipal water in some subdivisions. Couldn't a developer say they were creating these wind towers for the residents and their association, so the residents will be able to sell the excess back to the utility company?

Mr. Morales also opined the Town needed to follow the Epping ordinance and include geothermal, solar, wind, and biomass.

Mr. Steltzer explained that wind had been addressed as it has impact on the public versus a geothermal pump. A geothermal pump is all internal and underground, but still would need to comply to state building codes. It was his thought that there did not need to be any review by the Planning Board for the installation of a solar panel or a geothermal pump. There is not the same concern as there is with a wind turbine in regard to visual impact, noise, etc.

Mr. Morales stated that when he had read over the ordinance, he agreed with Mr. Steltzer that for a small wind turbine system it was too much of a difficult process and too expensive. Mr. Pendell did not like the idea of a surety bonding, which could double the cost of the wind turbine and discourage people from proceeding. They were glad that Mr. Steltzer had reminded them that the model ordinance was for larger systems and could be tailored for the needs of small system.

Mr. Morales asked if they were going to allow the Unutil experiment where they were installing turbines on utility poles, which take away the "drop zone". It would supply almost all of the electric needs of a home, but costs \$15,000. Mr. Pendell opined that as more and more people get interested, the cost would surely go down.

Mr. Pendell was concerned that there was no mention about quantity. What if he wanted to install four turbines on his property? Mr. Steltzer stated that the ordinance specifically addresses that scenario and it would not comply to the definition of a small wind system, which is that it needs to be to offset the electricity use of that resident. Mr. Pendell stated that he *would* be covering his electrical use, and making overage he could sell back to the utility company. He would be complying with all the requirements and would still be making \$50 a month. He does not know if they are concerned about quantity, but should they be concerned? Mr. Warren opined that if you were in compliance with all the restrictions of the guidelines proposed and not in violation of any of the ordinances and regulations, if you could fit three turbines on your property, why should it make a difference? Why should he care?

Mr. Steltzer stated that if someone were to install 3 turbines, each producing 50kw, and the usage for the property was 200kw, then that would be offsetting the usage. If the property only used 50kw and they installed 3 turbines that produced a total of 150kw, they would be selling back 100kw hours per month and they would not be off-setting the usage.

Mr. Pendell asked how would they monitor it. Mr. Steltzer stated it was done through the original state process of the review. It was Mr. Steltzer's opinion that the size of the individual unit would be increased before someone would want to install multiple units.

Mr. Sullivan noted there were three turbines at the Cider Hill Farm on Rt. 150; Mr. Steltzer will check them out.

Mr. Morales asked about ownership in regard to abandonment. If the property owner sold the home but not the turbine, who would be the person to approach to take the turbine down? The property owner may not be the owner of the turbine. Also, he felt more "teeth" should be used to enforce the abandonment. He noted, for example, that properties were told to clean up after the Town ride-around, and years later they still looked the same.

Mr. Morales stated, for instance, you could lease a large halogen light for your property from Unitil. You would have the use of it and pay monthly rent, but Unitil would be the owner. He wondered what would stop someone who had installed a turbine from doing the same – selling his house and retaining ownership of the turbine?

Mr. Warren thought they should make it as easy as possible for a resident to put up a wind turbine if they should so wish. He did not think there were too many places a wind turbine could be installed, as there was not a lot of wind in East Kingston.

Mr. Morales commented he had been below a turbine at the Isle of Shoals and could not hear it; the gulls were louder. He also noted that technology was allowing for less wind to do the job that used to take more wind. Mr. Steltzer thought that start-up speed for a turbine was 6mph; an average of 12-15 mph was desired to make it feasible.

Mr. Sullivan remarked that the Board would be reviewing this as an ordinance in the not-to-distant future. The Board commended Mr. Steltzer on the great job he did in writing this model ordinance.

Article 22. Mr. Steltzer reviewed that Article 22 requires stricter building codes measures for non-residential developments. It basically created a system of "points" earned for installing various types of energy production. Most communities have opted for educational measures to encourage residents to implement energy efficiency and conservation for *green building*. Or it could be used for larger developments.

Inclusionary Housing. Mr. Steltzer explained that inclusionary zoning is used for creating additional workforce housing and that SB 342 had recently enacted the *Workforce Housing* bill. Most communities will need to take some action within the next year to address the law's requirement that all communities with zoning allow workforce housing in a majority of their zoning districts; there will be a certain percentage of the Town that will have to be available to workforce housing if they do not already have their fair share. Handouts to the Board included the Background and Purpose, Appropriate Circumstances and Context for Use, Legal Basis and Considerations for New Hampshire, Examples and Outcomes where Inclusionary Housing has been Applied, and a reference to a Model Ordinance.

A lot of towns will be having something included in their Town warrants this coming March regarding inclusionary zoning and defining a certain area within their Town for inclusionary housing to be built, and to make it easier for developers to build that type of housing. There was discussion of the amount of area that would be available in East Kingston for this type of housing, since 39% of the Town is wetlands and there were also a significant number of conservation easements. Mr. Cacciatore asked if the Town would be penalized if they could not meet the percentage set forth for the Town. Mr. Steltzer did not know the answer to that question, but he suggested that one solution was to allow higher population densities in certain areas.

Mr. Morales asked what the official definition of affordable housing was. Mr. Steltzer noted that the definition of affordable housing meant, *“housing with combined rental and utility costs or combined mortgage loan debt services (property taxes and required insurance) that do not exceed 30% of a household’s gross annual income.”*

The definition of workforce housing means *“housing that is intended for sale and which is affordable to a household with an income of no more than 100% of the median income for a four person household for the metropolitan area or county in which the housing is located and published annually by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development”*

Mr. Steltzer informed the Board that there was an (IZIP) Inclusionary Zoning Incentive Program grant available for up to \$9,000 (plus technical services) and that the deadline to apply was July 15th. There are several consultants to choose from; the RPC is one of those choices.

MOTION: Mr. Warren **MOVED** that Mr. Sullivan and Mrs. White should work on the application and get it in, as the deadline is short. Mr. Cacciatore seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Letters of support from the community are required to accompany the application, and Mr. Steltzer will e-mail some contacts to Mrs. White for her to request those letters of support.

Suggestion from the Selectmen’s Office regarding ordinance and regulation fees. Mrs. White reported that the original intent of the Board had been to remove all the fees from the ordinance/ regulation book and include them on the Selectmen’s Fee Schedule. The Selectmen’s Office has suggested that the fees be moved to a separate sheet included within the book and not placed on the Selectmen’s Fee Schedule. This way the applicable fees would always be with the ordinances and regulations. The Board agreed this was a good idea.

Mrs. White asked if a Public Hearing would be necessary since they would only be moving the fees to another place in the book as opposed to changing them. It was the general consensus of the Board that a public hearing should be held that would comprehensively state that all dollar amounts of fees would be removed from the body of the ordinances and regulations and moved to a Fee Schedule page to be included in the ordinance/regulation book.

At the same time, a separate discussion would be held for any changes to fees in the ordinances. Those that needed to be updated would be identified and a Public Hearing would be held in the October timeframe for inclusion on the Town Warrant in March.

Mr. Morales opined that speaking of fees, his thought was that the whole definition and fee schedule for home occupations needed to be revised, as they were letting home occupations come in that only vaguely resembled the definitions that are presently included in the regulations. Some of the “home occupations” are huge businesses that should really be in the commercial/industrial zone and they are only paying \$50 per year. He suggested a third tier for large companies and a separate fee schedule for them. Mr. Cacciatore reminded him that certain business would be grand fathered. Mr. Morales noted that would not keep the Planning Board from revising the fees; his suggestion was for \$1,000 per year for larger businesses. Mr. Sullivan stated that

this was an entire new discussion and the agenda for the evening was already full. He suggested tabling this discussion for next month's meeting; the Board agreed. Mrs. White volunteered to contact a few surrounding towns and see what fees they are charging.

It was the Board's conclusion, and Mr. Steltzer's, that a public hearing would need to be held since they were touching the ordinances, ever so slight that it might be. Mrs. White suggested some wording for public hearing notification for moving the fees to a separate fee schedule within the book. The Board agreed the wording would cover what they wanted to do. Any other fees to be individually changed in the ordinances would be required to have their own public hearings closer to the October timeframe so those changes could be included on the Town Warrant in March.

Using the Pound School for Meetings. Mr. Sullivan reported that the Selectmen's Office is closing certain Town-owned buildings for the winter months. Mr. Pendell noted they expect to save approximately \$35,000 on heating costs by doing so. The Planning Board and the Zoning Board's scheduled meeting times will be inserted onto the same schedule for the Pound School as they are for the Town Hall. Use of the Pound School will begin with the September or October meetings, as there will be no heat in those buildings after September 1. The Board agreed this was a wise decision to save money.

Mrs. White will see that a notice is placed in the glass notice Board at the front of the Town Hall letting people know that after a certain date, the Planning Board and Zoning Board meetings would be held in the Pound School. She will also post a notice at the Post Office, Library and the Town Offices.

Recreation Committee. Mr. Pendell informed the Board that the Recreation Committee would be having a fund-raiser on Saturday, July 26th to raise money to improve the drainage at the Foss Wasson Field. They are trying to schedule a softball tournament between the Town Departments (eg., Police Dept. vs Fire Dept., Selectmen's Office vs Planning Board, etc.). They will also be having a fundraiser at Shooters in Exeter with an outdoor barbeque, games with cash prizes, etc.

Capitol Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Steltzer explained that last year the Planning Board had applied for TBD funding to have revisions done to the CIP. The Planning Board always updates Table 10 and Table 11, but had not updated a lot of the internal data since originally written in 2000. Mr. Steltzer and Mr. Day had sat down last fall and determined what needed to be updated - Table 1-5, Figure 1, add new tables for school enrollment, population trends and projections, and housing. It was decided to scrap Tables 6, 7 and 8. Mr. Day was to provide D & E.

Mr. Steltzer had created all the new tables and updated the information, and instead of reporting the information for the past 6 years, it had been decided it should be reported in 5-year increments, starting in 1990. He suggested that the Planning Board review the information and see if there are areas that need to be expanded, that the numbers made sense, and to complete Tables 10 and 11. Mr. Steltzer reminded the Board that this update of the CIP would need to go to a public hearing for acceptance by the Board.

Mr. Pendell reported he was at the budget advisory committee meeting for SAU 16 where they review the capitol improvement plan for the SAU, and that there were only 3 towns that asked for the information on a yearly basis, East Kingston being one of them. They mentioned that Mr. Day would always talk to them about what was coming up so it could be included in the capitol improvements for the town. Mr. Pendell asked who was in charge of getting that information, and what tables were involved, since even though it was out of town, it affected East Kingston and the tax rate.

Mr. Steltzer referred to Table 9, Committed Debt Service, which has to do with the bonds for buildings and structures. Table 9 includes the Police Station, Conservation Easements, and the Library. The elementary

school bond will be paid off in 2 years. The Cooperative School District has a bond on the new high school and CMS debt for the middle school. That is what is entered for the SAU.

Mr. Steltzer reflected that Mr. Day most likely did make those annual calls to input into Tables 10 and 11. Mr. Pendell asked about the capitol improvements, and Mr. Steltzer stated was on Tables 10 and 11. Mr. Day liked to call himself each year so he could keep in touch with the growth management ordinance so it could be kept in line. What Mr. Steltzer had updated was the core document, and Tables 10 and 11 would be updated each year.

Mr. Warren asked if workforce housing and changed density would affect the CIP; Mr. Morales said it would not.

Mrs. White will send out a memo to all the departments so they can given their input and provide their new numbers. Mr. Pendell asked that if it did not already specify, to ask for the next 5 years' projection. Mr. White will make sure the letter requests 5 years.

Mr. Steltzer Leaving the RPC. Mr. Steltzer informed the Board that he would be leaving the RPC and going to the OEP as their Policy Analyst working on energy issues and legislation, one of those being HB 310. He will continue to help with Circuit Riding until someone new comes on Board. He projected that August/September would be his last meeting with the Board.

The Board congratulated Mr. Steltzer on his new position, and commended the work he had done for the Board' he had been very proactive and useful. They were sorry to see him go, but happy for his advancement.

Next Month's Agenda. Mrs. White will add the CIP review to the agenda, along with discussion on Home Occupations.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there was any other Board discussion. There was none and a motion to adjourn was entertained.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Mr. Pendell **MOVED** the Planning Board adjourn. Mr. Warren seconded, and the motion carried unanimously at 9:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara A. White
Recording Secretary

There were no changes to the May 15 minutes.
--

DF Sullivan
Chairman

Minutes approved July 17, 2008