

**TOWN OF BARTLETT PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING**

**November 6, 2017**

**Members Present:** Chairman Philip Franklin; David L. Patch; David Shedd; Peter Gagne; Scott Grant; Kevin Bennett. **Members Absent:** David A. Patch (with notice).

**Also present:** Burke York of York Land Services; Andrew Fisher of Ammonoosuc Survey; abutters Terrence Spittler, William Duggan, Angela Huertas, Ron Lanigan, Bill Fabrizio, Ruthann Fabrizio, Pauline Wright and Steven Wright; Joe Berry, Sheila Duane, and Ace Tarberry of AMSCO; Leslie Mallett; Bert George; A.G. Peters; MeriEllen Lazdowski; Robert Holmes; Jessica and Mark Spaulding; Paul Pagliarulo.

The meeting was opened at 6:00 pm by Chairman Philip Franklin, who reviewed the agenda.

**1. Public Hearing: AMSCO, Cobb Farm and Stanton Farm Roads.** File: 2017-1236. Application to subdivide 73± acres of land into seven lots. Tax Map 5COBRD, Lot 045RW0.

Burke York presented. The Chairman noted the board had looked at this plan a few months ago and asked Mr. York whether anything had changed. Mr. York said a wetland delineation note and the state subdivision number had been added and, other than that, everything else was the same. He briefly described the project as subdividing the land south of Razor Brook into six building lots, with the seventh lot being the remaining 46-acres north of Razor Brook which was to remain undeveloped at this point. Two driveways would serve three lots each, with one drive coming off Cobb Farm Road and the other coming off Stanton Farm Road.

The board reviewed the plan, which showed each lot had two-to-three times more density than was required by the state, each had 50-ft. of road frontage, and corner pins had been set. The Chairman asked if there were any questions. With none, he called for a motion to accept the application. Motion made by David Shedd; seconded by David L. Patch. Vote: All in favor. The meeting was then opened for public comment. Several people approached the table and asked to view the plan, which was provided to them, and other copies were passed around to people sitting in the audience. Abutter Bill Fabrizio asked where the building envelopes for each lot were shown on the plan. Burke York said this was just a subdivision and it was not necessary to show them. In response to severe flooding which occurred a few days previously and which resulted in this area being underwater, Mr. York was asked what the FEMA-designated flood zone was. Mr. York said it was Zone A. Bill Fabrizio said he didn't want to go into the flood situation at this time, but had a question specifically for Mr. York which pertained to his boundary. Mr. Fabrizio said many years ago he had conducted a quasi survey of his property to ensure he did not encroach on his neighbor's land, and that he had used ski poles to indicate the corners. Mr. Fabrizio admitted the ski poles were not "gospel" as he did not own surveying equipment, but said based on the location of the poles compared to what was shown on Mr. York's plan, he thought Mr. York's survey was off by over ten feet. Mr. Fabrizio further felt that the boundary lines were skewed and did not line-up at a 90-degree angle to the road. Mr. York acknowledged he had seen the ski poles and described how he had located and held legitimate survey evidence on the ground, such as an existing iron pipe and data from the prior Howard two-lot subdivision, to base his survey on. This resulted in the dimensions of Mr. Fabrizio's property being 200'x160', figures which exactly matched his deed. Furthermore, Mr. York said there was nothing in Mr. Fabrizio's deed which said his boundary ran perpendicular to the road. Had it said that, then that's what he would have held. Mr. Fabrizio listened to Mr. York's explanation, but said he still had issues with it.

Abutter Bill Duggan enquired as to what percentage of the 16-acre area was in the floodplain. Mr. York said there was very little, according to FEMA – probably a small amount on each of the six lots. Mr. York was then asked about swales in the area and what they were there for. Mr. York indicated where the swales were on the plan and said they had likely been installed as the result of a wetlands report many years ago to act as an overflow channel. When asked whether they were designed to handle overflow from Razor Brook, Mr. York said he did not know that. Abutter Ron Lanigan said the swales had probably been there for a long time. He shared that during the recent flood, 5-ft.- deep fast-moving water had come through his back yard, which did not originate from Razor Brook but from the Saco River. Mr. Lanigan said the breached dike situation on the Saco needs to be addressed before houses are built in this subdivision.

The Chairman said he understood people's concerns, but one of the things he felt was important to point out is that the Saco breach is outside the realm of what we have to look at for this application. Had the water been generated by this development, then that would be a different matter, but it wasn't; it came from off-site and was flowing through it. The Chairman said repairs to the Saco dike would likely be the responsibility of the selectmen, or some higher authority.

The Chairman asked if there were any further comments from the public. Bill Fabrizio spoke again, saying his comments weren't directed specifically at the subdivision, but at the area in general and the water, the drainage, and the bridge in particular. He described his experiences during three other floods he had seen happen since living in the area, and described the locations of where each particular breach of the Saco had occurred and the damage the debris had caused to the levy. Mr. Fabrizio said the levy has got to be shored-up. He acknowledged this was not the responsibility of the planning board, but felt the board should have some input and work with the selectmen on this issue. The last point Mr. Fabrizio spoke strongly about was the need for a second bridge across the Saco River in case this type of situation happened again. He said a lot of people lived in the area and that was where all the developable land was located. He cited a report prepared for Cave Mountain Associates when the Stillings Grant area was first being developed which apparently included an emergency plan B if a bridge was not feasible. This involved laying planks across the bridge trestle at 2<sup>nd</sup> Iron, and Mr. Fabrizio felt material and equipment should always be available to make the trestle passable in the event of another emergency. He suggested it was time for the planning board to start planning and deal with this issue, along with the selectmen, Army Corp of Engineers or whoever else needed to be involved. He reiterated again that his remarks were not directed at this particular subdivision.

Jeff Rothen, who said he lived on Cobb Farm Road, asked Mr. York what data he had used to delineate the floodplain and whether it was from the 1970s floodplain map. Mr. York said it was not from the '70s, but he had obtained it directly from FEMA's website and it was the most-recent they had. The Chairman asked if there were any further questions. With none, he closed the public hearing and thanked people for their comments. David Shedd said he appreciated Mr. Fabrizio reminding the town in general that a second access has to be dealt with. With no other questions from the board, the Chairman called for a motion to continue the application to the November 21 work session. Motion made by David L. Patch; seconded by Scott Grant. Vote: All in favor.

**2. Informational discussion with Ammonoosuc Survey Co. re a proposed 3-unit PUD on Glen Ledge, Granite Ledge and Pebble Ledge Roads, for C.C. Russo.** File: 2017-1237. Tax Map 2GLENL, Lot ON2000.

Andy Fisher was before the board for a preliminary discussion regarding a proposed 3-unit PUD on 9.34-acres of land off Glen Ledge, Granite Ledge, and Pebble Ledge Roads. Mr. Fisher said he had done a boundary survey with topography and had also performed a high-intensity soil study (HISS) due to the steepness of the property. Density calculations showed the property would support just over nine bedrooms, based on Bartlett's density requirements. Mr. Fisher said it was proposed to build three stand-alone dwellings which would contain three bedrooms each. Access would be off Granite Ledge Road, which was on the higher end of the property. Mr. Fisher said Granite Ledge Road was in fairly good condition for most of the way until it passed an existing house when it then turned a little rough. Mr. Fisher acknowledged the road would certainly need some upgrading since this is where the three dwellings would be located. Mr. Fisher referred to that portion of road as the Granite Ledge Road extension. Peter Gagne asked whether Granite Ledge Road was a town road or a private road. Mr. Fisher said it was private, and he believed Pebble Ledge Road was a private road as well. The Chairman asked whether the frontage would be on Glen Ledge Road. Mr. Fisher said the parcel had 66-ft. frontage on Glen Ledge and 587-ft. frontage on Pebble Ledge Road. David Shedd said if Pebble Ledge was not a town road, what difference did it make how much frontage there was. Mr. Fisher responded that it didn't have to be a town road, but his understanding was that it had to be a road accepted by the planning board on a recorded subdivision plat. He noted there were many private roads in town.

David L. Patch said, basically, what Mr. Fisher was proposing was a lot with 66-ft. of frontage on a town road and three houses on a driveway. David Shedd noted there was already another house there, which would make four. Mr. Fisher pointed-out that the existing house was on a roadway; Granite Ledge Road. David Shedd said in Bartlett we have either a town road, a road built to town standards, or a driveway. There was nothing in-between. Mr. Fisher agreed there were certainly roads in town meeting the standards stated by Mr. Shedd, but there were other private roads which were approved by the planning board and recorded on a plat at the registry. He said Granite Ledge Road was recorded on a subdivision plan in 1976, which was prior to zoning. Mr. Fisher said it was 66-ft. wide, was referred to as a roadway in the deed, and was intended to provide access and frontage for any lots that were situated along it. When David Shedd again said that you can't create a lot unless it was on a town road or a town built to town standards, Mr. Fisher said that he wasn't creating a lot as the lot has existed since 1976. He agreed the property probably could not be used for a lotted subdivision with individual lots, but a PUD was a zero-lot-line subdivision. David L. Patch said there was no question one house would be allowed on the parcel, and felt that a PUD was the best way for Mr. Fisher to go. David Shedd expressed his opinion that a PUD development was merely a way of skirting the requirements of the zoning ordinance. He asked Mr. Fisher whether the owner would consider having only two houses on the driveway. Mr. Fisher indicated the answer to that would probably be no.

A long discussion ensued as to whether the entire road would need to be upgraded to town standards, or whether a town-standard road should be built from Glen Ledge to the area marked on the plan as "end of Granite Ledge Road ROW." From that area onward, there would be a long driveway serving three houses which would need to comply with town driveway specs. Not disputed was the fact the road would certainly need some improvements, to include the addition of emergency vehicle passing areas. Peter Gagne asked Mr. Fisher whether the PUD would be considered a condominium. Mr. Fisher was hesitant to immediately answer yes, not being sure if that was an apt description. Mr. Gagne read the subdivision regulations which stated a lot which is to be subdivided by condominium must front upon and be accessed from a Class V street or a privately-owned and maintained street which meets town road specifications. Mr. Fisher asked what road standards were in effect when the subdivision was approved in 1976, and said he felt it would be unfair to impose today's standards. He was advised that no matter what the planning board decided, it was the selectmen who had final jurisdiction over roads in town and it would be prudent of him to go and speak to them.

**3. Informal discussion with Paul Pagliarulo.** The Chairman reminded Mr. Pagliarulo this was an informal, non-binding discussion since the board wasn't sure what he wanted to talk about. Mr. Pagliarulo said he would consider it a pre-application informal discussion which involved his property on 833 Route 302. The board and Mr. Pagliarulo discussed which property this was to ensure the board knew where it was located. It was described as being the old Lyman Garland house between Attitash and Mountainside. Mr. Pagliarulo further described the house and being brown and said he was looking to develop some workforce housing on the property. He said soil testing and density calculations had been done which showed the two-acre parcel could support 4,000 gpd, which represented approximately 28 bedrooms. He said he would be applying under RSA 674:58-61, which was the workforce housing statute. Mr. Pagliarulo said there were several different ways he could build; either a single free-standing 26-bedroom building or three or four separate duplex-style buildings with four bedrooms each. He said he was here to see how the board would like to see the property developed. Mr. Pagliarulo said there was a specific need for workforce housing, as well as a lack of available houses.

Mr. Pagliarulo said there was also a possibility of locating the housing well-back on the property and have it accessed from Attitash property instead of off Route 302. There would be a parking lot with a walking trail leading directly to the individual units. The Chairman asked Mr. Pagliarulo how far back on the property he was talking about. Mr. Pagliarulo said he wasn't sure, but estimated it to be approximately 450-ft. David Shedd said he was familiar with the requirements of accessory dwelling units, but he did not fully understand what regulations workforce housing came under. David L. Patch said usually it involved allowing more septic density if it was workforce housing. Mr. Pagliarulo explained it started with a supreme court decision in 1996 resulting in RSA 674:58-61, which he mentioned previously. The Chairman said the board may need to do some research

on that particular RSA. When Mr. Pagliarulo indicated he assumed the board would be familiar with it, otherwise he would have brought a copy, he was reminded the board was not aware which one of his properties he was coming in to speak about.

Scott Grant asked Mr. Pagliarulo whether he was going to subdivide the property. Mr. Pagliarulo said he was not planning on doing that, which led to Mr. Grant to ask why the planning board was involved. Mr. Pagliarulo explained that part of the process to apply for a workforce housing was to first present the proposal to the local planning board. David Shedd asked whether workforce housing tenants had to move out once they were no longer part of the workforce. Mr. Pagliarulo said that was a valid question but did not provide a direct answer, instead saying there were no statutory land-use requirements for a lot of things and described how loggers often skirt regulations by clearing land then subdividing at a later time. Mr. Shedd noted Mr. Pagliarulo had previously quoted how many bedrooms he could have, based on soil types, and asked him again what that number was. Mr. Pagliarulo said the way the statute reads, absent an agreeable compromise with the planning board, there are remedies to get workforce housing in towns that don't have a workforce committee, which he believed Bartlett did not. He said the state supreme court stepped-in in 1996 and basically said there was a need for workforce housing. The number of bedrooms allowed would be based on soil type, and as long as the soil density was there to support those bedrooms, and as long as it could be shown that there was a direct need for housing, any efforts to provide it should be looked upon favorably. David L. Patch asked whether that was "should be" or "shall be." Mr. Pagliarulo said it was actually "shall be," that the statute was pretty onerous on towns and local boards to permit workforce housing as there was really a need for it. He said Attitash certainly had a need for housing for its employees, which prompted David Shedd to ask whether a particular housing project could be targeted to a particular business. Mr. Pagliarulo said it was not a matter of targeting a particular business, but more the fact that the need for it had to be demonstrated, and Attitash just happened to have such a need. He described how the kids lived in scattered housing all over town and either rode bikes to work or used the shuttle service provided by Attitash. Mr. Pagliarulo said what he was proposing was a much better scenario where they could walk to work. He said the number of bedrooms allowed would be calculated by what the state allows based on the type of soil on the property. Scott Grant said he thought what Mr. Pagliarulo was trying to do was excellent, but reminded him that Bartlett took a 25% septic reduction from what the state allowed and asked whether he was saying that reduction would not be allowed under workforce housing. Mr. Pagliarulo quickly agreed that was not the case, that the number of bedrooms could not exceed town regulations. He said density calculations showed the soil could support 4,000 gpd, with each bedroom being calculated as using 150 gpd. Peter Gagne asked whether there was a process in-place whereby Mr. Pagliarulo could go to the ZBA and ask for a special exception or a variance to have that 25% reduction waived. David L. Patch advised that was not an option, since the zoning ordinance did not provide any means to do that. The ZBA can only grant variances or special exceptions for things specifically mentioned in the zoning, therefore everyone is held to 75% of what the state allows for septic density.

Mr. Pagliarulo said if he went the route of affordable housing, as he sees it and as his attorney sees it, it would be the path of least resistance and the fastest way to get the needed housing up-and-running, whereas if he went the market-based route it could take a year or two. David L. Patch advised Mr. Pagliarulo that what he was trying to do was no different from any other PUD or development. He added that sometimes towns will allow the full state density, or a little more density if x-percent of the housing was intended for affordable housing, but Bartlett does not do that. Mr. Pagliarulo asked whether he could come back and speak to the board further after they had a chance to review the affordable housing RSA, saying perhaps he had misread it. He said he had assumed he would have got more-favorable treatment by building affordable housing, but if he was not going to get a break on septic and would have to take the 25% reduction, then he may as well go with a market-based PUD. Mr. Pagliarulo indicated he was glad he had come in to speak to the board and thanked them for their time. Before leaving, David Shedd asked whether the workforce housing would be considered a residential or commercial venture. Mr. Pagliarulo said he has the water rights to Stoney Brook which he retains through a deed, and the water system is through a community well which doesn't allow for commercial use. Therefore, it would be a strictly residential use, the same as the condos. Mr. Pagliarulo said he would be willing to post a

performance bond to ensure that it stayed residential. He said Attitash would use the workforce housing during the winter months, and he would use it for his farmers during the summer, so it was a win-win situation. The Chairman asked Mr. Pagliarulo what his plans were for the existing house on the property. Mr. Pagliarulo said it would stay the same as it was now, as a single-family rental. He said should the workforce housing work-out, and for aesthetic value, he may raise it and rehab it to match the new workforce housing.

**4. Discussion with Burke York re Tsoules property:** Mr. York provided a plan showing the latest concept for Mr. Tsoules' property on the corner of Route 16/302 and Town Hall Road. What he was now proposing was a commercial PUD on the property with two exclusive-use areas. The board looked at the plan, and David Shedd asked where the frontage for Lot B was. Mr. York said it was a PUD with common area so it did not need frontage. David L. Patch agreed it wasn't a two-lot subdivision, but a PUD with two exclusive use areas, which elicited a short discussion as to how the property would be taxed. Mr. York acknowledged he didn't know exactly how it would be taxed, but guessed there would be separate bills for each exclusive area and another for the common area. He said his intent now was simply to make sure the planning board was happy and then go to the state for approval. David Shedd asked how many businesses would be using the driveway. Mr. York said he was showing a proposed drive in the common area, but for a short distance where the drive immediately came off Town Hall Road there would be four businesses sharing it. When Mr. Shedd asked how four businesses could share a driveway, Mr. York said that three houses could share a drive and asked whether it was different for commercial. David Shedd asked him why that would be the case? Why wouldn't commercial ventures have to comply with the same driveway standards? Mr. York indicated he didn't know, but that's what he was here to find out.

Scott Grant asked why Mr. Tsoules could not put his own driveway in off Town Hall Road. Mr. Shedd said he couldn't because it has got to be within 400-ft. of Route 16/302. Peter Gagne wondered how three businesses got approved to share a single driveway in the first place. It has only been a year since three dwellings were allowed to share a drive, which seemed to indicate there were different standards for residential and commercial drives. David L. Patch said he thought there was, but would need to look into it. David Shedd said one of the reasons for the 200-ft. frontage requirement on Route 16 was to limit commercial activity, and felt that the PUD process circumvented that. David L. Patch disagreed that the intent was to limit commercial activity. He said it was intended to make the area useful because it was right on the main road and was a great place for such an activity, but since it bordered a residential area a larger amount of frontage was required. David Shedd again said his concern was that a PUD for commercial use basically allows those frontage requirements to be disregarded. Burke York asked if a residential PUD was built, would only three houses be allowed on a driveway. Mr. Shedd said yes, unless it was built to town road standards.

Following a long discussion on the rationale of commercial PUDs, other minor topics were brought-up. David Shedd asked about a septic area and test pit which were shown on the plan, saying he hadn't witnessed any pits being dug. Mr. York said this was only a preliminary plan and a test pit hadn't been done, but that he was just showing a logical place to do it. Peter Gagne asked whether the wetlands had been designated yet. Mr. York said they hadn't; there were some wetlands in the back corner but he could guarantee there was enough room left for what Mr. Tsoules wanted to do. He added that Mr. Tsoules wanted to create an area of his property which he could use to generate funds to help recompense some of the purchase price. Mr. Shedd directed a question to Mr. York about PUDs by saying he did not really understand them, but thought people owned the foundation under their building and the rest of the land was held in-common. David L. Patch advised it could be done either way; they could either own the immediate land under the building or could own a designated area, such as 100-ft. or 200-ft. around the building. It depended on what the recorded documents said.

David Shedd expressed that he was not comfortable allowing Mr. Tsoules' PUD until the frontage situation had been resolved. Peter Gagne suggested asking the Municipal Association. The Chairman said we need to first understand what we're asking. Can we allow four business accesses off one small piece of driveway? At this point Kevin Bennett disclosed he may have a conflict of interest, saying it was his son-in-law who was probably

going to buy the second exclusive-use area. David Shedd said he appreciated what Mr. Bennett was saying, but felt it wasn't cause for concern right now since it was none of our business who was buying it and any decision was not based on that. The board agreed, but said Mr. Bennett's conflict may be revisited in the future, if necessary. The Chairman asked what we wanted to ask the Municipal Association. Scott Grant made the motion to ask the Municipal Association whether we can allow four commercial businesses off one two-hundred-foot frontage. David Shedd asked again where the frontage was. He said he could see a lot being created and it was being called a PUD, but he didn't see what difference that made. He asked why were they exempt from frontage requirements just because it was called a PUD, when it was basically the same as any other lot. Scott Grant said that was the question he was asking the Municipal Association. The Chairman pointed-out where the frontage on Route 302 was. Mr. Shedd argued the zoning ordinance stated in order to create a lot you needed to have frontage. In unison, board members told him a lot wasn't being created, despite the fact it looks like a lot and acts like a lot.

The Chairman asked whether there was a second on Scott Grant's motion. David L. Patch seconded the motion. Vote: All in favor. David L. Patch suggested if the Municipal Association says what is being proposed is fine, then it wouldn't hurt to give the selectmen a heads-up. David Shedd said he felt strongly about this, not so much in this particular situation, but he can see the changes it implies, in general. He asked whether he could go and speak to the selectmen himself. Peter Gagne said his only concern is what if the Municipal Association says this is allowed and the applicant goes to all the expense and work of setting-up a PUD and the planning board approves it, then Mr. Tsoules goes in to the selectmen for a building permit and is denied. David L. Patch said that is why he suggested going to the selectmen as soon as we heard from the Municipal Association. Just so he was clear, Burke York confirmed what was being asked of the Municipal Association was that the common area that has the frontage can be shared. David L. Patch added they were being asked if it could be shared by four businesses, not three. Mr. York then provided a copy of a 2008 Ammonoosuc Survey plan for the Dunkin' Donuts PUD which he claimed hadn't been given subdivision approval from the planning board because it was not a subdivision, it was a planned unit development. He said the plan met our regulations and a note was added saying, "I hereby certify that I have filed a copy of this plat with the planning board in accordance with RSA 676:18(4)". Peter Gagne checked that particular RSA and found that filing a copy with the board was required. David Shedd asked David L. Patch if he understood why it never came before the planning board. Burke York answered that he guessed it was probably because it wasn't a subdivision, but a planned unit development. David L. Patch said he wasn't sure, but perhaps they came to see whether they needed to go through site plan review.

Before leaving, Burke York asked about the new policy of waiting 30-days after the plan is approved to send it to the Registry for recording. The secretary described how that was a strong suggestion made by lawyers at a OEP seminar she had recently attended. Since there is 30-day appeal process of any planning board approval, waiting for that period to expire prevented plans being recorded which later changed if someone lodged an appeal, even though it was acknowledged that rarely happens. Mr. Burke felt that was too long to wait and asked whether the 30-day clock could start ticking from when the application was accepted at the public hearing, and not two weeks later when it was usually approved. The two-week wait is a condition in our zoning ordinance. The secretary indicated she would follow whatever process the board wanted, but reiterated how strongly the lawyers had urged to wait the 30-days.

**5. Discussion on zoning amendments:** Due to how long this meeting had run, the Chairman suggested the discussion on any proposed zoning amendment be put-off until the work session

**6. Review and Approve Minutes:** The minutes of the October 2 meeting were reviewed. In Item 4, David Shedd noted that Greg Tsoules' name was spelled incorrectly in that there was an "s" on the end of it. A motion was made by David Shedd; seconded by David L. Patch to approve the minutes as amended. Vote: All in favor. There were no minutes for the October work session since a meeting was not held.

**7. Continuation/Final Approval: Attitash Mountain Service Co., (AMSCO), Block G, Stillings Grant:**  
File: 2013-1187. This is an application to reconvene review of a continued application to subdivide Block G into 40 residential units. Tax Map 5STLNG, Lot G00.

This application has been continued indefinitely until a review by the town engineer review is completed..

**8. Mail and Other Business:**

- A letter from Sean Shannon, who was before the board recently to talk about his potential purchase of the Glen Sand and Gravel pit, was noted. The Chairman said Mr. Shannon was looking for a letter from the planning board confirming what had been said at that meeting. Since the letter had only been received tonight, the Chairman suggested it be sent to each member to read so they could discuss it at the work session and be comfortable if they signed-off on it. David Shedd said he was not signing-off on anything until he sees a map. Scott Grant said it was an informal discussion with Mr. Shannon and until he saw written specific questions, he wasn't prepared to sign anything either.
- The Chairman spoke about people's concerns regarding the recent flood. He noted there had been a lot of discussion about it and a lot of people came to the meeting tonight to hear about it, but it had not been discussed in detail because the planning board really had nothing to do with it. However, the Chairman said he had spoken to selectmen Gene Chandler and Jon Hebert and Mr. Hebert was talking about forming a committee of selectmen, planning board members, and others to talk about issues of where things stand in town regarding the different rivers and streams and what needs to be done about the levies and blockages which contain the water so the water doesn't jump the river banks again. A second access across the river also needs discussion as does what, if anything, needs to be put on the town ballot to determine what funds voters are willing to allocate to the cause. Scott Grant said he attended the selectmen's meeting tonight to give his input regarding the need for emergency repairs right now, before spring run-off causes even more damage. The Chairman said if the selectmen do decide to form a committee, he would like to have representation from the planning board and indicated he would be willing to serve. Scott Grant also offered his services.
- Scott Grant said he would like to see a zoning amendment which deals with the "blight" conditions at Lynn Roberts' former home in Glen.

With no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Scott Grant; seconded by Peter Gagne. Vote: All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Bush  
Recording Secretary