

# **Newton Planning Board**

# **Public Meeting Minutes**



November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023

The Newton Planning Board public meeting was called to order at: 7:07PM

Present were Mr. Moran, Mr. Marchand, Mr. Eddy, and Alternate Mr. Gibbons. Also Present: James Doggett – PB AA and Ms. Rowden - Circuit Rider

Present via Zoom, Ms. White, Ms. Eddy, Ms. Burke,

Chairman Moran led the salute to the Flag.

Chairman Moran seated Mr. Gibbons as a voting member for the excused Mr. Ryan

Chairman Moran commented that since there were only 4 members present, that later in the meeting when Mr. Gibbons recused himself owing to being an abutter to public hearing A and B, there would be no quorum present. Ms. Burke agreed to come in as soon as her vehicle was available. Mr. Moran then announced that the Board would deal with Public Hearings C and D first to allow Ms. Burke time to get to Town Hall

# 1. Public Hearings

## C. A continuation of M. Ryan Norman Of Newton NH's request for a Public Hearing for an 8-lot Subdivision at 17 Thornell Road in Newton, NH. The property is referenced as Tax Map 12, block 1 Lot 4.

Mr. Moran asked Mr. Quintal to present the application.

Mr. Quintel stated the property is at 17 Thornell Road it is tax map 12 block 1 lot 4. I made the presentation at the last meeting and the planning board did accept jurisdiction; the waivers that were presented were approved; and also the conditional use permit was granted. We received comments from the Town Engineer and since that meeting I have made some revisions to the plans so I will go through those. On the plan sheet here the 4 waivers and the conditional use permit are noted. On sheet three which, I will turn to, I am going to actually read through them and same thing with Jennifer's comments. Sheet three shows the calculations and the requirements for the open space and the recreational requirements and also the lot size by soil type The calculations are on the left side of the page and the lot size by soil type are on the right-hand side of the page. Sheet three and four have defined areas for the limit of vegetation removal I had shown on lots two, three, and four a hatched area with a limit of cut to 60% but actually the deed says that the vegetation removal cannot be greater than 60% so it is really only 40% that needs to be left on each lot. What I show now is not a hatched area, because anybody that buys or develops each of these lots it does not really

matter really where they are going to be cutting the trees as long as they leave their percentage or their square footage for each lot. What I am showing for at the top of the page for lots two, three, and four is the square footage of area that must be left for vegetation and the calculations are at the top of the page for the required total amount and each of the square footage adds up to. What the total needs to be for that parcel of land which was originally the Town piece. I can answer any questions on that if it is not clear. That was so that it is shown on sheet three and also on sheet four. I am going to turn to sheet four and again this is the sheet that is going to be recorded. It is important that that calculation which are at the top of the page and on sheets two on lots 2 three and four show the square footage that needs to be remained for vegetation on sheet four. I also added the note number two which is over on the left-hand side of the sheet. That was one of the comments from Jennifer about the inspection and reporting for the storm water management. It is one of your standard notes that needs to be put on the plan and that certainly is on this plan for that is the sheet that is going to be recorded also the waivers and the conditional use approval are noted right underneath that. That would be also included on the sheet that gets recorded sheet five there is really no changes to that that just shows a better scale for the beginning part of the road construction sheet six shows again the at a different scale obviously but also shows the minimum square footage that must remain for vegetation on each of the lots. On lots two, three, and four it showed a path at the south side of lot 7 across the upland area it is a little hatched area that can show where access to the recreation area is. This is on the eastern part of the property and on sheet seven you can see that area as the open space that is on that eastern part of the property, where the where the gas lines crosses are, and, I think if the hatching comes through, you can see where I am trying to show the access from the roadway along the south side of lot 7 that gets to that open space area and eventually to the area that goes on each side of the gas line. This provides an area for recreational purposes and certainly that can be utilized for the homeowner's association if they want to. I think that that is all I need to show on that sheet eight that again it is a different scale, but it is just a match line that shows the square footage on lot two that needs to be remain vegetation and also the portion that is on the conservation land obviously. That is going to be left as well. I am going to shoot over to D1 which is the detail sheet. I am just going to go through the comments from the Town Engineer Mike Vignale and I will go through those as he has presented them. Number one says the proposed project a 10% grade for the center line of the road the maximum allowed by a subdivision regulation is 8%; also the landing area at the intersection with Thornell road is proposed to be 25 ft when 100 is required. The second one is similar in the sense that it reviews the waiver requirement the roadway width proposed is 20 foot with two-foot shoulders and the subdivision regulation requires 24 feet with 4-foot shoulders, a waiver from the regulation is required which again we went through that at the last meeting and got that approved. Third one is again the same thing another waiver requirement the landing area at the intersection of Thornell Road is proposed to be 25 when 100 ft is required a waiver from regulation is required and so again that one we got approval for at the last meeting comment number four is about the bituminous berm that we are proposing along each edge of the roadway for much of the length of the road. Maintenance requirements are less for open drainage, no berm, than closed drainage. Understanding that this may be a requirement from NHDES closed drainage systems are preferred and should be used whenever possible. It kind of is a requirement from DES as far as their best management practices for capturing and treating runoff from the roadway. Where a good part of the road passes over the wetlands, there is not enough room to allow the water to just drain over the edge of the road and treat it

properly. That is why we are trying to capture the water as it just approaches the wetland and just after the wetland and get it into some catch basins and then directing the water to the grass swale and treatment area. I think the Conservation Commission would agree with that. As far as treating the runoff

From the street, that is what we are proposing to do. We think that is what should be done but again your Town Engineer has basically stated that they like to see open drainage for Town roads. This is going to be a private road maintained by the Association so it would not be anything that the Town would be required to maintain. That was number four comment, number five the typical roadway section depicts a top of a 2:1 slope beginning only a foot behind the proposed bituminous berm and at the edge of the proposed shoulder, same with the 3:1 slope, this is very close to the berm and considering a rounding between the berm and the top of the slope is required for stability. Additional level area beyond the berm slope is required, so on this sheet I added some extra dimensioning for, on the side of this roadway, beyond the shoulder and beyond the bump so they will be at least 3 feet from the edge of the roadway before it turns into a rounding or before it goes into to the transition to the slope. You can see that on the cross-section of the plan that I have showing you in the center of the plan set so that was number five number. Six check guardrail warrants and depict the guardrail on the plans and on the typical roadway section roadway section if warranted. Alternatively 3:1 slope could be used. I have provided a detail just to the left of the title block that shows a guardrail detail and a note up on the cross section beside the guardrail that shows that the guardrail shall be used where slope is steeper than 3:1. Which is basically what he is saying if it is 3:1 we do not need to have a guardrail but if it is steeper than 3:1 then it should have a guardrail so that is where the detail for the guardrail and the note that is shown on the crosssection. So that was number six, number seven, storm water onm manual includes a description for the detention basin maintenance, for an infiltration basin, is proposed. Please edit the manual accordingly and 72-hour basin drain range time, so I have sent those to the Town. I have a couple of copies here that show the infiltration. We amended so on the previous omm I did not have that infiltration basin requirement and in in there for the maintenance requirements and those were the seven comments from Mr. Vignale. I sent the revised plan and copy of this on and to him I have not got a response back from him but maybe he feels as though if I am presenting the stuff and clearly shows that I complied with his requirements, perhaps that is enough, so the homeowners association declaration and bylaws have been completed and emailed to the Town. I know you have a copy, but I have got a hard copy here I just get it to Jim for your file.

Mr. Moran asked if Board members had any questions, there were none.

Mr. Moran opened the floor for Public Comment

Jeffrey Goucher (Abutter, 11 Thornell Road) stated I just want to understand one thing, is for seven a lot development and on the agenda it says eight lot it is just a confusing thing to me.

Ms. Rowden informed him there are eight total lots. The existing house is the eighth.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to approve the application with the following facts and conditions:

# The Board found the following facts concerning the application:

- 1. That the plan falls within the scope of the applicable Zoning and Site Plan regulations for a subdivision.
- 2. That Justice would be served by approving the application.

#### Proposed conditions: Conditions Precedent:

1. Legal protections for the Town of Newton and liability waivers must be in place per Site Plan Regulations:

# 8.2.4 Driveway, Access, Road Design and Traffic Technical Design Standards

# 1. Access to Town Roads

As part of any waiver request, the applicant shall present language that releases the town from any liability for failure to access any site served by the common driveway with safety vehicles and equipment due to substandard construction, lack of maintenance, negligence on the part of any landowner served by the common driveway, and failure to maintain all season passability. Such language shall be placed on the recorded Mylar.

# 4. Private Roads

Private streets serving developments shall remain in private ownership and the developer shall provide legal instruments to insure their continued maintenance and ownership. All private roads shall comply with these and other town regulations relating to construction and maintenance.

- 2. Submit a recordable mylar and wet signed copies of the legal protections as well as the HOA documents to be recorded contemporaneously.
- 3. Set the bound points.

Ms. White seconded.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye

Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS.** 

While people were leaving at the end of the public hearing, Ms. Burke arrived in the Town Hall.

## D. Duane Skofield of Plaistow, NH requests a public hearing for an Accessory Dwelling Unit at 39 Amesbury Road, Newton NH. The property is referenced as Tax Map 16, Block 4, Lot 1-1A.

Mr. Moran invited Mr. Skofield to present his application.

Mr. Skofield stated is was for an accessory apartment.

Mr. Moran asked Ms. Rowden for her input.

Ms. Rowden stated, I do think the application is complete seems to conform to your conditional use permit requirements for accessory dwellings. I know a question did come Up about the fact that the door for the accessory apartment is on the side of the building to the right of the garage. Your requirements say that the accessory dwelling unit access has to be on the side or rear of the building it does not say which way it has to face so if because this is behind I will say the plane of the front of the building it is technically on the side of the structure, so I think it conforms with your requirements.

Mr. Moran asked if there were any Board questions.

Ms. White asked about the square-footage of the apartment.

She was informed it was under 700 square-feet.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to take jurisdiction; Mr. Eddy seconded.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye

The vote was UNANIMOUS.

Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye

Mr. Moran asked for public comments.

Mr. Moore (Abutter, 41 Amesbury Road) stood in support of the application.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** the following:

The Board found the following facts concerning the application:

1. That the plan falls within the scope of the applicable Zoning and Site Plan regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units.

2. That Justice would be served by approving the application.

**Conditions Precedent:** 

- 1. Obtain all local and state permits including an occupancy permit.
- 2. A copy of the approved septic plan be on file.

# Conditions Ongoing:

1. The limits of the accessory apartment are as follows:

**SECTION XIII** ACCESSORY APARTMENTS (Added March 2001, amended March 2012)

Pursuant to RSA 674:71, 674:73 the Planning Board is hereby authorized to grant a Conditional Use Permit to allow for accessory apartments in accordance with the restrictions and requirements of this section. To increase housing alternatives while maintaining neighborhood aesthetics and quality, an accessory apartment shall be permitted within all single-family dwelling units. Maximum of one (1) accessory apartment per property.

- 1. The property owner must occupy one (1) of the two (2) units.
- 2. No more than two (2) bedrooms are permitted in the accessory apartment.
- 3. Not more than four (4) people shall occupy said apartment.
- 4. Off-street parking sufficient for both units must be provided (space for a minimum of four (4) vehicles).
- 5. The septic system shall be adequate for both units, per New Hampshire Water Supply and Pollution Control Standards.
- 6. The accessory apartment must be attached to the primary dwelling unit. Accessory apartments are not permitted in detached accessory structures on the same lot.
- 7. The accessory apartment shall have convenient and direct access to the primary dwelling unit (a connecting inside door) AND its own separate entrance/exit.
- 8. Appearance shall remain that of a single-family residence. New entrances for the accessory apartment shall be located on the side or rear of the building.
- 9. The size of the accessory apartment shall be a maximum of 800 square feet.
- 10. The primary dwelling unit and the accessory apartment shall share common utilities including well, septic system, heating, and electrical service.
- 11. Design of the accessory apartment shall be such that it would be readily adaptable to conversion into part of the primary dwelling.

# 2. Meet all Life Safety Codes.

#### 3. Utilities must be shared by the main house and the Accessory Apartment

Seconded the motion

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy - Aye Mr. Marchand - Aye Ms. Burke - Aye Mr. Gibbons- Aye

Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was UNANIMOUS.

Chairman opened the Public hearing Reading: The Board found the following facts concerning the application:

1. That the plan falls within the scope of the applicable Zoning and Site Plan regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units.

2. That Justice would be served by approving the application.

**Conditions Precedent:** 

- 3. Obtain all local and state permits including an occupancy permit.
- 4. A copy of the approved septic plan be on file.

#### Conditions Ongoing:

#### 4. The limits of the accessory apartment are as follows:

**SECTION XIII** ACCESSORY APARTMENTS (Added March 2001, amended March 2012)

Pursuant to RSA 674:71, 674:73 the Planning Board is hereby authorized to grant a Conditional Use Permit to allow for accessory apartments in accordance with the restrictions and requirements of this section. To increase housing alternatives while maintaining neighborhood aesthetics and quality, an accessory apartment shall be permitted within all single-family dwelling units. Maximum of one (1) accessory apartment per property.

- 12. The property owner must occupy one (1) of the two (2) units.
- 13. No more than two (2) bedrooms are permitted in the accessory apartment.
- 14. Not more than four (4) people shall occupy said apartment.
- 15. Off-street parking sufficient for both units must be provided (space for a minimum of four (4) vehicles).
- 16. The septic system shall be adequate for both units, per New Hampshire Water Supply and Pollution Control Standards.
- 17. The accessory apartment must be attached to the primary dwelling unit. Accessory apartments are not permitted in detached accessory structures on the same lot.
- 18. The accessory apartment shall have convenient and direct access to the primary dwelling unit (a connecting inside door) AND its own separate entrance/exit.

- 19. Appearance shall remain that of a single-family residence. New entrances for the accessory apartment shall be located on the side or rear of the building.
- 20. The size of the accessory apartment shall be a maximum of 800 square feet.
- 21. The primary dwelling unit and the accessory apartment shall share common utilities including well, septic system, heating and electrical service.
- 22. Design of the accessory apartment shall be such that it would be readily adaptable to conversion into part of the primary dwelling.

## 5. Meet all Life Safety Codes.

#### 6. Utilities must be shared by the main house and the Accessory Apartment

Ms. Burke Seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Abstained Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS** 

Mr. Gibbons recused himself from the Board for the next 2 public hearings.

A. A continuation of 125 Development NH Corp of Plaistow, NH's, request for a public hearing for a 4-building site plan off S. Main Street, in Newton NH. The property is referenced as Tax Map 14, Block 1, Lot 27- 3. This is a Reapplication.

Attorney Tilsley asked to withdraw the application.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to retroactively extend the conditional approval of the existing application with an end date of March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023, with the previously stated conditions; Ms. Burke seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke - Aye Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS** 

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to request that the Selectmen refund the application fee associated with this application; Ms. White seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke - Aye Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye Mr. Ryan – Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS** 

#### B. A continuation of 125 Development NH Corp's request for a public hearing for a 44-unit Residential Development and Private Roadway for their land off Puzzle Lane, in Newton NH. The properties are referenced as Tax Map 14, Block 1, Lots (1-1), 2 (27-3)(27-6) and (27-7).

Mr. Moran invited Mr. Gier to present his application.

Barry Gier (Jones & Beach Engineers agent for the applicant) stated the intent of the project is to construct a 44-bedroom multifamily project on lots 14-1-(-1-1) and two. This will be in eight five plex units and one four plex units so a total of nine buildings on a cul-de-sac. It is about 535 foot and to construct the remaining roadway necessary to connect Puzzle lane from phase one of the Southern New Hampshire Industrial Park

Project to phase two which is about 4400 linear feet. Since the last meeting we submitted updated plans that have addressed the comments from the board, the Town Planner, and the Town Engineer. The highlights of which are the relocation of the extension Road outside of Plaistow addressing the comments regarding the roadway proposed by from the Town we provided septic system designs that are in the package that you have, a landscape plan has been provided for the development area and lighting plan has been updated as requested. Additionally, the hydrogeological report was completed the conclusion of the study was that no adverse impact are anticipated due to proposed development. The constructed project does require wetland impact of

7,494 square feet this is all for the wetland impact is all for the construction of the proposed extension road, none for the 44-unit development specifically. We also require a wetland buffer impact of 64,8 square feet. All but 5,275 of which are for the roadway. There was some questions about the buildings, it is my understanding that the buildings meet building code, ADA, and have been reviewed by the fire department. The applicant is also committed to installing fire sprinklers. We are currently before the ZBA for multiple variances required for the construction of the roadway. We are in front of the ZBA next week. The project does require several state permits including an alteration of terrain, a per state permit for the water system and the septic systems, and also the wetland permits.

Ms. Rowden stated my main comment is that I do think because of the revisions to the Roadway, or at least the roadway section they have pulled farther into Newton you do need Mike Vignale's comments on those. Which to my understanding has not been received yet. Also, getting his review of the septic design that should also be part of The update. Those are my two big comments just to reiterate though this project Cannot go forward unless the one that we heard just a few minutes ago goes forward.

Ms. White stated I was looking at the this, the schematics here for the bathroom and stuff and it all on all of the handicap ones it says future grab bars so does that mean that although you are advertising these as handicapped accessible you are not going to install any of the grab bars in any of the bathrooms.

Mr. Gier replied no, they will be installed even though it says future they will be Installed.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to find the application complete and to take jurisdiction; Ms. Burke seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke - Aye Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS** Chairman Moran opened the floor for public comment.

Chris Herman (no address given) asked is it an elderly complex you are talking about, handicapped accessible bathrooms.

Mr. Gier stated the proposal is not slated to be for elderly housing although that would not preclude someone who is elderly from living there so it is 44 one-bedroom apartments.

Steve Beck (Abutter, 20 Ridgewood Road, Plaistow) stated, Barry you mentioned this evening that there is an electrical plan that is been for streetlights on this road. I was Wondering if the applicant would be open to discussion on what type of lighting. Having sat through many iterations of this plan lighting is a huge issue because we abut this property. If you light that road up like a Christmas tree it is a concern to us, so I do not know if there is already designed lights for it if you could comment on that and if there be a possibility of speaking with the applicant might be just using down lights for streetlights as opposed to broadcast lights.

Mr. Gier stated just to clarify the only place we are proposing lights is on the proposed Colac for the 44-unit development the extension Road that is going from Puzzle Lane to Phase 2 will not have streetlights on it all. The proposed lights are dark sky compliant, so they are full cut off, so it is only light the area around the proposed residential Buildings.

Mr. Marchand addressed Mr. Gier stating you have your pen in hand, I have a new resident at 10 Howard Lane her name is Ann Barden and I respectfully request that when you start sending out any further abutter notices that she get notified because the person John R. Bowden who used to live there no longer lives there.

Mr. Gier stated we will not be sending out any new abutter notices. They are noticed at the beginning of the project and then it is continued to a date specific.

Mr. Marchand replied so you can make a note in your on your files please.

Mr. Gier stated we will.

Mr. Marchand Moved to continue the public hearing to December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023; Ms. Burke seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Ms. Burke - Aye Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr.

Moran - Aye

The vote was **UNANIMOUS** 

Mr. Gibbons rejoined the Board

## **Board Business**

a. Acceptance of minutes of the 11/14/23 meeting

Mr. Eddy **MOVED** to accept the minutes as printed. Mr. Marchand seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Mr. Ryan – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye Ms. Eddy - Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS**.

# b. NPREA Manifest

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to pay the NPREA Manifest in the amount of **\$40.71** Ms. Burke seconded the motion.

Chairman Moran asked A.A. Doggett to call the roll.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye Ms. Eddy – Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS.** 

# c. Budget and Schedule

A.A. Doggett presented the budget for 2024 and the schedule. He explained the changes to both. January 23<sup>rd</sup> has been set for the Presidential Primary so that was changed on the schedule. He was asked to review the salary line in the budget.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to adopt the new schedule and budget. Ms. Burke seconded the motion.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye Ms. Eddy – Aye Mr. Moran - Aye The vote was **UNANIMOUS.** 

# d. Discussion of vehicle weight limits for home-based business.

The Board discussed the matter of GVW of vehicles used for Home-Based Businesses.

Mr. Marchand **MOVED** to take the change of vehicle weight, for those allowed on properties with Home-Based Businesses, from 12,000lbs to 26,000lbs. Ms. Burke

seconded the motion.

Ms. White -Aye Mr. Eddy – Aye Mr. Marchand – Aye Mr. Gibbons– Aye Ms. Eddy – Aye

Mr. Moran - Aye

The vote was UNANIMOUS.

# e. Invest NH update and Master Plan Housing Chapter.

Ms. Rowden informed the Board: I will be working on putting together what will be sort of The Education Outreach material for this next engagement phase. It includes the draft goals of the master plan chapter that we've discussed briefly it includes the outreach from the survey that was done this fall giving the updated statistics that would be in the master plan chapter, then solicit public feedback the intention would be to have something second half of January where you would invite the public. We can do it at a Planning Board meeting, take the first 45 minutes. I am also going to put it up on what will be like a little mini website, it will sort of look like where the survey was, if you went and took the survey. It will just have more background information along with the survey results, if people cannot come to the public meeting they can at least still see the information. We can put the recording of that meeting up there as well. We can have the draft information, people can still comment, so it is sort of like a hybrid public engagement event, but it will have an in-person component with the main presentation. The other thing that has been going forward is the regulatory audit, that is looking at your zoning, site plan, and subdivision regulations to see; what do you have, what could you tweak to allow for more housing opportunities, or what might you want to not necessarily change but alter that might be procedural things or things that you might want to really keep because it is while it is a restriction on housing it is beneficial for say wetlands, ecological purposes, and Environmental Protection. It is looking at it from a bunch of different vantage points, but also giving you background as to why you have some provisions; why you might want to change things, if the goal is to increase Housing Opportunity and diversity. The workforce housing thing is a vein of all of this, but it is mainly opportunity, not necessarily solely targeted towards workforce housing. My intention would actually be to present that to you probably the end of January - first week of February I would like to be able to do that honestly before any changes to the board just because you guys have been the ones working on it. It is not a document you have to approve, it is not part of the master plan it is a reference document so that if there are funds available going forward, to work on some of those zoning changes, you have the background tool to be, well we looked at it, we studied it, we did some education outreach to see what ones we might want to pick from. It gives you good backing if you were to go for a regulation change and or see grant funding to do that work.

# 3. Adjourn.

Chairman Moran adjourned the meeting at 8:40PM

Respectfully Submitted,

James L. Doggett, A.A.

Newton Planning Board