

Town of Bedford Planning Board Minutes January 23, 2023

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, January 23, 2023, at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were Charlie Fairman (Chair), Hal Newberry (Vice Chair), Chris Bandazian (Town Council Alternate), Phil Greazzo (Town Council), Priscilla Malcolm, John Nelson (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director) and Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director). Absent: Chris Swiniarski (Alternate), Matt Sullivan, Steve Clough, and Matt Nichols (Secretary).

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chairman Fairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and appointed Mr. Nelson to vote. Ms. Harris review the agenda:

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings:

1. The Planning Board will conduct the second public hearing on proposed zoning amendments submitted by the Planning Board and by citizens' petition. The full text of the amendments is available in the Town Clerk & Planning Department offices during normal business hours and on the Town website at www.bedfordnh.org.

III. New Business: None

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. Development Update

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to accept the agenda as read. Vice Chair Newberry duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings:

1. **The Planning Board will conduct the second public hearing on proposed zoning amendments submitted by the Planning Board and by citizens' petition. The full text of the amendments is available in the Town Clerk & Planning Department offices during normal business hours and on the Town website at www.bedfordnh.org.**

Chair Fairman stated the first item on the agenda for tonight is a second public hearing on the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. Does anyone on the Planning Board have any comments at this point beyond last week? We'll move right into a public meeting on the zoning amendments. If anybody would like to speak, please go up to the microphone, give your name and address, and speak to the zoning changes.

Ms. Hebert stated Mr. Fairman, I can give a brief update on the citizens' petition which was of significant public interest at the last meeting. At the first public hearing, the Board took testimony on zoning amendments, #1 through #8, which are the amendments proposed by the Board. I can go through them briefly if you'd like or we've talked about them at a number of meetings. Chair Fairman said I think the Board has had adequate discussion on them. So, I don't think we do. Ms. Hebert continued; amendment #9 is proposed by citizens' petition. The amendment is intended to restrict roosters on lots smaller than five acres in the residential and agricultural zone and also restrict the keeping of geese on lots smaller than 5 acres.

At the last public hearing, we had a lot of testimony from residents concerned about the restriction on the keeping of roosters and geese, and the petitioner spoke to the Board and said that he would like to withdraw his petition. I discussed that process with the town attorney. The process for withdrawing a citizens' petition involves collecting all of the same signatures that are on the petition for the zoning amendment on a withdrawal petition. The petitioner has talked with me, and although he no longer supports the amendment, he doesn't feel that he's going to be able to track down all of the signatures from his original petition. So, he is not planning to come tonight and, as he stated, would like to withdraw the petition, but for logistical reasons he feels like it's not going to be possible for him to collect all of the necessary signatures to legally have the zoning amendment removed from the Town ballot.

Chair Fairman said thank you for the update, Ms. Hebert. Just a reminder to everybody that the Planning Board tonight will vote to either support or not support the petition's amendment. We don't vote to approve or disapprove it. We vote to support it or not support it, so we will be doing that before tonight's meeting closes. Vice Chair Newberry stated I would just comment that I think at our last meeting we had also talked a little bit about the description that typically accompanies both proposed Zoning Board amendments and also citizens' petition amendments. I think what we discussed was that staff would, as they normally do, provide a description of the proposed amendments and I think we had talked about that description would include the fact that the original petitioner no longer was in support of the citizens' amendment. I think that's important to keep in mind because that's what will be there describing that particular proposed amendment. So, when people go to vote, they will see that description and the description will include the fact that the petitioner no longer supports the petition. So, I just say that as a reminder to everyone who may not have been here last week, that we did have that conversation. And I think that description can be a part of what's posted. Is that that correct, Ms. Hebert? Ms. Hebert replied that's correct. I think we can expand on this statement here where it says the Planning Board does not support passage of this amendment because the petitioner has stated he'd like to withdraw the petition or no longer supports the petition. Vice Chair Newberry said that's all I have, Mr. Chairman. There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

Public Testimony Zoning Amendment #9, citizens' petition:

Ms. Lauren Messina of 157 Nashua Road, Bedford, comments: Thank you. My name is Lauren Messina. I live at 157 Nashua Road. I'm going to share something that I had written up to share last week and we were all very excited with the petitioner's changing of heart. Obviously with the snow, we've got some diehards here who came out. Mr. Chairman, I don't recall seeing you here last time so just to update, this place was full—all ages here supporting something that means a lot to us. And it breaks my heart a little to hear the petitioner say it's not in my means to go back and get those people. I think if their life or if the family's dog's life depended on it, they would be signed again in a heartbeat. And that's how we

feel about our homes, our farms, our animals. I live on 157 Nashua Road in Bedford, only a few miles down from the road where I and my husband grew up. When we bought our land in this Town nine years ago, we had no intention of actively farming, but our realtor made sure to inform us that because we were located in Bedford's Agricultural District, aside from there being a limit to the number of pigs per acre, there were no other limits should we choose to bring the Spurway's old farmhouse back to life. A spontaneous adventure I am so glad we chose to take on with our children as part of their home education. I could go on all day, and I won't, about what I have learned in nine years of farming with my children; about the importance of roosters to protect and establish a healthy pecking order in a flock of hens or their anatomical differences that make them uniquely designed for their job. Like the way their eyes can focus in two separate directions to better guard their hens, not to mention the obvious need for roosters for the reproduction of next spring's flocks. Thanks to our roosters I will never need to give my kids the birds and the bees talk.

I would love to educate our community about the use of geese as companion animals for other solitary livestock on the farm, as well as alerting for danger and defending the more vulnerable farm animals such as lambs, chickens and in many cases even the family dog or children. But the more I look into this amendment that is being proposed to our Town, the more I am realizing it does not even stand up to the laws set in place in our Live Free or Die Granite State.

It was brought to my attention recently that New Hampshire has what is commonly known as the right to farm law. It talks about immunity from suit in section 432:23, where it states that no agricultural operation shall be found a public or private nuisance as a result of changed conditions in or around the locality of the agricultural operation if such agricultural operation has been in operation for one year or more, and if it was not a nuisance at the time it began operation, this section shall not apply when any aspect of the agricultural operation is determined to be injurious to public health or safety under RSA 147:1, RSA 147:2. This makes me think that the original concern to vote on amending Bedford's current agricultural zoning regulation because of one neighbor's annoyance of the sound coming from the neighbor's farm should not have been an option in our state in the first place. If anything, we should be writing up a proposal for an alternate ordinance that states that recognizing that Bedford is a historic Town rooted in agriculture for more than 250 years, the right to farm shall not be infringed on. Further, all the natural sounds that come from the traditional farm shall not be considered a noise pollution or any other nuisance under the Town's ordinances, nor may such be a valid basis for any lawsuit or other legal action against the resident.

We have been listening to roosters crowing, and sheep bleating on our Town for longer than we have accepted the constant hum of motorcycles or Amazon trucks backing down our driveways. I do not perceive us asking to outlaw either of them anytime soon. So, this brings us to the question of what qualifies a Town? Or what qualifies a farm? RSA 21:34 defines a farm as any land, building or structure on or in which agriculture and farming activities are carried out or conducted and shall include the residence or residence of owners, occupants or employees located on such land. The Webster's Dictionary reads that farming is synonymous for agriculture. It goes on to say that agriculture is the science, art, or practice of cultivating the soil, producing crops and raising livestock and varying degrees of preparation and marketing of resulting products. So, does this mean that we need to have an established or licensed farm that makes a profit selling to the public to consider ourselves as farmers to use the land as agricultural? No.

Many of us in our Town practice what is called subsistence farming. According to Britannica, subsistence farming is the form of farming in which nearly all the crops or livestock raised are used to maintain the

farmer and the farmer's family, leaving little if any surplus for trade or sale. Sorry to bore you with the legal details and book facts, but as a home educator and my role as a parent, it is my job to teach my children to think for themselves and to learn from life as well as from the success and failures of those that came before them. Among other topics, we study history and science together to be able to use the facts others worked so hard to attain and the lessons our world, country, state, and town have learned over the years of trial and error. To better understand, appreciate and take care of our world we will be leaving behind for generations to follow. The variety of life lessons we have learned through farming alone, both with plants and animals, has been the biggest surprise and gift living in our beautiful Town has given to my family. To think that my grandchildren may only read about this lifestyle in the big green Bedford history book on our shelf and not get to experience it firsthand unless they choose to move further out of Town, breaks my heart. Once we start messing with the terminology of what a farm is and what agriculturally zoned really means, we begin down a slippery slope that we'll never be able to climb back again. First, it is our roosters. Next it is our family dogs. Before you know it, we are only allowed to plant flowers in our front yards as cucumber plants are considered an eyesore to the newcomers in our Town. There's no shame in admitting that some of us have moved to our Town with unrealistic expectations of what life in our new homes would look and sound like. And moving on to a more suburban environment, whether it be a Bedford community with a strictly regulated homeowners association or a different town entirely. But for those of us who appreciate the way Bedford is today, let's not let others change our unique town into a place they came from. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Blais of 453 Joppa Hill Road, Bedford comments: Steve Blais, 453 Joppa Hill Road. I have Joppa Hill Farm and I've been farming since '77 when we moved into Town with my family and continued on with the family thing. I just want to bring to the attention that you want to raise everything on the farm. I've got 50 cows. Everything's been bred from a bowl. I don't want to bring artificial stuff in because then you get disease. You have pink eye, all the different stuff that comes out—avian flu. All that stuff by just bringing different flocks and different herds together. The best thing you can do for the farm is to keep the breeding and that would come with the roosters too. So that's what I wanted to bring to the Board just on that knowledge. And another thing is like when you do go, and you buy chickens—I've done this because my kids have raised chickens up—you end up with I'm going to go buy a dozen hens. Seven months later you hear a rooster crowing. So now you're going to have a sad kid because you've got to get rid of the rooster. I just wanted to bring that to the Town's point of my view. Thanks.

Miss Autumn Messina of 157 Nashua Road, Bedford, comments: Hi, my name is Autumn. I live on 157 Nashua Road. I wrote this e-mail a few weeks ago but I never sent it. I'm a 12-year-old 4-H'er, and I've been farming in Bedford for eight years. I'm extremely worried about the new law that might be passed in March that says anyone who has five or less acres cannot have roosters or geese. The problem is both roosters and geese are extremely important for a safe and strong farm. Roosters are very unique. They were made to protect their hens with their life. A rooster's eyes were made to look in two different places at once so he can watch the hawks in the sky while also keeping an eye on his hens to make sure they're all safe. Most roosters are actually very caring about their hens. Through all my years as a farmer, I've begun to realize that a rooster will do pretty much anything to keep his family of hens happy. Sometimes when I go to feed my chickens, I notice that the roosters will actually carefully pick out a little bit of food for themselves and then let the rest of the chickens eat the rest. Fifty to fifty-five percent of the chicks in the brooder are roosters. So, this means that about 50 percent of the chickens in Bedford will most likely be killed because it's very hard to find people willing to take in extra roosters. Even though they can be the sweetest, most trustworthy of animals. What a lot of people don't see behind the work of a farm is the caring bond between the animals and the farmer. Many families,

including mine, will have to part with many loyal companions for life. My geese used to follow me around pretty much anywhere. They were actually very protective of me because I brought them up like my own children and they loved me as if I was one of them. It's very hard for us farmers when people who know very little about the farm life start telling us how to do our job even though they don't know how everything works. For instance, it's kind of like if a plumber starts telling a rocket scientist how to calculate the aerodynamics of a missile or my dad telling me how to put on my makeup. We both understand why some neighbors are annoyed with the animals, but other people love it. My family has some neighbors who complain about the farm. But we also have many people who tell us that they think the farm is great. My point is if this law gets passed, there'll be a lot of devastated families in Bedford. Chair Fairman said thank you, young lady, very much. Any other comments?

Ms. Lauren Messina added, a couple other thoughts that I thought. With the way that this is worded, the acreage is what would determine whether or not that land would be able to be a future farm. So many of our lands, even with more than five acres, you could have 20 acres, but the part that's up by the road might be 1/2 acre wide. So just because one of us has a bunch of acreage, doesn't mean that having oh well your rooster's not going to bother the neighbors or vice versa. You could have a small acreage out in the middle surrounded by other properties where the houses are far from you. But now because it's a small lot of land, you're not allowed to have the farm that you wanted to have on there. So, the wording of the law doesn't even help the problem. It's not going to solve the problem of this neighbor because from what you're saying, these current roosters are going to be grandfathered in. But it's not even logistically sensible to say that the size of your lot determines whether or not your animals are going to annoy the neighbor, and you shouldn't have them.

The other thing that I'd seen is, that there'll be new laws as far as your where your chicken coop is. And they have new rules of how far away from the property edge they are. But they're grandfathered in as long as you don't move them or repair them, which is going to bring a lot of redneck looking chicken coops around if we are not allowed to fix up our chicken coop. Because if we do we have to move it and we can't move it on our property the way that would make sense. It just doesn't make sense, so I understand wanting to do a law, that or an amendment to the law or rules that actually makes sense and helps people. But this is just ridiculous, and I don't even think it should be on here in the first place.

Public Hearing Closed

Chair Fairman asked are there any other comments? Seeing none, I will close the public hearing on the amendment #9. Any other discussion on the Board? Mr. Newberry stated just a comment for the audience, however you feel about this particular proposed amendment, get your friends to vote. Get your friends to vote. Ms. Hebert stated because the Planning Board has no power to change the wording of the amendment and it will go on the ballot as written.

Someone from the public asked you have until February 7 to get the signatures, correct? Ms. Hebert replied the petitioner can volunteer to do that, and he's indicated he's not going to be going through that process.

Mr. Gerard Gagnon of 41 Appledore Road, Bedford comments: Gerry Gagnon at 41 Appledore Road in Bedford. Can you tell me what the wording is going to be on the ballot exactly? I'm not sure if I can read what's up there right now. Ms. Hebert replied it's going to look just like this except the last statement will say the Planning Board—the Board needs to vote—but they will support or not support the passage of this amendment. And if they choose not to support it, we're recommending that there be a phrase

after that statement explaining that the petitioner has indicated their desire to withdraw the petition. Mr. Gagnon said OK. And that decision by the Planning Board has not yet been made. Is that correct? Ms. Hebert replied that's correct. Mr. Gagnon said OK, thank you.

Zoning Amendments 1-8

Chair Fairman asked are there any other comments or questions? If not, any comments questions at this point from the Planning Board on the zoning amendments #1 through #8? If not, I would entertain a motion on zoning amendments #1 through #8. Ms. Hebert asked did you officially open the public hearing on one through 8? Chair Fairman said we didn't. We just did #9. I thought it was everything. So, do you want me to open it again to make sure? Ms. Hebert replied I would, just to be clear that you're opening and then closing the public hearing for #1 through #8. Chair Fairman said OK. Just to clarify, we will open the public hearing again on zoning amendments #1 through #8.

Public Hearing on Zoning Amendments #1 through #8

Atty. Donald Kennedy of Manchester, NH, representing Alan Chartrand, Gary Chartrand, and Steven Chartrand, 54 Rundlett Hill Road, Bedford, comments: Hi, my name is Donald Kennedy. I'm an attorney, I represent Gary, Alan, and Steven Chartrand who are the owners of 54 Rundlett Hill Road. We were here last public session, and we still want the Board to propose the amendment to change 54 Rundlett Hill Road from Industrial to General Residential. And we would hope that you would not only propose it but support it. We're here to answer any other questions you might have.

Chair Fairman asked any other discussions on Amendments #1 through #8? If not, then I'll close the public hearing on amendments #1 through #8. We previously had a public hearing on Amendment 9.

MOTION Ms. Malcolm moves that the Planning Board moves Zoning Amendments #1 through #8 as proposed by the Board to the 2023 Town Ballot. Mr. Nelson duly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Greazzo said Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Amendments #1 and #3. Chair Fairman asked is there a reason you could tell us? Mr. Greazzo replied sure. Reducing the number of units from 28 to 18—I don't see any reason for that. It's elderly housing. Something that we're going to need. Number 3, expanding the amount of open space from 25 percent to 40 percent of any given lot automatically precludes that person from using 40 percent of their property in any way they choose. I don't think that's appropriate.

Vice Chair Newberry replied that would only apply if they chose to develop as a cluster residential as opposed to a general residential. And it doesn't restrict the number of units. So, I don't think it really precludes how somebody develops their property. They can develop it as a residential development. They can develop it as a cluster residential development and it doesn't change the number of cluster units that they can put on that given property. It just says that they need to be done more compactly so that—one of the goals of it is to maintain more usable open space for the residents than spreading it out and having little undeveloped alleyways going here and there across the property. the way I look at it, that is going to tend to make cluster developments better for the residents and it doesn't really have a negative impact in terms of what the property owner can develop.

Mr. Greazzo said potentially, unless the potential homeowners want a bigger yard and that becomes an issue for them. The person that wants to develop the property is then bound to leave 40 percent open space rather than develop the property that they choose to develop however they choose to develop it. It seems like a large restriction, 40 percent.

Ms. Hebert said it's for a certain type of development. Mr. Greazzo said sure, I understand that. Ms. Hebert continued a property owner would have the choice of doing a conventional subdivision, which just uses the base dimensional standards for that zoning district. Or if they elected to do the cluster subdivision, they have some incentives by not having minimum lot sizes, minimum frontage requirement. And in exchange for that, the developer protects a significant amount of open space. It's just a development option.

Vice Chair Newberry said so, Mr. Chairman, we have a motion and a second for all eight Amendments. And at least one member of the Board will have to vote against all of them. The way we currently have it. I don't know if you want to consider breaking them up or not? Chair Fairman said we can break it up into individual amendments. Would you prefer that we do it that way? Mr. Greazzo replied that's your determination, Mr. Chairman. Chair Fairman said why don't we do that? Why don't we vote Amendment #1 and #2 together as they're both relative to making elderly housing requirements compatible with our workforce housing requirement for these new State requirements. And then we'll do #3 separately, #4 and #5 together, # 6 separately, #7 separately and #8 by itself. So, if you would?

Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, I think the existing motion needs to be removed first. Chair Fairman replied yes. Mr. Greazzo said clarification from the planning director? Ms. Hebert said yes. Mr. Greazzo asked even if they continued with the motion that they had and I opposed the motion, it would still pass, correct? The motion would still pass if all the other members voted in favor. Mr. Greazzo replied there we go. There's no need to separate them out, Mr. Chairman. It's fine. Chair Fairman said all right, thanks.

Vote taken – 4 to 1 to accept amendments #1 through #8, as proposed by the Board, to the 2023 Town Ballot. Phil Greazzo voted in the negative. Motion carries.

Amendment #9

MOTION Ms. Malcolm moves that the Planning Board does not support Zoning Amendment #9, which is proposed by citizens' petition, because the petitioner has stated that he would like to withdraw the petition. Mr. Newberry duly seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Bandazian said if I may. I'm not going to vote on this obviously, but I've spoken against this proposed amendment a number of times. I'm not going to reiterate what I've said before. But I would like to see the Planning Board also not support it and not merely to rely on the petitioner's withdrawal. But I'd like to see an affirmative statement by the Planning Board that the Planning Board does not support the amendment in addition to the petitioner withdrawing it. Ms. Malcolm asked would you prefer that it reads: the Board does not support zoning Amendment #9, which is proposed by citizens' petition. And leave it at that? Mr. Bandazian said I would prefer to see both: the Board does not support, and the petitioner wishes to withdraw. Chair Fairman said I would say in addition, the petitioner has requested to withdraw the petition. Mr. Nelson said Mr. Chairman, just to clarify, I think the concern is, the

way it reads now is we're saying because the petitioner, we're ... Chair Fairman said I'd say in addition to. The Board agrees.

MOTION Ms. Malcolm moves that the Planning Board does not support Zoning Amendment #9, which is proposed by citizens' petition. The petitioner has stated that he would like to withdraw the petition, and the Board does not support. Mr. Newberry duly seconded the motion.

VOTE – All in favor – unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Fairman said thank you to all that came out in opposition to that petition. As Vice Chair Newberry stated, it will be on the ballot. You want to get your friends and neighbors to come out and vote against it in the March election. Thank you very much.

III. New Business: None

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. Development Update

Chair Fairman asked Ms. Harris for the Development Update. Ms. Harris said I'll get you through this quick so you can get home. This is the January 23rd 2023 development update on development activities around Town. We'll start off with the subdivisions currently under construction.

We have Olympus Way which is a 7-lot subdivision which is a private road off of Ministerial Road. Currently there are two lots under construction in this 7-lot subdivision. They have also completed their storm water improvements. This is a snapshot of the subdivision. So you come in off Ministerial and these two lots on the right-hand side are currently under construction right now.

Huntington Ridge cluster residential subdivision. This is a 9-lot subdivision off Stowell Road and New Hampshire Route 101. This one is nearing completion. They have eight lots either under construction or complete, and I would anticipate that this would be fully developed at some point this year. And here's a snapshot of that subdivision off of Stowell Road.

Not an awesome picture, but this is the 9-lot elderly housing condominium development off of Old Bedford Way behind BVI. The private road for this development is currently under construction. And they expect to continue construction on this through 2023, potentially into 2024. Chair Fairman said excuse me, they have run into a little more ledge than they expected, from what I understand, slowing them down a little bit. It shouldn't be a surprise in that area. Ms. Harris said yes, this is just another view looking up from the grand parking lot. You can see how it's opened up the view to Bowman Place there. And a snapshot of that development. Picture one was looking this way to where the private road is being developed and picture two was looking up this way from the parking lot.

LSNE which is now called PCI at 29 Commerce Drive, they have the majority of the exterior site improvements complete there, working on interior fit up now. The emergency access road is complete, and they expect that this will be fully constructed and CO'd in 2023. This is 7 Commerce Drive, sorry. Another PCI development. The addition at 7 Commerce Drive is going a little slower than they expected. They've got the addition framing underway, and they expect that the construction on this addition will continue through at least the beginning of 2024.

Wirebelt Company of America at 17 Colby Court recently got their CO, and they're looking pretty good out there. They have some landscape improvements that they'll complete in the spring.

Bow Lane Apartments off Chestnut Drive which I believe is now called Riddlebrook; right now they've got buildings 1 and 2 CO'd at this point. Building 3 is expected to be complete in 2023. It's looking pretty good as well.

Market and Main development on South River Road: construction continues on phase 2 buildings C1, C2, D, F, G & K are all part of this phase. And this is another view looking into the buildings currently under construction there. And what you were just looking at was building C1, which was announced for REI and then building C2 looking this way and down Main Street along this side of the street.

Optima Dermatology, which is a change of use at 176 South River Road. They are expected to have their CO in January so I would expect that within the next couple weeks they'll be done.

And then Eckman Construction started Phase 2 on their building addition over there, and they expect that that will be complete this year as well. And that's it for the update.

Chair Fairman said thank you, Ms. Harris. Are there any comments on the updates from the Board? Vice Chair Newberry stated I think I've asked this before. Does this get posted on the website? Ms. Hebert replied I don't know if we posted it, but we could. Vice Chair Newberry said it may be only of interest to some of us, but it just occurs to me that might be nice for anybody who's on the Town website to be able to see what's going on in the way of building around Town. Ms. Harris said yes, we can do that.

Ms. Hebert stated I did final inspections at the Wirebelt facility, and I would encourage everyone to drive up there and take a look at it because it looks so different from the Walmart retail complex, and they've spent a lot of time and investment improving the site. It came out very well.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings (January 9, 2023)

Chair Fairman asked are there any questions, comments, or corrections? There were none.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry moves that the Planning Board approves the meeting minutes as written from January 9, 2023. Ms. Malcolm seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Chair Fairman abstained. Motion carried.

VI. Communications to the Board: None

VII. Reports of Committees:

Chairman Fairman asked are there any reports of committees? Ms. Hebert stated we could report that the Housing Working Group worked with staff to finalize the grant application for the Housing Opportunity Program grant and we received feedback from the steering committee that reviews those applications and they asked for some adjustments to be made to the application. We met again with the Housing Working Group to make some minor adjustments to the schedule and the project scope, and we'll be resubmitting the application this week. Thank you to the committee for the hard work they've been doing to get that grant application in and also to the Board this evening.

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to adjourn at 7:42 pm. Vice Chair Newberry duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is scheduled for February 13, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by
Sue Forcier