

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
TOWN OF LITCHFIELD**

**Held on April 2, 2013**

**Minutes Approved April 16, 2013**

The Litchfield Planning Board held a meeting in the Town Hall conference room 2 Liberty Way, Litchfield, NH 03052 on Tuesday, April 2, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Russ Blanchette (Chair), Thomas Young, Kevin Bourque, Selectmen's Rep, Joel Kapelson, Steve Perry (Alternate) and Mike Caprioglio (Alternate)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bob Curtis, Michael Croteau

**ALSO PRESENT:** Joan McKibben (Admin. Assistant), Jen Czysz (NRPC Senior Planner), Frank Byron

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Blanchette called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and joined the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Perry and Mr. Caprioglio were asked to be voting member of the Board tonight.

1. **Home Occupation application by Karla Benjamin for a Doggy Daycare at 323 Charles Bancroft Hwy, Tax Map 15 Lot 12. Owner of property Marion and Carrie Colby. Case was continued from March 5, 2013.**

Karla Benjamin handed out documents to the Board and the Board reviewed. Russ read a letter from Kevin Lynch stating that Fred McQuesten stated to him that he had no issues or concerns with the application submitted by Karla Benjamin for the Doggy Daycare. Karla mentioned that she met with Fred and Janet and they stated to her that they had no issues.

Mr. Perry stated that he was not here for the first meeting and had the applicant go over the application request with him so that he may be brought up to date.

Karla stated that she rents at 323 Charles Bancroft Hwy, with permission from the owners of the property; they have agreed to let her open up a home occupation of a doggy daycare. Everything is already in place for the business so nothings needs to be put up or built. The proposed area is a fenced in back yard as well as storage area in back of the garage which would be the indoor area of the daycare.

Mr. Caprioglio stated that at the last meeting Karla stated she would meet with the abutters of the area. Karla said she met with Fred and Janet and they have no issue, there was a question about the property line, but there is no longer a question. Karla stated that she has not met with the

author of the second letter from Paul and Carol Mallory at 328 Charles Bancroft and the owner of that property is Sandra Makowiec and stated that she has tried to meet with her but has had no response. Mr. Caprioglio asked how the property line was addressed and was it corrected. Karla stated that there was a question about ownership coming onto part of her fenced area, so she went to the Hillsborough County of Deeds office and pulled deeds back to 1927 and brought them to Fred McQuesten. He looked at them and then realized there was just a verbal mistake of what he thought his property line was. Karla stated that Fred and Janet were pleased with what they discussed. The hours of operation would be Monday through Friday from 7:30 am until 6:30 pm. This would be a drop off and pick up service. The industry standard is 15 dogs maximum.

Mr. Perry asked how the noise would be handled. Karla stated that her job as the provider is to distract them when they are under stressful situations; dogs generally bark when they are left alone or are under some sort of stress. Her job is to intervene and give them constructive playtime. Mr. Bourque asked if it was solely going to be her or would she have an employee. Karla stated that it would just be her. Karla stated that as far as the driveway, it is a circular driveway and goes back very deep so no one would ever have to back out into the street.

Mr. Caprioglio asked Karla to address the letter from the abutter. Karla started with the concern of peace and quiet. Karla said people are paying her to give constructive playtime to their dogs, so the noise will always be managed by her and she would not let the dogs get into a situation where they would be barking frantically. They also live on a State route and she called the DOT and there are no restrictions on that route, they have 5300 cars pass each day in each direction, so there is a huge amount of traffic noise. Karla stated that her area is set so far back in the yard that an occasional bark will be drowned out by the traffic. The 15 dogs that she is requesting, is the industry standard set by the ASPCA any one person handling a doggy daycare situation. Dogs are only accepted into the program that are social family dogs, it is not her goal to have uncooperative dogs, so if there is a dog that is not a good fit for the doggy daycare then she would not accept them into her program. Karla mentioned there was a concern in the letter about weekends, her hours of operation would be Monday through Friday from 7:30 am until 6:30 pm. No weekends. There is no boarding or overnight. There was also a reference about her being a renter, and the Town does provide for her to have a home occupation even though she is a renter and she does have permission from the owner. There is a reference in the letter about the opposite side of the street, further down from her is the farms stand and there was a reference to the huge amount of traffic that the farm stand brings; that traffic parks on the street during their busiest hours and her cars will be in and out and no one will stay parked for more than 5 minutes and will never have to go on the street. Karla stated that there are several references in regards to the noise; there is one section that states that some of the neighbors have health concerns that would make a pack of dogs always barking. Karla stated that a lot of these issues reference the barking and noise issues and feels she has addressed this.

Jen wanted to remind everyone where their standard for review are: Zoning Ordinance section 504, Site Plan Regulation 151; item E is the maximum for the business is 500 square feet and knows the application says 250 and wanted to confirm what part of the 250' is outside versus inside and what the breakdown of the square footage was for the exterior and interior space. Section I is relative to the noise and vibrations and other smells not allowed to be produced by a

home occupation. Jen stated that she believes the applicant has already addressed the question. Jen stated from the Site Plan regulations; they pretty much set the boundaries for what needs to be submitted and just doing a quick scan through of what they have there, it looks like everything has been submitted; but the one thing that is not shown on the site plan is the facts of trying to understand what portion of this would be within the setback. Jen stated that this does not mean that what is proposed in the setback would be prohibited because it is a fenced in yard space. Karla mentioned in regards to the inside outside, on the tax map for her property the storage area is actually 336 square feet which is the inside area for the dogs to be kept. Karla stated when she originally discussed it in the application; she was told that the outside space was not considered part of the square footage for the home occupation. It was the inside space. Jen stated that the inside versus the outside space is new and unique to this application, most home occupations exist solely inside; one of the other criteria in the zoning ordinance is there is no outdoor storage of materials, and Jen wouldn't necessarily say having a yard with dogs in it is the outside storage of materials. Mr. Byron wanted to mention to the Board that a couple of years ago off of Pilgrim Drive there was the same type of home occupation with outside space as well. Mr. Perry stated that when they did Fur N Feathers, they made them do a chain link fence with a 5 or 6 foot buffer to a vinyl fence, for the visual barrier and the noise barrier was buffered. Karla stated that she did say at the last meeting; for the visual, she does have the wire fence and she will put stockade on the front and the side where there is a small section of visual from the street.

**Mr. Blanchette opened the meeting for Public Comment:**

Sandra Makowiec of 328 Charles Bancroft Highway came forward and stated that she lives across the street and Karla keeps saying this is behind the house, it is on the side of the house and she is directly across and does not approve of this doggy daycare. Sandra stated that they are all retired in the neighborhood and are home all day. Sandra stated that Karla could have come to her door at any time and she did not.

**Public Comment Closed.**

Mr. Perry asked about the dog waste. Karla stated that she has three sources; she has private trash pickup and she also has a permit for the dump and there are also services that come and remove doggy daycare waste. Karla mentioned that she is also putting down special mulch for playground and doggy daycares which makes removing the waste much easier without going into the ground.

Mr. Caprioglio stated that it mentions that Karla has a multi-year lease. Karla said if the doggy daycare gets approved, then her lease will be re-evaluated and then she will sign a multi-year lease and there are special conditions for her to provide by for having this business. Mr. Caprioglio asked if Karla knew the specifics of those conditions. Karla said there would be rent adjustments and a review from the owner who will be coming to inspect and make sure that everything is as it is supposed to be. Karla stated they came to the agreement to let her do this because they know her as a good tenant and as a person and believed she would be responsible enough.

Jen mentioned a clarification to one of her previous statements: the fence is already an existing fence, but by definition fences are a structure and no structures are permitted in the setback.

Mr. Bourque asked if the fence was there prior to her. Karla stated it was there when she moved into the house and there was already a kennel built into that structure. Mr. Caprioglio asked if there was already a similar use there before. Karla said no, that the prior renter just had it there for his dog.

Karla was asked if there was any licensing required for a doggy daycare. Karla said no, there are no certifications or state licenses, just industry standards.

Jen stated from the perspective of the Board putting together their decision letter, if you were to use noise as a basis of your decision; you would have to have evidence that a doggy daycare would produce more noise than necessary. Jen mentioned that the testimony that Karla has provided is that she is actively engaged in working with the dogs and keeping the dogs engaged. She has provided testimony as to why there would not be the noise; so the Board would have to be able to justify why that is false. Mr. Bourque asked if Karla has ever done anything like this before and she stated not as her own business, but she has been involved in rescue and doggy daycare for about 20 years.

***Motion: by Mr. Blanchette that the Board approve the home occupation application by Karla Benjamin for a Doggy Daycare at 323 Charles Bancroft HWY, Tax Map 15 Lot 12.***

**Second:** by Mr. Young

Mr. Byron suggested there may be some conditions that you wish to put on the motion, so you may want to amend it such as the fence, waste, treatment, etc.

***Amended Motion: by Mr. Young to include the waste pickup, the stockade fence in the front and side and the waste removal.***

**Second:** Mr. Blanchette

**The amendment to the motion carries: 5-1-0. The amended motion carries 5-1-0.**

**2. Continuation of an application by Konis Corporation and Sousa Realty & Development to subdivide one lot into eight single family residential lots at 9 Nesenkeag Drive, Tax Map 10 Lot 77.**

Present were Mr. Anthony Basso from Keach-Nordstrom representing the applicant Sousa Realty & Development. Mr. Basso stated that last time they were before the Planning Board; they had a slightly different plan. Aside from the comments that were generated by Mr. Caron's office and Jen from the prior meeting, they have addressed those but additionally they went to the Zoning Board and asked for a variance at the end of Nesenkeag to eliminate the cul-de-sac that they were going to have for two lots and just allow two separate driveways with less than the required frontage and they were granted that variance about two weeks ago. They have eliminated one of the cul-de-sacs, the two lots are still there, but they will each have their separate driveway and 25 feet of frontage instead of the required 150 foot requirement which is a major change to the plan. Mr. Basso stated that it is more environmentally friendly and less impervious area, they didn't get any more lots then they would have gotten either way and the Town does not have to maintain a cul-de-sac there now. Tony stated that the other thing they

did aside from addressing all the comments; the big question asked was really about showing what the lots would look like developed. The grading plan of where the houses are going to be situated and that sheet got added to the set. What they have there is the road coming in; they made the change to pitch it to the center like they were asked to. They also show house and septic locations. They have shown the developed area of each one of these and the concern was for the neighbors up here to make sure that storm water from these didn't get directed towards those houses, so they made provisions to bring the storm water around and toward their system and also the other issue was keeping the swale that goes through the property intact and keep it connected which they also provided which was another abutter issue. The plan also shows the two individual driveways, this is not a common driveway, they will each have their own and their own frontage. Mr. Basso stated that he knows that Lou Caron has re-reviewed the plans and has a couple of comments and Jen also has a few. Mr. Basso stated they got those comments today and will address them on the new revised plan. Mr. Basso stated that they did write a letter and re-submitted it with each addressed item that they did for Mr. Caron and Jen.

Jen went over her comments: Most of the concerns from the initial submission and review have been addressed; the one item that she flagged is that there still will be the need for the one waiver request for the one irregular shaped lot, however her recommendation was to first see if there was a way the lot itself could be reconfigured that would not necessitate or require the waiver in the first place. Mr. Basso stated that he could address this not. He showed the lot that requires the waiver, and what their issue is here is that he looked and had one of his techs go through it and try to reconfigure this lot to see if there was something they could do and the bottom line is what is happening here, is that this is an exterior boundary line and that configuration given the oddness of it goes down into the power line and then back up and over and it jogs around, and this exterior perimeter is what is really adding the biggest problem. Short of chopping off a leg of this (which he can't do) he has no way of doing that because he would have to give it to somebody; it has to be given to an abutter if they want it. The concern was the strip going down to the front, but really when you look at the total perimeter it is this issue (which he showed on the map) that ends up causing the problems. Mr. Basso stated that this lot is huge and if he ends up chopping it up, the other lots ends up funky and the other one will still need the waiver because of the way it is laid out. Looking at the map, Mr. Basso showed the board what really needs to happen is that he needs to whack two chunks off, which would do the job but he has no place to put them, they are on the exterior perimeter so he can't put them with one of their other lots, it is the way the lots were left when all of these lots were chopped out years ago by another developer, they left this irregular shaped piece. Jen stated that the bottom line is that they need the waiver request, from the Administrator stand point.

Jen also mention that there are a series of 8 different easements that have been submitted, and stated that if at this point the Board has no concerns with the easements, they should be forwarded to Town Counsel for review. Jen stated that one of the things she requested in the last set of comments was to show where snow removal areas and stock pile would be; the stockpiles have been shown and her general question was space for future snow removal if there is room and space for that so that folks can still get out of lots without traffic accidents. Mr. Basso stated that it is in the middle like they were asked to do. Another thing is that the applicant has followed up from previous comment and Jen noted that GIS data for streams and noted that there was a small stream running through the property and they have gone out and tried to match

things up and one portion of the stream that is showing up on the GIS data is that there is absolutely no evidence of it on the site, but the other portion of the stream appear that it is actually that ditch line that runs east/west across the property. Mr. Basso stated that there is a ditch that is man made with straight wall and there is dirt piled up on the side of it. It has been there forever. His guess is that the developer thought it would cause the water table to be lowered. It is not just on their property it travels along the backs of several of the lots on Nesenkeag. Jen also had a question for both the developer and Lou is how the treatment of that ditch line, if the ditch is to remain, it didn't appear that there was a culvert being in that location for the road crossing and so making sure that they weren't going to have to worry about that road washing out or other issues from that ditch line filling up in the Spring. Mr. Basso stated that what they were proposing to do with that is the ditch line comes down from the abutters, they are going to direct it towards their system and out into the direction of the power lines. Instead of putting a pipe under here they are going to carry it in their street ditch line and re-continue on the other side. They will keep the ditch essentially intact; there is no point in putting a culvert there. They are going to provide the relief through their storm water system instead. Jen stated that her only question to Lou would then be if it is adequate as proposed. Jen's next couple of comments were related and had to do with the two new driveways in lieu of the cul-de-sac and just the close proximity of the series of driveways coming into that intersection and just making sure that it is the safest configuration. Jen showed what she was talking about on the map. Jen stated that the concern was that they have the intersection at Nesenkeag and Nakomo coming directly into that intersection you have two driveways in proximity to each other and then also the abutting property has two curb cuts and one is right next to the other so you have three driveways coming to one point on that intersection. Mr. Perry stated that it looks nothing like the drawing. Mr. Basso stated that the site distance is really good there, there is no issue and the Zoning Board asked them to provide a stop sign at the driveway. Mr. Basso stated they would probably place it back 10 feet. Jen stated that she would recommend that the location of the stop sign gets noted on the plans.

Another comment Jen had was looking at the two properties, with the two parcels having the long neck driveway access, this is your frontage so your 50' set back would fall somewhere within this point (looking at the map) for your frontage set back and your remainder of the property line would only have the 20' set back. Jen stated that for one of them they have a 50' vegetation buffer and was curious of why one got the 50'. Mr. Basso stated that he spoke to the Palmer's and they were concerned that they keep a little of the vegetation there, so he offered them the 50' buffer and he was happy with it and he did that with the Zoning Board the night he met with them. Jen stated that the last bullet was just a heads up to the applicant; looking at these two driveways and how they fit the driveway regulations of Appendix J, there might be a few things there. Jen stated that this was all she had at this time.

**Lou's comments:**

- The detention pond #1 is located in the easement at the end of Hamel drive, and there is a woods road that follows the power lines, is this particular easement within the PSNH easement, and whether or not the drain basin grading would bury the wood road or access road. Mr. Basso stated that he would have to look because he is not certain.
- Lou stated that one of his prior comments on spot elevations, the intention he had was to have the spot elevations to be put on the cross sections, they added them to the plan except for when you look at the plan, the scale they have it show a lot of lines crossing

over the notes, and they are hard to see. Lou's recommendation is to add the spot elevations to the side road ditches and adjacent top of the berms at each appropriate cross section. Mr. Basso stated that they would be happy to do that.

**Lou stated that he has questions on easement I which deals with the detention pond:**

- The easement is located on land belonging to the Konis Corp. and it lies within a PSNH easement. The Sousa Realty and Development Corp. is listed in the easement as the Grantor. Shouldn't the Konis Corporation be the Grantor and does PSNH need to sign off on this easement. Mr. Basso stated that Konis Corp. should be the Grantor and they have started their joint use agreement with PSNH.
- The easement shall "convey the perpetual right and easement, for ingress and egress, by vehicles and by foot" However, the proposed detention pond #1 occupies this "access area". Based on the location of the detention pond as shown on the plan, I envision that only vehicles including motorcycles or ATVs could use this access easement. Is this the intent? Also, the Grantee is not specifically identified in this sentence. Which entity is the Grantee? The Town of Litchfield, Konis Corp. or Sousa Realty and Development Corp? Mr. Basso stated the easement we are talking about is accessing to the Konis property. The Konis property currently adjoins access on Brickyard. They are providing an alternate means of access as well, so that way in the future if that land could be developed in some manner, they could do some sort of a loop configuration possibly from here to Brickyard, if the property can be developed. Tony stated that it is not meant it is not meant to be a driveway access or logging access or anything like that, it is not meant to be used except in the case that this would become developed in some way and if that happens then that would have to be completely reconfigured, there would be a whole new design before this Board and the storm water pond would change. It is not meant to be an access that is meant to be used today, it is meant to be an easement that should there have a need to extend the road through that it could be done in some manner. Mr. Basso stated that as far as who the easement belongs to, he hasn't spoken with either his client or the back land owner, it could be an easement to them or it could be a public easement so that it could be a road in the future. There are a lot of ways to address that which is something they could talk about and tell the Board what it is or the Board could tell them what they want. As far as the pond goes, Mr. Basso stated that it would definitely have to be relocated.
- This easement is further described as "being shown as the proposed 50' Access and Drainage Easement on the plan..." such a note is not shown on the plan. Please clarify the language and intent. Mr. Basso stated that what he thinks the Attorney was trying to do with that is describe the access as 50', obviously the drainage part is not 50', it is irregularly shaped, so they can definitely make some clarification between the deed and the plan on that to better describe it.
- The easement conveys "The Grantor, its successors and assigns, shall have the right to cross and otherwise utilize the easement area for all reasonable purposes..." who defines "reasonable purpose?" How can this area be utilized for anything other than the Detention Pond as shown and how would this clause apply relative to the Town's rights under the Drainage and Slope Easement? Mr. Basso stated that what they need to do is add some language in this that would state in the easement that if you are to use the access portion of this easement, that that pond has to be reconfigured and this plan (the drainage) has to be revisited as part of it and they will certainly add language there. Mr.

Basso stated the big issue here is if someone does develop this, obviously there is a whole new plan and so they are trying to provide an easement that is reasonable to provide some kind of connection, but on the other hand you don't want to go so far as to say they want to pull everything out because it is a sure thing. They have no way of knowing whether it is or not, or even if it is feasible. They will provide clarity language in the deed itself that says if you're going to revisit this and access this easement, the storm water for the subdivision has to be dealt with and comply with the Town's requirements and with the conditions put forth on this plan.

- If there was any future desire to extend Hamel Drive as a public road into the abutting Konis Corp. property, I would expect that the owner of proposed Lot 77-5 would need to convey the Right of Way necessary to accomplish this goal. Mr. Caron stated that he thinks this whole access issue can be easily resolved by taking the westerly chunk out of Lot 77-5. Then there is no access easement needed. Mr. Caron went to the Map to show Mr. Basso what he was meant.

**Drainage:**

- Post development Drainage area 501S contributes most of the runoff to Detention Pond #1, including a significant portion of the roadway runoff. However, the existing topography in this area contains existing ditches (specified not to be filled) and low areas below the side road berm elevation and the pond bottom itself. The drainage calculation likely overestimates the contributing area of this sub catchment. Mr. Caron stated that the important thing is that it does catch the run off in the road, but he believes a lot of the water beyond that roadside berm they have around the cul-de-sac that the water will never get into the ditch that gets into the basin and told the applicant they should take a look at it.
- The calculations for detention pond #1 include infiltration at the rate of 3.0 in/hr. No documentation is provided to support this infiltration rate. Please provide supporting data in accordance with the NHDES New Hampshire Stormwater Manual Volume 2 or eliminate the infiltration discharge components from the calculation. Mr. Basso stated that they did use that manual and it allows for 6. Mr. Caron stated that they should document it in their report.
- The post development plan and the non-binding sheet 15 includes a couple of plan notes specifying "existing ditch line not to be filled" and "place 12" high continuous berm through woods around trees" on proposed Lott 77-6. I recommend that these note be added to the Subdivision Plans. The applicant stated that he will add this note.
- Overall the post development drainage plan depicts surface runoff draining from the north to the south or from the residences along Nesenkeag Drive towards the power lines. The area is very flat and given the drainage issues raised by the abutters, I recommend that this condition be verified, if possible during a field walk of the site. Mr. Basso stated that they have looked at this extensively, and surveyed onto the property to the south to try and find where the relief was and basically there is barely a foot out there and it pitches toward the power line and it sort of splits. There is very little pitch out there and they walked the whole thing extensively to figure it out and did extra topo of the whole area. Mr. Basso stated that there is not a lot of relief, but there is some and they are maintaining that in that direction.

Mr. Caron stated that this new non-binding plan shows the detention pond #2 and #3 built on the house lots and if you were to look at the post development drainage plan, there are nice little arrows showing the water going to these two ponds and Lou questions whether that will ever happen. Mr. Basso stated that they think it will get there, but it is going to lay there in those detention ponds and in those low flat areas like it currently does.

**Public Input:**

None

Mr. Perry asked about the pitch of the road that is going in, now that we only have one road; how long is the distance that it goes up before it goes back down? Mr. Basso stated that the high point is about 300 feet and then the rest of it pitches back the other way. Mr. Perry asked how much they were going to increase going towards Nesenkeag. Mr. Caron stated that there is only 200 feet that will drain towards Nesenkeag, because on the east side 200 feet of it is curbed and 100 feet that is uncurbed that will go out to the edge. On the west side there is a berm ditch that will collect the run off and go contrary to the grade to the detention pond. Mr. Basso stated that it does have slight increase in the 2 year event, we go from 0.17 to 0.19 in the 10 year it is 0.41 to 0.51 and the 25 year is 0.92 to 1.24. Mr. Perry asked if that system runs underneath the road. Mr. Basso said it runs across the road in the easement and discharges towards the brook. Mr. Perry asked how the owner of lot 77-6 going to know not to cut that. Mr. Basso stated that it is going to go in the deed and they are going to mark it in the field. Me. Perry asked when they say mark it in the field how is that. Tony stated that they are going to put up little placards those up along the line as a no cut area. Mr. Perry asked where the hydrants were. Mr. Basso showed where they were on the map and they are labeled.

Jen stated that they still need the waiver requests and to be able to act on the waiver request. Mr. Basso stated that he did submit the waiver request and had a copy with him and gave it to Jen and the Board.

Mr. Blanchette asked if we had replies from the Fire and Police department. Jen stated that we do not have one from the Police. Mr. Basso stated that the Fire did comment. They have a comment letter. It mentions that they want the hydrant color coded. Jen stated that she did not have a copy of the letter from the Fire. Mr. Basso gave a copy to Jen and the Board. Mr. Basso stated that he did not hear anything from the Police Chief. Jen stated that the easements still need to go to Town Counsel for review. Mr. Basso said there would be changes for one easement and they will submit it.

**Mr. Basso stated that they voluntarily extend the 65 day clock period for another two months.**

***Motion: by Mr. Perry to approve the waiver request for Subdivision Regulations Section 415, Irregular shaped Subdivision Lot.***

**Second:** By Mr. Young

**Vote:** 6-0-0

***Motion: by Mr. Perry to continue the hearing to May 7th***

**Second:** by Mr. Bourque

**Vote:** 6-0-0

The Board requested a site walk for Friday April 12<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 pm.

**3. Update on Road Acceptance Procedures**

No updates as of yet, will continue to the meeting of April 16<sup>th</sup>.

**4. Update on CPG Application**

Jen mentioned that the scope of work that the Board looked at the last meeting was forwarded to New Hampshire Housing and within a matter of hours they sent back the full set of contract documents which have been sent to Jason to be place on the Selectmen's agenda for Monday evening. Jen stated that the Board needs to do the contract with their consultant to do the work and Jen will follow up on that piece.

**5. Impact Fee Update**

Joan stated that there are no updates, she has not heard back from Mr. Mayberry.

**Approve Minutes of March 26, 2013** - defer to next meeting

**Other Business**

Joan wanted to remind everyone that there is an OEP Conference on May 1<sup>st</sup>.

***Motion: by Mr. Perry to adjourn***

**Second:** Mr. Caprioglio

**Vote:** 6-0-0

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

**The next Planning Board meeting will be held April 16, 2013.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Russell Blanchette, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Young, Vice Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Byron, Selectman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Croteau

---

Joel Kapelson

---

Michael Caprioglio

**Minutes taken by: *Donna Baril***