



# PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF BELMONT, NH

Monday, September 27, 2021  
Belmont Mill, Tioga Room  
Belmont, New Hampshire

Present: Chairman Peter Harris; Vice Chair Ward Peterson; Members Michael LeClair, Richard Pickwick, Kevin Sturgeon and Jon Pike, Ex-Officio; Alternate Member Dennis Grimes.  
Staff: Candace Daigle, Rick Ball and Colleen Akerman.  
Zoom: Member Gary Grant and Alternate Member Rick Segalini, Jr.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and welcomed those in attendance.

The Board agreed to postpone the Marden hearing due to a delay with their agent arriving.

## **OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **A. Approval of Minutes 09/15/2021:**

**MOTION:** J. Pike moved to approve the minutes of September 15, 2021 as written.

The motion was seconded by M. LeClair and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

**1. Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Lewis Orrin Marden & David Marden:** Request subdivision approval to subdivide one lot into two. Property is located on Seavey Road, Tax Lot 237-007-000-000 in the “RS” Zone. PB # 1721P.

Alternate Member Dennis Grimes stated he is an abutter in the audience for this application.

The Chairman opened the public hearing and read the lot history: This is a vacant property with a private cemetery and the applicant presented to the Application Review Committee October 22, 2020.

Mr. Steve Smith of Dubois & King, Mr. David Marden, Mrs. Barbara Binette and Mr. Richard Binette were present for this application.

The Chairman stated there were no waiver requests. This is a minor subdivision so it is exempt from some plans such as Aquifer, Utilities & Fire Protection and Stormwater Management.

**MOTION:** K. Sturgeon moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 12/1/21 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by R. Pickwick and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

The Chairman stated the following definition will be used to determine if the applications before the Board tonight have a regional impact. He explained that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities, the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; transportation networks; anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

**MOTION:** P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

Mr. Steve Smith stated he is here to represent the Marden family for a proposed subdivision for Lewis and David Marden. The lot is 20.65 acres with frontage on Seavey Road of 1,200 feet and Hurricane Road of 994 feet. All of the property is in Current Use. It is in the Residential Single-Family Zone, and in the Aquifer District. The lot is located west and north of the rural zone on the side of Hurricane Road. The easterly side of Seavey Road is residential and is where the high school is located. The majority of the parcel is open field. It is proposed to be divided into two lots. The original lot will become 10.26 acres with 667 feet of frontage and the new lot will be 10.39 acres with 542 feet of frontage on Seavey Road. Both lots will remain in Current Use. The new lot has a private memorial plot. There are no dimensions but they can be added. Approximate driveway locations are shown on the plan with 400 feet of sight distance. The memorial plot is a private family plot for one family member. There are not any others. The property is staying in the family and they would rather not define an easement. If the property is conveyed out of the family in the future, they will provide easement access.

Mr. Smith explained the applicants would like to ask for a waiver of Subdivision Regulations 9.C.2 for municipal sewer and submitted a written waiver to Staff at the meeting. The sewer line would need to be 900 feet long and would require 3 manholes and digging in the road, which could be very expensive. These lots are 10 times the size of the required lots. It would make sense if they were putting in 50 lots. There is plenty of land for septic with no impacts. Mr. Smith said he looked at the sewer ordinance, which requires connections within 250 feet of the sewer, but he did not see the 500 feet requirement in the subdivision regulations. He believes the project meets the standards within the zoning ordinance. He concurs with the staff review and understands the notes to be added to the plan.

J. Pike indicated there should be an easement for the private memorial so that anyone can visit there for years to come even if the property changes hands. Mr. Smith said it would be easy to put an easement along there. Mr. Marden said that would be on his lot and he has no issue with it. M. LeClair observed that when the property is passed down, and someone sells, the area needs to be protected.

Mrs. Binette wanted the Board to know that in regards to the sewer waiver, all of the property has been perc tested. J. Pike told Mrs. Binette that as a Town Official, he wants them to know the Town is replacing a lot of piping from Wildlife Boulevard to Hurricane Road, and we don't want you to come later for the sewer.

C. Daigle explained there are subdivision regulations which cover granting waivers and the regulation to connect to sewer. The purpose is that it moves the sewer forward at the cost of the developer rather than the cost of tax payers. The sewer is good for properties close to the community center. It is not going to further the subdivision but it looks to what happens in the future and is not based only on who owns the property today.

Mr. Smith replied that he understands why the regulation is there. If something other than these two lots happens, they would have to come back before the Board. J. Pike commented that they plan to do the road in the upcoming year and they don't want to create a hardship. C. Daigle explained there needs to be unique consideration given to how a waiver is granted. Mr. Smith answered that there are only two lots of 10 acres each, owned by family members. He estimated it would be about \$70,000 to connect to the sewer. If there were more lots it would make sense. P. Harris stated the Board is concerned about the legalities.

J. Pike asked for confirmation of a written waiver. C. Daigle said yes, it was just submitted this evening. W. Peterson asked if the Board has done this before. C. Daigle answered that she does not think so. It does not come up a lot. She mentioned that there is another application next month also requesting a waiver for the sewer connection. Mr. Craig Clairmont, Public Works Director, informed everyone that if the Board waives this, there will be other things coming down the pipeline. J. Pike asserted that these are two substantial lots that don't need sewer because there is more than enough land for septic. C. Clairmont said in the near future there could be an issue and the Board will have to justify it.

R. Segalini had a poor Zoom connection, but reported that the price for sewer on the open market is about \$30 per foot, which would be \$27,000. If this waiver is granted, does the Board make them stub onto the main sewer, then onto the property and then the Board is out of it? C. Daigle said there is no main sewer line there. R. Segalini asked for clarification on where they would be connecting into the line. C. Daigle said at the corner of Hurricane Road and they will have to bring it up Seavey Road. It is about the same distance from Hurricane Road or Seavey Road. W. Peterson questioned the distance and said it appears to only be 200 feet. Mr. Smith explained they need to get to the corner of the second property. There was discussion that they are not installing the sewer for just the two lots, but for what it will be in the future.

Mrs. Binette said making them put sewer in is not very cost effective. It should be put in if it is developed. Making them put it in for a field used for farming is not cost effective. They are not going to develop it. The developer should pay for sewage.

J. Pike asserted the Town's voters voted in these regulations. If the Board waives it, someone else will come in for the same waiver. Mrs. Binette maintained that there would be no houses on the lots, but they have been perc tested. They are just going to be fields for farming. M. LeClair suggested if there are no houses, a waiver should not be needed. J. Pike said the ordinance would still need to be waived, or it could become a standard. M. LeClair proposed if houses are not put on the lots, they should not need to pay for the sewer connection; but if they put a house on the property, they would have to put sewer in. C. Daigle said she is not sure how that could be enforced.

There was discussion about the timing of connecting to the sewer with a subdivision. C. Daigle confirmed that sewer needs to be brought in immediately for two saleable building lots. The applicant's intent is not the question, because we have no control over it.

Mr. Smith declared that without the waiver they would have to put in sewer even if they are not building. K. Sturgeon asked if a condition of approval can be added that a house can't be put on the lots. C. Daigle answered no, we can't stop them from developing the properties. She said the regulations are written so that people go into the process understanding the costs. If there is a condition that sewer is not needed until a house is built, then the owner with the further lot may need to pay a large amount. That could make the lot unbuildable. The Board needs to find a unique reason in the land to grant the waiver or they have to apply the regulations in a fair and consistent manner. It could be a problem for years if the waiver is granted. If it is granted, how could you not grant similar waivers in the future? There was discussion about the lot ownership and reasons for subdividing the lot.

P. Harris said this is a tough application. The Board respects the applicants, but also needs to respect others who had to connect to the sewer system. Where would this stop and start? Mrs. Binette asked if this applies to the whole town. J. Pike said it depends on the location of the property and the sewer system. Mrs. Binette asked who paid to extend the sewer to the corner of Seavey Road. C. Daigle answered that in many cases tax payers paid to place sewage. There was discussion about being creative with the lot lines to save on piping, but C. Clairmont noted that it is relatively the same distance from Seavey Road or Hurricane Road, and C. Daigle confirmed both lots must be connected.

R. Segalini commented that he can't vote on this application but asked the Board to consider that there are large pieces of land in town that because of regulations, will not have anything done with them without sewer. There are large parcels that would be great to develop but it is not cost effective. G. Grant said that he agrees.

There was discussion about how to run the lines to save money, and if the sewer could be run to the first lot, then use an easement over that lot to connect to the second lot. Mr. Smith said the state won't allow that and it is still 900 feet of sewer line either way.

Mr. Grimes reminded the Board that he is an abutter for this hearing. He asked if the town knows where the sewer will go in the future, and if the Town would go in half and half on the connection cost. J. Pike responded that if it was a commercial property on Route 106, the Town may consider it. He agrees with granting the waiver because these lots will be used as farm land, but the Board has to work with the ordinance. Mr. Grimes said if the land is sold and developed then they would have to pay for it. That is common sense. W. Peterson said the Board has no teeth to enforce that down the road. That is the biggest problem. It sounds great but there is no way to enforce it.

R. Ball mentioned an agricultural easement could be put on the property so that it always stays farm land.

R. Pickwick asked about the house on the corner of Seavey Road that burned, and if it had sewer. Mrs. Binette said they had their own septic and well water.

Ms. Sharon Ciampi spoke as a Cemetery Trustee about the memorial for Jeff Marden. She explained it meets the state requirements but the trustees don't have any boundary information or paperwork and it is a concern. She wanted to take the opportunity to make it known that this is a long-term recurring issue. The trustees maintain 22 of 41 cemeteries in Town, at tax payer expense. A trust fund can be set up with the Town to offset the costs of future maintenance when there is no immediate family left. She recommends that it be marked with a boundary. She also recommended the area have its

own tax lot number assigned to it. Mr. Marden asked if putting a fence around the headstone would be sufficient. Ms. Ciampi said there has to be a clear boundary that is maintained. It is preserving the memorial for the future. She also noted there is a 25-foot buffer zone around cemeteries so people can't develop the lot.

Mr. Smith stated they will put a boundary around the memorial area with a dimension and define it if the subdivision is approved.

Mr. Smith addressed the waiver request and said he has 40 years of experience. He said the waiver should be granted because it is only for two 10-acre lots. These lots can't be built on unless sewer is brought up. The Board would need to work out conditions if they grant the waiver. J. Pike requested to read the written waiver. Staff noted it was not submitted in time to be part of the noticed file as it was only submitted this evening.

P. Harris suggested tabling the application for further review. Mr. Smith said he is trying to simplify things with specific uses. It is a reasonable request. The lots are 10 acres in a 1-acre zoning area. The families have no problem with tabling the application. He said he thought the regulation was 250 feet, not the 500 feet in the subdivision regulations. He is not concerned about conditions related to building.

R. Pickwick said the key is "building lots" if one part of the project falls within 500 feet. C. Daigle explained these are considered "building lots". The Board could not approve a lot that was not suitable for building. It needs to meet zoning requirements in order to subdivide. W. Peterson wondered if the Board could condition a building permit with sewer extension. C. Daigle asked what happens if the further lot comes in to build first. She is not saying it can't be done, but it needs a practical application. C. Daigle asked if lots can be transferred without sewer. If so, how does the Town tell a young couple with a new lot the furthest out from the sewer line, that they have to pay to connect to the sewer?

M. LeClair asked C. Clairmont when work will be done on the road, and if it would be less expensive to complete a connection when the Town is working on the road. C. Clairmont said there would be no pavement costs, but all other costs would be the same.

M. LeClair asked how long does the applicant have to install the sewer if the subdivision is granted. C. Daigle said there is no time limit, but they can't record or transfer ownership until it is constructed or secured. Mr. Smith observed the approval is only good for one year. C. Daigle said they can ask for extensions. R. Pickwick asked if it is approved do they have a certain time to connect. C. Clairmont confirmed they will be working on the road next June. Mr. Smith said it is still going to be expensive. R. Pickwick said it will, but the cost won't be as much. The Board is trying to see how they can help. K. Sturgeon questioned the requirements and suggested adding one structure for sewer. C. Daigle stated this is a public benefit requirement.

Mr. Grimes asked for clarification about the distance of 900 feet for the connection. There was discussion about going across the first lot to connect the second lot but C. Daigle stated regulations do not allow that. It has to be public sewer. That would not serve the needs of the public to move the sewer forward. The regulations are not to benefit the lots. C. Clairmont remarked that private systems fail, but the public systems improve water quality and infrastructure. Mr. Marden said it would be moving forward at their expense, to go where. C. Daigle explained that it is not what the Marden family is doing, it is what will be done in the future. The Board can't differentiate based on who owns the property.

W. Peterson suggested that it makes sense to take the time to have a second look and talk to an attorney. J. Pike said he would be willing to grant the waiver if it would protect the Town in the future. P. Harris said this regulation is for the public welfare and it is in there to protect things. C. Daigle noted the regulations are very specific if any part of the project is within 500 feet of the sewer. There need to be specific characteristics for a waiver that makes sense. J. Pike agreed with W. Peterson that the Board should table this application and get some advice.

**MOTION:** J. Pike moved to table the Marden subdivision application to October 25, 2021 at 6 pm at this location in order to further review and obtain advice on the waiver request for the sewer connection requirement of Subdivision Regulations Section 9.C.2, submitted at the September 27, 2021 meeting. No additional noticing is required.

The motion was seconded by P. Harris and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

#### **B. Budget 2022:**

Staff sent the Board a budget to review this evening to see if it is ready to send to the Board of Selectmen (BOS). A memo was generated based on the last meeting's conversation about reconfiguring the Land Use Office to meet the strengths of what we have and what we see coming forward in the future.

There is a need to funnel administrative duties downward. C. Daigle said previously she would do a lot of them herself but we can't expect new professionals to do that same level of administrative work. This reclassifies Administrative Assistant Elaine Murphy to a higher classification to recognize what she is doing today and moving other duties down to her, which leaves her short for time to do clerk duties. It would have the 7-hour clerk move to 25 hours, which would better situate the office to handle the main flow of duties coming in.

Building permits are taking an inordinate amount of time to process. Last year was the highest number of permits in a long time, and this year we are two months ahead of last year's numbers. People are redeveloping and it is more difficult to process. This is going to continue for the foreseeable future.

This budget was built on J. Pike's comments about utilizing the people you have in positions and acknowledging the work they are doing. Town Administrator Jeanne Beaudin has looked at the budget. It does go up significantly but it is formulated to address the concerns the Board has had. There is no more vehicle, but that will be offset by the mileage for people who have to go out. The clerk's salary is in there until April 1<sup>st</sup> and then would be absorbed by the Building Official.

This is the best shot to handle the things that were discussed at the last meeting. There are things that have not been done for a year with the loss of the full-time Building Inspector, and a new part-time Code Enforcement Officer. They are doing their parts but we don't get full time work and there are two new people in the positions. Realistically we are going backwards.

C. Daigle reported she is handling the current work but there is still a backlog on the table. Only projects that are ready to move forward again have been moved out of the backlog. The permit was issued today for the cell tower. Things have to move forward. This is our best shot and we are presenting it to the Board for approval. The pay will change a little with the Planner rate, the Administrative Assistant

being reclassified, and an increase for the Land Use Technician. We look to the BOS to determine whether or not to add a COLA. Other items have increased as well. Notices, advertising and mailing went up drastically because of USPS costs, but also due to the number of applications. There have been no adjustments in the last two years so we are out of money. There is some catch up to do after three years. Under Legal and Professional we are asking for an increase from \$3,000 to \$6,500 because we will have to pay more to keep the new Planner's certifications and will need some extra for C. Daigle to continue providing some help.

J. Pike said the Town was remiss in not asking C. Daigle to continue helping two years ago. Who is going to do the review? Who knew how far we were behind in the office? We want her to come in and see that we are on track.

C. Daigle said a phone for the Planner was added to the budget because people expect it for that level job. It is time to step up.

W. Peterson commented that when you see the amount of work going on in there, it is obvious that we need more help.

**MOTION:** W. Peterson moved to approve the Land Use budget as presented.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

### **C. CIP Update:**

P. Harris asked C. Clairmont how things are going at the DPW. He said we are in good shape for winter and the new guy is working out well. He can attest to the fact that the Land Use Office is busy; the whole town is busy. C. Daigle said that if we are successful, it is because we pass things back and forth. Everyone needs to share.

J. Pike reported we are a month away from a public walk through on the new police station. There was an issue with the elevator electronics and people can't be in and out because of that. The generator is on the way. An open house will be held perhaps in mid-November. The BOS has decided not to tear down the entire old police station; only the front of it. The storage space in the new station is minimal. The Selectmen went to Tilton's new station to check out the antennas and generators and got a tour of the facility. There are issues with evidence storage. The police department has to keep evidence until it goes to court. The back half of the existing building will be kept with an overhead door and another room with shelves that can be locked up for evidence storage. Some cleaning was done and lots of furniture and desks were donated. Bonnette, Page and Stone were a benefit to this project.

J. Pike also reported the tax collector let them know we are 46% ahead of last year in the collection of taxes on vehicles.

D. Grimes thanked C. Clairmont for his assistance with getting the power company to tag and remove some trees above the wires on Gilman Shore Road. There is a pumping station there.

P. Harris said he can't thank C. Daigle enough for her work. C. Daigle said it takes the Board to set the stage for what happens.

Staff is looking for the document to be accepted for the public hearing to be held at the October meeting.

**MOTION:** J. Pike moved to accept the CIP document for the public hearing to be held October 25, 2021.

The motion was seconded by K. Sturgeon and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

There was discussion about the cemeteries and bids for work. R. Pickwick reported an error with a gravestone and J. Pike asked him to contact the Town Administrator.

#### **D. Staff Report:**

##### **Zoning Administrator Language:**

C. Daigle stated that this year with a part-time Building Inspector and part-time Code Enforcement Officer there have been a lot of conversations about enforcement, and about the new Planner. The BOS has investigated who the Zoning Administrator works for. The Zoning Ordinance says the BOS administers enforcement and the Zoning Ordinance. The BOS hires and guides the Zoning Administrator. It has always been assumed the Planner was the Zoning Administrator and works for the Planning Board. Rather than wait for conflict, the BOS talked with the Planning Board Chairman and Vice Chair and came up with some language on the memo that was passed around. It is good language if you are a Planner. It shows how to apply the Zoning Ordinance. If the Planner is looking at a building permit, they are working for the BOS. If the building permit needs conditions from a Site Plan, etc. then the Planner is working for the Planning Board. It identifies who the guidance.

Sometimes we come back to the Board for weird situations. It will appear the ordinance should be applied a certain way, but we need to know in order to avoid errors. It was forward thinking of the BOS and the Chairman and Vice Chair to work with each other to differentiate who guides those strange situations. The BOS have accepted the language and the Chairman and Vice Chair are comfortable with it. But the Board needs to feel that it represents their philosophy. The person who is stuck making every decision about how the zoning ordinance works has to make determinations based on the ordinance.

P. Harris explained the document was modified after discussions with a Planner applicant. W. Peterson said the Town is not going to have a contract with the new Planner like we have had in the past. They are going to be a Town employee. J. Pike suggested that the Town needs to be better about doing reviews and helping the new Planner adjust to the job. The first six months are imperative. The paperwork will show that. This document differentiates how the zoning administrator will work for two bosses; the BOS and the Planning Board.

**MOTION:** P. Harris moved to accept the Zoning Administrator Language document as written.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, R. Pickwick and G. Grant. (7-0)

##### **Route 3 – Map/Lot 201-016-000-000:**

Tomorrow staff will be meeting with the new owner of the former Odie Cormier parcel on Route 3 next to the St. Francis home to discuss their proposal.



**Condominium Subdivision:**

C. Daigle provided an explanation of the limited common area in condominium ownership. If someone owns a condominium unit, whether in a building, or a separate cabin, they own a box to the outside of the walls that is considered their unit. Someone's yard is owned by the association but the building owner has special rights to the yard. A condominium unit is enclosed in walls and is defined in the condominium documents.

Once in awhile, a stand-alone condominium owner wants to expand. They need to come to the Planning Board for subdivision approval because they are capturing some of the limited common area previously owned by everyone in the association. That is required by law, in our regulations, and in the condominium documents. It is easy and there is not a lot to look at. The application comes before the Board, and our regulations require that they come to the ARC for any Planning Board application. However, there is no input required from department heads. We are asking if it is acceptable to waive the ARC requirement for this type of application. We also plan to come back with an amendment to consider for these types of applications. We will continue to send them to the departments for review but we can't capture something we don't control. G. Grant asked if this is something that would be approved by the condominium association. C. Daigle answered yes.

It was the consensus of the Board to waive the ARC requirement for this type of application.

**Zoning Amendments:**

Staff will be submitting some amendments to the Board for review at the next meeting. The process should be completed by mid-January in order for them to be placed on the ballot.

**E. New Business:****Property Maintenance Ordinance:**

J. Pike asked if Fire Department Chief Newhall has come to see C. Daigle about an ordinance about living conditions. He referred to a specific property with a number of issues and violations including septic capacity. But there is difficulty with enforcement. J. Pike commented how nice it was that some other properties have been cleaned up. C. Daigle mentioned that two previous Code Enforcement Officers presented similar ordinances to the BOS and they were not adopted because the ordinance covers aesthetics, which are not entirely black and white. The BOS was concerned that employees could apply the ordinance heavy-handedly. It is hard in a community. There may be a problem on one visible property that is enforced but it is not enforced on others. The National Building Code for Property Maintenance covers everything from painting to grass. J. Pike stated it would need to be modified down and portions of it adopted. At some point these things become a health issue and the Health Officer needs to have some teeth to enforce it.

G. Grant left the meeting at 8 pm.

**Sewer Connection Regulations:**

The Board discussed the two different regulations related to sewer connection requirements. One regulation requires connection within 250 feet and one within 500 feet. C. Daigle explained if an existing structure is within 250 feet of the sewer they must connect. This regulation helps support extension of the sewer. Our regulations are driven by good growth.

Staff informed the Board there is an applicant next month who will be requesting a waiver of the subdivision regulations because the new lots being created are more than 600 feet from the sewer.

M. LeClair asked how the regulations were crafted. C. Daigle stated they were taken from other communities. He asked if the regulations were enacted by the now-defunct Sewer Commission. C. Daigle answered no, they are a Planning Board subdivision regulation. It is a set of regulations adopted for the Board's use, which promotes smart growth. M. LeClair questioned if 500 feet is the correct number to use in the regulations. C. Clairmont commented it wouldn't matter in certain circumstances. The problem is that outlying properties are affected the most.

**DPW Road Plans:**

R. Pickwick asked C. Clairmont if Jamestown Road will be rebuilt or repaved. C. Clairmont replied it is going to get a maintenance shim and overlay. They have been surprised and pleased at how well this has worked on other roads. The Town can't afford to rebuild the road. They are working on the ditches. Roads can be resurfaced for about 10% of the cost of a rebuild. The section of Seavey Road that was done cost \$105,000 whereas to rebuild it would have cost \$1.1 million. They are using good asphalt and getting a good bang for their buck.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION:** J. Pike moved to adjourn at 8:10 pm.

The motion was seconded by P. Harris and carried on a unanimous roll call vote by P. Harris, W. Peterson, J. Pike, M. LeClair, K. Sturgeon, and R. Pickwick. (6-0)

Respectfully submitted:

Colleen Akerman  
Building & Land Use Clerk