

WEST WINDSOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Draft Minutes
September 10, 2010

Present at Hibler site visit: Glenn Seward, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Martha Harrison

Present at Bieling site visit: Glenn Seward, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Martha Harrison, John Bieling, Merle & Leone Bushkin

Present at Harrington site visit: Glenn Seward, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Jane Hoisington, Martha Harrison, Dennis Lemire, Wyatt Kniffin

Present at Fiorillo site visit: Glenn Seward, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Martha Harrison

Present at Public Hearings: Glenn Seward, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Jane Hoisington, Martha Harrison, Dennis Lemire, Dennis & Tammy Conley, Richard Vacca, Wyatt Kniffin, Merle & Leone Bushkin, Tom Kenyon, John Bieling

1. Call to Order - Chair Glenn Seward called the meeting to order at 7:20 PM and noted that the Development Review Board (DRB) had site visits earlier this evening at the Hibler property, the Bieling property, the Harrington property and the Fiorillo property.
2. Changes or Additions – None
3. Public Hearing: Fiorillo – Glenn opened the public hearing on application #2419 by Mike Dunne (applicant) and Elizabeth & Vincent Fiorillo (landowners) for a 29' variance of the side yard setback requirement of Section 2.3-4 to allow construction of a 6' x 19' x 14' covered entrance at 290 Village Lane (parcel #3-97). The application is subject to review under Section 2.3-4 and 6.8 of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations. Glenn said he would like to cover the procedural elements involved in all the hearings before considering the specific hearings. Glenn asked the DRB if there has been any ex parte communication or if there are any conflicts of interest. Glenn said on the West Windsor Moonlighters application, he will recuse himself because he is related to the landowner and is also an abutting property owner. Shannon said she will recuse herself from the Moonlighters application as well since she owns the property involved. Glenn reviewed the definition of an interested party and noted that all interested parties must sign in. Glenn swore in all those interested parties planning to offer testimony. Glenn asked if Mike Dunne or the Fiorillos were present. They were not. Martha said Mike called today and said he thought he might have a hard time getting here tonight. Glenn said Section 2.3-4 indicates that the setbacks in the Resort Residential district are 30' on all sides. Glenn said at the site visit he noted that the porch roof would be about one foot off the property line. Shannon agreed. Glenn read the first variance criterion and said he didn't notice anything at the site visit that met this criterion. Shannon said if the applicant were here, he might argue that the property line is the hardship. Shannon said she is not saying that she would agree with that. Hal said there is an existing concrete patio and the variance does not exceed the depth of the patio, which is one foot from the property line at one corner. In other words, it doesn't increase the distance between existing construction and the existing property line. Shannon said it's difficult to know without a stake at the corner that is certified as the property line. Hal said we guessed as best as we could. Glenn read the second variance criterion. Hal said it is too bad that the applicant is not here because it would be nice to know the purpose of the roof extension. Hal said the DRB can speculate but he doesn't think they should. Glenn and Shannon agreed. Tom Kenyon asked for clarification on the dimensions of the proposed construction. The DRB clarified the length, width, and height of the construction. Tom

asked if the original building was built too close to the property line. Hal said yes. Shannon said it's possible that it was built too close but she doesn't know what the zoning was at the time it was built. Glenn said the property was built in the early 1970s. Tom noted that it could have been built prior to zoning. Tom asked what is on the other side of the boundary line. Glenn said there is a section of woods and then a driveway to an adjacent house. Glenn read the third variance criterion. Hal said presumably that's true unless he's the original owner. Shannon said he's asking for it and it's within the 30 feet, so she would say that he's creating the hardship. Genevieve said the house is existing and in use presently so she understands Shannon's opinion. Glenn read the fourth variance criterion. Hal, Glenn and Shannon said they think the application meets the fourth criterion. Glenn read the fifth variance criterion. Genevieve said she doesn't think the proposed plan is the least deviation possible. Shannon agreed. Glenn made a motion to close the public hearing and schedule a deliberative session. Shannon said she doesn't have a problem making a motion in public but if Glenn would rather do it in private, that's okay. Glenn said he would prefer to consider it in a deliberative session. Hal had no objection. **Glenn moved to consider the Fiorillo application in a deliberative session. Genevieve seconded the motion, which passed with Shannon dissenting.**

4. Public Hearing: Harrington – Glenn opened the public hearing on application #2420 by the West Windsor Moonlighters, Inc. (applicant) and Matthew Harrington (landowner) for conditional use approval for a 10' x 30' stream crossing for snowmobiles and for a variance of the wetland buffer requirements of Section 3.14 of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations to allow for the relocation of a portion of the VAST snowmobile trail on the Harrington property at 390 Harrington Road (parcel #2-147). A portion of the relocated trail will pass through a 10' x 200' section of wetland/wetland buffer. The application is subject to review under Section 1.7(10), 2.3-2, 3.13, 3.14, 4.11, 5.3, and 6.8 of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations. Glenn and Shannon then recused themselves from participating in the hearing as members of the DRB. Dennis Lemire said the trail is currently to the west on property owned by Charles Ober. A portion of the trail is on a south facing slope of the Ober's lawn and for the past two springs, when it became bare, the snowmobiles were cutting up his lawn and he closed the trail. Dennis said the best place for a re-route of the trail is the Harrington property. Dennis said after the first spring (2009), he approached the Harringtons and they said if it was still a problem the next spring (2010), Dennis should come back and see them. Dennis said it did become a problem again and Chuck Ober asked him to look for a re-route so he approached the Harringtons again and Matt signed a permission form. Dennis then applied for a wetlands permit with the State of Vermont Wetlands Division, and subsequently the town. Dennis said the Moonlighters are not looking to expand the trail system; this re-route is due to landowner request. Hal noted that the DRB did a site visit today. Genevieve asked if the Moonlighters have received a wetlands permit from the state. Dennis said the time for public comment was up on September 7th so he expects the permit will be coming in the mail. Dennis said Rebecca Chalmers was his contact at the Wetlands Division. Hal asked if the permit includes the stream crossing. Dennis said he called the stream alteration people and described the project and they said, "Have Rebecca Chalmers look at it." According to Dennis, Rebecca agreed that the stream alteration engineer doesn't need to come out for that. Dennis said it's on his application what he needs to do for the stream. Hal said we're not talking about a variance here, we're talking about a conditional use. Shannon said there is a request for a variance for the wetland. Shannon said Dennis approached her the year before and she wasn't real excited about it but Matt signed the paperwork. Shannon said the Harrington's open their property to hikers, bikers, horses, hunters, and just about anybody that asks and respects the property. Shannon said they could apply for current use but they don't so they don't get any tax exemption. Shannon said she feels bad because she knows it's a lot of work but she wants to state for the record that if she doesn't like it, because she doesn't like noise or odor and she walks her dogs in the proposed trail area all the time, she's going to have to revoke permission. Dennis said, as a landowner, that's Shannon's privilege. Genevieve suggested looking at Sections 3.14 and 4.11 with regards to the wetland. Genevieve noted that the map shows the trail going through a wetland. Martha said the trail goes through a 100' section of wetland in the area where there were ferns growing. Martha said the state determined that it is a

class 2 wetland. Hal said if the DRB were to take action on this application, it would have to be conditioned on the Moonlighters getting their permit from the state. Genevieve asked if the state permits are “yes or no” or if they come with conditions. Martha said she hasn’t seen one. Hal said if there are conditions, we will have to have another public hearing. Hal said it may be important to continue this public hearing until such time as Dennis has his state permits and then it may not be necessary to go into a deliberative session, depending on the nature of the permit. Dennis said he will be glad to come down if the DRB needs another session. Jane asked what happens if the town approves it and the state permit doesn’t come through or comes through with conditions. **Genevieve made a motion to wait to do a deliberative session until we have the state permit.** Hal asked Genevieve if she means that we should recess this public hearing until the town receives a copy of the state permit. Martha said if you’re going to continue the hearing, you have to continue it to a date certain. Jane asked Dennis if he is assuming that the state permit is going to come by the end of next week. Hal said let’s allow two weeks. Hal said he knows that Dennis is anxious to get the permits so he can work on this before it snows. Dennis said the Moonlighters start their trail work tomorrow; they only work on Saturdays and it’s all done with volunteer help. Dennis said October is bow and arrow season and November is deer season. Genevieve asked if the DRB can schedule their deliberative session to be at a time when we think the state permit will be in. Martha said the DRB can deliberate any time they want after they close the hearing. Hal said the DRB has to have a public hearing after they receive the state permit so they can tell people what’s involved in this request. Martha said the DRB can take evidence tonight and condition their decision on whatever the state decides. Hal asked Dennis if he’s willing to let the DRB do that. Dennis said yes. Dennis said Rebecca Chalmers did a site visit, but he doesn’t have the final permit. Barbara asked Dennis if he got a sense from Rebecca that she was okay with the project. Dennis said yes. Hal said his suggestion is that we go into deliberative hearing and hope that we get something from Rebecca by that time so we can see the final report. **Hal moved to close the hearing unless the DRB wants to make a decision right now.** Martha asked if the DRB wants to go through all the other sections of the zoning regulations. Shannon said as an outsider she would think that the sections should... Genevieve said we certainly can; the second part is for the construction of the stream crossing. Jane asked Dennis how he’s going to start work tomorrow if he doesn’t have the permit. Dennis said he’s not going to be working on that particular project tomorrow. Genevieve asked if Section 1.7 and the other sections are for the bridge construction. Martha said all of the sections listed are relevant to the whole application, which is for two things – a variance and a conditional use. Martha said you need a variance to go through a wetland and a conditional use to go over the stream. Hal said if you think you have enough testimony now, the problem is once you close the hearing, you have to start all over again from scratch. Hal said he’s not sure the DRB can accept testimony once the public hearing is closed. Genevieve asked Hal if, by testimony, he is referring to the state permit. Speaking as an interested party, Glenn suggested that the DRB go through the criteria outlined in the warning and ask the DRB to go into a deliberative session and make their findings contingent upon the receipt of a state permit. Genevieve said that will entail whatever the state determines he has to do. Glenn suggested that the DRB condition the local permit on whatever their findings are, and if the state comes up with additional conditions, just make the local permit... Glenn said the public hearing could be closed, the DRB could go into deliberative session, and issue findings contingent upon the findings of the state and receipt of the state permit. Hal said that makes sense. Merle Bushkin asked what a deliberative session is. Hal described a deliberative session. Merle said his understanding is that action has to be taken in public. Hal said you can take action in a deliberative session and you make a written decision that is then published. Tom said it is his understanding that the decision will not say how each individual person voted. Hal said it’s the board’s decision. Hal said he made a motion to go into deliberative session as far as the town permit and conformance with the Zoning bylaw, conditioned upon receipt of a permit from the state. Shannon said but that wouldn’t allow the applicant to be part of it, would it? Hal said if he wants to comment on the zoning bylaws, conditional use is pretty straightforward; he has no control over the wetlands issue – it’s a state permit – so even

the sections of the zoning regulations can be overridden by the state as far as wetlands are concerned. Glenn said as an interested party, he would appreciate the board reviewing each of the pertinent sections of the zoning bylaws. "And coming to an open decision tonight?" Hal asked. Glenn said no, if the DRB wants to deliberate in private, that's fine but he would appreciate a review of the sections. Hal read Section 1.7 (10), which has to do with exemptions. Barbara said this project can't be exempt because it requires a structure. Hal agreed. Hal said Section 2.3-2 contains the standards for the Secondary Growth district and includes "outdoor recreational use" as a conditional use. Hal said Section 3.13 has to do with protection of natural resources, and Section 3.14 has to do with rivers, streams and wetlands. Hal said applications for stream crossings must be approved by the State of Vermont River Management Program and the Zoning Board following conditional use review. Glenn said it sounds like the applicant has applied for the necessary state permits. Shannon said the last statement in Section 3.13 says that, in approving a conditional use, the Zoning Board (which is now the DRB) may impose conditions to ensure the protection of natural resources. Hal agreed that the DRB can impose conditions. Hal asked Dennis about the width of the snowmobile trail and the disposal of trees, roots and stumps. Dennis said the traveled tread width is 10 feet wide and they clear brush and small trees on either side an additional three feet. Dennis said they try to bury the stumps and use the fill from the hole they dig to put the stumps in for low places in the trail. If they can't do that, the stumps are put on the side of the trail and seeded and mulched so they grow ferns and grass and blend in with the woods. Dennis said the wood and brush are stacked off to the side. Dennis said they can pile the brush or scatter it loosely so it resorts back to dirt quicker. Glenn asked if there is going to be any imported fill in connection with the bridge. Dennis said no. Shannon asked about the construction of the bridge. Dennis said there will be four hemlock streamers placed six foot on center; those are all peeled so they last longer. Then it's planked and runners are placed on top of the planks to keep the snowmobiles off the decking of the bridge to give the planks longer life. Dennis said the hemlocks will be brought in from off site. Dennis said he is assuming that Matt Harrington is going to be interested in the hardwood. Hal said Section 4.11 has to do with landfill. Hal asked Dennis if he said that there would be no fill brought in. Dennis said that is correct; he doesn't think they could get fill in there even if they wanted to. Hal read Section 4.11 and asked Dennis if he adheres to all the criteria. Dennis said yes. Shannon asked if the area is in a mapped floodplain. Martha said no. Hal said Section 6.8 has to do with variances and this is a variance of the wetland buffer. Martha noted that Dennis provided a written response to the variance criteria. Hal read the first criterion and asked Dennis to read his response. Dennis said he had a difficult time answering the questions because he thinks the questions have to do with buildings and not snowmobile trails. Dennis read his response to the first variance criterion. Hal said he thinks the Moonlighters were placed in a position where they had no choice but to relocate and they did receive permission. Hal read the second variance criterion and said it is not applicable. Hal read the third variance criterion and said that is correct because the Moonlighters were asked by the property owner where the trail currently goes to remove that portion of the trail. Dennis read his response to the third variance criterion. Hal read the fourth variance criterion. Dennis read his response. Hal noted that the trail will improve access to renewable energy resources to a limited extent. Dennis said he didn't want to put his neck too far out on a limb. Hal read the fifth variance criterion. Dennis read his response. Jane asked how far the relocated trail will extend the snowmobile season. Dennis said it's in March when they have the problem so they will potentially get all of March. Depending on what kind of a year it is, Dennis said, he has snowmobiled the first week in April. Genevieve said we skipped Section 5.3. Dennis said if we have a January thaw and the snow is almost gone or it's bare on that knoll, it's still a consideration in January. Hal read a portion of Section 5.3. Hal read the general and specific conditional use standards. Speaking as a landowner, not as a board member, Shannon said, since the conditional use criteria state that there shall be no unreasonable interference with the use or enjoyment of the property, she wants to go on the record saying that she hikes that area all the time and she's worried that she's not going to enjoy it anymore. Shannon said there's something in the Town Plan about trails and she's concerned that the more she allows people to use her land, they're going to start mapping it as a forever trail; it seems

like there is more taking that goes on. Tom asked if this trail is restricted for use by the snowmobile club. Dennis said they cannot grant other users permission – that’s up to the landowner. Tom said horses can’t go and use that trail. Hal said not without permission from the landowner. **Genevieve made a motion to close the public hearing. Hal seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

5. Municipal Land Use decisions – In response to Merle Bushkin’s earlier question, Glenn read from the state guide to municipal land use decisions dated October 2009, which specifically states, among other things, that deliberative sessions are exempt from the open meeting law.
6. Public Hearing: Bieling – Glenn opened the public hearing on application #2421 by John Bieling for a variance of the wetland buffer and landfill requirements of Section 3.14 and 4.11 of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations to allow for the construction of a woodlot access at 2458 Rush Meadow Road (parcel #4-37). Construction of the access includes the placement of fill in a 12’ x 70’ section of wetland/wetland buffer. The application is subject to review under Section 2.3-3, 3.5, 3.13, 3.14, 4.11 and 6.8 of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations. John said this is an access from the town highway, making a 90 degree turn and going down to a landing. John said he put up a buffer with filter fabric and hay bales. John said the terrain is difficult to work with. John said there’s a right-of-way and sometime in the far future, there will be an access that includes a bridge across to the other side of the brook. Glenn asked John if he has access approval from the Selectboard. John said yes. Glenn said the Selectboard reviews access into the town right-of-way as one permit and work outside the right-of-way is reviewed by the DRB. Barbara asked John if his intent is that this portion is the beginning of a longer access to land on the other side of the brook. John said yes. Barbara asked if that land is a separate lot. John said no – the right-of-way is the ROW for a back lot that Michael Dunne owns so it’s written into that contract. Shannon asked about the right-of-way. John said the ROW as shown on the map has numbers – that’ the ROW to the back lot. Shannon asked if that is exactly where the curb cut is. John said yes. Barbara asked where on the numbered part does the portion of the road John is talking about stop. John said it stops at #2. Barbara noted that John would have to have further permitting to extend it across the brook. Barbara asked if there are wetlands on the other side of the brook. John said no. Glenn said Section 2.3-3 has the standards for the rural residential district. Merle asked what the minimum size parcel is in that district if John wanted to subdivide. Glenn said the minimum size is 5 acres. Regarding Section 3.5, Glenn said obviously there is a steep slope dropping off the roadway and this section states that any gradient in excess of 20% shall be subject to review. Glenn noted John’s plans for erosion control using hay bales and silt fencing. Barbara asked if there is any limit to how much fill can be used. Glenn said he doesn’t think there is a limit. John said he would probably need at least 500 yards of fill. Barbara said it’s going to start at the road height and gradually go down hill to the knoll. John said yes, it will be zero grade at the knoll. Glenn read Section 3.13, protection of natural resources. Barbara asked if the wetlands are under federal or state jurisdiction. Martha said they are not class 2, so she assumes they are class 3. John said the state wetland ecologist has not come out yet. Martha asked John if he requested a site visit with the wetland ecologist. John said yes. Martha asked if a date has been set. John said no. Shannon said she thinks there is a wetland there to deal with. Merle asked if there are limitations on the type of fill you can bring into a wetland. Glenn said West Windsor’s zoning regulations don’t have limitations on the type of fill but he’s not sure if the state regulations have limitations. Glenn said obviously old tires and junk cars wouldn’t be appropriate. Merle asked about used soil. Glenn said there is nothing in the zoning regulations that dictates that. Merle asked if the state regulations allow used soil. Glenn said he’s not familiar with the state regulations. Shannon said she would think that, if John has to get a state permit, the state will require a plan from him that is more detailed than the plan he has provided with his variance application. Glenn read Section 3.14 and asked John if the stakes with the red ribbons marked the 50’ stream buffer. John said yes. Glenn asked John if, in his opinion, there is no construction in the buffer area. John said no, there is no construction in the buffer area and that would seem like the logical place to put the filter fabric and hay bales. Glenn noted that the wetland situation is yet to be determined. Shannon asked John where he measured the 50’ buffer from. John said he

measured from the high water mark. Glenn read Section 4.11 and asked Martha if she has checked the floodplain map. Martha said it's not in the floodplain. Glenn asked John where the project is located in relation to his property line. John said the center of the proposed driveway is 16' from his property line. Glenn asked John if he knows what the slope is off the downhill side from the roadbed. John said approximately 2 to 1; he can get more specific if necessary. John said if it needs to be 3 to 1 he can do that without getting into the stream buffer. Barbara said she thinks the significance of Section 4.11 is going to be contingent on whether it is deemed an official wetland. Barbara said if it is deemed a wetland than the project would involve filling a wetland. Regarding Section 4.11(4), Shannon said it looks like it is about 40 feet from the curb cut to the property line, which is less than 100 feet. Glenn said when he comes up onto the road, the fill is not going to be as considerable nor will it create a slope until he gets down a ways. Glenn said it's still within 100 feet. Shannon said it looks like the brook is only about 60 feet so something's kind of funky. Hal said we run into that kind of problem because the Selectboard approved that point of access. Hal added that it was investigated by somebody before the Selectboard approved it. Hal said Mike usually looks at those things. Hal said John is required to meet a certain gradient, so he's going to have to fill. Genevieve said she thinks John planned on meeting that gradient anyway. Tom said the Selectboard looked at sight distances there and judged that to be the best location. Tom said sight distance is the most important of all the access criteria. John said it is steeper further on upstream. Shannon asked John if he is trying to work within the right-of-way shown on the map. John said yes. Shannon asked if the map showing the right-of-way is on record. John said yes. Martha said the map is on file but it's confusing to her, in reviewing the permit history, as to whether the right-of-way was approved. Martha said there was an earlier right-of-way that was definitely approved and an earlier access that was definitely approved, but it's not clear to her that the right-of-way shown here was approved. Martha noted that she sent the DRB a summary of the property's permit history. Glenn agreed that it's a rather confusing pile of documents, which is unfortunately the nature of the way things were back in the day. Hal noted that the previous actions were primarily in the 1990s. Glenn read the first variance criterion and said he thinks we just addressed the first criterion. Shannon asked Martha if John had provided written answers to the variance criteria. John said he did not recall being asked to provide written answers. Glenn read the second variance criterion. Glenn asked John if there is any other way he can do this; any other access point, for example. John said no, there really isn't. Glenn asked John if he caused this hardship. John said he doesn't believe so. Shannon asked John if the survey was done for him; if he has owned it that long. John said yes. Glenn asked John if he feels the proposed access will alter the character of the neighborhood. John said he doesn't believe so. Glenn asked John if he feels he will permanently impair the appropriate use or development of any adjacent property. John said no. Glenn asked John if he feels he will reduce access to renewable energy resources. John said no; it's a woodlot. Glenn asked John if he sees it as a detriment to public welfare. John said no. Glenn asked John if the variance, if authorized, is the minimum that will afford relief. John said yes. Shannon asked if the purpose of the access is for wood removal. John said the purpose of this initial access is to clean it out and use the firewood that is available there. Shannon asked if John might eventually turn it into a driveway. John said yes. **Hal made a motion to close the public hearing. Genevieve seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Glenn made a motion to schedule a deliberative session for this application and the previous applications that have been reviewed tonight.** The DRB agreed to meet in deliberative session on Tuesday, September 21st at 6:30 PM. John said the state is supposed to be doing their site visit sometime that week. Glenn asked John to contact Martha as soon as he gets an indication from the state. Hal said this would be contingent on receiving approval from the state. Glenn said he thinks the DRB would want the local permit to be contingent on any conditions the state might impose. Shannon said with other permits we've talked about whether we can have a contingency based on a contingency. Martha said you can't with wastewater, although she thinks you can now but you have to put it in your zoning regulations. Genevieve said the applicant is going to have to meet the state requirements whether we make our approvals contingent or not. Glenn said John is asking the DRB not to hold him accountable to the

local zoning regulations. Glenn said in the past we have made out permit contingent on the applicant receiving a permit from the state. Genevieve said the DRB can impose additional conditions and requirements. Genevieve said by waiving Section 3.14, the DRB would be saying that the applicant does not need state approval. Hal said he doesn't think the DRB can waive a state requirement. Shannon said she doesn't think granting a variance would mean that the applicant does not need to get a state permit, just that the state permit is not necessary in order for the DRB to grant the variance. Genevieve said if you waive Section 3.14, you're waiving the section that requires a state permit. Shannon said she needs to think about it. Hal said the DRB could approve the variance with the exception of Section 4.11, meaning that he has to go to the state to get a wetlands permit. Glenn said we should have this conversation in a deliberative session. Barbara said it's hard because Section 4.11 says "there is no disturbance to...wetlands." Glenn agreed that it's cut and dried but he's applying for a variance of that regulation. Barbara asked in a situation like that where a road is dropping right on to a wetland, whether the state wants to call it a wetland or not, are we saying that's okay. Genevieve said we would only be waiving for the town, not the state. Barbara said since we're not wetland experts, it would seem that state approval is important. Shannon agreed. Shannon asked if the other members of the DRB had noticed the water table. Barbara said yes; we've had no rain and there's a water table in there. Hal said you could find that he has no other access to his land and state law says you have to provide access.

7. Review Sample Subdivision Application Forms – By consensus, the DRB agreed to table consideration of sample subdivision application forms.
8. Minutes – July 13, 2010: **Hal made a motion to approve the minutes of July 13, 2010 as written. Genevieve seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**
9. Other Business – Tom said he is concerned that there are a number of areas in the zoning regulations that are going to take considerable scrutiny to reflect the wording and intent of the Town Plan. Tom asked when the revision of the zoning regulations is going to begin. Hal said the Planning Commission is going to begin reviewing the zoning regulations and the subdivision regulations on September 15th. Tom said he wants to make sure the public has a chance to participate. Hal said every meeting is warned and open to the public. Glenn said there are a number of zoning regulations that are not practical in his opinion. For example, Tom said "high water mark" doesn't always make sense as a point of reference. Tom said he thinks the abutter should have some say in a variance situation such as the roof extension that is one foot from the property line. Shannon said the abutter was notified and chose not to come. Glenn said obviously the abutter doesn't feel strongly about it.
10. Adjourn – **Glenn made a motion to adjourn at 9:00 PM. Barbara seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Harrison