

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/ZOOM PLATFORM
November 10, 2021

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Erik Russell (Vice Chair), Dan Kiley (via Zoom platform), Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative, via Zoom Platform), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer)

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Phil Vermeer

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Taylor- Land Use and Community Development Administrator, Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary

GUESTS: Leigh Davis (via Zoom Platform), Chris Rollins, LLS (Land Surveyor representative for Mark Kenney), Celie Aufiero (via Zoom Platform)

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and took a “roll call” of members present for attendance.

Chair Fracht elevated Mr. Bonner to a voting member for tonight’s meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT:

The Selectboard met on November 1. Chair Fracht attended and provided an update on the community workshop and Master Plan Task Force.

Mr. Gotthardt spoke to the Selectboard about streaming meetings. Broadcasting the Zoom will be a first step, and there will be a test pilot with the Selectboard meeting. If this goes well, meetings for Selectboard and Planning Board will be live streamed.

Recreation commission came with a proposal to convert two part time positions into one full-time position and will be meeting with the budget committee.

There was a look at upcoming capital reserve funds. There is an updated proposed personnel policy, to include advanced education and tuition reimbursement and be more competitive.

There were some reassignments to committee members. The Selectboard also accepted some donations.

IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: October 27, 2021

Ms. Jones MOVED to approve the October 27, 2021, Minutes presented in the November 10, 2021, agenda packet as presented and amended.

Seconded by Mr. Gotthardt

Amendments:

Line 97 – 4-bay car wash, change to 2-bay.

Line 126 – Flanders Ave to Flanders St.

Line 140 – Flanders Ave to Flanders St.

Line 95 – remove “formerly”

Line 100 – change “part of the car wash in R1” to “part of the self-storage facility in R1”

Line 113-114 – add B. Bergeron and R. Bergeron for clarification

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Jim Bonner **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative) **Abstained.**

*** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (6-0-1).**

V. HEARINGS:

Enfield Land Use Case # P21-11-01, Mark Kenney is seeking minor subdivision approval to create two lots from one on Oak Hill Road (map 12, lot 21-1). The subject property is in the “R5” zoning district and is currently 11.4 acres total. Lot “A” is proposed to become 6.42 acres and lot “B” is proposed to become 5.03 acres. Mark E. Kenney is the property owner, and he will be represented in this land use case by Chris Rollins, LLS.

Chair Fracht opened the public hearing.

Chair Fracht invited Mr. Rollins to describe the subdivision property for the board. Mr. Rollins noted that he is a land surveyor representing property owner Mr. Kenney. He explained that the lot itself was created by a minor subdivision in 2000. It went through another minor subdivision in 2008. Mr. Rollins explained that Mr. Kenney wishes to create another minor subdivision, with driveway access to the proposed new lot off Oak Hill Road. The lot is straight and there would be no driveway visibility issues. Mr. Rollins shared that the rear $\frac{3}{4}$ of the lot is a very nice, private location for a potential home. The soils appear to be well drained; he estimates at a 3ft water table. He noted that as you get closer to the road, it is more of a source of wetness. He did not note any wetlands, but it is a wet soil closer to the road. He noted that if the board should approve the subdivision, he wishes to provide corrected plans at the lot separation line (he noted

Enfield Planning Board Minutes, November 10, 2021

85 6.42 on the current plan, however it is 6.02). He stated it does not take away from the description
86 on the main plan, but he is happy to provide the update to the board. Mr. Rollins shared that Mr.
87 Kenney's intent is to sell the new lot.
88

89 Mr. Gotthardt asked, in the deed itself for the current parcel there is a restriction on single- and
90 double-wide mobiles (he assumes mobile homes). Mr. Rollins stated correct, he assumes so as
91 well. Mr. Gotthardt asked, would this carry over to both lots now? Mr. Rollins stated that he
92 presumes it would carry onto both properties.
93

94 Mr. Gotthardt asked, for the reserved right of drawing from a well (outlined in the deed) – did
95 Mr. Rollins see any well that this may be referencing? Mr. Rollins stated no. This language was
96 on the original parcel and has carried through for each subdivision.
97

98 Ms. Davis stated that she was interested in the clarification of “not wet land but land is wet”. Mr.
99 Rollins stated that the land isn't a wetland, but that the water table is higher. He stated one
100 category for soils is the presence of water and how close it is to the surface. Near the road of the
101 lot, it is flatter, so water does not drain as quickly as in the back. He stated he would expect that
102 section has a water table 2ft down, versus the higher land where he estimates it is 3ft down. Ms.
103 Davis thanked Mr. Rollins for clarification.
104

105 Chair Fracht closed the public hearing.
106

107 Chair Fracht opened board member discussion. There was not further discussion from each
108 board member.
109

110 Chair Fracht asked the board – would you like Mr. Rollins to correct the acreage on the inset,
111 with correction on the mylar, or would you be ok with him crossing it out and initialing? Mr.
112 Gotthardt noted that he would be ok with crossing out if the Registry of Deeds accepts it. Mr.
113 Rollins noted that he would prefer to correct it versus cross it out. He is unsure if the Registry of
114 Deeds would accept this. Mr. Gotthardt noted, for the paper copy for filing a hand correction
115 would be acceptable.
116

117 Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor – do we need to condition this upon an approved septic permit.
118 Mr. Taylor stated no. Mr. Kiley clarified the state asks for this for 5 acres or less, the proposed
119 lot is over 5 acres.
120

121 **Mr. Gotthardt MOVED to accept the minor subdivision of the Mark W. Kenney Property**
122 **Map 12 Lot 21-01 as presented, with corrected mylar.**

123 ***Seconded by Mr. Russell***
124

125 **Roll Call Vote:**

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative) Jim Bonner **all voting Yea.**
None voted Nay.
None Abstained.

** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0-0).*

Chair Fracht stated to Mr. Rollins that they would likely have the decision out over the weekend. Mr. Rollins stated that he would provide Mr. Taylor with the corrected Mylar later this week.

VI. PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS:

A. Proposed Zoning Changes – Final Draft, Kurt Gotthardt

Mr. Gotthardt stated that he made changes based on the prior meeting. Pages 1 and 2 had no further changes.

On page 3, Chair Fracht noted regarding the Community Business (CB) district change 401.4 V. – based on the recent Master Plan Task Force work, there was overwhelming response to focus on the Village/Main St. area. He stated that he agreed personally with this as the direction that the town should go. He asked, with this being the case, why are we taking this out when we will likely be putting it back in as part of the Master Plan? Mr. Gotthardt noted that this section requires the change as if the language is eliminated, it makes housing an option. Chair Fracht stated that if the drive is for businesses in the CB district, he feels the board should not delete the language. Mr. Gotthardt stated that he felt it would give more flexibility to a developer. Chair Fracht asked, what has it produced? Mr. Gotthardt stated, nothing has gone in. There have been no commercial businesses with residential space above. Mr. Russell agreed that it would provide more flexibility, however he asked, given how many changes we already have should this wait until after the Master Plan? Mr. Taylor stated that this was put in at the request of Enfield Village Association, he believes. Mr. Kiley confirmed. Mr. Russell stated that removing the language would have less impact on new businesses that come in, versus businesses that currently exist (such as the laundromat). This language change would allow residences by default in some of those locations, versus by special exception. Mr. Russell noted that he was thinking on a practical level, which properties would this impact? Mr. Taylor stated that there was once a feeling that if businesses are converted to residential, there is a misconception that it can never be changed back to a business. He noted upgrades like a full bathroom and kitchen would benefit a business. Chair Fracht agreed, but noted that there would be a full process of waiting for a tenant to leave, not renewing a lease, etc. He stated that is the provision is removed, a building owner or landlord may be more motivated to find a commercial/retail tenant. Ms. Jones stated that she believed the original thought of the language was part of the Main St. Program, with the philosophy of having commercial business on the main floor and residential areas above – mixed used. She stated that the reality was that businesses didn't want to be on Main St, and the few that were there didn't make it. The language did not help. Mr. Gotthardt noted that he still felt that it would benefit a developer to have less restriction. The need for housing continues to come

up, and this would allow apartments on the first floor. Ms. Jones stated there are apartments on the first floor. Chair Fracht stated in some buildings, this would allow for all the buildings to do so. Ms. Stewart stated that she would normally support this change, however she feels there is unclear messaging. She stated that whenever there is talk of change and new ideas, this can cause rumors, which can make community members uncomfortable and speculate other potential changes. She wonders if making the change will add to the confusion. Mr. Gotthardt noted that he is ok with the change either way. With the potential for a Village Zone, perhaps this is a complete re-write of the district and it would be changed then. Mr. Taylor shared that he was contacted by the owner of the Erigo property, who intended to come in for a special exception to provide flexibility for the property. Mr. Taylor believes that the property has now sold, and he is unsure of what the new owners will do. He stated that he felt if buildings were converted to residential, it would benefit them to be turned back into office space with amenities like a kitchen and bathroom. Flexibility is great, though he agrees with Ms. Stewart that it is probably not a good idea to go back and forth a few times. Mr. Taylor, Mr. Russell, Ms. Stewart, and Chair Fracht agreed that putting the language change off to next year is the best option. Mr. Kiley agreed he would be ok with this, and it would make the ballot smaller. Chair Fracht asked if the board was comfortable with removing the 401.4 V. language change off the list. Ms. Jones agreed she was comfortable with this. Mr. Gotthardt will remove this entirely from the draft.

Mr. Gotthardt continued review of page 3, and onto page 4 regarding Signs. There was a correction to 408 SIGNS on Mr. Taylor's title to: Land Use and Community Development Administrator.

Mr. Gotthardt continued to 408 D – Sign Illumination. Chair Fracht asked, for the last paragraph should “display messages” be changed to “displayed messages”? There was not a clarification from any members of changing. Ms. Jones stated, regarding historic homes, some other towns have special regulations for historic districts. Mr. Gotthardt noted that by zoning regulations Enfield does not have a historic district. There is an area with historical homes, etc. but there is not a historical zoning district. Ms. Jones clarified that there are two districts, however there are no special regulations for them – the reason is to become a certified local government. She continued, the reason for this is that a certified local government is eligible for grants that are much, much larger. Mr. Gotthardt stated that he didn't feel it was appropriate to write a new section for this at this point in the change. Ms. Jones suggested perhaps it could belong in a different place. Chair Fracht suggested it could be incorporated into the Master Plan. Ms. Stewart asked, do we really want to get into differentiate signs and lighting among different parts of town? Canaan has sign regulations in their historic district that differ. Ms. Stewart suggested a language change that would work everywhere in town? Ms. Jones stated she finds that the Canaan St. regulations are not unfriendly. Ms. Stewart noted that she had heard from a resident who also owns property on Canaan St. that there was concern about Enfield adopting complicated Historic District regulations like Canaan's which are “picky”. Mr. Gotthardt stated that this would be a town-wide zoning ordinance. He feels that any special sections of town

209 should come from the Master Plan, if that is the direction the town wants to go. Chair Fracht
210 stated that he feels there is enough language in the sign ordinance as proposed that it should
211 provide for control over the signage near a residential area, historic district, etc. Mr. Gotthardt
212 agreed that the language as proposed should cover any situation that may come up, and if it does
213 not, they will find out. Chair Fracht noted that if a problem should arise, he feels they could
214 modify what the applicant would be asking for. He asked Ms. Jones if she was more comfortable
215 with this. Ms. Jones stated she understood the point.

216
217 Mr. Gotthardt moved forward to page 5, and onto 6 with 408.7 removal and replacement
218 language: Sign Permit Procedures and Enforcement. Chair Fracht asked, when you say “any
219 changes to signs shall require a new permit” – what does this mean? If the message changes,
220 does this require a permit? Mr. Russell suggested “modifications” instead of “changes”. Mr.
221 Bonner suggested “structural modifications”. Mr. Russell clarified it is both structural and
222 cosmetic. He suggested “physical modifications”. Chair Fracht clarified “physical modifications
223 to signs shall require a new permit”. Mr. Taylor suggested “physical design”. The final proposed
224 language agreed upon was: “any modifications to the physical design of the sign shall require a
225 new permit”.

226
227 Chair Fracht asked, “applications for sign permits involving nonresidential sites shall be made
228 concurrently with site plan applications to the Planning Board.” – this language seems to be
229 confusing if there is no site plan available. Mr. Russell suggested changing this instead to be that
230 site plans require the sign review, not that sign reviews require site plans. Chair Fracht suggested
231 “site plan applications should include sign permit applications where needed”. Ms. Jones asked,
232 what is the sign says “visit Ruggles Mine”? Chair Fracht stated that he did not believe there was
233 any restriction. If someone wants to put up a Billboard, if it is within the sign regulations, it is
234 within the rights on a commercial property. Mr. Gotthardt circled back to the wording; Mr.
235 Russell provided the final language “site plan applications to the Planning Board should include
236 applications for sign permits. Ms. Jones asked, is there a fee for the sign permit? Mr. Taylor
237 stated it is \$25, set by the zoning board.

238
239 Ms. Jones asked Mr. Taylor, per the last meeting, do you have a sign permit form that you can
240 share with us? Mr. Taylor projected the form for the board to review. The board reviewed the
241 form, Chair Fracht stated “total area (including supports)” seemed unclear. Mr. Gotthardt stated
242 that he interpreted it as measuring from the outside of support posts, not inside where the sign
243 itself is. Chair Fracht asked, for a 4x8 sign, on 4x4 posts – would I add 8” to the width, and any
244 height that the posts go above the top of the sign? This will reduce my sign area. Mr. Taylor
245 stated this was correct. Typically, a smaller 4x4 post won’t add much surface area, but in some
246 cases (like one in town with a bear climbing the post) the post size becomes more important.
247 Chair Fracht stated that he is reviewing it from the perspective of a sign maker. Mr. Taylor stated
248 that if the board wishes to remove the language, he will support it. Mr. Russell asked, do we
249 need to change the form? Or, if the language is correct in the ordinance, is it Mr. Taylor’s

responsibility to ensure the form follows the regulation? Chair Fracht and Mr. Gotthardt agreed that the detail of the application was not necessary in the ordinance. They chose to remove the language that directly referenced the application itself. Ms. Stewart asked, do we have fillable forms? Mr. Taylor stated that we don't, as he does not currently have a full version of Adobe. Ms. Stewart stated that she has one, as did Chair Fracht. Both agreed that they would be happy to help set this up. Mr. Taylor will work with Ms. Stewart and Chair Fracht separately to update this, he agreed it would be important. Ms. Stewart added it would be easier to read the applications this way. Mr. Gotthardt circled back to the zoning regulations document and confirmed: we are going to delete the exact language of what is on the application, and it is Mr. Taylor's responsibility to ensure the form complies with the ordinance. All members agreed.

On page 6, Chair Fracht asked – does Mr. Taylor set fines? Mr. Taylor stated that he does not. Chair Fracht asked Ms. Stewart to confirm who sets fines for ordinance violations. Mr. Kiley stated the Selectboard. Ms. Stewart agreed, unless the state law says otherwise the Selectboard is free to set fines. The language “All costs to include collection, fines, penalties, disposal of unlawful signs, including attorney's fees, costs and expenses related to the removal of an unlawful sign shall be borne by the violator. The Land Use and Economic Administrator shall from time to time set the fines and penalties related to unlawful signs.” Is in question. Ms. Stewart and Mr. Taylor will ask Town Manager Mr. Wozmak for clarification. Mr. Gotthardt and Mr. Kiley suggested removing the final sentence. Mr. Taylor suggested “failure to comply with regulations would be subject to penalties”. Ms. Stewart added “fines or penalties”. The board agreed to remove the last sentence.

Chair Fracht reminded Mr. Gotthardt to correct Mr. Taylor's title for consistency throughout the document. Ms. Jones asked, is it incorrect to just use Land Use Administrator as the title? Mr. Taylor stated he did not believe so.

Mr. Gotthardt moved the review forward to page 7. Mr. Kiley stated that he would remove the very last part of the final sentence on page 7, after “owner of the property”. Remove: “upon which...”. The board agreed. It is the owner of the property that must comply with the zoning.

B. Draft Village Residential (VR) District

Chair Fracht moved the review forward to the final zoning amendment proposal: Village Residential District.

Ms. Jones stated that there was a typo “contiguous to a street or fifteen (10) feet from any other lot boundary,”. Mr. Russell stated that they had agreed on 10 feet (not fifteen).

Mr. Russell continued review of the edits from the R1 district language, what had remained the same and what had changed for the proposed Village Residential (VR) district. Mr. Russell stated that the two questions at the bottom (energy efficiency standards and form-based standards) he did not believe were necessary at this time. He stated that the goal of the district would be for providing more clarification on uses of the Shedd St. property, if/when the Selectboard sells the property or puts out the RFP for projects.

294
295 Mr. Kiley asked, how many accessory dwelling units (ADU's) can they have? Should there be 1
296 per lot? Mr. Russell stated that ADU's only apply to single-family homes.

297
298 Mr. Gotthardt noted that he is not in favor of sport-zoning like this. Chair Fracht agreed he was
299 not either. Mr. Gotthardt asked, sections A-I: does this reference what is currently in the zoning?
300 Mr. Russell stated yes, this was a cut/paste of the current zoning for the R1 district. Chair Fracht
301 added they had put in bullets rather than letters, but this could be easily changed.

302
303 Mr. Gotthardt asked, for the 1/8 acre lots and road frontage, what is the current lot size/frontage?
304 Mr. Russell stated it is essentially 2 acres, but whatever their road frontage is, they'd have to
305 have that per lot. Mr. Taylor stated Ms. Aufiero had asked (via Zoom Platform) where the
306 property was. He noted it is the former Public Works facility on Shedd St. Ms. Aufiero clarified
307 that she had asked this question earlier about the Erigo property. Mr. Gotthardt reviewed the
308 current lot size, with the setbacks proposed, he came up with a 32'x32' buildable area per 1/8-
309 acre lot. Mr. Russell clarified that a typical 1/8-acre lot is 50'x100', which would give a
310 30'x80' buildable area. Mr. Taylor projected the dimensions of the lots on screen for review. Mr.
311 Taylor stated that he believed, in terms of the RFP's, the Selectboard would like multi-family.
312 Chair Fracht stated that the Selectboard is soliciting developer proposals. Ms. Stewart clarified
313 that they are looking at very specific proposals for high-density housing – multiple units either
314 within multiple buildings or a larger subset of buildings. There was also talk of preference to
315 creativity, accessibility, pocket-parks, etc. Mr. Gotthardt stated that he would be more supportive
316 of selling the lots as-is with deed restrictions. Ms. Stewart stated that from an environmental and
317 economic standpoint, it makes more sense to encourage development that is dense and
318 residential in the downtown, walkable, accessible area. Mr. Russell added that he felt the reason
319 this change was needed is that the only RFP's the Selectboard can entertain are for ½ acres.
320 Anything else violates zoning. The zoning must be expanded to allow the 1/8-acre type RFPs to
321 be entertained. Chair Fracht stated that the idea of the “spot zoning” (which he also does not
322 like) is to provide denser housing, see if it is affordable, and allow the Selectboard to choose a
323 design. Ms. Stewart added that one example the Selectboard had discussed, going into Norwich
324 from Hanover there is a substantial-but-dense housing unit that appears historical, and is very
325 nice. She also stated that the town owns 3 lots at the end of Johnston Dr. These are waterfront
326 lots, and this is another example of an area that might benefit from spot zoning. Ms. Stewart
327 noted that the Shedd St. property is a good opportunity to explore if this is a good option for the
328 town. Mr. Gotthardt stated that if the spot-zoning goes forward, he would like to see the 1/8 acre
329 lots eliminated, and the broader term multi-family housing. He stated he does not feel you can
330 put multi-family housing on 1/8 acre lots. Ms. Stewart stated it is possible, as examples along 4A
331 near the lake and townhouses can show. Mr. Russell noted that he felt they also needed to have
332 an acreage size. Mr. Gotthardt stated couldn't they just create a subdivision? Chair Fracht stated
333 that they could not. Mr. Russell asked, what size lot do you think would be appropriate? Mr.
334 Gotthardt stated ¼ acre, as referenced on lot 59 along Pillsbury St. Mr. Russell asked what other
335 board members thought. Ms. Jones and Chair Fracht agreed that they liked the 1/8 acre as Mr.
336 Russell had proposed. Chair Fracht stated it would be only 1/8 acre as a trial, and depending on
337 how we define the VR district, if it does get expanded, we may want to look further at current
338 lots and how to subdivide them. We can revisit the question of lot size later but should look at
339 this as a relatively short-term zoning procedure – strictly for the purpose of allowing the town to

340 create a housing demonstration project on lots that it currently owns. Mr. Gotthardt stated that
341 the goal is to have higher density residential units on the property. He has no problems with
342 multi-family homes there. Chair Fracht agreed it would be multi-family
343 structures/condos/apartments. Mr. Gotthardt stated he would prefer if they got ideas from
344 developers based on the parcel location, size, etc. and how many units can fit with parking. Mr.
345 Russell stated that this is what the Selectboard would do. Mr. Gotthardt suggested that they get
346 ideas first and then change the zoning. Mr. Taylor, Ms. Jones, and Chair Fracht agreed that they
347 would need the zoning first. Chair Fracht felt developers were unlikely to submit an RFP if the
348 zoning is unknown. Mr. Gotthardt asked Ms. Stewart if discussion of selling the property had
349 been had by the Selectboard. Ms. Stewart stated that the Selectboard had discussed and
350 committed to progress on this property. It is currently cleaned out and has no stated future
351 purpose. Ms. Stewart asked, has the RFP launched yet? Mr. Taylor stated no, but there is a draft.
352 Ms. Stewart noted that she could address the plan for the property and timeline with Mr.
353 Wozmak this coming Monday. Mr. Taylor stated that there is also the subject of what will the
354 neighbors have to say about the proposal? Ms. Stewart stated that it was a relatively dense area,
355 and that the lot is currently somewhat unsightly. She expects that there will be mixed reactions,
356 though the neighborhood is used to some traffic. Ms. Jones stated that she felt the exciting part is
357 that the Selectboard has the say in what happens – they can choose to say no to proposals that
358 don't fit the needs/wants of the town. Ms. Stewart added, something that hasn't been mentioned,
359 is that there is no specific senior housing other than one currently existing. As those look at
360 retirement and may not want to keep large homes, the multi-unit housing may allow someone
361 who wants to downsize but remain in the community the opportunity to do so. She also noted
362 that it would then allow more families potentially to move into town. Ms. Stewart stated there
363 are a lot of possibilities.

364
365 Mr. Kiley stated he felt that they should move forward with the VR district proposal as presented
366 by Mr. Russell.

367
368 Chair Fracht asked for further comments or questions. Mr. Gotthardt stated that he felt they
369 should require site plan review for all dwelling unit numbers. He worried a developer could
370 come in and fill up the lots and sell them. Chair Fracht and Ms. Jones stated that in this case the
371 Selectboard could say “no” to the proposal(s). Mr. Russell asked, do we need to include
372 clarification of “lots containing more than 5 dwelling units”. Chair Fracht agreed specificity
373 would be good. Mr. Russell noted he would change the wording about the number of units per
374 lot. Ms. Stewart asked, would it help for the board to see a copy of the RFP draft? Mr. Russell
375 stated he felt a wording change was all that was needed. Ms. Stewart stated Mr. Wozmak could
376 be another good resource for help with the wording. Chair Fracht stated he personally would
377 love to see the draft proposal, although it may not be necessary for the writing on this specific
378 draft. Mr. Taylor will circulate the draft RFP to the board.

379
380 Chair Fracht asked for further comments and questions on the proposed VR district. There were
381 none.

382 383 **VII. CONCEPTUALS:**

384 None.

VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK:

Co-Chair Fracht stated the past weekend was a marathon for the MPTF. There were two live community workshops, about 2.5 hours each, and one Zoom workshop that was close to 3 hours. The workshops were all well attended. He guessed there were about 25 attendees Saturday morning, a few less than 20 Saturday afternoon, and about 12 on Sunday. Ms. Stewart stated she felt there was more like 20 people on Sunday (with multiple people on some Zoom accounts). Co-Chair Fracht noted overall there were somewhere between 80-100 people attending.

Co-Chair Fracht shared that the events were very successful. There were common themes of interest in: community buildings, gathering places, focusing development in the Downtown/Village/Main St. area. The visioning sessions included some interested ideas.

The community-wide survey also launched. As of this evening, there are about 100 responses after being open for 3 days. The MPTF will continue to push the survey. There will be paper copies at: The DPW, Whitney Hall in the Library and Town Offices, and there is one additional paper-survey drop box that can be moved around town. Co-Chair Fracht stated the plan is to close the survey out around Thanksgiving.

Co-Chair Fracht stated at the last MPTF meeting on Monday, the consultant shared a timeline of what must happen by what dates to have a draft ready of the Master Plan for Town Meeting. The task force is focusing on a quality product, not necessarily within the March 2022 timeline.

IX. NEXT MEETING: December 8, 2021**X. ADJOURNMENT:**

*A MOTION was made by Ms. Stewart to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.
The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Gotthardt.*

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Erik Russell, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative), Jim Bonner **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0).*

Respectfully submitted,

Whitney Banker

Recording Secretary