

**Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes**  
**DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
**PLATFORM**  
**October 12, 2022**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair), Linda Jones, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer (Secretary, via Microsoft Teams), Tim Jennings, Brad Rich, Kurt Gotthardt (Alternate), Jim Bonner (Alternate and Videographer), Whitney Banker (Alternate)

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**STAFF PRESENT:** Rob Taylor- Land Use and Community Development Administrator, Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary, Ed Morris (Town Manager)

**GUESTS:** Celie Aufiero

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and took a “roll call” of members present for attendance.

Chair Fracht said that he had received feedback from the community that watching the video feed when there are multiple conversations going on is difficult to understand. He said he will try to be aware of this and keep singular discussions going tonight.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**III. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: September 28, 2022**

***Ms. Stewart MOVED*** to approve the September 28, 2022, Minutes presented in the October 12, 2022, agenda packet as presented and amended.

***Seconded by Mr. Rich***

Amendments:

Line 69 – he to she

Line 308 – bus (not building)

Line 40 – add “everybody online”

Line 228 – thy to they

Line 285 – imbedded to embedded

41 Line 80 – “is” to “was”

42 Line 381 – dove to drone

43 Line 352 – but to ;

44 Line 424 – leech to leach

45 Line 340/341 – change “agreed to” to “No board members voiced disapproval”

46

47 **Roll Call Vote:**

48 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair), Linda Jones, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard  
49 Representative), Phil Vermeer (Secretary), Tim Jennings, Brad Rich **all voting Yea.**

50 **None voted Nay.**

51 **None Abstained.**

52

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

54

55 **IV. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Kate Plumley Stewart**

56 The Selectboard met October 3. They looked at the short-term rental ordinance which is now  
57 being handed on to the Planning Board because the Selectboard is not a land use board. Town  
58 Manager Morris said it was taken to the Selectboard to get a sense of if this is an item worth  
59 discussion, the Selectboard agreed it was, and has moved it to the Planning Board as the  
60 appropriate board to discuss further. Ms. Stewart said she felt the proposed process was a great  
61 process to go through before having problems arise. She recommended that board members read  
62 the draft with an open mind. Mr. Taylor elaborated that the ordinance is aimed at getting  
63 property owners to take care of important safety measures in the case of short-term rentals  
64 (occupancy, fire and emergency numbers, fire extinguishers, off-street parking, etc.). Mr. Taylor  
65 said this may be an item to discuss at the next meeting. Chair Fracht said the board could review  
66 tonight as well if time allows.

67

68 Ms. Stewart said that because of the Master Plan, they are covering topics of rural character,  
69 recreation, and how we use spaces in town. She said she feels this is a timely discussion because  
70 of the Master Plan movement at this time.

71

72 Town Manager Morris said that some of the discussion that takes place about this ordinance will  
73 determine if it would fall under Planning Board or Zoning Board of Adjustment. Chair Fracht  
74 asked if it would go both ways, some land use, and some ordinance. Town Manager Morris said  
75 he did not think so, but he is unsure which way it could go. He said that he thinks the Planning  
76 Board is the right place to begin the discussion.

77

78 There was considerable discussion about creating a committee for the Johnston beach property.  
79 Town Manager Morris is in the process of working on a questionnaire (like the municipal  
80 facilities) to invite community members and be inclusive. There was discussion about how this  
81 aligns with the Master Planning Task Force.

82 Ms. Stewart said that there was also a discussion about the financing option for water and sewer  
83 connection fees over \$10,000 to allow payment plans. The board also updated surplus property.  
84

85 Chair Fracht said that he had heard that part of the Johnston Drive committee will be a member  
86 from the Planning Board and the Master Plan Task Force. Town Manager Morris said they were  
87 looking at one person from the Master Plan Task Force; he encouraged applications from any  
88 members who wanted to apply to do so. Chair Fracht said that he agreed Planning Board would  
89 not be appropriate in case a site plan review comes to the board. He agreed that a Master Plan  
90 Task Force representative made sense.  
91

92 **V. HEARINGS:**

93 None.  
94

95 **VI. CONCEPTUALS:**

96 None.  
97

98 **VII. ZONING CHANGES FOR INCLUSION ON TOWN MEETING WARRANT**

99 **A. Flood Plain Ordinance**

100 Chair Fracht said that this afternoon he received an email from the State Office of Planning  
101 informing us of their review of the town's flood plain ordinances. They found that to maintain  
102 membership in the Federal Flood Plain Management Program, which also allows those people in  
103 flood plains to buy flood insurance, changes will need to be made. Chair Fracht said that this  
104 involves about 6 pages of the zoning ordinance that will need to be updated.  
105

106 Mr. Taylor shared his screen to Teams and on the TV screen. He pointed out the areas where the  
107 state made edits to the ordinance.  
108

109 Mr. Gotthardt said that he assumes that there is standard language the state has asked for. Chair  
110 Fracht agreed.  
111

112 Ms. Aufiero asked if this is any help to those that live in the flood plain. Chair Fracht said he did  
113 not know. Ms. Stewart said that she thought it was not a detriment to them; it is required for  
114 those individuals to be able to purchase flood insurance.  
115

116 Mr. Taylor pointed out that the document edits from the state included a sample warrant article  
117 for this update.  
118

119 Mr. Jennings asked if the board members could be sent this document to review individually.  
120

121 Chair Fracht asked if there was any more discussion on this ordinance update. There was none.  
122

Mr. Taylor said he would circulate the document to board members.

Chair Fracht moved on to the first item from the list discussed at the previous meeting.

## **B. Parking Space Standardization**

Mr. Jennings put together a draft change for *409 PARKING AND LOADING AREAS*.

Mr. Taylor projected the document on the TV screen.

Mr. Jennings said that he was unable to find anything regarding parking except in this section 409 of the ordinance. Chair Fracht and Vice-Chair Kiley said that they believed this was the only place.

### **1. DIMENSIONS**

Mr. Jennings suggested two possible minimum parking spot sizes. Regarding dimensions, Chair Fracht said that he felt the board had discussed this in past years and wanted 10'x20' to accommodate large pickup trucks that many community members drive. He said that he felt they should be consistent throughout the town. Mr. Gotthardt said that there is at least one section that has a smaller size parking space (9' x 18') and he said that there was another section that did not have any dimensions at all. Chair Fracht said that one year they had added to the definitions section the 10'x20' size. He said that he wanted them to go through the ordinance and make changes for this consistent size throughout.

Mr. Taylor said he did not find the dimensions in the CB district. Chair Fracht said it should be added here. Mr. Gotthardt said that he would suggest the parking space size be the same throughout the entire ordinance. Mr. Kiley said that the aisle size is also important to allow space for larger vehicles to back in/out. Vice-Chair Kiley suggested a 16' minimum for aisles.

Secretary Vermeer said that he did a quick Google search and found the spaces ranged from 8.5' to 9'x18'. Town Manager Morris said that he found the standard to be 9'x18' in most places. Mr. Jennings said it sounded like they should settle on the 9'x18'. Mr. Gotthardt said that a standard may include smaller vehicles in cities, and in our rural area, many more community members drive trucks. Mr. Jennings said that he felt they should measure what fits a pickup truck well. Mr. Rich said they had done this, they are 9' but 10' would be better.

Ms. Stewart said that there is a perceived parking issue downtown, so having the standard be larger would make fewer spots. Ms. Jones said she felt they should use the larger dimensions, and those that need an exception can seek relief from the ZBA. Chair Fracht said he felt Ms. Stewart was looking at downtown parking specifically, but there are many rural areas that are more likely to be housing areas that must accommodate vehicles community members will be driving.

Mr. Gotthardt said that 80% of the ordinance already says 10'x20', and he suggested they make the remainder of the ordinance match this. Vice-Chair Kiley said that they only reason the ordinance is 10'x20' is that the board changed it about 5 years ago; the original size was 9'x18'. Ms. Stewart said that she wanted to also consider how many things may need to be sent to the ZBA if they use a 10'x20' space as the standard. Town Manager Morris said that they would be restricting density by using larger spaces. Mr. Jennings said that he agreed and suggested instead of putting the responsibility on the ZBA put it on the Land Use Administrator. Town Manager Morris suggested using Mr. Jennings' draft as written: the desired space size of 10'x20' with Mr. Taylor being able to allow 9'x18' in special cases. Mr. Taylor said he agreed with the larger space, but narrower space allowed by approval of the Land Use Administrator in constrained spaces.

Mr. Rich asked if they must also follow handicapped spaces; Vice-Chair Kiley said that they follow federal guidelines.

Mr. Jennings suggested a 20' minimum for all aisles. Ms. Stewart said that if it is 20' minimum for an aisle, and the spaces are 20' minimum, it may cause more space issues. Mr. Jennings said he thought they needed to pause the discussion and get engineering standards for these.

Board members agreed to move forward to the next section.

## 2. NUMBER OF SPACES

No discussion, change was from "GLA" to "Gross leasable area" for clarity.

## 3. ON-STREET PARKING PROVISION

Mr. Jennings said that he felt on-street parking would be useful for residential areas downtown if it was not used for the minimum parking available to residents. Mr. Gotthardt suggested removing this item. Mr. Jennings asked if they would want to encourage property owners to create street parking for the public. He said that he felt it would look favorable for a developer who could not get enough parking on site but purchased a nearby lot for public parking. It would be an investment in the town. Mr. Gotthardt said that if it is residential, the tenants need to be guaranteed a place to park. In the case of creating public spaces, this could leave a tenant with no place to park. It is different for retail versus residential. Vice-Chair Kiley agreed, he said this would be for a place that guests may park (off-site, in the public parking area). Chair Fracht and Mr. Rich agreed.

The board agreed to delete this item entirely.

## 205 8. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

206 Mr. Jennings said that he was unsure of what the “twice the minimum parking space” language  
207 meant. Vice-Chair Kiley said that this was made to prevent large, empty parking lots. Mr.  
208 Gotthardt said that a previous regulation was using a larger national standard that did not apply  
209 well to rural use. Chair Fracht said that the planning theory was to plan for the maximum number  
210 of people in that case, but most of the time a percentage of the spaces are vacant.

211  
212 Mr. Jennings said that to accomplish what he believes was intended; this section requires editing.  
213 Mr. Rich said that he felt it should also talk about the stormwater drainage and that they do not  
214 want the parking to be unnecessarily large. Chair Fracht said that a rationale is a good idea, but  
215 he did not think they would need to have a rationale for every item in the zoning regulations.  
216 Vice-Chair Kiley said that an example where this was not well used was the Family Dollar store  
217 that has windows on the front that go to nothing.

218  
219 Mr. Jennings said that for plans that have retail parking that seem excessive, the board could ask  
220 the applicant why they are asking for as much parking and restrict it at that time. Mr. Gotthardt  
221 said that he wondered if this was a holdover from the old regulations that required more parking  
222 than would ever be needed. He said that this would also benefit the developer to not have to pay  
223 for parking that will never be used.

224  
225 Vice-Chair Kiley said he felt they should remove this section. Secretary Vermeer said he felt that  
226 a lot of this could be put in the site plan review section but removed here. Chair Fracht asked if  
227 they should keep the minimum number of spaces for parking lots. Secretary Vermeer said that he  
228 felt it could just be part of the site plan review. Parking could be negotiated in the site plan  
229 review. Chair Fracht said they have performance standards by which they evaluate the site plan.  
230 With no guidance, the applicant could ask for one thing, and the board could say no but would  
231 have no standard to fall back on as a basis for making the decision. A standard in the zoning  
232 provides that basis for deciding and a clear procedure to follow for justifying additional spaces  
233 from that standard.

234  
235 Vice-Chair Kiley said that there are different types of retail. Jake’s is likely close to twice the  
236 minimum, and their lot is regularly full based on the nature of the business. A furniture store, for  
237 example, would not need nearly as many spaces for regular business. He said that he feels if  
238 owners meet the minimum, it should be up to them to decide how many spaces their type of  
239 business requires. Mr. Jennings said he could not see a situation where this would happen in  
240 town where they would regret removing this section.

241  
242 The board decided to remove most of the language in this section.

243  
244 The board kept one sentence in the next paragraph: “The Planning Board may require a parking  
245 study to quantify parking demand”

Ms. Stewart said that there were several definitions at the end (“Retail”, “Business”, etc.) which should be moved to a definitions section.

Vice-Chair Kiley said that they are getting close to having too much on the ballot, with the 7-pages of floodplain updates.

Town Manager Morris said he would research with Mr. Taylor the requirements for posting the flood plain article. He said that he suspected they could put the language for the warrant article there and direct community members to another area to review the information.

Mr. Jennings said that the definitions at the end need to be in the appendix; one of them is there, and the other two are not. Mr. Taylor said if they wish only to move them, they can do this without putting them on the warrant. Mr. Jennings said that he thought they would need to change them also.

#### 4. PARKING SERVING MULTIPLE USES

Mr. Jennings said that he did not understand what this table was trying to say.

Town Manager Morris said he would like the board to move forward and come back to this section after doing some research on parking standards.

#### **C. 413 Non-Conforming Lots and Uses**

Mr. Jennings said that he had several changes here that may be better reviewed individually and discussed at a future meeting.

Ms. Stewart said that given the directions that the Master Plan may take, this could be a section that they do not wish to focus on yet.

Vice-Chair Kiley said that there is planning money available for towns that ask for it. Town Manager Morris said he will work on getting these funds.

Mr. Gotthardt said that one thing he wanted to bring up was when there is a change of use the grandfathering goes away and does not continue with the new use. Mr. Jennings said that he had added a lot of information in this section, including abandonment. Mr. Jennings said that he was considering the recent Conkey Gravel Pit application where a previous owner passed away, and the pit was inactive for a period. He said that he feels they should allow for this situation to happen. He said that the one-year period seems to be very confining. He said he in general tried to build information into the language to cover notifying the town that owners wish to continue use in the future, they just do not know how at the time.



Mr. Gotthardt said that he felt the Conkey pit was a different issue than grandfathering. He used the example of a business in a residential area that was grandfathered. Vice-Chair Kiley said that in a case where the business is non-conforming, what if it takes more than a year for the owners to find a buyer for the business? Mr. Jennings agreed this was what he was trying to include. Chair Fracht said that the point is that the business is there, and the use has not changed. Mr. Gotthardt used the example of the roller-skating rink, with grandfathered non-conforming things such as the sign on the road and the floodlights. The use has changed but these remain on the property. He said that he felt the one-year restriction played into this. Mr. Jennings said that he felt the 1-year timeline is still very tight for certain situations. Mr. Gotthardt suggested that owners could ask for an extension. Mr. Jennings agreed he was trying to build this language into this ordinance.

On the case of abandonment and defining it, Chair Fracht said that he felt they may need more legal advice.

Mr. Gotthardt said that he felt they should re-write the gravel pit ordinance to match what the state law says. The current ordinance is significantly out of date. Mr. Jennings asked if this is a Planning Board document. Mr. Taylor and Chair Fracht agreed that they felt it was. Mr. Gotthardt said that he felt they should adopt the state's model ordinance. Ms. Stewart said that in the interest of not overwhelming community members, they may wish to make a priority "list A" and "list B" of things to work on this year, and things to continue to work on in the future years. Mr. Morris said he would also recommend not changing this in the middle of the hearings for the Conkey gravel pit.

#### **D. Housing Density**

Mr. Taylor asked if they could devote some time tonight to housing density. He said that based on the Master Plan direction and upcoming projects these would be important to have as a high priority.

Ms. Stewart said that [The Atlantic has a good article on ADUs](#) that promoted good thought. She will send the link to Mr. Taylor to circulate to the board.

#### **1) MULTIPLE ADU (ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS)**

Chair Fracht said that the town currently allows ADUs on any lot, even non-conforming lots. Town Manager Morris said that the single ADU is a state law, but any additional ADUs would be up for discussion.

Vice-Chair Kiley said that he would be in favor of any number of ADUs if the land and septic can support them. Ms. Stewart said that she feels that they may be making it so that community members cannot age in place with their families. She said that allowing multiple ADUs is in line with the town's heritage and past practices.



Town Manager Morris said that he would look at limiting buildings on a lot. Chair Fracht suggested existing buildings. Ms. Stewart said that having a guest house that could potentially be an office for those who work at home would also be an asset. She said she is not in favor of limiting property use and would encourage allowing the ADU as well as another building for a potential office.

## **E. 2 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

Mr. Taylor suggested allowing two ADUs. Mr. Jennings said that he can't see why a fixed number must be assigned. He asked what the current restrictions would be for a large home being converted into apartments. Mr. Taylor said that acreage is what determines this. In the R1 he said they would need 3 acres (1.5 downtown where there is sewer available). Ms. Stewart said that she felt the other thing it could do is make Enfield more attractive to new residents.

Mr. Rich asked if any members could think of a downside. Mr. Jennings said that he could imagine issues with architectural character and property value. Chair Fracht suggested detached ADUs must be within an existing outbuilding. Vice-Chair Kiley said one detached ADU is allowed per state law, but they would only be looking at adding another (either attached or detached).

Ms. Aufiero said that many historical houses in town are very large, and this would be great for the town and heritage.

Town Manager Morris said that these ADUs will have to meet building codes.

Ms. Jones asked if an ADU can be a mobile home. A mobile home does not count as an ADU.

Mr. Taylor will draft a change to allow 2 ADUs.

## **F. Increase Density with Municipal Water/Sewer**

Mr. Taylor said he felt they should also talk about the R1 where homes are attached to municipal water and sewer increasing density. He suggested housing be allowed from 1 per  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre to 1 per  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre. Chair Fracht said that he felt that they should eliminate this ordinance entirely and if there is enough parking allow for whatever can be placed on those small downtown lots. This would put housing where the sewer and water system is, where the services are. Mr. Taylor said that the R1 already requires a site plan review.

Mr. Rich asked what this would do with the recent Laramie Farms proposal. Ms. Jones said that for this recent proposal, the property owner has planned what he will ask for (6 buildings total). She said that her concern was the amount of traffic going onto Route 4, but the property owner already cleared the land to allow for 6 buildings (instead of the 3 recently proposed). Ms. Stewart

369 said she felt the board should not discuss the property when the owners are not here. Vice-Chair  
370 Kiley said the water capacity for the property would limit the number of buildings (6 may not be  
371 doable).

372  
373 Mr. Jennings said that his concern is at what point do they reach a problem with the water  
374 system and not being allowed to add more connections. Mr. Taylor said one problem is that there  
375 have not been customers added to the system, so the cost has gone up. Having more rate payers  
376 would allow for improvements to the system.

377  
378 Town Manager Morris said that this would be something that happens during the planning  
379 process. This developer has been spoken with about a water supply of their own if needed.

380  
381 Chair Fracht reminded board members to keep the conversation generic as a zoning conversation  
382 and not about a specific project.

383  
384 Mr. Gotthardt asked if the changes Mr. Taylor was suggesting were in R1 or the CB district. Mr.  
385 Taylor said it would be only R1, it is allowed already in the CB district.

386  
387 Mr. Taylor said that one idea he has is tying together the Shaker Village water system (that has  
388 great quality wells) with the municipal system. This is a great potential benefit to all parties that  
389 the combined system would serve.

390  
391 Mr. Taylor will draft a change to the R1 density.

#### 392 393 **E. Street Setback**

394 Mr. Taylor said that one thing the ZBA was looking at was the street setback. He said he had  
395 spoken with the town attorney as well and the current language specifies a lot line to the street  
396 and is good language.

397  
398 Ms. Jones asked for clarification of the original statement. Mr. Taylor said that they have always  
399 enforced setbacks equally whether a road was private or public. They will continue to enforce  
400 this unless it goes to court, and they are told not to. Town Manager Morris said that the town's  
401 land use attorney has told them that he believes the zoning language is written correctly to allow  
402 enforcement of this.

#### 403 404 **F. Building Height Measurements**

405 Mr. Gotthardt said this was another item that came up at the ZBA meeting, building height  
406 measurements. The ordinance says from the front. Mr. Taylor said he and Mr. Ehrenzweig both  
407 agree that the road-facing side is considered the front.

Chair Fracht said there had been a case that came before the board and the ordinance was updated to say it is measured from the front.

Ms. Aufiero said there is a home being built across the street from her. The house has cleared the lot and is close to the road. The property owners built the ground up quite a bit before they began to build, so it is even larger than it would have been at the original ground level. She said that she felt this was not right.

Mr. Rich said he did not think this was being enforced uniformly. He said that he has a sloped lot, and it was measured from the lakeside.

Mr. Taylor confirmed from the zoning ordinance that the definition of Height was listed as: Height shall be measured from the natural surface of the ground on the side of a structure facing the street, road, or right-of-way.

Chair Fracht said that the board will continue this discussion at the next meeting.

#### **VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK: David Fracht (Co-Chair)**

Co-Chair Fracht said that the task force met Monday and went over the entire plan. They are about 90% toward completion.

The next step is for consultant Ms. Saxton to incorporate the changes made at Monday's meeting. Then, the draft will be circulated to volunteers to proofread and edit. Co-Chair Fracht asked Mr. Gotthardt if he would proofread the maps. Mr. Gotthardt agreed he would.

Once proofreading is complete within a few days, the edits will be sent to Ms. Saxton. The final-draft will then be circulated to the public, it will go up on the [Enfield LEAPS website](#), a mailing will go out, and signs will go back up.

There will be a final review for the community on Sunday, November 13. The community building is not available, but Mr. Taylor is checking with the Enfield Shaker Museum. Ms. Stewart suggested also checking on the Enfield Village School (in the past this has been free). Mr. Rich said that the final review time will be 2 pm to 4 pm on November 13.

Co-Chair Fracht said that after public input, they will move on to the official Planning Board public hearing where they hope to officially adopt it. He said that it would be nice if the group thinks they could do two public hearings on the same evening. For the first meeting in December, December 14, they could review both the Master Plan and the Zoning Regulations. He said that he anticipates that the Master Plan hearing will not take very long.

Mr. Jennings asked if the task force was set up by the Planning Board. Chair Fracht said yes, they selected members for this. Mr. Jennings said it would seem that the task force would come to the Planning Board to present the draft Master Plan, and the board would then deliberate about any further changes that should be made. Chair Fracht said this was essentially the plan. Mr. Jennings said he hoped to have enough time for the Planning Board to make changes. He asked if they would vote on a draft to take to a public hearing. Chair Fracht said he did not believe so. Vice-Chair Kiley said he believed they would have to vote on this, and Mr. Gotthardt said he thought so as well. Mr. Gotthardt said he would suggest having the Master Plan hearing separate.

Mr. Jennings clarified that he wants to have time for the board to review the plan before they decide if they are ready to present it to the public (the proposed November 13 date). Mr. Taylor asked if they could decide this at the November Planning Board meeting. Mr. Kiley said they have two meetings in December so they could have two hearings. Mr. Taylor said that he felt that the task force has the momentum to get the plan approved by the end of the year. Mr. Gotthardt said he felt any changes from the Planning Board would be minor, he assumed. He said they had not seen a complete draft as a board. Ms. Stewart agreed and said she had asked for references to be put in for pieces of data. She did not see these references in the document that the task force reviewed during their Monday meeting.

Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor to circulate the next update to the draft to both the Planning Board and the Master Plan Task Force. Mr. Rich also said Mr. Taylor may want to remind Ms. Saxton about the references.

Mr. Jennings asked how important timing is for whatever zoning amendments they may propose that the Master Plan be completed before. Chair Fracht said there is no time relationship between the two. Mr. Jennings said to garner support for the zoning changes they would likely want the Master Plan available before the town meeting. Chair Fracht said that the plan might be simultaneous with the hearing.

Ms. Jones asked if there are financial things that the town will benefit from by having the Master Plan completed. Chair Fracht said yes, many grants and other funding opportunities would become available. Vice-Chair Kiley agreed that there are a lot of historical grants that require a Master Plan. Chair Fracht said that this also involves transportation and common areas of interest (Route 4 and Maple Street intersection); the Master Plan can help with these discussions. Vice-Chair Kiley said that housing also factors in, so DOT knows that they would be increased traffic on Route 4.

## **IX. OLD BUSINESS:**

None.

491 **X. NEW BUSINESS:**

492 None.

493

494 **XI. NEXT MEETING:** October 26, 2022

495

496 **XII. ADJOURNMENT:**

497 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Stewart to adjourn the meeting at 9:41 p.m.*

498 *The MOTION was seconded by Vice-Chair Kiley*

499

500 **Roll Call Vote:**

501 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair), Linda Jones, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard  
502 Representative), Phil Vermeer (Secretary via Microsoft Teams), Tim Jennings, Brad Rich **all**  
503 **voting Yea.**

504 **None voted Nay.**

505 **None Abstained.**

506

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

508

509 Respectfully submitted,

510 Whitney Banker

511 Recording Secretary