

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/MICROSOFT TEAMS
PLATFORM
October 26, 2022

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley (Vice-Chair), Linda Jones, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Phil Vermeer (Secretary), 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, Nancy Smith (via Microsoft Teams platform), Lindsay Smith (via Microsoft Teams platform)

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.

No alternates were elevated.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT: Kate Plumley Stewart

Ms. Stewart said that there was a lengthy discussion on town-owned property on Methodist Hill Road. The Conservation Commission asked to have the town consider not selling or developing the property, as did many neighboring property owners.

There was a discussion about mailing the town meeting book (it has more recently not been mailed). The Selectboard decided to mail the warrant itself, like how the school board does.

There was a discussion on the printed calendar costs.

The Selectboard accepted more money for Lakeside Park.

IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: October 12, 2022

Ms. Jones MOVED to approve the October 12, 2022, Minutes presented in the October 26, 2022, agenda packet as presented and amended.

Seconded by Secretary Vermeer

Amendments:

Line 57 – “manger” to “manager”

Line 56 – add “because” before “the Selectboard”

Line 87 – “once” to “one”

Line 351 – answer to can an ADU be a mobile home – a mobile home is not considered an ADU.

Line 215 – add “go to” before “nothing” and remove “do”

Line 464/465 – change “draft Monday” to “earlier draft) “during their Monday meeting.”

Line 443 – “is” to “if”

Line 100 – “this afternoon he received an email from ... said that this afternoon he received an email from the State Office of Planning informing us of their review of the town’s flood plain ordinances.

Line 139 – add “pickup” before trucks

Line 204 - the “twice the minimum parking space” language

Line 207 “spots” to “lots”

Line 389 – Clarify

Roll Call Vote:

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

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

V. HEARINGS:

None.

VI. CONCEPTUALS:

None.

VII. ZONING CHANGES FOR INCLUSION ON THE TOWN MEETING WARRANT:

Mr. Taylor handed out a draft of the changes discussed at the previous meeting.

- **Parking Spot Standardization**

Parking spaces shall be a minimum size of 10'x20' in all districts, however, the Land Use Administrator may approve a minimum of 9'x18' for constrained lots or extenuating circumstances.

Ms. Jones said that she liked the updated language. Chair Fracht agreed. Mr. Gotthardt said that he would rather have the 9'x18' spot approval go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA).

Mr. Jennings said that the way he looked at it was if someone was building a business (retail or even apartments) the 9'x18' can be a business decision. This could be consciously done by the owner/developer, but 10'x20' would make it easier for customers to park and access parking. He said that he felt the idea of this change was to allow for Mr. Taylor to suggest smaller spaces in areas where the 10'x20' would not work. Vice-Chair Kiley agreed and said that the smaller 9'x18' would be only for when an owner could not meet the minimum number of spaces. Secretary Vermeer clarified that this would be the decision point. Vice-Chair Kiley said yes that he expected that a developer would only use the smaller spaces if they cannot meet the minimum with the 10'x20' spaces. Mr. Gotthardt said that he would put the weight of the decision on the developer and the ZBA to avoid excessive space. He said his concern would be having too much of an impermeable surface. Mr. Jennings said that he did not think they would be likely to have this as an issue here. Chair Fracht said that he felt that the old theory was to build for the maximum possible parking, however, the new theory was to go for something smaller and suitable for regular use. Mr. Jennings asked why the old theory was to build so much more parking. Chair Fracht said that this was more of a planning trend in the '70s and '80s to build parking lots to the maximum use scenario. This has changed. Ms. Stewart said that she liked the idea of having the decision go to the Land Use Administrator. She said that she felt doing this would allow the ordinance to flow with the changes in times (right now many people use Amazon, but in the future needs or trends may change). Mr. Taylor said that he did some research, and echoed Ms. Stewart's suggestion to give the task to the Land Use Administrator. He said that Enfield does a very high number of variances through the ZBA. He said that the hope is that the market takes care of itself. Town Manager Morris said that he felt there should be some caveat to using multiple space sizes (both larger and sub-compact spaces) and that this decision should be something a developer can determine. He suggested the ordinance specify a minimum amount of the larger 10'x20' spaces, after which a developer could decide to do smaller spaces, motorcycle spaces, etc. Ms. Stewart said this could be a limiting discussion with a focus only on cars. There are a lot of advances in technology and different types of travel. Secretary Vermeer said that he felt the language was good as is. Mr. Gotthardt said that it does not address the number of spaces per site plan. Vice-Chair Kiley said this is a different conversation, this is specific to the size of the parking spaces. The number of spaces allowed is not part of this section of the ordinance. The other issues would be a separate ordinance change. Mr. Jennings said that he did not agree. He had reviewed the parking section and felt if they were going to

125 address this portion of the ordinance, they should do the entire thing. Mr. Rich said that
126 he felt the board may not have the time to devote to the larger discussion needed for
127 this. Vice-Chair Kiley, Chair Fracht, and Secretary Vermeer agreed.

128
129 Mr. Jennings said that there were other sections that the board had difficulty
130 understanding in the parking area and suggested that they be removed. Chair Fracht said
131 that he felt just removing sections was an easier task than re-writing. He said that he
132 would be in favor of proposing deletions this year. He would not be in favor of a larger
133 rewrite for this year. There is not enough time for one.

134
135 Mr. Taylor and Mr. Jennings will work together to review the proposed deletions and
136 add them to this document for review at the next meeting.

137
138 • **ADU increase to two units**

139 **A second ADU of up to 800 sf shall be allowed in all residential districts (including**
140 **the R1, R3 & R5 districts). The second ADU may be attached or detached and shall**
141 **have no more than 1 bathroom and 1 kitchen facility.**

142 Chair Fracht said that he did not think they had to include that 1 bathroom and 1 kitchen
143 were allowed; in 800 square feet, it would be unlikely.

144
145 Ms. Jones asked if last meeting they discussed that each ADU must have its own septic
146 tank. Chair Fracht said if the ADU is detached it needs a separate tank but can use the
147 same leech field.

148
149 Mr. Jennings said he did not think stipulating the bathrooms was necessary. Mr. Taylor
150 said he included it because the state law is a minimum, however, the town could
151 technically change the allowed size and allow a larger space (such as 1000 square feet).
152 Chair Fracht said they have the definitions of what an ADU is, and he felt they can add a
153 second ADU with the same constraints that exist for the first.

154
155 Mr. Taylor said that having a second ADU requires the building inspector to be less
156 rigid. He said the building inspector is willing to work with the board on adding this.

157
158 Town Manager Morris said he still recommends they only allow one detached ADU. He
159 also said that in the spirit of the building code, if there are 3 units in a single structure
160 this should be considered a multi-family.

161
162 Ms. Jones said that Enfield has one of the largest historic districts in the state of New
163 Hampshire, including a Main Street with a lot of historic homes. She said she felt the
164 town may lose some attractiveness of the homes and the street scape if these homes
165 become filled with apartments. She said that she wondered how many homes have an
166 ADU. Mr. Taylor said it was a lot, however he felt for many you could not tell that an
167 ADU was there.

Chair Fracht said that he would suggest that no new structures be allowed for the ADUs. Ms. Jones said that she looked through the minutes and saw that they said new structures would be allowed. Vice-Chair Kiley asked Mr. Taylor if state law says an ADU can be detached. Mr. Taylor said that state law says it is allowed, but the town can say it is not allowed. He said, for example, in his town (Plainfield) a detached ADU requires an exception and has an architecture standard so that it matches the main home.

Chair Fracht said that he felt in R1 they have more strict standards, and in R3 and R5 they have looser standards. Ms. Stewart said she did not agree and felt it should be the same. Mr. Rich agreed that the standards should go across all the districts.

Mr. Jennings asked if there is an existing section of the ordinance that talks about ADUs. Mr. Taylor said that it is a state law. Mr. Jennings asked where it is in the ordinance, Mr. Taylor said that it is in the definitions section under Accessory Dwelling Units. Mr. Taylor said that the ADU is not subject to density, but the lot must meet septic and setback requirements.

Mr. Taylor said that an interesting thing about the septic system is that it is required to be designed but does not have to be installed. Secretary Vermeer said for homes on municipal sewer, does the ADU go into the same connection. Mr. Taylor said yes. Chair Fracht asked if it counts as a separate connection. Mr. Taylor said it is not required.

Mr. Taylor will strike the 1 bathroom and 1 kitchen language from the proposed update. He said that he would also update the language of having only 1 attached ADU and 1 detached ADU or 2 detached ADUs in a single separate structure.

Ms. Stewart said that she felt they should not restrict new structures. Secretary Vermeer said he is in favor of new structures, they can be much more energy efficient, have solar, etc.

Mr. Rich said that he felt they should say a maximum of 1 new footprint be added to the language. Mr. Taylor said he would add this language. He said that Enfield would be pioneering this effort.

Mr. Taylor and Town Manager Morris will work together on the language update. Mr. Taylor will send the draft to board members prior to the meeting. He reminded them that they can respond to him but cannot respond to one another about the draft language outside of the meeting.

Ms. Smith asked if the ADU would restrict use in any way. She asked what if she wanted to have short-term rentals in an ADU. Mr. Taylor said this is coming up in a future discussion, he does not think they are prohibiting short-term rentals.

- 211
- 212 • **Increase density in R1 (e.g. – lots with Town water and sewer)**
- 213 **Minimum lot size shall be one (1) acre except for dwellings, in which minimum lot**
- 214 **size shall be one acre per dwelling unit with on-lot water and sewer supply, but**
- 215 **may be ~~one-half acre~~ one-quarter acre lot size for a dwelling where municipal**
- 216 **water and sewer are used.**

217 Vice-Chair Kiley said he liked the language as written. Ms. Stewart agreed.

218

219 Ms. Jones said if this does not relate to the ADU what does it relate to? Mr. Taylor said

220 the R1 could currently have a single-family or multi-family home. Currently, if someone

221 wants to build a duplex in this zone, for areas on town sewer and water the lot must be

222 one-half acre currently. They are proposing this change to one-quarter acre. Ms. Jones

223 clarified that this has nothing to do with the ADU. Mr. Taylor said it did not.

224

225 Mr. Taylor said that this change is to take advantage of sewer and water. The density in

226 the village has been largely unchanged for many years, which was not the original

227 intent. An increase in density can bring more housing and more services.

228

229 Mr. Gotthardt said that he likes this change but is concerned about the timing. He felt

230 that they should wait until the Master Plan is adopted. Vice-Chair Kiley said the intent is

231 to adopt the Master Plan prior to the Town Meeting. Mr. Gotthardt said once the Master

232 Plan is adopted, the intent is to do a complete re-write of the zoning ordinance and he

233 would suggest they do the change then. Mr. Rich said this is an easy change and will

234 drive desired behavior in town. Ms. Stewart agreed. Mr. Taylor said the R1 setback is

235 only 15', the smallest Enfield has. Mr. Gotthardt said he still felt this should wait until

236 they do all things later. Chair Fracht said he did not think this would be something they

237 would change. Vice-Chair Kiley said he would not see them reducing the setbacks from

238 15'. Ms. Stewart said that she also felt fire safety was an issue. Secretary Vermeer said

239 he felt they could look at this again when they do the later re-write. Mr. Jennings said

240 that if this article is proposed and does not have the Master Plan to back it up, voters

241 will either approve it or not. If voters say no, the board will learn something. Ms.

242 Aufiero said another issue is air and light, which is part of the reason for the 15' setback.

243

244 Mr. Taylor said he would hope the Conservation Commission would support this idea to

245 put more housing where the services are near the municipal water system and preserve

246 the land further out. Mr. Jennings said he felt they would still have the same pressure on

247 the R5 market that they have now.

248

249 Ms. Jones said that she would like to know if the density affects any large

250 developments. Chair Fracht said it does and it would affect the Laramie Farms

251 development. Ms. Jones said that the applicant told the board before he left that his plan

252 was waiting to see what the town does to determine the total number of units. Mr.

253 Jennings said this would change the development from ~150 units to ~300 units. Chair

Fracht said that they could potentially put on a time restriction for phased development. Ms. Stewart said that she did not think the board should discuss the case without the applicant here.

Mr. Taylor said that he was at a planning conference last week, and he thinks in larger communities and in the future of Enfield is to offer bonus density for things that the town wants – such as affordability. For example, if a developer can make housing more affordable, they can get more units, or violate housing in a different way etc. Chair Fracht said this is in the state regulations for alternative development schemes. He said that there are model ordinances the state has put out that they may want to think about adopting when they do the big re-write. Ms. Stewart said that she would be fine with market rate lots with this one-quarter acre, and have a future rewrite offer bonus density. Chair Fracht said he would agree. Bonus density is something that they can look at down the road. He said realistically, going down to one-quarter acre can only be beneficial to the town. Mr. Taylor said they could always change it next year. Mr. Gotthardt said he felt this could cause problems and add confusion to the matter.

Chair Fracht asked Mr. Taylor if he knew the percentage of non-conforming lots in the R1 district. Mr. Taylor said it is a lot. Vice-Chair Kiley said he thought it was over 50%. Chair Fracht said one thing the Master Plan recommends is to have the zoning ordinance reflect that exists on the ground.

Mr. Jennings said he did not think there was any rush to add this. Mr. Rich said putting this forward now would help the water and sewer rates. Ms. Jones said that she would like to see some design guidelines in place before they go to one-quarter acre. This is something that the heritage commission is working on to bring Enfield up to speed with a Certified Local Government (which can help get much larger grants). Ms. Stewart said that the Certified Local Government would need to go to the Selectboard, and she did not know where this would fall with their goals.

Vice-Chair Kiley MOVED to put the one-quarter acre density change on the warrant.

Seconded by Secretary Vermeer

Roll Call Vote:

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

Linda Jones, Tim Jennings **voted Nay.**

None Abstained.

**** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (5-2).***

295 • **Strike R1 language – Paragraph U**

296 ~~No lot shall have more than one dwelling or principal building.~~

297 All board members were in favor of striking this language.

298

299 • **Short Term Rentals Ordinance (document forwarded to Planning Board Monday,**

300 **10/24).**

301 Mr. Taylor said that he helped put this together based on similar regulations that other

302 communities have. It is not meant to prohibit short-term rentals, but to regulate them for

303 safety. Mr. Taylor said there are communities in NH that have tried to prohibit short-

304 term rentals that have court cases at this time. This is to help with safety and neighbors.

305 He said there are things like ensuring a fire extinguisher, adequate parking, identifying

306 the number of bedrooms, etc.

307

308 Mr. Taylor said they are starting to see hedge funds investing in short-term rental

309 properties. Mr. Jennings asked if there were any in this town. Mr. Taylor and Vice-Chair

310 Kiley said yes in this town. The ordinance also includes a local contact for issues. He

311 said there has been some discussion about whether this is land use, or perhaps the

312 Selectboard.

313

314 Mr. Taylor said there have not been many problems here. Mr. Rich asked if there is a

315 record of any problems that the town has had. Mr. Taylor said lower shaker village has

316 prohibited short-term rentals under 30 days. Mr. Jennings said this is a homeowner's

317 association regulating it. Mr. Taylor said yes.

318

319 Mr. Taylor said other concerns are impacts to neighbors, water quality, impact on lakes,

320 impacts to sewer or septic systems, etc. Mr. Rich asked if there is any regulation for lake

321 property where the people that own the property are not town residents – do these

322 owners have a voice on the issue. Town Manager Morris said that everything works this

323 way (property owners like this may not have gotten to vote on the new Public Safety

324 facility but help pay for it).

325

326 Mr. Rich said he thinks that this makes it harder for them to do this, and he thinks it will

327 not be received well. Mr. Rich said depending on whom they speak with, there will be

328 different issues with different parts.

329

330 Ms. Stewart said that she thinks that the ordinance sets expectations on how to be a good

331 neighbor while also doing short-term rentals. She said that she feels if they try to go into

332 it as helping owners be good neighbors it may go a little further.

333

334 Chair Fracht said that short-term rentals may double septic use, causing the system to

335 fail earlier than normal. The ordinance limitations would help protect the owner as well

336 as the neighborhood. Vice-Chair Kiley said that most of the short-term rentals are on the

lakes, and an example of an issue could be a cabin with a small septic system, but a short-term renter puts 18 people into the cabin – septic issues will run into the lake.

Mr. Gotthardt said that if an owner only rents to a few people, but the renters have many friends show up the owner will never know what is going on. Ms. Stewart said that some short-term housing will identify the ability to host “a large party” etc. where it is likely that this is happening. Chair Fracht said that neighbors will notice if there are regularly short-term rentals with large parties happening often.

Mr. Jennings said that the ordinance is not to prohibit short-term rentals but does have restrictions. He said that he felt each area of the proposed ordinance would need to be debated by the board. He said the key thing that the ordinance would provide is knowledge of where the short-term rentals are based on the permit process. Currently, the town does not know how many there are. Mr. Rich asked if the town has a right to know. Mr. Jennings said that he felt they did, for example, if the short-term rentals are using up workforce housing this could identify an issue for the town to work on. Mr. Jennings said he did not think restricting large parties would be needed and would happen less often. Town Manager Morris said that part of the discussion for this would be whether this is a town ordinance enforced by the Selectboard or another body. He said if there is an issue right now, the town cannot do anything about it. With an ordinance in place, in the case of a large party showing up the town could send officers to the property to enforce it. He also said that if they do not have restrictions this could start to impact property values in the area.

Mr. Vermeer said that based on his experience renting short-term for Air BnB, an ordinance like this would have helped him with about 10% of the renters who cause issues. He said that he felt the town would be wise to adopt this ordinance. He said he would support some version of this ordinance.

Chair Fracht asked what board members thought about following Mr. Jennings's suggestion and make a list of the topics the ordinance addresses and discusses as time allows. Ms. Stewart said she would suggest going by line and number.

Ms. Nancy Smith said that when she opened her BnB in the 90's, she had to go to the ZBA and Planning Board. Neighbors had the opportunity to comment as well. No Air BnB people have had to do this. She thinks that the town does have a right to put in the ordinance and have short-term rental housing go through this same process. She said that she thinks these are real issues including owners who are never a part of the town, and short-term rentals taking away workforce housing. She said she also thinks regular water testing and septic checking were also important health and safety issues.

Mr. Gotthard said that because this is an ordinance, this would not have a time limit for town meeting, correct? Town Manager Morris said he spoke with their attorney, and it would need to go to town meeting, even though it is a Selectboard decision.

Ms. Aufiero said that she did not know if there was a mechanism for regulating lake rentals – it just happens and there is no way the town would know. Chair Fracht said the town would become aware when problems arise. Mr. Gotthardt said the town would only know about these if there were a problem, and many of the things are already part of town ordinances. Chair Fracht said that the idea is to have a single regulation, so property owners know what their responsibility is, and tenants understand their expectations. Town Manager Morris said having a penalty for those who do not register is no different from any other zoning issue (such as building at their home without permits and when the town finds out they must deal with it).

Mr. Jennings asked if personally renting a camp to a single family for one week every year, would count as a short-term rental. Mr. Gotthardt said that he believed it would.

Ms. Nancy Smith said that she felt many of the larger companies out of state doing the short-term rentals are spoiling it for families in town who have done this kind of thing for many, many years.

Town Manager Morris said that the board could discuss having an exception to the registration for those who live onsite. Ms. Smith suggested checking Air BnB for places in town that rent homes or rooms. Town Manager Morris said that for rentals where the owner lives on-site, he believes these situations would be better regulated.

Mr. Gotthardt clarified we should come up with comments to discuss at the next meeting. Chair Fracht said yes.

Chair Fracht said that all members will review the short-term rental ordinance and make notes on what to keep or what to remove to discuss at the next meeting.

- **Floodplain Regulations Update as mandated by FEMA and State of NH (document forwarded to Planning Board on Monday, 10/24).**

Chair Fracht said that the state has told the town they need to adopt this, or the town loses eligibility for flood insurance. Mr. Taylor said he spoke with Ms. Bonnette they can summarize this on the ballot to help streamline.

- **Proposed Additions**
 - **Building height regulations**

Mr. Gotthardt said that he would propose building height be measured from the natural surface of the ground to the highest drip edge of the fascia. He included a diagram to clarify the different parts of a home. Vice-Chair Kiley said the function of the 35' is for fire ladders and access. Mr. Gotthardt asked how they define the front. Mr. Gotthardt said his house doesn't face the street; his gable end faces the street.

Town Manager Morris suggested Mr. Taylor research what other towns do in this case and propose a definition.

- **Non-conforming lots**

Mr. Gotthardt suggested adding clarification around "if a new use or uses of that lot requires a site plan review by the Planning Board". He said the way it is worded now; parts of a previous use can be grandfathered. Chair Fracht said if the same non-conforming use is continued it can be done, If the commercial use changes, it goes to a site plan review which can allow or not allow this use.

Mr. Gotthardt said he would need to work on this more. Mr. Jennings said that he would like to work with Mr. Gotthardt as he had notes on this section as well.

VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK: David Fracht

Co-Chair Fracht said that a mailing that was supposed to go out for delivery on November 1 have begun to be delivered today. The latest draft is up on the Enfield LEAPS website. The mailing has a QR code which is not currently working.

Co-Chair Smith said she spoke with Ms. Jones and the QR code is not working but will be within the next few days. She said there are many other ways to find the website even while the QR code is not working.

Co-Chair Fracht said that proofreaders got a draft of the document today as well. As changes come back from them, as well as the Planning Board and the Master Planning Task Force, the draft will be updated.

Co-Chair Fracht said that the community review on November 13th is to provide questions about content, not grammatical errors. Photo credits and descriptions as well as links will continue to be added in time for that community review.

Co-Chair Fracht said that Mr. Taylor ran into someone from the NH Housing Authority at a recent conference who said there is a lot of grant money that they are looking to give away, including updates for zoning regulations if they relate to housing. There is also grant money available for Master Planning if it relates to housing. Co-Chair Fracht said for the next five

459 chapters, he feels that energy, historic preservation, and recreation all relate to housing. He is
460 going to request \$5,000 for each chapter (\$15,000 total) to help write three of the next 5 Master
461 Plan Chapters. Mr. Taylor will also be looking at the grant for zoning regulation re-writes.

462
463 Co-Chair Fracht said that if there are common issues that pop up at the November 13 community
464 meeting, they will go back and look at these sections to see if there are issues or items
465 overlooked.

466
467 Co-Chair Smith said the meeting on November 13 is to focus on the guiding principles and
468 vision, and recommendations. The comments are to see are the recommendations ones that make
469 sense and those sorts of things.

470
471 Co-Chair Fracht asked the Planning Board to read through the draft and provide comments on
472 the recommendations to send them to the task force. After the November 13 meeting, there will
473 be more comments from the community that the task force will address and hope to resolve. The
474 next step is to present a finished document to the Planning Board, and the Planning Board can
475 decide if they would like to accept the draft and hold a public hearing. Co-Chair Fracht said they
476 are trying to get this approved before the end of the year if possible. He said the
477 recommendations and implementation matrix are important areas to review. He said they were
478 not looking for feedback on spelling and grammar (there are already volunteers reviewing for
479 these things).

480
481 Mr. Gotthardt said that when maps overlap pages the middle section is cut off. He said on the
482 screen there is a page small section of the map and then another page with a larger map. It
483 appears to be a formatting issue. Co-Chair Fracht said he will bring this to the attention of
484 consultant Ms. Saxton via email tomorrow (Thursday).

485
486 Town Manager Morris said he would recommend in the implementation section that the goals
487 would get numbered. He plans to use these for budgeting purposes. Co-Chair Smith said one
488 comment from focus groups was that when they had things numbered, they correlated that to
489 priority, so they were removed. She said that she understands his need for a reference point and
490 asked for other ideas on how to number these without causing the priority issue. Co-Chair Fracht
491 said he would discuss this with Ms. Saxton to see if she has a suggested solution based on
492 previous experience.

493
494 Mr. Jennings asked what formats the plan will be in. Co-Chair Fracht said it will be primarily
495 web-based, and there will be some printed and spiral-bound copies available for those who may
496 want them. He said that based on funding available they may limit the number of copies printed.
497 Mr. Rich said the web version will be more complete because it will include links and be more
498 robust. Co-Chair Fracht said yes. Mr. Jennings asked if the links would go to outside sites. Co-
499 Chair Fracht said that he believed it would only be to data they have, and not external sites.

Ms. Aufiero asked if they are going to print it for this year, they should include something that lets community members know there are not future chapters included in the print. Co-Chair Fracht said this will be in the printed plan, as well as online, in the social media posts, etc. Co-Chair Smith said she and Co-Chair Fracht wrote a paragraph of what the next chapters will be, and that this version is only the first five chapters. It is not in the current copy because the current copy was not supposed to be released today.

Mr. Jennings said he thought the place to make this information known would be on the content page. Ms. Stewart suggested page 3 near the credits. Co-Chair Fracht said they had already asked Ms. Saxton to put it in another area but it can be changed if others feel it is important.

Co-Chair Fracht said that the idea of this first version is to have the important chapters for an approved plan to open the door to more grants etc. The plan will be added to and reviewed and revised regularly in the future. The goal is to have a living and changing document that reflects what is happening in the community.

IX. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

X. NEW BUSINESS:

None.

XI. NEXT MEETING: November 9, 2022

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION was made by Vice-Chair Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Rich

Roll Call Vote:

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

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Whitney Banker

541 Recording Secretary