

TOWN OF ENFIELD

2014 TOWN MEETING MINUTES

Moderator Dr. David Beaufait called the meeting to order at 9:00 am on Saturday, March 15, 2014 at the Enfield Elementary School. He led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. A round of applause by the audience followed a thanks to the road crew for their excellent service.

He explained the rules of order. P. Mirski made a motion to allow non-residents to speak, S. Hagerman seconded the motion. A voice vote carried the motion. D. Kiley made the motion to allow the Moderator not to re-read each article in entirety after discussion, H. Shaffer seconded. A voice vote carried the motion. The Moderator asked the audience for their permission to allow Mr. Carrier, chairman of the Capital Improvement Program Committee, to offer a presentation at the beginning of Article 9 which would apply to Articles 9 and 11-13, to which the audience agreed. (A copy of the Power Point presentation Mr. Carrier used is attached to this record).

The Moderator recognized the recently deceased resident Donald Labounty, and Canaan resident David Barney. At 10:00, the time of Mr. Labounty's funeral, a moment of silence was observed in memory of him.

Selectman John Kluge presented certificates of appreciation to outgoing board and committee members. The Moderator introduced the head table: Selectmen Cummings, Crate and Kluge, Town Manager Steven Schneider, Town Attorney James Raymond, Chairman of the Budget Committee Doug Pettibone, Budget Committee members Gayle Hulva, Shirley Green, Samuel Eaton, Lori Saladino, Annabelle Bamforth, David Stewart, Paul Mirski and Janet Shepard, Alisa Bonnette, Executive Assistant and Town Clerk Carolee Higbee.

Meredith Smith, chair of the Heritage Commission, presented a Shaker box to Richard Henderson for all his work on Enfield history, specifically deed research. His daughter, Jean Patten, accepted in his place.

The Moderator presented the results of Articles 1 through 8, which were voted on by ballot on Tuesday, March 11th:

Article 1. To choose by ballot all necessary Town Officers for the ensuing year.

For Two Years:	One Moderator David Beaufait	1101
For Three Years:	One Selectman John W. Kluge	1061
	One Town Clerk Carolee T. Higbee	1133
	One Treasurer Sasha Holland	1040
	One Trustee of Trust Funds Cynthia Hollis	1018
	One Cemetery Trustee Mary E. Quintana	1192
	One Fire Ward B. Fred Cummings	921
	One Library Trustee Philip N. Cronenwett	1041
	One Zoning Board of Adjustment Member Tim Lenihan	147 write-in votes
	Three Budget Committee Members Annabelle Bamforth	615
	Gayle Hulva	717
	Mike Lorrey	431
For Six Years:	One Supervisor of the Checklist Nancy A. White	1043

Article 2. Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 1** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to delete the current definition of Abutter in the Zoning ordinance and replace it with the following definition:

Abutter: Shall mean the owner, or owners, of record of a parcel of land which is contiguous at any point to the parcel being subdivided, or which lies directly across a public right-of-way or stream from the parcel being subdivided. In the case of *all* subdivisions *and site plan reviews*, the term shall also include the owner or owners of record of a parcel of land which is two hundred (200) feet from any point on the boundaries of the parcel being subdivided.

Article 2 involves a change to the definition of abutter in the regulations for Subdivisions. The change is for the definition of Abutter to include ALL parcels within 200 feet of any point on a parcel being subdivided or requiring a site plan review. This change will make the requirements for notice the same for site plan reviews, minor subdivisions as for major subdivisions. This change also effectively provides notice to more people than would be notified under the existing regulation.

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 758, No 194. Article 2 passed as printed.

Article 3. Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 2** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to add the following sentence to the definition of “*Driveway*” in the Zoning Ordinance:

“Driveways serving three or more parcels shall be constructed to Enfield Street Design Standards”

Article 3 involves adding information to the definition of Driveways to clarify the existing standards for construction of driveways serving more than 3 (three) adjoining lots. Current Town regulations require driveways serving more than 2 adjoining lots to be built to the Enfield Street Design Standards. This change puts the requirement into the definition, to help get the information to the public.

Driveway: Any improved or unimproved area serving as an area of access, entrance, exit, or approach from any street to any parcel of land, regardless of public or private ownership. ***Driveways serving three or more parcels shall be constructed to Enfield Street Design Standards***

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 739, No 226. Article 3 passed as printed.

Article 4: Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 3** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will delete the current definition of “**Street**” in the Zoning Regulations and insert the definition for street listed below in to the regulations:

Street: A state highway, town road, avenue, lane and/or any other way used or in existence for vehicular travel including driveways which serves three or more adjacent lots or sites. The word street shall include the entire right-of-way.

Article 4 involves adding information to the definition of Streets to clarify the existing standards for construction of Driveways serving more than 2 (two) adjoining lots. Current Town regulations require Driveways serving more than 2 adjoining lots to be built to the Enfield Street Design Standards. This change clarifies the requirement.

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 753, No 206. Article 4 passed as printed.

Article 5: Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 4** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to include the following definition for “**Subdivision, Major** “ into the Zoning Ordinance:

“Subdivision, Major: Shall mean the division of a lot, tract, or parcel of land into three (3) or more lots, sites, tracts, or other divisions of land.”

*Article 5 involves providing a definition for **Subdivision, Major**. This change is made because the definition is not currently in the Zoning Regulation. In 2007 the Town voted to remove all definitions from the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations and put them all in the Zoning Ordinance. This was done to eliminate conflicts between definitions in various regulations. The definitions for Major and Minor Subdivisions were not included on the published list. This change is to include the definition as it existed in the 2007 definitions in the current zoning ordinance.*

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 766, No 183. Article 5 passed as printed.

Article 6: Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 5** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to include the following definition for “**Subdivision, Minor**” into the Zoning Ordinance:

“Subdivision, Minor: Shall mean the division of a lot, tract, or parcel of land into two (2) lots, sites, or other dwelling units, and which requires no new roads, public utilities, or other municipal improvements. A parcel of land which has been subjected to minor subdivision shall not be eligible for further minor subdivision for a period of five (5) years from the date of the most recent minor subdivision approval.”

Article 6 involves providing a definition for Subdivision, Minor. This change is made because the definition is not currently in the Zoning Regulation. In 2007 the Town voted to remove all definitions from the Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations and put them all in the Zoning Ordinance. This was done to eliminate conflicts between definitions in various regulations. The definitions for

Major and Minor Subdivisions were not included on the published list. This change is to include the definition as it existed in the 2007 definitions in the current zoning ordinance.

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 1028, No 269. Article 6 passed as printed.

Article 7: Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 6** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to add the following requirements for Recreational Vehicles on Lots in the Route 4 District:

- *A recreational vehicle, such as a motor home or camper, may be permitted on a lot, with an existing dwelling unit, so long as it is not used for occupancy or as a dwelling in excess of three weeks in a calendar year.*
- *A recreational vehicle such as a motor home or camper, may be permitted on a lot without an existing dwelling unit, so long as sewage and gray water disposal is in accordance with State law. Occupancy shall be limited to six months in a calendar year.*

Article 7 is requested because no restrictions for Recreational Vehicle on lots in the Route 4 District currently exist. The district was added to the Zoning Regulations in 2013, but the language did not include language on Recreational Vehicles. The language proposed is exactly the language currently in the CB District, which is the district the Route 4 zone was in prior to the change.

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 979, No 351. Article 7 passed as printed.

Article 8: Are you in favor of the adoption of **Amendment No. 7** as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town of Enfield Zoning Ordinance as follows?

To see if the Town will vote to add the following setback requirements to waters and wetlands located in the Route 4 District

- *No structure shall be placed, located, or constructed within fifty feet from the seasonal high water line of any river, stream, wetland, lake, or public pond, and no dock may be located nearer a side lot line than the distance permitted for building setbacks in the Zoning District the property is located in.*

Article 8 is requested because no setbacks to waters and wetlands on lots in the Route 4 District currently exist. The district was added to the Zoning Regulations in 2013, but the language did not include setbacks to waters and wetlands. The language proposed is similar to the language currently in the CB District, which is the district the Route 4 zone was in prior to the change. The difference is that dock setbacks are written to be the same setbacks as buildings in the Route 4 districts as opposed to being that of the water body setback.

Approved by the Enfield Planning Board by a vote of 7-0.

Yes 991, No 329. Article 8 passed as printed.

Article 9: To see if the Town will vote authorize the Selectmen to enter into a long term lease/purchase agreement in the amount of two hundred sixty five thousand and 00/100 dollars (\$265,000) payable over a term of ten (10) years for the purpose of leasing two one-ton dump trucks and one fully equipped (plow, wing, and sand/salt spreader) truck (GVW 25,100) for the Department of Public Works and to raise and appropriate the sum of forty one thousand one hundred and 00/100 dollars (\$41,100) for the first year's payment for that purpose. Said appropriation to be offset by the withdrawal of \$41,100 from the Capital Improvement Program Capital Reserve Fund for which the Board of Selectmen are agents to expend. It is the intent of the Board of Selectmen to utilize the Capital Improvement Program Capital Reserve Fund for principal and interest payments for the life of the lease.

Special Warrant Article

2/3 Paper Ballot Vote Required

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 5-3.

J. Kluge made the motion to accept the article as printed, F. Cummings seconded the motion.

L. Carrier, chairman of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), presented a review of the 2013 expenditures and the 2014 Capital Items requested. A copy of his power point presentation is attached as a part of this record. J. Patten commended the CIP Committee for their time and effort, and asked if the boat launch is owned by the Town or the State?

S. Schneider answered that it is actually a Town Class V road. L. Saladino asked if the engineering was being put out to bid, and L. Carrier explained that there is \$10,000 requested for the engineering, which will be done by the same engineer that did the US Route 4 sewer expansion engineering, and that the CIP will seek estimates to present to Town Meeting next year for the actual work. L. Shippen asked why the State didn't repair it since they used it as their staging and work area for the new Shaker Bridge? S. Schneider replied that they did repair the parking lot but their work did not impact the boat launch itself. T. Jennings asked why the Board of Selectmen were 2-0 on their Article recommendations, to which F. Cummings explained that he was on vacation for the vote but that he did recommend them. T. Jennings asked why there was dissension in the Budget Committee's recommendation, and said that he commends the Committee for their work and would like to see a three year projection in the Town Report, and asked why this was being presented as warrant article? J. Raymond replied that since this represents an obligation that extends beyond one year the Department of Revenue Administration treats it as a bond, which requires a 2/3 paper ballot .

L. Carrier explained that the Budget Committee's recommendation had changed to unanimous. S. Eaton and A. Bamforth had asked for and received more information which clarified the Article for them, to which they concurred. The Moderator declared the polls open for one hour for a paper ballot vote. R. Cusick made the motion to table the Article until the ballot count was done,

D. Langley seconded the motion. The audience approved. Later D. Kiley made the motion to move the Article off the table, R. Stewart seconded. The audience approved. The Moderator declared the vote as 119 Yes, 14 No. Article 9 passed as printed.

Article 10: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the Budget Committee's and Selectmen's recommended sum of five million, four hundred seventy-seven thousand, five hundred sixty-one and 00/100 dollars, **(\$5,477,561)**, for general municipal operations. This article does not include special or individual articles addressed. (Estimated tax impact \$5.70/ \$1,000 valuation.)

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 8-0.

F. Cummings made the motion to accept the Article as printed, D. Crate seconded the motion. D. Pettibone, chairman of the Budget Committee, spoke to the Article. K. Gotthardt questioned the continued increase in the street lighting line item and why it seems to always be under budgeted? S. Schneider explained that budgeting is an inexact science and that at times it was a best educated guess. J. Taylor, Director of Public Works, explained that in the last two years numerous photo cells have had to be replaced in the downtown area which impacted the budget. W. Smith explained that the Energy Committee had spent hours reviewing the street lights and that the Town needed to act on their recommendations. D. Saladino asked why there is a sewer deficit fund balance? S. Schneider explained that the sewer rates don't impact the property tax rate at all and that the sewer rates are dominated by Lebanon's rates. When Lebanon raises their rates we have to raise ours to pay them. A voice vote passed the Article unanimously. Article 10 passed as printed.

Article 11: To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to enter into a long-term lease/purchase agreement in the amount of thirty thousand and 00/100 dollars **(\$30,000)** payable over a term of four (4) years for the purpose of leasing one cruiser for the Police Department, to authorize the municipal officials to negotiate such lease and to determine the rate of interest thereon, and to raise and appropriate the sum of eight thousand dollars **(\$8,000)** for the first year's payment for that purpose. Said appropriation to be offset by the withdrawal of \$8,000 from the Capital Improvement Program Capital Reserve Fund for which the Board of Selectmen are agents to expend. It is the intent of the Board of Selectmen to utilize the Capital Improvement Program Capital Reserve Fund for principal and interest payments for the life of the lease.

Special Warrant Article

2/3 Paper Ballot Vote Required

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 7-1.

D. Crate made the motion to pass the Article as printed; J. Kluge seconded the motion. D. Stewart explained that he was the dissenting Budget Committee member but since researching it now supports the Article. At 10:45 the Moderator declared the polls open for one hour for a paper ballot vote on the Article. C. Pellerin made the motion to table the Article until the vote was counted; D. Kiley seconded the motion. The audience approved. Later D. Kiley made the motion to remove the Article from the table; R. Cusick seconded the motion. The Moderator declared the vote as 110 Yes, 18 No. Article 11 passed as printed.

Article 12: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of two hundred ninety one thousand, seven hundred eighty three and 00/100 dollars (\$291,783) to be placed in the Capital Improvement Plan Capital Reserve. (Estimated tax impact \$0.53/ \$1,000 valuation.)

Special Warrant Article

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 8-0.

J. Kluge made the motion to accept the Article as printed; F. Cummings seconded the motion. R. Bickford asked what Articles 10 and 11 impact the tax rate. S. Schneider and L. Carrier explained that all the monied articles, including the budget, add up to a tax rate of \$6.24/1000 valuation. A unanimous voice vote passed the Article. Article 12 passed as printed.

Article 13: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate ten thousand and 00/100 dollars (\$10,000) for permitting and engineering for the repair of the Route 4A Mascoma Lake Boat Launch parking lot. Said appropriation will be offset by the withdrawal of ten thousand and 00/100 dollars (\$10,000) from the Capital Improvement Program Capital Reserve Fund. (This appropriation will have no impact on the 2014 municipal tax rate.)

Special Warrant Article

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 7-1.

F. Cummings made the motion to accept the Article as printed; D. Crate seconded the motion. D. Stewart explained that he had been the dissenting Budget Committee member but now thinks that we ought to look at it. K. Gotthardt questioned asked what would be done to resolve the Boat Launch parking problem? S. Schneider explained that we are hoping to pave the lot and delineate the boat trailer spaces to be able to enforce the parking rules. J. Patten moved the question. S. Eaton asked if a fence would solve the problem, to which S. Schneider replied no, it wouldn't. The Moderator asked for a voice vote to call the question and received unanimous approval. A unanimous voice vote passed the Article. Article 13 passed as printed.

Article 14: Shall the Town adopt the provision of RSA 80:52-a, to authorize the prepayment of taxes and authorize the tax collector to accept these payments. *Majority Vote Required*

D. Crate made the motion to accept the Article as printed; J. Kluge seconded the motion. C. Higbee, Tax Collector, explained that this is what is known as a housekeeping Article. She has several property owners who make monthly payments against their property tax bill. A unanimous voice vote passed the Article. Article 14 passed as printed.

Article 15: Shall the Town modify an Exemption for the disabled under the provisions of RSA 72-37-b as follows: the exemption from assessed value for qualified taxpayers shall be \$50,000. To qualify, the person must be eligible under Title II or Title XVI of the Federal Social Security Act, must occupy the property as his or her principle place of abode, must own the property individual or jointly, or if owned by a spouse, they must have been married for at least 5 years, had in the calendar year preceding April 1 a net income from all sources, of not more than twenty-six thousand dollars (\$26,000) if single, and thirty-six thousand dollars (\$36,000) if married, own net assets not in excess of seventy thousand dollars (\$70,000) excluding the value of the person's residence.

J. Kluge made the motion to accept the Article as printed; F. Cummings seconded the motion. S. Schneider explained that the Article increases the income limits and that they were last raised in 2004.

A request signed by five registered voters was presented for a paper ballot vote. The Moderator declared the polls open for a paper ballot vote. B. Cusick made the motion to table the Article until the votes were counted; P. Withrow seconded the motion. Later B. Cusick made the motion to remove the Article from the table; D. Langley seconded the motion. The Moderator declared 117 Yes, 16 No. Article 15 passed as printed.

Article 16: Shall the Town modify the elderly exemptions from property tax in the Town of Enfield based on assessed value, for qualified taxpayers, to be as follows:

For a person 65 years of age up to 75 years, \$46,000;

For a person 75 years of age up to 80 years, \$69,000

For a person 80 years of age or older, \$92,000.

To qualify, the person must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least 5 years, own the real estate individually or jointly, or if the real estate is owned by such person's spouse, they must have been married for at least 5 years. In addition, the taxpayer must have a net income of less than twenty-six thousand (\$26,000) or if married, a combined net income of less than thirty-six thousand dollars (\$36,000); and own net assets not in excess of seventy thousand dollars (\$70,000) excluding the value of the person's residence.

F. Cummings made the motion to accept the Article as printed; D. Crate seconded the motion. S. Schneider explained that this Article raises the income limits so the elderly and disabled will have the same income limit. S. Eaton asked where the Article's language came from and S. Schneider replied that it came from the State Department of Revenue Administration. P. Mirski warned that the Town could be subsidizing people with high property values and would never recover the lost taxes. J. Raymond explained that the exemptions are governed by State statutes. A request signed by five registered voters was presented for a paper ballot vote. The Moderator declared the polls open for a paper ballot vote. B. Cusick made the motion to table the Article until the votes were counted; C. Pellerin seconded the motion. Later R. Cusick made the motion to remove the Article from the table; M. Madore seconded the motion. The Moderator declared 104 Yes, 14 No. Article 16 passed as printed.

Article 17: To see if the Town will vote to amend the Tax Incremental Finance (TIF) District Plan, Section V. District Plan, Project List by adding the new municipal parking lot construction (up to \$150,000) to serve the town, police, and new library buildings, and the Lovejoy Brook Road culvert replacement.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the Article as printed; J. Kluge seconded the motion.

P. Cronenwett, chairman of the Library Trustees, explained that they were working with Fair Point to acquire property from them to expand the existing parking lot. The drainage is important and there will be a redesign of the landscaping. Construction is planned to begin in 2015 and they hope to have the new library completed in the spring of 2016. 75% of the cost will be covered by grants.

S. Schneider explained that the Lovejoy Brook Road culverts continually fail with any substantial rainfall and that the two existing culverts will be replaced with one box culvert. C. Auffiero said that Lovejoy Brook Road has a history of environmental issues. The hill behind it was cut over so there's nothing to absorb the water coming off it. S. Hagerman stated that she would like to see pervious as opposed to impervious paving for the parking lot. K. Gotthart asked if the problem with the culverts is caused by beaver dams or ground water, and if the road will be raised?

S. Schneider replied that the road may be raised a little and that the beaver dams are a concern but the issue is really the size of the culverts. R. Lacroix explained that the culverts were last replaced in the late 1970's. The land cut over is located in Canaan. The storage business located on the road is impacted when the road floods and customers can't access their storage units. S. Stancek asked the audience to keep in mind that this is located in the TIF District and we need to do

improvements to encourage development. T. Jennings asked how the Article will be funded, and S. Schneider answered that a variety of funds would finance it. B. Cusick stated that when the CIP Committee looked at the potential development that the culverts impacted they made sense.

A voice vote unanimously passed the Article. Article 17 passed as printed.

Article 18: To see if the Town will vote to accept a piece of real estate approximately 1.5 acres located off Lovejoy Brook Road. Said property is owned by Robert LaCroix, is identified as Map 15 Lot 5, and is adjacent to the property on which the municipal Prior Well is located and is within the wellhead protection zone.

J. Kluge made the motion to accept the Article as printed; F. Cummings seconded the motion.

S. Schneider explained that this Article had been presented before with a dollar amount requested but this is now a donation to the Town. R. Lacroix explained that this property abuts his land and railroad land and that this donation allows him to purchase a half acre from the railroad.

K. Gotthardt asked if the Town will survey the land and mark the corners, to which S. Schneider replied absolutely. D. Saladino asked if Mr. Lacroix was the only person eligible to buy the adjoining land? S. Schneider explained that the State Department of Transportation will auction the property off to the public at large, not just Mr. Lacroix. P. Mirski stated that this was in the best interest of the Town. A voice vote passed the Article. Article 18 passed as printed.

Article 19: Should the Town allow the use of an approximately 2.0 acre portion of the idle field adjacent to the Shaker Recreation Park on Route 4A (Tax Map 11, Lot 44) for a volunteer funded and managed off-leash fenced municipal dog park. The property will remain at all times the property of the Town of Enfield. All costs of construction, operation, and maintenance will be paid for by funds raised by the Mascoma Valley Dog Park Supporters, a nonprofit group. The Mascoma Valley Dog Park Supporters, with the approval of the Recreation Department and Selectboard, will be responsible for the planning, development, and management of the dog park. This article has no impact on the 2014 tax rate.

F. Cummings made the motion to accept the Article as printed; D. Crate seconded the motion. M. Herrin sponsored the Article and explained that as a 25-year resident of Enfield Center she had a year-old Australian Shepard and had started going to the Hartford, VT dog park and her dog loved it. Dogs need socialization and the dog owners from all walks of life socialize too. One in five people in Enfield own a dog. The park supporters have met with the Board of Selectmen, the Town Planner, the Recreation Commission, and the Enfield Village Association. They contacted the property abutters and have taken into consideration some concerns from the Sloan Road residents. Lebanon, Canaan and Hanover people have shown interest in the park. The Hartford park opened in 2008 and has been very successful. Volunteers have kept it going and have assisted with our proposal. D. Kiley asked if a bond would be required to clean this up if it doesn't work and what about liability insurance? M. Herrin replied that Hartford had no increase in their insurance policy because the existing one covered it, and if the park folds all that would have to be done is to take down the fence. S. Schneider explained that the park would not increase the Town's liability much, considering that we have a public beach and police cars that are high liability. C. Depuy asked if there would be any land excavation because there is a Shaker canal on the east side of the property that shouldn't be disturbed. M. Herrin explained that there would be no excavation and that at most some trees would be planted for shade. S. Eaton asked about parking since the adjoining parking lot is always full for sports events. M. Herrin stated that the Supporters would fund raise to build another parking lot. R. Lacroix asked why Lebanon or Hanover hasn't built a dog park? M. Herrin explained that parks had been proposed there about ten years ago but Hartford embraced them so they went there. She said that there is a group talking to Lebanon now. R. Stewart said that she realized that the property had some deed restrictions and asked if a parking lot would be allowed? S. Schneider said that it would be allowed for the support of recreational facilities, which a dog park would be considered. R. Cusick stated that people from other towns use our boat launches and this would be people from other towns using our dog park. Anything that draws people into Town and shows a high quality of life benefits the Town. S. Stancek made a motion to amend the article to include bonding as determined by the Board of Selectmen; D. Kiley seconded the motion. P. Mirski stated that he did not see a necessity for a bond. M. Herrin said that Hartford is not bonded and that it would add complications. C. Higbee asked if this would require the Board of Selectmen to request a bond or if it was just advisory, which J. Kluge replied as advisory. The Moderator called for a voice vote on the amendment, which failed. Jo Shelnut Melendy stated that a dog park is no louder than a baseball game and is a benefit to the community. She said that she's too old to run her dog to tire her out but that the dog park lets the dog exercise and socialize. D. Langley stated that she can't own a dog any longer but can go to the dog park and enjoy other people's dogs. C. Lagrand stated that he and his wife are new residents of Enfield and that the proposed dog park was an attraction to them to move here. J. Patten moved the question, which received audience approval. The Moderator called for a voice vote, which passed the Article. Article 19 passed as printed.

Article 20: Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of two thousand and 00/100 dollars (**\$2,000**) from the 12/31/2013 unreserved fund balance, for deposit into the Cemetery Maintenance Expendable Trust Fund, an expendable general trust fund previously established under the provisions of RSA 31:19-a for the purpose of maintaining cemeteries? This money represents 2013 revenue from the sale of cemetery lots in 2013 and is available to offset the appropriation.

Special Warrant Article

The Board of Selectmen recommends this article by a vote of 2-0.

The Budget Committee recommends this article by a vote of 8-0.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the Article as printed; J. Kluge seconded the motion.

D. Stewart stated that as a Cemetery Trustee he wanted to remind people that there are lots available at Countryside Cemetery. The Moderator called for a voice vote, which was unanimously for the Article. Article 20 passed as printed.

Article 21: To hear the reports of agents, auditors, committees, or any other officers heretofore chosen and pass any vote relating thereto.

D. Crate made the motion to accept the article as printed; J. Kluge seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

P. Cronenwett made the motion to adjourn the meeting; everyone seconded the motion.

The Moderator declared the meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Carolee T. Higbee
Town Clerk/Tax Collector**