

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**27 School Street**  
**HILLSBOROUGH, NH**  
**January 04, 2023**

**TIME:** 7:00 p.m. – 8:35 p.m.

**DATE APPROVED:** 01/18/23

**MEMBERS:** Susanne White- Chairperson, Melinda Gehris -Vice Chair, Adam Charrette, Ed Sauer, Steve Livingston, Nancy Egner

**EX-OFFICIO:** James Bailey III

**PLANNING DIRECTOR:** Robyn Payson

**ALTERNATES:** Kim Opperman, Dana Clow

**Excused:**

**Public:** Leigh Bosse, Peter Mellen LLS., Heather Ellis, Richard Head, Zach Whitney, Troy Zsofka,, Anthony Costello

**Call to Order:**

Chairperson Susanne White called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Susanne White appointed Dana Clow to sit in place of Nancy Egner until she arrived at the meeting.

**Minutes**

**12/21/22** Melinda Gehris made a motion to approve the minutes. Dana Clow seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ed Sauer abstaining.

Nancy Egner entered the meeting and Dana Clow stepped down.

**Public Hearing-Zoning Articles**

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 1.

**Article 1**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Construction Services to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Construction Services to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone and permitted by Special Exception in the Rural Zone.

**Construction Services:** Any of the activities commonly referred to as construction and shall include without limiting thereby, building, plumbing, heating, roofing, interior remodeling and/or excavation as defined in RSA 155-E.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 1 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion. The motion carried

unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 2

**Article 2**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Contractor's Storage Yard to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Contractor's Storage Yard to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone and permitted by Special Exception in the Rural Zone.

**Contractor's Storage Yard:** An area of outdoor open storage for materials used for construction and for construction equipment. The materials and equipment are typically employed in the course of the contractor's business or may be available for sale or rent.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 2 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Nancy Egner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 3

**Article 3**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Entertainment Establishment to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Entertainment Establishment to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone and Central Business District.

**Entertainment Establishment-**Any establishment (indoors or outdoors) where entertainment, either passive or active, is provided for the pleasure of the patrons, either independent or in conjunction with any other use. Such entertainment includes but is not limited to vocal and instrumental music, dancing, karaoke, comedy, and acting. This does not include any of the uses defined in Article XI Sexually Oriented Businesses.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 3 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 4

**Article 4**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Entertainment, Live to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Entertainment, Live to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone and Central Business District.

**Entertainment, Live-**A musical, theatrical, dance, cabaret, or comedy act performed by one or more persons. Live Entertainment does not include any of the uses defined in Article XI

Sexually Oriented Businesses.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 4 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 5

#### **Article 5**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Event Venue to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Event Venue to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone, Central Business District and permitted by Special Exception in the Rural Zone.

**Event Venue:** A commercial site that accommodates the gathering of groups and/or individuals to host recurrent events such as wedding(s), business meeting(s), or any other commercial events. Such events are allowed to be conducted indoors or outdoors within or around the primary and/or accessory buildings or structures on a property.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 5 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 6

#### **Article 6**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Manufacturing to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Manufacturing to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone.

**Manufacturing-**The commercial, mechanical, or chemical transformation of materials or substances into new products, including the assembling of component parts, the creation of products, and the blending of materials including but not limited to oils, plastics, and resins.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 6 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 7

#### **Article 7**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Pet Grooming to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Pet Grooming to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the

Commercial Zone, Central Business District, Rural Zone and permitted by Special Exception in the Residential Zone.

**Pet Grooming** The grooming of a domestic animal, including bathing, cutting of hair, trimming of nails, and other services generally associated with the act of grooming but shall exclude veterinary services, breeding, boarding, and overnight accommodation.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 7 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 8

#### **Article 8**

Shall the Town vote to add the definition of Commercial Hydroponics Facility to Article II General Provisions section 226-6 and add such Commercial Hydroponics Facility to the Table 4 Chart of Uses as a permitted use in the Commercial Zone.

**Commercial Hydroponics Facility**-A commercial facility that houses the cultivation of plants by placing the roots in liquid nutrient solutions rather than in soil. This definition will not limit the use of hydroponics conducted on a farm or agricultural operation as defined in RSA 21:34-a II

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 8 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 9

#### **Article 9**

Shall the Town vote to amend the Table 4 Chart of Uses, Residential Uses Note number 2, to Divide note number 2 under Residential Uses in the Central Business District into two separate notes. Note number 2 will state that Dwellings at street level require a Special Exception. New note number 3 will reduce the minimum floor area of any dwelling unit from 600 square feet to 300 square feet for a one-bedroom dwelling unit. Units two bedrooms or more require an additional 120 sq. ft. per additional bedroom.”

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 9 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 10

**Article 10**

Shall the Town vote to amend the Table 4 Chart of Uses to add Residential Solar Energy Systems permitted on any residential structure, and Commercial Solar Collection Systems permitted in the Commercial Zone and Residential Zone.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 10 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 11

**Article 11**

Shall the Town vote to amend the definition of Light Industry in Article II General Provisions section 226-6 to remove the requirement allowing no more than 30 employees and adding the language “outside the enclosed building”.

**LIGHT INDUSTRY**-- An activity primarily concerned with the enclosed manufacturing, processing or warehousing of goods that causes no traffic congestion, undue noise, vibration, odor or other nuisance outside the enclosed building, and poses no hazard to public health or safety.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 11 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 12

**Article 12**

Shall the Town vote to amend Article III General Provisions section 229-12 to add Conditional Use Permits to the Zoning Ordinance.

There being no comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 12 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 13

**Article 13**

To see if the town will vote to amend the language of Article IX Administration and

Enforcement 229-59 H.

**From:**

A building permit for a building, structure, alteration or proposed land use or otherwise shall become void if the work is not substantially started and completed with all reasonable due diligence within 2 years.

**To:**

A building permit for a building, structure, alteration or proposed land use or otherwise shall become void if the work is not started and substantially completed with all reasonable due diligence within 1 year.

Robyn Payson introduced this article by stating that this change in the zoning was a language change. State Building code allows building permits to be valid for one year. State Building Code preempts town code so regardless of what the language in the zoning states, building permits are only valid for one year.

Steve Livingston said, often a building project cannot be completed within a year. He asked how that would come into play.

Robyn Payson said that the permit could be renewed if need be. As long as work was continuing on a project there would be no problem.

Dana Clow said according to State Building Code the permit would not have to be renewed if work was ongoing.

Nancy Egner asked if there is a cost associated with renewing.

Robyn Payson said she did not know and would have to check with the Building Inspector.

There being no further comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Ed Sauer made a motion to Approve Article 13 in its final form and place it on the ballot for Town Meeting on March 14, 2023. Jim Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Susanne White opened the public hearing on Article 14

**Article 14**

To see if the town will vote to adopt a new Article XX Dark Skies Ordinance and the associated Dark Skies Lighting Levels Map as published in the 2022 Town Report and on the Town website.

Adam Charrette reviewed changes that needed to be made to the ordinance. One was the amortization date which was set to be March 14, 2033. This is the date all lighting in town is expected to be Dark-Skies compliant. A lighting curfew for non-essential outdoor lighting to be reduced by 30% or extinguished by 11:00 pm and corrections to Chart F "Maximum Vertical

Illuminance at any point in the plane of the property line” in Lighting Zone 2 to 0.2 FC or 2.0 LUX which is more consistent with state requirements.

Robyn Payson reviewed changes to the map that included increasing the lighting level in the area of the proposed Gateway Zone, from Low Ambient Lighting to Moderate Ambient Lighting.

These changes will be addressed at the second public hearing which will be held on Wednesday January 18<sup>th</sup>.

Heather Ellis asked if holiday lighting had to be off by 11:00 pm.

Adam Charrette said holiday lighting and motion sensor lights are exempt from the ordinance.

As there was no further comment Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Steve Livingston said it ought to be up to the individual. People don't like to be told what to do. He said he would be surprised if it passes.

Adam Charrette brought up a house that is located in what used to be one of the darkest spots in town, and now you can see it from a mile away and it looks like a “high security compound.” He said there are lights on the roof pointing in all five directions. He said it's probably quite a nuisance to the neighbors up there. This ordinance gives the neighbors some protection so they can enjoy their land as they like.

There being no further comment, Susanne White closed the public hearing.

Adam Charrette made a motion to continue this article to the next meeting on January 18<sup>th</sup>. Ed Sauer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **Public Meeting**

### **Subdivision-Board Deliberations-Re-Open Public Hearing**

Dascomb Road and Myrtle Street (Map 11P Lots 191 & 400, Map 23 Lot 113)

Dascomb Associates

Susanne White opened the public meeting.

Melinda Gehris said the Board contemplated asking the lot owners to address the drainage on the individual lots. They had some significant concerns, and after a conversation with Counsel she does not believe they can do that. She said it is clear that the subdivision regulations require the developer to provide the Board with information on drainage. Not just for the construction of the road but also for the drainage for the development of the lots. She said the Board asked Mr. Davison to do that and he provided us with the kind of drainage report the Board talked about. She said that she believed the Board needed to ask Mr. Bosse to provide them with a drainage report that addresses the build out of the lots.

Nancy Egner said she agreed.

Adam Charrette said his understanding from the meeting with Town Counsel is that the drainage information is required under site plan review but once they become individual residential lots site plan review no longer applies. In order to make sure these are all compatible with being built on lots, that information needs to be found out beforehand because after the fact the Planning Board has no jurisdiction.

Susanne White opened the public hearing.

Leigh Bosse said he wondered if Town Counsel knows that all they have to do is submit plans for a tiny one-bedroom house. It clearly meets all of the drainage requirements. You approve it and lose all jurisdiction. Then the lot is sold and a four-bedroom house with a four-bedroom septic is built. It is way more intrusive, and nobody has any jurisdiction. He said you're insisting on control over nothing. He said he doesn't know what is going to be built on that property, nobody does at this stage. He said if the Board is bound and determined to do it, we will probably do it.

Anthony Costello, the engineer on the project spoke. He said when he first started the project, he contacted the Town to see if they wanted the drainage design to include the road and the house lots but there was no definitive answer given to him. He said he contacted Mr. Mellen, and he was not quite sure, so they went ahead and did the road design.

He said in most instances you don't know what is going to be built on the house lots. If you design a detention pond for a road and the house lots are draining into that direction, they would incorporate similar development of those lots. In this instance on the northwest side the land dips away from the road.

When you build a house, the water is going to be going downhill. Not knowing where the houses are going to go, we have to put them on the downslope side, probably on the property line. You don't know how big a system to put in because you don't know what people are going to be building for houses. When that happens and the design is part of a subdivision, he said he believed the Town is responsible to maintain that drainage structure. Then we would have to create access roads to get down there and if something were to happen to that drainage system then the Town would be responsible for maintaining and fixing it. A lot of the time the DPW doesn't want to deal with these things.

He said if you are going to have us do the drainage analysis to incorporate the lots, that's fine with him. His problem is when he designs it, he is going to have to make assumptions on the size of the house and driveway etc. If someone comes in and builds a bigger house and driveway it changes the entire drainage pattern, and what we designed is not going to work. He said legally a neighbor is not allowed to have additional flow on to another person's property. The onus is on the builder to meet that requirement. The person who is building and owning the house is responsible for the drainage. He said he will design it how the Board wants but he sees it as a liability to build a giant detention basin on the down slope side that the Town is going to have to maintain.



Dana Clow said the road is laid out along the ridge at the top of the hill, and the road is designed entirely in fill. Why is that?

Mr. Costello said it makes it cheaper for construction. Typically, he likes to use eight inches of loam. The loam is stripped off anyway, so he designed the road, so the subgrade is around where those eight inches is, is stripped away. There is less work for the contractor. They have to strip the land anyway so if they are taking eight inches off and start putting down the road materials it gets you approximately two feet above ground. It is a cost-effective way of designing a road.

Dana Clow asked if this was related to high ground water.

Mr. Costello said it was not.

There was discussion about the road construction and drainage.

Dana Clow said the drainage could be designed for a typical house. That gives you a reasonable estimate of the increase in runoff that results from the individual lot development.

There was further discussion about drainage design.

Mr. Costello said he could make assumptions about the houses and the roads and the driveways if it makes the Planning Board happy but in reality, it's not going to have an effect on what is going to be built.

Dana Clow said the Planning Board does not have the authority to require the individual property owners to go through site plan review for site development.

Mr. Costello said the state does. He said he spoke to an abutter that went out on the site walk with them and he told them whatever happens on the subdivision, water is not allowed to be increased onto their land. When they start building houses and they notice there's a difference they can call him, call the state, call the Alteration of Terrain bureau and tell them your neighbor is increasing water on your property and it's causing problems.

Dana Clow said the option is to avoid those problems.

Mr. Costello said that the point is that they can put things in place.

Dana Clow said Mr. Costello is operating under the assumption it is not going to work. He said he agrees that some may not work, but his responsibility is to design for six homes and the six lots and the six driveways that are going to be developed there as best you can. There is no assurance that it is going to be built that way, but you have an obligation under the rules to not just design for the road.

There was discussion about the four feet of cover over the pipe crossing under the road.

Leigh Bosse said what is frustrating to him is when he first came in here Dana Clow said this

was the best design and most complete application he's seen, and the Board nodded in approval. Even Richard Head said the design had a de-minimus impact. He said he understands they are responsible for protecting the area from what we do, which is building that road. We have designed something that has de-minimus impact. It meets every single requirement of the zoning board for what we are doing. He said he disagrees with Town Counsel. There is nothing in the regulations that says we have to protect against work that is done by somebody else.

Susanne White called on Highway Director Ernie Butler for comment.

Mr. Butler said he can't approve the road because he has to see it. He said his second point was that he didn't like how it was being said that the Town was going to take it. If there is damage the Town is going to pay for it. Why should the Town have to fix everything if something goes wrong?

Mr. Costello said if he designs something there is going to have to be an easement put around it and that easement is going to be owned by the Town. The Town is going to be responsible for what is in that easement. If that's a detention pond the Town is going to have to maintain it. He said he agrees and thinks it puts too much pressure on the Public Works Department.

Mr. Butler said he can't approve it now because he needs to see it.

There was discussion about the depth of culverts and the pipe crossing under the road. Mr. Butler agreed that the pipe under the road should be at a depth of four feet.

Mr. Butler said he has not seen any plans on the road, and they have changed again so how can he approve a road anyway? He said he was just concerned when Mr. Costello kept saying the Town can pay for any problems.

Mr. Costello said that was his point about individuals dealing with the drainage on their own property, so the town does not have to take care of drainage structures. He said the intention of the drainage design was to address the drainage that resulted from the road construction.

Mr. Butler said his concern is the street water and where it is going because we know its wet back there. He said he is just worrying about the Town years from now.

Mr. Costello said that the side that is not going into the pond is sheet flow. The water won't be concentrated and there wont be any concentrations of water flow.

Dana Clow asked how far sheet flow was good for.

Mr. Costello said 100 feet.

Dana Clow said 100 feet is the maximum.

Dana Clow asked if the Highway Department had seen the plans.

Mr. Butler said he had seen the first set, but Mr. Bosse came and took his and he hasn't seen anything since, and they changed. He said he went and measured the width of the road and it was 60 feet. He said he saw it took half a deck and the resident's driveway. He said he was curious about that, but it was a right of way.

Mr. Butler was shown the plans and there was discussion about the road and the right of way.

Peter Mellen asked if the Board requires Mr. Costello to design the lot and there have to be some kind of structures to keep that water on the property but those structures are not adjacent to the road, is the Town going to take those over, or does the Town just want to see them on the plan?

Susanne White said she doesn't believe the town is planning on taking any water management over.

Mr. Mellen said nothing that is not connected to the road. He said he wanted to clarify that.

Dana Clow said it is important to keep in mind that you are only compensating for the increase in runoff. He said he didn't think you necessarily needed to end up with structures in the back yard that need to be taken care of. He said there are more creative ways and standard ways to address that.

There was discussion about different drainage design.

Adam Charrette asked what would happen if all of the runoff goes toward the road. Would the road be in jeopardy?

Mr. Costello said nothing would happen to the road because the ditches are down low enough. They would have to change the size of the pond if everything were to flow into it.

There was discussion about the size and location of the detention pond.

Susanne White asked Mr. Butler what he would need to approve and accept the road.

Mr. Butler said he could look at the plans and say they look great, but he has to see it and see the runoff. He said he doesn't want to jump in and say the Town will take it.

Mr. Butler asked about the location of the pond relative to the "fall zone" from the cell tower that will be erected on one of the lots.

Mr. Costello said that the fall zone is located on the cell tower property.

Robyn Payson said the cell tower has its own site plan and it must be built according to that site plan. You couldn't make changes to that site plan unless you re-opened it.

Mr. Costello wanted to determine how to move forward. He said if he designed a pond to deal with the runoff between two properties and put an easement around it, would it be the Town's

responsibility to maintain it?

Mr. Butler said if the Town takes the road they would.

There was discussion about developing the drainage design.

Melinda Gehris said what she heard from Mr. Costello was that the Board could get a drainage plan that addresses the build out of the lots, and that's what the Board needs. She said there is also a timing issue.

Mr. Butler asked if when this subdivision is approved is the Town going to hire an engineer to oversee the construction of the road.

Dana Clow said yes, they want to look at it as its being built as opposed to after its done.

Melinda Gehris asked Mr. Costello if he had any questions.

Mr. Costello described several drainage methods.

Dana Clow said he should show any shoulder sloping relative to the construction of the road, you should show that grading. Not the front yards. Dash in your estimate of a building of a reasonable size conforming to zoning.

Mr. Costello said he would put a note on the plan that says the lots need to be graded to drain water to the pond. He said that would make him more comfortable about what they are doing.

Dana Clow said if you take both sides of the road and control that and use the assumption that they will be required to install recharge chambers at the four corners of the building. Use that assumption to offset your increase.

Mr. Costello said that made him feel more comfortable.

Susanne White asked if this was something that the Town would have to maintain?

There was discussion about the detention pond and Dana Clow said this is part of the infrastructure that the Town is going to take.

Robyn Payson brought up the timing issue. The Planning Board by statute has 65 days to make their decision unless the applicant grants an extension. The next Planning Board meeting (January 18<sup>th</sup>) is 62 days, 65 days is January 21<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Bosse said they would not be ready by January 18<sup>th</sup>.

Robyn Payson said the February 1<sup>st</sup> meeting is 76 days. If the applicant were to grant an extension, that's where we are.

Melinda Gehris said the Board is going to need the plan with time for the Board to review it prior to that meeting. So, if they are not going to have them 5 or 6 days before the February 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, we need to be talking about the next meeting in February. (February 15<sup>th</sup>).

Robyn Payson said if the Board is given an extension it doesn't need to be for a specific number of days.

Melinda Gehris said she is hearing that this is not going to be completed within 65 days. She said there are two options. One is that the extension is granted and the other is that the application is denied without prejudice which the Board does not want to do.

Mr. Bosse agreed to the extension.

Melinda Gehris said to Mr. Butler that he has just seen the new plans, there has been a question raised about one of the driveways, she asked if the two driveways at the Myrtle Street entrance meet all of the Town's driveway requirements.

Mr. Butler said he has nothing to go by.

Melinda Gehris said that was not something that they were going to ask for right now, but they are concerned about it.

Mr. Bosse said the Whitney's, owners of 84 Myrtle Street do not have an easement, it was not granted by their predecessor. He said its easy to cure. The predecessor can grant them one. They have an easement but where it is, is not specified. He said he has no objection to wherever it is. He said he agrees that it can be put on his lot wherever the Town and the Whitney's agree. They have his permission to define the easement but under the law it is not defined by where they put their driveway.

Robyn Payson read RSA 477:22 which states:

**“477:22 Limited Interest.** –A conveyance made by a person having a limited interest in an estate, purporting to convey a greater interest than he possessed or could lawfully convey, shall not work a forfeiture thereof, but shall pass to the grantee all the estate which he could lawfully convey.”

Mr. Bosse said it was an inadvertent thing that the predecessor forgot to include the easement. It is clearly in the predecessor's deed, but it is not passed on. You can't take it away but there should be a corrected deed.

Troy Zsofka said the current landowner's title company failed to include it in the deed at purchase. The corrected deed has been drafted and will be executed. He said he is the owner of 80 Myrtle Street.

Leigh Bosse said that the easement is no 40ft, it is over a 40ft lot.

Dana Clow said that the legal standing is not a Planning Board matter, it's the physical location of the driveway and the potential liabilities that presents in the event there was an incident or accident with injury.

Melinda Gehris said the Board should hear from Mr. Butler if the plan meets the regulations.

Dana Clow said it is clear that a driveway is not to be located 50 feet from intersecting roads. Now we have two intersecting roads with a driveway smack in the middle of the intersection. Its in the regulations and it is common sense.

There being no further discussion, Sussanne White closed the public hearing.

Following discussion, Melinda Gehris made a motion to continue the public hearing on Dascomb Road and Myrtle Street by Dascomb Associates to February 1<sup>st</sup> 2023. Ed Sauer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no other business:

Nancy Egner made a motion to adjourn. Melinda Gehris seconded the motion.

**Meeting Adjourned 8:35 pm**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Robyn L. Payson, Planning Director