

**PLANNING BOARD  
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
August 3, 2004  
MINUTES**

**DATE: August 3, 2004      TYPE: Public Hearing      DATE APPROVED: 09/07/04**

**TIME:** 7:00-9:30 PM. Katie Duffy, Chair

---

**CALL TO ORDER, at 7:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL:** Katie Duffy, David Tower, Parker Charles Carroll Richard Isakson, Kim McCummings, James Hoard, Arthur Fiorelli, Jo Anne Carr, Robyn Payson,

---

**Appointment of Alternates, Robyn Payson for Dr. Gerry Parker**

---

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:** , David Tower moved to accept the minutes of 7/06/04 Arthur Fiorelli 2<sup>nd</sup>, so voted. David Tower moved to accept the minutes of 7/13/04 with amendments Arthur Fiorelli 2<sup>nd</sup>, so voted. Richard Isakson moved to accept the minutes of 7/20/04 with amendments David Tower 2<sup>nd</sup>, so voted

---

**PUBLIC HEARING-GROWTH MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE**

David Tower opened the hearing stating the purpose of the Growth Management Ordinance. The ordinance is not a moratorium, it is not an effort to stop growth in the town, it is an effort to manage growth for a limited period of to allow the Community Facilities, Highway Department, schools, Fire Department and Police Department time to catch up with the unprecedented growth in Rindge. Rindge's Municipal Facilities are overcrowded and outdated. The town needs to slow the pace of residential development and moderate the rate of growth. He pointed out that the Town of Rindge is the fastest growing town in Cheshire County. He cited comments from the previous hearing. One citizen said, "It seems like everybody wants to move to Rindge." Another asked "Why does everybody want to come to Rindge" He said that there is a quality of life in Rindge that we all appreciate which we have to preserve with planning for growth. This ordinance is a planning document that will help us expand the facilities that need to expand and give the Town time to do it. There is a sunset provision, which sets the ordinance to expire in March of 2008. The Planning Board wants to bring this to the voters at the New Hampshire Primary on September 14, 2004.

Selectman Arthur Fiorelli took the floor to explain the statistics and facts that were the basis for Growth Management Ordinance. There are at least 18 cities and towns in New Hampshire with Growth Management Ordinances. Many of those were used as a guide to develop the Growth Management Ordinance proposed for The Town of Rindge. "The Findings of Fact" were gathered by comparing the growth rate in Rindge with its historic growth rate the growth rate of the county and the growth rate of the surrounding communities. The towns abutting Rindge are Jaffrey, Fitzwilliam New Ipswich and Sharon. He used bar charts to demonstrate the differences in number of building permits from 1998-2003. The chart illustrated the explosive growth in Rindge as compared to the abutting towns over that period of time. Selectman Fiorelli stated that

in the previous hearing on July 20, the total number of building permits included some condominiums for Franklin Pierce College students. At that hearing, the Growth Management Ordinance did not exempt student housing. It was decided at that meeting, to exempt the housing in the college district. The data displayed currently does not include student housing. The Growth Management Ordinance does not apply to commercial construction, elderly housing, modification of existing dwelling units that do not add dwelling units or student housing. Percent growth of residential units in Rindge as compared to an average of its abutting towns. Towns in Hillsboro County and Cheshire County have grown at about 1% per year over the past five years. Last year the four abutting towns grew about 2%. Rindge grew at a rate of 4.1%. This is important from a tax standpoint because 73% of the taxes paid are for the school tax. 50% of the budget of the school district is distributed between Jaffrey and Rindge on the basis of percent Equalized Valuation of the two respective towns. If Rindge had 50% of the total Equalized Valuation of all property in the two towns, half of that budget would get distributed to Rindge and half gets distributed on the basis of the percentage of the number of pupils each town has. Rindge has 47 ½ % of the students in the Jaffrey Rindge Cooperative School District. That part of the budget, which is raised from real estate taxes gets distributed on the basis of the relative equalized valuation of the two towns. If our property values are higher than Jaffrey on an equalized valuation basis which means on their current value, our percentage of that equalized valuation is gone from 50.3% and our share of taxes in 2001 was 50.3% the percent share has increased to 53.7% this year. And we are paying 57 ½ of the taxes. We have 47 ½ of the students and paying 57 ½ of the taxes. The large jump is because of the state wide property tax. When the equalized valuation of the town goes up not only does the share of the budget allocated to Rindge go up, but the amount of state wide property tax also goes up. We get less state aid the higher our equalized valuation. Budget allocation goes up and state aid goes down. This is what happens when one town's Equalized Valuation goes up faster than the other town in the school district. Someone at the last hearing asked if the reason the equalized valuation was going up due to residential construction or isn't it due to the fact property values in Rindge are going up faster than Jaffrey. It isn't in fact the case. Based on numbers from the state, the increase percent of property value in Jaffrey from 1999-2003 is 69% and in Rindge is 59%. Therefore, Equalized Valuation increase cannot be explained on the basis of property values in Rindge on individual homes. How they can be explained is as follows; Total residential building assessed valuation. Residential buildings only, no land 1999 and 2003. In the case of Rindge the total value of residential buildings has increased by 18 ½ million dollars. In Jaffrey, it has increased about 14 million. The percent increase in Rindge is 16.4% and the percent in Jaffrey is 12.7%. That is what explains the increase in school tax. Selectmen Fiorelli's last chart illustrated the dramatic increase in Rindge's population when compared to the abutting towns.

David Tower finished the presentation by summarizing and explaining the rest of the ordinance, including how the amount of building permits allowed is arrived at. He explained that per advice from Town Council, subdivisions approved before this ordinance would be grandfathered, provided that there had been active and substantial development within a year of approval. If nothing had been done and a subdivision had been approved over a year ago it would not be grandfathered and fall under the ordinance. He informed the audience that other changes to the Ordinance that had been made at the hearing of July 20 included limiting subdivision approval to no more than 5 lots was removed. It was suggested that this was redundant with the Phased

Development Ordinance in place. The Board agreed, and decided to remove it from the Ordinance. The sunset provision was changed from:

*This ordinance becomes effective upon adoption and shall remain in effect until 11:59 PM, March 31, 2008. However, the Planning Board shall annually review the need for the ordinance and send a status report on growth and the progress Rindge has made toward improving its capital facilities to the Board of Selectmen by January 1 of each year the ordinance is in effect. If the Planning Board finds that the capital facilities needs have been resolved, then it shall make a recommendation for rescission of this ordinance. However, if any school in the Jaffrey Rindge Cooperative School District attended by Rindge students is at an enrollment of 90%, or greater, of the capacity of that school, as determined by the Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District School Board, then this ordinance will continue in full force and effect.*

To:

*This ordinance becomes effective upon adoption and shall remain in effect until 11:59 PM, March 31, 2008. However, the Planning Board shall annually review the need for the ordinance and send a status report on growth and the progress Rindge has made toward improving its capital facilities to the Board of Selectmen by January 1 of each year the ordinance is in effect. If the Planning Board finds that the capital facilities needs have been resolved, then it shall make a recommendation for rescission of this ordinance. However, if any school in the Jaffrey Rindge Cooperative School District attended by Rindge students is at an enrollment of 90%, or greater, of the capacity of that school, as determined by the Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District School Board, then the Planning Board may recommend the extension of the Ordinance beyond 11:59PM, March 31, 2008.*

Information regarding the appeal process was added to the ordinance:

*Unless otherwise specified in this Ordinance, any decision under the Growth Management Ordinance may be appealed in the same manner provided by statute for appeals for the officer or Board making that decision, as set forth in RSA 676:5, RSA 677: 2-14 and RSA 677:15.*

Percentage of permits to be allocated to single lots or subdivisions with 3 lots or less from 25% to 45%

Student Housing was exempted from the ordinance.

Dave Tower closed by saying this ordinance is presented to allow the town time to plan and proceed to expand so we have the necessary facilities we need for the expanding population.

## QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

**Norman May Middle Winchendon Rd**-What was the population in 1998 or 1999 and what is it supposed to be now?

**Arthur Fiorelli**-In the year 2000, the census number was 5450 it is projected to be about 5800 now. If the growth rate continues the growth rate is projected, by the year 2020 it will be over 7000. This is not including any growth in Franklin Pierce College. In the number 5450 there are approximately 1020 Franklin Pierce College Students, they didn't get them all. There were really over 1400 students in the year 2000 at Franklin Pierce College. That number 1020 stays constant in these projections.

**Dan Whitney Butterfield Rd**-Is a town the size of Sharon a fair to include in a comparison with Rindge?

**Arthur Fiorelli**-If you exclude the low number (Sharon) you would also have to exclude the high number (New Ipswich) which would leave you with only two towns for comparison. Other

towns that have had ordinances that calculate building permits use all the towns around them. The building permit limitation is calculated by determining the average percent growth in those four abutting towns and apply that percentage to our base of residential units for the previous year. In 2003 Sharon had the highest percent growth of the four towns. You don't have to have many building permits in Sharon to increase the percent growth significantly.

**John Hunt**-Is this a problem that we don't want any more people living here? Is this a lifeboat problem that we all like what we have and we don't want anybody else here? Or, is this an issue of property taxes and how this impacts our taxes? I have seen a lot of graphs and a lot of information I've tried to process in my head every time I get up there at the legislature and vote for the state wide property tax is, and what the tax rate is, and what the impact to our community is and what the differences are in the equalization ratio and I'll tell you its very complicated. And I'm not sure anybody understands it, as a matter of fact if you probably watched the legislature didn't really know what it did either. But at the end of the day, Rindge still has the lowest property taxes around. Now, I'm not going to say its because we've had all this growth, because I don't know that. I don't know what's the secret. Maybe we've deprives all our facilities. We don't build that new High School we don't build the new Fire Station we don't build all those things because we are so cheap we don't have any of those things and that's why our taxes are so low. All I know is everyone needs to know why we are voting for this. Are we voting for this because we want to keep Rindge small, because we want to keep the population small we want to keep the rural nature or are we really thinking this is going to have anything to do with our property taxes?

**Arthur Fiorelli**-First, is this a no growth thing, obviously its not. The twenty four building permits is higher than the average five years ago. So its obviously not an attempt to stop growth. It is an attempt to time the development of the town to time facilities so they can catch up. The issue is not, what is the population of the town, the issue is how fast is the town growing relative to its ability to absorb that growth. That is what all these Growth Management Ordinances are aimed at throughout the state. Not just this one. They all have a sunset provision because its not a forever thing, you hope within the period that the ordinance might be effective, if the town votes for it the proper planning and execution of those plans will be done so that at the end of that period of time the town has caught up. There is no question that the residential growth and the increase of the equalized valuation of Rindge vs Jaffrey has increased the portion of the the School tax rate that we pay. There is no question about that, all you have to do is look at the data.

**Roberta Oeser**-If we limit growth too much the existing units are going to increase in value. If our houses are worth more money we will be paying a higher percentage of the school tax.

**Arthur Fiorelli**-There are many things that affect property values, not just Growth Management Ordinances or limitations. The limitation may look low because of the explosive growth we have had in the last five years but when compared to our historical growth rate, its actually 33% higher. This is not a moratorium.

**Roberta Oeser**-Wanted to know why the building permits from 1987, which was a huge growth year were not included in the Findings of Fact.

**Jo Anne Carr**-The table was generated from a summary of electronic files that were kept by the building department, information going that far back was not readily available.

**Marty Aho**-"I am a builder along with my father and brothers. My grandfather, mother and I grew up in this town and I love it as much as anybody. Everyone here agrees that there are problems in this town with over crowding in the schools with the children stuffed into trailers

like sardines and the teachers are under-paid. But, what has been put forward as a solution makes no sense. What we have a problem with is how our state makes us fund a combined school district. Limiting building permits in this town won't lower our home owners tax burden one bit. If anything, it may increase it by artificially limiting supply, that could increase demand therefore driving home values higher and I guarantee that if you check the towns that have passed Growth Ordinances their taxes haven't gone down at all. As Roberta mentioned, last year Rindge passed the school and Jaffrey shot it down. You can't dance with someone who doesn't want to. And the answer to Rindge I believe is to build our tax base a little more and build our own school. You are not going to get out of this situation of how the state has us funding a combined school district. Therefore, passing anti-growth ordinances and increasing our site plan review process from 16 to 26 pages of legalese designed to shut down whomever you want, will do nothing but exacerbate our problem of funding a school. The other thing is, the idea that everyone in this room costs the town more than they pay in taxes which is I believe false. As proof of this, at one times Rindge had zero residents, now it has 7000 and its not bankrupt yet. We all could be personally bankrupt in a week if we wanted to. Just do short sighted foolish planning and spend money like a drunken sailor and it will happen. That is what could hurt this town too. And that is about all I have to say."

**Tim Halliday**-“I think we are all here for the same reason, we are concerned about the town. There were some very good comments made last time, some of them sad about people seeing the town grow. I think a lot of us came here from somewhere south or east of here because it was too busy where we were so we came here trying to buy ourselves a few years. So we bought ourselves 10 or 20 years and now we are back where we came from. Its going to happen. How far do we have to move north or west of here to buy another or 20 years. I ask that of people all the time. I ask people how far you can go to northern Vermont, how many years is that going to buy you until you are going to have the same thing. Growth is coming, we are in a town that has two highways, a college and is a border town. The quote 'I want a rural atmosphere' is used a lot by everybody, everyone has a different idea of that. We are all looking for the same thing. I don't know if this ordinance is going to accomplish that because I still see like Marty said, that the school funding is really what is prompting this. The taxes and the school funding seem to be what's doing this by saying we have to cut growth because the school fund is killing us. I think the school funding is part of the issue and what the solution to that is, I don't know. But I think we all seem to be looking for that rural lifestyle. Its somewhat gone here. Its somewhat sad to say but its partially gone and if someone wants a rural life style its partially up to residents to protect land themselves on their own. If you want to control what you are looking at you have to be more active as far as buying the land and controlling it, not selling your land. When a house lot is worth twenty-grand you say 'oh lets keep it, I like the privacy'. When its worth seventy thousand for a lot or one hundred thousand for a view lot, 'that's a college education for one of my children I think I'll sell it.' It changes the flavor of what you are looking at. We are partially responsible for all these changes so if we have to create what we want to see. As far as growth goes in this town, I am not totally opposed to some sort of growth ordinance I think 24 building permits is low. Winchendon is running at 55 building permits per year with their growth ordinance maybe that's kind of high but I think 24 is a little low personally. The other comment I have is that the growth I am more concerned about is the growth of the Town government. The population is not all that greater but amount of things going on at the Town Office to me are. I am more concerned with growth at the Town Office. Some of the positions created, other things the size of the boards, other things. I am more concerned about that than I am about the housing.

If the Growth Ordinance does pass I think that the size of the government should coincide with that.”

**Chris Asaf**—“It seems to be like trying to put a Band-Aid on a belly wound at this point if our biggest problem is the school. My brothers went to this school, and I will admit that I grew up in Massachusetts in a town called Harvard, and it is destroyed. Harvard was a farm town. We moved here in 86 . Rindge was a lot like Harvard when we moved there in 78. I understand the Growth Ordinance, I understand the logic behind it. What I don’t understand is... I have also spent the last five years working in Wellesley Massachusetts who also has no land. So just limiting it to new buildings where you are allowing additions, there is a giant increase in town value. Elderly housing is the same thing. So we put 5000 elderly units its going to increase our town value as well, student housing as well. Its still going to increase the value of our land. So, we don’t have residential houses, in the big picture what does it matter? If you are saying I could build 300 acres of elderly housing and that also brings in to the commercial aspect of this, what’s happening as far as our commercial base is the site plan review is ridiculous. Who’s going to come in to town with a five square foot sign on the side of RT. 202. So our commercial is going to be somewhat crippled. And how would we end up making any more money for the town to give to the school and I’d like to know why we can’t secede from Jaffrey as well.

**Roberta Oeser**-Three times at the last meeting it was stated that existing lots will be exempt from this ordinance. How can it be a Growth Ordinance, if there is probably over hundred existing lots? If substantial work had been done, meaning a road but most of the subdivisions that were done prior to the last couple years where new roads were laid out were on existing roads. Does anybody know how many lots are in town? That’s a very important thing to know because I think maybe making bigger lot sizes or more road frontage or having different areas of density?

**Jo Anne Carr**-There are 813 vacant lots in town. Take out about 200 parcels to account for town owned parcels, parcels restricted for Conservation easements or agencies like The Monadnoc Conservancy or The Forest Society.

**Roberta Oeser**-If existing lots aren’t regulated, how can you regulate changes of seasonal residences to full time. You don’t need a permit to put a furnace in, you don’t need a permit to put new windows in you don’t need a permit for insulation. The state has regulations for converting seasonal to year round so you don’t need town approval for that. I think this ordinance is flawed and you brought up a very big issue which I had questioned. I want to know, and this is research that I feel the Planning Board should have done and have the answers to. How many lots, how many acres are set aside and not develop-able because its owned by the Town, Forest Society, or similar and how much is delineated as wet land and not buildable. Another problem with our density is water. We have 16 lakes and ponds in this town and most of them are very heavily populated because they were camp lots that were converted. So there is a lot of land in this town that’s not going to be built on. And I know of several hundred other acres that are not in Conservation now that will be. I think something needs to be done but not just with building permits. It has to be done with land use, the size of the building lots, road frontage etc. and maybe have different zones. But I think any time anyone wants to get in to growth management they have to know how much of this town is not buildable to begin with.

**Arthur Fiorelli**- The number of lots that were quoted were not exempt from the ordinance. First, any lot can apply for a building permit up to that limit in any given year. The lots that are exempt from the ordinance are those which have had substantial activity within 12 months of being approved by the planning board. Even four years later, as long as they have had

substantial activity within that first 12 months they are still exempt. Now that is a state law. No ordinance can alter a state law. That applies right now. Lets say the planning board alters its subdivision regulations. Those lots in that subdivision provided there is active and substantial development within 12 months of approval by the planning board, are exempt from those changes in the subdivision regulations. But the subdivisions that did not have any substantial activity would not be exempt even from changes in the subdivision regulations. Those 813 lots are lots of record but are not all going to be built on within the next 4 years, which is the sunset provision of the ordinance.

**David Tower**-The law provides that in lots that have been approved by the planning board in the previously approved subdivision are exempt from future zoning changes provided that, what the statute calls "active and substantial" development has taken place within the first 12 months. RSA674:39 Four Year Vesting.

**Charlie Phillips**-What is the triggering date for the grandfather or the carry over of existing subdivision which do have achieved substantial improvement so that they are exempt.

**Jo Anne Carr**- Approximately 28.

**David Tower**-The ordinance becomes operative on the date it first becomes posted by the planning board for a public hearing and it would continue until the day of the vote and if the Town votes "No" it goes away, if the Town votes "Yes" it proceeds.

**Jo Anne Carr**-There are a couple of questions being asked here. One, that Roberta asked was how many lots there are. I can tell you how many lots there are that are unimproved. That doesn't mean they are exempt or not exempt its just a blanket statement. Some sub set of those lots are not exempt because they have never did anything with the land. For this upcoming year we have about 28-32 building permits for people who have phased developments that are exempt from the ordinance. So if the Board set a limit of 24 building permits and adding the 28 exempt building permits, there is the potential for 52 building permits issued for that year.

**Ed Lamoreaux**- Thank you for all your work. There's a lot of questions about growth the school property rights builders commercial, I am all for taking a break. Its not anti-growth its just a growth management ordinance. Take a breather it has a sunset provision, get a handle on it, as we all know its growing. I think it's a great ordinance. I'm all for it.

**Shirley Carney**-I want to thank you all for your hard work. I know that the people who directly profit from development would be against any kind of balanced growth in Rindge. And I just wanted to thank you on behalf of those of us who don't think \$4000.00 property taxes are easy. And who would like to retire in our homes and we would like the population of Rindge not to be in coming from other states; and just give everybody a break and we feel that this plan is more for the little people who don't have the money or the lobbying to over run the town.

**Dan Whitney**-The information as to whether it is 28 or 32 regarding number of grand fathered lots. That could make a huge difference on how people are going to vote. Would it be possible to have that information could be published a couple of weeks before the vote is taken as to how many parcels qualify as having had that work done? Because that could greatly change how this question is looked at.

**Jo Anne Carr**-I can do my best. The number 28 is a minimum for this year, which falls under the phased development. That does not address any of the pre existing subdivisions or lots.

**Katie Duffy**-People should check if they have done a subdivision some time previous if you have not done work on it or you subdivided to sell off a piece of your home and you haven't done any substantial work over the previous year, most likely you are not grand fathered. If you

have a question you could call Jo Anne and ask if you personally needed to know if you are grand fathered.

**Mary Danley**-I think its time we all started to think about this growth ordinance, and I would like to see it on the ballot in September so I could vote in September for it.

**Jason Czekalski**- People seem to be getting hung up on the idea that this is an anti-growth ordinance and it isn't. Growth is a good thing, but in the human body when growth gets out of control we call it cancer and it ultimately kills us. I don't know if the growth we have seen over the last two years reaches the cancer stage yet, but my gut feeling that we are pretty close to being pre-cancerous. The other issue is we seem to be hung up on the money. Its not just money its quality of life. We could count the number of cars down our road. Now there is traffic. As far as number of permits, this is just a little below the average. Its not an unreasonable number. The only complaint is the "first come first serve" and a waiting list. Maybe issue by quarter? Spread them over the year? Instead of creating perpetual waiting lists. Instead, once you hit your limit. As of January, start over at zero again.

**Arthur Fiorelli**-It is copied after using examples from at least a dozen other ordinances. Now, in the majority of those we have seen, they have used first come first served process. There are some, a couple who have used a lottery process there are others that have had all of them as you suggest basically a curtain comes down at the end of the year you start all over. In talking with several planning board members from around the state and other selectmen the general conclusion was that although there may be an administration issue this year, after that first year it tends to even out. As a matter of fact in some towns since they have had their Growth Management Ordinance they have never reached their number of building permit limitation. The Administrative procedures will be arrived at jointly between the Planning Board, the Building Inspector and The Board of Selectmen. The Board of Selectmen are in there because the Building Inspector reports to the Board of Selectmen. This Ordinance can be amended at a future town meeting so if there is fine tuning to do we can always bring it back to the voters to correct it.

**Eric Poor**-Is the vote going to be a simple majority?

**Katie Duffy**-It depends, residents and land owners have the opportunity to file a petition 20% of the land owners and 2/3 vote. And that would have to be done 7 days before the vote.

**Arthur Fiorelli**-Without that it's a majority vote.

**Katie Duffy**-Chris was your question answered? Because nobody responded.

Chris Asaf wanted to know why the school systems can't be separated? Dan Whitney offered to discuss it with him.

**Arthur Fiorelli** -explained that this was not purely a school issue. Even if there were no problems with the schools the other facilities are also over burdened enough to warrant this ordinance.

**David Druin**-The school is a big part but Rindge did not vote for a school last year. Our recreation department has one field and middle school age kids with no fields to play on. There are new trucks for the Fire Department and the Highway Department but no place to keep them. There is no money to pave roads that need paving

**John Hunt**-Hypothetically speaking, without the schools in the math. No new development is not going to help the town. Growth is good. I am not sure that this is going to do any good with so many lots out there. The test is going to be when it is time to renew it at that time it will be a problem. My question is, if we really do need more infrastructure why haven't we gotten an impact fee which really would deliver new money and I sponsored that legislation many years

ago because I was told that was the best thing that this community needed and yet we have never enacted it and Jaffrey has.

**Katie Duffy**-I can answer that, right now we have a consultant Bruce Mayberry working with the CIP committee and they are coming up with a fee schedule. We have an impact fee ordinance and we are in the process of having that schedule set up. There was a time when it got held up when we hired Jo Anne and then it got put on the back burner for a few months but it is now its active.

**Jason Czekalski**-(Referring to John Hunt) You are mixing apples and oranges. You said “no growth” this ordinance has growth built right in. 24 new homes a year. The only growth that can possibly lower your property taxes is commercial and industrial. Because that doesn’t feed the school system but if your growth is oriented to residential I don’t know too many homes around here with 2 kids that are paying 14,000.00 per year in property taxes because that is what a home has to pay to break in for two kids coming in to our school system and that’s assuming that they are not special ed. Very few houses in this town are generating enough property taxes to pay for their children in this school system. So every time you build a new house you are going deeper and deeper in debt. So with residential growth you cannot grow your way to lower taxes.

### END OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION

**Minutes of 7/20** were discussed by the board and amendments were noted by secretary Robyn Payson. The corrected minutes will be distributed to the board. Richard Isakson moved to accept the minutes of 7/20/04 with amendments David Tower 2<sup>nd</sup> , so voted

**Finalize Growth Management Ordinance**-Robyn Payson proposed some minor grammatical changes which in no way changed the content of the ordinance. David Tower moved to accept changes Arthur Fiorelli 2<sup>nd</sup> changes accepted unanimously.

David Tower stated that the next step in the process was to request that a motion be made to request that the Selectmen call a Special Town Meeting to Vote on the Growth Management Ordinance. Arthur Fiorelli stated that in preparation for this he suggested to the Selectmen that they call the special town meeting July 14, with the understanding that it would be cancelled should be board choose not to recommend the Ordinance.

Katie Duffy stated that she was in favor of growth management but after hearing the concerns of the members of the audience felt that the number of allotted building permits was too low and that the assumptions of what was grand fathered had changed since the beginning of the discussion of the ordinance. She recommended that the number of building permits be raised in favor of the smaller landowners.

**Jo Anne Carr** stated that counting all building permits applied for this year, excluding grandfather subdivisions only 11 of the 24 building permits are spoken for.

**Katie Duffy**-Said she had compassion for people who have lots that can’t be built on. When small subdivisions were made they didn’t know they would not be able to get permits for their land so they can’t sell it and aren’t going to get a tax abatement for it.

**Dave Tower**-If we make a substantive change like changing the formula and require another public hearing it would throw off the time table for voting on the September primary.

**Katie Duffy**-This is one of the major problems I have had with this ordinance. It seems rushed.

**Arthur Fiorelli**-I heard people who would like to see it reduced further.

**David Tower**-You have a point and if that's the case and people vote it down then it can be back to the drawing board.

**Arthur Fiorelli**-We have not discussed do you count the exempted lots toward the total counted?

**David Tower**-The Planning Board as proponents of this ordinance do not intend to count exempted lots toward the total number of building permits allowed per year under the Ordinance.

**Arthur Fiorelli** Motion not to count lots exempt under ordinance and state laws will not count toward the limitation of number of building permits that can be issued in a given year. David Tower 2<sup>nd</sup> motion carried unanimously.

**David Tower** made the following motion:;“I move that the Planning Board vote to request that the Selectmen call a Special Town Meeting for Tuesday, September 14, 2004 for the purpose of voting on the proposed Growth Management Ordinance” Robyn Payson 2<sup>nd</sup> motion carried unanimously.

**David Tower** made the following motion “I move that the Planning Board ‘recommend approval’ of the Growth Management Ordinance and that such recommendation of the Planning Board approval appear upon the official Ballot to be used at the September 14, 2004 Special Town Meeting. Robyn Payson 2<sup>nd</sup> Katie Duffy abstained James Hoard opposed Richard Isakson Charles Carroll, Robyn Payson, David Tower Arthur Fiorelli approved.

Richard Isakson Motioned to adjourn David Tower 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Meeting Adjourned 9:30pm**

**NEXT MEETING**

**Public Hearing**

**August 10, 2004**

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Payson