



# *Town of Weare Planning Board*

15 Flanders Memorial Road  
Weare, NH 03281  
Fax: (603) 529-4554  
Website: [www.weare.nh.gov](http://www.weare.nh.gov)

## Planning Board

Craig Francisco, Chairman  
Frank Bolton, Vice Chair  
Neal Kurk, Secretary  
George Malette, Member  
Keith Lacasse, Ex-Officio  
Bruce Fillmore, Jr., Alternate  
John VanLoendersloot,  
Alternate

## PLANNING BOARD – JUNE 12, 2014 FINAL MEETING MINUTES

**Present:** Craig Francisco, Chuck Bolton, George Malette, Neal Kurk, Keith Lacasse, Bruce Fillmore, Jr., John Vanloendersloot, Chip Meany and Wendy Stevens

**Guests:** Chris Rand, CAK Realty, Dave Beckwith, Subway, Deborah Brown, Michael Dahlberg.

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Francisco called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

### II. **PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **CONTINUATION OF APPLICATION**

#### **DEBORAH BROWN, MOODY POND MARKETPLACE, 3 GEORGE MOODY RD.**

Mr. Dahlberg asked if Mr. Meany has gone through the checklist to see if the 14 items were addressed. Mr. Meany said you have the driveway permit, a letter from NH Dept of Agriculture, Markets & Food that says she is not a farmers market. Mr. Dahlberg said they changed the name from a Farm Stand to a Produce Stand throughout the plan. He corrected Note #6. He added to Note #7: "450 gallon per day design flow rate", and added Note #15 for temporary signage, they revised the lot coverage calculation to include the gravel, they moved the handicapped space up by the building, in order to accommodate for the new gravel, they added a small portion of the existing gravel area in front of the pergola that is going to be converted back to lawn to compensate for increased coverage (the pergola north of the handicapped spot), and the increased coverage is just to the west of that, indented. They slid two parking spaces north of the proposed produce stand in the existing gravel area. They flagged off the proposed sign on the west side of the plan, on the west side of the garden shop. They corrected Note #12 labeling the farmers market area on the plan, adjusted the parking spot locations, added a cross hatch area east and southeast of the proposed produce stand that says no plowing of snow into that area.

Chairman Francisco asked about the gutter at the back of the produce stand. Mr. Dahlberg said he added a note to backgrade behind the produce stand and there is going to be a gutter on the backside of the produce stand. He added that they modified the Note that offsite parking during market days is provided on map 405 lot 60 with a letter of permission to do so on file with the Planning Board.

Chairman Francisco asked why does the plan say Farmers' Market Area if she is not a farmers market any longer? Ms. Brown stated it should be renamed to Market Area.

Mr. Kurk checked the items in last month's minutes and was not sure that all of the items are accurately reflected in the Notes. In the application, Ms. Brown said this was going to be an eat-in and take out restaurant for no more than 17 people. The Plan says a 17 seat café, which doesn't say anything about take out. Ms. Brown stated she was not going to do take out. Mr. Kurk asked to have the Note say that she was not going to do take out. Mr Dahlberg said under Note #2 he will add it is inside and outside eating, with no take out. Vice Chairman Bolton said he reflected back to the last meeting, and he has never seen a restaurant without take out. Mr. Kurk stated the problem has to do with parking, if a 17

seat restaurant becomes a major take out, then the parking requirements become exponential. Mr. Lacasse asked why can't parking overflow go to the other parcel? Ms. Brown stated she can use that parking anytime she wants. Mr. Lacasse asked why couldn't the employees use those spaces if parking became an issue to free up those 3 spaces? Mr. Kurk stated expecting customers to park in the overflow parking area is not ideal. Mr. Kurk asked Ms. Brown if her father were to sell the pit, would she still have the right for overflow parking? She stated she would make sure. Mr. Malette stated if a business were to change hands, that designated overflow parking may not be available anymore for the event that is held seasonally one day a week. Mr. Lacasse stated we are ruling based on conditions that exist today. He thinks decisions have to be made on conditions that are in place today. Mr. Malette stated he has never seen that as a permanent stipulation on adjacent land because of an agreement. Mr. Kurk said the question is, Ms. Brown's business goes on 50 years, her father sells the parcel next door. Mr. Lacasse stated that was speculation. Mr. Malette stated at the last meeting, the overflow parking was for the vendors for market days.

Mr. Malette asked regarding the letter, even though she is not calling herself a farmers market, she still meets the legal definition of one. Mr. Malette thought the letter the board was going to receive from the state was a letter acknowledging her existence as a farmer's market. Mr. Malette stated by state statute her activity of bringing agricultural vendors together fits the definition of a farmer's market. Ms. Brown stated she does not want to be a farmer's market. Ms. Brown stated she was Market Days long before she was a farmer's market, and she only became a farmer's market because she had a wine vendor, and a wine vendor can only participate in an open air market that is recognized by the state as a farmer's market. She stated that is the only reason why she became a market. Ms. Brown stated that it is not a farmer's market so the RSAs do not apply to her. She stated she is no longer a farmer's market and she will never be a farmer's market. Ms. Brown stated the definition states two farmers, and she does not have two farmers. She added the State of NH had no problem with her continuing as Market Days, and they told her if she wants to become a Farmer's Market again that is no problem. Mr. Kurk stated the only thing the letter says is she removed herself from the state listing of farmers' markets. Ms. Brown stated that when she contacted the Dept. of Ag a year ago, because her selling area was opposite from the vending area, the Dept. of Agriculture was fine with the farmer's market. However when she requested a letter from the Dept. of Agriculture, they refused to put it in writing. Mr. Malette referred to RSA 21:34a, Roman Numeral V. Chairman Francisco asked if she was selling anything at the farmers market? She stated seafood. Chairman Francisco stated then you are a vendor. Ms. Brown stated she will not be a farmer's market. The board interpreted RSA 21:34a to read that she would only be a farmer's market if she were not a vendor, but because she is selling something there, she is not meeting the definition of a farmer's market. Mr. Lacasse interpreted the RSA to mean that a farmer's market would be held on either public property or property owned not by people doing the selling.

Mr. Kurk stated we have the letter for off-site parking, and we have the driveway permit. The farmer's market area is shown, the farm stand is reworded to produce stand, the gutter, regrading the land footnote, backgrade area around produce stand to keep drainage out of wetlands, overflow parking and the parking agreement is already signed. Mr. Kurk reviewed Note #12, the minutes say Note #12 has to be changed to reflect three changes of signage; 1) the removal of one 3x10 sign, move the marketplace sign in place of one sign on the eastern side of the existing shed to the western side of the existing shed, going to be 2 x 3 and can't be higher than 12 feet above the ground, and the second sign, the stand-alone new sign in the location indicated and the dimensions are on the application but they need to be on the Note. Ms. Brown stated she has not decided on that sign yet. Mr. Kurk replied it needs to either be eliminated or she can come back later. Ms. Brown stated it will be within the 16 square feet requirement. Mr. Kurk stated if you don't want to say 2 x 8 dimensions in the Note, just say 16 square feet and let's get it in the Note. Mr. Fillmore asked what if the sign ordinance increases in the future, perhaps it shouldn't be in the Notes. Mr. Kurk replied if that occurred, then she could come in and readdress it. Mr. Kurk stated remove existing 10 x 3, place a sign on eastern sign of shed up to 16 square feet. Ms. Brown stated that one sign will be 2 x 8. Mr. Kurk clarified it can't be higher than 12 feet and that needs to be in the Note. It was agreed the Note #12 needs to signify 16 square

feet.

Mr. Kurk continued down the list, lot calculations, add gravel? Chairman Francisco confirmed that was done. The number of parking spaces were reviewed. The total number of parking spaces required were thought to be at 17. Mr. Malette and Mr. Kurk counted 16. Mr. Dahlberg pointed out the handicap space, three spaces north of the existing building/café, there are two spaces, one on each side of the produce stand, three in front of the existing garden shop, there are two north of the garden shed, and two east of that which makes 16. Mr. Dahlberg stated they need 16 parking spaces, and there are 16. Mr. Dahlberg stated 17 was the number of seats in the restaurant.

Mr. Kurk continued reviewing the items requested, and stated we have received a letter from the Dept. of Agriculture. Mr. VanLoendersloot asked what happens if she goes on vacation, is her weekly market day then a farmers market on a technicality? Mr. Kurk stated he doesn't think so.

Mr. Kurk summarized that as far as he knows, those are all of the items listed that have been discussed.

Chairman Francisco invited the public to speak. There was no one. He closed the Public Hearing.

Vice Chairman Bolton stated he is still concerned about take out. He asked to look at page 16 of the regulations. He stated the regulation includes a definition of drive through and carry out, and she is a restaurant, not a drive through, so he does not think she should be removing take out as a service from her establishment.

Vice Chairman Bolton stated you need one space for every 50 square feet, and asked how big was the building? Mr. Dahlberg stated 28 x 30. Chairman Francisco stated that calculates to 17 more spaces. Mr. Dahlberg stated that the parking spaces are aggregate of all of the uses, and there is no way there can be 17 more spaces. Mr. Dahlberg stated he thinks if he could reconfigure the entire site, they could probably fit the parking on there, but he will leave it up to the board.

Vice Chairman Bolton stated he thought we should revisit, and the overflow parking was mentioned. Chairman Francisco stated there is another option to waive the requirement for the parking for the take out. Mr. Malette asked about the ramp and the service area. He stated you would have to get a variance, but it would be nice if people could park near the ramp, and people might like to park as close to the restaurant as possible. Mr. Dahlberg stated he knows, and they would like to put parking closer to the building but it will not conform to the setbacks. Mr. Dahlberg stated they could probably fit all the parking there, but they would have to go for a variance because it is in the the Zoning Ordinance, and the Planning Board cannot waive a Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Francisco stated the Planning Board does have the authority to waive the parking requirements. Mr. Dahlberg said they would like to park near the building but it won't conform to the setbacks. Mr. Malette asked why don't they take the existing gravel area and turn it back into lawn to offset it somewhere else to meet the impervious surface percentage? Mr. Dahlberg said because it is all existing, and it would be a gigantic grading plan with a lot of compensation required to meet the number.

Vice Chairman Bolton stated take out takes 3 minutes, 4 minutes or 5 minutes, and he can't imagine it affecting the parking on a large scale. Mr. Dahlberg stated he was over the 10% impervious service and that is part of the difficulty in meeting the parking requirements. Chairman Francisco asked if the board would consider waiving the parking requirements.

Vice Chairman Bolton made the motion to waive the requirements for a carry out. Mr. Lacasse seconded. Mr. Lacasse stated if the parking becomes an issue, the market will decide that. It is up to the people to see if they will walk from the overflow parking, etc. The employees can be parked strategically. Chairman Francisco stated the issue would be parking on George Moody Rd. - instead of people parking in the pit, they will park on the road. Mr. Meany said the police can give out parking

tickets.

Mr. Kurk asked if this motion could be amended so if it turned out it was a problem such as affecting abutters or Rt. 114, that the waiver could be withdrawn? So it allows the opportunity to do take out but if it turns out there are parking problems, we need to do something so the neighbors weren't unreasonable inconvenienced. Mr. Kurk stated the way the motion reads now, the waiver would be in effect regardless of any problems. Vice Chairman Bolton asked how would we word that?

Mr. Kurk stated to say "this can be withdrawn subject to withdrawal by the Planning Board if it turns out there is any inconvenience to neighbors or traffic creates unsafe conditions". Mr. Kurk added neighbors can change. Mr. Malette asked how complicated is it to make a change to the Plan in the future? Could Ms. Brown come back and ask for take out in the future and request a variance? Mr. Malette would like to see some reclamation of the wetland buffer and that would offset that square footage. With vegetative growth going on in that wetland buffer area, that would offset the square foot area for additional parking along with the variance. Mr. Dahlberg said he would encourage his client to do it, it's a good idea, however at this time he does not know what the future holds.

Mr. Kurk stated he does not want to create a blanket waiver where problems are created, which has an end result of upset neighbors and police being called. Mr. Lacasse stated the customers would be in violation, and that is not the business owner's responsibility. Mr. Lacasse stated we are speculating. Mr. Malette stated when there is space on a property that meet the requirements of the law, it can be a win win situation, additional spaces can go in the lawn area, the impervious surface is offset, and it would require a variance.

Mr. Fillmore asked what about requiring signage about where you can park and where you cannot park. Mr. Malette stated the parking for this business is not well setup. We do have a responsibility for health and safety. The customers are going to end up making their own parking spaces.

Mr. Kurk made a motion to waive the requirement with respect to parking places for carry out restaurants, and the implication is to change the Note to allow for carry out. To waive the parking requirement with respect to carry out or drive thru restaurants provided, as long as there is no unreasonably adverse impact on neighbor's access to their properties or on traffic in general. There was no second to the motion. Mr. Malette stated he doesn't think it is thorough enough. Chairman Francisco suggested provided there is no parking on George Moody Rd.

Vice Chairman Bolton then seconded Mr. Kurk's motion.

Mr. Lacasse stated he thought Mr. Kurk's proposed motion was a little broad, who is to say how to define adverse impact? Vice Chairman Bolton stated he would look to the Code Enforcement Officer if problems arise. Mr. Meany said if there are traffic problems, the police should be called. Chairman Francisco mentioned towing and Mr. Meany said this is her business and she wouldn't want things to get to that level. Ms. Brown stated if that starts happening, then it is time for a variance. Mr. VanLoendersloot asked what regulations are there about parking on the side of the road? Mr. Kurk stated when people park on George Moody Rd., it is a very narrow road and it essentially creates a one way street. Mr. Meany stated you can't impede the flow of traffic.

Chairman Francisco asked Vice Chairman Bolton if he wanted to amend his motion or continue with the motion as is? Vice Chairman Bolton stated he wanted to stay with his original motion, to waive the requirements for carry out. Mr. Kurk proposed a formal amendment to the motion, so it reads "the Planning Board waives the requirement for a carry out or drive through restaurant with respect to parking provided that there is no unreasonable adverse impact on neighbor's access to their properties or on traffic in general". There was no second to the formal amendment.

Chairman Francisco read the original motion, to waive the parking for carry out or drive through. Mr.

Lacasse seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-2-0. Mr. Malette and Mr. Kurk were opposed.

Chairman Francisco reviewed the status of items received at tonight's meeting, and asked Ms. Brown if she had anything further to submit? Mr. Kurk asked if it is Thursday, not on market day, will people be parking on George Moody Rd.? Ms. Brown stated no.

Mr. Malette stated he wanted to remind the board that we do look for recommendations from other boards and the Conservation Commission has made a recommendation that no parking spaces, nor a produce stand, nor a storage areas shall be in the wetland buffer. He stated he has never seen the board ever, allow things of this nature to be in the buffer. He stated we've had another restaurant take out business, and it was required that their building and their parking that was encroaching into the wetland be removed. Now two additional spaces have been added within the wetland buffer.

Mr. Dahlberg stated it is already disturbed and it is impervious. Mr. Malette stated the purpose of a buffer is to protect the wetland, and the property is on the aquifer. Mr. Dahlberg stated the disturbance was already disturbed before the buffer was created and it is a pre-existing grandfathered use. Mr. Malette stated it is not. Mr. Dahlberg stated as long as they aren't increasing the non-conformity, than it is not an issue. Chairman Francisco stated there is no increase in non-conformity since it is already gravel. Mr. Malette stated that we are now allowing four additional parking spaces that weren't there before that could be leaking gasoline & oil. Mr. Dahlberg stated that vehicle leaks stays within ½ an inch of an impervious surface. Mr. Malette reminded the board that we have never allowed this before, and it was a requirement with other businesses. Mr. Kurk stated that this was not a wetland buffer that is in its' natural state. Mr. Malette stated the other business had a gravel area as well. Chairman Francisco stated they have no other place to go. Mr. Malette stated that is not true, they could go for a variance and he pointed out the spaces for parking. Chairman Francisco stated while he agreed with Mr. Malette, putting parking spaces in the wetlands buffer is probably not an ideal situation, it has been previously disturbed and per definition it is impervious, impacted gravel surface, and he doesn't see a minimal amount of gas and oil leaking from 2 and 2/3rds parking spaces having an impact on the wetland. Vice Chairman Bolton stated sometime when time allows, it would be a good idea to get the parking spaces out of there. Chairman Francisco stated he was sure Ms. Brown would really rather have her parking spaces near the restaurant. Chairman Francisco stated if the applicant is successful, he has a feeling she will need to come back to increase her parking and drainage issues will be addressed.

Mr. Kurk moved that the application be approved subject to the changes in the Notes dealing with signs, change the Note saying 16 square feet, change the Note wording of farmers market area to market area, and a note about the parking for the carry out. Note 12 will reflect the gable end sign and the removal of the Moody Pond sign. Mr. Kurk added obviously it is going to reflect the Waiver. Mr. Lacasse seconded.

Mr. Malette stated we do not have approval to allow things to be allowed in the wetland buffer, that this has to go to the Zoning Board. He stated we are allowing new items to go into the buffer zone, and we cannot do that, and he would like to uphold the regulation. The buffer definition was reviewed, pg 40, 28.29, a buffer made of vegetation with no ground disturbance allowed except for planting to remain within 25 feet. Chairman Francisco stated she is not disturbing any ground that he can see. Mr. Kurk stated the problem is there is no native vegetation there. Mr. Dahlberg stated it is a pre-existing condition. Chairman Francisco stated them agreeing to regrade away from the wetlands is at least helping the situation somewhat. The vote was 4-1-0. Mr. Malette was opposed. The motion passed.

### III. PUBLIC HEARING

#### **EXPEDITED SITE PLAN REVIEW: CAK REALTY/SUBWAY RESTAURANT AT 425 SOUTH STARK HIGHWAY, TAX MAP 109-07, CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE SPACE TO RESTAURANT USE.**

Dave Beckwith stated he was here to propose a Subway Restaurant in Lanctot's Plaza in the Town of

Weare.

Chairman Francisco asked if that was going in Building A? Mr. Beckwith stated it is going in Building E, Unit #1. Chairman Francisco asked of the five units, how many are taken? Mr. Rand stated there are vacant office spaces in the upstairs of Building E, upstairs from the proposed Subway, and there are vacant offices spaces above Building D where the insurance company is. Aside from that, the building is occupied. Mr. Kurk asked who is in Unit C and D? Mr. Rand stated the insurance company is in Building D and Granite State Telephone occupies Buildings C, B and half of A. Mr. Rand stated not every building has two floors, most of them do. He confirmed the second floors are in Building E and D.

Mr. Malette noted there were no variances.

Mr. Malette made a motion that the application be accepted as complete. Mr. Lacasse seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Malette asked regarding water and sewer, if this was approved, how is the water and sewer holding up as well as parking spaces. Mr. Rand replied that there are just under 2,500 gallons per day that all of those buildings together can draw out of the water system and put into the septic. Currently the entire complex, all three buildings, are using just over 1,000 gallons per day. He stated that buildings A through E have 2,400 gallons available to them, and Subway has asked for 300 gallons per day. The day care has asked for 100 gallons. Granite State Telephone is estimated at 100 gallons per day. He summarized that this leaves quite a buffer.

Mr. Malette asked what about parking spaces? Mr. Rand stated the spots are not designated to tenants. The spots directly around the Dunkin' Donuts building are designated to them, but the rest of the parking lot is on a first come, first serve basis. Mr. Malette stated because of the potential need for spaces, during optimal times of the day, how many spaces are vacant? Mr. Rand showed on Building E, just to the left of it, all of those spots are unused and they would be available for Subway. In addition, the spots in front would also be available to Subway customers. That area is totally unused now.

Mr. Kurk asked who is the tenant, Dave Beckwith or Subway Corp? Mr. Beckwith stated Subway Corp. Mr. Kurk asked if Mr. Beckwith was authorized to speak on behalf of the Corporation, and if he agrees to something, is it going to be bound? Mr. Beckwith stated yes.

Mr. Malette noted the zoning was commercial.

Mr. Kurk asked to discuss the signage. On #5, signage "spacing for signage is available and must comply with the town's current guidelines". On #4 prior page, a sign is shown that is not compliant. It exceeds the size and is in conflict with the lighting requirements. An internally lit sign is not allowed in the town. Mr. Kurk stated you could have external lights on the sign that had to be downward pointing. Mr. Beckwith asked we could not have an internally lit sign? He asked about the Dunkin' Donuts sign? Chairman Francisco stated that sign was before the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Kurk said the sign ordinance went into effect in 2011. Mr. Kurk said for two or more independent business, in addition each independent business shall be allowed a sign not to exceed 16 sq feet each such additional sign to be attached to its building on the lot either parallel or perpendicular to a vertical wall on the building, or to be placed on the roof of a farmers porch, no part of any sign attached to a wall shall be higher than 12 foot grade, so you could have a 2 x 8 or 1 x 16 foot sign on that wall and then you could have lights on shown on it from above, with no light escaping. Mr. Kurk furthered that the other condition is that the sign can only be lit when the business is open.

Mr. Fillmore asked if stickers on the window count? Mr. Kurk asked about open hours and they were provided on the application. M-F 7a-10p, Sat-Sun 8a-10p. Mr. Kurk asked what is the pylon sign referring to? Mr. Beckwith stated that is for the main sign that lists all of the tenants and they are

proposing a sticker sign.

A photo was reviewed. Mr. Kurk asked if that entire wing was cut in half perpendicular? Mr. Beckwith explained that the entrance will be the doorway to the right, and they will occupy the lower floor. The door on the left leads to the upstairs unit. Mr. VanLoendersloot asked about an OPEN sign? Mr. Beckwith stated he would like an OPEN sign lit. Mr. Kurk said as long as it is not blinking. Mr. Beckwith stated he will also turn off the OPEN sign when they are closed. Mr. Kurk read the definition of a sign. He explained that it is ok to plaster the windows with menus, sale items, etc., as long as it is not visible from 114. Mr. Beckwith stated he would not plaster every window as they want people to see in or see out for safety purposes, that there may be a few signs such as posters but they will not fill the entire window.

Mr. Beckwith requested to change his open hours from 7am to midnight since he would have to come back to change that request in the future, as currently the application states 8am. Mr. Kurk stated he may have a problem at midnight. When the carwash came before us, and there was a residence across the street, they agreed upon closing time was 9pm because folks thought it was unfair to the resident. Mr. Kurk stated there is one residence at Lanctot's at the far end. And there is a second residence almost right next to that, closer to the highway. There is also a residence across the street. Mr. VanLoendersloot asked what is the objection to being open until midnight? Mr. Kurk said we have zoning so that we have a balance of commercial interests and residential interests. People may not necessarily want to live in a house where business activities are going on day and night. He assumed Margo's house might eventually be a residence, and this is asking a lot of the three or four residences in the area. Mr. Kurk stated it seems to be leaning too far to the commercial interests. Mr. VanLoendersloot stated Boondock's is allowed to be open until 1 a.m.. Mr. Lacasse stated he would be ok with Open 24 hours in this situation. Chairman Francisco stated every parcel in that area is zoned commercial. Vice Chairman Bolton stated you open up Pandora's Box – if you go to midnight there, then all the other businesses will want to become midnight, and that is something to be considered. Mr. Beckwith stated right now the closing time is 10pm. Mr. VanLoendersloot asked if other Subways were open that late? Mr. Beckwith responded yes, Elm St. is open until 1am, and one on Main St. in Manchester is open until 12 midnight. Mr. Kurk stated this is Weare, not Manchester. Vice Chairman Bolton stated he thought 7 – 10 would be fine, or even 6-10, but he is not comfortable with after 10 pm. Mr. Meany pointed out that all of the abutters were notified about the application and no abutters appeared here tonight. Mr. Kurk stated many people are very hesitant to speak up in public and they rely on the board's judgement rather than appear.

Chairman Francisco asked for any comments from the public. There were none. He closed the public hearing.

Mr. Malette said he did not have a problem from 7-11. He doesn't think in Weare, that there will be much business after 10. Mr. Beckwith proposed that the business open hours change to 7 days a week, open at 7 am and close at midnight. It was noted that Dunkin' Donuts opens at 5 a.m. Mr. Beckwith stated if they open at 5, it is still dark in the winter.

Mr. Malette asked about square footage. Mr. Rand said it was 1,860 square feet.

Mr. Kurk moved to approve the application provided that the hours of operation be 7am to 10 pm 7 days a week. Vice Chairman Bolton seconded. Mr. Lacasse made a motion to amend the motion that the application is approved for the hours of 7 days a week, 7am to midnight. Chairman Francisco seconded the amended motion. Mr. Lacasse, Mr. Malette and Chairman Francisco were in favor of the amended motion. Vice Chairman Bolton and Mr. Kurk were opposed. The amended motion passed 3-2-0.

Mr. Kurk made an amendment to the motion that the hours be approved from 7am to midnight, but that the sign on the building not be internally lit and be no more than 16 square feet as per the ordinance,

and not as per the application. Mr. Lacasse seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Beckwith was approved for hours of operation at 7 days a week from 7am to midnight in the original motion as well as the sign delineations in the amended motion.

#### IV. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Fillmore stated he went to a planning seminar last Friday and they had the demographics housing changing in NH. There was a study and he grabbed some handouts and shared them with the Planning Board. He added they were encouraging towns to look at their regulations and see what they can do to accommodate the wave of the future. It considered college students living with parents longer, and looking at in-law apartment regulations, and it seems that generational type housing might be changing.

Mr. Malette stated we have applied for a grant to update two Chapters in the Master Plan and perhaps we could address the land use section where they do a buildout of the town based on existing regulations so that could be looked at.

Vice Chairman Bolton made a motion to adjourn at 9:08pm. Mr. Kurk seconded. The vote was unanimous.

A true record,

*Wendy J. Stevens*