

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD

Minutes

December 1, 2010 – 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mark Loopley, Chair
Fran McMahon, Vice Chair
Tracy Emerick
Rick Griffin, Selectman Member
Keith Lessard
Mark Olson, Clerk
Ann Carnaby, Alternate
Jamie Steffen, Town Planner

ABSENT: Bob Viviano

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Loopley began the meeting at 7:00 p.m. by introducing the Board members and leading the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

II. ATTENDING TO BE HEARD

- Bruce Mayberry – Impact Fees

Mr. Mayberry appeared from BCM Planning out of Gloucester, Maine. In 2002 through 2003, they did a school impact fee study. It has not been updated since that time. It is facilities driven. It is not for operating or administrative costs. The fee was split into two components in case Winnacunnet did not go forward. Baseline conditions are K-8 which are operating at 77 percent capacity. Impact fees for new developments are in good shape. Enrollment was 1,166, leaving a deficit of space. The new facility total came in at 1500 capacity, so it has an increase of 550 from the base year. Substantial debt service occurred. Debt service was discussed.

Impact fees deal with the future capacity costs, but most impact fees are on a recoupment basis. Impact fees represent reimbursement back to the town. Impact fees can be spent to offset debt service of schools for both cooperative and district facilities.

The change in the SAU was discussed, but impact fees are not impacted with that. He believes an update should occur. Enrollment for housing has gone down; expenditures in the earlier report were just estimated, but it was not recorded as to what was actually spent.

Mr. Steffen told Mr. Mayberry that more specific facility plans are in the works. Police facilities were discussed. It is a recoupment fee. The planning for that facility was made for long-term growth. Impact fees can be applied to outstanding debt. If a debt is paid off, the money recouped should be invested into the department/facility, to the department; not to personnel.

Fire and Rescue was discussed. The newest station is Winnacunnet Road and the beach station is even older than the Winnacunnet Road department. The demand on department service was

discussed and he named two options; estimate for cost of fire department and capital equipment for fire firefighting. The sizes of the stations were discussed.

Fees not being huge as far as return goes was discussed.

Recreation impact fees were discussed. There really isn't a definitive recreation plan for improvements as of now. There are no specific plans for those facilities at present. Goals, objectives and standards should be put in place first and then go to the impact fees.

He stated in 674:21(5) in 2004, there were changes which may affect the Ordinance. He wants to make sure it's consistent with what he is discussing. Also 674:39 should be reviewed.

Mr. McMahon discussed the current impact fee. The school impact fee is about \$3,700 on a new single-family home. He asked if that is a one-shot cost up front. He asked if it's spread over a lengthy period, or if whoever buys that house has to pay it up front. Mr. Mayberry said it's for new construction. It's not a tax on a purchase, but an assessment of new construction. It's paid once. It's an up-front fee added to the expense. Mr. McMahon discussed affordable housing and adding additional numbers on top of affordable housing. He asked if a lot of money is being added to the cost of new construction. Mr. Mayberry stated most Boards wrestle with that. He stated costs should be paid up front. Mr. Mayberry wants to get costs proportionate. He also discussed reduced fees for reduced housing. Waivers were discussed also and where to draw the line. Mr. McMahon stated the more stipulations that get added on, the more confusing it gets. He wants it as clean as possible.

Mr. Emerick asked if this is for commercial and Mr. Mayberry said it is for police and fire. The beach has a big impact. Mr. Mayberry feels everyone should be assessed a fee.

Mr. Lessard asked how that is applied to change of use applications. Mr. Mayberry said it's based on the ordinance language. If there's a change in the use, it would be looked at for change of floor area—single to duplex unit, etc., and that one would apply the fee for a single-family home from a two-family home and maybe charge the difference. It's based on the fee formula. You don't start from scratch with old places becoming a new business. The ordinance would deal with that.

Additional square footage would add additional impact fees. Mr. Mayberry stated there are three groupings which was discussed above.

Mr. McMahon asked about tentative fee schedules. Mr. Mayberry stated the public safety report is being looked at with the assessment records. Tiered rates and Ordinance waivers were discussed.

Mr. Lessard asked about the current impact fee ordinance. He asked if people can challenge fees. Collecting the fee at the certificate of occupancy stage was explained by Mr. Mayberry. Assessment would state a fee is due at some point in time. Mr. Mayberry wants the fee right up front or when completed.

Off-site exactions were discussed and direct improvements as defined in the statutes.

Mr. Steffen discussed additional fees. The Budget Committee is sending the Board a letter for the Board to consider additional fees for roads, sidewalks, drainage and he stated those fees can be treated differently. System development charges were discussed by Mr. Mayberry along with the six-year rule. Land use regulations, system-wide impact fees and benefits from the impact fees were explained.

Mr. Lessard asked how deferred maintenance and newly-improved is defined. Mr. Mayberry described the statute and legislation and gave examples. Proportionality was discussed and that is the goal in setting the impact fee. Mr. Lessard discussed existing sidewalks and potholes and not having impact fees to cover that. Mr. Mayberry stated that is a gray area. Charging only for a portion to be attributed to new development is what needs to be fine tuned—fair versus proportionality.

Mr. McMahon asked for the difference between more mature communities and younger towns. The developments Hampton sees are small. We have smaller neighborhoods. Evolving towns versus

developing neighborhoods. Mr. Mayberry discussed the per unit cost—new and existing alike—and that the impact fee is based on that.

- T.R.D. Entertainment – 81 Ocean Boulevard

Attorney Peter Saari appeared along with John Anzalone, the gentleman behind the proposal. The Zoning Board asked for them to appear before the Planning Department. This is the second floor of the former Traficante property. Mr. Anzalone bought this in 2007 and he is remodeling it. The 2nd floor is unused currently. He discussed the gaming operation out of the jurisdiction of the State if it is charitable related. This gives income to the charities and attraction to the beach. This is a much smaller operation. Bets are limited to \$4. Some tournaments may take place. It would provide employment and additional activity to the beach and would extending the season.

Mr. Anzalone wants to run a business as gaming operators on behalf of charitable organizations. Each charity will have ten days. Food will be offered through the kitchen – no fine dining will be offered and they are applying for a liquor license. The charities will get their portion of the money that comes into the business. Security was discussed by Mr. Anzalone. He has spoken to the Chief of Police and they will have armed security. Fire safety is informed and sprinkler systems are in place. There will be an upgrade to add fire retardent adhesives to the walls and beams and ceiling area. Fire alarm warnings will be updated. FSC Engineering did preliminary report on egress and there are many different exits to the facility. There will be handicap accessibility. He believes all safety issues have been addressed.

Mr. Emerick asked for the hours of operation. They are from 11 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Monday through Friday and Saturday it is 12 noon and Saturday and Sunday is also to open at 12 noon.

Mr. Lessard asked Mr. Anzalone to describe to the viewing public how it operates and how the charity is involved. Mr. Anzalone stated it is not a casino. They cannot open the doors unless there is a charity that makes the proper application (they will assist) to the Racing and Game Commission for a permit to operate games of chance, and the maximum number of days is 10 days per year. IRS compliance and certain members have to be in place. There is a list of compliance elements that must be complied with along with an application.

Once the application is submitted, it is reviewed. There will be a calendar person who will figure out which days they can run games of chance in accordance with the schedule. Everyone wanting to be there in the summer was discussed. Mr. Anzalone discussed he is trying to establish a year-round draw to the beach area. One charity having all days during the summer was discussed and the charity's days will have to be spread throughout the year.

A member of the charity must be present each day that the facility is raising money for that charity. Accounting is then checked and standard paperwork is filed. The charity then gets its percentage of revenues. Percentages are according to the statutes. Poker, blackjack and Let it Ride were named as just a few of the games.

Background searches are done on employees before the business can start. People must be 18 years of age to enter and 21 years old to drink.

Mr. Griffin asked how people know money isn't being skimmed off the top. Mr. Anzalone discussed the safeguards and there is a cash cage. Everyone who comes in is monitored. Keeping track of chips and income coming in, etc. is monitored by the Racing and Charitable Games Commission. A computer system will be set up and it will show how many people have come in. Mr. Anzalone said there is a limit set and they are audited. They have to be in compliance. Mr. Griffin asked about the rules changing in the near future regarding how it's all regulated. Mr. Anzalone discussed that the

Charitable Game Commission is always discussing changes. Which games to be allowed, etc. were discussed. Mr. Griffin discussed the State having more regulations and Mr. Anzalone's business needing to comply.

Mr. Griffin discussed that police coverage is paid for by the establishment. The summer influx of people was also addressed. Noise issues were discussed. He knows they would be on a probationary period so they plan to do things right.

Mr. Lessard asked about a list of charities that may sign up. He asked about the validity of 501s. On the NH Racing and Charitable Games Commission website, Mr. Anzalone does not see that he needs to list the charities. It was asked if the charity can be for local support of charities. What if it's a Manchester, Concord, or Nashua charity, for example. Mr. Anzalone said Hampton charities will get priorities as long as Hampton is eligible according to the statute, etc. and those charities will get priority. Mr. Griffin asked if it's in accordance with statute, and Mr. Anzalone said it's not on the statute, but he could provide a list.

Mr. Griffin stated there are over 100 charities in this area. Mr. Lessard asked about private parties and Mr. Anzalone said "no" - it's not in the statute. It has to be open for the public. He added the statute is silent for times before 11:00 a.m. though.

Mr. Lessard asked about seating being about 380 with a maximum capacity of 450. Mr. Lessard asked where additional seating comes in. Mr. Anzalone stated the porch, patio area, bar area, etc.

Mr. Lessard discussed the age again. Mr. Lessard asked if he can bring a child with him. Mr. Anzalone stated members of the charitable organization that is having money raised can bring someone under the age of 18. This is only offered to members of the charity. He gave the Girl Scouts as an example.

Mr. Lessard discussed alcohol being served while gaming. He asked about the policy. Mr. Anzalone discussed two different policies and they need to figure it out. Some places card every drinker. Some liability carriers train the people to card people who look close to the age of 25 or 30 and use judgment. All people will be carded at the door. No open bar was discussed. Alcohol will be for purchase only.

Mr. Lessard asked about access to ATMs and the impact on addicted gamblers, etc. Mr. Anzalone discussed the statute will help alleviate that issue. There is a cap on tournaments and amounts spent. There will be ATMs on site. Double downing was asked about by Mr. Griffin and it was stated you can double down. Black jack you can play one hand. Poker tournaments are capped at \$150 day.

Ms. Carnaby asked if they are relying on charity to bring people into the place or if that is not an expectation - that it's just for the public. Mr. Anzalone stated it is for both. Members of the charity will attend as well as visitors. Mr. Carnaby asked about small charities in the town. She asked if some charities can share a day and Mr. Anzalone needs to check the statute. If it's allowed, he doesn't have a problem with that. Everything is set in stone by the statute. A charity member has to be there when door opens and when the door closes. Having charity members being involved during the day was discussed.

Mr. Olson asked about his operation based in Florida. He asked if there are other successful locations. One partner lives in Florida; one in New Jersey—it goes under "Ocean Gaming, Inc." and that is its only facility. Mr. Anzalone formed the corporation in New Hampshire. They reside in different areas.

Mr. Olson then asked how many similar type companies or entities he is aware of as far as competitors and if Mr. Anzalone is familiar with other entities. He discussed 12 gaming operators for the entire State. Other business may have an interest in this. Zoning stated they would have to come

before the Town. Other businesses tried to take a different approach, but he wants to be up front. The Zoning Board stated they are going to keep an eye on this business and they want it controlled. They don't want other businesses just popping up. He stated if they wish to expand, they will have to come before the Zoning Board.

Mr. Griffin asked him to discuss signage. Zoning stated it would not be Atlantic City sized signs. No loud noises. No flashing lights. There will be a lit sign centrally located over the front, central door. Temporary banners were discussed. Mr. Lessard asked about naming the charity for the day on the signage.

Mr. McMahon asked for Mr. Anzalone's experience. He works with his relative who was in the audience who is knowledgeable about gaming. Mr. Anzalone is an attorney in New Jersey. He is not a gaming attorney.

Mr. McMahon asked about sorting numerous charities down to a smaller number. It was going to be on a first come/first serve basis initially. He has received inquiries, and they will make a list and Hampton charities will take priority – after that, there will be a waiting list.

Mr. McMahon discussed tournaments and how it interfaces with charities. Mr. Anzalone discussed that they are the beneficiary for that day. Space for tournaments was discussed. The rear of the second floor is for tournament activities.

Mr. Griffin discussed how much money goes back to the winnings and to the people and Mr. Anzalone stated that it is hard to say. Mr. McMahon asked about other locations in Hampton and Mr. Anzalone stated possibly in the future. At this point, they aren't really thinking about that. Every facet of the business is controlled by the NH Racing Charitable Games Commission.

Mr. Griffin discussed big gamblers will not arrive to make \$4 bets. Making the games less intimidating by small bets was discussed.

Mr. Loopley discussed entertainment. He asked about bands. Mr. Anzalone said there will be a sound system playing music, but having a band has not been addressed. Mr. Anzalone stated the State receives 10 percent.

Celebrity events were discussed by Mr. Lessard. Mr. Anzalone stated it would be promoted if it was brought to them.

PUBLIC

Mr. Preston appeared. He wished Mr. Anzalone well with the endeavor. He liked the questions the Board brought forward. The lottery system with dates and tiers were discussed. He read a letter about his concerns which included avoiding legal actions. Snow removal and snow storage was in his letter. He compared us to how Boston is open year round, but in winter, snow is an issue. He asked if DRED has been spoken to yet. He does not want to be reactive. He wants this addressed before the parking ban next year (2011), which is November 15th through March 15th. The State and town taxpayers paying for snow removal was discussed. Public parking (not private) was discussed. He discussed the 1300 spots that the state has. The Town has some and Precinct has its own parking area. He asked how this can be addressed as year round without a parking plan in place. He asked if DRED, the Town and the Precinct should get together. He discussed the Newburyport system. If strobe lights are on, no one parks in Town. He wants the Town to get it right sooner rather than later. If there is not good parking, there will not be good business.

Mr. Griffin stated the Hampton Beach Commission is planning to address this. He stated the Town isn't looking to have added expense for parking. Mr. Anzalone discussed needing the parking.

Mr. Emerick asked when they are planning to open. Mr. Anzalone stated April 1st.

Mr. McMahon asked about electrical service and a transformer being needed or a generator.

Mr. Anzalone discussed that they have an engineer looking into those issues.

Reaching out to charities was discussed and Mr. Anzalone cannot solicit charities. The numbers he can be reached at are: 732-928-6929. The main number is 732-855-6021. His email address (to be checked with video) is anzalg@wilentz.com.

III. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Olson stated that 15 Church Street has been requested to be continued to January 5, 2011.

MOTION by Mr. Emerick to continue 15 Church Street to January 5, 2011.

SECOND by Mr. Olson.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

10-054 407 Ocean Boulevard

Map: 265 Lot: 9

Applicant: Ocean Spray Condominium Association

Owner of Record: Same

Special Permit to Impact Wetlands: To remove and replace asphalt paving

Mr. Gary York appeared, President of Ocean Spray Condominiums. He wants to remove the existing aged parking pavement including the driveway area in front of the garages and parking lot area in the rear of the building. The same elevations as are presently there will remain unchanged. Sensitivity of wetlands and shorelands was discussed. Proper departments were contacted. He had updated plans for the Planning Board showing elevations were on hand. He discussed the stipulations of the Conservation Commission. He did contact the building department, the Department of Public Works, the State and the Conservation Commission.

He has no issues with the Conservation Commission stipulations. Mr. Loopley stated it is pretty clear cut. The silt fence along the edge will be there. Pavement away from the marsh was discussed.

Mr. Olson asked if it is grandfathered within the buffer. Mr. Loopley stated it is just repaving and putting another layer. Mr. York has letter from the DES stating there is no issue.

PUBLIC

Mr. Richard G ____ (?), abutter to 407 asked about the slight elevation and chain link fence. He asked about holding the dirt under the pavement in that area. Mr. York discussed that with the Conservation Commission and he stated to them that he wants to prune the rear slope and it was stated that the shrubbery cannot be pruned because of erosion issues. Richard stated his concerns that they were shrubs, but they are now trees. Mr. York stated that the trees near the power lines need to be cut.

Mr. York is hoping to not disturb the area. The buffer zone was discussed. Richard asked about the fence. Mr. Griffin discussed a warrant article about having a tree warden coming to Hampton in the near future.

MOTION by Mr. Lessard to grant the special permit in accordance with the Conservation Commission letter of November 29, 2010.

SECOND by Mr. Emerick.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

10-055 1 Alumni Drive

Maps: 204 & 205 Lots: 217 & 218

Applicant: Winnacunnet High School

Owner of Record: Winnacunnet Co-Op School District

Special Permit to Impact Wetlands: Maintenance dredging of small pond adjacent to athletic fields

Mr. Jim Gove of Gove Environmental Services appeared. This is regarding a small pond near the athletic field. He showed the area which is 2,100 square feet that will be disturbed. Getting the area to the original depth was discussed. It will be dredged. Dewatering was discussed and it will go back to the pond. It is a maintenance dredge. He met with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Emerick discussed if this area was part of the approval of the site plan and included maintenance. Mr. Emerick mentioned an issue a couple of years ago that included that they maintain wetlands. It went to attorney and the conclusion then was if part of a site plan approval included in the maintenance, you didn't need to get approval for site plan. Mr. McMahon stated "no" - that other site had a lot of problems. Mr. McMahon stated it did not come through the Planning Department. Mr. Lessard stated there was a baseball field issue in the past also.

Mr. Gove spoke with Mr. Rogers who is working with him on the plan. Everything on the Conservation Commission letter is fine with Mr. Rogers. Filter bag areas, swale issues and silting were discussed and agreeable. Mr. Gove discussed sandbags and Mr. Rogers thought he could get rid of sandbags and be able to put a control structure there...a concrete dam-type structure. That is his ideal plan. Mr. Gove stated he will work with the State. He contacted Mr. Evan Lewis as he would like to fix that condition. All suggestions from the Conservation Commission are agreeable with Rick. They will go back to the Conservation Commission on the structure. Mr. Loopley discussed town money and the phragmites running downstream, etc., and the Conservation Commission is concerned about dumping a lot of fresh water by not having sandbags do what they are supposed to do. Mr. Emerick asked if it should be continued until after it is modified. It was discussed that July 15th is the low flow time. Mr. Emerick is fine with the condition of approval of structure from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Gove stated the applicant believes he has enough money to do the structure. He discussed dropping the water level, doing the dredge and removing the sandbags and doing concrete base and sides so that the water levels can be controlled. Once the pond gets lowered down, he doesn't need the pond to be as high as it is now.

Mr. Lessard asked about storm conditions and how things will change. Mr. Lessard and Mr. McMahon think it's going to be so much more complicated with the structure.

PUBLIC

MOTION by Mr. Emerick to grant the special permit including the Conservation Commission letter of November 29th, as well as modification of the dam structure that will be acceptable to State. This will have to go back to the Conservation Commission as well with the new structure they intend to install.

SECOND by Mr. Griffin.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

IV. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

124 Landing Road (continued from 7/7/2010 & 08/04/2010 & 9/1/2010 & 9/15/2010 & November 3, 2010)

Map: 239 Lot: 2

Applicant: Tuck Realty Corp.

Owner of Record: Tuck Realty Corp.

Subdivision: Two-Lot Subdivision

Attorney Peter Saari and Joe Coronati of Jones & Beach appeared. The two items being looked at are the septic and water line. The major change is with the septic.

Mr. Coronati stated at the Zoning Board meeting they discussed providing a 30-foot deed restriction on the northern side of Lot 2 with the existing home. The drainage is the same as before. They are still proposing one new house. The drainage design is the same. The sewer moratorium was discussed. They went to the Zoning Board for septic systems and they approved it. Using town water and not town sewer was discussed.

Mr. McMahon asked about the existing system being removed and being replaced and Mr. Coronati stated “yes”. Joe Coronati stated the existing well will be abandoned and town water will be brought in. It was noted that no hydrant is being placed on the street, but it is on the plans.

Mr. Loopley asked about the existing driveway behind the house and how much elevation is there. Mr. Coronati stated that the new septic on the existing home is about two feet higher than the existing driveway. Mr. Loopley asked about the big tree going away. Joe Coronati discussed the tree is not going away. He believes only one pine tree will need to be removed.

MOTION by Mr. Emerick to approve the two-lot subdivision along with the Planner’s Memorandum letter dated November 29, 2010.

SECOND by Mr. McMahon who also noted that the plan needs to be corrected to take the hydrant off. Mr. Steffen read the conditions from his memo.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

Mr. Lessard asked about the rain garden maintenance being put in the deed. He also discussed limiting the development to two four-bedroom houses. Mr. Lessard said that should be in the deed also.

MOTION by Mr. Emerick to modify the prior motion as well to include rain gardens being added in the deed.

SECOND by Mr. McMahon.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

106 Mill Road (continued from November 3, 2010)

Map: 145 Lot: 18

Applicant: MetroPCS Massachusetts, LLC

Owner of Record: Aquarion Water Company of NH

Site Plan Review: Locate & operate wireless telecommunication facility
Waiver of Section V(E)(8) re: stormwater drainage control

Scott Lacy appeared. A letter was written to the Planning Board confirming that the revised plans comply with the Zoning Board of Adjustment for approval.

Mr. Steffen stated they should provide a more detailed landscaping plan before recording the site plan.

Mr. Griffin is surprised no one from the neighborhood is attending the meeting. Mr. Lessard would like plants to be upgraded. Noise was discussed.

Mr. Steffen wants more detail on where and what the plantings will be and what has been installed already. Mr. Lacy stated it will be done.

VOTE by Mr. Emerick to approve the site plan and grant the waiver Section V(E)(8) regarding stormwater drainage control.

SECOND by Mr. Lessard.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

It was added that the site plan modification is the Zoning Board letter of November 22, 2010 and Mr. Steffen's Memo of November 29, 2010. Mr. Lessard stated he would also like it added that the the sound emitted by MetroPCS is not louder than a home window air conditioner from the location of the cabinets.

Mr. Lacy said that is generally the sound. He stated db's at 5 feet and wall air condition units is the generic. The number of BTUs is 64 decibels. Generally, they are 65 decibels. Mr. Lessard asked that they submit that information.

V. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES of October 6, 2010 and November 3, 2010.

MOTION by Mr. McMahon to accept the Minutes of October 6, 2010.

SECOND by Mr. Lessard.

VOTE: 4 – 0 – 2 (Mr. Emerick and Mr. Olson abstained)

MOTION PASSED.

MOTION by Mr. McMahon to accept the Minutes of November 3, 2010.

SECOND by Mr. Lessard.

VOTE: 5 – 0 – 1 (Mr. Griffin abstained)

MOTION PASSED.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

- New Proposed Zoning Issues

Mr. Steffen mentioned the Petition articles that we received and the scheduling of the public hearings. He noted that December 8th is the deadline for submission. Our next meeting is December 15th and we won't make the public hearing that date. One public hearing is needed for petition articles. He explained that the ones we've received could be controversial so he is recommending a special

meeting on December 29th 2010. Mr. Griffin will not be able to attend on the 29th. Mr. Emerick stated we cannot make any changes to these, but Mr. Steffen noted we still need to vote on them if we approve or disapprove. The wording of petitioned articles cannot be changed. Mr. Steffen said if there is a lot of public input, there may be the need for a second hearing. Mr. Emerick thinks it should just take place at the first meeting in January.

Mr. Lessard asked about the martial arts weapons issue. Mr. Lessard thinks the first meeting in January should suffice. Mr. Lessard stated the first meeting in January could be continued to a second date before January 18th.

The Board wants just one public hearing. Mr. Loopley said the Board does not want meeting on December 29th.

A second change to the sealed surface was discussed by Mr. Olson. Housekeeping changes for impact fees was discussed by Mr. Lessard.

A proposed regulation change to add Charitable Gaming was discussed by Mr. Steffen. Mr. Steffen suggests that if it gets added to use regulations to allow it as a special exception as business zone or business seasonal zone. Permitted use may require site plan for use change approval – this is with regard to charitable gaming. Mr. Steffen gave a chart to make reference to. Mr. McMahon discussed snow issues and trash that was not discussed, and also transformers were not discussed. Mr. Emerick goes with the “P”, but will go with the “S” on both. Mr. Steffen said we are shooting for the 15th on this one. If there will be substantial changes, the next meeting can address that at the January 5th meeting.

- Changes to Hampton Planning Board – Rules of Procedure (to be voted on by Board)

Mr. Steffen stated the Rules of Procedure need to be updated. Page 4 contains the primary changes and those are to make the rules for notice of decision and minutes being made available to the public consistent with current State statutes. Mr. Steffen stated the Board can make these changes at this meeting. The other change is on Page 3, to Order of Business, A through J. heard.

Mr. Olson asked that the agenda be changed to go to new procedure.

MOVED by Mr. Lessard.

SECOND by Mr. McMahon.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED to adjourn by Mr. Emerick.

SECOND by Mr. Olson.

VOTE: 6 – 0 – 0

MOTION PASSED

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Olivier, Administrative Assistant