

**TOWN OF THORNTON  
PLANNING BOARD**

Approved on: 8-18-22  
PB Initials: NAD  
Rec'd by Town Clerk on: 8/25/22  
Town Clerk Initials: ACK

**Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
July 21, 2022**

**CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Chairman Decoteau called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Members present at Town Hall:** Nancy Decoteau, Chairman; Steven Babin, Vice-Chairman; Frank Freeman, Donna O'Donnell, Peter Laufenberg, Dave Rivers, Kathy Menici, Planning Director; Kerrin Randall, Board Assistant

**Members Absent:** Karen Waters

**Alternates present at Town Hall:** Cynthia Schofield, Jack Gaites

**Others present via call-in (names are as they appeared via Zoom):** John Harris, Scott

**Others present at Town Hall:** Shawn Magoon, Christina Guilbert, Bob Gallagher, Diane Gallagher, Roxana Wright, Brad Trott, Cecile Trott, Michael Riley, Maureen Norman, Erik Stevenson, Michael Wright, Bob Murray, Lin Murray, Christina Gilbert, Philip Hastings, Deb McKinnon, Gerald Warren, Mahlynn Warren, Tom Duffield, Karen Prince, John Bousquet, Chad Stocker, Jon Warzocha

Ms. Decoteau sat Ms. Schofield as a voting member in place of Ms. Waters. Ms. Decoteau stated that the public hearings would be moved up on the agenda.

**HEARINGS:**

1. APPLICATION/PUBLIC HEARING – Excavation Permit Renewal; Erik Stevenson as agent for Brox Industries, Sunset Rock, LLC [Map 242 Lot 15].

Mr. Freeman commented that this excavation pit has always had their information in order and used to be routinely visited with no concerns.

Planner Menici advised that excavation permits differ from the requirements of a site plan review. When reviewing the renewal application, all materials were provided, and she has no concerns at this time.

**MOTION: "To accept the application as complete."**

**Motion:** P. Laufenberg

**Second:** D. O'Donnell

**Discussion:** None

**Vote:** 7 YES - 0 NO – 0 ABSTAIN

**Motion Passes**

Ms. Decoteau opened the public hearing at 6:04 p.m.

Karen Prince, John Bousquet, Michael Wright, and Erik Stevenson were present, representing Brox Industries, Sunset Rock, LLC, and R.M. Piper.

Mr. Stevenson reviewed that they are seeking a renewal of an excavation permit, as they have done every five (5) years for the past 20 years. He reviewed the submitted plan for excavation.

Myrtle Lewis, abutter, asked what kind of materials are going to be excavated and commented that she sometimes hears, what sounds like, target shooting. Mr. Bousquet commented that they will be excavating gravel, hauling

out materials, and grinding materials; all will be done during designated business hours. Mr. Freeman commented prior to Brox Industries obtaining the property was used by locals who used it as a pseudo shooting range. Mr. Bousquet stated that the pit is gated, but they find people walking through occasionally when not in operation even though the property is posted for no trespassing.

Mr. Rivers questioned the operation times of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mr. Babin provided historic information supporting the operation times, and Planner Menici reviewed that those times are the standard adopted by the board in the excavation regulations. Mr. Rivers thanked them for the information.

Mr. Freeman asked about dust concerns from abutters, and Mr. Bousquet stated that they have used water to remediate the concern. Al Lewis, abutter, commented that the equipment used in excavations is not loud, but the noise from those using the area as a shooting range is.

Ms. Decoteau asked for additional comments. Mr. Lewis commented on the distance from the edge of the pit and his property being within 70 feet. Mr. Wright stated that all abutters are being treated as 'disapproving abutters' that require a 50-foot setback from the excavation. He commented that there is a berm at 50 feet from an abutter, followed by additional setbacks that will exceed the 50-foot requirement.

Ms. Lewis asked how far from the wetlands shown on the plan is the excavation and Mr. Wright stated the excavation is more than 50 feet from the wetlands and they have no intention of going near them. Ms. Lewis asked, as chair of the Conservation Commission, if she could get a tour of the excavation and Mr. Wright agreed. Planner Menici stated she will provide contact information to Mr. Wright and Ms. Lewis for them to set up a time to tour the site.

Ms. Decoteau closed the public hearing at 6:20 p.m.

Lengthy discussion on the reclamation bond format and review by legal counsel occurred. Mr. Babin commented that no other applicants have had bonds reviewed, at their cost, by legal counsel and this applicant should not be required to do so. No further discussion was had.

**MOTION: "To approve the Excavation Permit for Brox Industries, Sunset Rock, LLC [Map 242 Lot 15] with the following conditions:**

- Excavation activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to noon on Saturdays. No excavation activities are permitted on Sundays or Federal holidays.
- On-site storage of solid waste is not permitted on the site.
- Processing machinery to be erected or maintained on the lot as approved within the operational plan and to be removed from the lot upon expiration of the permit.
- Blasting is not permitted on this site.
- Backhauling, importing, and storage of material is not permitted on this site.
- Crushing is permitted on this site during the following hours only: Monday through Friday between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No crushing is permitted on weekends or on any holiday.
- Surety for reclamation activities to be provided in a form and amount acceptable to the Planning Board.
- Applicant to provide a cost-based itemization of the reclamation activities to support the surety amount proposed by the applicant.
- It is the responsibility of the applicant to renew the bond throughout the duration of the permit."

**Motion:** P. Laufenberg

**Second:** D. O'Donnell

**Discussion:** None

**Vote:** 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN

**Motion Passes**

2. APPLICATION/PUBLIC HEARING – Site Plan Review; Tom Duffield as agent for Pemi River Campground. [Map 240 Lot 129]. *Adding 38 Campsites.*

The Board reviewed the submitted application and planner review. Ms. Decoteau reviewed the procedures for the public hearing:

- The Board will review the materials and determine if the application is substantially complete.
- If the application is accepted as substantially complete, the public hearing would be opened for discussion. If the application is not deemed complete, the public hearing will not occur.

Mr. Duffield commented that he received Planner Menici's review prior to this meeting, and changes have been made to the plan to address some of them. Mr. Freeman asked Mr. Duffield if the plan he is proposing tonight is different from the one the Board received, and Mr. Duffield stated the number of sites has not changed and a permanent building was removed.

**MOTION: "To accept the application as substantially complete."**

**Motion:** S. Babin

**Second:** P. Laufenberg

**Discussion:** Ms. O'Donnell asked Planner Menici what concerns she had with the plan and Planner Menici stated her biggest concern is campsites located in the floodplain with no hazard mitigation plan submitted. She commented there are several other items that have not been submitted including, but not limited to, ROW authorization from abutters and LOMA approval from FEMA.

Discussion on the completeness of the application continued.

**Vote: 3 YES - 2 NO - 2 ABSTAIN**

**Motion Does Not Pass**

**MOTION: "To accept the application as 51% complete."**

**Motion:** S. Babin

**Second:** P. Laufenberg

**Discussion:** Mr. Laufenberg asked Mr. Duffield what the status of the multiple missing materials was and Mr. Duffield reviewed that a LOMA has been applied for, but is not needed as the campsites have been moved out of the flood zone. Septic permits and subdivision applications have not been submitted, as the status of the site plan will determine if those are needed. Mr. Duffield stated a hazard mitigation plan is in process and all but three (3) campsites have been moved.

Mr. Laufenberg stated the motion being made is not to approve or deny the application, but to allow for the public hearing to be opened. He commented there are several abutters present that may wish to ask questions, as many materials are still missing.

Ms. Decoteau stated it is frustrating for the Board to not have all materials prior to a meeting and discussion occurred.

**Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**

**Motion Passes**

Ms. Decoteau opened the public hearing at 6:52 p.m. and repeated the procedures moving forward.

Mr. Duffield reviewed the plan being presented and commented that four (4) sites will no longer need septic as they are proposing a mobile bathhouse; Mr. Duffield described the mobile bathhouse as being similar to a mobile home on wheels with shower stalls and toilets. He stated the tanks will be pumped and water will be disconnected when not in use.

Mr. Duffield commented that based on conversation from the last meeting where an expansion was proposed, the applicant moved the sites back 250 feet, out of the shoreline protection area, and reduced the number of sites originally proposed.

Mr. Duffield also reviewed the waiver request to allow seasonal campers to remain on site through the winter; water and electric would be disconnected. He stated these campers will belong to long-term patrons of the

campground that routinely come each year. Mr. Freeman commented that these are structures being placed on the parcel, and Mr. Duffield commented they will all be on wheels and able to be moved.

Ms. Schofield addressed Gerald Warren, owner of the Pemi River Campground, if his kayak and tube rental business will expand because of the addition of the proposed sites and Mr. Warren stated, no. He commented there is demand for private, seasonal sites and current campers have expressed interest in moving their campers to the new site and they will be moved to the new site once approved.

Mr. Laufenberg asked if the LOMA numbers listed were determined by FEMA and Mr. Duffield stated, no and he determined them as the FEMA maps are inaccurate. Ms. Decoteau commented that the entire parcel is listed as being in floodplain and asked if he has an approved LOMA. Mr. Duffield stated yes, and Mr. Laufenberg questioned why it was not included in the materials. Mr. Duffield clarified that he is in the process of submitting the LOMA.

Mr. Laufenberg, as ex-officio, commented that there is concern that if approved and something happens when there is a flood, the owner of the campground could be held liable as well as the town. Mr. Duffield commented if the campground looks at the weather and sees the potential for flooding, they will have time to move campers within an hour.

Ms. Decoteau opened the floor for public comment.

Diane Gallagher, abutter, commented there are too many unknowns at this time and it makes her very uncomfortable that there is nothing in the presentation that is tangible. She stated the applicant did not voluntarily move the sites back 250 feet, the state mandates that there is 250 feet between the river and activity for shoreline protection. She cited that she had to obtain a LOMA for the lower part of her property and had to hire a state arborist to have problem trees removed that were within the shoreline protection area. Ms. Gallagher stated the applicant has no hardships listed to grant waivers to allow campers to remain in place in the winter and the request is ridiculous. She commented that proposed footpaths will not be followed and plants will be trampled and destroyed within the shoreline protection area.

Bob Gallagher, abutter, stated the town assessment has the whole parcel is in floodplain, FEMA has it listed as 100% in floodplain, and note five (5) on the plans submitted by Mr. Duffield say the parcel is in floodplain. He asked Mr. Duffield for the LOMA case number to verify that one has been submitted. Mr. Gallagher stated the town has permitting for development in floodplain and that is not included in his application submission. He distributed documents that claim the existing wells failed inspection and adding more wells will add to the problem. Mr. Gallagher reiterated Ms. Gallagher's comments on the lack of hardship for the waiver.

Bob Murray, abutter, stated he is disappointed and surprised that the Board is hearing this application as there is significant deficiencies and is clearly incomplete. He agrees with all points made by Mr. and Ms. Gallagher and commented that Mr. Duffield is purposely being misleading in his application and has not submitted information that he claimed was already being processed. Mr. Murray stated the applicant is placing more emphasis on storing campers rather than opening a campground and it is starting to sound like a storage facility. He commented that Mr. Warren stated he will move campers to the new site once approved, but the BOS advised that no activity be done on that parcel until site plan approval; there must have been work done to be ready for campers. He recommended the Board perform a site visit.

Mr. Murray stated until something is presented that disputes that the parcel is in floodplain, then it must be treated as 100% in the floodplain. He commented people regularly use his property to access and exit the river without permission, and expansion of the campground will increase activity on the river resulting in more people walking onto his property to access or exit the water. Mr. Murray reviewed that the National Forest has mandated that campsites are not allowed in a floodplain and the parcel in question should be treated no different. He stated he is concerned for people camping.

Lin Murray, abutter, stated this is the first time she has heard Mr. Warren reference moving campers kept at the current campground to the proposed new one over the winter. She stated the campers kept over the winter at the current campground are grandfathered on that site, not the new one.

Cecile Trott, abutter, stated when there is flooding, they maybe have 30 minutes to evacuate their home; this means moving trailers, vehicles, and animals. She stated there is no doubt that parcel will flood, and people will be using her property, as has happened in the past, to evacuate the campground.

John Wallace, abutter, stated he is at the highest point of the abutting property and can see directly onto the parcel. He emphasized and agreed with all comments made from other abutters and commented that there have been catastrophic floods in the past that resulted in fatalities when a flash flood overran a campground. Mr. Wallace commented that it would be irresponsible to approve a campground on that parcel.

Christina Gilbert, abutter, shares all the concerns of her neighbors and commented that after hard rains last week, the water level at her stairs that go into the Pemi was up a foot. She stated she is concerned for people at the campground and their lives.

Cheryl Wallace, abutter, stated the river is shifting its path with the increase of debris, land use, atvs, soil erosion, etc. She stated when the river floods and recedes it is apparent that flow is changing.

Mr. Murray stated he honestly didn't think they would be having this hearing based on the Planner Review submitted. He commented he has been to hearings where the Board has expressed the need for balancing equity, and they need to seriously consider what is being proposed. Mr. Murray stated the current campground has smoke, fireworks, and noise that is a concern for abutters. He commented that there are currently trails in the bank leading down to the river without permits that can be obtained when following the proper channels. He stated it is bothersome that the applicant has shown that regulations mean nothing to them.

Ms. Decoteau asked Mr. Warren if he wanted to comment and Mr. Warren said, yes. Mr. Warren addressed the failed wells and reviewed that the documents presented were from 2019 when he experienced a heart attack and when he was back on his feet, the concerns with the wells was remedied; there have been no failed tests before or after 2019.

Mr. Warren stated people using neighbors' properties to access and exit the river are rude and are not from the campground, as they have transportation for guests to access and exit the river. He stated if people are cutting through yards and parking on private property, the owners of those properties need to do more to protect their land.

Ms. Decoteau closed the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Mr. Freeman commented that if the Boards feels that the application is 51% complete, nothing can be decided until the other 49% is submitted.

**MOTION: "To continue the APPLICATION/PUBLIC HEARING – Site Plan Review; Tom Duffield as agent for Pemi River Campground [Map 240 Lot 129] to August 18, 2022 at 6:00 p.m."**

**Motion:** D. O'Donnell

**Second:** D. Rivers

**Discussion:** Ms. Decoteau asked if a third-party review could be done on the plans from Keach-Nordstrom and Planner Menici stated yes, but that would be a decision of the Board.

Planner Menici reviewed that the Board has 65 days to render a decision, and the applicant can request more time if needed. She also addressed the abutters present and explained that NH State Law is very specific in that an application to the Board cannot be denied because the applicant has not received state or federal permits; these permits will be conditions of approval, but applications cannot be denied if those permits are not in hand.

Mr. Gallagher asked if a permit from the Town of Thornton to build in floodplain would be needed, and Planner Menici commented that it would be required and could be a condition of approval at the discretion of the Board.

Discussion of a site visit by the Board was had, and Mr. Duffield will work with Mr. Warren to schedule a date certain and will inform the Planning Director.

Mr. Babin asked Mr. Duffield to provide a simple plan that shows the locations of the proposed sites with hookups and without. He used a copy of the current campground map as an example and Mr. Duffield agreed to prepare one for the next meeting.

**Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**

**Motion Passes**

**MOTION: "To have a third-party review of the proposed plan by Keach-Nordstrom at the applicants' expense."**

**Motion: S. Babin**

**Second: P. Laufenberg**

**Discussion: None**

**Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**

**Motion passes**

#### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. Preliminary Discussion: LCJ Holdings, LLC. [Map 240 Lot 109]. *'Country Store' with food services and Tesla charging stations.*

Attorney Hastings reviewed there were notification and application concerns discovered and he would like to have a preliminary discussion to better prepare for the public hearing. He stated they are proposing the addition of single-story building with parking to include electric charging stations that will be located at the corner of Lafayette Road and Clubhouse Lane.

Mr. Warzocha commented there has always been a plan to have a type of convenience store with a deli. There will be a small patio area and limited indoor seating totaling 40 or so seats. The store will be available for the public and guests at Owl's Nest and the electric vehicle charging stations will include Tesla specific areas and stations for any type of electric vehicle.

Attorney Hastings reviewed the store will be on existing Owl's Nest property and partially onto the Meadows Condominium common land; a BLA will be requested to be in compliance with setbacks.

Ms. Decoteau asked if there is an upper floor on the proposed store, and Mr. Warzocha commented he does not believe there will be a second floor as the ceiling will be exposed.

Ms. Decoteau asked if, at the next meeting, Attorney Hastings could guide the Board through the master plan illustration of Owl's Nest so that members can better orientate themselves to where projects are happening, and Attorney Hastings said, yes.

Ms. Decoteau asked if Keach-Nordstrom has the plans already and Attorney Hastings stated, yes. Planner Menici asked that she be copied on emailed plans to Mr. Keach in order to keep within the timeframes determined for applications. Attorney Hastings commented he will follow up with his team on that request.

Mr. Laufenberg asked what the Board can expect for applications coming up from Owl's Nest and Attorney Hastings stated there will be Hotel Village Phase II that will include a hotel with a spa.

Attorney Hastings shared that his client agreed to the request of the Board to count the Hotel Village Phase I as 13 on the LDA. He commented his client was very happy that the LDA worked out with both parties. Ms. Decoteau expressed that she would support Mr. Babin sign the LDA for the Planning Board, as he spent significant time working on it. The Board all agreed that Mr. Babin sign for the Planning Board.

Mr. Stocker stated there is a small addition needed for an existing pumphouse as well as another pumphouse that needs to be built, and asked how he should proceed with them, as they are similar to other structures that were deemed ancillary and did not need a revised site plan.

Planner Menici stated that the proposed should be given to her for review with Ms. Decoteau for determination of how the plan will be moved forward.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Upon distribution and review of the meeting minutes of June 27, 2022 Meeting, the members took the following action:

**MOTION: "To accept and approve the meeting minutes of the Monday, June 27, 2022 meeting as amended."**

**Motion:** D. O'Donnell

**Second:** C. Schofield

**Discussion:** Ms. Decoteau, Mr. Laufenberg, and Mr. Rivers provided additional corrections that were grammatical in nature.

**Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**

**Motion passes**

#### **PRELIMINARY BUSINESS:**

##### **1. HB 1661 Review**

Planner Menici reviewed that on June 24, 2002, the NH State Legislature passed HB 1661, components of which will affect how municipal land use boards conduct business with some changes becoming effective on August 23, 2022; others become effective on January 1, 2023. She commented that a summary of the changes affecting land use Boards will be provided to the Board at the August meeting.

##### **2. Short-Term Rental Regulations: Update**

Ms. Decoteau reviewed that a rough draft of an application form has been provided and Ms. O'Donnell commented the form is a starting point.

Ms. O'Donnell stated the thought she and Mr. Rivers have is to make the process simple and non-burdensome to applicants:

- If you own a short-term rental (STR) and are not an occupant at the property, a registration form is filled out.
- The Board reviews the form
- If approved, a Notice of Decision or Certificate will be sent to the applicant, and will be required to be posted at the STR.
- If guests at the STR are causing disturbances, the PD will need to be called.

Ms. O'Donnell stated there are still items that need to be discussed:

- Fees?
- Expiration Date of approval?
- Courtesy letters to abutters to inform them of a STR in the neighborhood?

Mr. Rivers stated he had concern with making sure people understand the ordinances in place and suggested a pamphlet with applicable ordinances be provided to applicants.

Discussion on ordinances currently in place occurred.

Mr. Babin stated it is not the authority of the Planning Board to create an ordinance. He stated what is being brought is suggesting that people are using property as commercial use. Ms. O'Donnell commented that people using their property for STR are using it for non-residential commercial use.

Planner Menici distributed an article that was also sent in April from NHMA that is very clear in that short-term rentals are a non-residential use and are subject to site plan review.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the fact of the matter is that STR is allowed. She stated no one is trying to stop STR from existing, but in order to ensure they have proper life safety standards, some kind of registration that shows property owners acknowledging they meet safety standards is needed. Ms. Decoteau asked that Ms. O'Donnell and Mr. Rivers continue their work, and Ms. O'Donnell asked that any input be sent to Planner Menici for distribution.

### 3. Master Plan Committee: Update

Ms. O'Donnell stated the sub-committee is working on survey questions and hope to have surveys out in August.

### 4. Posting Video of Recorded Meetings: Update

Ms. Decoteau stated she attended the BOS meeting on July 13, 2022 and deferred commenting on the conversation that occurred to Mr. Laufenberg as the ex-officio.

Mr. Laufenberg reviewed that Ms. Decoteau came to the BOS and explained that the Planning Board voted to post video recordings of meetings online. The consensus of the BOS was that they are not in favor of this Board recording and posting video recordings online. He continued that Ms. Decoteau asked, respectfully, if the Planning Board decided to continue with the posting of recorded meetings, what would happen, and it was made clear that BOS would be adverse to it.

Mr. Laufenberg commented that he, personally, is in favor of posting video recordings of meetings online; if there is technology available that will add another form of transparency it should be utilized. Mr. Laufenberg advised that he feels it is unwise to get into conflict with the BOS over this and the matter should be left alone to possibly be revisited another time.

Ms. Decoteau shared that she got a copy of the audio from the meeting and transcribed her comments given as representative of the Planning Board. She proceeded to review her transcribed comments:

'Asked each Selectboard member their opinion on posting/archiving videos of PB meetings and what their response would be if the Planning Board moved forward.

J. Monti when the Board discussed the topic at the end of the pandemic it was about archiving the videos while in the process of renewing the Zoom contract. At that time, the Board agreed that having the ability for residents to Zoom in and view the Board meetings in real time was a capability the town wanted to keep -- for transparency. The Board also agree they did not want to incur additional expense to archive the video.

R. Sabourn Agreed with the points J. Monti made. R. Sabourn stated he is also concerned about archiving material that could be used to ambush Boards or individuals in the future. The town has been involved in lawsuits with individuals who would love to search back through years of meetings to catch a Board member making a statement that they probably shouldn't have or wished they hadn't. R. Sabourn stated he doesn't believe in "feeding the monkey" and that is what we'd be doing by archiving video recordings of meetings.

R. Sabourn stated the cost is certainly a factor. Minutes are always available for the public to review. To archive the video recordings of meetings is a huge mistake.

M. Peabody stated the public can Zoom into the live meeting or attend the meetings -- what more is necessary?

J. Monti stated the Town of Thornton does a great job on the meeting minutes for the various Boards. The audio file is available up until the Draft Minutes of the meeting are printed. The ZBA is discussion how to make more information available to the public prior to the hearing. The ZBA is looking into



433 making the application and supporting documents available on line so the public has more than just an  
434 abutter notice prior to the meeting.

435 B. Benton stated he is in agreement with what has been said and in not in favor of posting/archiving the  
437 Planning Board meetings. And having it out there for years for people to look back on. The Town offers  
438 the option to Zoom-in to live meetings and that is fair enough rather than putting the video recording out  
439 there forever.

440  
441 P. Laufenberg stated he does not agree that there is a cost issue. P. Laufenberg stated the bigger issue as  
442 he has consistently said is the transparency issue. Before Covid the Town did not have the infrastructure  
443 to record meetings, but now the Town has the ability to record meetings and post the videos. The BOS  
444 hold meetings at 10:00am and 3:00pm which is not necessarily an easy time for people to access the  
445 meetings. Why would the Town not make the video recordings of meetings available to the public to view  
446 down the road in an effort to be transparent. P. Laufenberg summarized by saying he thinks the  
447 recordings of the BOS, ZBA and Planning should be posted online. P. Laufenberg stated policy would  
448 need to be established as to how, when, where etc.

449  
450 J. Monti asked about the PB discussion at the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

451 I responded that the issue came up at the close of the meeting and that it isn't something the Board has  
452 spent a lot of time discussion. The members didn't see why the PB wouldn't do it. The members want to  
453 be transparent they want the public informed. The long-term legal ammunition we may be handing people  
454 didn't come up. The general consensus was wanting the public to have access to see and review what  
455 goes on at the Planning Board –for informational purposes.

456  
457 M. Peabody pointed out the PB meetings are in the evening so it is convenient for the public to Zoom-in  
458 or attend.

459 J. Monti stated P. Laufenberg raised an interesting comment with regard to the timing of BOS meetings  
460 compared to the ZBA and PB.

461  
462 The BOS engaged in conversation regarding transparency of their own meetings, why they hold their  
463 meetings at 10:00am and 3:00pm

464  
465 I asked what reaction there would be from the BOS if the PB decided to move forward with posting the  
466 meetings.

467  
468 R. Sabourn stated he will not be impressed with a decision from the PB to move forward on this. R.  
469 Sabourn stated we are elected to look out for the town's best interest moving forward on this is certainly  
470 not in the town's best interest. R. Sabourn stated if the PB moved forward he would bring it up to legal  
471 consul and ask for an opinion. R. Sabourn stated there were 4 No's and 1 Yes from the BOS today and  
472 hopes that "you take that back to your Board"

473  
474 I stated I am in a hard position because the majority of one board disagrees with majority of another  
475 board. I stated I will take their comments back to the Planning Board.

476  
477 J. Monti stated it is the Ex-officio's job to state the BOS opinion/position to the PB.

478 I stated that P. Laufenberg is doing his job as ex-officio and that I took it on myself as a new chairman to  
479 speak personally with the BOS members.

480  
481 Town staff indicated the website is under the BOS domain. Video recording will take a lot of space. The  
482 question of editing the video and how long the video would be up etc.

483  
484 B. Benton and J. Monti will be a recurring issue.'

485  
486 Mr. Babin commented that he appreciates Mr. Laufenberg's comments to not get into conflict with the BOS, but  
487 the Board has a duty and obligation to hold the BOS accountable. He stated he is unsure why the BOS is against

488 this, whether it be fear or wanting to hide. He stated there is regulation that allows citizens to record the  
489 meetings, but the BOS doesn't want to allow public participation with access to recorded meetings. He continued  
490 that the Board needs to hold themselves and the public accountable. Mr. Babin stated the BOS was asked to  
491 change meeting times and they said, no; the TA was asked to mail out minutes of meetings for those who don't  
492 have internet access and that was rejected as well. He commented that good governance is needed and that  
493 recording and posting video of meetings would be simple, and the BOS is not allowing it due to fear of litigation;  
494 more due diligence needs to be done by the BOS.

495  
496 Ms. Decoteau thanked Mr. Babin for his comments. Mr. Freeman commented that if there are people who have  
497 no internet access, how would they access the proposed recordings of meetings.

498 **MOTION: "To make video recordings of Planning Board meetings available online for public access."**

499 **Motion:** S. Babin

500 **Second:** None

501  
502 **MOTION: "To rescind the motion made at the May 19, 2020 meeting; "To provide video recordings of**  
503 **Planning Board meetings for public access."**

504 **Motion:** N. Decoteau

505 **Second:** D. O'Donnell

506 **Discussion:** Mr. Babin commented that as a private individual, he can record meetings and post online.

507 **Vote: 5 YES - 1 NO - 1 ABSTAIN**

508 **Motion passes**

509  
510 **COMMUNICATIONS:**

511 1. 'Thank You' Note

512 The Board reviewed a 'Thank You' note from Ms. Kimball for her service recognition gift.

513  
514 2. Zoning Compliance Letters – FYI

515 Ms. Decoteau shared that the Zoning Compliance Officer will now be copying the Board with notices that are sent  
516 to those who are in non-compliance with the Zoning Ordinance for informational purposes.

517  
518 **ADJOURNMENT:**

519 **MOTION: "To adjourn at 8:54 p.m."**

520 **Motion:** D. O'Donnell

521 **Second:** C. Schofield

522 **Discussion:** None

523 **Vote: 7 YES - 0 NO - 0 ABSTAIN**

524 **Motion passes.**

525  
526 Respectfully Submitted,

527  
528 Kerrin Randall, Board Assistant