

counsel and an updated driveway plan from Housing Support that shows the grading and a note that snow not be plowed (*or otherwise deposited*) on adjacent lot at 188 Main Street. The agreement with the neighbors is that any extension of the driveway (when completed) will be graded to avoid having any stormwater runoff onto the neighboring property. He noted that they would do that anyway because you can't add stormwater to other people's lots. There is a note on the plan that when the driveway is plowed it will be pushed forward and into each of the snow areas shown on the plan. Mr. Baum commented that this is an amendment to the plan that went to the ZBA and was approved by the Historic District Commission (HDC) to show the snow storage.

They would like to have the driveway permit approved and the only reason they are here tonight is because of the proximity of the driveway to the neighbors. The neighbors are not opposed with this proposal provided it is done in line with this plan and the agreement with the letter submitted by the two abutters' counsel.

Mr. Bashaw commented that he did speak with Phil Coombs, Public Works Director (PWD) when the driveway permit application was referred back to the Planning Board. He explained that the PB diverts some of its authority on driveway permits to the PWD, however, if he believes the request is outside his scope he can refer it back to the PB for review. The correspondence from the abutters' attorney was specific and the property owner and the abutters have agreed to the details. Mr. Bashaw said that the PWD has concerns with how close the driveway is to the property line and some of the rules agreed upon he wanted it to go to the Board to have them review it and sign off. The PWD had concerns about the snow removal with the driveway being so close to the lot line. The PWD didn't have any objections to what was agreed upon between the two (2) parties.

Mr. Coombs, PWD was in the audience and agreed with Mr. Bashaw's explanation regarding this matter. Ms. Merrill said that Director of Public Works agrees with what Mr. Bashaw said.

Mr. Greenwood gave his comments and said he reviewed the variance that was granted by the ZBA. He reviewed the letter sent to the Board by Attorney Donovan (attorney for the two (2) abutters). He has spoken at length with Attorney Baum (attorney for Housing Support, Inc.) and it does seem that everyone is in agreement that if these three (3) conditions are made a part of the driveway permit by the Planning Board that all parties are in agreement as to how to move forward and that it seems like a reasonable course of action.

Mr. Bashaw commented that this appears to be a concession with the parties because the applicant felt that they could meet the number of parking spaces in the driveway but it would not be esthetically pleasing with cars parked all over the place and that this appears why both parties made concessions to go along with extending the driveway and made a mutual agreement.

Ms. Merrill asked the Board if they wanted to take any action on this matter.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to approve the driveway permit application with the conditions as outlined in the agreement by both attorneys representing their clients. Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Request for a continuation to October 17, 2023:

Housing Support Inc.

186 Main Street

Map R34 Lot 21

Purpose:

This is a site plan review application for the total renovation of the existing structure to create four (4) one (1) bedroom housing units, including a small addition at the rear. Also, the extension of the right-side driveway to accommodate one handicapped parking space and three extra parking spaces at the rear.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to continue the Housing Support, Inc. public hearing to the October 17, 2023 Planning Board public hearing at 6:45 PM at the Kingston Town Hall. Any revised plan sets must be submitted in writing to the Planning Board office by Thursday, October 5, 2023 at noon.

Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

Unitil Energy Systems

Owner: 24 Towle Road Realty Trust

24 Towle Road, Map R12 Lot 26

<Board note: This hearing began at 7:02 PM.>

Ms. Merrill read the legal notice.

Purpose:

- 1) Site Plan application for a proposed Solar Field with associated access and stormwater management improvements. –
 - 1) A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for disturbance for a wetland buffer associated with the proposed Unitil Solar Facility Project is being requested by the applicant. The proposed project will require approximately 200,095 +/- sq. ft. (4.6 +/- acres) of disturbance to the 57-ft. wetland buffers within the Wetlands Conservation District.

Applicant: Present were Nicholas Golon, P.E. licensed engineer, Civil Department Manager, Principal for TF Moran and Patrick Aquilina for Unitil Service, Manager of Electrical Operations. (Jake Dusling of Unitil Energy was not able to attend tonight). James Hasselbeck, Chief Operating Officer for Revision Energy and Solar Power was also present.

Mr. Golon spoke and said that from the last meeting there were a couple outstanding items. 1) Making sure that the Town Engineer completed his review of the proposal and give them the opportunity to address his concerns. They have accomplished this. Mr. Golon referred to a memorandum from Dennis Quintal (Town Engineer) dated September 15, 2023 indicating that the items have been addressed; and 2) making sure the Conservation Commission had the opportunity to review the plans, give comments and give TFMoran the opportunity to make any revisions to be more consistent with their expectations. He noted that correspondence was provided from the Conservation Chair.

- One of the requests was to reduce their buffer impacts. They were able to achieve this specific to wetland area 5 which was considered the higher valued wetland on the site. This had a reduction of over 4,000 S.F. and almost 14,000 cubic feet of fill removal.

- They are here tonight for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the disturbance of a wetland buffer. This value has now been downgraded to 195,855 S.F. which reflects the 4,000+ S.F. of impact that was deleted.

Town Planner comment(s):

Mr. Greenwood said they have addressed his previous comments for the most part. He went over the items that remain outstanding from his comments -

#5. In the title block on two of the first three plans sheets the town of Exeter has been truncated to Ter. These need to be changed to show Exeter.

#6. The plans should show the frequency that employees will be on site and when their visits normally occur. Mr. Hasselbeck asked if this should be post-construction and Mr. Greenwood said, right.

#12. Would like an estimate of the number of arrays there will be noted on the plan. Mr. Golon said 11,038 is the estimate.

#15. The Board should make a determination regarding what would constitute substantial improvement for the purposes of vesting the project. A suggestion is possibly to declare a substantial improvement, the improvement to the Towle Rd. intersection would show their intent for the project and would act as a way of vesting their future rights of any potential change in the zoning ordinance.

Town Engineer comment(s):

(Mr. Quintal was not present tonight.) Ms. Merrill read his two remaining comments from Mr. Quintal's review dated September 15, 2023.

#26. Article **904.11 & 12** – Bond is required for Engineering Inspection of on-site improvements.

“The Bond Cost Analysis was submitted for Off-Site Improvements only. In the past, inspections were required for on-site improvements, particularly with regard to sediments control, stormwater structures and wetland protection. The amount was set at 4% of the Estimated Cost.”

#27. Section 907.3 A.3 – “I was not aware of an agreement with the with the Town for the requirement of just 12 inches of gravel for Towle Road. Provided that is true, I have no objection with the Revised Bond Cost Analysis dated 9-5-23. For the Amount of \$128,455.05. If inspections will be required for this work on Towle Road, an additional amount should be added.”

Department comment(s):

Evy Nathan, Chair of the Conservation Commission (CC) read CC's formal review comments on behalf of the Conservation Commission.

“The Kingston Conservation Commission has met with Until and TF Moran twice: once for an initial presentation on July 13; and, again on September 14.

Conservation has carefully reviewed the plan set and updates as well as Town Engineer Dennis Quintal's questions and comments in his engineering review dated August 21. Several members of Conservation attended the site walk on June 17. I, personally, reviewed the entire Functional Analysis and Dredge and Fill permit application, and submitted

193 detailed questions to Unitil/TFM. Mr. Golan and Mr. Aube were prompt with
194 answers.

195 Conservation is committed to protecting Kingston's natural resources,
196 particularly when shorelands, wetlands or vernal pools are located on
197 proposed development sites. We are adamant about enforcement of
198 Kingston's wetland setback requirements, which the town has purposefully
199 made more stringent than the State standard. There are a total of five
200 wetlands of varying values on the proposed solar array site. The original
201 plan proposed filling three of the lesser value wetlands, and encroaching
202 on the buffer of two other wetlands. Subsequently, Unitil acquired
203 additional property, allowing them to shift solar panels to minimize the
204 impact of the project on the highest value wetland (#5).

205 Conservation is concerned that adequate mitigation in Kingston will be
206 chosen and approved for the 3 filled wetland areas and remaining buffer
207 incursions.

208 Dennis Quintal's engineering review made several observations and
209 requests regarding the placement of solar panels in proximity to wetland
210 buffers, positioning of panels on slopes, and erosion control. Conservation
211 supports Mr. Quintal's recommendations, and anticipates that Unitil/TFM
212 will consider accommodating them.

213 Of particular concern to Conservation is the impact of this project on
214 wildlife corridors. For security purposes the entire solar array site will be
215 fenced, impairing the ability of wildlife to move through, or access the area,
216 thereby disrupting established migration patterns of turtles and other
217 wildlife in the area. Conservation understands that Unitil/TFM are
218 consulting with NH Fish and Game to find a solution, and would support
219 Fish and Game's recommendations.

220 Conservation does approve of the proposed native pollinator wildflower
221 mix to be planted around the solar panels, as amended by Fish and Game,
222 as well as Unitil's assurance that no herbicides will be used to control
223 vegetation growth on the site.

224 While Conservation always finds it a difficult decision to approve projects
225 that involve large-scale disruption of undeveloped land, especially when
226 wetlands or shoreland are present, we also recognize the value of this
227 project in providing renewable energy as part of a long-term strategy to
228 reduce reliance on energy sources detrimental to the climate and the
229 environment. Another consolation is this property has been heavily logged
230 in the past, and few old growth trees, if any, will need to be taken down.

231 It is also advantageous that the proposed site is situated beside an
232 existing substation, minimizing the need for acquiring and clearing
233 additional woodlands.

234 Finally, Mr. Golan, Mr. Aube and Mr. Dusling have consistently responded
235 to Conservation's questions. We feel they have been acting in good faith in
236 addressing all of Conservation's concerns regarding the project and its
237 impact on Kingston and the environment. "

238 **Board comment(s):** Ms. Merrill asked the Board if they had any further questions. There were
239 no questions from the Board.

240 **Public comment(s):**
241 Public comment opened at 7:16 PM. There was none. Public comment was closed at 7:16 PM.
242

243 **Conditional Use Permit (CUP) conditions - Section 202.8.B.**

244 **Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to grant the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) indicating that it**
245 **meets the following criteria:** (Mr. Bashaw read the conditions outlined in the TFMoran letter
246 dated July 12, 2023 re: CUP Request – Disturbance to a Wetland Buffer).

1. "The proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land not within the Wetlands Conservation District.

In order to meet the required contiguous area to site a Photovoltaic (PV) facility, an extensive site evaluation was conducted to identify lands which met the topographic requirements with relation to existing slopes and appropriate orientation to solar tracking and interconnectivity to the electric grid. Due to the geometry/location of jurisdictional wetlands located on the subject site, impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers are essential for the productive use of upland areas. The layout as proposed limits areas of impact to the lower valued, lower functioning wetlands as described in both the Wetlands Functions and Values Assessment and Wildlife Habitat Assessment prepared for the project.

2. Design, construction, and maintenance methods will be such as to minimize detrimental impact upon the wetland and will include restoration of the site as nearly as possible to its original grade and condition.

The proposed project has been designed to minimize impacts to wetlands and buffers. Low impact design (LID) methodology has been incorporated through vegetative buffers and bio-retention areas, which provide stormwater conveyance, attenuation, and treatment of site related stormwater runoff. Existing slopes have been maintained to the greatest extent possible to minimize the amount of grading required to site the arrays. Groundcover below the solar arrays will consists of Conservation Wildlife Seed Mix, and construction methods shall adhere to the NHDES approved best management practices (BMPs) to minimize impacts to wetlands and restore the site as nearly as possible to pre-construction conditions.

3. No alternative route which does not cross a wetland or has less detrimental impact on the wetland is feasible.

Numerous iterations of the facility layout were conducted to reduce impacts to the greatest extent possible. Based on the configuration required to provide interconnectivity to the existing electrical systems, panel access and maintenance, maximum allowable slopes, and orientation to solar tracking, the presented is the most feasible design that results in the least possible impacts on wetlands and associated buffers.

Design iteration has also limited areas of impact to the lower valued, lower functioning wetlands as described in both the Wetlands Functions and Values Assessment and Wildlife Habitat Assessment prepared for the project.”

Based off of the Applicant, and the reviews done the Town Planner and Engineer, and input from Conservation Commission that they are meeting the requirements to grant a CUP. Seconded by, Mr. Bakie. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to grant Conditional Approval of the project based on the following conditions:

1. That the frequency of employees on the site for maintenance be included on the plan.
2. Fix the Ter in two (2) places on the Title Block (should read Exeter).
3. There are going to be approximately 11,038 solar panels.
4. The substantial improvement to the Towle Road intersection will be considered substantial improvement of the property for the purposes of vesting the project.
5. The Bond Cost Analysis must be submitted for on-site improvements as well. The percentage to be agreed upon by the Town Engineer.
6. The conditions to be made to the plans within 90 days.

Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

<Board note: This hearing ended at 7:25 PM.>

Ms. Merrill asked if there was anyone present from Summit Distributing, LLC. There was no representation for Summit present for the public hearing.

Summit Distributing, LLC
Owner-Quick Stop Property, LLC
249 N.H. Route 125
Map R40 Lots 15 & 16

Purpose:

The applicant is seeking Planning Board approval for a proposed retail motor fuel outlet having a quick service restaurant with drive-through window and gasoline station. The applicant is also requesting a lot line adjustment between lots 15 & 16 on Map R40.

Mr. Greenwood said he contacted the engineer for Summit last week regarding their plan and have not heard back on their plans for this application. He explained that what we have is an application being completely predicated on use that they no longer have relief from the ZBA (Special Exception Article 109:7 in the C-II District).

Ms. Merrill said they are not here so we cannot hold their hearing. The Board discussed how to handle this.

Mr. Greenwood mentioned that the 30 day period for Summit to appeal the ZBA decision has lapsed.

Motion made by Ms. Merrill to deny the Summitt Distributing, LLC application without prejudice. Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

(Continued hearing from 08/15/2023)

Souhegan River View Investments

255 Route 125

Map R40 Lot 12

<Board note: This hearing began at 7:30 PM.>

Purpose:

The intent of this project is to construct a 2,000 +/- square foot barn for an ice-skating rink.

Applicant: Barry Gier, P.E. of Jones & Beach Engineers was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Gier explained that they asked for the continuance to address the comments raised by the Town Planner and Engineer. The noteworthy ones are:

- 1) The infiltration basin design.
- 2) Septic capacity for the lot and septic design in case the existing one failed. They had to complete additional test pits.
- 3) Completed lot loading calculations for the lot.
- 4) They responded to all of the comments from the Town Planner and Town Engineer. They have received Mr. Quintal's 2nd review letter which indicates that all the items have been addressed.

Town Planner comment(s):

Mr. Greenwood said they have addressed all his comments from his previous review letter.

Town Engineer comment(s):

Ms. Merrill read Mr. Quintal's comments:

He conducted a second engineering review for this application. "This review includes compliance with the requirements of the Town's Site Plan Review Regulations and customary engineering practices. I have not conducted an on-site inspection of the property. I based this review on the following documents received September 7, 2023, July 6, 2023.

- 1) A 6 sheet plan set, proposed site plan, tax map R40 Lot 12, 255 RT. 125 owned by Souhegan River View Investments, by Jones & Beach Engineers, revised date August 29, 2023.
- 2) Drainage Analysis, Erosion and Sediment Control plan proposed site plan, tax map R40 Lot 12, 255 RT. 125 owned by Souhegan River View Investments, by Jones & Beach Engineers, revised date 08/31/2023.
- 3) Construction Cost Estimate dated August 31, 2023 (incorrect location).

I offer the following comments. 1.) All my previous comments have been addressed. No additional comments. 2.) I have no objection with the Construction Cost Estimate presented."

Board comment(s): Ms. Merrill asked if there were questions from the Planning Board. Mr. Bashaw commented that the plans seem very complete and thorough and the Town Planner and Engineer said their comments have been addressed.

Public comment(s):

Public comment opened at 7:16 PM.

Kathy and Gary Avery, 257 RT. 125 –

- Ms. Avery mentioned she has become accustomed to the noise, lights, rumble strips. What she isn't going to be accustomed to is the noise 24 hours a day, 365 days a year from the condenser system. The condenser system is supposed to go on the other side of the garage and not on their side where they wouldn't hear it. Mr. Avery questioned where will the chillers go? Where will the system drain?

Board brought up that the plan should specify where the chillers go. Ms. Merrill mentioned that the concern seems to be noise, drainage and placement of the equipment/heat pumps. Mr. Bashaw explained the applicant would have to abide by the Town standards, which the Town's people have voted in (i.e., noise ordinance). Mr. Bashaw said that the decibels for noise are measured from the property line. Mr. Avery asked what he could do if there is an issue with noise. Mr. Bashaw explained that if there was a violation with noise they would report it to the Town. They have an approved calibrated tested decimal meter to check noise levels.

Ms. Merrill read the information on the decibels in the C-II (the zone for this area); it is 70 from 9 AM – 9 PM and from 9 PM to 7 AM is 65.

Mr. Gier said that he is not an expert on these systems, but what he has been told it is the same as a typical residential air conditioner. He commented that the Town has noise ordinances if there are any noise issues.

Mr. Tersolo asked how much water comes out of the system. Mr. Gier said it was like typical condensation from an air conditioning system, a refrigeration system.

Mr. Bakie asked about the drain shown on the plan. Mr. Gier responded that it is a roof drain that is directed to the infiltration system. He noted that if there is other runoff they can direct it to the infiltration system too.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to grant Conditional Approval and a condition is that the Engineer has committed as a condition of use would locate the condensers or chillers be placed on the south side of the structure to limit some of the noise that would migrate to the abutters that were present. A condition of use must meet the Town noise standards for any of the equipment for the ice rink. Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

Mr. Gier explained that they are going to need the Board to deny or suggest they need a Special Exception for the use of the garage, as a garage. The existing garage is in the Aquifer Protection District. They are seeking a Special Exception with the ZBA and they request a denial from the Planning Board. If the Board determines that they will need a Special Exception for the use of the garage as an automotive body shop, allowed by Special Exception in the aquifer zone Mr. Greenwood could write that up and they could include it in their application package to the ZBA.

Ms. Merrill questioned whether the garage is no longer grandfathered? Mr. Gier said the grandfathering has expired and the applicant would like to seek the Special Exception.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw that the Planning Board needs to direct the Applicant to seek a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the applied for use. Seconded by, Mr. Padfield. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

Mr. Bashaw added that because it is not grandfathered anymore so we can't tell them what can be done, the applicant will have to request a formal hearing before the ZBA. Mr. Bashaw mentioned this is not in the Planning Boards purview, it would have to go the ZBA and that it will be noticed and abutters notices will be sent about the formal ZBA hearing.

Ms. Merrill explained that when you stop using a use in a zone, there is a certain period of time they can continue that use. If they do not continue the use within that period of time and they don't apply for a continuance of the use during that time that use runs out.

Public comment closed at 7:57 PM.

<Board note: This hearing ended at 7:57 PM.>

BOARD BUSINESS

Correspondence Cont.:

- 1) **Voluntary Lot Merger request** – Nicholas and Lyndsey Delp, 1A (R23-12) and 3 (R23-11) Halfmoon Lane. R23-12, 1A Halfmoon is .215 ac. And R23-11, 3 Halfmoon Lane is .168 ac. Ms. Merrill said that they are making 2 non-conforming lots more conforming.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to approve the Voluntary Lot Merger which would merge Tax Map R23 Lot 11 and R23 Lot 12. Seconded by, Mr. Bakie. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

- 2) **Civil Construction Management, Inc. invoice** dated 08/30/2023 re: 249 RT. 125, R40-15&16 for Summit Distributing, Inc. site plan engineering review - \$825.

The Board approved this invoice.

- 3) **Application for Business Occupancy Permit** request – Daniel Mastroianni, Church Street Antiques & Gifts at 14 Church St. came before the Board on April 18, 2023 to inquire about changing the office building to having an antique shop on the 1st floor and an apartment on the 2nd floor. They met with the former building inspector and fire inspector to make sure they had a plan in place for how they were going to meet all the ordinances. At this time the Board determined that no further action was to be taken by the Planning Board and they were referred to the HDC and Building Dept. Mr. Greenwood brought up to the Board that there is no site plan for the structure. The office building to the antique store isn't a problem. He noted that there is a request for an addition of the apartment in a commercial structure that there isn't a site plan review on. He said if the Board is comfortable with what was said in April, he is fine with it, but wanted to clarify it knowing there is no site plan review and a new use in the structure. Mr. Bashaw commented that the Board already voted on this and the person made decisions based off that vote, no further action was needed, if the Board is having reservations on the changes, it would be inappropriate to go back and revisit that in this case. In the future if the Board encounters the same exact situation it is important to discuss it on the record that moving forward and the same circumstance is encountered that there may actually be a requirement for a site plan review. But in this case we were going off of the

information we had at the time which did allude to the apartment over the business we need to stand by the Board's decision in April. Board members agreed.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to reaffirm the decision that was taken on April 18, 2023 in regards to Mr. Mastroianni's application or intentions for 14 Church Street. Seconded by, Mr. Bakie. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

- 4) **Application for Business Occupancy Permit** request – Sohil Patel, Indian Food Distributors (wholesale supplier) at 34 RT. 125, Unit 7, The Fieldstone project.

Ms. Merrill brought up that this is going into a condominium in the condo complex and that there isn't some of the information that may be supplied in a letter but it is a Business Occupancy Permit form that they have filled out correctly. It doesn't include some of the information the Board usually will receive in a letter (i.e., # of employees), we may want to look into adding this information to the form. The Board discussed that based on the information provided for this application that this is an allowed use in the C-III zone.

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to approve the application for the Business Occupancy Permit based on the limited information on the form. Seconded by, Mr. Bakie. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (5-0-0)

- Application for Business Occupancy Permit process –

The Board discussed the process on how to handle these requests. Ms. Merrill said many times a letter is sent to the Board explaining what they are proposing with some details about the business and the Board can take a vote on this information. If it doesn't comply then the Board may request that a site plan is done or request more information on it.

The Board discussed updating the form to include more information that would be required for someone opening a new business (i.e., # of employees, hours of operation, adequate parking, hazardous materials, etc.). In the meantime, until a new form is completed, the information can still be requested to accompany the application form.

The Board discussed that the process for handling the Application for Business Occupancy will be submitted to the Building Inspector for review and approval. If the Building Inspector determines that additional information is need to make a decision on it he can refer it to the Planning Board for review and approval, thereafter, it will be returned to the Building Inspector for final approval. The forms should be completely filled out by the applicant, including the site plan review date where applicable. Ms. Merrill mentioned that if the site plan was approved then that pretty much says that you don't have to come to the Planning Board because it is already approved as long as they comply with it.

- Joint meeting with the HDC is on October 3rd to discuss compliance with ordinances and also look at how to streamline the processes.

- Mr. Greenwood is drafting language for the proposed changes to ordinances previously discussed by the Planning Board and will bring to the October 3, 2023 meeting.

[AI. 1-09.19.2023].

- **Zoning calendar for the 2024 Warrant Articles** – Ms. Carter to look into when this calendar will be available. Discussed that the Citizen Petition Articles are usually due in December and deadlines set are statutory deadlines. **[AI 2-09.19.2023]**

Approval of the June 6, 2023; August 1, 2023; and August 15, 2023 Minutes:

Motion made by Mr. Bashaw to accept the 06/06/2023; 08/01/2023; 08/15/2023 minutes as written. Seconded by, Mr. Bakie. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed. (6-0-0)

- Mr. Greenwood brought up a letter sent to the Planning Board and the ZBA from Camp Lincoln. They would like to add two new cabins. He asked the Board what they would like to see from Camp Lincoln. The Board would like to see completed engineered plan showing the location of the new proposed cabins. Mr. Greenwood to advise Camp Lincoln that the Board would like to see updated engineered plans. **[AI 3-09.19.2023].**
- Look into scheduling a joint meeting in November with the ZBA for Camp Lincoln and a potential application for a lot line adjustment that needs to go to the ZBA first. **[AI 4-09.19.2023].**

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Merrill declared the meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

****Next Public Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 3, 2023. Subject to change.****