

**Town of Goshen  
Planning Board  
Minutes of December 12, 2013**

Members Present: Doug O'Clair, Chair; Chip Ball; Bob Bell; Alicea Bursey; Allen Howe; Ed Peckham

Chair O'Clair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Robert and Carol Dombrowski**

The Board reviewed a conceptual subdivision proposal presented by Tom Dombrowski for a simple subdivision of approximately 11 acres into two building lots. The parcel of land is at the end of a Class VI road which is considered to be a discontinued road.

Mr. Dombrowski stated that when a road is discontinued, the land over which the road was laid out becomes reverts back to the abutting properties. There is a provision in the zoning ordinance to allow two building lots access off one driveway; but in this case, the lots would have no frontage on a public right of way.

Chair O'Clair commented that the Board would need to obtain consult town counsel regarding the legality of approving a subdivision on a discontinued road. He advised Mr. Dombrowski that if such a subdivision is feasible, the applicant would need to obtain a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance from the 175' road frontage requirement prior to applying to the Planning Board for subdivision.

Mr. Howe commented that there is a Town policy that was adopted by the Board of Selectmen regarding building on a Class VI and discontinued roads. He is not sure what the policy states, but that also would be something to look into.

Mr. Dombrowski stated that he will check the Town's website for the policy in addition to researching the documentation on the discontinuance before he proceeds with the subdivision. He will be back in touch with the Board at a later date when he is ready to proceed.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Proposed Zoning Amendments for 2014**

Chair O'Clair appointed Mr. Howe as a voting members in the absence of George Hebert.

Chair O'Clair opened the meeting to the Public Hearing on the Proposed Zoning Amendments for March 2014. He explained that one of the duties of the Planning Board is to create and periodically amend the Zoning Ordinance for the Town as needed. The purpose of this public hearing is to gather input from the public regarding the proposed zoning amendments. After consideration of public input, the Board will discuss the amendments and vote whether or not to present the amendments to the voters. If substantial changes to the language an amendment are deemed necessary by the Board, it is required that a subsequent public hearing be held to discuss the newly reworded amendment. If no substantial changes are made, then the amendment will move forward the 2014 Town Meeting ballot.

Chair O'Clair explained the protocol for the public hearing and explained the first amendment.

Amendment 1 proposed by the Planning Board:

*Light Commercial District Section III Article A.3*

*There shall be a light Commercial District extending from Newport town line on Route 10 to the Lempster town line on Route 10, extending back from the road 500 feet or to the existing properly line, as of the date of passage of this amendment (March 2014), whichever is less. All activities allowed in Tourist Related or Residential-Agricultural Districts shall be allowed in this District.*

Chair O'Clair explained the reasons for this proposal is to isolate the Light Commercial District in one area. Route 10 is where the existing Light Commercial District lies and where the bulk of activity happens, so it make sense to expand the existing district rather than have it enter the residential district.

Peta Brennan asked if the expansion of the district will impact the property taxes on the effected properties.

Chair O'Clair stated that property taxes will only be effected if the property owner builds or makes changes to their property that would affect their assessment. This would be an overlay district, and any new light commercial activity would have to go through the site plan review process.

Linda Janicke asked for the definition of Light Commercial.

Chair O'Clair explained that the definition of Light Commercial is in the zoning regulations, and it was read aloud. This intent of this proposed amendment is to keep the light commercial activity focused in one area.

John Scranton commented that when entering the Town of Goshen from Newport, there are very attractive properties which introduce the Town. Those residents have put alot of time and effort into making their properties attractive. To allow light commercial activity in those areas would be a disservice to the residents and the Town.

Jim Carrick asked how these proposed changes relate to the Goshen Master Plan. He felt the amendments were "somewhat contrary" to the spirit of the Master Plan.

Chair O'Clair commented that the Master Plan is subject to interpretation. Town Counsel was consulted and he saw no issue with proposing these amendments. If the voters don't approve of the amendments, then they will not pass the March vote. He reiterated that this amendment, if passed would not eliminate the requirements for site plan review or provide lighter regulations; it would just lessens the steps required to for approval/denial.

Mr. Howe commented that the survey for the Master Plan was fairly evenly split on this particular issue.

Mr. Carrick commented that there are areas of Route 10 and Brook Road that are designated as flood plain under FEMA.

Chair O'Clair stated that this would be an overlay district not intended to override flood plain restrictions. Building is not allowed in a federal flood plain. Any development would be considered on a case by case basis.

Amendment 2 proposed by the Planning Board:

#### *Recreational District Section III A.4*

##### *A.4 Recreational District*

*There shall be a Recreational District to accommodate the needs of year-round recreational and other uses within the leasehold area of t. Sunapee Resort and adjoining lands. More specifically, the purpose of this district is to: (a) provide for the base and on-mountain facilities necessary to operate the ski mountain; (b) encourage the use of the facilities and site for year-round recreational and cultural uses and activities; and (c) allow for commercial and other uses.*

##### *A.4.a District Boundaries*

*The boundaries of the Mt. Sunapee Recreation District are defined as the area where the Mt. Sunapee Resort leased from the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development ("DRED") as referenced in the lease signed on April 30, 1998 and effective on July 1, 1998, and including all of the land shown on the Town of Goshen Tax Map 411 as Parcels 010, 013,015,024,025, and 011 and on Tax Map 412, Parcel 32.*

##### *A.4.b. Uses Permitted (subject to site plan review approval by the Planning Board)*

*A.4.b.1 Chair and surface lifts, and gondolas;*

*A.4.b.2 Alpine and cross country ski trails, hiking biking and snowshoe trails;*

*A.4.b.3 Bas lodge facilities to accommodate lift ticket sales, ski and bicycle repair, rentals, sales and accessories; ski and bicycle lockers/employee locker room; ski school and ski patrol facilities; restaurant/lodge/banquet facilities/snack bar sales; meeting facilities; offices and*

*facilities ancillary to the Mt. Sunapee Resort including recreational, real estate sales and rental offices cultural and educational programs; and parking lots;*

*A.4.b.4 Ski racing facilities;*

*A.4.b.5 Snowmaking facilities;*

*A.4.b.6 Outdoor ski and bicycle storage facilities;*

*A.4.b.7 Inline skating and skateboard park;*

*A.4.b.8 Recreational uses and facilities including, but not limited to, parks playgrounds, play fields, tennis and volleyball courts, swimming pools, and ice rinks;*

*A.4.b.9 Special community events;*

*A.4.b.10 Daycare centers/nurseries for recreational activities, day camps and child care services;*

*A.4.b.11 Temporary structures/tents to accommodate cultural, recreational, educational or commercial uses;*

*A.4.b.12 Accessory buildings for maintenance equipment, water treatment and storage, and other storage needs accessory to the principal recreational uses;*

*A.4.b.13 Public utility and public service structures and service; wastewater treatment facilities and portable water wells;*

*A.4.b.14 Any use permitted in the Residential/Agricultural District; and*

*A.4.b.15 Tourist related services, as defined in Section II of the ordinance.*

#### *A.4.c. Uses Permitted by Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review by the Planning Board*

*A conditional use permit issued by the Planning Board as well as site plan review will be required for the following uses by the application of flexible zoning to assure that the use is appropriately located within the district and serves the purposes of this district and has no adverse effect upon the character of the area in which the proposed use will be located, the highway and sidewalks or use thereof located in the area town services and facilities:*

*A.4.c.1 Toboggan, luge, and bobsled runs; alpine slides;*

*A.4.c.2 Equestrian facilities;*

*A.4.c.3 Water slides and water parks;*

*A.4.c.4 Miniature golf and golf driving range;*

*A.4.c.5 Other structures or uses ancillary to the operation of the principal recreational uses; and;*

*A.4.c.6 Structures or uses permitted under Section III.A.1 of the Goshen Zoning Ordinance with alteration of frontage setback, height, number of dwelling units per building or other density limitations otherwise provided in his Ordinance Instead of a special exception or variance fro the Zoning Board of Adjustment be required for such an alteration, the Planning Board in this district may determine by grant of a conditional use permit that the flexible application of one or more of those limitations should be made in order to accomplish the purposes of this district, provided that the use and structures are appropriately located within the district.*

*In granting such conditional use permits, the Planning Board may impose such reasonable conditions as it deems necessary to implement the purposes of this district.*

A.4.d. Uses Not Permitted:

*Prohibited uses within the Mt. Sunapee Recreational District include:*

A.4.d.1 *Golf course and associated facilities; and*

A.4.d.2 *Motorized Dirt Bike and/or Motor Cross tracks.*

A.4.e Steep Slope and Clear Cutting Exceptions for Trails

*Notwithstanding any other provision of this Ordinance, the Planning Board may grant approval of clear cutting for maintenance, development of new trails, or widening of existing trails, and installation of lift structures and snow-making equipment on steep slopes if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board through the Site Plan Review provided that: (a) the slope shall be stabilized both in the short term during construction and for the long term after construction to minimize soil erosion and thereby minimize the potential negative impact on downstream water resources; (b) new or expanded trails will not damage old growth forests; and (c) erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be prepared ad designed in accordance with the standards and specifications outlined in the Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Urban and Developing Areas in New Hampshire.*

A.4.f Scenic Ridgeline and Hillside Overlay Provision

*Chairlifts, Towers, and equipment required for their operation are exempt from Section III M Scenic Ridgeline and Hillside Overlay Provision of the Goshen Ordinance.*

Chair O'Clair explained that currently Goshen does not have a Recreational District Overlay. This ordinance would streamline the application activity from Mount Sunapee to one Board, the Planning Board, instead of two Boards, the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the Planning Board. There are currently no plans for expansion at Mount Sunapee, but in the event there were changes proposed, this ordinance would provide one set of rules for the applicant to follow. This ordinance mirrors the Recreational District Ordinance used by the Town of Newbury for Mount Sunapee in order to maintain consistency. Tim Mueller, owner and Jay Gamble, General Manager have both stated that there are no plans for expansion at this time. If anything was to happen, it would be three to five years out since there are no active applications applied for at a State level. This ordinance will benefit the Town by saving time and expense on both sides, as well as streamlining the information to one venue. The criteria that currently need to be met for the Zoning Board of Adjustment is written into the proposed ordinance to be overseen by the Planning Board. This change, if enacted, will not bring revenue into the Town unless there is development.

Bea Jillette commented that recreational activities could be desired by private home owners on Brook Road and wanted to know why the proposed ordinance did not include those properties.

Chair O'Clair explained that he did not want to change the zoning for private land owners.

Ms. Brennan asked why the requirement to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment is left out if all the criteria is the same.

Chair O'Clair explained that there is no loosening of the regulations, just stream lining to one board. There is no change in the height, setback, density etc requirements.

Mr. Peckham clarified that this ordinance provides the applicant with one set of guidelines to follow instead of two.

Ms. Brennan asked if there were condominiums planned for the future.

Chair O'Clair stated that nothing has been proposed at this time - the economy cannot justify building condos.

Mr. Howe explained that other districts in the ordinance do not recognize activities of ski areas. The purpose of this ordinance is also to identify and recognize those different types of uses. The Masterplan refers to acknowledging a recreational district as having an existing use which is unique and should be identified. There is a basis for the district in the Masterplan, but he commented that in his opinion, this proposal goes beyond what is necessary.

Mr. Carrick commented that he participated in the creation of the Masterplan on the outset. The early stages of the Masterplan recognized a recreational district to be contained within the existing State-owned boundaries, not "adjoining lands."

Mr. Howe commented that the focus group session for the Masterplan ended the recreational district with existing boundaries. He stated that he believes the Town should have a recreational overlay district for Mount Sunapee, but not beyond the existing state boundaries. A contingency clause should be added to the proposed amendment to tie the recreational district boundaries in to those of the state-owned lands in the event that the State should acquire additional land in the future.

Mr. Carrick commented that he feels the ordinances should not limit the Town's control over future development.

Chair O'Clair stated this is not about a proposal for development, but to streamline and recognize the unique use of Mount Sunapee and provide a method of control.

Gary Janicke asked how much land Mount Sunapee owns in Goshen.

Jay Gamble, General Manager of Mount Sunapee, explained that there is 656 acres total, 275 acres are in Newbury. Some of the land is taxed ad valorem, some is taxed under current use. He explained that shortly after becoming the General Manager at Mount Sunapee, he received a call from the Planning Board Chair in Newbury informing him he was operating a business in the residential district; and therefore, they should work together to create a district recognizing the unique business. It was an opportunity for the Town to say what they want and what they do not want in the district. The owners/operators of the Mount Sunapee agreed to those conditions. He commented that he does not know of another business in the State of NH that the Town's regulations do not acknowledge. Goshen is still silent on the existence of this business. Due to

the nature of this multifaceted business development and current land use policy, it makes sense to proceed under conditional use permitting in front of the Planning Board. Every five years, Mount Sunapee provides a Masterplan. The most recent Masterplan proposes one expansion with very specific criteria. If the expansion is approved, the relative land would be deeded to the State of that it would become State land and be under the purview of the Recreational Overlay District. Each time Mount Sunapee goes to the Newbury Planning Board, it presents and amended Site Plan Review outlining only the changes/alterations it seeks since the prior application. The Mount Sunapee land in Newbury is all State owned and does not allow residential use.

Gigi Schendler asked Mr. Gamble to explain the history of Okemo Mountain vs. Mount Sunapee. She commented that she heard a statistic that only 15% of property owner can afford to live in Ludlow due to the development of Okemo.

Mr. Gamble explained that historically, water and mills became the basis for development. It is a known fact that businesses that are located closer to the resort thrive more than those further away. He commented that he does not think that statistic is accurate.

Ms. Brennan asked who would provide the municipal services if the area was expanded.

Mr. Gamble explained that those issues would be negotiated between the business and the Town. The most recent Masterplan contains an economic study which proves a net gain for the municipality.

Mr. Carrick commented that he could see that there could be a short term positive economic impact, but in the long term, it will cost the town more.

Mr. Gamble explained that Okemo established an enterprise fund for the Town which is designed to provide a revolving fund and is refreshed annually, used at the discretion of the Town.

Mr. Howe commented that he feels this proposal goes far beyond what the Goshen Masterplan intend. The potential expansion land should be eliminated from the proposal and the proposed amendment reworded to include the additional land if and when the existing land is expanded.

Linda Janicke commented that Newbury did not include private lands in their Recreational District. This allows the recreational area to have things other property owners cannot under the same process.

Ella Winkler asked what is the benefit of changing the process of the applicant going in front of the Zoning Board of Adjustment and then the Planning Board. There must have been a reason for being required to go to both Boards.

Chair O'Clair reiterated that it is very cumbersome for the Town and for the applicant. This would streamline the information and provide one set of rule to follow.

Jolyon Johnson commented that he appreciated the notification of the proposed amendments. He stated that he sees two differences in the proposed Goshen ordinance from that of the existing Newbury ordinance. 1. The Newbury ordinance is limited to the leasehold area only; and 2. Newbury does not have anything pertaining to housing. He commented that it would be very premature to address/create a housing cluster away from supportive utilities, which is also not consistent with the Masterplan. The ordinance should be kept small and limited as a starting point.

Mr. Bell clarified some issues. He stated that he did meet with Mr. Gamble and believes that the Recreational District should be restricted to state boundaries. Whether or not to extend the overlay district into privately owned land is an issue that will take more time and investigation to come to a fair proposal. Since there is no rush for development of the private land, then he suggested to eliminate the "adjoining lands", vote on the amendment, and in the next year or so, research the ramifications of including "adjoining lands", it can always be added at a later date.

Gary Stanfield commented that after listening to the testimony tonight, it seems as though there are a lot of problems with this amendment. He commented that this amendment does not agree with the Masterplan; it does not "mirror" Newbury's working ordinance since Newbury only includes State-owned land; this amendment seems to create spot zoning. Spot zoning being changes made in regulations that benefit a small group of people, which is illegal. He expressed support for the amendment if it only incorporates State-owned land. He submitted his proposed changes in writing - to eliminate "adjoining lands"; end paragraph A.4.a after '...July 8, 1998.'; eliminate A.4.b.14 and A.4.b.15; and eliminate all of paragraph A.4.c.

Chair O'Clair informed Mr. Stanfield that Goshen's legal counsel advised the Board that this proposed amendment does not fall under the description of spot zoning.

Nancy Marashio, member of the Mount Sunapee Advisory Committee for the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests provided the Board with a letter from SPNHF in support of the overlay district if it restricts the overlay to the ski lease area within the existing Park boundary. The Forest Society originally acquired the lands for protection of the land and for public benefit.

Amendment 3 proposed by the Planning Board:

*Inlaw Apartment Section III Article B.3*

*There shall be only one building allowed for residential purposes on a lot; provided however that the Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant a special exception authorizing a second dwelling unit, either contained within or attached to a single family dwelling or within a detached accessory building on the same lot. In order to grant such a special exception, the board must find, in addition to the other standards contained in this ordinance, that a finding that the following conditions are met:*

- 1. The living space in the second dwelling unit shall not exceed 700 square feet*
- 2. The existing or proposed home is and will remain a single family, owner-occupied structure*



3. *The existing or proposed home is currently conforming to zoning*
4. *The existing or proposed home is currently or planned to be owner occupied*
5. *The property owner states that the occupant of the accessory dwelling unit shall be a family member and that the accessory dwelling unit shall not be used as a rental unit*
6. *The property shall have only one curb cut and driveway*
7. *the accessory unit shares utilities in common with the primary structure*
8. *Evidence of adequate septic capacity*
9. *Adequate vehicle parking and turn-around on site*
10. *That a site plan be approved by the planning board to insure that the accessory dwelling unit does not change the character or negatively impact the neighborhood*
11. *An agreement is signed with the Board of Selectmen with approval conditions and including a restriction that the accessory dwelling unit shall not be used as a rental unit be executed prior to the issuance of a building permit.*

Chair O'Clair explained the purpose for this amendment is to support the need for affordable housing and the growing needs of extended families.

Linda Janicke asked what constitutes "detached".

Chair O'Clair explained that detached would be considered the upstairs of a detached garage or barn that has been renovated into a living space. This amendment is not designed to accommodate two independent dwelling units on one lot. The accessory apartment may be incorporated with new construction (a barn or garage for example) or a renovation of an existing building.

Ms. Brennan asked what impact this ordinance would have on density.

Chair O'Clair explained that there is a maximum square footage allowed in order to address the density issue.

Ms. Bursley commented that this amendment as written is somewhat discriminatory since condition 5 states that the occupant must be a family member.

Chair O'Clair further explained that property owners will need to sign an agreement with the Board of Selectmen acknowledging that the accessory apartment is not to be used as a rental property. There are many buildings already in existence with accessory apartments. Hopefully this ordinance will allow the rest of the homeowners in Goshen the same opportunity.

Mr. Carrick stated that he agrees that the amendment should require the homeowner to provide a written provision in their property deed for all people to be aware.

Chair O'Clair stated that he did not want to force the deed requirement. Such a requirement may put unnecessary expense onto a homeowner to have to rewrite and record their deed. If the property has mortgage, bank approval may also be necessary if the deed is being altered.

Mr. Carrick commented that the Board's priority should be to protect the Town. He asked what is meant by attached lines.

Chair O'Clair stated that the electric would run through the same lines and there would be one septic system. If the home is off grid, then they will not be discriminated against.

Amendment 4 proposed by the Planning Board:

*Steep Slopes Section III Article B.6*

*No building permits will be granted to build buildings on land designated on official town soils and elevation maps as having a slope of 20% - 25% except by Special Exception granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment following presentation of satisfactory evidence that septic, erosion, and access factors will be adequately addressed.*

Chair O'Clair commented that the surrounding area, Goshen included, is a very mountainous area. It is often difficult to find flat pieces of land. As a result, walk-out basement construction is often an option. This amendment tries to eliminate too much restriction on normal building practices.

Mr. Stanfield commented that the Masterplan was written to protect the steep slopes and visual aesthetics of the Town. If the economy is such that there is not a lot of building happening, then there is no reason to relax the existing regulation.

Chair O'Clair stated that many people have requested this change. The existing steep slope ordinance is over restrictive to the building industry in light of more modern building techniques and styles. If the voters don't want to relax the steep slope ordinance, then they don't have to vote for it in March.

CindyPhillips commented that she feels if someone wants the zoning ordinance changed, then they should prepare a petition and present it to the Planning Board at a meeting, not stop the Board members on the street or call them at home individually.

Mr. Scranton commented that the steep slope ordinance was put in place in the 1970's with the assistance of a county engineer. He identified that there is a particular soil structure in this area with a lot of ledge underneath. To reduce the slope requirement would not be good.

Chair O'Clair commented that from personal experience, the soils maps are not 100% accurate.

Mr. Peckham explained that as a Planning Board, the Board is required to review the zoning ordinances and propose changes based on current and existing conditions. Over time, conditions change and our ordinances should reflect those changes.

Amendment 5 proposed by the Planning Board:

*Occupancy Permit Section III Article B.2*

*No new house or apartment shall be occupied until a certificate of occupancy has been issued by the town official or employee designated by the Board of Selectmen.*

Chair O'Clair explained that this is basically a housekeeping amendment. Harry Warburton, Building Inspector, pointed out that under the existing ordinance, if someone sells their house, the buyer cannot move in until they receive a certificate of occupancy. This amendment would pertain to new construction and/or apartments only.

Amendment 6 proposed by the Planning Board

*Density Requirement Section III Article B4*

*Three apartments or units for permanent or temporary residents shall be the maximum allowed for any one building except when a Special Exception has been granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment following satisfactory evidence that septic, parking, and access factors will be adequately addressed. In no case shall the overall density on the lot exceed three dwelling units per three acres.*

Chair O'Clair stated that this issue was brought up to a Board member. When trying to plan a community, one may try to keep the apartments with the village area. Building lots in the village area are not nine acres, which is what would be required under the density regulations. This would allow an apartment building to go anywhere in town, but apartments are usually located in the village areas where the services are located. The Building Inspector would inspect the units. If there were three units with three bedrooms each, then the septic system would have to be build big enough to accommodate nine bedrooms, per State law.

Mr. Scranton suggested that perhaps this type of housing should be restricted to the light commercial district, whatever that turns out to be.

Mr. Howe suggested that the last sentence should read to state that the minimum lot size for a multifamily dwelling is three acres.

Ms Brennan asked if there would be a height limit.

Chair O'Clair stated that all of the other building requirements remain in force. If the property owner wants to build taller than what is allowed in the existing regulations, then they would need to apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance.

The Board began deliberation on the proposed amendments.

Amendment 1

**Mr. Howe made a motion to delete proposed amendment 1 based on the testimony from the public. There was no second. Motion failed.**

**Mr. Peckham made a motion to place the proposed amendment 1 on the ballot for the March 2014 Town Meeting as written. Ms. Bursey seconded the motion. Majority in favor.**

Amendment 2

Chair O'Clair stated that he agrees with Mr. Howe that there should be a contingency statement added in the event of land expansion and will contact Attorney Waugh for the legal wording.

**Mr. Howe made a motion to amend the proposed Amendment 2 to make the following changes:**

**A.4.c.1 becomes A.4.b.14**

**A.4.c.2 becomes A.4.b.15**

**A.4.c.3 becomes A.4.b.16**

**A.4.c.4 becomes A.4.b.17**

**A.4.c.5 becomes A.4.b.18**

**Delete paragraph A.4.c**

**Delete "...and adjoining lands." in paragraph A.4**

**End paragraph A.4.a after "....July 1, 1998."**

**A clause addressing land within the State owned boundaries only are subject to the recreational overlay district.**

**Mr. Peckham seconded the motion. All in favor.**

Amendment 3

Ms. Bursey commented that criteria 5 should be amended to eliminate the reference that the occupant must be a family member. She commented that she would not be in favor of requiring a addendum to the property deed at this point in time. A written agreement with the Board of Selectmen should suffice. That issue can always be revisited in the future if necessary.

**Ms. Bursey made a motion to amend the proposed Amendment 3 to edit criteria 5 to read: The property owner states that the dwelling unit shall not be used as a rental unit. Mr. Howe seconded the motion. All in favor.**

Amendment 4

Ms. Bursey pointed out that the Masterplan is a guideline, not a law. A small adjustment in the slope could open up alot of land if the economy picks up. On the flip side, she stated that she does not want to create conditions that would result in erosion.

Chair O'Clair commented that the erosion controls on slopes are often overseen by the State and are very thorough.

Mr. Howe commented that this issue could be handled with the process that is already in place.

**Mr. Howe made a motion to delete the proposed Amendment 4. There was no second. Motion failed.**

**Mr. Peckham made a motion to place the proposed Amendment 4 on the ballot for the March 2014 Town Meeting as written. Mr. Ball seconded the motion. Majority in favor.**

Amendment 5

**Mr. Howe made a motion to place the proposed Amendment 5 on the ballot for the March 2014 Town Meeting as written. Mr. Peckham seconded the motion. All in favor.**

Amendment 6

**Mr. Howe made a motion to amend the proposed Amendment 6 to add the following sentence at the end:**

**The minimum lot size for a multiunit residential structure shall be three acres.**

**Ms. Bursey seconded the motion. All in favor.** Discussion followed on Amendment 6 as amended by Mr. Howe.

**Mr. Howe made a motion to strike the proposed Amendment 6 from the ballot this year based on the testimony from the public and discussion by the Board. Ms. Bursey seconded the motion. All in favor.**

Chair O'Clair commented that there were many good questions and issues brought up this evening and the Board should keep a list to review for next year.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Budget**

Chair O'Clair asked the Board for authorization to cut the proposed budget to the minimum in light of the recent tax rate increase. The Board agreed.

**Mr. Bell made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Howe seconded the motion. All in favor.**  
Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Next meeting: January 2, 2014 unless otherwise notified.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Plunkett  
Recording Secretary

Planning Board  
Goshen NH