

**ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL**

Present: Steve Beckert – Chairman, Jeff Duncan, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Dennis Lentz, Melissa Horner – Alternate.

Also present: Kate Pelletier, Planning Assistant.

Absent: Dutch Dunkelberger – Alternate (excused).

**ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE**

**ITEM 4 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES, AS NEEDED**

Mr. Duncan moved, second by Mr. Lentz to approve the minutes of December 2, 2014, as amended.

**VOTE**  
**4-0**  
**Chair concurs**

RECEIVED  
JAN 12 2015  
BY Wendy Rawski,  
Town Clerk

**ITEM 5 – REVIEW “NOTICE OF DECISION” LETTERS, AS NEEDED**

**PB14–19: Zaremba Group – Site Plan Review**

This will be reviewed at the next regular meeting.

**PB14–21: Pierson – Increase size of non-conforming structure in Shoreland Zone**

This was not reviewed.

**ITEM 6 – PUBLIC APPLICATIONS OR PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED**

**A. Continued review of proposed amendments to the Growth Management Ordinance.**

Ms. Pelletier said that she and Mr. Dunkelberger worked on a draft, too, and has copies for the PB.

Mr. Duncan said that, based on the trend, 2015 would have 18 growth permits available. He added that he would like to know what the ten-year average is that the 18 is being calculated on; what the ten-year average is assuming that all 18 are consumed in 2015 if we make no changes and what the impact would be for 2016. He clarified that he was trying to get a flavor for the downward movement in available growth permits.

Ms. Pelletier said that she would get that.

Mr. Whalen said that, in doing some research, he found that the Census Bureau in Maine showed a pretty steady population through 2020 and then it starts to go down from there; that in Eliot (from a website) the population was listed as 6,180 in 2000; that the Census Bureau had us at 6,204 in 2010 (.42% increase); that in 2013 the estimate was 6,246 (.7% increase). He added that the only school population figure he could find was for 2012, which was 2,316 students. He also discussed permits given from 1997 through 2012.

Ms. Pelletier said that she thought some of the numbers Mr. Whalen found were not right; that she went through the Town records to get those numbers and had them on file. She added that the average over 34 years was 29.7 growth permits issued per year.

Mr. Duncan, discussing Mr. Pomerleau's recommendations on the Growth Ordinance, queried that, in the research Mr. Pomerleau has done, Mr. Pomerleau has not found a percent number in a dozen ordinances.

Mr. (Robert) Pomerleau agreed.

Mr. Duncan said that he was surprised because looking at the statute it certainly seemed to him that they are looking for a percentage on top of the ten-year moving average. He asked why our 48, which we originally had, be deemed non-compliant with the law if we have towns out there picking a number per year.

Ms. Pelletier clarified that when the Town ordinance was amended in 2007 that amendment limited it to 105%. She added that that's not to say you couldn't put that number back in there if you wanted to but, right now, we would have to amend it to say something other than 105%.

Mr. Duncan said that he understands but it is just that the State law that our amendment is based on says pick a number as long as it is at least 105% of the ten-year average; that it doesn't say pick a number of growth permits but it sounds like there are a bunch of towns out there that have just picked a number.

Ms. Pelletier said that she honestly thought you could read that language both ways; that she could see both sides of that argument. She added that she was almost in favor of using the percentage as a calculation tool, only, and presenting it as a number to the voters, and what that represents as a percentage based on the last ten years. She said that, if she was writing the ordinance, she would propose that you do not put either in it; that you just put the mechanisms for determining how that number will be arrived at and that way you don't have to keep going back to change it. She added that she would change the year they run on to be the fiscal year instead of the calendar year; that in that way you could present it to the voters at June Town Meeting and have it take effect July 1<sup>st</sup> every year; that, otherwise, you're going to be way behind.

Mr. Beckert discussed the history of this ordinance. He asked if, at the time, we got any clear direction, or asked for any clear direction, from Bernstein & Shur or SMRPC on our consistency with the State law.

Ms. Pelletier said that, at the time, they reviewed the language and we were in compliance with the 105%.

Mr. Beckert said that the 105% was when the problem comes, if it doesn't meet the State guidelines; that they're fine until somebody challenges them. He added that that would all be background information if we wanted to go look at it to see what the discussion was and what the recommendations were from Bernstein & Shur.

Ms. Pelletier said that she has gone back through and she has found nothing that was any help. She added that there was nothing, really, in the 06/07 minutes that shed some light on how we got to where we are; that there was a brief discussion and she thought that it was probably the assumption that 105% was probably pretty safe; that we didn't have the kind of demand we have now for them, and that was probably okay. She said that it wasn't a hot topic at the time.

Ms. Horner said that that wasn't much of a demand because if we were still at that 48 number it would end up being around 32 per year; that if we still had the 48 permits language we still would not have hit that with all this "demand".

Ms. Pelletier said that it could be hard to calculate but agreed we probably would have been okay.

Mr. Pomerleau said that, from his perspective, there is nothing that would have stopped the Town, following the change in the law, at resetting the permits at 48 if that is what they had wanted to do. He added that there is nothing wrong with using a percentage; that either way will meet the conditions of the statute as far as how they instruct you to calculate the number of permits, if you are going to have an ordinance at all; that you have to follow their formula, not their language. He said that, in his opinion, 105% is a safe thing to do when things are relatively stable and precludes having to readjust these things; that when we have recessionary fluctuations there can be a drop in the calculation because of a lower mean and the next thing you know you have 16 permits and 25 people who want to build. He added that, going forward, he thought the most critical piece was the reviewing process, whether you use a percentage or a number. He said that it was designed to be reviewed and recalculated to see if it was doing its job every three years and, if that was done, then he had a method that would work. He said that he truly thought he would find someone that was using a percentage and found it odd that he did not. He added that using a number was more predictable for the Town versus a percentage; that it depended on what the trend was at the moment and how simplistic you want to make it as far as predictability, but either way, he thought the key was to put a sunset provision in it, which will force a review. His suggestion was to use language that the 'number' would revert back to 105% if this was not reviewed within three years.

Mr. Whalen asked if the PB had the authority to set a number autonomously; that when we say 'set', that is really a recommendation that, in turn, goes to the Selectmen and then to the voters.

Ms. Pelletier said that the PB has authority over the ordinance to change it; that what you propose to the Selectmen does not get changed by them; that it just passes through them to go onto the ballot; that the PB does not have the authority to set a number at this point because the ordinance has limited you to 105% of increase based on the last ten-year average. She added that the PB presents the warrant article, itself, to the Selectmen and that goes on the warrant, as written.

Mr. Whalen asked what mechanism, what language, would allow the PB to then recalibrate, if you will, that number without it going to the Selectmen and to the Town; was that within our authority.

Ms. Pelletier said that it can be. She added that her sense from their last discussion was that it was her sense that the PB wanted this to go to the voters on a yearly basis but, if the PB amended it, then that amendment to give the PB flexibility regarding the number of growth permits would go to the voters; that once the ordinance was changed it would not be a change to the ordinance that voters would be voting on but just a warrant article regarding the number of permits – after you change it to give yourselves that flexibility to set a number every year.

Ms. Horner said that she thought that the PB didn't think that was a good idea because of the arbitrariness of a number given to the general public that they don't have anything to base that on.

Ms. Pelletier said that they could give the voters the last three years of numbers as a comparison; that the PB would have to give a rationale for how they arrived at the number.

Mr. (Jack) Murphy said that he has read the PB minutes dating back to September 2006 and found there was no discussion on how it was going to be done but there was a discussion over several meetings that affordable housing was going to be 10% of the number and what that looked like. He added that there was no recognition how the economy might impact the 105% calculation until 2011 when Mr. Pollard made a mention of his concern about being able to put a bottom on it if it got too low; that the Annual Reports only showed the number of permits that would be allowed; that they showed the numbers going down each year but no explanation and no prediction; that furthermore that didn't go before the people to be voted on; that there was no record in the minutes that the PB decided what the number was going to be. He discussed the reason for this limitation of growth control at all established from the possible difficulty of the Town being able to meet the municipal support for growth; that the whole basis is on that and you have to, or should have to, have procedures for this Town every year to look at fire, police, community services and schools in a technical way to try to find trends that may impact these services. He added that, if the Town is okay and can

support, then there is no reason to have any limit at all; that it is just that that is controlling it and that is what the ordinance should have in it somewhere – a process for making this decision with real technical input from those four departments – where is the growth taking place and can the fire department really fight fires and deal with any other emergencies there?; how does residential growth affect the Police Department's budget and their plans for the future? – that that was where he thought there was a lack.

Ms. Pelletier said that, in working on the draft with Mr. Dunkelberger, she did start to address that very thing, which is that lack of procedure and how this number is arrived at. She added that, in the draft, they said something like if you change it to the fiscal year then by January you guys are meeting, or soliciting input somehow, from the department heads to understand the effect of growth on their departments; that that would give you the opportunity to get information from them on a periodic basis in order to make your recommendation; that she wasn't sure what else to put in there to help the PB.

Mr. Beckert said that he thought the Highway Department was a good example; that for instance, they would look at subdivisions that might create the potential for more roads to be taken over in any given year by the Town, which requires plowing, hot-topping, ditching and other maintenance that adds to their need and wear-and-tear on their vehicles, etc. He added that they can quantify that, project what that is going to do to their budget and their need for services because there are formulas for so much a mile to maintain roads.

Ms. Pelletier commented that she wasn't sure how much of that should be in the ordinance.

Mr. Beckert agreed and said that he thought the piece was making sure that that was looked at, at a minimum of every three years. Regarding space in the schools, he knew that for the past few years the school population has been declining; that he thought that each department could quantify what they have and what they are going to need.

Mr. Lentz agreed and said that there was no doubt in his mind that the rationale to develop that number is critical; that in his mind there were two different levels of that rationale – how does the PB sit with those departments that are responsible and the other level is how does the department head calculate, or, what does he use to calculate his input to that; that it is not an easy thing to do.

Mr. Duncan said that, just like the health department has some formula that says a septic tank has to be 'this' size for so many bedrooms, the Police Department has to have something that says they anticipate X number of calls per 100 population, for instance.

Mr. Bouchard asked what we would take for data; would it be, for instance, what is the pressure put on the Highway Department or what are their costs. He asked, in the last ten years, number of growth permits turned into building permits, what was the relationship of that number to the population in Eliot.

Mr. Murphy said that he graphed that all out but he didn't know if they had copies of that; that the population hasn't changed that much – from 6,100 to 6,200. He added that it is the outside financial aspect of the world that enables people to find capitalization for growth; that that is what controls the vigor of the Town and that's why just averaging the ten isn't enough and it is bigger than just the PB. He said that this affects the whole Town and the whole Town wants to be part of this decision; that that's why you take it to them. He asked if the PB was planning to take it to them every year to approve the number chosen and are the Townspeople going to approve it...no; that it has to be shown to them why the number has to be; that he thought that was why you need the Town Manager, and the CEO, with all these records of who has applied and how many have applied who didn't get in, there's a backlog demand; that you have to know that every year and have feedback at the departmental level. He added that that, of itself, would reassure the populace that it isn't just one group who may be slanted, or not.

Mr. Pomerleau said how complex this is or much sophistication you want in projection depends on how much money you throw at it. He added that he did see models on the internet when he was researching this; that if you had a full-time planner, someone trained and skilled, he would probably have this on his computer; that they do calculations – how many households, how many children, so, for Eliot, what is the average cost to the police per household. He said that the biggest impact in almost all communities is growth in schools and that is what growth ordinances were targeting, as far as affordability with school growth and we all know, that here, school growth is declining and is projected to be for the next 20 years. He added that, in a small town like Eliot, he didn't believe it needed to have a high level of sophistication but did need to be a Town-wide, collaborative effort to arrive at some number that appears to have some sense of reasoning behind it. He said that it might be as simple as, for example, have 40 houses per year for the next five years, so, 200 houses and what is the average value per household with one child per household; if that were projected growth, how does that impact the schools, the Police Department, or Public Works. He added that that was why, in some of the ordinances he saw, they actually allowed unused permits to be carried forward and put a cap on it; that if that was based on a 5-year plan what difference would it make if it was 20 in year one and 40 in year two if we were still headed toward that 5-year objective without the precision number each year. He discussed how he suggested controlling that so that they would always sit level with the base number. He suggested that if they had had something like this with the current ordinance it wouldn't have been as devastating as it has been because all those unused permits would have been coming forward to some degree and that average wouldn't have dipped so low.

Mr. Whalen asked what it took for this PB to hold a public hearing.

Mr. Beckert said that the PB can call a public hearing to get input.

Ms. Pelletier said that, if he is talking about the issue in general, the Town has had hearings through the Selectmen on this to discuss the issue.

Mr. Beckert said that, for an ordinance change with a final draft, the PB is the entity that holds the official public hearing that meets the legal requirements on any land use ordinance change, period. He added that the Selectmen have an informational public hearing and that is all that is.

Mr. Whalen asked about an unofficial hearing.

Mr. Beckert said that they could at any time they wanted to.

Mr. Whalen asked if there was any merit in engaging the public.

Mr. Beckert clarified that the Selectmen called two before we got to this point.

Ms. Pelletier said that that was how we got here; that they had two to discuss it generally; that it was initiated by people who were upset coming to the Selectmen and, through the Town Manager, she thought he wanted to get us in on what people were feeling.

Mr. Whalen asked if they were well-attended.

Ms. Pelletier said that they were; that there were people in attendance who were upset and people who wrote the ordinance 35 years ago.

Mr. Murphy agreed that was how he found out there was a problem; that that was why he dug into it and did all those calculations, developed a history, and the graph of what has actually occurred and, if nothing happens, what is going to occur out in the future.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought we could all agree that there needs to be a process to develop the rationale behind the number; that, for one, it will be good for the Town and, secondly, people will believe what we are saying. He asked if that whole process have to be part of the ordinance.

Ms. Pelletier said that she thought they needed a framework, at least; that she would propose something very general based on something reasonable, gathering this input; that the PB is laypeople and it isn't supposed to be that technical of an ordinance that no one can ever administer it. She added that framing it to take input from the department heads, from the Town Manager, coming up with a rationale and reason for the people, have a public hearing, get their thoughts on it, put it in a warrant article and present it; that she thought that was the best they could do. She agreed with Mr. Pomerleau that if you don't have a ton of money behind you to do all these complicated studies, then you have to rely on the department heads to be able to make those calls for you; that that was part of their job, to make those determinations. She said that the ordinance is silent on several things that are the elephants in the room and they just need to be addressed.

Mr. Duncan said that, in looking at the existing ordinance, it says we should be having these discussions at least every three years; that he also goes back to the November vote that said the majority of the voting public didn't want any change.

Mr. Beckert said that they didn't want the one we presented to them.

Mr. Duncan did not agree; that if we are going to come up with a change we need to recognize that a change is being asked for by what he considered to be a small minority of the adult community in this Town and the majority of those that voted said that they don't like change; that we needed to keep that in mind as we discuss this.

Mr. Bouchard said that, in his opinion, the ordinance doesn't need to be changed; that what he thinks the PB needs to do is come to a number, as a Board, or with the public, Mr. Pomerleau, Mr. Murphy, or whoever wants to participate, a reasonable number that we think will work and changing the percentage a little bit so that the numbers come out right and, then, bring the departments in and see if they could live with that number for two years, or three years, one year, but have it set up to let it be voted on and if it passes, it passes; if it doesn't, it doesn't; that we go back to where we were; that if it does pass and if, in two or three years it isn't reviewed again, then it goes back to 105%. He said that that was just an idea he was throwing out there because we can get all the data and make our heads spin; that we can make this as complicated as we want and he thinks we are starting to do that.

Several PB members agreed.

Mr. Murphy said that he thought the emphasis should be on adding two words – 'or more', which were omitted and part of the original State law. He added that he thought it might have been presented wrong in November; that it was sort of presented to give management more leeway in doing kind of whatever they wanted to do; that they should have said to make our ordinance agree with the statute.

Mr. Duncan disagreed; that the State statute says the Town shall choose a number, which is 105% or more; that it doesn't say that the town ordinance shall say 105% or more but telling us we need to find a number – 105%, 106%, 172%, 7, 430% if you want – but it's a number that is more than 105%. He added that it doesn't want us to put 'or more' in our ordinance.

Mr. Beckert said that, in playing the devil's advocate, if we fix our ordinance so that we interpret the ordinance, and this board governs the ordinance, so that, we, this Board, picks a number, 105% or more of the ten-year running average, then we don't have to go back to the Town for anything after we've changed it so that it is in concert with that.

Mr. Duncan said that his concern was that if you put the words 'or more' in there then some Board is going to choose a gazillion % and you are going to have complete Town build-out in one year.

Ms. Horner said that our zoning protects us from that.

Mr. Duncan said that there is a maximum build-out in Town; that all 3-acre lots can be built on; all ¼-acre lots can be built on; all 1-acre lots can be built on; that there is a maximum number, which is full build-out.

Mr. Pomerleau agreed that the statute did not require you adopt their language; that it's structured in how you calculate your ordinance. He added that the problem with using 'or more' is that the voters just voted that down and they voted it down because it is clear that that, then, would allow the PB to arbitrarily set any number without it going to the voters for approval. He said that, right now, if you put 200% or 40, either way, and you put no sunset provision, it remains that way until you do another amendment and, then, the amendment would have to go to the Town. He added that that is preferable to 'or more' because we know what it is and you can't change it without going back to the voters; that he thought adding the words 'or more' was a complete disaster, all around, and it isn't necessary. He reiterated that the key is the review process; is this working the way we want it to; have we got too few or have too many; that then you are on top of the problem and you do an amendment; that there is no need for the language 'or more' because if you find there is a problem you amend it.

Ms. Pelletier said that she thought that language needs to be in there but as the floor; that it is to be stated as the minimum as 105% or more; that it can't go below that. She reiterated that that needs to be stated as a minimum, not a maximum and, then, you put in the language about how you arrive at the maximum, however that may be. She added that she didn't think you should actually have a number in the ordinance; that it is very expensive to amend an ordinance; that if you put the process in there that involves the voter in it on a however many years basis you want, that's the protection and, then, they still get the input, you just don't have to change the ordinance every time; that you're just voting on a warrant article for how many growth permits are available.

Mr. Murphy said that the trick here, though, is this ten-year averaging; that that reacts very quickly to an increase; that we want to increase it rather rapidly for the next few years but we don't want it stuck up there because it may suddenly go right up; that you want to be able to move it rapidly and he thought that three years was too long for the next several years; that we had to watch very closely the recovery from this depression we are in now – this storm anchor that is holding us down and will hold us down for a ten-year period if we do nothing about it.

Ms. Pelletier suggested requiring a review on a yearly basis and, then, to be put to the voters at least every three years; that then you could actually have the growth review on a yearly basis, even if you didn't act on it by proposing anything to the Town.

Mr. Murphy reiterated that it was bigger than this Board and that is why you should involve the Town – the Town Manager, etc.

Mr. Beckert said that he thought all that needed to be in the ordinance was wording that the PB pulls in the appropriate departments and it is within the Town to arrive at the number; that he didn't think you had to name the departments in the ordinance.

Mr. Whalen said that he thought the term 'growth ordinance' was sort of an oxymoron in the sense that, if one believes that growth is predicated on a population influx for, again, increase and one feels that the result of that is negative in nature to the quality of life or the ability of the community to sustain itself, then you have to look statistically at what's going on – to, really, take a global approach to this. He added that he knows we are just a small blip on the radar but, in fact, for populations and countries to sustain themselves it is common knowledge among the demographers that a household unit has to be reproducing itself to the rate of a minimum of 2.1 persons per household in order to sustain current survivability. He added that there are only two countries in the western world that sustain themselves at that rate and none of the familiar countries are included in that, not even the US; that all of these countries are being faced with the fact that their reproductive rates are not sustained in the population. He said that the net result of that is – just look to China because China is a classic example of what happens when a country doesn't sustain itself; that since 1995, China's economy has been in the tank; that they have had deflation because there aren't enough people that are, in essence, creating an environment in which there is economic and social sustainability. He added that the US rate is 1.9 and the only salvation that the US has in the world today is that we have an immigration policy that allows that number to rise above the 1.9. He suggested that Eliot, as part of that population moving in and out of a community, would be inundated over the next 3, 5, 10, 50 years. Mr. Whalen said that he thought growth ordinances are the absolute antithesis of what a democracy is all about; that he knew this community was probably not going to get to the point where they were going to 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' because they've got it and that's the way it's going to be; that it was totally unnecessary, in his opinion, and the community would be much better off without it. He added that you can try to do all the central planning you want and you can try to maneuver the statistics but that old adage 'figures lie and liars figure' are just going to permeate the process; that there was no right way to do this to come up with a number that will ever work for anybody all the time; that there are just no absolutes in what you are attempting to do.

Ms. Horner said that she thought that was a philosophy; that we can explain to the voters why it would work and they will believe us.

Mr. Lentz discussed Ms. Pelletier's question on whether we thought this should be taken to the voters every year; that he thought not only should it be viewed by the voters but do they have a judgment on it and, if so, then that takes us to another step and he doesn't know what the answer to that is. He added that he thought we did say we want the voters to vote on it every year.

Mr. Beckert straw-polled the PB: if we propose a change and we come up with a method to come up with a number, is that your will to take that review and that number back to the voters every year for approval:

Mr. Whalen – no.  
Mr. Duncan – no.  
Mr. Bouchard – no.  
Ms. Horner – no.  
Mr. Lentz – yes.

Mr. Beckert asked another question: of the ones who said no, how often do you want it to go back to the voters:

Mr. Whalen said he would not want it to go to the voters at all.

Ms. Pelletier said that she thought you were going to have to; that you will have to look at it every three years by State statute.

Mr. Duncan said that he thought that three years was a sufficient period of time; that he would like to be able to say that there is a method in place that establishes the limit each year that's generic enough that we don't have to go to the voters every year; that there's a cap on it and we know there's a minimum on it; that there could be a generic method if the Town would agree to trust us to work within that framework to come up with a different number every year without them voting on it every year.

Ms. Pelletier said that what she was suggesting is not you coming up with a different number every year; that she was suggesting you presenting the number, or the number changing, every three years; that the number would stay the same until you change it, so, we could have it go for three years and then present a new number to the voters or present the same number, with rationale.

Ms. Horner, answering Mr. Beckert's poll question, said 3-5 years.

Mr. Bouchard said 3.

Mr. Pomerleau said that the statute says, at a minimum of three years; that it doesn't preclude you, if there is some problem, from doing it sooner than that and amending it then. He added that he didn't think it needed to be done on an annual basis. He said that he thought that a percentage gave you a little less predictability, although Mr. Murphy has a table that you could pretty closely calculate in three years where it ends up; that a flat number makes it real clear and clean. He added that he thought it should be based on a longer outlook because it was hard to predict anything of a financial sense in a short time of a year – impact.

Mr. Murphy said that if you are thinking in terms of the number of growth permits to be allowed then that's what you should probably talk to the people about but, internally, you are going to have to get that number by following the computation required by the statute and that is a percent increase out of the average, which is changing each year, so that you might have a different percentage increase each year in order to maintain a constant number of growth permits.

Ms. Pelletier said that she didn't think that number needed to change every year because the statute says you calculate it at least every three years based on whatever the preceding ten years were; that as long as it is not falling below 10% you are okay.

Mr. Duncan said that, at some point, it would overshoot the demand and start to level off. He added that, once it overshoots, the average would start to pull it back down; that there is always a delay in that system.

Mr. Beckert asked Ms. Pelletier if she had enough input.

Ms. Pelletier said that she did; that she and Mr. Dunkelberger would continue to work on their draft, incorporating the PB's ideas, and present that to the PB at a later date.

The PB agreed.

### **B. Review and approval of 2015/2016 Planning Board budget request**

Ms. Pelletier said that it may be that some things get moved around and it may end up being a lower number.

Mr. Whalen asked how much had been spent, to-date, under Consultants.

Ms. Pelletier said that she was still trying to get a handle on that; that Public Works, Assessing and Planning split a lot of the same costs that have to do with mapping, GIS, etc. She added that she didn't know why this stuff came out of your budget; that we have postage but the BOA doesn't; that it comes out of the Administration budget, as it should. She said that the Town Manager is trying to streamline this a bit and move things around so that number will probably be reduced.

It was the consensus of the PB to approve this request.

### **ITEM 7 – DISCUSS STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS**

This was not discussed.

### **ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANT, AS NEEDED**

**December 3, 2014 memo from the Town Manager regarding 2015/2016 budget requests.**

### **ITEM 9 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING**

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for January 6, 2015 at 7PM.

**ITEM 10 – ADJOURN**

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 PM.

  
Steve Beckert, Chairman  
Date approved: 1-6-15

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary